

AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL
TOWARDS A TRAINING PROGRAM INVOLVING THE COMPREHENSION OF
BASIC SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

by

Carlton Lampkins

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Jim C. Fortune
Co-Chairman

Kenneth E. Underwood
Co-Chairman

Houston Conley

Ronald L. McKeen

John F. Schreck

May, 1989

Blacksburg, Virginia

AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL
TOWARDS A TRAINING PROGRAM INVOLVING THE COMPREHENSION OF
BASIC SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

by

Carlton Lampkins

Committee Co-Chairmen: Jim C. Fortune and Kenneth E. Underwood
Educational Administration

(ABSTRACT)

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) are located in the Commonwealth of Virginia, approximately fifteen miles south of Washington, D.C. This school system is the tenth largest in the United States and it has a student population of approximately 130,000. Because of the size of the FCPS system, it is divided into four administrative areas--Area I, Area II, Area III and Area IV.

Area II of FCPS has a student population of approximately 26,000 students, and of those 26,000 students, approximately 9 percent of them are of Hispanic origin. This English as a Second Language (ESL) population is of special interest to the school system because these students often do not possess the communication skills necessary for matriculation/graduation. Therefore, their academic performance is frequently below average. This poses problems and raises concern for the educators that serve them.

As a part of FCPS' minority achievement program, which began in 1983, an Area II staff member initiated a two-part training program entitled, "Intensive Spanish for Educators" patterned on a similar program used with Arlington County, Virginia educators. The program carries university credit and provides a forum for the presentation of oral and aural Spanish language skills, as they relate to relevant school situations and Hispanic cultural awareness.

Based on the perceptions of the program participants, this dissertation represents an evaluation of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" program, utilizing information obtained from on-site observations of class sessions, examination of planning documents/proposals/syllabi/etc., interviews with the program administrator/coordinators, program trainers and randomly selected program participants, and a questionnaire.

The results of this evaluative study indicated that the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program is a worthwhile and valuable program because it provides the opportunity for teachers, pupil personnel staff and administrators to acquire knowledge and skills in an area that can be used on a daily basis, it is well planned and it is sanctioned by the Area II Superintendent. The participants were enthusiastic about being in the program and felt the program should be strongly recommended, but not made mandatory.

Acknowledgements

Words cannot express the gratitude I have for the many people who have touched my life and whose support, encouragement and love have sustained me through the completion of the doctoral program. Without them, where would I be?

To Almighty God for directing my life and guiding me through this project. Thanks for the victory!

To the five scholars, Drs. Jim C. Fortune, Houston Conley, Ronald L. McKeen, John F. Schreck and Kenneth E. Underwood, who served on my dissertation committee: Your assistance, support and interest in this study are greatly appreciated. A special thank you is extended to my co-chairmen, Dr. Fortune and Dr. Underwood, who provided hours of assistance and encouragement and who never were too busy to lend a hand or answer a question.

To Dr. John F. Schreck, my mentor and friend: Thanks for the idea, the direction, your expertise, your words of encouragement and your integrity; you're a man for all seasons!

To the Fairfax County Public School System: Thanks for allowing me to conduct this study, using your resources and personnel.

To _____ and the Program Participants: Thanks for the information, your efforts and cooperation; without you, the completion of this study would not have been possible.

To my family: Thank you for your undying love and support. I love you all!

To my many friends: Thanks for your friendship, your concern, the good times and the bad times.

To my fellow colleagues - , , , and : 'Thanks' for 'your' friendship and 'the' many hours of cooperative learning.

To , , , and : Thanks for your support!

To my Philadelphia family: Thank you for your kindness and love over the past fifteen years. I love you all!

To the staff and student body of the Carol Morgan School in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: Thanks for allowing me the opportunity to experience the culture; that's an experience I will always treasure!

To and the Covenant Christian Community: Thanks for the spiritual energy.

To : Thanks for being there!

To and : Thanks for your secretarial support and patience.

To and : Thanks for your smiles; you're the greatest!

To , who was the first and only person to encourage me to be a teacher: Thanks for that encouragement; I love it!

To my buddies, , and : Thanks for being there. You are special!

To , my high school counselor: Thanks for believing in me.

To all of the fine educators I've had the pleasure of working with: Thanks for the camaraderie.

To : Thanks for your encouragement and support. I never realized how boring yogurt and salad could be!

To : Thanks for the thorough job you did with the statistical analyses.

To : Thanks for the professional typing of this manuscript; its beauty is evident in each page.

DEDICATION

IN MEMORY OF
MY UNCLE,

1941 -

1987

THANKS FOR ALL OF YOUR SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction.....	1
Need for the Study.....	5
Statement of the Purpose.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Definition of Terms.....	7
Limitations of the Study.....	9
Organization of the Study.....	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
Issues and Concerns in Training Evaluation.. Naturalistic and Participant-Oriented	12
Evaluation Approaches.....	16
Evaluation Models.....	19
Evaluation of Multicultural/Bilingual Training Programs in School Systems.....	25
Hispanic Demographics and Its Impact on Public Schools.....	30
Summary.....	35
III. METHODOLOGY.....	36
Research Methodology.....	36
Population.....	37
Instrumentation.....	40
Collection of Data.....	41
Analysis of Data.....	45
Summary.....	46

IV. RESULTS.....	47
Description of the Training Program.....	48
Description of the Population.....	60
Evaluative Comments.....	99
Relationships Between Evaluative Concerns...	100
Summary.....	101
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	103
Summary.....	103
Conclusions.....	110
Recommendations.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	113
APPENDIX I.....	117
APPENDIX II.....	121
APPENDIX III.....	126
APPENDIX IV.....	130
APPENDIX V.....	132
APPENDIX VI.....	135
APPENDIX VII.....	140
APPENDIX VIII.....	143
APPENDIX IX.....	146
APPENDIX X.....	149
VITA.....	152

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Randomly Selected Program Participants Used to Form Interview Sample.....	39
2	Training Completed by Program Participants.....	62
3	Age and Gender of Program Participants.....	63
4	Race of Program Participants.....	64
5	Nationality of Program Participants.....	66
6	Program Participants' Years of Work Experience..	67
7	Educational Position Presently Held by Program Participants.....	69
8	Years of Spanish in Elementary, Junior and/or Senior High School of Program Participants....	70
9	Previous College Coursework/In-Service Training of Program Participants.....	71
10	Program Participants' Travel and Teaching Experience in a Spanish-speaking Country.....	73
11	Program Participants' Living, Travel or Teaching Experience in a non-Spanish Speaking Country..	75
12	Prior Spanish-speaking, Reading or Writing Proficiency of Program Participants.....	76
13	Program Participants' Perception Relative to Program Meeting Objectives.....	81
14	Program Participants' Identification of Most Beneficial Aspects of Training Program.....	83
15	Distribution of Responses Relative to the Training Program Meeting the Program Participants' Expectations and Being Helpful..	85
16	Grade Distribution of Program Participants - Part I/II.....	86

17	Attitudes of Randomly Selected Participants Prior to and After Completing Program.....	88
18	Program Participants' Interest in Further Spanish Language and Culture Study.....	94
19	Program Participants' Identification of Least Beneficial Aspects of Training Program.....	96

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

According to a recent report by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987), the Hispanic population in the United States has increased 30 percent between the years 1980 and 1987. This report, which uses a new estimating method designed to produce a more accurate count, found a great increase in the number of school-age Hispanics over the past five years. Hispanic children, ages 5-19, increased by 14 percent during the years 1982-1987, from 4.7 million to 5.4 million. This census report also indicates that the number of children under the age of five increased from 1.7 million to just under 2 million, as did the number of Hispanics in prime child-bearing years, ages 20-29, increased from 3.13 million to 3.93 million.

During this same period of time, the level of educational attainment for Hispanics also increased. The median number of years of school for Hispanics, 25 or older, increased from 10.8 in 1982 to 12.0 in 1987. In addition, this age group showed an increase in completion of four years of high school from 45.4 percent to 50.9 percent for the same time interval.

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) are located in the Commonwealth of Virginia, approximately fifteen miles south of Washington, D.C. This school system is the tenth largest in the United States and it has a student population of approximately 130,000. Because of the size of the FCPS system, it is divided into four administrative areas--Area I, Area II, Area III and Area IV. Each of these areas has a central administrative facility housing support facets which assist in the education of students. From transporting the students to their designated schools to providing meals, to developing and implementing curricula, activities supporting the mission of the system are performed by area staff members.

Area II of FCPS has a student population of approximately 26,000, and of those 26,000 students, approximately 9 percent of them are of Hispanic origin (Fairfax County Public Schools, 1988). This English as a Second Language (ESL) population is of special interest to the school system because these students often do not possess the communication skills necessary for matriculation/graduation. Therefore, their academic performance is frequently below average. This poses problems and raises concern for the educators that serve them.

In an attempt to address the needs of its Hispanic and other minority populations, the FCPS system developed a

minority achievement program in 1983 to increase minority student performance. As a part of FCPS' minority achievement program, an Area II staff member initiated a two-part training program entitled, "Intensive Spanish for Educators" patterned on a similar program used with Arlington County, Virginia educators. The program carries university credit and provides a forum for the presentation of oral and aural Spanish language skills, as they relate to relevant school situations and Hispanic cultural awareness.

Part I of this program began in the Fall, 1987 (two sections) and it was subsequently offered in the Spring, 1988, Summer, 1988 and Fall, 1988, with one section each session. The objectives for Part I (Appendix I) were: 1) to introduce basic conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community, and 2) to gain an awareness and understanding of the different cultural backgrounds of Spanish-speaking students. These objectives remained the same for each section of Part I, with the exception of the Fall, 1988 section (Appendix II), when an additional objective was added; to provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities. The activities provided to accomplish the Part I objectives ranged from learning the alphabet and numbers to learning standard greetings and how to ask for directions, to developing lessons and activities that focused on Hispanic

heritage. In addition, aspects of the different Spanish cultures, based on assigned readings and projects, were discussed.

