CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE LEVEL

ESL ADMINISTRATORS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Paula Shipper-Cordaro, B.S., M.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1994

CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE LEVEL

ESL ADMINISTRATORS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Paula Shipper-Cordaro, B.S., M.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1994

Shipper-Cordaro, Paula C., <u>Characteristics of College Level ESL Administrators.</u> Doctor of Education, December, 1994, 93 pp., 23 tables, bibliography, 43 titles.

While many studies have been conducted on the methodology of teaching English, second language (ESL), few have focused on ESL administration, specifically college level ESL administration. This descriptive study analyzed and evaluated the personal and professional characteristics of college level ESL administrators.

The data were collected during the Spring of 1993, in a mailed survey of 247 Head Administrators of college level ESL institutions. Fifty-one percent of the surveys were returned. The data collected found that most college level ESL administrators were female, between the ages 36 and 55. They mostly reported to Academic Deans and were seen as Administrators or Faculty. More than fifty-seven percent had doctorates.

College level ESL administrators felt most confident about their jobs in Student Interaction and least confident in Curriculum Design. Beginning administrators found the areas of Budget and Personnel most difficult. Head Administrators wrote in individual suggestions for specialized training for Head Administrators and special qualities an ESL Administrator should possess. The six general categories suggested for specialized training were: (1) Budgetary and Financial, (2) Staff Development, (3) Aspects of change, (4) Administrative and Management training, (5) ESL curriculum and (6) Cross-cultural issues.

The data showed correlation between six areas. They were: (1) The older the age of the administrator, the longer he or she had been in their present position. (2) The higher the administrator's terminal degree, the longer he or she had been a primary administrator of any ESL program. (3) The larger the ESL program, the more likely the program's director would be considered an administrator.

This study found that ESL Administrators have no consistent professional training backgrounds. Further research is recommended to determine consistent professional standards and ways to improve professional development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank Dr. Howard W. Smith Jr., my Major Professor, for his continued support and friendship throughout the years. Thank you for believing in me when I moved from Texas and needed to begin writing my dissertation. Thank you for the extra effort you gave me in registration, materials, etc. even though I lived in California. Thank you also for challenging me to complete my doctorate against many odds.

I would like to thank my mother, Cheri C. Shipper who always told me I could do any thing I wanted. Thanks for your (subtle) pressure and cajoling, "How is the doctorate coming?"

I would like to thank my father, Edward S. Shipper, for always loving me unconditionally.

Lastly, I would like to thank my wonderful husband, Roy, for patiently word processing all of my dissertation and retrieving research articles from the various national computer data bases. Through several years and countless rewrites, he never quit. His working for American Airlines certainly made it easier to fly back and forth between California and Texas! Thank you for your love and support throughout the entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

GLOSSARY

The following terms were divided into four subheadings and had restricted meaning. They were defined for this study:

Courses

English, Second Language (ESL). English Language programs that feature beginning, intermediate, and advanced level proficiency in reading, writing, listening and speaking English to non-native English speaking clients (Maurice and Pankowski, 1991).

English, Foreign Language (EFL). A term used interchangeably with ESL.

English Language Training (ELT). A term used interchangeably with ESL.

Second Language Acquisition (SLA). A term used interchangeably with ESL.

Bilingual Education (BE). A term used to describe the teaching of English as a Second Language interchangeably at the secondary level and below in the United States school system (Ambert, 1988).

Teaching

Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The act of teaching non-native English speakers in intensive English language courses consisting of reading, writing, listening, and speaking English (Maurice and Pankowski, 1991).

Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). A term used interchangeably with TEFL.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). A term used interchangeably with TEFL.

Instrument

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). The standardized test for placement and promotion with English, second language programs (Maurice and Pankowski, 1991).

Professional Organizations

Administrators and Teachers in English as a Second Language (ATESL). The association of educators engaged in the administering and teaching of English as a second language.

National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). The association of international educators engaged in the teaching of English as a second language.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A national study of English, second language administration at the college level concerned two distinct areas; higher education administration and English as a second language. Both areas were justifiably important in their own right. There have been many dissertations done in each category in the last two decades.

Higher education administration is an area of great interest today not only within academia but to the average citizen. With the current economic recession, citizens are demanding accountability for the actions of state governments and agencies. Citizens are demanding accountability for their taxes being spent within institutions of higher learning.

The financial difficulties affecting higher education today affect both administration and the classroom. Alan Tucker in his 1984 book, *Chairing the Academic Department*, stated the dilemma for higher education administration today:

> The increasing complexion of operating institutions of higher education along with the shrunken budgets, have led deans and other university administrators to delegate more and more tasks to department chairpersons. Thus, it is in the best interest of colleges and universities to ensure that department personnel become as knowledgeable as possible.

Tucker was specific in outlining the roles of academic coordinators or head administrators. In discussing their tasks and duties, there were questions about the amount of training and preparation one must undergo to become

competent as a higher education administrator. Henry Rosovosky, Lewis P. and Linda L. Geyser University Professor at Harvard University, wrote in his book, *The University - An Owners Manual*, "academic administration is a very peculiar art."

If Rosovosky was correct, and one followed Tucker in agreeing to the many tasks and duties of higher education administration, how does one become a proficient administrator of an academic department? For purposes of this national study, the academic departments in which key administrators were questioned were English, second language. English, second language departments are concerned with teaching English reading, writing, speaking and listening to non-native English speaking clients (Maurice and Pankowski, 1991).

English, second language administration at the college level has become a dominant force on college campuses as the number of foreign students and immigrants has increased. The economic climate of America has caused reduced enrollments in indigenous populations and caused recruiters to open larger numbers of slots for foreign students.

Donald M. Taylor from McGill University's 1991 conference on Bilingualism, Multiculturalism and Second Language Learning, charged that changes in immigration policy have caused dramatic increases in the numbers of qualifying immigrants. U.S. Government policy to reunite families, along with greater numbers of Third World immigrants, have increased the influx of immigrants from all countries; specifically the former U.S.S.R. and Southeast Asia. He stated, "As we approach the year 2000, politicians, everyday citizens, and social scientists must confront the challenge of understanding the

integration process, and of forging a social climate where human diversity and harmony can coexist."

The Immigration and Naturalization Act funded by Congress in 1988 and updated in 1990, (Appendix D) has allowed for 131,000 foreigners of different status levels (immigrants, refugees, etc.) to enter the United States each year. Since that time, almost 1,000,000 legal foreigners have moved to the United States. Many of these individuals have a goal of obtaining a college degree. Besides these new Americans, U.S. colleges and universities continue to educate large numbers of foreign students. In 1988 -1989, 69,704 foreign students received a degree at or above the bachelor level as stated in the *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* (1991). In its January 22 1992 issue, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported that 396,588 foreign students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities for the academic year.

Mark D. Rentz of Arizona State University wrote in *Newsweek*, "How we treat foreign students on our campuses can have lasting consequences for our country" (1987). He cited an impressive record of heads of state, diplomatic and other luminaries with degrees from the United States. "Attending to the educational and cultural needs of international students studying in the country is in the national interest" (Rentz, 1987).

All students with English as their second language must pass the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) examination before entering a U.S. institution of higher education. Even after obtaining a passing score, many students continue to take advanced English language and writing courses to improve their skills. English as a second language (ESL) departments at four year colleges and universities are striving to meet the challenge of educating a large and varied population. Few college level ESL administrators have formal

training in ESL and ESL administration. Pennington, author of many books and articles on ESL administration, cited the lack of formal training of ESL administrators as a grave concern in this "emerging profession" (Pennington, 1985). Staczek and Carkin (1984) gave five causes for ESL program disparity. They stated as their first and foremost reason, "The field is relatively young. ESL has yet to gain status enjoyed by older disciplines."

A national study on the background and training of college level ESL administrators in the 1990's is beneficial in assisting the profession in making suggestions for future college level ESL administration programs and professional training. Since a national study has not been completed in the United States since the early 1980's, it is of interest to students, faculty, and administrators involved with college level ESL to have current data as a basis for planning for the next century.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerns the characteristics of college level ESL administration in the United States.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to determine:

1. The demographics of ESL programs in relation to types of program, size, to whom the Head Administrator reported, Head Administrator status within the institution, form of payment for the Head Administrator, usage of a reward or bonus system for the Head Administrator, and the powers who dictated policy for the program.

2. The demographic characteristics of college level ESL administrators at Proprietary, Intensive Language Programs, and Non-Intensive Language

Programs programs with respect to gender, degrees, age, major field of study, professional preparation, amount of time in current position, and amount of time in ESL administrative positions in total.

3. College level ESL administrators' perceptions of aspects of their current positions in which they had the most and least confidence.

4. Perceptions of college level ESL administrators of aspects of their jobs that were most difficult when they were beginning administrators.

5. Forms of professional development which had contributed to the role of ESL administration.

6. Suggestions for specialized training for college level ESL administrators.

7. Suggestions for special qualities an ESL administrator should possess.

Research Questions

To carry out the purposes of the study, the following research questions were asked:

1. Is the program a Proprietary, Intensive Language Program or a Non-Intensive Language Program?

2. What were the sizes of college level ESL programs?

3. To whom did the Head Administrators of college level ESL programs report?

4. What status did the Head Administrators of college level ESL programs have within the institution?

5. How were the Head Administrators of college level ESL programs paid?

6. How long had these college level ESL personnel been employed in their current position?

7. How long had these college level ESL administrators been employed as the primary administrator of any ESL Program?

8. What gender were college level ESL administrators?

9. What were the approximate ages of college level ESL administrators?

10. Was a bonus or reward system for college level ESL administrators set up within the institution?

11. Was the bonus or reward system for college level ESL administrators linked to specific outcomes or results?

12. Who dictated policy at the current institution for the ESL college level program?

13. What were the highest terminal degrees of college level ESL administrators?

14. What were the major fields of undergraduate college study by college level ESL administrators?

15. What were the major fields of graduate college study by college level ESL administrators?

16. What were the professional backgrounds of college level ESL administrators?

17. What were the types of professional development training of college level ESL administrators?

18. What were the areas of their current positions with which college level ESL administrators felt most confident?

19. What were the areas of their current positions with which college level ESL administrators felt least confident?

20. What were the areas of greatest difficulty when they were beginning college level ESL administrators?

21. What were suggestions for specialized training for college level ESL administrators?

22. What special qualities should a college level ESL administrator possess?

Significance of the Study

ESL administration is viewed as "an emerging profession" (Pennington, 1985). Thirty-nine dissertations and Masters theses written on ESL administration were listed in ERIC and *Dissertation Abstracts On-line* as of Fall, 1993. Most of those 39 studies were correlated with the methodology of teaching. Fewer of those were written concerning college level ESL programs. There has not been a national study of ESL administrators since 1982. This study was significant in that it determined and described:

1. The demographic characteristics of college level ESL administrators with respect to gender, age, degrees, major field of study, professional and academic preparation, and professional development training.

2. The demographics of ESL programs in relation to types of program, size, to whom the Head Administrators reported, Head Administrators' status within the institution, form of payment for Head Administrator, usage of reward or bonus system for Head Administrators, and the powers who dictated policy for the programs.

3. College level ESL administrators perceptions of the aspects of their current positions in which they had the most and least confidence.

4. Perceptions of college level ESL administrators on what aspects of their job were most difficult when they were beginning administrators.

5. Possible suggestions for specialized training for college level ESL administrators.

6. Possible suggestions for special qualities college ESL administrators should posses.

Limitations

This study was subject to the limitations recognized in collecting data by mailed questionnaires.

Organization of the Study

This study was divided into five chapters. Chapter One included the statement of the problem, the purposes of the study, the research questions, the significance of the study, the definitions of terms, and the limitations. Chapter Two included a review and summary of literature on college level English, second language administration, foreign college level English, second language administration, and foreign secondary and adult literacy program administration.

