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Abstract

The Latino Outreach Program (LOP) of Community Ministries of Rockville (CMR), which was established in 1993 to meet the needs of the Latino foreign-born population of Montgomery County, Maryland, targets new members of the Latino community to provide basic English language skills, workplace instruction, to support participants with the U.S. naturalization process, and to provide school readiness training using a unique, family-centered approach.

The purpose of this case study was to assess the structure and outcomes of the LOP in meeting the literacy needs of the Adult Latino immigrant population. LOP grant requirements, and thus continuation of the LOP programs, are contingent upon the successful accomplishment of LOP goals and objectives. In order to assess the level of program effectiveness, the researcher benchmarked research findings against current research in the area of Latino literacy and workplace issues.

Data collection included instructor and student interviews, classroom observations, job fair participation and observations, document review, and leadership interviews. The analysis examines student, instructor, and LOP leadership perspectives with regard to program objectives, literacy training needs, workforce training needs, and workforce training barriers. Participants in the case study included three LOP instructors, eleven adult students, one CMR Board of Trustees member, LOP Co-directors, and one job fair recruiter.

Results indicate that LOP objectives and goals are being met, and that the level of program effectiveness is reflected in LOP design. The LOP program design optimizes grant funding by optimizing (a) resources, (b) access, and (c) quality.
Community Ministries of Rockville

Latino Outreach Program: A Needs Assessment

The Latino Outreach Program of Community Ministries of Rockville (LOP CMR) was established in 1993 to meet the needs of the Latino foreign-born population of Montgomery County, Maryland. The mission of Community Ministries of Rockville (CMR) is to give voice to conscience and serve human needs. The Latino Outreach Program (LOP) is a direct service program of CMR which targets new members of the Latino community to provide basic English language skills, workplace instruction, to support participants with the U.S. naturalization process, and to provide school readiness training using a unique, family-centered approach.

The objective of the LOP is to empower foreign born community members by helping them to improve English skills, to enhance knowledge of workplace culture and etiquette, and to be assimilated into the American culture.

The U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration (1993, pp.2-9) reports:

The Hispanic population grew by fifty three percent between 1980 and 1990 and by sixty one percent between 1970 and 1980. The median income was lower than that for all Americans...Just over two of every ten Hispanic families were living in poverty in 1990 compared with less than one of every ten non-Hispanic families.

"Nationally, legal immigration surged from 1995 to 1996. Approximately seventy percent of Maryland’s immigrant population resides in Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties where the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officials estimate there were 180,000 legal and 44,000 undocumented immigrants in 1997.
likely to be poor, especially those who recently arrived. Thirty two percent of the foreign-born population in the United States are naturalized citizens. It is not known what percentage of the remainder are temporary residents and what percentage intends to become U.S. citizens (Community Ministries of Rockville, 2000).”

The LOP CMR provides adult English language classes, Spanish literacy classes, employment skills development, and citizenship/naturalization programs. All of the programs are funded by grants. “By focusing on the Latino population (as opposed to all non-native speakers of English), LOP hopes to create a welcoming, shared community, utilizing language classes as the medium (Community Ministries of Rockville, 1996).”

LOP currently offers Basic English I, II, III, Workplace English I, II, III, Spanish literacy classes, alcohol and drug prevention workshops, semiannual job fairs, and immigration and naturalization support. Two main barriers to LOP participation were identified by Program management: the need for childcare, and lack of money to purchase program materials. Program Directors removed these two major barriers to participation by providing free program materials and on-site child care, resulting in improved attendance.

According to the Community Ministries of Rockville 1998 Annual Report (1998, p. 9) “LOP served a total of 374 individuals (260 adults and 114 children)... The typical student was a female, 35 years of age, with an average of two children, performing one or two jobs.” A grant proposal submitted to the Society for Human Resource Management Foundation (Latino Outreach Program of Community Ministries of Rockville [LOPCMR], 1998) describes how the LOP education/training project impacts the school to work transition:

Over 65% of the adults in the Latino Outreach Program (LOP) have not completed elementary school. Most work two or more jobs to support their
families, a task made more difficult by the language barrier and lack of familiarity with the American work habits and customs. Not-for-profit LOP takes a holistic approach by teaching English and building workplace skills such as interviewing, office vocabulary and etiquette. Twice yearly Job Fairs offer Montgomery County Society for Human Resources Management chapter members and other businesses a chance to recruit LOP adults and students. (One former student hired at a Job Fair now represents his company at the Fairs.) Student involvement in LOP is a unique feature and a key to its success. Five adult students presently enrolled in the program have positions on the staff as child tutors or care providers, and one teaches Spanish Literacy. This assures that they have basic job skills and well-developed senses of responsibility and commitment. Their experience prepares them for the expectations and demand of the American workplace. LOP is unique because it addresses most of the barriers to adult participation by providing care to the children, tokens for transportation, and classes scheduled in the evening when most adults have finished work.
Review of Literature

Theories of Learning and Training

Blanchard and Thacker (1999) theorize that training methods fall into two general categories:

1. Cognitive methods which primarily influence knowledge and attitudes.

2. Behavioral methods which primarily influence skill development and attitudes.

By first clearly defining learning objectives and the current Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes (KSAs) of the learning audience, the instructional designer can make the best choice of training methodology. Table 1 (Blanchard & Thacker, 1999, p. 322) is a useful summary that matches training methods to specific learning objectives. The important feature to note from this table is that no one training method can satisfy complex learning of behavior and skills.
**Table 1**

Training Method Effectiveness at Meeting KSA Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal of training</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training methods</strong></td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer based</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Simulation & cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Business game</th>
<th>In-basket</th>
<th>Role play</th>
<th>Behavior modeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business game</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-basket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior modeling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On the job training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job instruction training</th>
<th>Apprentice</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale:

1 = not effective
2 = mildly effective
3 = moderately effective
4 = effective
5 = very effective

\[a\] This rating is for general technical skills. For some specific skills (i.e., computer software) the rating would be a 5.

\[b\] If the business game is designed for interpersonal skills, this would be a 4.

\[c\] If multiple in-baskets were used this rating would be 3.

\[d\] Specifically role reversal.
According to Robert Gagné (1985) a learning event includes a learner, a stimulus situation that can stimulate the learner's senses, and an action, or response that results from the stimulation. Learning causes an observable change in the learner; hence a training outcome statement can be derived from knowledge of the desired behavioral change.

Blanchard and Thacker (1999) and Gagné (1985) suggest that there are five categories of learning: (a) Intellectual skills, (b) cognitive strategies, (c) verbal information, (d) motor skills, and (e) attitudes.

Designing instruction involves analyzing lower level and higher level skills, selecting media, and designing the instructional events (stimulus). Skills should be learned one at a time and lower level objectives must be mastered before higher level objectives can be met.

Gagné's work has contributed to the field of instructional technology especially regarding the design of instruction. According to Gagné the following steps should be clearly thought out when designing instruction (Gagné, 1992): (a) identify the types of learning outcomes, (b) identify any prerequisite knowledge or skill for each outcome, (c) identify the internal conditions or processes the learner must have to achieve the outcomes, (d) identify the external conditions or instruction needed to achieve the outcomes, (e) specify the learning context, (f) record the characteristics of the trainees, (g) select media for instruction. Books, white board, Computer Assisted Instruction and video are common examples.

All training methods are aimed at producing an outcome, whether it be cognitive, attitudinal, or motoric in nature. According to Gagné's Taxonomy of Learning Objectives (Gagné, 1985): (a) intellectual skills/concepts are demonstrated by labeling or classifying, (b) intellectual skills/rules are applied and principles are demonstrated, (c)
intellectual skills/problem solving are demonstrated by generating solutions or procedures, (d) verbal information is stated, (e) motor skills are demonstrated by physical performance, (f) attitudes are demonstrated by preferring options.

Knowles’ theory of Andragogy (Knowles, 1984) is a theory specifically related to the needs of the adult learner. Knowles emphasizes that adult learners are self-directed and expect to take responsibility for decisions. Adult learning programs must accommodate the following fundamental adult learning needs: (a) adult learning programs should capitalize on the experience of participants, (b) adult learning programs should adapt to the aging limitations of the participants, (c) adults should be challenged to move to increasingly advanced stages of personal development, (d) adults should have as much choice as possible in the availability and organization of learning programs, (e) adults need to know why they need to learn something, (f) adults need to learn experientially, (g) adults approach learning as problem solving, (h) adults learn best when the topic is of immediate value.

Andragogy means that instruction for adults needs to focus more on the process and less on the content being taught. According to Knowles (1984) training methods such as case studies, role-playing, simulations, and self-evaluation are most useful for the adult learner.

The Criterion Referenced Instruction (CRI) framework developed by Robert Mager (1988) is a comprehensive set of methods for the design and delivery of training programs. Critical aspects of CRI include (a) goal/task analysis to identify what needs to be learned, (b) performance objectives-- exact specification of the outcomes to be accomplished and how they are to be evaluated (the criterion), (c) evaluation of learning in terms of the knowledge/skills specified in the objectives, (d) development of learning modules tied to specific objectives.
Training programs developed in CRI format are self-paced courses involving a variety of different media, e.g., workbooks, videotapes, small group discussions, and computer-based instruction. Learning is self-paced. A course manager administers the program and is available to help students with problems.

CRI is based upon the ideas of mastery learning and performance-oriented instruction. It incorporates many of the ideas found in Gagné's theory of learning (e.g., task hierarchies, objectives) and is compatible with Knowles' theory of adult learning because of its emphasis on learner initiative and self-management.

Motivation

Content Theories

Maslow (1954, 1968), and Clayton Alderfer (1969) developed the needs theory of motivation, known as ERG theory. The acronym, ERG, represents the three basic needs: (a) Existence, (b) relatedness, and (c) growth. Existence needs correspond to Maslow's lower-order physiological and security needs. Relatedness needs correspond to Maslow's belonging and love needs. Growth needs combine Maslow's esteem and self-actualization needs.

People can experience needs in all three areas simultaneously (Alderfer, 1969; Schneider & Alderfer, 1973). Relative satisfaction level in each needs area determines which are more important. Unsatisfied needs motivate people. As needs in an area are met, motivation decreases. However, needs in all three areas are subject to renewal and expansion.

Process Theories

Process theories of motivation include (a) reinforcement theory, and (b) expectancy theory. E. L. Thorndike (1905, 1913, 1932) developed the theory of the law of effect which states that behavior followed by satisfying experiences tends to be
repeated, and behavior followed by dissatisfaction tends to be avoided. B. F. Skinner (1953, 1968) used this principle in developing the operant conditioning model and reinforcement theory. Skinner theorized that behavior is determined by consequences, and is controlled by positive and negative reinforcement.

Positive reinforcement involves the administration of positive consequences for desired behavior. Negative reinforcement involves the withdrawal of feedback for undesirable behavior. Thus, a person’s motivation (direction and magnitude of behavior) is a function of their personal reinforcement history.

Vroom’s expectancy theory (1964) has three foundations: (a) Individuals believe that certain behaviors are linked to certain outcomes, (b) outcomes (rewards) have varying degrees of value, (c) an individual’s efforts to acquire the associated outcome are associated with the person’s belief in the probability of success. Level of effort expended by the individual depends upon: (a) Expectancy (how well will the person be able to do what they set out to do), (b) instrumentality (expected outcomes and the likelihood of their occurrence), (c) valence (subjective value of the outcome to the individual).

Wagner and Hollenbeck (1992) found that desire occurs only when both valence and instrumentality are high, and effort occurs only when valence, instrumentality, and expectancy are high. In order to motivate individuals, the instructor must demonstrate that success is likely and that the right outcomes are attached to the successful completion of the training program.

Self-Efficacy

The basis of self-efficacy is the individual’s self-image regarding personal competency. According to Bandura (1977), high self-efficacy is associated with the belief that one can and will be successful while low self-efficacy is associated with a preoccupation with concerns about failure. Research by Gecas (1989), Gist (1987), and
Manz and Simms (1981) supports the theory that the higher the self-efficacy, the better the performance. Locke, Lee, and Bobko (1984) found that those with high self-efficacy try harder in difficult situations while those with low self-efficacy reduce efforts or give up.

According to Blanchard and Thacker (1999), training can improve self-efficacy. If the trainee has low self-efficacy, but has the requisite KSAs, a program of improving self-confidence is needed. If the low self-efficacy is due to a lack of requisite KSAs, training for competency in these KSAs should improve self-efficacy if the training program allows the trainee to demonstrate mastery during the training process. Kraiger, Ford, and Salas (1993) found that assessing trainee self-efficacy prior to and during training is useful because self-efficacy beliefs appear to be a reliable predictor of both learning and transfer of learning to the job.