Part II of this program began in the Spring, 1988 (two sections) and it was also offered in the Summer, 1988 and the Fall of 1988. However, the enrollment for the latter two sessions was insufficient and had to be cancelled. The objectives for Part II (Appendix III) were: 1) to develop conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community, 2) to recognize the differences in the various Spanish-speaking cultures represented in FCPS, and 3) to become familiar with organizations that seek to serve the Spanish-speaking community of Northern Virginia. The activities provided to accomplish the Part II objectives ranged from using the library to intervening in a fight, to how to deal with pleasant/problem parent-teacher conferences. In addition, the program participants discussed the book, Hunger of Memory by Richard Rodriguez, who writes about his adjustments to the American way of life and his opposition to bilingual education.

Each part of the program lasted for a fourteen-week period and the participants were required to complete various assignments. The assignments included the preparation of abstracts on Hispanic-related readings and the maintenance of

a learning log. In addition, each participant was required to complete a project that required direct interaction with members of the Hispanic community. Mid-term examinations and final examination/projects were also required. The participants received three graduate credits for each part of the program through the George Mason University, which is located in Fairfax County, Virginia.

Based on the perceptions of the program participants, this dissertation represents an evaluation of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" program, utilizing information obtained from on-site observations of class sessions, examination of planning documents/proposals/syllabi/etc., and interviews with the program administrator/coordinators, program trainers and randomly selected program participants. In addition, information from a questionnaire administered to all of the participants will be used. This evaluation will provide beneficial information to the FCPS and other school systems with similar Hispanic populations.

Need for the Study

Educators constantly attempt to meet the needs of their culturally diverse student populations. These attempts are often undertaken to facilitate higher academic achievement of those students who do not perform at or above grade level. The "Intensive Spanish for Educators" program was designed to

help school personnel communicate with and understand the cultures of the Hispanic students and parents which they serve. Thus, through better communication and understanding, educators would be able to provide those learning experiences and services that foster higher academic achievement and assist the Hispanic student in becoming acclimated to the educational environment.

If Fairfax County Public Schools are to continue to meet the needs of its rapidly growing Hispanic population, it is necessary for school officials to receive feedback on how this program has aided the participants in effectively communicating with the Hispanic students and their families. In addition, this study could serve as a model for other school districts who have a similar student population. Finally, this study could contribute meaningful information to the body of research pertaining to the evaluation of training.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program based on the perceptions of the program participants. This training program was established in the FCPS to provide a basic understanding of Hispanic youth through the study of Spanish language and culture.

Research Questions

The research questions to be addressed were:

1. Is there agreement among the program administrators, program trainers and program participants about the purposes/objectives of the program?
2. Did the program meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned?
3. What impact did the program have on altering the perceived attitudes of the participants about working with Hispanic students?
4. What impact did the program have on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture?
5. What were the most beneficial and least beneficial aspects of the program as perceived by the participants?
6. What portion(s) of the program would the participants retain, modify, expand or delete?

Definition of Terms

Hispanic: The term Hispanic and Spanish are used interchangeably in this study. Persons of Hispanic origin are those persons who originate from Mexico, Puerto Rico,

Cuba, Central or South America, or some other Spanish country, such as Spain or the Dominican Republic (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1985).

Intensive Spanish for Educators: This program was designed to introduce basic oral and aural Spanish skills to stimulate more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community as well as provide an awareness and understanding of different Hispanic cultures.

Evaluability Assessment: This evaluation technique is a preliminary evaluation of a program's design which is undertaken to insure that the program objectives are well-defined, program assumptions or objectives are plausible and the intended uses of evaluation information are well-defined (Wholey, 1979).

Responsive Evaluation: This evaluation technique, according to its author, "is what people do naturally in evaluating things. They observe and react." An educational evaluation is responsive evaluation if it orients more directly to program activities than to program intents, if it responds to audience requirements for information and if the different value perspectives present are referred to in reporting the success and failure of the program (Stake, 1975a).

Limitations of the Study

The responses to the interview questions and the questionnaire will be assumed to be the true attitudes and opinions of the program administrators/coordinators, program trainers and program participants, based on their personal observations, perceptions, experiences and preferences. This study will not attempt to explain the impact of the program trainers (i.e., different trainers for each part of the program) on the success of the program.

Organization of the Study

This evaluative study of the perceptions of school personnel about a Spanish language and culture training program is divided into five chapters.

Chapter 1 contains the introduction, need for the study, statement of the problem, research questions, definitions and limitations of the study.

Chapter 2 focuses on a review of the literature relating to (1) issues and concerns in training evaluation, (2) naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches, (3) a synopsis of the evaluation models to be used in this study, (4) evaluations of multicultural training programs in school systems, and (5) Hispanic demographics in the United States, the Commonwealth of Virginia and Fairfax County, Virginia, and its impact on public schools.

Chapter 3 contains a description of the research methodology, the training program population and the sampling technique used. In addition, an explanation of the interview process, the administration of the questionnaire and the statistical procedure used to analyze the questionnaire is provided. The procedure for reporting the interview information is also included.

Chapter 4 contains a description of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program and a description of the sample population based on data obtained from the questionnaire. In addition, a restatement of each of the six research questions with relevant findings is provided. Evaluative comments and the relationships between evaluative concerns are also discussed.

Chapter 5 is devoted to a summary of the findings, program recommendations and conclusions relative to the effectiveness and value of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" training program.

The bibliography contains all of the sources of information used in this study.

Finally, the appendices contain the questionnaire and the interview protocol sheets used in obtaining the evaluative data. Also included are the outlines of the evaluation models used in this study, a copy of the

participants consent form, copies of the program syllabi and other pertinent materials.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature relevant to (1) issues and concerns in training evaluation, (2) naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches, (3) the evaluation models used in this study, (4) evaluations of multicultural training programs in school systems, and (5) Hispanic demographics in the United States, the Commonwealth of Virginia and Fairfax County, Virginia, and its impact on public schools, and a summary.

The sources reviewed included books, periodicals and journals.

Issues and Concerns in Training Evaluation

According to Broad (1982), Kelly (1982), and Grant and Anderson (1977), corporations spend billions of dollars training employees to perform certain tasks. However, there appears to be very little return on the companies' investments. From this, it can be surmised that there is a problem with the evaluation or assessment of the effectiveness of training programs.

Grant and Anderson (1977) elude to many concerns and issues surrounding training evaluation. There is controversy about whether evaluation can be characterized as research; at

best it is applied research in the service of management decisions. Some experts in the field of training evaluation also feel that there is the need for new and improved program evaluation methodology. In addition, organizations need to take a look at whether a program should or needs to be evaluated; management needs to get its money's worth from evaluations. Company decision-makers need to take a long look at the cost of developing and implementing training programs in terms of the returns to the company, and also in relationship to alternative strategies for solving the same or similar organizational problems that the training program(s) was designed to solve. Decision-makers need to obtain information regarding the implementation and operation of programs for understanding. Another concern to the companies is that the evaluations focus on the design and implementation of the evaluation. Little attention is given to the treatment-training content and methodology. Finally, training evaluations need to be concerned with the various purposes and uses of evaluations. If the evaluation results do not lead management decisions to the improvement, modification, or abolishment of the training program, then the evaluation really serves no purpose and is therefore a waste of time, energy and money.

With all the concerns that surround the evaluation of training programs, why is it necessary to evaluate? Zenger

and Hargis (1982) make three suggestions to answer this question:

- training programs can be fine-tuned in content and methodology. Only with a good assessment of effectiveness can programs be made more relevant and practical. Evaluation research will make training more scientific and will improve its products;
- training departments often seek ways to increase their influence and visibility because they are frequently the first to be cut in times of fiscal austerity. Until good research is provided, management support will be based primarily on faith and emotion, which can change from day to day; and
- trainers seek credibility in their organizations. Assessment data on program results will help strengthen management's trust and confidence in training specialists and their contributions.

Kelly (1982) and Broad (1982) focus on another very important issue in the training process--transfer of training from the "classroom" setting to the job site.

Broad contends that most evaluations of training find very little, if any, difference in the behavior of an employee once the employee completes a training program, and that the desired result of training is only achieved in

situations where management supports the transfer of that training to the job.

In a study done by Broad (1982) on a group of human resource development leaders, it was found that the opportunity to use training on the job was rated high and seen as very important by 96% of the leaders. However, the leaders did not observe any change in behavior on the part of the workers as a result of the training. This indicates that the degree of follow-up after the training was next to being nonexistent.

Kelly (1982) takes a slightly different view of transfer of training. Her position is that building in transfer begins before the first specific behavioral objective is chosen, before the first course activity is imagined or before a packaged product is selected. Transfer begins with the development of a "content plan." This content plan flows from facts to ideas to actions, and helps the course designer decide in what order to present the material. In addition, the content plan helps the course designer to decide what activities will be the catalysts as participants work to master content and transfer it to the workplace, what activities help participants anticipate how attitudes toward the content will be received in the workplace and how to manage conflict with regards to the new materials and skills.

The issues and concerns surrounding the evaluation of training are numerous, and they obviously pose problems for managers, trainers, and decision-makers. The best advice that can be given to the training personnel, managers, etc. is summed up nicely by Anderson, et al. (1975):

"Planning the instructional program and planning the evaluation of the program are--or usually should be--closely linked. Program evaluation should not simply be a supplement to an instructional program, but an integral part of it. The consequence of planning one without the other is that the relationship of the results of an evaluation to the objectives and content may be ambiguous."