The description of the methodology for this study, presented in Chapter Three, included a description of the research design, the instrument, the population, and procedures for sampling, collecting, and analyzing the data. The statistical analysis and interpretation of the findings, based on the research questions, were provided in Chapter Four. Chapter Five included a summary of the study, discussion, conclusions, implications of the study, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provided a background for the study of English, second language administration at the college level. In researching material on ESL administration at the college level, more than 90 per cent of all dissertations, thesis, and documents were found to concern the methodology of teaching. A Fall 1993 review of documents contained in *Dissertation Abstracts On-line* and ERIC, showed thirty-nine Masters theses and dissertations on ESL and Bi-Lingual Education. Of these, five dealt with administrating ESL programs in foreign countries. Only two dissertations published within the last twelve years dealt specifically with United States college level English, second language administration.

The limited literature on U.S. college level ESL administration was supplemented by literature on foreign college level ESL administration and foreign secondary and adult literacy programs. United States ESL administration studies reviewed were divided into three categories: overview of ESL college programs and administration, the departmentalization within the University, and evaluation and self studies.

Domestic Literature
Overview of ESL College Level Programs and Administration

The University of Michigan began the first Intensive English Program (IEP) or known as Intensive Language Program (Intensive Language Programs) in 1941. Barrett (1982) gave a detailed analysis of shared characteristics of those programs. They contained nine distinct features:

First - All IEP's had multilevel programs. They offered study on three levels: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. Most of these levels were then divided further and contained a set of teaching materials and curriculum. Students progressed sequentially to the next higher level (Barrett, 1982).

Second - Some form of standardized testing for initial placement were used. The most widely used were TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), the Michigan test, and CELT (Comprehensive English Language Test). Pankowski and Maurice (1986) advocated using TOEFL for placement and promotion.

Third - Four major language skills were taught: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Grammar classes were usually offered. Students must be equally proficient in each area to move to another level (Barrett, 1982).

Fourth - The IEP was considered a service unit of a college or university and was placed within the academic setting (Barrett, 1982). Depending on the institution, this placement occurred as an individual department, within the Extension division or within a department of English or Linguistics. There were many private (proprietary) institutions set up independent of any institution of post-secondary education.

Fifth - The IEP had a year long program allowing students to progress without long breaks. Students had to complete this process and pass the TOEFL before official admittance to the college or university.

Sixth - The IEP offered from twenty to thirty hours of instruction per week, for a total of 200 or more hours per quarter or semester (Barrett, 1982).

Seventh - Advisement services of academic, social, cultural needs and an initial orientation program were available to students (Barrett, 1982). Pankowski and Maurice (1986) noted that IEP's provided special kinds of student services. Three areas they believed students needed advising were: immigration, academic problems, and personal matters.

Eighth - IEP students were adult learners. They all had high school diplomas and often had degrees from their native country. They were a heterogeneous group with different native languages, countries of origin, and levels of English proficiency. (Barrett, 1982).

Ninth - IEP's were staffed by a director (head administrator) and faculty. Faculty and teachers came to the IEP with different backgrounds and experience in teaching ESL (Barrett, 1982).

Intensive English Programs have been described as a cousin to continuing education's foreign language program (Pankowski and Maurice 1986). They believed the ingredients for success of IEP's largely paralleled those of continuing education. Both required institutional commitment to the program, budgetary stability, and strong connection to integration within the institution. Both contained clearly defined administrative responsibility and a sense of mission.

Selection of students and admission policies were linked to issues of quality and financial efficiency. They note that balancing the student population linguistically and nationally became an important but difficult task. They believed the best IEP's showed awareness and sensitivity to unique needs of students.

The responsibilities of a college level ESL head administrator focused on issues in four areas: (1) program (2) students (3) faculty and (4) administration. Fox (1988) gave a detailed overview of program administration in his paper, *ESL Program Administration in Higher Education*. He detailed each of the four areas listed previously and gave ideas and tips for implementing each area:

1. Program Issues - One of the administrators primary concerns were the establishment and maintenance of the curriculum. An ESL program may include both an intensive and a non-intensive component. In both the intensive and non-intensive components, the administrator was responsible for the selection of the placement test, establishment of the placement options, and placing students at the appropriate level. They were also responsible for ordering the textbooks and selecting initial texts in a new program.

2. Student Issues - Recruitment and retention of students, and the provision of student services were another important element of the administrator's job. The administrator developed the contacts necessary to promote the program and to make it attractive to potential students. An initial English proficiency test was required before any student application was processed. The administrator assumed the availability of support services. They supplied an academic counselor and provided opportunities to meet American students.

3. Faculty Issues - The ESL administrator must be careful to hire only those faculty with qualifications who meet those established by the profession. They ensured that the faculty were paid a salary equivalent to that of other academic departments. The administrator should provide for the development

of faculty and staff development. New faculty and staff should recieve an orientation to the program.

4. Administrative Issues - Among the most important of all administrative concerns was financing. Other administrative concerns included attracting future students and maintaining linguistic and cultural balance within the student body. To whom does the administrator report? How does the program relate to other units on campus? The overriding goal of the ESL Head Administrator was to ensure that international students learn English efficiently and by actively monitoring all aspects of the ESL program (Fox, 1988).

Pennington, speaking at the 1984 TESOL Annual Convention, gave two possible structures for program implementation in her workshop, "Effective Administration of An ESL Program". She stressed the human skills needed to implement ESL programs and addressed current political climates effecting ESL such as low enrollments and priority levels within college administration. She stressed that all ESL administrators must have technical skills training (classroom skills in ESL reading, writing, listening and speaking) to have the full respect of the department (Pennington, 1984).

Departmentalization

In researching college level ESL programs, there were no consistencies in the placement of the ESL programs within the academic community. In "The Departmentalization of the ESL Program" Bolton (1987) reviewed prevailing patterns in the academic sponsorship of ESL programs in colleges and universities. His paper presented the advantages and disadvantages of ESL program affiliation within an English department. Ronnett, Butler, and

Lanier's (1981-1982) "Profiles of Selected ESL Program and Their Staff Conditions" found a pattern. They found that ESL programs in community colleges tended to be organized within English Departments. Where the ESL was intensive, they were typically not in English departments but were self-contained. Staczek and Carkin (1984) stated, "ESL programs - intensive and non-intensive - find themselves in departments of English, linguistics, modern foreign languages , in centers or institutes, as adjuncts to international studies programs, or as occasional coursework in a continuing education operation."

Carey (1986) compiled a survey of thirteen institutions nominated by a publisher of ESL text books. At the eight community colleges responded, two of them had non-departmentally based programs. Of the five universities responded, three had departmentally based programs.

Staczek and Carkin (1984) gave five reasons for an "easily observable distinction between ESL programs and other programs and their collateral departments in the academic mainstream:"

1. The field was relatively young; ESL had yet to gain status enjoyed by older disciplines.

2. Credit for ESL courses was frequently not given.

3. The image of ESL programs, in and of itself, sometimes projected a lack of status. There had been labeling of ESL programs as pre-admission or remedial in character or quality.

4. There was no undergraduate major in ESL.

5. ESL programs and the Faculty who teach them were sometimes seen as gratuitous since teachers were usually native speakers.

Employment conditions were a mitigating factor in where an ESL program is placed. In Ronnett, Butler, and Lanier's (1985) study, salaries where ESL programs were departmentally based were 16.6 higher than in non-departmentalized programs. Governance and involvement in decision making and grievance procedures were often positively correlated with the placement of ESL programs within a department.

Staczek and Carkin (1984) stated a major disadvantage for ESL program placement within a department could be in the distribution of resources. They believed surpluses generated by ESL programs were likely to be consumed by more senior established colleagues.

Bolton (1987) gave five institutional characteristics which should be analyzed in determining the placement of ESL programs:

1. The mission of the institution and the mission of the ESL program.
2. Politics and the distribution of resources.
3. Conditions of appointment and employment.
4. Course Credit.
5. Program Status.

Carkin (1988) detailed Utah State University's process of transforming an intensive language institute to a credit bearing program. He stated:

> The program evolved from an intensive English language institute whose proficiency-granting process became tedious for staff and administrators. As a result, the proficiency exam used was abolished and the program was set up for monitored, gradual, and controlled student passage through intensive English Courses and into the full-time university degree program.

Students admitted to the university were admitted as full matriculated students whether they were in full-time, part-time, or no courses in the Intensive English Language Institute (IELI). From the beginning of the program, academic credit was granted for ESL study. The administration of

the program was moved under the Head of the Language Department. Courses were assigned undergraduate level numbers depending on the level of proficiency (similar to foreign language credit.)

Three objections were raised by the administration within the Language Department to having the IELI contained within their academic unit:

1. Foreign language classes teach higher and more complex grammar than ESL classes.

2. The goal of intensive English studies was to improve access to the literature of a country or culture.

3. ESL should be viewed as having remedial status, because language proficiency is a prerequisite for admission to most universities.

Rebuttals were given for each of the three complaints enough to convince the majority of voting members to vote in favor of accepting the program as full-credit. The IELI staff wrote course curricula which was examined by the university curriculum committee. The English and Foreign Language Departments supported the IELI proposal (Carkin 1988).

Richard L. Daesch's paper, "The General Administration of the IEP" (1982) discussed the variety of "workable administrative relationships within the parent institution." The relationships could be described as autonomous or integrated. He described both of these relationships yet believed there were probably very few totally autonomous or integrated programs. Regardless of the organizational structure, he believed that all students should have the benefit of university facilities, services, extra-curricular activities, and that faculty, staff, and administrators have the capacity to develop professionally throughout the institution:

In short, the conditions which should be met for the effective operations of an intensive English program on a college or university campus are as follows:

1.) There should be a strong institutional commitment to international education on the college or university campus.
2.) The role and scope of the intensive program within the university should be clearly defined.
3.) The intensive program should function as part of the college or university and have ready access to the benefits of association with the parent institution.
4.) The faculty of the intensive English program should have the same rights and privileges as the tenure-accruing departmental faculty at the same institution.
5.) The intensive program should be continuous with a stable base of funding and personnel. (Daesch 1982)

Evaluation and Self-Studies

Brown and Pennington (1986) wrote extensively on evaluation systems for language programs. They offered an overview of the twenty or more evaluation tools utilized by ESL programs at all levels. They stated, "Language program evaluation is not an exact science and requires subjective judgments at many points. It is a multi-faceted, long term process in which many people will be involved". Six categories were listed as procedures for evaluation: existing records, tests, observations, interviews, meetings, questionnaires. The role of the program administrator in developing and implementing the evaluation process was thoroughly discussed. They concluded by offering eight conditions needed for a fair and effective program evaluation.

A novel approach to ESL program evaluation was conceptualized at the University of Southern California during 1975 - 1985 by Eskey, Lacy, and Kraft. Developed at their American Language Institute (ALI), it included both subjective and objective procedures involving the entire university and correlating closely with students' academic programs inside of their language

training. Students were evaluated across the full range of language skills during several phases of their language training. They were compared to non ALI students and between themselves by their GPA's.

The evaluation process at the community college was a collaborative effort. Teachers, students, and the program itself were evaluated by predetermined criteria which were examined and adjusted every year. Teachers met with mentors and program administrators to discuss classroom observations and student data. An individual growth plan was developed dependent on the instructor. Staff development workshops were offered throughout the year (Eichel, 1989).