**English for Speakers of Other Languages**

The National Institute for Literacy (2000) reports that over one fifth of the adult population in the United States have low literacy skills. Literacy encompasses skills such as reading, writing, speaking, calculating, and critical thinking. Literacy affects jobs and the economy. Adults with low levels of basic literacy skills are more likely to have poor health outcomes.

Recent immigrants have lower initial levels of English ability, as well as lower levels of education, than previous immigrants and their western European counterparts (Gonzalez, 2000). Hispanic immigrants who do not speak English earn 17% less than immigrants who speak English (Borjas, 1994; Meisenheimer, 1992). Studies of immigrant earnings find that the immigrant wage assimilation is explained by the increase in English-speaking skills resulting from more time in the United States (Gonzalez, 2000; Meisenheimer, 1992). Immigrants who complete English as a Second
Language (ESL) courses have higher levels of English ability (Gonzalez, 2000; Venezky & Wagner, 1996).

**English as a Second Language**

English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in the workplace were an outgrowth of the effort to help immigrants succeed in jobs (Hill, 2000):

In 1999, the Employing Internationals Workshop: A Series of Events, was held to inform employers about the possibilities of hiring internationals, to help potential employees prepare for interviews, to bring employers and job-seekers together and to evaluate the process.

Eventually, it became clear that employers needed a way to help non-English-speaking employees learn how to communicate on the job, so workplace ESL programs were born.

Gonzalez (2000) found that the financial returns for immigrants learning English language skills are greater on oral proficiency than the returns on literacy skills (writing, reading, calculating). Of the remaining three literacy skills, writing skills are more valuable than reading skills. Workers with limited English skills earn less than comparable workers who are proficient in English (National Bureau of Economic Research, 1993, 1996; Chiswick & Miller, 1992, 1995; Grenier, 1984; Jasso & Rosenzweig, 1990; McManus, Gould, and Welch, 1983; Tainer, 1998; Zavodny, 1998).

Durham-Vichr (2000) reports on the growing number of companies that are enrolling their employees in the speech therapy program offered by Fairfax Language Institute (FLI) in Fairfax, Virginia. FLI clients, many of whom work in technical industries, have reached a point in their careers where they feel they have "run into a wall" because of difficulties in communicating with customers. They come for help on an individual basis, seeking to refine their speech and often in preparation for a career
change. This type of speech therapy is costly and out of reach of the “working poor” who would benefit the most from such training.

The Maryland English Institute (MEI) Speaking Partners’ Program (see Appendix A) provides non-native English speakers with ESL training and an American “speaking partner.” Speaking partners provide the “conversational link” in the ESL learning process. International students improve their command of everyday, conversational, “American” English from their partner. American speaking partners receive a workbook from the MEI which is intended to provide practice conversational topics in a systematic and sequential manner which promotes mutual learning throughout the process.

**Culture and Learning English as a Second Language**

Gardner (1983) argued that, because language is an integral part of culture, the learning of a second language is dependent upon the learner’s willingness to identify with the culture of the target language and to incorporate aspects of the target-language culture, including linguistic repertoire, into his or her own behavior. Zaid (1999) found that while culture is an important component of language study, cultural confrontation should not take precedence over linguistic acquisition in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom.

Two common approaches to teaching “culture” in the context of EFL programs are: The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) approach to culture as “intellectual refinement” and “artistic endeavor”—often called culture with a capital “C.” Or anthropological culture, the way of life of a target language society—often called culture with a small “c” (Brooks, 1964, Zaid, 1999). Thus, in a culture-focused EFL classroom, in order for the student to grasp a second language, he or she must undergo not just training in language, but also a socializing experience (Brown, 1987).
Ellis (1985) found one negative consequence of the culture-oriented classroom can be "cultural shock." Cultural shock is defined by Ellis (1985, p. 252) as the "disorientation stress, fear, etc. [which a learner experiences] as a result of differences between his or her own culture and that of the target language community." Furnham (1993) and Kramsch (1993) describe a second negative outcome in which the students appear to create and use a personal "third culture" to express their meaning apart from the meaning established by either their own or the target language community.

Classroom strategies designed to break down native and target cultural barriers may be perceived as attempts to invalidate the native culture, thereby causing students to develop defensive feelings toward the native culture and hostility toward the target culture (Kelman, 1996).

Gardner’s (1983, p. 199) socioeducational language model suggests that second-language learning is facilitated by an integrative motive which "reflects a high level of drive on the part of the individual to acquire the language of a valued second language community in order to facilitate the communication with that group." According to Clement (1980), the concept of integration may be tempered by the fear that involvement with the target-language group may result in alienation from one’s own group. Wong-Fillmore (1991) suggested that success in learning a second language is contingent on the existence of the following conditions: (a) motivated students who realize they need to learn the target language, (b) target-language speakers who support the second-language learners, and (c) frequent social contact between target-language speakers and learners.
Barriers to English Language Training

The problem lies not in motivation to learn English, but the opportunity.

According to Harlan and Berheide (1994):

Enforcement of rigid work schedules, requirements of excessive time commitments, and lack of family-sensitive employee benefits constrain women's promotional opportunities as they try to combine jobs with the needs of their families. Ironically, low-wage jobs are the most inflexible and least likely to have benefits attached to them. Corporations short-change workers in lower-level jobs on opportunities for training and job development. Furthermore, the company employees most likely to participate in training were in management, professions, and sales.

A report on employer-provided training among young adults shows that, on the whole, employers make greater training investments in better-educated, white, and male workers. College graduates were almost twice as likely as high school graduates to benefit from employer-sponsored training, and their training lasted 25 percent longer. Whites (21.4 percent) were more likely than blacks (17.4 percent) or Hispanics (15.4 percent) to receive training. Employers in general provide less training to women, particularly women in low-wage, part-time, or seasonal jobs in the informal and secondary economy.
Training Outcomes

According to Blanchard and Thacker (1999) the objectives of training are to influence and/or change the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the trainee. The desired outcomes of training fall into three categories of learning: Knowledge, skills and attitudes:

Training outcomes for influencing knowledge include the following:

1. The trainee will know the facts (declarative knowledge).
2. The trainee will understand how and when to apply declarative knowledge (procedural knowledge).
3. The trainee will plan, monitor, and revise goal-directed activity (strategic knowledge).

Training outcomes for influencing motor skills include:

1. The trainee will demonstrate a specific task, e.g. conduct quality control and machine maintenance on the new lab machine within 30 minutes, allowing time for thinking through the process and referencing necessary material (compilation).
2. The trainee will demonstrate a specific task in a quick and efficient manner, e.g. conduct quality control and machine maintenance on the new lab machine within 10 minutes (automaticity).
3. The trainee will implement a business strategy.
4. The trainee will communicate effectively.

Training outcomes for influencing attitudes include the following:

1. The trainee will be motivated.
2. The trainee will report a positive opinion.
3. The trainee will report new beliefs.
Program Outcomes

The National Institute for Literacy (2000) recommends the following outcomes for literacy efforts based on the three priorities established by the National Literacy Summit 2000 which include optimizing resources, access, and quality:

1. Changes in existing federal and state laws and policies to expand and enhance services for adults in the adult education, language, and literacy system. Develop active partnerships among federal programs to make services mutually supportive.

2. Increase federal and state appropriations to levels sufficient to support access and quality in the adult education, language, and literacy system.

3. Make support services widely available for adult students. Develop strategies for social service providers, community organizations, and employers to increase transportation, childcare, counseling, translation, and other support services for adults.

4. Private sector investment in lifelong learning opportunities for adults in the workplace and community. Employers should compensate employees for class time. Encourage unions and employers to expand their joint efforts to provide adult education, language, and literacy services to workers and their families.

5. Raise awareness about the adult education, language, and literacy system with public and private partnership support.

6. Form strong local information network and referral systems to help students easily find appropriate programs to continue their learning, as well as support services such as child care, transportation, learning disabilities screening, and counseling.
7. Develop and support student recruitment activities to involve program staff, and current or former students to target hard-to-reach populations.

8. All students, including those with disabilities, have access to assistive technology.

9. Provide instructional services at times and in places that are convenient for adult students, especially those in under-served and hard-to-reach areas.

10. Program goals reflect the concerns of all stakeholders in the community. Build strong partnerships among providers and other organizations at community and state levels to achieve consensus on system goals, including efforts to align services and eliminate unnecessary duplication.

11. Program content standards and curriculum focus on needed knowledge and skills. Instruction should be geared to students' own goals for themselves and their families. Students should be involved in planning their instruction. Program content and focus should be on real-life skills.

12. All programs have a systematic approach to quality improvement. Qualitative and quantitative assessment tools assess content, reflect academic gains of students, and reflect the goals of the diverse populations.

13. Paid and volunteer staff in all programs are involved in professional development activities to upgrade their knowledge and skills.

14. Programs should have a strong research and development capacity, focused on teaching and learning and should develop knowledge and tools that are responsive to the needs of the field.

15. Involve students as primary stakeholders and full partners in every aspect of program operation.

Blanchard and Thacker (1999) maintain that evaluation of training is an integral
element of a training program and, therefore, should not be neglected. Omitting
evaluation of a training program would be like a business that doesn’t assess its
profitability. Evaluation should meet the objectives of the organization. Providing more
than what is needed is a waste of time and resources.

D. L. Kirkpatricks’ four-level evaluation model divides training reactions into affective
and utility reactions, and learning into post-training measures of learning, retention, and
behavior/skill demonstration (Alliger & Tannenbaum, 1997; Blanchard & Thacker,
1999):

1. Level 1: Reaction. Affective reactions regard how well the participant
“liked” the course. The affective reaction, when positive, is useful in
marketing a training program. Utility reactions involve how the
participants perceive the relevance of the training to their job/life. The
training needs analysis (TNA) directs the focus of the training program
in terms of objectives, KSA deficits, and relevance to the organization.
Hopefully, the participants perceive the importance of the training
program, learn the desired KSAs, and rate the program as “relevant.”
Quantifiable data that relates to organizational objectives and goals
cannot be provided at this level.

2. Levels 2-4: These levels measure Higher Level and Lower Level
Learning, Transfer of Learning, and Organizational Impact. These
three levels of evaluation are quantifiable and have been substantiated
in the literature as providing reliable and valid results.
Career Development for Minorities

Career planning incorporates a person's values, abilities, interests and achievements into priorities and goals set for career choice (Zunker, 1994). Lack of adequate information may lead to an ambiguous self-image within the working world (Herr & Cramer, 1992). A number of researchers (Credle & Dean, 1991; Henry, Bardo, & Henry, 1992; Hernandez, 1995; Murry & Mosidi, 1993) recommend the use of mentors and role models of the same ethnic background in the career development of African American and Hispanic individuals. Access to career counseling services is an important issue for career development activities (Hawks & Muha, 1991).

Literacy in the Work Place

Work place literacy is generally characterized as the ability to read and write in order to mediate action (Diehl & Mikulecky, 1980; Hull, 2000; Resnick, 1990). Gee, Hull, & Lankshear (1996) view literacy in a sociocultural perspective by characterizing it as "social," and connected to activities wherein people read, write, and talk about texts, hold attitudes and values about them, and interact with others around them in particular ways. This view integrates literacy with social, institutional, and cultural relationships instead of with neutral skills or psychological processes. Ways of reading and writing can be seen as companions to ways of talking, acting, interacting, valuing, and being in the world, including ways of constructing an identity as a worker. Hull (2000) outlines critical metacategories for literacy functions (see Appendix E, Table E1).

Acculturation

Immigrants experience specific types of stress while adjusting to new careers in the host country. Acculturation stress emanates from the demands, opportunities, and constraints encountered while embarking on new careers (Bhagat, 1999). Immigrants' intercultural effectiveness, coping skills, and career motivation are key moderators.
between acculturation stress and career outcomes (Bhagat, 1999; Nevo & Chawarski, 1997).

"Acculturation stress is experienced with immigrants' adopting the dominant values of the host country. Acculturation stress is associated with uncertainties in changing or accommodating to a new culture (Bhagat, 1999, p. 353)." Feelings of alienation and marginality are reported by immigrants undergoing acculturation stress (Berry & Annis, 1974; Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987; Ward, 1996). Self-esteem suffers as the immigrant loses his or her identity and place in the community or family (Espin, 1987; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Padilla, Cervantes, Maldonado, & Garcia, 1988; Romero, 1981).