Naturalistic and Participant-Oriented Evaluation Approaches

According to Worthen and Sanders (1987) naturalistic and participant-oriented approaches to evaluation are a relatively new phenomena in education. These approaches grew from theorists' concerns that evaluators were too preoccupied with stating and classifying objects, designing elaborate evaluation systems, developing technically defensible objective instrumentation, and planning long, technical reports that distracted from what was really happening in education. There was also a segment of the education community that argued that the human element, which was reflected in the complexities of the real world and the different perspective of those engaged in education, was

missing from most educational evaluation. Consequently, this new approach to evaluation stressed firsthand experiences with educational activities and settings.

Proponents of the naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches prefer naturalistic inquiry and see the involvement of the participants as crucial to the evaluation of a project, program, curriculum, etc. In this sense, the evaluator portrays the different values and needs of all individuals and groups served by the program. Thus, the weighing and balancing of this plurality of judgments and criteria are done in a largely intuitive manner, and what is judged "best" depends largely on the values and perspectives of whatever group of individuals doing the judging.

There are basically seven criteria that characterize an evaluation as naturalistic or participant-oriented. An evaluation of this type (1) is a more holistic approach which sees education as a human endeavor and admits to the complexity of the human condition. This approach doesn't simplify issues. Rather, it attempts to understand people and education in the context of the complexity of the human condition; (2) recognizes, accommodates and protects value pluralism even though the efforts to summarize these different perspectives is left to the intuitive keenness and communication skills of the evaluator; (3) allows for the preparation of descriptive accounts (i.e., "portrayals") of a

person, classroom, project, program or some other phenomena around which clear boundaries have been placed and positioned within the broader context in which it functions; (4) depends on inductive reasoning and understands an issue, process or event from grass-roots observation and discovery. In essence, understanding emerges and is not the end product of some preordinate inquiry plan projected before the evaluation is conducted; (5) uses a multiplicity of data from different sources and the data is subjective and objective, and qualitative and quantitative in nature; (6) does not follow a standard plan. The evaluation process evolves as participants gain experience in the activity. Often the outcome of the evaluation is a rich understanding of one specific entity with all its idiosyncratic contextual influences, processes, variations and life histories; and finally, (7) focuses on recording multiple rather than single realities. People are innately different. Each person has a different perspective on things they see and interpret in their environment. Therefore, no one perspective is the absolute truth; all interpretations are accepted as correct and it is the task of the evaluator to capture the realities and portray them without sacrificing education's complexity.

In summary, naturalistic and participant-oriented approaches see the participants as the most important figures in evaluation. These approaches allow for flexibility and

creative thought. In addition, individual differences in perceptions, values, opinions, and attitudes are all considered valid. The process of understanding emerges and is natural and people-oriented.

Evaluation Models

Responsive Evaluation

Robert E. Stake, one of the forerunners of naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches, developed the responsive evaluation model in the early 1970's. Stake developed this model in response to the need for evaluators to focus on the "stakeholders" of a program; meaning the issues and concerns of those persons in and around a program.

According to Stake (1975a), responsive evaluation stresses the importance of being responsive to realities in program and to the reactions, concerns and issues of participants rather than being preordinate with evaluation plans, relying on preconceptions, formal plans and objectives of the program.

In a comparison of preordinate and responsive evaluations, Stake (1975b) revealed that the responsive evaluator spends more time on observing a program, gathering judgments, learning client needs and preparing informal reports, whereas the preordinate evaluator focuses more on

preparing the instrument(s), administering tests, processing formal data and preparing formal reports.

Stake (1975a) used a "clock" as a mnemonic device to reflect the prominent, recurring events in a responsive evaluation (Appendix IV). He also suggested a number of steps that coincide with the times on the clock for conducting such an evaluation. Stake says that it might be best to start at 12:00 but emphasized that any event can follow any other event and the evaluator may want to move counter-clockwise or cross-clockwise depending on the needs of the evaluator. Many events occur simultaneously or one event may occur several times during an evaluation. There is continual moving back and forth as the evaluation proceeds. The steps as suggested by Stake are as follows:

1. The evaluator talks with clients, program staff and audiences--everyone in and around the program--to gain a sense of their posture with respect to the program and the purposes of the evaluation.
2. As a result of these conversations, the evaluator places limits on the scope of the program. The limits are also set because of inputs from other sources such as the program proposal, documents from program personnel, official records, etc.
3. The evaluator makes personal observations of what goes on in the name of the program to get a sense

of its operation. He thereby verifies its existence and can note deviations from his sense of the program as developed in the first two steps.

4. The evaluator begins to discover, on one hand, the purposes of the project, both stated and real, and on the other hand, the concerns that various audiences may have with it and/or the evaluation.
5. As the evaluator becomes more involved with the preliminary data, he/she begins to conceptualize the issues and problems that the evaluation should address.
6. Once the issues and problems have been identified, the evaluator is in a position to think about the design of the evaluation. For each purpose, issue, concern or problem identified, the evaluator specifies the kind of data and information that will be needed to deal with or respond to it.
7. Given those data needs, the evaluator selects whatever approaches are most useful for generating the data. The responsive evaluator will select whatever instruments are appropriate; most often, the instrument will be observers or judges; that is, human instruments.
8. The evaluator proceeds to carry out the data collection procedures that he/she has identified.

9. The evaluator now shifts to the information-reporting mode. The information is organized into themes and the evaluator prepares portrayals designed to communicate "in natural ways" to provide as much direct personal experience as possible. The conventional research report qualifies as a portrayal form, but much more effective are forms such as case studies, videotapes, thick descriptions, artifacts and other faithful representations.
10. The evaluator now separates those issues that will be reported. The evaluator matches issues and concerns to audiences in deciding what form the report will take.
11. The evaluator decides on what format the report will take. It is the evaluator's discretion based on what he/she deems appropriate.
12. Evaluator assembles formal report, if any.

It is of utmost importance to note that there is a great deal of interaction between the steps of responsive evaluation. There is no natural end point unless required for reporting; it is a continuous and interactive process.

Evaluability Assessment

According to Wholey (1979), evaluation is likely to be useful in improving program performance only if three

standards are met: (1) program objectives are well-defined (i.e., those in charge of the program have defined program objectives in terms of specific measures of program performance and, data on those measures are obtainable at reasonable costs), (2) program assumptions or objectives are plausible (i.e., there is evidence that program activities have some likelihood of causing progress toward meeting the program objectives), and (3) intended uses of evaluation information are well-defined (i.e., those in charge of the program have defined the intended uses of evaluation information).

Evaluability assessment, as defined by Wholey (1979), is a preliminary evaluation of a program's design which is undertaken to insure that the previously stated standards are met.

Evaluability assessment explores and documents (1) program objectives; expectations and causal assumptions of policy-makers and managers in charge of the program, (2) what political groups say the program objectives are, (3) the extent to which management's program objectives and information needs have been defined in measurable terms, (4) the program activities actually under way, (5) the likelihood that program activities will achieve measurable progress toward program objectives, (6) likely uses of information that could enhance program performance.

Evaluability assessment does not determine whether a program can be evaluated but whether the program performance is likely to be adequate and whether program evaluation is likely to be useful in improving the program's effectiveness.

To further explain the process of evaluability assessment, Wholey suggests the following eight steps (Appendix V):

1. Defining the program to be evaluated by determining what federal, state or local activities constitute the program to be evaluated.
2. Collecting information on the intended program by documenting intended program activities, objectives and assumptions linking activities with objectives. This can be accomplished by using information from program documentation and from interviews with key actors in the development, implementation, overseeing, etc. of the program operations.
3. Developing a concise description of the program by capturing the intended program activities and objectives as defined by key actors that clearly present the logic of causal assumptions linking the intended program inputs, activities and objectives.
4. Documenting the extent to which key actors in charge of the program have defined intended program activities and objectives in measurable terms.

5. Collecting information on program reality by actually making contact with the actual program operations and using information from program documentation.
6. Synthesizing information on program reality to clarify which program performance measurements are feasible and which objectives are plausible given the activities underway.
7. Identification of realistic objectives, feasible measurements of program performance, comparisons that could be made based on those measurements and possible uses of the resulting information.
8. Provide feedback to management about the results of the analysis and determination of the next steps to be taken based on management's need for and intended uses of the information that could be collected.

Evaluation of Multicultural/Bilingual Training Programs
in School Systems

There have been several attempts by school systems to provide their staffs with training in multicultural/bilingual education. Project Adelante (Hubert, 1982), a Spanish-English bilingual program in Hartford, Connecticut, received federal funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The intent of the federal funding was to improve the implementation of the Hartford School District's bilingual program by providing supplementary Spanish materials, personnel for staff development, parent involvement efforts and evaluation of the entire program.

The evaluation focused on student achievement in Spanish and English and other subject areas, and implementation of staff development and parent involvement activities. For the purpose of this study, the staff development training program will be addressed.

The staff development program of Project Adelante consisted of two elements: technical assistance to individual teachers through classroom visits by instructional consultants, and formal staff training activities. Evaluation of the technical assistance was based upon a classroom observation study and upon the teachers' perceptions conveyed to the evaluator via interviews and a questionnaire. The evaluation of the training program component was based upon teacher responses to questionnaires evaluating particular workshops, and upon evaluator judgments about the number, appropriateness and variety of workshops, and with respect to the use of resources in conducting the workshop activities.

The training activities of Project Adelante were in the form of in-service workshops, college courses or attendance at professional conferences. In the final year of the project, the workshops dealt with curriculum issues such as math and science curriculum training, special education issues for the bilingual teacher and diagnostic and prescriptive testing in Spanish language arts. The overall evaluation indicated that the workshops were well organized, met their objectives, allowed time for discussion and interaction with the presenters, and effective overall. In addition, all of the participants felt that they would be able to apply/use the workshop information in their classrooms.