The most extensive article about any type of evaluation role was written by Pennington and Young (1989). In their "Approaches to Evaluation for ESL", they surveyed the published literature on methods for teacher evaluation with a view to their application in ESL Programs. It assessed the applicability to ESL of seven common faculty evaluation methods: teacher interviews, competency tests, student evaluations, student achievement, classroom observation, peer review and faculty self-evaluation (Pennington and Young, 1989). Each method was assessed in terms of its strengths and limitations in regard to faculty evaluation in general and for TESOL in particular. From their findings, Pennington and Brown felt that there had been little attempt as yet to establish the reliability and validity of specific instruments for student evaluation of ESL teachers.

Pennington and Brown (1989) gave the following guidelines for ESL faculty evaluation:

- The instruments and procedures should be constructed by evaluation specialists sensitive to the nature of the ESL context.
- The instruments must provide opportunities for responses other than

choices on rating scales.
- Students need to be oriented to the content and purposes of the evaluation instruments and procedures.

In discussing the ESL profession in general, Pennington and Brown (1989) believed the viability of the profession rests on the credibility of its practices and its practitioners. They listed the following seven measures to ensure quality in the ESL profession and specifically within ESL faculty evaluation:

1. New instruments and procedures for faculty evaluation, and research on their effects and effectiveness.
2. Sensitivity of evaluators to the contextual factors affecting teaching.
3. Variety in methods and sources of input to faculty evaluation.
4. Active involvement by teachers in the evaluation process.
5. A developmental focus for evaluation integrated within a larger system of career development.
6. Training in the evaluation process for teachers and administrators.
7. Increased attention by teacher education programs to the gatekeeping function.

The concepts of self-study and self-regulation were addressed by Byrd and Constantinides (1988). The history of self-study processes instituted by the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) and the Teachers of English to Students of Other Languages (TESOL) during the 1980's was explained. The article discussed the concepts of process verses product in self-study, focused verses general self-study and detailed benefits of the process both programmatic and conceptual. Forces for or against self-study and change and choosing a design for self-study were addressed.

Individual colleges or universities and private programs surveyed their ESL graduates to determine what proportion of them had entered the field of bilingual education. The only national study occurred in 1978 as a mandate by the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a thirty month study of Bilingual Education training programs in colleges and universities:

The objective of the survey of graduates was to obtain data on the professional status of graduates of bachelor, master, and doctoral degree programs one to three years after completion of training. The major question of interest was what proportion of graduates subsequently participate in the field of bilingual education in what capacities. A national sample of 809 teacher graduates were surveyed by mail, and a sample of 168 trainer graduates by phone. (Johnson, 1985)

The article contained methods of the sampling, conducting the survey, data analysis, and conclusions. Interesting results on graduates of doctoral programs were given. For example, only 13 percent of those doctoral programs required a course on supervision; showing that ELT administration was not a strong area of training (Johnson, 1985).

The University of Hawaii conducted a 1980 survey on its Master's degree graduates in ESL. Approximately 375 questionnaires were mailed. They received a 46 percent response rate. The areas surveyed were: initial position, duties and responsibilities, location, current positions, and salaries. Conclusions stated that few of their graduates were in administration, and they urged other programs in ESL to consider offering instruction in ESL administration (Day, 1984).

Administering English, second language programs on foreign soil took many forms. The printed articles ranged from the role of deans or head administrators at the university level, evaluating the aspect of change in programs at the university level, administering government sponsored ELT programs, problems in administering ESL programs at the university level, and evaluating proprietary ELT programs for a multinational corporation.

In regard to evaluation of college level ESL in foreign counties, one of the longest processes undertaken included analyzing foreign programs used to train foreign employees of the Arthur Anderson and Company Accounting firm in 1990. This international survey reported the results of an evaluation

of the 55 English language training schools in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Central and South America. Arthur Anderson and Company has used English extensively in its business and training activities. Their professional employees were expected to possess sufficient English proficiency to fulfill all business obligations. They recently adopted a common language policy (English) that detailed specific skills and levels to be attained. Arthur Anderson hired the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C. to assist in implementing the policy and in helping to develop the programs in each area of the world.

Schleppegrell and Royster (1990) authors of the Arthur Anderson evaluation gave specific reasons to its importance; not only for business-oriented programs but for university programs. Important areas evaluated were: course objectives, staff qualifications, instructional approaches, and administrative procedures. The six criteria for identifying components in each program were: business English content, relevant goals, appropriate classroom activities, professional instructors, administrative support and sequenced instruction.

Administrative support was considered vital in working with business firms. Schools should have procedures for reporting attendance and progress to the firm and specific procedures for placement, testing, and advancement (Schleppegrell and Royster, 1990). The Center for Applied Linguistics found that 76 percent of the schools had good administrative support while 78 percent had sequenced instruction.

Results of the survey suggested there may be an expanded need for high quality business English programs worldwide. Schleppegrell and Royster believed that the most successful business oriented ESL teachers and

administrators were familiar with the business environment in their city. Only then could teachers and administrators offer programs developed to meet specific needs for specific companies in specific locations.

One of the best and most detailed analysis of ESL administration in a foreign country was not at the college or adult level. The Alberta, Canada Department of Education published an extensive guide for their primary and secondary schools. *English As A Second Language/ Dialect - Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs* (1982) could be a source for all ESL administrators regardless of level or country.

The Canadian guide was divided into six sections. Section One included rationale, definitions, philosophy, and program intentions. ESL students and ESL programs were defined. Goals and objectives for ESL programs were detailed. Section Two was concerned with the nature of culture. Cross-cultural adaptation, stages of cross-culture and problems related to difficulty in adapting were discussed. Suggestions for both the student and the school to facilitate adjustment were listed. Section Three encompassed assessment and placement procedures. Programs from initial placement and assessment through transition into regular programs were documented. The concept of ongoing evaluation and lists of achievement tests utilized completed the section. Section Four detailed the types of programs offered in Canadian schools. They ran the gamut from reception classes, partial classes, resource rooms, transition classes and support programs within regular classrooms. Section Five listed programs and services within schools and communities that assisted with ESL students. Section Six discussed the training of ESL teachers through pre-service and in-service opportunities. An Appendix

included copes of registration forms, placement forms, proficiency assessment instruments, math tests, and ideas for an orientation.

Abdulatif Hussein Faraj, Dean of the College of Education, King Saud University in Abha, Saudi Arabia wrote of the importance of understanding the educational status of entering students:

> Choosing the correct instruments are of primary importance. Only through pre and post testing can student progress be charted. Initial testing showed the need for remedial and proprietary instruction. Staff has been increased to teach the preparatory courses. English major studies have increased credit hours taught in English. (Faraj, 1987)

Faraj wrote that EFL Deans or Administrators should be the liaisons for varying ideas among members of a Department of English. He believed it was important not to make generalized statements but cite statistical studies. He believed it was the obligation of the dean or head administrator to facilitate the procedures for change and innovation (Faraj, 1987).

Rice discussed the importance of flexibility, ability in willingness to negotiate, and a sense of humor in administrating the ESL program for the Beijing, China Municipal University System co-sponsored by SUNY, Buffalo, N.Y. (1982). Cultural differences between Westerns and Chinese often led to misunderstanding and disparities in perception. There were grave problems when Chinese and Western educators planned a program on one end of the world (USA) to be run on the other (China). Major problems arose over the level of material prepared. Initial expectations of intermediate to advanced students and well-trained Chinese teachers were quickly realized to be intermediate level students and inexperienced teachers (Rice, 1982).

Problems in staffing were realized by inexperienced teachers. Several had only taught at the elementary school level and had good aural

comprehension. Two spoke English of the British variety. The teachers appeared to be more interested in learning about American literature, history, and culture than learning the methodology of teaching college level ESL. Rice emphasized that priorities were set in teacher training. Teacher training became a daily rather than a weekly priority. Duplicating materials for teachers became a problem. Several carbons were made of each exercise to be used on the day of preparation.

The overriding problems with administering personnel was their fear of failure in all skill areas. Preparation of tests was felt to be an impossible task, as was correcting the grammar (Rice, 1982). Finding suitable material for such a heterogeneous group of students in China was difficult. Lessons were developed by using familiar material from local publications such as *China Reconstructs*, *The China Daily* newspaper and *Care Package*, the textbooks provided for newcomers to China by the American embassy (Rice, 1982).

In administering non-university ESL programs on foreign soil, Paul Woods (1987) gave specific advice on how to manage a government sponsored program become self-sufficient. He coordinated the Sierra Leone Key English Language Teaching (KELT) Project sponsored by the Overseas Development Administration and the British Council from 1984 to 1987. Woods specified twelve areas on which project planners and coordinators should focus to ensure successful continuation when external funding has ended. The twelve key points were:

    1.) Involve local participants at all stages of the innovation process.
    2.) Leave behind materials which local personnel can utilize.
    3.) Provide adequate incentives. (for teaching)
    4.) Secure internal resources for maintenance.
    5.) Provide on-going support for replication and further development.
    6.) Involve all interested parties.
    7.) Create a nexus of counterparts.

8.) Invoke the principle of gradually diminishing control.
9.) Establish forecasting and reporting procedures and feedback loops.
10.) Ensure that examinations fit with revised syllabuses and materials.
11.) Replace high-cost "experts" by low-cost volunteers.
12.) Expect some loss of momentum but retain an optimistic attitude.

Woods elaborated on each of the twelve points and specific strategies where applicable. His expertise lay in teaching ESL in Third World nations, especially African nations. His main thrust was to ensure that the design of projects were sound enough for independent maintenance of projects by native administrators (Woods, 1987).

All ESL programs involved the process of change. Project managers, administrators, deans all deal with change at various levels but little has been written on the promotion of change in ESL programs (Kennedy, 1988). Kennedy, while working at the University of Birmingham, Birmingham England wrote extensively for ESL project managers (he refers to them as ELT project managers) for the non-academic post secondary programs. In his paper, he proposed that change is systemic. He theorized a hierarchy of interrelating subsystems in which an innovation has to operate. He described the hierarchy of interrelating subsystems as divided into six groups. The beginning (lowest) hierarchy was classroom innovation. He continued with institutional, educational, administrative, political, and ended with cultural as the highest subsystem.

He believed innovation (change) takes place more likely in a more loosely-organized system, with a high degree of openers to outside influences. The people involved in the change were called participants. Five roles for participants in the innovation process were adopters, implementers, clients, suppliers, and entrepreneurs (Kennedy, 1988). Adopters were those responsible for the allocation of recourses and have power. Implementers

carried out the policies set by the adapters. Clients received the services.

Suppliers provided the resources for the project. Entrepreneurs, or "change

agents" were a link between the four different participants. Entrepreneurs

were generally outside organizations or a national or local coordinator

(Kennedy, 1988). Kennedy emphasized the importance of power, support, and

leadership in innovation.

Summary

> Although the teaching of English as a second language (ESL) has a long
> tradition in the United States, it was not until the 1940's that ESL
> teaching began to emerge as a profession. Since that time, the profession
> has gained in stature and recognition, and now most states have teacher
> certification or endorsement in ESL. Yet one major area of concern has
> been discussed very little in the literature or the classroom; ESL program
> administration. (Fox, 1988)

A background for the study of the characteristics of college level English,

second language administrators was provided by studies and reviews on

English, second language administration at the college level, corporate and

proprietary English, second language administration, and English, second

language administration on foreign soil at all levels. Research indicated that

English, second language departments at the college level have shared

characteristics. They all have multilevel programs of English proficiency with

at least three levels: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. They used some

form of standardized placement tests. There was recognition of the four major

language skills to be taught: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In

respect to their placement within the university structure, ESL departments

or programs were usually placed within the literature or English departments.

Intensive English language programs often stood independently as a separate

unit. A small number were considered proprietary programs loosely associated with a college or university.

English, second language administrators at the college level shared little consistency in their professional preparation and training. The four areas of ESL administration deemed important to their job in ESL were: program development, students, faculty, and administration. Program development included the establishment and maintenance of ESL curriculum. The ESL administrator was responsible for the recruitment and retention of students and the provision of student services. Well-qualified teachers must be hired and maintained. The ESL administrator must manage budgets, cooperate with other units on campus, and maintain a balance of students in the day to day operations of the program.