One of the most significant acculturative stressors for Hispanic immigrants is the loss of social support in the form of family ties and close interpersonal relationships (Comas-Diaz & Minrath, 1987; Harrison, Wodarski, & Thyer, 1992; Smart & Smart, 1991). Loss of familiarity leads to feelings of anxiety and lack of control (Berry & Annis, 1974; Bochner, 1981; Smart & Smart, 1995). Loss of identity and social support can impair both the will and the ability to develop necessary coping strategies (Smart & Smart, 1995).

According to Wodarski (1992), the more strongly immigrants cling to their ethnic identity, the greater the stress they report and the lower their self-esteem. Furnham & Bochner (1986) found that successful adaptation outcomes to a second culture are related to the immigrant's ability to "mediate." Mediation is one of four adaptation responses and is marked by synthesis of both cultures and a positive integration of both experiences. The mediator is then able to mentor others in achieving positive acculturation outcomes. Harmony is achieved by preserving the original culture and forming a new pluralistic culture that incorporates a wider range of cultural values and
traditions. The three other adaptation responses are “passing,” chauvinism, and marginalization. These three responses have been shown to be ineffective and are marked by passivity, hostility, confusion, and isolation.

London and Sessa (1998) define nine dimensions of intercultural effectiveness:
(a) Comfort with other cultures, (b) positive attitude toward foreign cultures, (c) understanding cultural differences, (d) empathy, (e) valuing differences, (f) keeping an open mind, (g) sharing differences with others, (h) seeking feedback about how one is being received into the foreign culture, and (i) flexibility.

**Acculturation and Career Outcomes**

**Intercultural Competence.** Immigrants who exhibit intercultural competence and who are fluent in verbal communication are considered by members of the host country to be more competent (Dinges & Baldwin, 1996). The link between acculturation stress and low career outcomes is stronger for immigrants low on intercultural competence (Bhagat, 1999).

**Coping Skills.** The most important dimensions of coping skills related to acculturation stress are appropriate problem-solving abilities (i.e., knowing how to solve a problem), and effective management of emotions (i.e., not allowing feelings of frustration, ineffectiveness, anger, or anxiety interfere with constructive behavior) (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Ward, 1996; Berry & Sam, 1997). Effective coping skills must be problem-focused and deal with negative feelings that accompany crisis (Lazarus, 1991; London, 1998). Immigrants low on key dimensions of coping skills experience low career outcomes (Bhagat, 1999).

**Career Motivation.** If an individual is motivated to sustain his or her career, the adverse effects of acculturation stress will be significantly reduced (Bhagat, 1999). London (1998) and London and Noe (1997) report that career identity, insight, and
resilience are positively correlated with positive work outcomes. Career identity directs the individual’s efforts toward concrete goals, Career insight entails clear and objective understanding of self and work environment, and resilience keeps people energized and enables them to maintain commitment and overcome difficulties. Resilience is a key factor in predicting the extent to which unemployed people spend time constructively to find or create new jobs for themselves (Wolf, London, Casey, & Pufahl, 1995).

Employment Structure and the Effect on Latino Workers

Employment structure has been found to have the following effects on the Latino worker (University of Massachusetts, 1994, p. vii):


3. De-industrialization and cost-cutting competitive pressures in the manufacturing sector have induced downward pressure on Latino workers’ wages and limited their access to training and job advancement. However, modernizing of manufacturing operations in some firms has resulted in skill upgrading, higher wages, and better employment opportunities for Latinos.

4. Latinos have the lowest full-time and full-year employment rate. Part-year employment is particularly high among Latino workers. Most Latinos working part-time do so for economic reasons and not by choice. Part-year employment is associated with the dramatic decline in the demand for
operatives in non-durable manufacturing and to the higher educational requirements of new work processes.

5. The spatial rearrangements of jobs and the type of occupations that experienced rapid growth have been particularly harmful to Latinos in Northeast cities.

For instance, the decline in labor-force-participation rates for Puerto Rican women is associated with the dramatic decline in the demand for operatives in non-durable manufacturing and to the higher educational requirements of new work processes.

Barriers to Workplace Placement and Advancement

According to the Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy (University of Massachusetts, 1994), "understanding barriers to workplace advancement of Latino workers requires consideration of factors affecting access to employment and advancement in firms, occupations, and industries. These considerations fall under two general topics: Employment structure and work place organization. Employment structures refer to the labor-market context in which work organizations operate. The structure of career ladders, stereotypes, intergroup relations, and work-place culture affect advancement within organizations."

In many instances, the determinants of mobility are the same for men and women. For example, job attachment (i.e., annual hours worked) and higher pay both increase the chances of attaining a supervisory position. In addition, although the manufacturing sector creates internal labor markets that foster wage mobility, employment in manufacturing reduces the chances of receiving a managerial promotion as does membership in a union. Similarly, there is some evidence that unobserved heterogeneity is present in this sample: The more years workers remain in the risk set, the lower their chances of receiving a managerial promotion (Maume, 1999).
Work place barriers can be grouped into four major categories: (a) the structure of work or career ladders, (b) stereotypes and how these interact with managerial styles, (c) intergroup relations and group subordination, (d) and workplace culture (University of Massachusetts, 1994, p. viii). Of particular concern are the following issues:

1. Discriminatory practices in the recruitment and hiring of Latinos result in the under representation of Latinos in entry-level jobs and at all levels of hierarchies in organizations.

2. Work-place practices that are particularly damaging to Latinos are: the placement of Latino candidates in certain kinds of jobs only, the lack of culturally-sensitive mentors who can build upon Latino culture and values and overcome language and acculturation issues, and the stereotyping of Latinos as uneducated, poor, persons of color, who lack potential as good leaders and managers.

3. Latinos are affected by the prevalent practice of defining race relations in work organizations primarily in terms of black/white relations. This focus ignores ethnicity as an important category in determining social identity.

4. Latinos are adversely affected by the assumption that advancement within work organizations requires assimilation and acculturation to the dominant Anglo culture. Comparisons between Latinos and Anglos based on dominant perceptions mistakenly point to a lack of behavioral traits considered very important in determining managerial potential and appropriate work ethic.
5. Cultural traits regarding Latino interpersonal relations and forms of communication may, in the appropriate context, result in better managerial practices in work-place organizations.

6. Latino women are affected by the structure of work, family responsibilities, and cultural biases in ways that are unique, and distinct from the ways in which other women or Latino men are affected by these factors. Family responsibilities are an important barrier to the work-place advancement of Latino women to the extent that they are the primary care providers for children, they have relatively high fertility rates and large families, and very few employers offer the flexibility or benefits to facilitate their dual family and work roles.

7. Labor markets and workplace structure are greater impediments to workplace advancement than is language fluency.

**Job Access and Social Networks**

Access to jobs is limited. “Many entry-level positions are currently filled using other employers, recruiters, or incumbent workers; this practice is discriminatory given that Latinos, as other minorities or women, are not connected to mainstream job networks” (U.M., 1994, p. x). Social networks are an important element of word-of-mouth employment practices. Most immigrant Latinos are excluded from vital social networks as a result of various barriers, including language.
Recommendations for Improving the Latino Workplace Situation

Mentoring Relationships. Thomas, Porterfield, Hutcheson, and Pierannunzi (1994) found the following:

Informal systems, such as unwritten rules, norms of behavior, organizational politics, and accepted modes of operation have proven to be crucial in the incorporation of minority group members into the workforce. Most employees feel that unwritten rules do exist and that adherence to such rules is of paramount importance to career advancement. These invisible barriers are rooted in traditions, attitudes, stereotypes, and perceptions.

The lack of strategic placement for advancement seems to be strongly related to the lack of mentors or sponsors at higher levels within organizations.

There is strong evidence that employees (the mentor as well as the mentee) benefit from mentoring relationships. Mentors (a) act as a vehicle which provides information on organizational norms and/or career opportunities, (b) delegate responsibility on key projects, and (c) serve as liaisons between the employee and the upper-levels of the organization.

Glass Ceiling Recommendations. The Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy (University of Massachusetts, 1994) submitted the following recommendations to the Glass Ceiling Commission:

1. Firms should be encouraged to adopt innovative production organizations that require continuous skills enhancement for workers and broader job definitions. Young Latino workers will benefit particularly from continuous on-the-job skills enhancement because they have the lowest level of educational attainment of any worker group.
2. Latino workers will benefit from the improvement of training and job-placement services provided by state employment services and retraining programs.

3. Latino workers, because of their higher than average experience with part-year employment will gain from reforms to the system of benefit provision, be it the benefits provided as a matter of legal obligation or employer-provided, job-related benefits.

4. Latino workers will benefit from institutional reforms to the framework for union organization and collective bargaining. Latino workers are concentrated in industries and occupations in which union organization has historically raised wages and improved working conditions and promotion opportunities.

5. Latino agriculture workers will gain from reforms that mandate employers to provide a minimum standard of benefits, as well as workplace health and safety provisions.

6. Regular, random audits should be used by the Justice Department to enforce EEO compliance.

7. Because many entry-level positions are currently filled using other employers, recruiters, or incumbent workers, employers should be legally mandated to post all jobs at the local employment offices.

8. Employers should enter into formal arrangements with community and professional job clearing houses that connect qualified Latino applicants with potential employers.

9. The formation of Latino networks within large corporations and professional associates would parallel the formal and informal webs of
relationships developed by majority workers. Interest group organizations promote mentoring and workplace advancement.

10. Corporate- and publicly funded daycare facilities would improve labor-force participation for Latino women. Flexible work schedules allow mothers with infants or school-aged children to work.

Given the growing presence of Latinos in American work places, a thorough understanding of their work experiences and the degree to which language proficiency affects this experience would enhance organizational effectiveness and social progress (Bhagat, 1999; Dinges & Baldwin, 1996; University of Massachusetts, 1994). The application of training and motivation theory to learning English as a second language, the integration of language learning into the Latino acculturation experience, and career planning are three key elements to bolstering Latino immigrants’ self-efficacy and earning potential (Bandura, 1977; Bhagat, 1999; Blanchard & Thacker, 1999); Diehl & Mikulecky, 1980; Dingest & Baldwin, 1996; Gecas, 1989; Gonzalez, 2000; Harlan & Berheide, 1994; Herr & Cramer, 1992; Hull, 2000; Manz & Simms, 1981; National Bureau of Economic Research, 1993, 1996; National Institute for Literacy, 2000; University of Massachusetts, 1994; Venezky & Wagner, 1996; Wodarski, 1992; Zavodny, 1998; Zunker, 1994).

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to assess the structure and outcomes of the Latino Outreach Program with respect to meeting (a) program objectives and goals, and (b) the literacy needs of the Latino immigrant population. LOP grant requirements are contingent upon the successful accomplishment of program goals and objectives, as well as ongoing quality improvement activity. The following research questions were asked in order to
ascertain the level of LOP effectiveness in meeting the needs of the Latino immigrant population as well as LOP effectiveness in accomplishing Program objectives and goals:

1. Are LOP objectives and goals being met?

2. What is the current level of Program effectiveness as evidenced by LOP program design?

3. How are the literacy training needs of the LOP students being met?

Methodology

Participants

Individuals associated with CMR LOP: (a) three English instructors, (b) eleven adult students, (c) one CMR Board of Trustees member, (c) program Co-directors, and (d) one Job Fair recruiter.

Data Collection

Instructor interviews. Purposive sampling was used in which the researcher used personal judgment to select the sample from the pool of instructors that would provide the desired information. Three English Instructors were selected based on their years of service and experience with the LOP curriculum. The first instructor has been with LOP for two years and has taught Workplace III for those two years and mentors new teachers. The second instructor has taught Basic I, Basic II, and Workplace I, II, and III for three semesters (one year). The third instructor has taught Basic II for approximately six years. Private, informal conversational interviews were conducted with these individuals. The interview questions asked of this sample centered around their teaching background, their experience with the LOP, their opinions and experiences surrounding student motivation and needs, and their feelings about the direction of the program.

Class observations. Classes selected for observation were selected according to the principles of convenience sampling. The researcher did not wish to disrupt the
classroom processes unnecessarily. The following classes were observed at least once:
(a) Basic I, (b) Basic II, (c) Workplace II, (d) Workplace III. Basic I classes were observed twice—at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester. The researcher took on the role of complete observer in order to reduce disruption to class process. The researcher observed the Job Fair program in the role of observer-as-participant.