The technical assistance component consisted of classroom observations, approximately once a week each year, by instructional consultants. These consultants, provided by federal funding, discussed problems and situations with the teachers and provided suggestions and feedback. They also provided special materials to support instructional needs or directed teachers to sources of information or courses. The overall evaluation of the technical assistance program indicated that new teachers were particularly appreciative of the assistance. Generally, experienced teachers appreciated the stimulation of the consultant contact and the support provided. Half of the teachers perceived the project as an

important source of leadership, and 80% perceived the project staff's familiarity with their problems to be good or excellent. Eighty-five percent of the teachers saw communication with the project as being good or excellent, and nearly two-thirds indicated that the Project's teamwork with the teachers and principals was good or excellent. The technical assistance was appreciated by the teachers, and the teachers felt that the assistance was helpful in improving instruction and in boosting teacher morale.

Another example of training evaluation of a multicultural program for educators was a "Seminar in Multiethnic Relations" (Bass de Martinez, 1986) held in the state of Colorado. The seminar was held three times during the course of an academic year and a summer. This training program was developed to improve the teaching-learning environment through cultural awareness on the part of teachers. There were 95 participants from three neighboring school systems in the Denver metropolitan area. It was hypothesized "that greater exposure to cultural diversity through literature/folklore, multiethnic and legal history, and related topics would develop a greater appreciation and, therefore, greater empathy with the predominate ethnic and minority groups within the schools."

Throughout the duration of the seminar (i.e., 15 weeks, one day a week for three hours), the participants were

exposed to the contributions of ethnic and minority groups, encouraged to identify, analyze and utilize multiethnic materials, and presented with strategies for resolving cross-cultural conflict within the classroom. The seminar sessions were divided into four parts: Part I of the seminar focused on the historical, legal and sociological/psychological perspectives affecting the education of multicultural populations. Part II provided a different approach to understanding the multicultural setting through the use of folklore that pertained to the different ethnic groups. In addition, Part II provided insight on minority counseling and suggestions for better cross-cultural interaction among school personnel, the community and parents. Part III of the seminar focused on the assessment of testing strategies for cross-cultural individuals as well as selection and utilization of materials to better address the needs of a multicultural setting. Part IV of the seminar required that every participant prepare lesson plans, for use in the classroom, which positively recognized multiculturalism and to develop an implementation plan for sharing their seminar experiences with their colleagues.

At the end of the seminar, the participants evaluated the usefulness of their experiences. The evaluation questionnaire addressed the overall content of the seminar, the seminar presentations, attitudes about minority group

interaction, etc. Each of the items received a mean score ranging from 2.5-3.0; with 1.0 being positive, 4.0 being neutral and 7.0 being negative. The participants' responses indicated that the researcher's hypothesis was true. Thus, the researcher concluded that the use of a seminar format that focused on the cultural diversity of a particular community was a useful technique for providing in-service educators with the tools to better address the needs of all students in their classroom.

Hispanic Demographics and Its Impact on Public Schools

As indicated in the introduction of Chapter I of this study, the Hispanic population in the United States has increased 30 percent between the years 1980 and 1987 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987). More relevant to this study is the fact that the number of school-aged Hispanic children, ages 5-19, increased by 14 percent during the years 1982-1987, from 4.7 million to 5.4 million. In addition, the level of educational attainment for Hispanics also increased. The median number of years of school for Hispanics, 25 or older, increased from 10.8 in 1982 to 12.0 in 1987. In addition, this age group showed an increase in completion of four years of high school from 45.4 percent to 50.9 percent for the same time interval.

On a smaller scale, it is interesting to note that the Hispanic demographic changes (Hodgkinson, 1987) in the Commonwealth of Virginia are reflective of the national changes. During the years 1975-1980, the Commonwealth of Virginia saw an increase of over 600,000 whites move into the Commonwealth of Virginia, with a net of one-sixth (110,023) of the total immigration, while the black net of the immigration for the same period was one-third (31,221) and the Hispanic net of the immigration was one-half (15,960). These figures clearly show that the Commonwealth of Virginia's population became more ethnically diverse during that period.

According to Hodgkinson (1987), the ethnical diversity that the Commonwealth of Virginia is experiencing is reflective in Fairfax County, Virginia, the home of the Fairfax County Public Schools. For every white that moved into Fairfax County from 1975-1980, 65 percent of the whites moved out. However, for every black moving into Fairfax County only 25 percent of the county's blacks moved out. In addition, only 20 percent of the county's Hispanics moved out for every one who moved into the county. Thus, the Fairfax County population became more diverse due to patterns of in and out migration in addition to higher incidence of fertility among minority families. In addition, the minority student population in FCPS has grown from 9 percent of the

total in 1977-78 to 21.9 percent in September, 1983. The most rapid increases have been in Asian-American students, currently 9 percent, followed by black students, 8.7 percent, Hispanic students, 3.8 percent and American Indian students 0.2 percent.

In a recent report, "New Voices: Immigrant Students in U.S. Public Schools," by the National Coalition of Advocates for Students-NACS (April, 1988), it was found that many of the newcomer immigrants from Latin America arrive in the U.S. from Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras and the Caribbean, mainly Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Cuba. This report found in migration since 1960 to be 34% Asia, 34% Latin America, 16% European, and 16% from other continents. Muller and Espenshade (1985) estimate that approximately 40% of all immigrants in 1980 lived in Los Angeles (CA) and New York (NY), and another 20% lived in San Francisco (CA), Chicago (IL), Miami (FL), Houston (TX), and Washington, D.C.

According to NCAS (1988), theorists traditionally present migration as a response to forces such as overpopulation, famine, war, economic hardship or religious persecution within sending countries called "push" factors because they compel people to leave their homes. These "push" factors lead immigrants to other countries that have "pull" factors such as expanding economy, a high demand for

labor, or the availability of social opportunities. It is the "push" factors that immigrant children have experienced that influence their behavior. They bring to America the cultural scripts for roles modeled on the material and social environment of their previous lives. Cultural distinctions impart different learning skills and may affect classroom behavior and participation.

The NCAS project found culturally-based practices and behaviors to be a major conflict for young immigrants. Some cultures value cooperation and collectivity while in the United States individualism and competition are valued. Some cultures value passiveness rather than assertiveness. For some, looking in the eye is a sign of disrespect; patting on the head is an insult; beckoning with hand gestures is rude; and crossed fingers is obscene. In addition, the NCAS project found that the lives and hopes of immigrant students in the U.S. were often shaped by traumas of war and violence, the isolation of racism and the struggle to survive economically.

In terms of the U.S. public schools, the NCAS project found two basic dimensions to the lack of multicultural education in most schools: first, teachers and other school personnel do not understand the cultures of the children they teach and when multicultural education is not an integral part of school curricula, it cannot help to prevent conflict

between native-born and immigrant students or nurture the development of positive self-concepts for young newcomers. Secondly, one of the most serious barriers to equal educational opportunity for immigrant students is a lack of school personnel who are (1) equipped with language and other skills needed to teach these students effectively; (2) sensitive and well-informed about different cultures, (3) reflective of ethnic and cultural diversity to serve as guides and role models, and (4) committed to the school success of immigrant children.

In light of the findings, the NCAS project made several recommendations to the United States Department of Education, state and local education agencies, and teacher training institutions. Among those recommendations were the need to (1) provide funding for training of bilingual education personnel, (2) provide fiscal and other incentives to states to support the development and dissemination of quality multicultural education and intergroup conflict reduction models, (3) develop and disseminate to local education agencies model multicultural education curricula and provide training for implementation by bilingual/bicultural teams, (4) develop and provide training to local education agencies which help teachers and administrators broaden their understanding of other cultures, (5) require all classroom teachers to have a methods course for teaching the foreign-

born and limited English proficient, including second language acquisition theory and approaches, alternative teaching strategies and the background issues affecting immigrant children, and (6) provide as a required part of the training of regular classroom teachers, coursework covering issues facing immigrant students, second language acquisition theory and methods, diverse strategies for instructing children of mixed language fluency and cultural orientation.

Summary

This review of the literature focused on the issues and concerns in training evaluation; naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches; a discussion of the two evaluation models used in this study; evaluations of multicultural training programs in school systems; and Hispanic demographics in the United States, the Commonwealth of Virginia, Fairfax County, Virginia, and the impact of these demographics on public schools. An emphasis was placed on the evaluation of training programs, so as to gain the maximum, practical output when developing training programs. In addition, the Hispanic demographics provide a foundation for the importance of this study.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology, describe the training program population, explain the sampling techniques, describe the interview process, describe the administration of the questionnaire, and provide an explanation of the statistical procedures used to analyze the questionnaire data and the procedure for reporting the information obtained from the interviews.

Research Methodology

Evaluability Assessment by Wholey (1979) and Responsive Evaluation by Stake (1975a) are the two evaluation approaches used for this study. Each of these evaluation approaches were used with a specific purpose in mind.

The purpose for using Wholey's Evaluability Assessment procedure was to provide a preliminary evaluation of the program's design in order to insure that: (1) the program objectives were well-defined, (2) the program objectives were plausible and, (3) the intended uses of evaluation information were well-defined. The procedure followed for accomplishing this was to examine the program's documents (i.e., proposals, syllabi, etc.), conducting on-site observations of the training program activities and

interviewing the program coordinator/administrator and program trainers.

Stake's Responsive Evaluation procedure was used in order to capture the realities of the program from the reactions, concerns/issues and perceptions of the program participants. This was accomplished by interviewing a randomly selected group of program participants, administering a questionnaire to the total population of participants and documenting what actually happened in the name of the program via on-site observations. In addition, interviews were conducted with the program trainers.