Research showed faculty issues concern the ESL administrator on a daily basis. Experts believed the teaching faculty was the single most important feature of an ESL program. Teachers needed to be highly trained professionals with a set standards of training and credentials. Administrators were concerned with supervision and in-service training of teachers.

This study on college level ESL administrators will add to the body of current literature. It is the only national study on college level ESL administrators done since the 1980's. New information concerning administrators, academic backgrounds, and professional preparation may be discovered. Personal statements given by administrators concerning attributes and special qualities they need to administer a program, may be offered as suggestions which lead to changes in professional training. Information gleaned about areas of their positions in which they feel least confident may lead to improved training and development for administrators.

Information on the status of ESL programs within the institution and to whom Head Administrators report may give information to administrators which would bring a greater awareness of the profession to general university administrators. This study has the potential to provide information used by administrators, faculty, and students to improve college level ESL programs.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF DATA

Introduction

The sample for the study included 247 institutions teaching courses or containing programs of college level ESL. The institutions were randomly selected from the 489 institutions, proprietary, public and private colleges or universities, found in the 1988 catalogue, *The English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States.* The surveys were sent to the Head Administrator at each institution. Characteristics of ESL college level administrators were determined by relating their answers to: program information, personal background information, professional and academic background, and personal attitudes concerning ESL administrators. Personal remarks were given concerning suggestions for specialized training and special qualities an ESL college level program administrator should possess. Distribution of the instruments began on April 12, 1993, and collection was completed October 20, 1993.

Percentages, frequency scores, correlational coefficients, and listings of personal remarks were used to analyze the 127 responses. Of the surveys returned, more than one-third were completed without answer(s) marked for each of the nineteen research questions. Several of the subjects remarked they did not understand what a proprietary institution was as noted in Question 1,

Section 1. Detailed information on the research design, instrument, population, selection of the sample and procedures for collecting data was provided in this chapter.

A descriptive research design, specifically survey research, was selected for this study in an effort to obtain answers to the nineteen research questions as objectively, accurately, and economically as possible. The confidentiality of the research design for subjects were reviewed by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research and was exempted from further review under 45 CFR 46.101 (Witt, personal communication, August 4, 1992).

Instrument

One instrument was used in this study (See Appendix A). The original instrument was authored by Dr. Bill Gaskill, Director of the American Language Institute at San Diego State University, San Diego, California. As Chairman of the 1990 - 1991 California Association, Teachers of English to Students of Other Languages, (CATESOL) Committee on College Administration, he was commissioned to prepare a questionnaire for members of CATESOL (which also includes the state of Nevada). Gaskill designed and compiled his original survey based on more than twenty years experience as a teacher and administrator in the English, second language field. The questionnaire was prepared by Gaskill and sent to the CATESOL and Nevada members at the college level. The results of the questionnaire were submitted to *Journal of CATESOL* for future publication. The present instrument is an expanded version of the original questionnaire. Permission to adapt the original questionnaire has been granted by the author (See Appendix B)

The instrument was divided into six sections: Program Information, Personal Background Information, Professional and Academic Background, Personal Attitudes Concerning ESL Administration, Personal Remarks, and Responses. Each of the sections contained from two to seven questions. Subjects were asked to circle the appropriate letter or letters for each question. Where appropriate, an Other section was included for write-in answers or comments.

Program Information contained seven questions. Question 1 and 2 concerned the type and size of each program with a specific response required. Questions 3 - 7 called for the subject to circle the correct choice(s).

Personal Background Information contained four questions. The subjects were to chose one answer for time in present position, administrating in general, gender, and approximate age.

Professional and Academic Background contained four questions. Subjects were asked to circle the correct letter(s) for their highest terminal degree, fields of study as an undergraduate and graduate student, and previous professional experience. Each of the four questions contained an Other section to write-in answers where appropriate choices were not given.

Personal Attitude Concerning ESL Administrators contained four questions. The subjects were to chose one or more letter choices appropriate for each question. Question 1 concerned professional development opportunities. Question 2 and 3 concerned aspects of their current jobs which they felt most and least confident. Question 4 asked which job duties were most difficult when they first became an ESL administrator.

Head Administrators were requested to commit their personal thoughts to paper and write suggestions for specialized training and special qualities an ESL program administrator should possess.

Head Administrators were asked to respond to two questions. They were asked if they desired a synopsis of the findings and if they would send an organizational chart of their staff.

The Population

The population for the study came from the listing of colleges or universities and private organizations sponsoring Intensive Language Programs and ESL courses at the post-secondary level found in *The English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States*, 1988. *The English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States*, is published by the Institute of International Education, New York, New York. There were 494 organizations which met this criteria. The organizations were listed alphabetically. The full address and telephone numbers of each organization was listed. Gaskill, author of the questionnaire and Director of the American Language Institute at San Diego State University, San Diego, California, recommended this guide as the best source of updated post-secondary ESL level organizations.

The questionnaires were sent to the Head Administrator at each of the organizations. Of the 494 post-secondary organizations listed, 80 were proprietary institutions and 414 were private or public community college or four-year colleges-universities. Organizations on the list at the secondary level or below were not included.

Institutions in the United States with Post-Secondary

ESL Courses or Programs

Institutions in the United States with Post-Secondary ESL Courses or Programs were noted in Table 1.

TABLE 1

INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES WITH POST-SECONDARY ESL COURSES OR PROGRAMS

Institutional Type	Frequency	Mailed Surveys
College or University	414	206
Proprietary	80	41
Total	494	247

Selection of the Sample

The 1988 catalogue, *The English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States*, was used to identify the post-secondary ESL college level institutions. These institutions were listed alphabetically. The subjects of this study were selected by random sampling of the selected category of post-secondary ESL college level organizations from 494 organizations. Any institution teaching at or below the secondary level were excluded from the database. This population included public and private colleges, universities, and proprietary institutions. The Head Administrators of each educational organization were requested to answer the questions.

The Isaac and Michael (1982) *Table for Determining Needed Sample Size* recommended a sample size of 217 for a population of 500. This is the sample proportion needed to maintain a .05 population proportion with a 95 percent level of confidence. The population was inflated up to 247 in order to include the complete alphabetical listings of the institutions. It was determined that choosing every second institution would yield the needed number of 214. Identification numbers were coded on the back page of the instrument and the self-addressed stamped envelope. Those served to identify the name of the institution which had returned the initial survey, for return follow-up and sending a synopsis of the findings.

Administration Procedures

On April 12 and 13 1993, the survey materials; a cover letter, one instrument, and a self-addressed, return envelope, were mailed to the Head Administrator of the 247 institutions. Eighty percent of the surveys were returned by May 30, 1993. The other twenty percent came in slowly, possibly due to the end of the academic year or change of administrator in Summer, 1993. One survey was returned October 29, 1993 due to a change of administration at the end of Spring Semester 1993. Telephone calls to approximately fifty institutions were made between May 24 and 28 1993. Telephone calls included a message left on voice mail, answering machine, or personal message left with an office assistant to request return of the surveys. Six surveys were returned unopened due to closure of the institution (five proprietary) and one closure of department at a college or university. Responses were received from 127, or 51.4 % of the 247 subjects.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Scores utilized for each question were frequency and percentage. Correlational coefficient scores were tabulated, where applicable, between six different variables, yielding three correlations. Scores for each choice within a question were summed for a total. Each of those scores were then calculated by percentage. Responses to each of the nineteen questions and correlations were displayed in tables and described in the narrative in Chapter 4. The statistical package, Microsoft Excel, was used for data entry and statistical analysis.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

Answers to the nineteen research questions of this study were sought from analysis of the program information, personal background information, professional and academic background information, and personal attitudes concerning ESL administration from responses of the 127 subjects. In order to determine characteristics of United States college level ESL administrators, percentages and frequency scores were used for the nineteen research questions. Two questions for personal remarks concerning suggestions for specialized training and special qualities an ESL college level program administrator should possess, were included in a personal remarks section. Subjects were asked if they would like a synopsis of the research findings and if they would include an organizational chart of their staff. Six surveys were returned unopened due to closure of the program or unknown forwarding address. Of the six surveys returned, five were proprietary institutions and one was a college level institution. The chapter is organized to reflect the seven purposes of the study. Data from the questions included within each purpose is presented.

Purpose I

The first purpose of this study was to describe demographics of ESL programs. Program demographics were drawn by using the responses of the 127 subjects. Demographic items used in this study were: type of program, program size, to whom the Head Administrator reported, Head Administrator status within the institution, form of payment for Head Administrator, usage of a reward or bonus system for Head Administrator, and the powers who dictate policy for the program.

Type of Program

The type of ESL program, whether Proprietary, Intensive Language Program, or Non-Intensive Language Program is shown in Table 2. The largest group were Intensive Language at 70.9%. The smallest group were Proprietary Programs at 4.7%. Two subjects marked that they did not understand the term Proprietary.

TABLE 2

TYPE OF PROGRAM

Program Type	Frequency	Percent
Proprietary	6	4.7
Intensive Language Program	90	70.9
Non-Intensive Language Program	31	24.4
Total	127	100.0

Size of Program

The largest program size was 200 - 500 students at 40.6% as shown in Table 3. The programs of 50 - 99 students and 100 - 199 students were similar with 19.5% and 18.0% respectively. The two smallest groups had the least and most students enrolled, 10.9% for over 500 and 10.2% for less than 50.

TABLE 3

SIZE OF PROGRAM - STUDENTS

Program Size	Frequency	Percent
Less than 50	13	10.2
50 - 99	25	19.5
100 - 199	23	18.0
200 - 500	52	40.6
Over 500	14	10.9
Total	127	100.0

As indicated in Table 4, a majority of Head Administrators reported to their academic Dean at 63.0%. The smallest number reported to a Board of Director or Supervisors. Interestingly, 16.5% marked Other in marking their response. The third largest percentage, 15.7%, reported to the Department Chair. None of the subjects that marked Other wrote an answer.

TABLE 4

REPORTING OF HEAD ADMINISTRATOR

Reporter	Frequency	Percent
President	5	3.9
Academic Dean	80	63.0
Department Chair	20	15.7
Board of Directors or Supervisor	1	0.79
Other	21	16.5
Total	127	100.0

Head Administrator Status within the Institution

A total of 47.3% were considered Administrators at their institutions as shown in Table 5. Faculty accounted for 40.5% and 5.3% accounted for Staff. Other was chosen in only 9 responses. No write-in answers were given to this question.

TABLE 5

HEAD ADMINISTRATOR STATUS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION

Administrator Status	Frequency	Percent
Faculty	53	40.5
Staff	7	5.3
Administrator	62	47.3
Other	9	6.9
Total	131	100.0

Form of Head Administrator Payment

A majority of 81.7% were paid on a yearly contract as shown in Table 6. The smaller percentage, 4.7%, were paid on a term contract. A small response equalling 13.5% resported they were paid other than on a yearly or term contract or with pupil accounting.

TABLE 6

FORM OF HEAD ADMINISTRATOR PAYMENT

Payment Form	Frequency	Percent
Yearly Contract	103	81.7
Term Contract	6	4.7
Pupil Accounting	10	8.0
Other	7	5.5
Total	126	100.0

Bonus or Reward System

As shown in Table 7, only nineteen responses were received. Six received bonuses and thirteen did not. Of the six positive responses, five or 83.3% responded their bonuses were not linked to increased enrollment, competency of teachers or students or fiscal savings.

TABLE 7

BONUS OR REWARD SYSTEM

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	31.6
No	13	68.4
Total	19	100.0

If Yes, was it linked to the following association?