Leadership interviews. Purposive sampling was used in which the researcher used personal judgment to select the sample from the pool of CMR and LOP leadership that could provide the desired information about program operations and community relations. One member of the CMR Board of Trustees was briefly interviewed regarding overall CMR and LOP operations. Most of the program information was obtained from the program Co-directors in private, informal conversational interviews. The interview questions asked of this sample centered around their experience with the LOP, their opinions and experiences surrounding student motivation and needs, overall program operations and flow of communication, program direction and perceived needs of the program, and their feelings about the direction of the program.

Student interviews. Purposive sampling was used in which the researcher used personal judgment to select the sample from the pool of LOP students that could provide information about their experience with LOP, the curriculum, workplace issues, workplace knowledge, and obstacles to personal growth and advancement, and any other issues or concerns they may have that the researcher would be interested in hearing. The researcher chose the last day of school for the year to conduct informal interviews with students in Basic English I and Workplace English III. The last day of the school year was purposely selected because the students should have enough experience with the program to be able to speak about it and themselves with confidence and authority.
Students from Basic English I were purposely selected because it is the first step in the LOP English fluency process. Students in Workplace English III were chosen because they had successfully completed the entire program. This range in the selection would provide contrast. The number of students interviewed in the informal, group interview was left to chance. All students in attendance that day were interviewed collectively in the context of their classroom. Instructors allowed about ten minutes from class time for this interview. Seven students attended Basic English I, and four students attended Workplace III. All students showed interest in participating in the interview process.

The Interview Guide Approach was used in which pertinent topics and issues were specified in advance based on literature review. The researcher was at liberty to select the sequence and wording of questions during the interview process. An informal conversational interview technique was used to gain the confidence of the interview sample.

Participants were fully informed about the purpose of the researcher's program evaluation in advance in order to gain their trust and to avoid the possibility of introducing a response bias into their interviews and observed classroom behavior. Participants were told that the researcher was invited by LOP leadership to evaluate the program (see Appendix B for research questions).

**Group evaluation observation.** The program co-directors conducted a group student evaluation at the conclusion of the Spring term. Forty five students (20 male, 25 female) actively and enthusiastically participated in the group evaluation. The researcher took on the role of complete observer (with the help of a Workplace III translator) during this process. Afterwards the LOP Co-directors debriefed the researcher as well as reviewed the research notes and approved them after the session.
Job fair interview. A brief, informal, retrospective interview with a recruiter from a participating organization in the LOP Job Fair included questions about the benefit of the Fair to his organization (City of Rockville) and to the students. The Job Fair recruiter was purposely selected based on his years of experience with this particular program.


Analysis

As a result of the observations, interviews, and document review, the analysis examined student, instructor, and LOP leadership perspectives with regard to program objectives, literacy training needs, workforce training needs, and workforce training barriers. The results are compared to the research in these areas and reported in narrative form. The current level of program effectiveness is benchmarked against current recommended standards and presented in tabular form. Program outcomes as derived from student, instructor, and LOP leadership interviews are discussed and analyzed in
The research findings for training emphasis are compared to the perceived needs of the students and presented in narrative and tabular form.

Results

The LOP program goals, objectives are being met with effective program design and continuing quality improvement activities. By benchmarking LOP program design, goals, and objectives against the recommendations of the National Institute for Literacy (2000), the researcher shows that LOP is effectively complying with national standards for adult ESL literacy programs (see Appendix E, Table E2). The literacy training needs of the LOP students are varied and complex. Basic literacy needs include motivation, instruction in workplace culture and etiquette, addressing acculturation and assimilation issues, career development activities, and addressing the learning needs of adult students. The LOP is meeting the basic literacy needs of the students. Two primary requests that the students have for improving the program to further meet their needs are (a) access to a language lab, and (b) more conversation practice.

Are Program Design, Goals and Objectives Being Met?

The objective of the LOP is to empower foreign born community members by (a) providing a family-centered program, (b) helping them to improve English fluency skills, (c) enhancing their knowledge of workplace culture and etiquette, and (d) facilitating the assimilation process into the American culture.

The goals of the Adult Teaching Program are to improve participants’ (a) English, (b) language literacy, (c) workplace skills, and (d) survival skills. The objectives of the Adult Teaching Programs are to: (a) Teach Basic English as Second Language, Spanish Literacy, and Workplace English classes twice a week in 90 minute sessions from September to June, (b) provide workplace training through students’ participation in the LOP Job Fair, and General Educational Diploma (GED) workshop, (c) present
workshops on substance abuse awareness throughout the year, and (d) provide the opportunity to prepare for the Immigration and Naturalization testing process.

**Empowerment through English Language Fluency**

**Training outcomes.** Each course of study has clearly defined prerequisites, goals, and training outcome statements (see Appendix C for an example of a 1999-2000 Workplace III course descriptions). Lower level literacy skills are appropriately taught in Basic Spanish Literacy courses as well as Basic English courses. A placement test is administered upon enrollment in the program. As the students progress, higher-level literacy skills are added to the curriculum. Upon completion of a unit of learning, the student is given a written test. The curriculum and written examinations for Basic English I-III test basic literacy functions (as defined by Hull in Table E_1 in Appendix E) such as completing forms, copying, correcting, identifying, labeling, looking up, matching, note taking, practicing, proofreading, reciting, translating, etc. The Workplace English curriculum and testing process covers higher levels of literacy function (Hull, 2000) such as analogizing, contextualizing, citing, assessing, coaching, exercising critical judgment, using literacy to exercise or resist authority, etc.

Instructional methods and tools include straight lecture, discussion, chalk boards, textbooks, materials supplied by instructors, posters, magnetic alphabet board, and cue cards. Instructors report that they would like to incorporate Audio-Visual (AV) instructional design into the curriculum. Classroom space is adequate for now. With expansion of the program, however, new facilities will be considered.

The curriculum is reviewed every five years. The instructors are trained by the Co-directors and other volunteer educators. Training includes (a) lesson plan development, (b) principles of adult learning, and (c) Hispanic culture sensitivity training. The LOP advertises in the Washington Post and the Montgomery Gazette for instructors.
The yield on the job announcement this year was 15 responses. The instructors earn $11.60/hour @ four hours/week. The LOP found that paid instructors are more reliable than volunteer instructors. As a result, they no longer recruit for volunteer instructors. The attrition rate is low for paid instructors. An average of one instructor leaves per semester for personal reasons. A total of seven instructors are needed for core Adult English and Spanish Literacy classes. Instructors meet with LOP leadership on a monthly basis for round table discussion and to report student progress, relevant issues, and to communicate announcements.

The Co-directors report a dropout rate between twenty to thirty percent, especially in Basic English I classes. This year there were 25 people on the waiting list to get into Basic English I. The LOP leadership made follow up calls to the drop outs to discover the reasons for quitting. The main reason was that the students found jobs and classes interfered with their new work schedule. Many could only make one day of classes rather than the required two.

The average score on the final examination (written) for Basic I students in the Spring, 2000 semester was 81.33%. The students participate fully in the classroom experience. Students and instructors would like to have more time added to the class because they do not feel there is enough time to learn everything.

The Workplace III students reported that they had gained more respect from their employers as a result of improving their English-speaking skills. They are pleased with the outcomes of the program but would like more "after care" programs in which they can learn better interview skills, conversation skills, networking skills, improved fluency in English (as would be evidenced by putting on plays and doing more role playing), and career counseling. One of the female Workplace III students reported gaining access from her present employer to on-the-job training in accounting (she happens to have a
degree in accounting from her native country). She attributes her success to her improved fluency in English. Students expressed an interest in having access to a language laboratory. This would provide them with more practice in enunciation and more flexibility in scheduling.

**Level I written evaluations.** LOP adult students from all classes, i.e. Spanish Literacy, Basic English I, II, III, Workplace I, II, III, participate in a Level I evaluation at the end of each semester. The evaluations are based on a five-point Likert scale (see Appendix D) with instructions in both English and Spanish. Responses are collected by instructors and evaluated by the Adult Learning Program Co-Director.

**Level I group evaluation.** In addition to the written course evaluation, the program Co-Directors conduct a group evaluation. About an hour of time on the last day of classes is allotted for adult students from all levels of the program to come together and discuss the curriculum, workshops, and programs openly and freely. The evaluation is conducted in Spanish.

Forty-five adult students from all levels of the program participated in the group evaluation that the researcher observed on June 3, 2000. Twenty of the students were men and twenty-five were women. The co-directors began the session by encouraging the students to speak freely. By speaking honestly the students would have the most impact on improvements made to the program in the future.

Students expressed their gratitude to the program directors for the gratis school materials, transportation tokens, classes, and childcare. They did not want to be thought of as “ungrateful” when making recommendations. The Co-directors reassured students that all suggestions were welcome. Overall, the students did not talk over each other—they listened carefully to what everyone said and took turns responding. No side talking occurred during this hour.
Students were pleased with class size but requested more time for each class. They felt that the ninety-minute sessions twice a week were inadequate for learning everything in the course objectives. Students were enthusiastic about wanting more time for class, but many of them have jobs and children and they were getting home too late with the existing schedule. Suggestions were made to add another day on the weekends or during the week.

Students wanted more input into the curriculum and program planning. They would like to also participate in assisting instructors with running the classes. The National Institute for Literacy (2000) recommends involving students in planning their instruction and treating them as primary stakeholders and full partners in every aspect of program operation. Currently the LOP has a suggestion box, and the Co-directors make themselves available on school nights for student and instructor feedback. Program participants have positions on the staff as child tutors or care providers, and one is an instructor in the Spanish Literacy Program.

Students would like to see incorporated into the program (a) movies, (b) audio-visual materials, and (c) a language lab. They felt that a language lab would provide more flexibility with their schedules and more opportunity to study in a structured environment. Students said that they would cooperate with LOP and try to help raise money for a language lab. Students would also like to have computer training classes.

Throughout the entire discussion, the program co-directors facilitated the process by making positive comments about suggestions, explaining why some things could not be done, and by stimulating further discussion and ideas. Their attitude was friendly and enthusiastic.
During the debriefing session that the researcher held with the Co-directors after the group evaluation session, the program-co-directors expressed the following concerns and comments:

1. They would like more student participation in the workshops. Students admitted that they don’t take advantage of the workshops due to work and family obligations. The co-directors would like to elicit more interest from the students in these workshops.

2. The group session is conducted exclusively in Spanish in order to improve the flow of participation. This was the fourth group evaluation and the Co-directors have found that they get more feedback with the oral evaluation compared to the feedback obtained from the written evaluation. The group session also allows for “high context” communication, which, according to the Co-directors, is the typical type of communication for Latinos. The co-directors noted that the students are afraid of sounding “ungrateful.” To counteract that feeling, they facilitate the oral evaluation in such a way as to strongly encourage honesty. According to the Co-directors, many of the students have experienced oppression and repression of speech in their home countries. Therefore, the Co-directors make special efforts to coach the students to speak freely.

3. They are considering adding another Basic I class because of the large class size in this particular part of the program.

4. They would like to add a class in conversation because the students expressed that too much emphasis is placed on grammar and not enough on speaking skills.
5. If they add another day for classes, they will need to find another facility. Space is limited in their current facilities.

6. Funds and space are limited for adding a language lab to the program.

Motivation. The following points about student motivation were made by three of the instructors in interviews conducted by the researcher on March 9, 2000, and on April 27, 2000: (a) students are enthusiastic about the program, (b) students overcome many obstacles to attend classes, (c) students especially look forward to the job fair, (d) students require career counseling—focus on career goals would provide further direction, (e) instructors provide frequent positive reinforcement due to a perception that students lack self-confidence, (f) instructors feel that students would benefit from improved self confidence, (g) attendance is a problem—due to job & family obstacles and dropping out, and (h) many of the students come to the United States with a university education and/or a useful trade, which they cannot use because of the language barrier.

One instructor summed up the motivation of the students in this manner, "They want to learn, they want to hear and learn. It's humbling. I have met people who have not had the good fortune we have and they work so hard. These people have had to struggle and it humbles me. I don't want to take their struggles for granted. They have a tremendous will to learn."

The researcher observed from the classroom, between classes, the Job Fair, and the group evaluation a friendly, cooperative spirit among the students. Students greeted each other with excitement, great smiles, and hugs. Conversation seemed lively and enthusiastic (the researcher doesn't know the content of these conversations as she is illiterate in Spanish). Without being asked, all students (men and women alike) pitch in...
to ready the rooms for class by setting out the foldout chairs. They also conscientiously fold and return the chairs to the proper place, and stack them neatly at the end of class.