Population

Three distinct groups were included in the original study population. The first group consisted of two program coordinators/administrators, the second group consisted of three program trainers; and the third group contained eighty program participants. With the exception of one program participant, the remaining population participants included in this study are or were employed by FCPS. However, that program participant is employed by an agency that works with students of FCPS. In addition, one of the program participants did not possess an undergraduate degree, but was included in the original population and considered equal in ability.

One person was eliminated from the original program participant population because that person is one of the program coordinators/administrators and it was determined that her dual role might create unnecessary bias. Six other program participants were eliminated from the original population because they are no longer employed by the Fairfax County Public Schools. This left a remaining program population of seventy-three program participants.

The seventy-three program participants were divided into three sub-groups: (1) those that participated in only Part I of the training program, (2) those that participated in only Part II of the training program, and (3) those that participated in Part I and Part II of the training program. There were 49 participants in subgroup I, 7 participants in subgroup II and 17 participants in subgroup III.

The researcher chose a 33.3% random sample of each of the subgroups of participants to interview from each of the sections of Part I and Part II (See Table 1) using an approved sampling technique. The remaining 49 program participants were mailed a questionnaire to complete. The interviewed program participants completed the same questionnaire immediately following their interviews.

Table 1
Randomly Selected Program Participants
Used to Form Interview Sample

<u>Part</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Random 33.3% Selected</u>	<u>Grade Structure of Sample</u>
Part I only	49	16	7 Elementary 3 Intermediate 4 High School 1 Instructional Office 1 Outside Agency
Part II only	7	2	1 Elementary 1 High School
Part I & II	17	6	1 Elementary 2 Intermediate 2 High School 1 Area Office
	—	—	
TOTAL	73	24	24

Note. N=73

Instrumentation

The questionnaire (Appendix VI) used in this study was designed to accomplish two purposes. One purpose was to collect demographic and personal information about all of the program participants. The second purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain attitudinal information from the program participants. Perceptions of the training program as it related to program objectives and intentions were solicited from these participants.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part I gathered demographic information about the non-interviewed participants' personal characteristics (i.e., age, gender, race, years experience in an educational setting, position, and their formal and informal Spanish experiences). Part II gathered information about their perceptions (i.e., part(s) of the program completed, why they enrolled in the program, whether or not they perceived the program to be beneficial and/or helpful, and whether or not the program met its objectives) of the training program.

The questions selected for use in the questionnaire were based on the program objectives.

Following the development of the questionnaire, dissertation committee members and selected school personnel, not represented in the study sample, were asked to review the

questionnaire for clarity, understanding, ambiguity and appropriate choices for each question.

The concerns of the reviewing groups were analyzed for possible misinterpretations and changes were made accordingly. Special attention was given to the clarity of the questions and the appropriateness of the response alternatives.

Collection of Data

Six research questions were included in this study. They are as follows:

Question 1: Is there agreement among the program administrators, program trainers and program participants about the purposes/objectives of the course?

This question was answered by using steps A-D of Wholey's Evaluability Assessment Model (Appendix V). Protocol interview sheets (Appendices VII, VIII & IX) were prepared to guide the researcher through the interviews with the program administrators, course instructors and course participants. All interviews were pre-arranged at a time convenient to the interviewees. Each interview was tape recorded so as to guarantee accuracy and clarity when analyzing the response data. Interviewees were asked for copies of program proposals and policies, course syllabi, lesson plans, course announcements, etc. to assist the

researcher in defining and describing the program and linking the program activities with the objectives. Specific questions were asked of the interviewees to obtain an answer to question 1. It is important to note that Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (Appendix IV), steps one and two are integral parts of the evaluation interviews at this point.

Question 2. Did the program meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned?

This question was answered by using several techniques. First, on-site observations of Part I class sessions were made as suggested by Wholey in step E of his Evaluability Assessment Model (Appendix V) and with step 3 of Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (Appendix IV). The researcher recorded as much information about what was actually taking place in the class sessions; this allowed the researcher to link the actual observed activities to the program objectives. The researcher observed 85 percent of the Part I class sessions and obtained Part II information from the Part II program trainers.

Secondly, all of the program participants were asked to complete a questionnaire (Appendix VI). Statements number 16 and 17 on the questionnaire provided answers used in question 2. The questionnaire was piloted for clarity and

understanding by the researcher's committee members and school personnel who were not a part of this study's sample.

Next, and in conjunction with Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (Appendix IV), steps 4, 5, and 6, information obtained from the interviews (Appendices VII, VIII & IX) with the program administrators, program trainers and randomly selected program participants provided additional insight into the answer to question 2.

Lastly, the course grade(s) for all of the program participants were obtained from the program trainers after securing the participants' consent (Appendix X).

Question 3. What impact did the program have on altering the perceived attitudes of participants about working with Hispanic students?

This question was answered using information from the interviews with the randomly selected program participants. More specifically, question G on the protocol interview sheet (Appendix IX) provided pre and post-program attitude information. Steps 4, 5, and 6 of Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (Appendix IV) were also utilized in this instance.

Question 4. What impact did the program have on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture?

The answer to this question was provided through the interview process previously noted. Questions E and F of the protocol interview sheet (Appendix IX) pertained specifically to answering this question. Steps 4, 5 and 6 of Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (Appendix IV) also apply in this instance.

Question 5. What were the most beneficial and least beneficial aspects of the program as perceived by the participants?

This question was answered through the interview process. Question H on the protocol interview sheet (Appendix IX) provided specific information in answering this question. In addition, statements number 20 and 21 on the questionnaire provided additional responses to this question.

Question 6. What portion(s) of the program would the participants retain, modify, expand or delete?

This question was answered through the interview process. Question C on the protocol interview sheet (Appendix IX) provided an answer to this question.

It is important to note that the use of the Responsive Evaluation Model allows for a great deal of flexibility. More than one step of the procedure can be taking place at

any given time. This model also allowed the evaluator to probe deeper for clarity and understanding. Steps 7-12 of the model required the evaluator to use good judgment or the most appropriate judgment as he saw fit. In addition, the evaluator constantly checked and rechecked the collected data for accuracy. Therefore, the evaluator needed to schedule additional interviews with some of the program participants, program trainers and program administrators.

Analysis of Data

Once all of the information had been collected from the interviews, program documents and on-site program observations, the researcher analyzed the information in search of answers to the six research questions. The findings consisted of a restatement of each of the research questions and the pertinent information, obtained from the interviews, program documents and on-site observation, needed to answer each question. This allowed the researcher to draw conclusions about the effectiveness, continuation, value, etc. of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" training program.

The returned questionnaires were examined for correctness and completeness.

A total of 73 questionnaires (100%) were received with none being discarded. The total questionnaire data were

coded and entered into a computer. The data were analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS). All questions from the questionnaire were analyzed using frequency distribution.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the research methodology used for this study, describe the population and sample, explain the administration of the questionnaire, and explain the data collection process and the analysis of that data.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the Intensive Spanish for Educators program and to provide the questionnaire response data and the applied statistical techniques. In addition, a restatement of each of the six research questions and the appropriate information obtained from the interview/questionnaire responses to answer each question is provided. This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section describes the development, implementation, instructional activities and instructional strategies of the Intensive Spanish for Educators program based on program documents, interviews with the program trainers/coordinator and on-site observations of the program. The second section describes the program participants based on the information provided on the questionnaires. The third section presents the findings with respect to each research question. The fourth section provides a synopsis of the comments made by the program participants. The fifth section discusses relationships between evaluative concerns, and the sixth and final section presents a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Training Program

The Intensive Spanish Educators program was requested and developed by a group of teachers of the Arlington Public Schools in response to the rapidly growing school-age Hispanic population of Arlington, Virginia, a suburb of Washington, D.C. This program was based on the Familiarization and Short Term Training (FAST) curriculum of the Foreign Service Institute of the United States Department of State.

The FAST course series (Foreign Service Institute, 1980), in 14 languages, was developed in response to needs expressed by many U.S. Department of State employees and their family members, who reported that their lack of preparation for life and work at a foreign post made their adjustment in a particular country difficult. It was revealed that more than 50 percent of the people serving in overseas posts did not go through a Foreign Service Institute standard language program prior to departing for their overseas assignment. It was obvious that a short-term but high yield program was needed.

The design of the course, FAST, began with interviewing those who had served at various posts without language or area studies training. From these interviews, the desirability of language competence was highlighted, but the need for "how to" information was also stressed. Therefore,

it was clear that the course should achieve two primary objectives: 1) knowledge of how things work, and why, in many common situations, and 2) readiness to cope with these situations linguistically.

A FAST course is challenging, intensive, and practical and organized around selected situations (i.e., the alphabet and names, changing money, ordering a meal, asking for directions, talking on the telephone, social courtesies, looking for housing, buying groceries,) not around bits of language. The situations are those encountered by most United States Government overseas employees in daily life; some common office situations are also included.

A FAST lesson consists of learning about a situation and then learning the oral responses which are likely to be used in that situation. Grammar and vocabulary are learned as they arise in each situation. Most of the time is devoted to rehearsals between the teacher and the student. Students hear more language than they are expected to say or use. However, the students concentrate on "following" what is said to them and on mastering what they will need to utter in response.

The bulk of the FAST material deals with linguistic matters. The material consists of samples (conversations written as naturally as possible), cassette tapes (for home study), numerous drills and exercises (to help students

understand and retain the language), comprehension and speaking practices, suggestions for various types of rehearsals, grammar and usage notes (for in-class reference and home study), and word lists for review.

Not only is a FAST course specific in its design, its implementation is carried out using a very specific instructional technique called the step approach.