Association	Frequency	Percent
A) Increased Enrollment	0	0
B) Competency of Teachers	0	0
C) Competency of Students	0	0
D) Fiscal Savings	0	0
E) Other	5	100.0
Total	5	100.0

Powers Who Dictate Policy Within the Program

As shown in Table 8, it is evident there were double choices for some subjects. A total of 127 written surveys were received. The total responses for this question were 162. The majority of the institutions had the Head Administrator dictate policy. It was not evident which of the 162 responses were an individual choice for an institution or which institution may have more than one policy maker. Seven responses were given to indicate that none of the choices were applicable to their institutions. No written answers were given for those seven responses.

TABLE 8

POWERS WHO DICTATE POLICY WITHIN THE PROGRAM

Powers	Frequency	Percent
Head Administrator	126	77.8
Dean	0	0.0
Department Chair	18	11.1
Students	0	0.0
Administrative Council	11	6.8
Board of Directors or Supervisors	0	0.0
Owners	0	0.0
Other	7	4.3
Total	162	100.0

Purpose I Summary: Generalized Demographic Program Information

for ESL Administrators at the College Level

Based on the demographic data gathered in this study, English, second language programs at the college level in the United States were predominantly Intensive Language Programs, with program size between 200-500 students. The Head Administrator reported to a Department Chair and was either seen as an Administrator or Faculty member. The majority of Head Administrators were paid with a yearly contract and most do not have a reward or bonus system at their institution. The Head Administrator dictated policy for their program.

Purpose II

The second purpose of this study was to determine the demographic characteristics of college level ESL Administrators in respect to gender, degrees, age, major field of study, academic preparation, professional preparation, amount of time in current position, and amount of time in ESL administrative positions in total.

Gender

As shown in Table 9, 61.5% females and 33.1% males responded. Interestingly, seven subjects wrote-in they chose not to make a selection.

TABLE 9

GENDER

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	43	33.1
Female	80	61.5
Did not answer (wrote this in)	7	5.4
Total	130	100.0

Degrees

It is evident, as shown in Table 10, there were double choices for some responses. The subjects were asked to identify their highest terminal degree (one choice). A total of 135 responses were received; 127 individual surveys were sent. Over one-half, 57%, responded as having a doctorate. There were zero subjects with no degree.

TABLE 10

DEGREES

Degrees	Frequency	Percent
No Degree	0	0
Bachelor	7	5.2
Masters	51	37.8
Ed.D	10	7.4
Ph.D.	67	49.6
Total	135	100.0

Age

As shown in Table 11, fifty-five and fifty-four subjects, for 43.0% and 42.2% respectively, were between the ages of 36 - 45 and 46 - 55. Only 5.5% were over fifty-five years of age.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY AGE

Age	Frequency	Percent
25 - 35	12	9.4
36 - 45	55	43.0
46 - 55	54	42.2
Over 55	7	5.5
Total	128	100.0

Major Fields of Undergraduate Study

In Table 12, subjects marked dual responses due to the nature of the question. A total of 238 responses were given for 127 surveys returned. In turn, those dual responses were reduced to 166 relevant responses. Of the responses given, 41.0% stated they had an English language background. With 72 responses, at 43.4% stated none of the choices were accurate for them. From this response, it appears undergraduate field of study is not relevant for further study of ESL. Over half of the subjects later went on to receive a doctorate. Only 6 responses at 3.6% studied ESL as an undergraduate.

TABLE 12

MAJOR FIELDS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDY

Field	Frequency	Percent
ESL	6	3.6
English	68	41.0
Soft Sciences	1	0.6
Hard Sciences	0	0.0
Engineering	0	0.0
Education	18	10.8
Performing or Visual Arts	1	0.6
Did Not Attend College	0	0.0
Other	72	43.4
Total	166	100.0

Major Fields of Graduate Study

English and Education were identified at 20.6% and 21.8% respectively as shown in Table 13. Forty subjects, or 23.5%, studied ESL as a graduate student. Fifty-five, or 32.4%, stated that none of the choices were their field of study.

TABLE 13

MAJOR FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY

Field	Frequency	Percent
ESL	40	23.5
English	35	20.6
Soft Sciences	0	0.0
Hard Sciences	0	0.0
Engineering	0	0.0
Education	37	21.8
Performing or Visual Arts	0	0.0
Did Not Attend Graduate School	3	1.8
Other	55	32.4
Total	170	100.0

Professional Preparation

As shown in Table 14, the nature of the question called for dual responses. The largest number, almost one-third of the 335 responses, chose ESL college level teaching. Large groups of subjects had been teachers at all

levels. Eighteen had been an ESL teacher below the college level. A total of fifty subjects, 14.9%, indicated their former position had been an ESL administrator in either a college or in private industry. There were 36 subjects who chose the response of Other.

TABLE 14

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Professional Experience	Frequency	Percent
Teacher, K - 12	31	9.3
Teacher, College Level	42	12.5
Administrator, College Level	25	7.5
ESL Administrator, Private Industry	10	3.0
ESL Administrator, College Level	40	11.9
ESL Teacher, K - 12	18	5.4
ESL Teacher, College Level Courses	103	30.7
Volunteer Work, ESL	12	4.0
Volunteer Work, not ESL related	6	1.8
Private Industry, not ESL related	12	3.6
Other	36	10.7
Total	335	100.0

Time Administering Current Position

Most administrators, 28.8%, had worked between 4 - 7 years as shown in Table 15. The next largest group had worked from 8 - 10 years. Only 1.6% had worked for less than one year at their present position.

TABLE 15

TIME ADMINISTERING CURENT POSITION

Time	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	2	1.6
1 - 3 years	25	20.0
4 - 7 years	36	28.8
8 - 10 years	32	25.6
Over 10 years	30	24.0
Total	125	100.0

Time Administering ESL Programs

The largest number of subjects, 28.8%, had been administering ESL programs for 4-7 years as shown in Table 16. All other choices except less than one year had similar frequencies.

TABLE 16

TIME ADMINISTERING ESL PROGRAMS

Time	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	2	1.6
1 - 3 years	25	20.0
4 - 7 years	36	28.8
8 - 10 years	32	25.6
Over 10 years	30	24.0
Total	125	100.0

Purpose II Summary: Generalized Demographic Information for Head

Administrators of ESL Programs at the College Level

Based on the demographic data gathered in this study, English, second language administrators at the college level in the United States were female, between the ages 36-55, and had been in their current position between 4-7 years. More than half had been an ESL administrator for more than 4-7 years. The greatest number had a Ph.D. While 68 subjects marked English as their field of study; 72 subjects marked Other. Again, in analyzing their graduate programs, the largest group number, 55, marked Other. Similar percentages were noted for English, Education, and ESL.

Purpose III

The third purpose of this study was to determine aspects of college level ESL administrators' current jobs with which they were most and least

confident. The subjects' perceptions were analyzed by scores from the 127 returned surveys. Job aspects used to determine confidence were: Planning and Development, Staffing, Correspondence and Meetings, Daily Administration, Student Interaction, Curriculum Design, Teaching, and room to include Other aspects.

Job Aspects Administrators Feel Most Confident

As shown in Table 17, multiple answers were given for a total of 390 subjects. Student Interaction rated the highest percentage at 19.2 %, while Correspondence and Meetings were the aspects in which they felt less confident.

TABLE 17

JOB ASPECTS ADMINISTRATORS FEEL MOST CONFIDENT

Job Aspects	Frequency	Percent
Planning and Development	59	15.1
Staffing	50	12.8
Correspondence and Meetings	37	9.5
Daily Administration	56	14.4
Student Interaction	75	19.2
Curriculum Design	43	11.0
Teaching	70	17.9
Other	0	0.0
Total	390	100.0

Job Aspects Administrators Feel Least Confident

A sizable, 21.8%, of ESL Administrators reported that Curriculum Design was the job aspect they felt least confident as shown in Table 18. No one reported they felt uncomfortable with Student Interaction. A considerable percentage, 13.4% , reported there were Other aspects of their job in which they felt least confident.

TABLE 18

JOB ASPECTS ADMINISTRATORS FEEL LEAST CONFIDENT

Job Aspects	Frequency	Percent
Planning and Development	19	13.4
Staffing	25	17.6
Correspondence and Meetings	18	12.7
Daily Administration	7	4.9
Student Interaction	0	0.0
Curriculum Design	31	21.8
Teaching	13	9.2
Other	19	13.4
Total	142	100.0

Purpose III Summary: Job Aspects Administrators

Feel Most and Least Confident

Based on the data given by the subjects, college level ESL administrators felt most confident about their jobs in Student Interaction and least confident

in Curriculum Design. They ranked high in confidence in Teaching and Planning and Development. Staffing Problems were a major concern. A sizable number stated there were Other aspects of their job in which they were not confident.

Purpose IV

The fourth purpose of this study was to determine job aspects that were most difficult as a beginning ESL college level administrator. The subjects answered their question based on the following: Correspondence, Curriculum Design, Teaching, Daily Operations, Meetings, Planning, Personnel, Student Concerns, Budget, and Other. From the findings shown in Table 19, Budget and Personnel, with 26.7 % and 17.2 %, were the areas of greatest difficulty for a beginning administrator. Thirty-seven subjects, 20.6%, chose Other. Teaching and Student Concerns were areas in which they had little difficulty as beginning administrators.

TABLE 19

JOB ASPECTS MOST DIFFICULT AS A BEGINNING ADMINISTRATOR

Job Aspects	Frequency	Percent
Correspondence	0.0	0.0
Curriculum Design	19	10.6
Teaching	1	0.56
Daily Operations	5	2.8
Meetings	13	7.2
Planning	18	10.0
Personnel	31	17.2
Student Concerns	1	0.56
Student Services	7	3.9
Budget	48	26.7
Other	37	20.6
Total	180	100.0

Job Aspects Most Difficult as a Beginning Administrator

This study showed Budget issues were the primary aspect of Head Administrators' job in which they found most difficult as a beginning administrator. Personnel issues were also reported as difficult. Subjects marked Other 37 times.

Purpose V

The fifth purpose of this study was to determine the professional development training which has contributed to their role as Head Administrator.

Positive Professional Development Training

As shown in Table 20, 33.2% of the subjects stated Professional Conferences were positive professional development training avenues. Both Professional Associates and Professional Periodicals scored high with 27.8 % and 26.3 % respectively.

The findings showed Professional Conferences were positive professional development training avenues. Both Professional Associations and Professional Periodicals were second and third choices respectively.

TABLE 20

POSITIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING

Training	Frequency	Percent
ESL Administrative Seminars	25	7.2
Private Sector Training	12	3.5
Professional Conferences	115	33.2
Professional Associations	96	27.8
Professional Periodicals	91	26.3
Other	7	2.0
Total	346	100.0

Purpose VI

The sixth purpose of this study was to determine suggestions for specialized training for Head Administrators. Sixty-nine individuals wrote in personal remarks, ranging from one word to three sentences. The remarks were centered around six general categories. Those categories were budgetary - financial, staff development, aspect of change, administration - management training, ESL curriculum, and cross-cultural issues. The fact that many college level ESL administrators were not formally trained as administrators has lead to many responses concerning the need for more formal training. Administrators wrote often of a need to develop a network of administrators and workshops dealing with ESL needs. As one administrator stated, "Trial and error are ineffective."

Purpose VII

The seventh purpose of this study was to determine special qualities an ESL administrator should posses. Seventy individuals wrote in personal remarks. The number one response was flexibility. Administrators also cited patience as an important quality. Possessing business acumen along with organizational ability was cited consistently. Previous experience as an ESL teacher was seen as a "must" by many subjects. The ability to deal with faculty and staff were cited by more than half of the subjects. One administrator wrote, "Ability to work with teachers, students, staff, and the university administration. Making an ESL program work is a team effort."