Side talking was observed throughout some of the Basic I classes. The instructors and LOP leadership also mentioned this as a concern (without prompting from the researcher). However, they do not want to become strict about forbidding this type of activity because the students attend this program for social reasons as well. One instructor was fired for being too harsh on the students. The students also made the researcher feel like a part of their social order by enthusiastically and sincerely inviting her to their graduation party and graduation ceremonies. Students report that they enjoy coming to the LOP. Some have gone to other ESL programs and were “happy” to find LOP. They reported a sense of community and “friendly” atmosphere with the LOP that they didn’t experience at the other ESL programs.

Students reported that they would like a conversation class in which they only speak. Grammar and spelling would not be emphasized in this setting. According to the instructors, the students would benefit from such a class. They feel it would motivate them and provide them with the confidence they need to speak to non-Spanish speaking people.

When the researcher asked students if they were “respected” in the workplace, the consensual answer from the Basic I students was, “No, of course not! We don’t speak good English.” The Workplace III students reported that they are receiving “more respect” at work since they have learned better English skills. They report that they are a little more comfortable talking to Americans and that they are being understood better. The students in this class are excited by the opportunities that this country offers and plan on learning better pronunciation so they can gain more respect. One of the Workplace III students summed up the experience as follows: “If you don’t speak English they push
you aside. When you speak, they reach out.” Both groups reported that the lack of respect doesn’t really bother them because they take the blame upon themselves for not speaking English.

**What is the current level of LOP Program effectiveness?**

**Program design.** The staff track attendance, participation, improvement, volunteer hours, positive life changes, Spanish literacy, and English skills development. The students take a placement test and final exam. The results allow LOP to gauge participant satisfaction and program effectiveness. For the adult LOP, student participants evaluate classes and workshops using a questionnaire. Results are tabulated and a final report is produced. LOP programs are continuously improving based on increased attendance, return participation and constant evaluation, modification, and/or addition of needed services (LOPCMR, 1998, p. 3).” Table E2 in Appendix E outlines LOP program practices benchmarked against the National Institute for Literacy (2000) recommendations.

**Workplace culture and etiquette.** The second objective of the LOP is to enhance participant knowledge of workplace culture and etiquette. In two group interviews with Basic English I (six women and one man) and Workplace III (one woman and three men) students conducted on June 8, 2000, the researcher found the following:

1. The objective of all students interviewed was to learn better English. The LOP is doing a good job of meeting this need.

2. The students felt that if they knew English, they would receive more respect in the workplace and would be able to advance their skills and training.

3. Two of the female students were cosmetologists in their home country. Both are employed in this country as baby sitters and janitors. Both have two part time jobs that do not offer benefits.
4. Two of the female students were nurses in their home country and are presently employed as baby sitters and housekeepers. Both positions are part-time and do not offer benefits.

5. One of the male students was a contractor in his country, he is now working as a laborer painting houses.

6. All students interviewed who possessed some sort of developed skill asked the interviewer if she could help them get training and get connected to someone in the community who could help them utilize their present knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

7. The students stated that they did not understand their rights as an employee and further stated that employers do not explain their rights to them. One of the instructors stated that a handout is available on this topic and that a guest lecturer (a lawyer) came to one of the classes last year to speak on this issue.

8. All 15 students showed keen interest when asked if they were interested in joining a unionized workforce. The students feel that joining a union would improve their station in life. They would like more information on labor law and unions in the United States.

9. Only one of the eleven students reported having job-related training and opportunity for advancement. She gained these opportunities with the improvement of her English skills and with the help of a “friend” at work.

Workplace I, II, III classes and the Job Fair provide students with information and training in job-related vocabulary, reading classified ads, filling out employment forms, writing a one-page resume, writing a cover and thank you letter, and participating in an interview with at least two potential employers.
Job fair. The researcher attended the LOP Job Fair on April 27, 2000 in the capacity of potential employer and observer. Over 60 students attended this function. Of the seven organizations that planned to attend, only five actually participated. The job fair is held in the evening during class time in one of the host churches in which the classes are routinely held on Thursday evenings. There is no charge to the participating organizations.

The purpose of the Job Fair, as explained by the Co-directors, is to provide an opportunity to practice interview skills, to feel secure in a familiar environment, to provide students with potential employment opportunities, and to reward students’ hard efforts.

The researcher interviewed a representative from the City of Rockville Human Resources Department who was participating in the event. The representative reports that he finds the Fair useful in “stimulating people to be able to go through the process.” The City of Rockville acquaints students with their job line and brings a list of current job listings. The representative reported that he had attended “a few” of the Fairs and found that some of the students give “good interviews.” He also reported seeing the same people each time and has noted improvement in their English skills as they progress through the courses. They do hire people from this recruitment source.

The Job Fair begins with the Co-directors introducing each organization to the students. Each organizational representative stands in front of the students and explains a little bit about their company and the type of people they are looking to hire. The Co-directors translate each speech to provide a sense of familiarity and comfort. However, the interviews are conducted exclusively in English.

Job Fair participants were eager to visit the researcher’s recruitment table. The company being represented by the researcher provided flexible schedules and required
non-medical home helpers to take care of the elderly. The following observations were
gathered by the researcher:

1. The students from Workplace II & Workplace III exhibited overall more
certainty and better command of English. Those who had poor command of
English got a friend/fellow classmate to translate for them. The researcher felt
that these students actually knew more English than they were giving
themselves credit for. They seemed to lack confidence or were simply shy.

2. The female students reported the following occupations: Two students were
nurses in their home countries, they are now working as a housekeeper and a
Nanny in this country; a second woman was a teacher in her country for 10
years, she is now babysitting for private individuals; a third woman who was a
Bank Administrator in her country, is currently working as a janitor; a few of
the women reported being secretaries in their home countries, they are either
not working now because of language deficiency or they are working as
babysitters. The men reported occupations in their home countries in
Engineering, medicine (physicians), and construction (contractors). These
men have found jobs in this country in landscaping, food industry, day labor,
house painting, and the physician has a part time job as an EKG technician.

3. The researcher found seven individuals who qualified for the positions offered
by the non-medical home health company she represented.

Acculturation. LOP leadership seeks to assimilate students into American culture.

In interviews with the LOP co-directors on August 8, 2000, and October 27, 2000, the
following points were made about assimilation efforts:

1. The Job Fair is the one program that provides motivation to learn about the
American interview process in a controlled, Latino-friendly environment.
2. The instructors discuss American celebrations and holidays. Students are encouraged to embrace traditions which are not indigenous to their own culture, e.g. Thanksgiving, while maintaining their own cultural identity and celebrations.

3. Workshops on health prevention issues are intended to introduce participants to community resources available for those who do not have health care coverage, e.g. Mobile Medical offers sliding scale medical care and gynecological services. These workshops also cover important health prevention topics such as smoking and drug prevention.

4. Police and lawyers attend classes to discuss American law and law enforcement.

5. LOP makes efforts to inform students about the differences in age limits in drinking alcohol. Drinking alcohol is allowed at age 18 in most Latin American countries.

6. LOP instructors and leaders encourage participants to “keep your identity, but adapt. Take what is good here in the United States and put it in your life.”

7. Adult students report assimilation stress when dealing with their children. The children are growing up in this country and going to American schools. They are a part of the American system and yet are living in two worlds. At home they live in their parent’s country and then they go to school. Sex is taught in the schools and this is a “hard topic” for Latino nationals to discuss with their children. The parents are “shocked” when their children come home and talk about sex.

8. Many of the Latino women don’t work because they take care of the children. They are encouraged to attend the workshops to learn about new things and to
socialize. They report feeling “depressed” because they leave their families and everything behind them and feel isolated. Appropriate counseling services are not available for these women because there are not a lot of Spanish-speaking counselors who understand the culture. Counseling must be culturally sensitive and done in Spanish in order to gain the confidence of these women. The LOP provides a family-centered atmosphere for these women where they can learn English and make new friends. “This is their new family.”

9. Building confidence is difficult for instructors and students. “It’s difficult with language. You are self conscious and the accent is hard to get. In English you have to move your mouth. We feel shy and are afraid that someone will laugh at us. Teachers do point out the differences in pronunciation and show students that everyone is in the same boat.”

10. LOP instructors must be familiar with the teaching process as well as “sympathetic” with the Hispanic community. They must provide a pleasant, “safe” atmosphere in order to facilitate the learning process. The teachers report being “happy” even though they are often tired (they have full-time jobs). They come to “help”—NOT for the money.

The United States Citizenship classes are held in July and August (when no LOP English & Spanish literacy classes are scheduled). Participants pay $250 to receive help in filling out INS application forms. The Spanish Catholic Center partners with LOP to send qualified lawyers to run the sessions. The CMR sends the applications to the INS and coordinates follow-up issues with the INS. In January and February the LOP offers 90 hours of preparation for the Citizenship test. This course is done exclusively in English. Attendance and commitment are “good” for these classes. A prerequisite to
entering either of these classes is to be a participant in the LOP English and/or Basic Literacy classes.

How are the Literacy Training Needs of LOP Students Being Met?

Literacy Training Needs. The LOP provides an adult learning environment (Knowles, 1984) by (a) capitalizing on the experiences of students, (b) adapting to language and age limitations of students, (c) challenging students to increasingly advanced stages of personal development, (d) providing choices and accessibility to learning programs as well as childcare, (e) providing knowledge of why something is important, (f) experiential learning, and (g) introducing topics of immediate value.

Course prerequisites, learning outcomes, instructional method and media for instruction are carefully built into the curriculum. According to Gagné, these are critical elements for influencing positive learning outcomes.

Program motivational techniques include positive reinforcement (Skinner, 1953, 1968; Thorndike, 1905, 1913, 1932; Vroom 1964), meeting students’ needs (Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954, 1968; Schneider & Alderfer, 1973) for existence (teaching survival skills), relatedness (family-centered, culturally-sensitive focus), and growth (focus toward language and workplace achievement as well as Naturalization).

Self-confidence is an important element for success in language fluency and workplace advancement (Blanchard & Thacker, 1999; Kraiger, Ford, and Salas, 1993). Instructors and LOP leadership recognize the need for improving the self-confidence of students. Confidence issues have been identified by Program leadership as centering on the inability to be understood due to the “thickness” of the Spanish accent and the fear of being “made fun of.”

A number of researchers (Credle & Dean, 1991; Henry, Bardo, & Henry, 1992; Hernandez, 1995; Murry & Mosidi, 1993) recommend use of mentors and role models in
the career development of Hispanic individuals. Students have requested more conversation classes with no emphasis on grammar or language structure. According to the research (Gonzalez, 2000; Hill, 2000) financial returns in the workplace are greater for immigrants who exhibit greater oral proficiency than on literacy skills (writing, reading, calculating). Students could possibly benefit from a program such as the MEI, Speaking Partners Program (see Appendix A).

Many of the students possess skills and education that are necessary commodities in today’s tight Human Resource market. Students have expressed a desire to re-enter their careers (RN, engineer, and physician) or to utilize trade skills (hairdressers) in this country. Lack of adequate career planning information may lead to an ambiguous self-image (Herr & Cramer, 1992). Access to career counseling services is an important psychosocial, motivational issue for these students (Hawks & Muha, 1991; Herr & Cramer, 1992). Career counseling is outside of the scope of the current LOP curriculum. However, special workshops conducted by workforce training experts, such as State Job Training Associates (University of Massachusetts, 1994) may be a way of assisting students in their assimilation efforts as well as provide necessary focus and a clearer self-image (thus improved confidence).

**Career Development for Minorities.** According to the literature (Diehl & Mikulecky, 1980; Gonzalez, 2000; Hill, 2000; Hull, 2000; National Bureau of Economic Research, 1993, 1996; Resnick, 1990), the ability to speak fluently is of primary importance in gaining access to jobs, improved earning power, as well as to gaining job promotions. LOP certainly strives to meet the objective of providing basic English skills to enhance students’ job opportunities.

Students report that they are not offered career development opportunities at work unless they have a “friend” who can help them and unless they have basic speaking and
writing skills. Those students who bring with them post-secondary education from their home countries would like more help in learning about how they can get back into their original field of study. The two nurses that the researcher interviewed expressed keen interest in finding out how to become nurses aides and they would try to work their way up to full RN status from there. Family obligations, lack of money, and lack of information and networking prevent them from exploring career development opportunities.