The step approach (Foreign Service Institute, 1980) is a series of eight events for a FAST course that dictates the role of the instructor and students for different parts of each situational lesson. In addition, the step approach outlines what part of a dialogue the instructor should use when assuming a designated role. The eight events of the step approach are as follows:

1. Setting The Scene - Instructor's Role: Consultant. The consultant reads aloud the "Setting the Scene" and asks students to concentrate and form a mental image of the situation. This is the first step used at the beginning of each lesson.
2. Hearing It - Instructor's Role: Consultant. The consultant has the students listen to the taped dialogue twice with books closed, and encourages them to work together to guess and comment on what is going on. The consultant does not give grammatical explanations or ask the students to

translate. The consultant then has the students listen to the dialogue again with their books still closed. This event in the sequence is ended with the consultant answering students' questions and playing the dialogue again if necessary.

3. Seeing It - Instructor's Role: Consultant. The consultant has the students look at the dialogue silently while listening to the tape and soliciting from them what they understood. A minimum amount of time is spent on what the students understood. The consultant then plays the dialogue again, if necessary, and has the students complete the "Filling in the blanks" exercise and/or the "Scrambled dialogue" exercise.
4. Taking It Apart - Instructor's Role: Teacher. The teacher has the students open their books to the dialogue vocabulary. The teacher pronounces each word, and has the students repeat the word after him/her, together and then individually. This step is repeated as necessary in order that the teacher can correct their pronunciation. Then, the teacher has the students translate the words from the target language to English and vice versa. For the final part of this event, the teacher solicits

questions and provides short and simple explanations; the teacher does not lecture!

5. Getting the Feel of It - Instructor's Role: Teacher. In this event, the teacher helps the students become more comfortable with the American's lines in the dialogue. The teacher reads each sentence aloud and has the students repeat it together and then individually. The teacher corrects the students' pronunciation and intonation. It is important to note that at this point the students' books are closed and there may be the need to repeat this portion as deemed necessary by the teacher. In addition, this is where the teacher and the students work with all of the verbs which appear in the lesson and concentrate on the grammatical patterns illustrated in the dialogue. Very little, if any, additional vocabulary is introduced.
6. Putting It Together - Instructor's Role: Teacher. In this event, the teacher goes through a series of activities where he/she reads certain sentences of the dialogue and the students read/say the sentence(s) with their books open then closed. This is done as a group and individually. Also, the teacher starts the students working on the

"variants" of the dialogue with their books closed. A variant is a line that does the same thing in the conversation but with different words. In addition, the students work in small groups to translate the dialogue from English to the target language and vice versa.

7. Making It Work (Role Play) - Instructor's Role: Native Speaker. In this event, the instructor always takes the role of the native speaker and the students always take the role of the American. The Americans and the native speaker rehearse the dialogue with their books open and then closed. On the third rehearsal, small changes (i.e., a name, a personal pronoun, a color, a food or an adjective) are made in the sentences. More extensive changes (i.e., two or more small changes) are made in subsequent rehearsals. The most important thing to remember in this event is that no English should be spoken nor corrections made by the native speaker; be natural!
8. Using It - Instructor's Role: Native Speaker. In this step, the students engage in various activities using the language learned in the lesson by questioning the native speaker, providing information in response to the native speaker's

questions, or setting up a situation involving various aspects of the lesson. The information exchanged should be real - be it personal, practical or cultural. Neither the students nor the native speaker knows what the other will say ahead of time. No English is spoken and the exchange of information should be as natural as possible.

When a lesson has more than one dialogue, all of the events of the step approach should be completed except for the last event (Using It), which should be completed after having finished the lesson. In the "Using It" section, all the language learned from a lesson should be incorporated, including language from preceding lessons or a new word or sentence which emerged from a previous "Using It" activity.

While the step approach, as outlined, is the recommended sequence for getting the students to attain language skills and confidence, no class always operates as planned. Therefore, it will be necessary for the instructor to assess student progress and attitudes and to make sensible adjustments whenever necessary.

Based on the philosophy of the Foreign Service Institute's FAST course series and the step approach, a team of Arlington Public Schools educators, with the help of Foreign Service Institute personnel, designed and developed

the curriculum for the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program. This curriculum, like the FAST course series, is based on actual situations that public school educators face on a daily basis. Some of the dialogues contained in the curriculum are titled "In the Classroom," "Learning the Class Schedules," "In the Cafeteria," "Finding the Music Class," "Feeling Sick," "Making an Appointment," "Field Trips," "Inoculations," "A Pleasant Parent-Teacher Conference" and "A Fight."

The Arlington version of the FAST Course series was piloted in the summer of 1986, with a total of fifteen Arlington staff members who worked in classrooms, libraries, guidance departments, main school offices and other support roles participating. Sponsored by the Arlington Public Schools' Department of Personnel and focused strictly on Spanish language acquisition, this training program met for four hours a day for five weeks. Six semester graduate credit hours were awarded through the George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. Subsequent to the Arlington Public Schools' pilot, a staff member of the Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) in Northern Virginia became aware of Arlington's venture and sought to implement a similar program.

The Fairfax version of the Intensive Spanish for Educators was piloted in the Fall of 1987. This version of

the program was very similar to Arlington's in that its primary focus was on the acquisition of oral and aural Spanish skills. The differences were that the Fairfax program contained an additional component which focuses on the different Spanish-speaking cultures (i.e., Central America, South America, Spain, Mexico and the Caribbean) and the dialogues were divided into two parts to allow for the study of Hispanic cultures.

In Fairfax County, the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program is a six credit hour two-part graduate-program offered under the auspices of the George Mason University through the FCPS' Office of Planning and Organizational Development.

Part I of the program was designed for teachers, guidance counselors, administrators and staff members who had no previous Spanish training. The two sections (fifteen educators each) of Part I of the program were first offered in the Fall of 1987 and focused on practical oral and aural skills necessary to conduct conversations with Hispanic students and their parents. In addition to the acquisition of conversational skills, the cultural backgrounds of FCPS' Hispanic students were discussed with the purpose of sensitizing school personnel to the students and their special needs. School personnel in administrative Area II of the FCPS were given priority in registering for these initial

two sections. Subsequent sections of Part I were offered to school personnel in the Spring of 1988, the Summer of 1988, the Fall of 1988 and the Spring of 1989 regardless of administrative area. The objectives for Part I remained the same until the Fall of 1988 when an additional objective (i.e., to provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities) was added.

Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program, first offered in the Spring of 1988, was designed for the population who had completed the first part of the program. Essentially the content of the course maintained the same focus with the addition of one more objective; to become familiar with the organizations that seek to serve the Spanish-speaking community of Northern Virginia. However, registration for the first two sections of Part II was not only opened to Part I participants but was also opened to any school personnel, who had previous training in Spanish, regardless of the administrative area where he/she worked. Subsequent sections of Part II were offered in the Summer of 1988, the Fall of 1988 and the Spring of 1989. The summer and fall sections of 1988 were cancelled due to insufficient enrollment.

Each part of the Intensive Spanish for Educators program met one day a week for three clock hours in a specified location that was determined prior to the beginning of the

first session for a total of fourteen weeks. The trainers were all FCPS Spanish teachers, who were granted adjunct status through the George Mason University.

The language lessons for Part I deal with practical situations (i.e., greetings, days of the week, learning the class schedule and the names of the different rooms in a school, asking for directions, telling time, etc.) that Hispanic students may encounter on a normal school day. The cultural aspects deal with reading and discussing articles that focus on the education of Hispanic students in the United States and/or the adjustment of Hispanic families to the American way of life.

The language lessons for Part II deal with more in-depth situations (i.e., feeling sick, inoculations, field trips, the use of the library, parent-teacher conferences, a fight, etc.). In addition, the participants discussed a book, Hunger of Memory by Richard Rodriguez, a Mexican who writes about his adjustments to the American way of life and his opposition to bilingual education.

The course requirements for Part I were 1) class participation, 2) a mid-term examination (written and oral components), 3) three abstracts on readings about the education of Hispanic students in the United States and/or the adjustment of Hispanic families to the American way of life, 4) a recorded and written summary of an interview with

two members of the Hispanic community from the same country. Note: Each participant had to do an oral presentation, in English, in front of the class, and 5) a final examination (oral).

For Part II, the course requirements consisted of 1) class participation, 2) a mid-term examination (oral and written), 3) a final examination (oral and written), 4) the maintenance of a learning log with the participant's thoughts about second language learning, class discussions and selected course books and articles, and 5) a project, which could be a twenty minute presentation on the concerns and challenges facing the Spanish-speaking community of Northern Virginia or an interview with someone from a community or service organization that serves the Hispanic population of Northern Virginia.

In observing the class sessions of Part I and Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program, this researcher noticed that the trainers did not strictly adhere to each event of the step approach. Instead, the trainers allowed some participants the opportunity to assume the instructor's role as the teacher, consultant and/or the native speaker, while other participants assumed the role of an American. The trainers also interspersed the conversational dialogues with games, puzzles, geography activities, audio-visual activities and group activities,

where the students composed original dialogues related to the lesson being studied. In addition, the trainers allowed time for participants to share something they had learned about a current event dealing with Hispanics and/or an experience with an Hispanic student/parent or person outside of the school environment. The trainers also allowed the students to ask questions regarding grammatical structure and vocabulary. The trainers frequently shared their living/teaching/touring experiences in Spanish-speaking countries.

At the mid-point of each section of the Intensive Spanish for Educators, a tertulia (Spanish for a gathering) was held. This gathering consisted of all the participants of the program for that semester, regardless of level. Participants saw a movie (i.e., Stand and Deliver or El Norte) or listened to a speaker whose topics generally covered learning styles, services available to the Hispanic community or the plight of the Hispanic immigrant.

Regardless of the activity or instructional methodology, all of the observed instructional activities were geared toward meeting the objectives of the training program.