Correlative Studies

In addition to the general survey responses reported previously, several correlation studies seem to be possible for the existing data. These correlation studies are reported below.

Correlation 1 - Age and Length of Time in Current Position

The correlational coefficient in Table 21 indicates that the older the Head Administrator, the longer thay have been in their current position.

TABLE 21

AGE AND LENGTH OF TIME IN CURRENT POSITION

Variable	X	Y	XY	$X2$	$Y2$	
Age = X						
Length of Time = Y						
Total	114	90	287	406	234	$r = 0.931131$

Correlation 2 - Program Size and Status Within the Institution

The correlational coefficient in Table 22 indicates that the larger the program size, the more likely the program director would be considered an Administrator.

TABLE 22

PROGRAM SIZE AND STATUS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION

Variable	X	Y	XY	$X2$	$Y2$	
Program Size = X						
Status Within the						
Institution = Y						
Total	127	107	272	407	271	$r = 0.819006$

Correlation 3 - Terminal Degree and Length of Time in any ESL
Administrative Position

The correlational coefficient in Table 23 indicates the higher the terminal degree, the longer the Administrator had been the primary Administrator of any ESL Program.

TABLE 23

TERMINAL DEGREE AND LENGTH OF TIME
IN ANY ESL ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Variable	X	Y	XY	$X2$	$Y2$	
Length of Time = X						
Terminal Degree = Y						
Total	163	182	609	593	718	$r = 0.933314$

Findings Summary

To determine the characteristics of college level ESL administrators, frequency and percentage scores were used. The greatest majority of returned surveys were from Intensive Language Programs. Most programs were between 200 - 500 students. The largest number of Head Administrators reported to a Dean. It was not known in which school or college that Dean was situated. At almost half of the institutions, the Head Administrator was considered an administrator rather than faculty or staff. Almost all were paid on a yearly contract. Very few Head Administrators received any bonuses. They almost all dictated policy for their program. A very small number looked to a department chair or administrative council for policy making.

Most Head Administrators were female. The majority of Head Administrators were between the ages of 36 and 55 with over half holding a doctorate. All had an undergraduate degree, but less than one-third had a degree in English. As a graduate student, the focus had changed tremendously. Degrees in ESL, English, and Education were almost equally represented between 21% - 23%. Almost a third had a degree in an area not listed. Fifty-eight percent had been a teacher (from K - College) before acquiring their present ESL position. Most administrators had worked between 4 - 7 years in their current position. They had been working in ESL programs in general between 4 - 10 years.

Head Administrators felt most confident in student interaction and teaching. High marks were given for planning and development. They felt least confident about curriculum design. Other areas not listed were given as aspects of their job with which they felt least confident.

Head Administrators were prolific in writing personal remarks. Their views mostly concerned specialized training and special qualities an ESL program administrator should posses. Over sixty individual remarks were written for each of the two questions.

The data showed correlation between six areas. They were: (1) The older the age of the administrator, the longer they had been in their present position. (2) The higher the administrators' terminal degree, the longer he or she had been a primary administrator of any ESL program. (3) The larger the ESL program, the more likely the program's director would be considered an administrator.

This study found that ESL Administrators have no consistent professional training or backgrounds. Further research is recommended to determine consistent professional standards and ways to improve professional development.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains a summary of this study, and discussion and conclusions generated from the findings. Implications of this study and recommendations for future research are also included.

Summary

This study was designed to determine the characteristics of college level ESL administrators by acquiring information on: (a) The demographics of ESL programs in relation to types of program, size, to whom the Head Administrator reports, Head Administrator status within the institution, form of payment for the Head Administrator, usage of a reward or bonus system for the Head Administrator, and the powers who dictated policy for the program. (b) The demographic characteristics of college level ESL administrators at Proprietary, Intensive Language Programs, and Non-Intensive Language Programs programs with respect to gender, degrees, age, major field of study, professional preparation, amount of time in current position, and amount of time in ESL administrative positions in total. (c) College level ESL administrators' perceptions of the aspects of their current positions in which they had the most and least confidence. (d) Perceptions of college level ESL administrators on what aspects of their job were most

difficult when they were beginning administrators. (e) Forms of professional development which had contributed to the role of college level ESL administration. (f) Suggestions for specialized training for college level ESL administrators. (g) Suggestions for special qualities a college level ESL administrator should posses.

Frequency and percentage scores were used to determine the characteristics of college level ESL administrators. Correlation scores were tabulated, where applicable, between a small number of scores. Where appropriate, subjects were given the option to write in other material if the options given were not applicable. In addition, two questions called for write in answers only.

The findings, based on the analysis of this study, were as follows:

1. English, second language programs at the college level in the United States were predominantly Intensive Language Programs, with program size between 200 - 500 students. The Head Administrator reported to a Dean and was either seen as an Administrator or Faculty member. The majority of Head Administrators were paid with a yearly contract and most did not have a reward or bonus system at their institution. The Head Administrator dictated policy for their program.

2. English, second language administrators at the college level in the United States were female, between the ages 36-55, and had been in their current position between 4 - 7 years. More than half had been an ESL administrator for more than 4 - 10 years. The greatest number had a Ph.D. It was difficult determining their field of study as an undergraduate. While 68 subjects marked English as their field of study; 72 subjects marked Other. Again, in analyzing their graduate programs, the largest group number 55,

marked Other. Similar percentages were noted for English, Education, and ESL.

3. College level ESL administrators felt most confident about their jobs in Student Interaction and least confident in Curriculum Design. They ranked high in confidence in Teaching, Planning and Development. Staffing Problems were a major concern. A sizable number stated there were Other aspects of their job in which they were not confident.

4. College level ESL administrators found the areas of Budget and Personnel most difficult as a beginning ESL college level administrator. Thirty-seven subjects, 20.6%, chose Other. Teaching and Student Concerns were areas in which they had little difficulty as beginning administrators.

5. College level ESL administrators found Professional Conferences were positive professional development training avenues. Both Professional Associations and Professional Periodicals were second and third choices respectively to assist professional development training. There were no studies to corroborate those findings.

6. Head Administrators wrote in sixty-nine individual suggestions for specialized training for Head Administrators. The remarks were centered around six general categories. Those categories were budgetary - financial, staff development, aspect of change, administration - management training, ESL curriculum, and cross-cultural issues. The fact that many college level ESL administrators were not formally trained as administrators had lead to many responses concerning the need for more formal training. Administrators wrote often of a need to develop a network of administrators and workshops dealing with ESL needs. As one administrator stated, "Trial and error are ineffective."

7. Seventy Head Administrators responded to suggest qualities an ESL administrator should posses. The number one response was flexibility. Administrators also cited patience as an important quality. Possessing business acumen along with organizational ability was cited consistently. Previous experience as an ESL teacher was seen as a must by many subjects. The ability to deal with faculty and staff were cited by more than half of the subjects. One administrator wrote, "Ability to work with teachers, students, staff, and the university administration. Making an ESL program work is a team effort."

8. The data showed correlation between six areas. They were: (1) The older the age of the administrator, the longer they had been in their present position. (2) The higher the administrators' terminal degree, the longer he or she had been a primary administrator of any ESL program. (3) The larger the ESL program, the more likely the program's director would be considered an administrator.

This study found that ESL Administrators have no consistent professional training or backgrounds. Further research is recommended to determine consistent professional standards and ways to improve professional development.

Discussion

The findings of this study were compared with studies that primarily dealt with college level ESL administration at the secondary level in the United States. This comparison was based on research indicating that ESL college level administration was an emerging profession with more research

needed to be conducted in the future (Starzek and Carkin, 1986; Pennington, 1985).

<center>Demographics of College Level ESL Programs</center>

The first purpose of this study was to describe the demographics of ESL programs in relation to types of program, size, to whom the Head Administrator reported, Head Administrator status within the institution, form of payment for the Head Administrator, usage of a reward or bonus system for the Head Administrator, and the powers who dictated policy for the program.

The findings indicated that 71 percent of the programs were Intensive Language Programs while 24 percent were Non-Intensive Language Programs. These types of programs were previewed in the Barrett (1982) report, *Administration of Intensive Language Programs*. The findings showed over 40 percent of the programs contained 200 to 500 students. This cannot be corroborated by other written research. Even though Barrett's (1982) study contained a great deal of information on recruiting students and student services, it did not mention numerical size. The findings of this study which showed to whom the Head Administrator reported, a Dean at sixty-three percent, was consistent with the findings and recommendations of Daesch (1982) and Carkin (1988). Rebuttals to Head Administrators reporting to Deans were found in the study by Bolton (1987). He reviewed patterns in the academic sponsorship of ESL programs and presented the advantages and disadvantages of ESL program affiliation within an English department.

This study revealed that forty-seven percent of Head Administrators were considered faculty. This was consistent with the study by Ronnett,

Butler, and Lanier (1985) which showed that salaries, governance, and involvement in decision making and grievance procedures were often positively correlated with the placement of ESL departments with their own faculty and staff. Daesch (1982) reported that faculty of the IEP programs should have the same rights and privileges as the tenure-accruing departmental faculty at the same institution.

The finding that eighty-two percent of Head Administrators were paid on a yearly contract was consistent with recommendations by Daesch (1982) that IEP should have a continuous, stable base of funding and personnel. Bolton (1987) cited conditions of appointment and employment were important in determining the placement of ESL programs. The study by Ronnett, Butler, and Lanier (1985) showed that salaries of departmentally based programs were 16.6 percent higher than in non-departmentalized programs.

The finding that answered the research question relating to a reward or bonus system received only nineteen responses. Of the six positive responses, five responded that their bonuses were not linked to any calculable variable. There were no research studies found to compare or contrast with that finding.This study revealed that seventy-eight percent of Head Administrators dictated policy within their departments. This finding was substantiated by Fox (1988) who emphasized the four areas of ESL administration, specifically administrative issues. Pankowski and Maurice (1986) paralleled the importance of dictating policy when they wrote that IEP's should contain clearly defined administrative responsibility and a strong sense of mission. Studies which disputed the importance of self-dictation of policy were Staczek

and Carkin (1984). Daesch (1982) showed both sides to the policy dictation question in his paper, "The General Administration of the IEP".

Demographics of College Level ESL Administrators

The second purpose of this study was to determine the demographic characteristics of college level ESL administrators at Proprietary, Intensive Language Programs, and Non-Intensive Language Programs programs with respect to gender, degrees, age, major field of study, professional preparation, amount of time in current position, and amount of time in ESL administrative positions in total.

The findings showed English, second language administrators at the college level in the United States were female, between the ages 36 to 55, and had been in their current position between 4 to 7 years. More than half had been an ESL administrator for more than 4 to 10 years. The greatest number had a Ph.D. It was difficult determining their field of study as an undergraduate. While 68 subjects marked English as their field of study; 72 subjects marked Other. Again, in analyzing their graduate programs, the largest group numbered 55, marked Other. Similar percentages were noted for English, Education, and ESL.

The findings showed 41 percent of the subjects majored in English, 4 percent majored in ESL, 11 percent in Education and 43 percent chose another option as an undergraduate major. This finding was emphasized by Barrett (1982). His study stated that faculty and teachers come to IEP (Intensive Language Programs) with different backgrounds and experience in teaching ESL. Staczek and Carkin (1984) reported that as of 1984, there were no undergraduate majors in ESL.

The findings showed that 24 percent of college level ESL Head Administrators majored in either English or ESL, 22 percent in Education, while 32 percent chose another option. This was corroborated by studies done by Barrett (1982). The work by Staczek and Carkin (1984) related to undergraduate studies. Those generalizations concerning a lack of consistent training and academic backgrounds of college level ESL administrators was emphasized by Staczek and Carkin (1984). They observed distinctions between ESL programs and other programs in the academic mainstream. They stated as of 1984, there were no undergraduate majors in ESL and ESL programs and their faculty were sometimes seen as gratuitous, since teachers were usually native speakers.