Of the eleven students interviewed, only one of them held a full time job with “benefits.” The “benefits” this individual received was one week of vacation time. No health care benefits were offered to any of the individuals. Most of them were involved in day labor, part time unskilled labor, and they reported having to work at more than one job in order to survive. Students did not express anger or discouragement. They were hopeful that once they learned English, they would be able to improve their work situation.

Students feel that the curriculum is adequate with the exception of a perceived need for more conversation classes and for a language lab in which they can practice the more repetitive, declarative and procedural tasks of learning English. Blanchard and Thacker (1999),
Discussion

Impressions

The LOP program goals, objectives are being met with effective program design and continuing quality improvement activities as can be seen in Appendix E, Table E2. The addition of childcare and child tutoring are excellent examples of how the LOP implements continuous quality improvement in order to enhance and facilitate the adult learning experience.

The literacy training needs of the LOP students are varied and complex. The basic literacy needs of the students are mostly being met according to students’ report and the literature available on the subject. The addition to the LOP of access to a language lab and more conversation classes would enhance literacy training effectiveness.

Program Objectives

Family-centered. The researcher observed and experienced first-hand the family-centered, shared-community atmosphere of the LOP. Students cooperate over small and large tasks (e.g. putting chairs away, and planning graduation dinner), show an interest in the future of the program, and are even willing to try to raise money for a language lab. This type of atmosphere motivates students (Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954, 1968), improves their self-esteem, and thus contributes to improved performance (Alderfer, 1969; Bandura, 1977; Gecas, 1989; Gist, 1987; Locke, Lee, & Bobko, 1984; Manz & Simms, 1981; Maslow, 1954, 1968).

Improving English fluency. Overall, students report gains in English fluency. Gains are reported in terms of acceptance by work peers and job advancement. Final scores on end of year Basic I English exams averaged 81%. Instructors and a Job Fair recruiter also note gains in fluency.
Knowledge of workplace culture and etiquette. Workplace I, II, III curricula provide working knowledge and practice in basic workplace entry skills, i.e. writing resumes, cover letters, thank-you letters, and job interview skills. The Job Fair provides knowledge of Job Fair practices and an opportunity to practice basic interview skills. Students would like more information about workplace issues such as employee rights, e.g. Title VII, pre-employment testing and selection, Family Medical Leave Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Occupational Safety and Health, Workers’ Compensation, contract labor, wrongful discharge. Students also expressed an enthusiastic interest in learning more about unions. According to the literature (National Institute for Literacy, 2000; University of Massachusetts, 1994), unions provide expanded opportunities for Latino immigrants in terms of better pay, longer tenure, and training.

Facilitate assimilation process. A large part of the objective to maintain the shared-community, family-centered atmosphere is cultural sensitivity. Cultural sensitivity is required of instructors and further reinforced by initial training (upon hire) in Hispanic culture. Program leadership guards against cultural confrontation (Zaid, 1999) and assures that assimilation efforts include elements of the native as well as the target culture. This approach prevents students from becoming defensive and hostile toward the target culture (Ellis, 1985; Kelman, 1996). Second language learning is facilitated and students are more motivated when integrative attempts such as this are made to socialize students (Clement, 1980; Ellis, 1985; Fillmore, 1991; Furnham, 1993; Gardner, 1983; Kramsch, 1993; London & Sessa, 1998).

Other acculturative efforts reported by Program leadership include: (a) the Job Fair in which students learn about the American interview process, (b) discussion of American holidays and celebrations, encouraging students to incorporate the American celebrations that they like into their own lives without eliminating native celebrations, (c)
health prevention workshops provide necessary information on pertinent health topics and resources for affordable (often sliding scale and free) health care, (d) guest lectures from law enforcement officers and attorneys, (e) providing a "safe" social atmosphere in which students can discuss their experiences with "culture shock," (f) United States Citizenship classes, and (g) U.S. Citizenship Preparation classes.

Program Design

LOP priorities coincide with the National Institute for Literacy's (2000) recommendations to (a) optimize resources, (b) access, and (c) quality. LOP is completely funded by grants. Grant funds are used wisely with thought toward (a) maintaining continuity (paying Program leadership, tutors, and instructors), (b) holding classes in facilities that are easily accessible to public transportation, (c) providing gratis transportation tokens, classes, and instructional materials for people of low-income, (d) and procuring quality improvement advice from topic experts in Program/organizational development, curriculum development, and ESL training for instructors.

Many of the literacy standards cited by the Action Agenda from the National Literacy Summit 2000 (National Institute for Literacy, 2000) are being met by the LOP program structure and content:

1. **Student involvement.** Students (a) actively recruit for the ESL classes, (b) participate fully in program evaluation, (c) plan and execute celebrations, and (d) are eligible for employment within the Program.

2. **Visibility in the community as a critical human resource.** Evidence of this type of visibility lies in the fact that LOP receives grant funding from private businesses and organizations. State, county, and local government also refer
to LOP for assistance and input. LOP also receives beneficial media
coverage.

3. **Partnerships.** LOP has established numerous strategic partnerships.
Partnerships include affiliations with the Rockville Chamber of Commerce,
the Maryland State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Montgomery
County Public Health, County and City law enforcement agencies,
Montgomery Community College, the Mayoral Rockville City Council, and
the Mayor of Rockville.

4. **Technology.** Instructional materials utilizing newer technology are not a part
of LOP at this time. Program leadership, instructors, and students have
requested more technology for classroom instructional methods. According to
Blanchard and Thacker (1999) (see Table 1), use of computer-based
instructional training methods is rated as “very effective” in teaching
declarative knowledge (such as is required in the learning of grammar).
Students have requested a language lab that would satisfy their need for
flexible scheduling while learning the very basics of English.

**Literacy Training Needs**

The LOP provides an adult learning environment (Knowles, 1984) by (a)
capitalizing on the experiences of students, (b) adapting to language and age limitations
of students, (c) challenging students to increasingly advanced stages of personal
development, (d) providing choices and accessibility to learning programs as well as
childcare, (e) providing knowledge of why something is important, (f) experiential
learning, and (g) introducing topics of immediate value. Course prerequisites, learning
outcomes, instructional method and media for instruction are carefully built into the
According to Gagné, these are critical elements for influencing positive learning outcomes.

Program motivational techniques include positive reinforcement (Skinner, 1953, 1968; Thorndike, 1905, 1913, 1932; Vroom 1964), meeting students' needs (Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954, 1968; Schneider & Alderfer, 1973) for existence (teaching survival skills), relatedness (family-centered, culturally-sensitive focus), and growth (focus toward language and workplace achievement as well as Naturalization).

Self-confidence is an important element for success in language fluency and workplace advancement (Blanchard & Thacker, 1999; Kraiger, Ford, and Salas, 1993). Instructors and LOP leadership recognize the need for improving the self-confidence of students. Confidence issues have been identified by Program leadership as centering on the inability to be understood due to the "thickness" of the Spanish accent and the fear of being "made fun of."

A number of researchers (Credle & Dean, 1991; Henry, Bardo, & Henry, 1992; Hernandez, 1995; Murry & Mosidi, 1993) recommend use of mentors and role models in the career development of Hispanic individuals. Students have requested more conversation classes with no emphasis on grammar or language structure. According to the research (Gonzalez, 2000; Hill, 2000) financial returns in the workplace are greater for immigrants who exhibit greater oral proficiency than on literacy skills (writing, reading, calculating). Students could possibly benefit from a program such as the MEI, Speaking Partners Program (see Appendix A).

Many of the students possess skills and education that are necessary commodities in today's tight Human Resource market. Students have expressed a desire to re-enter their careers (RN, engineer, physician) or to utilize trade skills (hairdressers) in this country. Lack of adequate career planning information may lead to an ambiguous self-
image (Herr & Cramer, 1992). Access to career counseling services is an important psychosocial, motivational issue for these students (Hawks & Muha, 1991; Herr & Cramer, 1992). Career counseling is outside of the scope of the current LOP curriculum. However, special workshops conducted by workforce training experts, such as State Job Training Associates (University of Massachusetts, 1994) may be a way of assisting students in their assimilation efforts as well as provide necessary focus and a clearer self-image (thus improved confidence).
Limitations

The researcher triangulated findings by interviewing different sources and benchmarking findings against research information and research observations. The student group interviews were done in the presence of instructors. This presence may have affected the content and honesty of reporting information to the researcher. However, the researcher did not perceive any hesitation from students when answering questions. Instructor and Co-director interviews were conducted privately. No hesitation was noted from interviewees when answering questions about perceived program needs.

The information obtained from group evaluations could be skewed in that the opinions of those students who spoke may not represent the majority opinion. The researcher noted, however, that many of the silent students nodded their heads in agreement with what students who spoke out were saying. Reluctance on the part of students, instructors, and leadership to speak freely would minimally affect the researcher's ability to investigate areas of the program that may require some improvement due to the triangulation method being used in which interview findings are benchmarked against research findings.

The fact that the researcher speaks no Spanish may have affected students' understanding of and response to interview questions. The researcher, however, noted that responses were appropriate to questions being asked. Researcher conclusions may be unnecessarily influenced by her limited knowledge of Latin American history and culture. The effect of these factors on the study would be to show bias and inaccurate reporting which would affect recommendations and conclusions. Again, the use of triangulation with benchmarks against research literature minimizes this potential bias. The researcher also submitted draft copies of this study to the CMR Board of Directors as
well as to the LOP Director and Co-directors for review of accuracy of facts and possible misunderstandings.

Research was done exclusively for the assessment of the Latino Outreach Program and cannot be generalized to other populations. The sample is demographically, ethnographically, and geographically limited.
Conclusion and Implications

The Latino Outreach Program of the Community Ministries of Rockville provides cost-effective English language training, knowledge of basic employment practices, and psychosocial assimilation support for the Latino immigrant community in the greater Rockville, Maryland area. Program strengths lie in the areas of program design, the unique approach to shared-community, community visibility and partnerships, motivation, and elimination of barriers common to program participation throughout the United States. The Program design incorporates continuous quality improvement principles into each aspect of the adult classes and programs.

As the Latino immigrant population increases, the Program will necessarily expand as increased demands are placed on its valuable services. As a consequence larger, more modern facilities will be needed as well as incorporation of technological instructional materials and possibly computer-based learning centers. Greater grant funding and partnerships will be needed to facilitate expansion while maintaining the individualized, unique, shared-community approach to learning and coping in America.
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Appendix A

Maryland English Institute: Conversation Links Workbook

Dear Participants,

Welcome to the Conversation Links English conversation practice program! Although most international students, scholars, and other non-native English speakers arrive in the United States with a good technical mastery of English, many still need help to improve their command of everyday, conversational "American" English.

This workbook provides a means for non-native English speakers to practice conversation with native English speakers in a systematic and sequential manner that promotes mutual learning throughout the process. This workbook may be used to facilitate conversations and cultural learning for both individual partnerships (one non-native English speaker and one native English speaker) or in a group format (a small group comprised of both non-native and native English speakers).

It is suggested that partners or groups meet at least once a week, at regularly scheduled times and places. By utilizing the weekly exercises and suggested activities in this workbook, partners or groups can keep the sessions focused on continuous conversation and mutual cultural learning. Weekly conversation topics are provided, and exercises in the back of the workbook can help non-native speakers better understand slang expressions or idioms.
The space below is provided for you to make a note of when and where your sessions are scheduled to take place: My partner and I will meet ___________ My conversation group (or club) meets ___________. Again, welcome to the MEI Speaking Partners program! The Conversation Links workbook was created by, and is distributed by Teresa Brawner Bevis, M.Ed., who served as Program Coordinator for the University of Arkansas International Programs Office from 1994-1999.

PRACTICING CULTURAL COURTESY

Every culture has particular societal and inter-relational “norms.” For example, some cultures prefer standing or sitting very close to the persons with whom they are conversing, while others are accustomed to more distance. Some cultures are traditionally more “physical” and enjoy a friendly pat on the back or a hug, while others find that too personal if the other party is not familiar to them. Additionally, some cultures may find certain conversational topics uncomfortable, particularly if they involve very personal information, religious preferences, or politically sensitive arenas.

It is important for both international and U.S. students to anticipate that there will be some social differences, to respect each other’s ethnic and cultural traditions, and to be willing to make necessary adjustments so that both parties are at ease.