Description of the Population

The population for this study consisted of 73 persons who had completed Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for

Educators training program. Table 2 indicates that 49 persons or 67% completed Part I only; 7 persons or 10% completed Part II only; and 17 persons or 23% completed Parts I and II. Of the 73 participants, two-thirds (49) of them were mailed a questionnaire to complete and return. The other one-third of the participants (24) were interviewed and, in addition, were asked to complete the same questionnaire following the interview. After nine weeks, all of the interviews were completed and 73 or 100% of the questionnaires were returned.

Personal Data Relative to the Respondents

The distribution of respondents by their reported personal characteristics may be found in Tables 3 and 4.

Age of respondents. The data, as shown in Table 3, indicates that the largest group of respondents (30) were between the ages of 40 and 49 and represent 41% of the total. The second largest group was in the 50 or over age bracket (24 individuals representing 33%). Thus, 54 or 74% of the respondents were 40 years of age or over.

Gender of respondents. Table 3 indicates that there were 59 females (81%) and 14 males (19%) represented in the total sample survey.

Race of respondents. The number and percent of the respondents by race are shown in Table 4, indicating that 64

Table 2
Training Completed by Program Participants

<u>Portion of Program Completed</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
1. Part I only	49	67
2. Part II only	7	10
3. Parts I and II	<u>17</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 3
Age and Gender of Program Participants

	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
1. Age		
Younger than 30	6	8
30-39	13	18
40-49	30	41
50 or over	<u>24</u>	<u>33</u>
Total	73	100
2. Gender		
Female	59	81
Male	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 4
Race of Program Participants

<u>Race</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Asian	0	0
Black	8	11
Hispanic	0	0
White	64	88
American Indian	0	0
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

individuals or 88% of the sample was white and 8 individuals or 11% were black. No respondents fell in the Asian, Hispanic or American Indian categories. A total of 1 or 1% of the respondents marked the "other" category.

Nationality of respondents. The number and percent of the respondents by nationality are indicated in Table 5, and shows that the majority of the respondents, 64 or 88% were American. There were 7 or 10% of the respondents who indicated that they were of European nationality. Two percent or 2 of the respondents indicated that they were Central American (1 or 1%) or "other" (1 or 1%).

Educational Work Experience and Present Position of the Respondents

Years experience in an educational setting. As shown in Table 6, the largest group (19 or 26%) of respondents had 16-20 years of experience working in an educational setting. The second and third largest groups (14 or 19% and 12 or 16%) reported having between 11-15 and 21-25 years experience, respectively, in an educational setting. Six or 8% of the respondents had 26-30 years experience and 5 or 7% of the respondents had more than 30 years of experience in education. Thus, 56 or 76% of the respondents have had more than ten years experience in an educational setting.

Table 5
Nationality of Program Participants

<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
American, not Puerto Rican	64	88
Carribbean	0	0
European	7	10
Central American	1	1
South American	0	0
Mexican	0	0
Puerto Rican	0	0
Asian	0	0
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 6
 Program Participants' Years of Work Experience

<u>Years Work Experience in Education</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
1-5	7	10
6-10	10	14
11-15	14	19
16-20	19	26
21-25	12	16
26-30	6	8
More than 30	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Position presently held. The majority of the respondents (50 or 69%), as shown in Table 7, were elementary, intermediate or secondary teachers. The remaining respondents (17 or 23% and 6 or 8%) fell into the pupil personnel and "other" categories, respectively. The category titled pupil personnel included guidance counselors, social workers, librarians, psychologists, secretaries, speech and language pathologists, instructional aides and hospital-based teachers. The "other" category included school-based administrators, curriculum specialists and itinerant teachers.

Relevant Training/Coursework Experience of the Respondents

Years of Spanish coursework in elementary, junior and/or senior high school. As indicated in Table 8, 56% or 41 of the respondents had no previous Spanish coursework. Thirty-one or 43% of the respondents had 1-5 years of Spanish coursework and only one person (1%) had more than ten years of Spanish coursework in elementary, junior and/or senior high school.

Previous college coursework/in-service training in Spanish language. Forty-one or 56% of the respondents, as shown in Table 9, had no previous college coursework or in-service training in Spanish language and 32 or 44% of the respondents had previous college coursework or in-service

Table 7

Educational Position Presently Held by Program Participants

<u>Position</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Elementary Teacher	24	33
Intermediate Teacher	11	15
High School Teacher	15	21
Pupil Personnel	17	23
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 8
 Years of Spanish in Elementary, Junior and/or
 Senior High School of Program Participants

<u>Years of Spanish</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
None	41	56
1-5	31	43
6-10	0	0
More than 10	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 9
 Previous College Coursework/In-Service
 Training of Program Participants

<u>Experience</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
A. Spanish Language		
Yes	32	44
No	<u>41</u>	<u>56</u>
Total	73	100
B. Spanish Culture		
Yes	22	30
No	<u>51</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	73	100
C. Multicultural, Bilingual or ESL Education		
Yes	30	41
No	<u>43</u>	<u>59</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

training in Spanish language prior to enrolling in the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program.

Previous college coursework/in-service training in Spanish culture. As shown in Table 9, 70% or 51 of the respondents indicated no previous college coursework/in-service training in Spanish culture and 30% or 22 of the respondents indicated that they had at least some previous college coursework/in-service training in Spanish culture prior to their enrolling in the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program.

Previous college coursework/in-service training in multicultural, bilingual or ESL education. Forty-three or 59% of the respondents, as shown in Table 9, had no previous college coursework/in-service training in multicultural bilingual or ESL education and 41% or 30 individuals had previous training in one or more of these areas prior to their enrolling in the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program.

Teaching or Travel Experience to a Foreign Country

Travel experience to a Spanish-speaking country. As indicated in Table 10, approximately half (37 or 51%) of the respondents had traveled to a Spanish-speaking country, while the other half (36 or 49%) had not.

Table 10
 Program Participants' Travel and Teaching
 Experience in a Spanish-speaking Country

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
A. Travel Experience		
Yes	37	51
No	<u>36</u>	<u>49</u>
Total	73	100
B. Teaching Experience		
Yes	2	3
No	<u>71</u>	<u>97</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Teaching experience in a Spanish-speaking country. Only 3% or 2 of the respondents, as indicated in Table 10, had ever taught in a Spanish-speaking country.

Living, travel or teaching experience in a non-Spanish-speaking country. As shown in Table 11, 70% or 51 of the respondents had lived, traveled and/or taught in a country where Spanish was not the native tongue.

Spanish Proficiency of the Respondents

As shown in Table 12, 56% or 41 of the respondents did not speak, read or write Spanish to any degree prior to taking Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program. Thirty-two or 44% of the respondents had some degree of Spanish proficiency prior to enrolling in the training program.

Findings Relative to Each Research Question

Research Question 1. Is there agreement among the program administrators, program trainers and program participants about the purposes/objectives of the program?

Interviews with the two program administrators, three program trainers and one-third or 24 of the program participants provided the information to answer this question. All interviewees were asked what they felt were the objectives of Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for

Table 11
 Program Participants' Living, Travel or
 Teaching Experience in a non-Spanish
 Speaking Country

<u>Living, Travel or Teaching Experience</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Yes	51	70
No	<u>22</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 12
 Prior Spanish-speaking, Reading or Writing
 Proficiency of Program Participants

<u>Speaking, Reading or Writing Experience</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Yes	32	44
No	<u>41</u>	<u>56</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Educators training program. The unanimous response of those interviewed was 1) to develop some basic Spanish communication skills and 2) to develop an awareness and appreciation of Hispanic cultures. Thus, there is agreement among the program administrators, program trainers and program participants about the objectives of the program. However, the interviewees made it perfectly clear that Spanish fluency was not the purpose for their taking the course, but the acquisition of minimal Spanish language to establish a rapport with Hispanic students and parents was expected.

During the interviews with the twenty-four randomly selected program participants, the question, "What do you feel is the philosophy of this training program--to learn the language is to learn the culture or to learn the culture is to learn the language?" Only one of the program participants felt that the philosophy was to learn the culture was to learn the language. The other participants felt the philosophy of this training program was to learn the language is to learn the culture. However, several comments indicated that the two go hand-in-hand. Some of the comments were:

"I don't think you can separate them. I think they have to go together. The culture and language must be learned together in order to learn them both. The culture is so important in the language."

"I think the two are pretty much indivisible. I think in learning language you are learning the

culture. I suppose you could just try to learn language but they did a good job of putting the two together and I just don't think you can. I think it is best to learn culture and language together."

"To learn the phraseology of the language, to learn how to address a person, for example, to learn the proper way to say the last names, for example, that is learning a lot about the culture."

"That is kind of a chicken and egg question. It is hard to say which comes first. I think when you start dealing really heavily in either area, there is such an overlap that I think it was really a nice balance of the two. I think it was effectively done in my section."

The comments made by the program participants were confirmed by one of the program administrators who said, "I think initially what drew the teachers was thinking they were going to learn the language, but a language is only a result of its people, . . . they did not expect to learn as much culture as they did; it (the culture) was a beneficial by-product."

It should be reiterated at this point that a third objective (i.e., to provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities) was added to Part I of the training program in the Fall of 1988. None of the program participants (3) who were interviewed from that section of Part I made reference to that objective. However, several of the program participants from the Fall, 1988 section of Part I completed a project that focused on a school/classroom activity dealing with Hispanic Heritage

Week. Those participants shared their Hispanic Heritage Week projects with the class just as those who completed the interview project.

Research Question 2. Did the program meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned?

Data was obtained from the 24 interviews held with the randomly selected program participants to provide a response to this research question. In addition, the responses to questions 16 and 17 from the questionnaire, which was completed by all of the program participants (73), also provided data for answering this question. The grades for all of the participants were obtained from the program trainers and provided additional answers to this question.