The findings that presented professional preparation of college level ESL administrators showed that almost onetothird of the 335 responses had been ESL teachers at the college level. At least 50 percent of the respondents had marked some form of teaching or administration in an ESL environment. Pennington (1984) substantiated those findings by writing that all ESL administrators must have technical skills training (classroom skills in ESL reading, writing, listening, and speaking) to have the full respect of the department.

There were no research studies to compare the findings in respect to gender, age, amount of time in current position, and amount of time in ESL administrative positions in total.

Job Aspects Administrators Felt Most and Least Confident

The third purpose of this study was to determine college level ESL administrators' perceptions of the aspects of their current positions in which they had the most and least confidence.

The findings showed Head Administrators felt most confident in their Student Interactions. Equally high marks were given for Daily Administration, Planning and Development. Those findings were substantiated by Fox (1988) who stated that student issues, student interaction and maintenance of student services, were one of the four major areas for an ESL administrator in higher education. Administrative issues, which included daily administration, planning and development, were the fourth area important to administrators. Schleppegrell and Royster (1990) emphasized the importance of administrative procedures when they evaluated foreign programs used to train employees of the accounting firm of Arthur Anderson and Company.

This study demonstrated that ESL administrators felt least confident in Curriculum Design. They reported Staff Concerns to be the second aspect of their jobs in which they felt least confident. Those findings paralleled Pennington (1984) in her workshop, "Effective Administration of An ESL Program." She stressed all administrators must have technical skills training (classroom skills in ESL reading, writing, listening, and speaking) to have the full respect of the department. Problems in staffing were emphasized by Rice (1982) who administered the ESL program for the Beijing, China Municipal University System. Paul Woods (1987) related his staffing and curriculum programs when he coordinated the Sierra Leone Key English Language Teaching Project.

Job Aspects Most Difficult as a Beginning Administrator

The fourth purpose of this study was to determine perceptions of college level ESL administrators on what aspects of their job were most difficult as beginning administrators.

This study showed Budget issues were the primary aspect of Head Administrators' job in which they found most difficult as a beginning administrator. Personnel issues were also reported as difficult. Those findings were substantiated by specific personnel problems cited by Rice (1982) when administering the ESL program for the Beijing, China Municipal University System. He spoke of the overriding problem administering personnel was their fear of failure. Budgetary stability was emphasized by Pankowski and Maurice (1986). Fox (1988) stated among the most important of all administrative concerns were financing (budgets). (Brown and Pennington, 1986; Pennington and Young, 1989; and Eichel, 1989) wrote extensively on Personnel issues, specifically staff evaluation processes.

Positive Professional Development Training

The fifth purpose of this study was to determine forms of professional development which have contributed to the role of ESL administration.

The findings showed Professional Conferences were positive professional development training avenues. Professional Associations and Professional Periodicals were second and third choices respectively to assist professional development training. There were no studies to corroborate those findings. Pennington and Brown (1989) spoke of the issue of professional credibility. They spoke of the ESL profession in general and the need for credibility in its practices and practitioners. The need for positive professional development

was emphasized by Staczek and Carkin (1984). They stated the field was relatively young and had yet to gain the status enjoyed by older disciplines.

Suggestions for Specialized Training

The sixth purpose of this study was to determine suggestions for specialized training for college level ESL administrators.

The findings were actual write-in answers by the subjects. Sixty-nine subjects wrote remarks centered around six general categories. Those categories were budgetary-financial, staff-development, aspect of change, administration-management training, ESL curriculum, and cross-cultural issues. Budgetary-financial concerns were emphasized by Pankowski and Maurice (1986), Fox (1988), and Schleppegrell and Royster (1990). Staff-development issues were cited by Rice (1982), Woods (1987), Fox (1988), Daesch (1982), and Pennington and Young (1989). Aspects of change were cited in the study by Kennedy (1988) and Faraj (1987). Administration-management training was cited in studies by Barrett (1982), Fox (1988) Bolton (1987), Carkin (1988), Daesch (1982) Byrd and Constantinides (1988) and Schleppegrell and Royster (1990). ESL curriculum concerns were cited by Woods (1987), Barrett (1982), Fox (1988), Pennington (1984), Carkin (1988) and Brown and Pennington (1986). Cross-cultural issues were cited by Fox (1988), Barrett (1982), Schleppegrell and Royster (1990), and Rice (1982).

Special Qualities an ESL Administrator Should Posses

The seventh purpose of this study was to determine suggestions for special qualities an ESL administrator should posses. Seventy individuals wrote in personal remarks. The number one response was flexibility. Possessing business acumen, organizational ability, and patience were cited

consistently. Previous experience as an ESL teacher was emphasized by many administrators. The ability to work with faculty and staff was cited by more than half of the subjects. The importance of flexibility was discussed by Rice (1982) and Pennington and Brown (1989). Possessing business and organizational skills was cited by Daesch (1982), Fox (1988), and Barrett (1982). English, second language teaching experience was substantiated by Pennington (1984) and Day (1984). Working with faculty and staff were cited by Barrett (1982), Fox (1988), Ronnett, Butler, and Lanier (1985), Daesch (1982), Brown and Pennington (1986), Pennington and Young (1989), Rice (1982), Schleppegrell and Royster (1990).

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were generated:

1. There is no consistent educational background or training for college level ESL administrators

2. College level ESL administrators believe that both training in administration and ESL teaching should be a pre-requisite for ESL administration.

3. College level ESL administrators believe that training specifically related to ESL curriculum and design should be a part of ESL administration training.

4. There is no consistent location for ESL programs within university and college administration structures.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations were made to improve the awareness of college level ESL administration as a profession:

1. There is a definite need for universities to establish graduate programs in college level ESL administration.

2. The present study should be replicated using Proprietary institutions to provide an opportunity for statistical comparisons and observations between Proprietary and Intensive Language Programs at the college level.

3. National and international guidelines should be adapted as minimum standards in the academic training and development of college level ESL administrators.

4. College level ESL administrators may need to exhibit a greater professional and research commitment to their professions.

5. Research on aspects of college level ESL administrators' jobs with which they felt least confident and with which was most difficult when they first became administrators should be utilized by national and international professional organizations to plan professional development training.

6. Research on the placement of Intensive Language Programs within a university and research concerning to whom Head Administrators report should be conducted. Increased exposure, independence, and funding could be determined from this research.

7. All Intensive Language Programs' faculty and staff should be on the same tenure and professional track as other academic departments.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**Questionnaire for Administrators of
College Level ESL Programs**

Please circle the letter of the appropriate response(s).

I. Program Information:

1. Is your program a Proprietary, Intensive Language Program at college level or Non-Intensive Language Programs courses at college level?
a) Proprietary   b) Intensive Language Program   c) Non-Intensive Language Programs

2. Program size: How many students are enrolled in your program?
a) less than 50   b) 50 to 99   c) 100 to 199   d) 200 to 500   e) more than 500

3. As the Head Administrator, to whom do you report?
a) President   b) Dean   c) Department Chair   d) Board of Directors/Supervisors
e) Other_____

4. What status do you hold in your institution?
a) Faculty   b) Staff   c) Administrator
d) Other_____

5. How are you paid?
a) Yearly contract   b) Term contract   c) Pupil accounting
d) Other_____

6. Is there a reward or bonus system set up at your institution?
a) Yes   b) No
If Yes, would it be linked to the following:
a) Increased enrollment   b) Competency of teachers   c) Competency of students   d) Fiscal savings
e) Other_____

7. Who dictates policy for your program?
a) Yourself (Head Administrator)   c) Department Chair   e) Administrative Council   g) Owners
b) Dean   d) Students   f) Board of Directors/Supervisors
h) Other_____

II. Personal Background Information:

1. How long have you been in your position?
a) less than 1 year   b) 1 - 3 years   c) 4 - 7 years   d) 8 - 10 years   e) over 10 years

2. How long have you been the primary administrator of any ESL Program?
a) less than 1   b) 1 - 3 years   c) 4 - 7 years   d) 8 - 10 years   e) over 10 years
year

3. Are you Male or Female?
a) Male b) Female

4. What is your approximate age?
a) 25 - 35   b) 36-45   c) 46 - 55   d) over 55

III. Professional and Academic Background:

1. Please indicate your highest terminal degree.
a) No degree   b) Bachelor   c) Masters   d) Ed.D.   e) Ph.D.
f) Other _____

2. What were your major fields of study as an undergraduate student?
a) ESL   c) Soft Sciences   e) Engineering   g) Performing or Visual Arts
b) English   d) Hard Sciences   f) Education   h) Didn't attend college

3. What were your major fields of study as a graduate student?
a) ESL   c) Soft Sciences   e) Engineering   g) Performing or Visual Arts
b) English   d) Hard Sciences   f) Education   h) No graduate study
i) Other _____

4. In regard to your previous professional experience, what position have you held?
a) Teacher - K through 12   e) ESL Administrator - College   i) Volunteer work (not ESL
                                       Level   related)
b) Teacher - College Level   f) ESL Teacher - K through 12   j) Private industry (not ESL
                                                                           related)
c) Administrator - College Level   g) ESL Teacher - College Level
                                       courses
d) ESL Administrator - Private   h) Volunteer work with ESL
Industry
k) Other _____

IV. Personal Attitude Concerning ESL Administration:

1. As a present day ESL Administrator, has any of the following contributed positively to your professional development?
a) ESL Administrative   c) Professional Conferences   e) Professional Periodicals
Seminars
b) Private Sector Training   d) Professional Associations
f) Other _____

2. In what aspects of your current position do you feel most confident?
a) Planning &   c) Correspondence and   e) Student   g) Teaching
Development   Meetings   Interaction
b) Staffing   d) Daily Administration   f) Curriculum Design
h) Other_____

3. In what aspects of your current position do you feel least confident?

a) Planning &
Development

c) Correspondence and
Meetings

e) Student
Interaction

g) Teaching

b) Staffing

d) Daily Administration

f) Curriculum
Design

h) Other_____

4. In what areas did you have the most difficulty when you first became an ESL administrator?

a) Correspondence

d) Daily Operations

g) Personnel

j) Budget

b) Curriculum
design

e) Meetings

h) Student Concerns

c) Teaching

f) Planning

i) Student Services

k) Other_____

V. Personal Remarks:

1. What suggestions would you give for specialized training for the College based ESL administrator?

_____
_____
_____

2. What special qualities should an ESL program administrator possess?

_____
_____
_____

VI. Response:

1. Would you like a synopsis of the findings?

Yes   No

2. Would you please send an organizational chart of your staff?

APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION

SDSU

AMERICAN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
COLLEGE OF EXTENDED STUDIES
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN DIEGO CA 92182 1900

(619) 594-5907
Telex: 910-322-1345
FAX: (619) 287-2735

August 19, 1991

To Whom It May Concern:

Mrs. Paula Skipper-Cardenas has my permission to use and/or adapt the "Questionnaire for Administration of College/University Level ESL Programs," that I developed in connection with a project during my tenure as College/Univ. Level Chair of CATESOL, 1990-91.

Sincerely,

William H. Gaskill

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO INSTITUTIONS

University of North Texas

Office of Policy Studies
in Higher Education
College of Education

April 10, 1993

Paula Shipper-Cordaro, Ed.D. Candidate,
University of North Texas
9080 Oviedo St.
San Diego, CA 92129-2133

Dear Head Administrator,

As a doctoral candidate in Higher Education Administration at The University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, I am in the process of completing my dissertation entitled, *The Role of ESL Administration.* Your institution has been one of 247 chosen to be part of this national study of college level ESL administrators. Your name was selected at random from the publication, *English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States.* I would request the Head Administrator to complete the survey questionnaire. I will be using a revised form of a questionnaire written by Dr. Bill Gaskill, Director of the American Language Institute of San Diego State University, San Diego, California. Enclosed, is a copy of the questionnaire for your completion. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is also enclosed for easy return. It should take no more than ten minutes to complete the questionnaire.