PART I

Suggested Topics for Weekly Conversation Practice

HOW TO CONDUCT YOUR WEEKLY MEETINGS

The following schedule is a suggested format. You do not have to follow it exactly. These are things to keep in mind for every meeting: Be friendly and respectful Remember that for some of you this may be one of your first encounters with persons
from unfamiliar cultures. While cultural expectations and norms may conflict, everyone responds positively to a helpful and courteous attitude. American participants are the facilitators and listeners. Their role is to keep conversations going by asking questions about the week's topic, and by monitoring what is said in order to point out needed corrections. International participants should do most of the talking. This is very important to remember.

International students should try to come to each meeting with a list of words, phrases, gestures, etc. that you find difficult, or do not understand. When you encounter communication that you don’t understand, make a quick note of it and ask your group or partner about it when you meet. Don’t feel afraid or embarrassed about asking “foolish questions.” There are no “foolish questions” when one is attempting to learn.

BASIC PROCEDURE

First, the American participants or the group leaders initiate conversation exchange by asking the listed questions and listening to the responses. American students may also provide their own brief responses, but should remember to always let the international student do most of the talking. (And, you do not necessarily have to stick to the listed questions or topic).

Next, choose one of the Dialogs in Slang from the workbook. Participants take turns reading the lines. Then, take turns reading the Dialog in Standard English and discuss what each of the slang terms mean.
WEEK 1 TOPIC: LET'S GET ACQUAINTED

1. What is the correct pronunciation of your name? How do you wish to be addressed? Which name is your family name? How are names formed in your country (Surname first? Last? Is the father's or mother's name used? Does your given name signify something)?

2. Tell me about your town/city. If I traveled there, what would you want to show me?

3. Who are your family members?

4. Why have you chosen to attend the University of Maryland?

5. If this is your first trip to Maryland (or the U.S.) what have you found surprising? What have you found to be difficult? What do you remember the most about your first week on campus?

6. How do you like the food here? How is it different from what you eat in your country?

7. Do you live on campus or in an apartment? What are the facilities like compared to housing in your country?

8. What are you studying? What do you plan to do after you complete your degree?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

One person begins by stating his/her name, country, what you are studying, and something interesting about yourself ("My name is Mary Xu. I am from northern China. I am studying microbiology. I enjoy ballroom dancing"). Then, the next person in the group repeats what the previous student just said and then states his/her own information. Then the third person repeats both sets of information, in order, and adds his/her own, and so
on, until everyone has been included. This activity works best in groups of 6-10 persons.

WEEK 2 TOPIC: SHARING TRADITIONS

1. What are the most important holidays/celebrations in your country? Why are they celebrated?
2. What activities are associated with these holidays/celebrations?
3. What special foods are served during these celebrations?
4. Will you celebrate these holidays while you are in this country?
5. Are there special songs or dances performed for these ceremonies?

Have you had a chance to participate in any American holidays or traditional ceremonies since you have been here? What did you think of the experience? SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

Demonstrate any sort of traditional activity from your country. A song, dance, traditional holiday greeting, poem, folk story, game. If possible have others from the group join in, or teach the activity, song, etc. to your group.

WEEK 3 TOPIC: COMMUNICATION

1. The subtle ways in which people communicate can differ between cultures. For example, Americans tend to space themselves at a particular distance from each other when talking. Other cultures tend to stand or sit much closer together. Have you encountered these "space" issues? Can you give examples?
2. Some cultures tend to touch each other more than others. In many parts of Asia, people who are not friends rarely touch each other when communicating. In many Latin American countries, frequent touching, patting, or hugging is the norm. What examples of this have your encountered since your arrival here?
3. The way people greet each other differs between countries. How do you greet others in your country? Handshake? Bow? Hands together? How might you greet someone of higher/lower status in your country?

4. Eye contact can differ dramatically between countries. What is the norm in your country? How is eye contact different between workers/superiors, for example? Or between the sexes?

WEEK 4 TOPIC: EXPLORING GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

1. What system of government does your country employ? What are its basic tenants?

2. What do you believe are the most critical differences in the political systems in your country and those in the U.S.?

3. What do you feel are the most positive aspects of each system?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

Round-table discussion: If you could begin a new country and had the power to set up the perfect government, what basic components would you include as its basic philosophy?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

Each person recite or sing their national anthem, translate it (if necessary), and explain its meaning and origin.
WEEK 5 TOPIC: EXPLORING GEOGRAPHY, CLIMATE, AGRICULTURE

1. What countries border your country?

2. What are the important geographic elements? Major waterways? Mountains or other terrain?

3. What is the weather like? How does it compare to here? What sort of adjustments have you had to make?

4. What agriculture is predominant in your country? How has the geography and climate shaped the production?

5. What are the major foods produced and consumed in your country?

6. How are these foods typically prepared?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

Exchange recipes. Either write down a simple recipe and give a copy to each of your group (or tell what the recipe is and let everyone write it down for themselves); or, if you don’t know any recipes, share an idea for a new food (“Have you tried coffee with a little cardamom? It’s delicious!”) As many of the group as possible should prepare and sample the food or beverage during the week and then tell the group about it at the next meeting. Or, someone may want to make one of the recipes and bring samples to the next meeting for everyone in the group to try.
WEEK 6 TOPIC: HISTORY/LANGUAGE

1. How did your country originate? How old is it?

2. What sorts of people make up the population?

3. If not indigenous, where did population groups migrate from? Why? With what result?

4. What languages are spoken?

5. What are the most important historical events of your country?

6. What do you think your country will be like in 10 years? Will there be major changes in daily life, government, religion, or education?

7. How do you feel technology will affect your country and its people over the next decade?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

If your language is written in something other than the English alphabet, demonstrate how it looks by writing each group member’s name on a sheet of paper. Explain what each letter or symbol means and how it sounds. Write large and use a single sheet of paper so that the group member can take it with him/her to keep.
WEEK 7 TOPIC: EDUCATION

1. What level of education do most people in your country receive?

2. How are the levels of schooling set up? Are they different than in the U.S.?

3. Do many people have the opportunity to go to college?

4. What is the grading system like in public schools?

5. How is the level of discipline different from that in this country?

6. Is the level of respect for teachers/professors different? How?

7. Engagement in open discussion and challenging the professor is a common form of learning exchange in the U.S. Are you comfortable with that method of inquiry? Why or why not?

8. Are sports or other extracurricular activities important parts of public school education?

WEEK 8 TOPIC: DATING/MARRIAGE/GENDER ISSUES

1. In the U.S., teenagers typically begin dating in groups or in pairs. Americans (male and female) may have a number of casual dating relationships before deciding on a permanent partnership such as marriage. How is this practice similar or different in your country?

2. What are the prevalent attitudes about the roles of men and women in the marriage contract? Are marriages ever arranged in your culture? How are the marriage roles different between men and women? What is typically expected from each?

3. The U.S. divorce rate is over 50%. What are your thoughts about this problem? What is the divorce rate in your country? Is it lower or higher, Why?
4. If a woman seeks to become a professional in business or another field in your country, what will be her greatest obstacles, if any?

5. How do educational expectations differ between males and females in your country?

6. Do women in your country have equal legal protection? Why or why not?

WEEK 9 TOPIC: RELIGION

1. What are the prevalent religions in your country? Do you practice an organized religion? If so, what?

2. How do you routinely practice your religion in your own country? Are there daily/weekly rituals?

3. How has being at the University affected the way you practice your beliefs? Are there facilities/churches/temples available?

4. In this country, evangelism is a big part of many Christian groups. Have any Christians approached you or Christian groups? How do you feel about that?
WEEK 10 TOPIC: GOALS

1. Goal-setting is essential to organizing one's life course. Have you decided on specific goals to accomplish while you are at the University? What are they?

2. What will your life be like 5 years from now? Professional life? Marriage? Children?

3. What will you be doing 10 years from now? Describe in detail the scenario you imagine.

4. Are you on a path that you believe will take you these goals? How?

5. Have your goals changed since your arrival at the University? If so, why and how?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITY

Each person take a sheet of paper and create a time chart for the goals you want to accomplish over the next 20 years. Be creative if you wish, as long as the chart is a visual representation of what you will be doing toward your goals at any given point in time. Then share them with the group.
Appendix B

Questions for Instructors:

1. What seems to motivate the students?

2. What are some student needs that you have identified?

3. How could the classes be improved?

4. What are some improvements to the program that you have found beneficial?

5. What are some of the resources available to you from the LOP?

6. What are some resources that you would like made available to you?

Interview Topic areas for Students

1. What is your educational background from your home country? Do you bring special skills or a trade with you to this country?

2. Are you able to use your skills or trade? If not, what are the barriers to doing so? Would you like to use your previously learned skills, training, & education in this country? What barriers to doing so?

3. What further information and help in re-entering your previous occupation, trade, and area of education do you require?

4. What is your current job? Do you have benefits? How many jobs do you have? Is your job full time or part time? Do you feel as if your boss & colleagues respect you and that you may advance professionally?

5. Are you aware of your rights as an employee? Would you be interested in learning more about employment law and labor issues?

6. What do you hope to gain from LOP classes? What have you gained?
7. Has the course/s had any impact on your interactions in the workplace? Are you able to speak English confidently in the workplace? What prevents you from attempting to speak more English in the workplace?

8. Are the times & locations of LOP classes convenient?

9. Has the program helped you become more capable of coping in the U.S. culture?

10. Does your job provide training for employees? Do you participate in this training? Why?

11. Does anyone at your job try to help you get through the system to advance? Do you help others to do so?
Appendix C

Community Ministries of Rockville
Latino Outreach Program
English in the Workplace III

Course Description

The English in the Workplace III provides a continuity of the elements of the English language in speaking, reading, listening, writing, as they relate to the workplace. This course will provide job related skills such as interviewing, resume writing, listening and comprehension, pronunciation and conversation. This course will also review grammar rules such as negative and affirmative sentences, contractions, idioms and analogies usage and expressions. After the completion of this course, the student will be able to effectively communicate in the workplace. The course is developed in 45 hours and is divided into six units.

Outcome Objectives

By the end of this course students will be capable to communicate effectively in the workplace and will have good command of the English language in reading writing and verbal

Course Content

Unit I  Grammar (Part I)
Singular and plural nouns, articles, verbs, adjectives, and pronouns.
Review of past, present, and future tense of most common regular verbs.
Conjugate irregular verbs in present and past tenses.

Process Objectives

At the end of the unit students will be able to:
Identify singular and plural words.
Identify the elements of a complete sentence.
Conjugate the most common irregular verbs in present, past and future tenses.

Evaluation

This unit will be evaluate as follows:
In a given written quiz, students should be able to differentiate the singular and plural.
In a given exercise, students will identify all the elements of five complete sentences.
In a given quiz, students will conjugate five of the most common irregular verbs in present past and future tenses.

UNIT II  Grammar (Part II)
Negative and Affirmative sentences.
Verb Agreement.
Contractions.
Punctuation. Period, exclamation and question marks, comma, semi-colon, colon.
Review of idioms.
Analogy.
Process Objectives
At the end of this unit students will be able to:
- Recognize the structure of negative and affirmative sentences.
- Identify the verb agreement in a sentence.
- Identify contractions, (should've, would've, won't)
- Recognize the basic elements of punctuation. (Period, exclamation and question marks comma, semi-colon and colon.)
- Recognize the proper use of punctuation rules in English.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
- In a given written exercise, students will recognize affirmative and negative sentences.
- In a given written exercise, students will recognize the verb agreement in a sentence.
- In a given quiz, students will write contractions in five sentences.
- In a given paragraph, students should be able to write punctuation rules.

UNIT III Writing
Description of work schedule and daily activities.

Process Objectives
At the end of this unit students will be able to:
- Write a short paragraph.
- Write their own work schedule and describe daily activities.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
- In a given class exercise, students will write a paragraph no longer than a quarter of a page.
- In a given format, students will complete their work schedule or daily activities.

UNIT IV Reading
Pronunciation.
Comprehension.
Job related vocabulary.
Job abbreviations and classified advertisement.

Process Objectives
At the end of this unit students will be able to:
- Improve their pronunciation level.
- Improve and/or increase their comprehension level.
- Enhance job related vocabulary.
- Identify common job abbreviations when reading classified ads.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
- In a given written page, students will read a short story silently and out loud. Students will pronounce with approximately 80% of accuracy.
- In a given class exercise, students will write at least 90% of a dictation.
- In a given newspaper or magazine article, student will identify the main idea.
In a given quiz, students will write ten job related words.
In a given classified ad, student will read and identify 10 job abbreviations.

UNIT V    Speaking and Listening
Pronunciation.
Spelling.
Conversation.
Elements of five minutes speech.