There are several reasons why participation in this study will be of benefit to your institution: 1) This is the first national study on ESL college level administrators since the early 1980's. 2) Your institution has been chosen to be one of 247 institutions involved in a national study for the 1990's. 3) The results of the questionnaire will provide your institution with valuable information for your department and comparative analysis with other institutions.

As a means to insure the confidentiality of each questionnaire returned, each return envelope will be coded with a number. In the event I do not

receive your completed questionnaire during the six weeks of requesting returns, I will contact you by mail and by telephone.

There will be no cost to you for completing and sending back the questionnaire. If you request, I will be happy to send a synopsis of the questionnaire results upon completion of my dissertation. Please check the appropriate box at the end of the questionnaire to request results.

Thank-you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Paula Shypper-Corben

APPENDIX D

REFUGEE ADMISSIONS CEILING

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Refugee Resettlement

Washington. D.C. 20447

October 18, 1990

NOTE TO STATE REFUGEE PROGRAM COORDINATORS

SUBJECT: FY 1991 Refugee Admissions Ceiling

On October 12, 1990, the White House issued Presidential Determination No. 91-3 in which President Bush has authorized up to 131,000 refugee admissions for FY 1991 (see attachment.) Of this 131,000, 121,000 admissions will be Federally-funded while the remaining 10,000 are to be supported by the private sector.

Chris Gersten, Director
Office of Refugee Resettlement

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 12, 1990

Presidential Determination
No. ___91-3___

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: Determination of FY 1991 Refugee Admissions
            Numbers and Authorization of In-country Refugee
            Status Pursuant to Sections 207 and 101(a)(42),
            Respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality
            Act

In accordance with section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality
Act ("the Act") (8 U.S.C. 1157), and after appropriate
consultation with the Congress, I hereby make the following
determinations and authorize the following actions:

a. The admission of up to 131,000 refugees to the United
    States during FY 1991 is justified by humanitarian
    concerns or is otherwise in the national interest;
    provided, however, that this number shall be understood
    as including persons admitted to the United States
    during FY 1991 with Federal refugee resettlement
    assistance under the Amerasian admissions program, as
    provided in paragraph (b) below.

    Ten thousand of these admissions numbers shall be set
    aside for private sector admissions initiatives, and
    may be used for any region. The admission of refugees
    using these numbers shall be contingent upon the
    availability of private sector funding sufficient to
    cover the reasonable costs of such admissions.

b. The 131,000 admissions shall be allocated among
    refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United
    States as described in the documentation presented to
    the Congress during the consultations that preceded
    this determination and in accordance with the following
    regional allocations; provided, however, that the
    number allocated to the East Asia region shall include
    the number of persons admitted to the United States
    during FY 1991 with Federal refugee resettlement
    assistance under section 584 of the Foreign Operations,

2

Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations
Act of 1988, as contained in section 101(e) of Public
Law 100-202 (Amerasians and their family members):

Africa   4,900
East Asia   52,000
Soviet Union   50,000
Eastern Europe   5,000
Near East/South Asia   6,000
Latin America/Caribbean   3,100
Not Designated 10,000*

* Funded by the private sector

Utilization of the 121,000 federally funded admissions
numbers shall be limited by such public and private
funds as shall be available to the Department of State
and the Department of Health and Human Services for
refugee and Amerasian admissions in FY 1991. You are
hereby authorized and directed to so advise the
judiciary committees of the Congress.

Unused admissions numbers allocated to a particular
region within the 121,000 federally funded ceiling may
be transferred to one or more other regions if there is
an overriding need for greater numbers for the region
or regions to which the numbers are being transferred.
You are hereby authorized and directed to consult with
the judiciary committees of the Congress prior to any
such reallocation.

The 10,000 privately funded admissions not designated
for any country or region may be used for refugees of
special humanitarian concern to the United States in
any region of the world at any time during the fiscal
year. You are hereby authorized and directed to notify
the judiciary committees of the Congress in advance of
the intended use of these numbers.

An additional 5,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be
made available during FY 1991 for the adjustment to
permanent resident status under section 209(b) of the
Act (8 U.S.C. 1159[b]) of aliens who have been granted
asylum in the United States under section 208 of the
Act (8 U.S.C. 1158), as this is justified by
humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national
interest.

In accordance with section 101(a)(42) of the Act (8 U.S.C.
1101(a)(42)), I also specify, after appropriate consultation with
the Congress, that the following persons may, if otherwise
qualified, be considered refugees for the purpose of admission to

3

the United States while still within their countries of nationality or habitual residence:

    a.   Persons in Vietnam and Laos who have past or present ties to the United States or who have been or currently are in reeducation camps in Vietnam or seminar camps in Laos, and their accompanying family members.

    b.   Present and former political prisoners, persons in imminent danger of loss of life, and other persons of compelling concern to the United States in countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, and their accompanying family members.

    c.   Persons in Cuba who are (1) in immediate danger of loss of life and for whom there appears to be no alternative to resettlement in the United States, or (2) are of compelling concern to the United States, such as former or present political prisoners, dissidents, or human rights and religious activists, or (3) were employed by the United States Government for at least 1 year prior to the claim for refugee status; and their accompanying family members.

    d.   Persons in the Soviet Union and Romania.

You are hereby authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress immediately and to arrange for its publication in the Federal Register.

cc: The Secretary of State
       The Attorney General
       The Secretary of Health and Human Services

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Department of Education. *English as a Second Language: Dialect. Guidelines and Suggestions for the Administration and Organization of Programs.* 1982.

Ambert, Alba. *Bilingual Education And English As A Second Language: A Research Handbook, 1986-1987.* Garland Publishing Company, New York, N.Y., 1988.

Barrett, Ralph Pat. *Administration of Intensive English Language Programs.* Ed. Ralph Pat Barrett. 1982. Washington, D.C. Conference: National Association of Foreign Student Advisors.

Bolton, John K. "The Departmentalization of the ESL Program." A paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Miami, Florida, 1987.

Byrd, Patricia. *Teaching Across Cultures in the University ESL Program.* ed. Patricia Byrd. 1986. Washington, D.C. Conference: National Association of Foreign Advisors.

Byrd, Patricia and Constantinides, Janet C. "Self-Study And Self-Regulation For ESL Programs: Issues Arising From The Associational Approach." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors, 1991.

Carkin, Susan. "A Case Study: The IED as an Academic Unit in the University." A paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Chicago, Illinois, 1988.

Daesch, Richard L. "The General Administration of the IEP." Barrett, Ralph, P. ed. *The Administration of Intensive English Language Programs.* The National Association For Foreign Student Affairs. 1982.

Day, Richard R. "Career Aspects of Graduate Training in ESL." *TESOL Quarterly.* Vol. 18, No. 1. (March, 1984).

Douglas, Dan. *English Language Testing In U.S. Colleges and Universities.* ed. Dan Douglas. 1990.

Eichel, Bette. "Training Part-Time ESL Instructors." A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States for Inservice Education. San Antonio, Texas, 1989.

English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States. 1988 Edition, IIE Books, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Eskey, David E., Kraft, Cheryl A., and Lacy, Richard. "A Novel Approach To ESL Program Evaluation." *Building Better English Language Programs,* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Faraj, Abdulatif Hussein. "The Role of a Dean In An ESL Program: A Case Study." *College Teaching.* 1987, Vol. 35, No. 1.

Fox, Robert P. "ESL Program Administration In Higher Education." *ERIC Digest. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.* 1988.

_____ . "Evaluating The ESL Program Director." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Jenks, Frederick L. "Designing And Assessing The Efficacy of ESL Promotional Materials." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Johnson, Donna M. "Results of A National Questionnaire of Graduates of Bilingual Education Programs." *TESOL Quarterly.* Vol. 19, No. 1. (March 1985).

Kennedy, Chris. "Evaluation of the Management of Change in ELT Projects." *Applied Linguistics.* Vol. 9, No 4. Oxford University Press, 1988.

Matthies, Barbara F. "Administrative Evaluation In ESL Programs: How'm I Doin'?" *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

McCarthy, Martha M. "Legal Forum-the Changing Federal Role in Bilingual Education." *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership.* Vol. 6, No. 1., (Spring 1986).

Middlebrook, Geoffrey C. "Evaluation Of Student Services In ESL Programs." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Oshner, Richard. "Job Related Aspects of the Main TESOL Degree." *TESOL Quarterly.* 14(2):199-207, 1980.

Pankowski, Mary and Maurice, Keith. "Intensive English Language Programs: Continuing Education's Foreign Cousin." *The Journal of Continuing Education.* 1986, 13-16.

Pennington, Martha C. "Effective Administration of an ESL Program." A paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Houston, Texas, 1984.

_____ . *Building Better English Programs: Perspective on Evaluation in ESL.* ed. Martha Pennington: National Association of Foreign Student Advisors. Association of International Educators, 1991.

Pennington, Martha C. and Brown, James D. "Developing Effective Evaluation Systems For Language Programs." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

_____ . "Unifying Curriculum Process and Curriculum Outcomes: The Key To Excellence In Language Education." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Pennington, Martha C. and Young, Aileen L. "Approaches to Faculty Evaluation for ESL." *TESOL Quarterly.* Vol. 23, No. 4. (December 1989).

_____ . "Procedures And Instruments of Faculty Evaluation In ESL." *TESOL Quarterly.* Vol. 23 No. 4. (December 1989).

Ponder, Roger and Powell, Bill. "Creating And Operating A Statistical Database for Evaluation In An English Language Program." Robinett, Betty W. *English Language Proficiency Guidelines.* ed. Betty W. Robinett. 1977.

Rentz, Mark D. *Newsweek.* (1987). Quoted in John K. Bolton. "The Departmentalization of the ESL Program." A paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Miami, Florida, 1987.

Rice, Donna S. "Problems of Administrating an ESL Program in the People's Republic of China." A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs. Seattle, Washington. 1982.

Ronnett, Carol L., Mary Butler, and Lois Kleinhenn Lanier. *Profiles of Selected ESL Programs and Their Staff Employment Conditions.* Vol. I: "ESL in Higher Education." Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. 1982.

Rosovsky, Henry. *The University: An Owner's Manual.* W. W. Norton & Company, New York, N.Y., 1987.

Schleppegrell and Royster, Linda. "Business English: An International Survey." *English for Specific Purposes.* Vol. 9 pp. 3-16, 1990.

Spaventa, Louis J. and Williamson, Janis S. "Participatory Placement: A Case Study." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Staczek, John K., and Susan J. Carkin. "Intensive English Program Fit in Traditional Academic Settings: Practices and Promise." *On TESOL '84.* Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Washington, D.C., 1985.

Taylor, Donald M. "Bilingualism, Multiculturalism, and Second Language Learning." *The McGill University Conference in Honour of Wallace E. Lambert.* Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1991.

Tucker, Alan. *Chairing The Academic Department: Leadership among Peers.* The American Council on Education, Macmillan, New York, N.Y., 1984.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac. August 28, 1991. Washington, D.C.

Winskowski-Jackson, Christine. "Evaluation of Culture Components In ESL Programs." *Building Better English Language Programs.* The National Association of Foreign Advisors. 1991.

Woods, Paul. "Pulling Out of a Project: Twelve Tips For Project Planners." *ELT Journal*, Vol. 42-3 (July, 1988). Oxford University Press. 1988.