Process Objectives
At the end of the unit students will be able to:
Improve their pronunciation.
Spell their names and mailing address.
Converse on the phone and on one to one basis.
Recite a five minute speech of any topic.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
In a given written page, students will read a short story silently and out loud. Student will pronounce with approximately 80% of accuracy.
In a given oral class exercise, students will spell at least three of their family member names.
In a role playing exercise, students will simulate a telephone conversation of any topic.
In a given class exercise, students will prepare a five minutes speech for the graduation ceremony.

UNIT VI    WORKSHOPS
Health Prevention Workshops
GED Workshop

Process Objectives
At the end of the unit students will be able to:
Identify the main idea of the presentation.
Discuss the message of the presentation.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
Guided by the teacher student will be able to identify the workshop’s main ideas.
In groups of four the students will discuss the workshop’s messages.

UNIT VII    JOB FAIR
Filling out employment forms. (Sample of company job application forms, W-4 forms, State Withholding forms, Maryland Registry forms).
Writing a simple resume, cover letter and thank you note.
Successful job interview.
Process Objectives
At the end of the unit students will be able to:
Fill out different types of employment forms.
Write one page resume, one cover letter and thank you note.
Be interviewed by at least three potential employers at the LOP Job Fair.

Evaluation
This unit will be evaluated as follows:
In the given different types of employment forms, student will be able to fill out at least 90% of the information requested.
Students will be able to write a one page resume, one cover letter and thank you note.
During the Job Fair, students will be interviewed by at least three employers and obtain an excellent rate.

Teachers learning-teaching activities suggested for this course
Prepare written lesson plan.
Prepare written materials, handouts, guides, dictation, dialogues etc.
Prepare test and quizzes according to every unit evaluation.
Assign homework and revise them with students periodically.
Workshop attendance.
Encourage students to participate in every planned activity of LOP.

Students learning activities suggested for this course
Read local newspaper.
Practice writing at home.
Listening to English news on local TV channels and/or radio stations.
Group discussion.
Active class participation.
Mandatory workshop attendance,
COMMUNITY MINISTRIES OF ROCKVILLE
LATINO OUTREACH PROGRAM
EVALUATION

Course/Curso: ____________________________

Teacher's Name: __________________________

Semester: Spring 2000

Date: ______________________________________

Instructions/Instrucciones

Your opinions and feedback are important to us. Please complete this evaluation so we know how we are doing and how we might improve things in the future. You may write your comments in Spanish if you wish. Circle the choice that the best reflect your opinion.

Su opinión es muy valiosa para nosotros; por favor haga los comentarios que desee, puede escribirlos en español. Marque con un círculo la selección de su preferencia.

I. ABOUT THE COURSE

1. Were the course objectives explained at the beginning of semester?

¿Les fueron explicados los objetivos del programa al inicio del semestre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely</td>
<td>very well</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Was the content appropriate for your level of comprehension?

¿Fué el contenido del curso apropiado a su nivel de comprensión?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely</td>
<td>very well</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Was the quality of the course what you expected?

¿Tuvo el curso la calidad que usted esperaba?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely</td>
<td>very well</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Were test and quizzes done according to your level of comprehension and understanding?

¿Fueron los exámenes y quizzes hechos de acuerdo a su nivel de entendimiento, comprensión y habilidad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you agree with your final grade obtained?

¿Esta de acuerdo con los resultados finales que obtuvo?
Yes ______ No ______ Somewhat ______ Not at all ______

II. ABOUT YOUR TEACHER AND COURSE MATERIALS

Please rate your teacher on the following:
Por favor evalúe a su profesor en lo siguiente:

6. Classes were organized and presented in a logical manner?

¿Las clases fueron organizadas y presentadas en forma lógica?

excellent very good good fair poor

7. Checked with students to determine if topics were understood?

¿Chequeaba con los estudiantes constantemente para determinar si el tema se entendía?

Yes ( ) No ( ) Sometimes ( )

8. Provided a variety of interesting activities and additional written material (example: role-plays, group exercises, dictation, props, handouts etc.).

Planeó actividades interesantes y usó material escrito adicional como por ejemplo: ejercicios de grupo, dictado, fotocopias etc.

Yes ( ) No ( ) Sometimes ( )

9. Did the instructor check the students progress periodically?

¿Chequeaba periodicamente el progreso de los estudiantes?

Yes ( ) No ( ) Sometimes ( )

10. Did the teacher assign and review homework periodically?

¿Revisaba el profesor periodicamente las tareas de casa que les asignaba?

Yes ( ) No ( ) Sometimes ( )
11. Did the teacher inform and keep you updated on all Latino Outreach Program planned activities. For example preparation for job fair, workshops, etc.
¿Su profesor lo informó y actualizó acerca de todas las actividades planeadas en el programa durante el semestre? Por ejemplo los preparó para la feria de trabajo, les anunciaba los workshops, etc.

Yes ( )  No ( )  Sometimes ( )

12. Please give an overall rating of your teacher in terms of class presentation, preparation, and knowledge of subject matter.
Califíque a su profesor en términos generales de como presentó sus clases, su preparación y conocimientos de la materia.

5  excellent  4  very good  3  good  2  fair  1  poor

13. Did the instructor treat you with respect, courtesy and kindness.
¿Al dirigirse a usted su profesor lo hacía con respeto, cortesía y amabilidad?
Always_____ Oftentimes_____ Sometimes_____ Not all the times_____

III. ABOUT THE LATINO OUTREACH PROGRAM

14. Please rate the overall quality of this program.
Califíque la calidad del Programa Latino Outreach en términos generales.

5  excellent  4  very good  3  good  2  fair  1  poor

15. Was the amount of time you spent in classes during this semester.
El tiempo de las clases durante el semestre fue.

Too long_______ Too short_________ About right_________

16. Were there any weaknesses in the program? Please be specific.
¿Puede decírnos cuál aspecto del programa pudiera ser mejorado? Por favor sea específico.
### ABOUT THE JOB FAIR

17. Did the employer participants bring interesting job opportunities to you?  
   ¿Para usted fueron interesantes las posiciones de trabajo que fueron ofrecidas?  
   Yes ( )  No ( ) Somewhat ( )

18. How was the Job Fair organized?  
   ¿Qué le pareció la organización de la feria de trabajo?  
   
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>very good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Was the job interviewing process a positive experience for you?  
   ¿Fue el proceso de entrevistas una experiencia positiva para usted?  
   Yes ( )  No ( ) Somewhat ( )

20. Do you think the job fair was a valuable experience?  
   ¿Cree usted que la feria de trabajo provee a los estudiantes de LOP experiencia valiosa?  
   Yes ( )  No( )  Somewhat ( )

21. What do you think about the health fair?  
   ¿Qué opina acerca de la feria de salud?  

22. What would you recommend or suggest for future job fairs? Please explain and write.  
   Diga sus recomendaciones y sugerencias para mejorar futuras ferias de trabajo y de salud.  

---

### ABOUT THE CHILD TUTORING AND CARE SERVICES

24. If you used the child tutoring or child care services, please rate how helpful this was to you.  
   Si usó los servicios del programa de niños, dime. ¿Cuán útil fue la atención y asistencia de la niñera?  
   Yes ( )  No ( ) Somewhat ( )

25. Have you noticed any improvement in your child from his or her school work?  
   ¿Observó en su niño alguna mejoria o avance en lo referente a asignaciones de la escuela?  
   Yes ( )  No ( ) Somewhat ( )

---

26. If you used the child tutoring or child care services, please tell us how much you think your child was benefited as a result of this program.  
   Si usó los servicios del programa de niños, dime. ¿Cuánto cree usted que su hijo se ha beneficiado del programa? Marque todas las que considere necesarias.  
   
   Habla is more responsible in doing homework and assignments.  
   El/ella es más responsable en hacer los deberes y tareas.  
   El/ella socializes with peers and adults at least as better as he/she did before.  
   ¿El/ella socializa igual o mejor con compañeros y adultos que antes de venir al programa?  
   
   Have you noticed if his/her English/Spanish has improved?  
   ¿Ha observado si su niño ha mejorado al hablar inglés y español?
V. ABOUT THE CHILD TUTORING AND CARE SERVICES

23. Did you use the child tutoring or child care services we provided?
¿Usa usted los servicios de cuidado de niños que brindamos en el programa?

Yes__________ No__________

24. If you used the child tutoring or child care services, please rate how helpful this was to you.
Si usó el servicio de cuidado para niños, por favor califiquelo en términos de lo útil que fue.

5 very helpful 4 helpful 3 somewhat 2 hardly 1 not at all

25. Did you see any improvement in your child from his or her school work?
¿Observó en su niño alguna mejoría o avance al hacer su tareas y asignaciones de la escuela?

Yes____ Some____ No____

26. If you used the child tutoring or child care services, please tell us how much you think your child was benefited as a result of this program.
Si usó los servicios del programa de niños, diga ¿Cómo su niño se benefició del programa? Marque todas las que considere necesarias.

____ He/she is more responsible in doing homework and assignments.
El/ella es mas responsable para hacer su tarea y asignaciones.

____ He/she likes to come to LOP on Tuesdays and Thursdays
El/ella le gusta venir los martes y jueves al programa.

____ He/she socializes with peers and adults at least as better or same than before.
¿El/ella socializa igual o mejor con compañeros y adultos que antes de venir al programa?

____ Have you notice if his/her English/Spanish has improve?
¿Ha observado si su niño ha mejorado al hablar inglés y español?
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
Recomendaciones y sugerencias

27. Please feel free to make any additional comments that might help us to improve the program in the future.

Por favor, haga cualquier comentario adicional que usted considere puede ayudarnos a mejorar el programa.
### Table E1

**Metacategories for Literacy Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacategory</th>
<th>Literacy functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing basic literate functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing forms</td>
<td>Copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>Identifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboarding</td>
<td>Labeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking up</td>
<td>Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notetaking</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading</td>
<td>Providing documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciting</td>
<td>Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting documentation</td>
<td>Tallying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using literacy to explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogizing</td>
<td>Contextualizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating</td>
<td>Dramatizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td>Exhibiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrating</td>
<td>Role playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing show-and-tell</td>
<td>Revising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking part in discourse around &amp; about text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>Constructing rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting</td>
<td>Miming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perusing</td>
<td>Presenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recounting</td>
<td>Referencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting</td>
<td>Signifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacategory</td>
<td>Literacy functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in the flow of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Constructing rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving instruction</td>
<td>Invoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td>Providing linguistic assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clarification</td>
<td>Requesting clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking direction</td>
<td>Seeking instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Calculating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>Conjecturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorizing</td>
<td>Gauging reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating hypotheticals</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Revising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising critical judgement</td>
<td>Bestowing blessings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>Critiquing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certifying</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputing</td>
<td>Interpreting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring</td>
<td>Validating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using irony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising or resisting authority</td>
<td>Admonishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action</td>
<td>Constructing rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning</td>
<td>Fudging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferring</td>
<td>Granting permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauging reactions</td>
<td>Invoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td>Proposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using irony</td>
<td>Reprimanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>Requesting approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIL standard</td>
<td>Description of LOP compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually supportive partnerships</td>
<td>Partnerships with County &amp; State public health, law enforcement, colleges, City Council, public schools, Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby to increase federal &amp; state funding for adult language education</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make support services available for students:</td>
<td>Classroom locations accessible to public transportation, transportation tokens available, child care &amp; child counseling tutoring provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek private sector investment</td>
<td>Grant funding from private &amp; public foundations &amp; corporations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage unions &amp; employers to provide ESL to workers &amp; their families</td>
<td>Private &amp; public sector investment in LOP programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong information networks &amp; referral systems</td>
<td>Media coverage: cable television, newsprint, City newsletter. Referrals: word-of-mouth, CMR member congregations, flyers, media, public &amp; private organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIL standard</th>
<th>Degree of LOP compliance</th>
<th>Difference from standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenient time &amp; location for classes</td>
<td>Evening classes, convenient to public transportation</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program content focus on needed knowledge, geared toward students’ own goals, students treated as stakeholders</td>
<td>Curriculum based on ESL Standards &amp; cultural needs, ongoing student evaluation elicited, students may be hired by LOP</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic approach to quality improvement</td>
<td>Scheduled &amp; unscheduled program evaluations, student placement based on test results, ESL instructor training, expert consultants for program and curriculum development</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dashes indicate no difference between NIL Standard and LOP Compliance, i.e. a high degree of compliance. The NIL Standards are published by National Institute for Literacy, (2000).