The stated program objectives for Part I of the Intensive Spanish for Educators program, from its inception until the Fall of 1988, are 1) to introduce basic conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community and 2) to gain an awareness and understanding of the different cultural backgrounds of Spanish-speaking students. A third objective, to provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities, was added in the Fall of 1988.

The objectives for Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators program are 1) to develop conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community, 2) to recognize the differences in the various Spanish-speaking cultures represented in the Fairfax County Public Schools, and 3) to become familiar with the organizations that seek to serve the Spanish-speaking community of Northern Virginia. These objectives have not changed since the first section of Part II was held in the Spring of 1988.

As indicated in Table 13, the majority of the respondents, 66 or 90%, felt that the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program met its objectives. The other 7 or 10% of the program participants felt that the objectives of the program were at least somewhat met. This distribution of responses can be confirmed from the information obtained from the 24 program participants who were interviewed.

In talking with the 24 program participants, all of them pointed out the fact that the Spanish dialogues and related language activities were a very necessary and crucial component of the program. They all indicated that while they are by no means fluent in Spanish, they could recognize vocabulary words and phrases when listening to or speaking with Hispanic students and parents. The program participants also pointed out that their limited Spanish-speaking skills

Table 13
 Program Participants' Perception Relative to
 Program Meeting Objectives

<u>Did Program Meet Objectives</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Yes	66	90
No	0	0
Somewhat	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

served as a helpful tool in getting the attention of Hispanic students and it also allowed them the opportunity to diffuse verbal or physical confrontations that involved Hispanic students. The program participants felt that the language activities used focused on school situations that they encounter on a daily basis. In addition and probably the most important aspect, all of the program participants eluded to the fact that the Spanish they learned helped them to develop and/or enhance their working relations with Hispanic students.

The cultural activities of the training program included discussions about current events dealing with Hispanic immigration to the United States, the reading of Hunger of Memory by Richard Rodriguez in Part II of the program, reading selected articles about Hispanics in American schools in Part I of the program, viewing two award-winning movies (i.e., El Norte and Stand and Deliver), listening to guest speakers and the completion of a project that involved interviewing a Hispanic student, parent or a representative of an agency or organization that serves the Hispanic community.

As shown in Table 14, eighty-five percent of the questionnaire respondents indicated that the discussions about Hispanic cultural issues were extremely beneficial. Ninety-five percent or 69 of the respondents cited the oral

Table 14

Program Participants' Identification of Most
Beneficial Aspects of Training Program

<u>Training Program Content Areas</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Readings		
Yes	23	32
No	<u>50</u>	<u>68</u>
Total	73	100
2. Discussions		
Yes	62	85
No	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	73	100
3. Lectures		
Yes	29	40
No	<u>44</u>	<u>60</u>
Total	73	100
4. Oral Language Activities		
Yes	69	95
No	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	73	100
5. Trainer's Experiences		
Yes	54	74
No	<u>19</u>	<u>26</u>
Total	73	100
6. Learning Log		
Yes	5	7
No	<u>68</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	73	100
7. Projects		
Yes	40	55
No	<u>33</u>	<u>45</u>
8. Other		
Yes	11	15
No	<u>62</u>	<u>85</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

language activities as being quite beneficial. In addition, seventy-four percent or 54 of the questionnaire respondents indicated that the discussions that focused on the trainers' experiences were also quite beneficial.

As shown in Table 15, 58 or 79% of the questionnaire respondents felt that the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program met their expectations and will be helpful to them when dealing with situations that involve Hispanic students and their parents. The remaining 21% of the respondents indicated that the training program somewhat met their expectations.

The majority (51 or 70%) of the respondents as shown in Table 16, received the grade of A for Part I and/or Part II of the training program. Four or 5% of the respondents received a grade of A for the first part of the program and a grade of B for the second part. Twelve or 17% of the program participants received a grade of B for Part I and/or Part II of the training program. The lowest grade of C was received by 4 or 5% of the participants for Part I and/or II of the program. Two or 3% of the program participants chose not to give consent for the researcher to obtain their grades. Thus, the majority, 67 or 92% of the respondents received a grade of B or better in the training program.

Observations of Part I and Part II class sessions led the researcher to observe several strategies that linked the

Table 15
 Distribution of Responses Relative to the
 Training Program Meeting the Program
 Participants' Expectations and Being Helpful

<u>Did Program Meet Expectations</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Yes	58	79
No	0	0
Somewhat	<u>15</u>	<u>21</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

Table 16
Grade Distribution of Program Participants - Part I/II

<u>Grades</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
A	51	70
A/B	4	5
B	12	17
C	4	5
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

activities with the program objectives. At the beginning of each class, the trainers would go over the day's activities, which were written on chart paper attached to the chalkboard. The trainers would also display charts of verb conjugations, examples of dialogue changes, maps of Spanish-speaking countries and new vocabulary words written on the chalkboard. In addition, the program trainers would distribute a variety of handouts related to the dialogues and cultural-related activities. The researcher can attest to the fact that the program activities were directly linked to meeting the program objectives. Thus, the program did meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned.

Research Question 3. What impact did the program have on altering the perceived attitudes of the participants about working with Hispanic students?

The information to answer this question was obtained from the interviews with the 24 randomly selected program participants. The researcher posed the following question to each of the persons interviewed, "Prior to taking Part I and/or Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program, did you feel you were prejudiced or biased against Hispanic students? Only 5 or 21% of those interviewed admitted to being prejudiced against Hispanics (Table 17). The remaining interviewees did not think they

Table 17
 Attitudes of Randomly Selected Participants
 Prior To and After Completing Program

<u>Attitude</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Had Prejudice		
Yes	5	21
No	<u>19</u>	<u>79</u>
Total	24	100
Changed Positively		
Yes	19	79
No	<u>5</u>	<u>21</u>
Total	24	100

Note. N=24

were prejudiced against Hispanics. Below is a few of the positive and negative comments made in response to the previously stated question:

"I don't think I was. That is a hard question. I don't think I was biased against or prejudiced against Hispanic kids or parents. Ignorant, yes!"

"Yes. I grew up in an area in _____ very heavily populated with Puerto Ricans and I certainly had a negative type of prejudice towards Puerto Ricans"

"No. I am _____. I think because having grown up where I did in the suburbs of _____, if you weren't Anglo-saxon, WASP Protestant, there was a tremendous prejudice against you . . . I think I can understand the prejudices that the Hispanics go through."

"No. I don't think so because I am so used to having a variety of languages in this school. . . I just didn't have as much knowledge to be more effective in reaching them."

"No. Probably, if anything I am more biased for them. That's why I was taking the course. I wanted to make the kids feel better."

"I have never felt any biases. I never have thought about it. I don't really think about them. I guess I have been in it too long; children are children"

"I hope not. I don't think so. I certainly had a lack of awareness of just how bad things were for so many people, but I don't think I had any prejudices . . . but, I certainly was ignorant of a lot of things."

Although the comments cited are just a few examples, they provide the tone of the responses given by all of the program participants that were interviewed.

Subsequent to asking the randomly selected program participants about their prejudices/biases before enrolling in the training program, the researcher raised the following question; "Since taking Part I and/or Part II of the training program, has your attitude or perceptions about Hispanic students changed?" Of all the randomly selected participants, only 5 or 21% (Table 17) said that their attitude or perception had not changed because they did not have a negative view of Hispanics prior to enrolling in the training program. The remainder (19 or 79%) of the interviewees felt that their attitudes or perceptions had changed, but the change was due to the enlightenment they had received from the program and not because of any prejudices. Even those 5 persons who felt that they had held prejudices or biases against Hispanics experienced a positive attitude change and indicated they felt a sense of increased cultural awareness. The following comments express the feeling of the interviewees after their involvement in the training program:

"I doubt if it has really changed my particular perceptions because I came with positive needs; except in the sense that it might have made them more positive."

"No. I think that I went to the course with a pretty high level of sensitivity towards the Hispanic culture and language and things like that because I have studied it previously and had kids in the classroom . . . It was a nice and comfortable forum to talk about the Hispanic culture and the cultural experiences these kids have when they came here and try to assimilate."

"I am a little quicker to jump on people that say, don't expect that from him; you know the attitude - it will happen tomorrow. I am quicker to say to those people, hey, they have a culture, you have a culture. Just because theirs is different from yours, it is not wrong."

"I guess I have become more understanding of the Hispanics and their language problems since I was put in the same position, not having the language background . . ."

"Compassion, understanding, acceptance and tolerance. I wouldn't be so quick to turn around and tell a child they are fooling around when I know that they have never had a formal education before. It's hard . . ."

"Yes, I think so. I think I'm much more tolerant of what a kid has to go through. Having taken an immersion experience, I am more tolerant of what a kid has to go through to immerse himself in English and what a parent has to go through when having to deal with delicate information and not be able to speak the language."

Therefore, the program did have an impact on altering the perceived attitudes of the participants about working with Hispanic students.

Research Question 4. What impact did the program have on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture?

The information needed to answer this research question was obtained from the interviews with the 24 randomly selected program participants. These program participants were asked two questions: 1) Can you hold a conversation in

Spanish with a Hispanic person? and 2) Are you aware that there are different Hispanic cultures?

Only two of the interviewees felt they could hold a reasonably coherent conversation with a Hispanic person. The remaining interviewees did not feel they could hold a conversation with a Hispanic person. Many of those who admitted to their lack of Spanish fluency did feel that they could get a point across in Spanish. One interviewee indicated that just the use of a Spanish command or vocabulary word would ignite a flame in the eyes of some Hispanic students. Another interviewee spoke of how her limited Spanish has helped her be the mediator between a teacher and a Hispanic student. Other interviewees indicated that they felt their limited use of Spanish vocabulary has helped to spark more interest on the part of Hispanic students; the Hispanic students view the teacher as a caring and interested person, who is making an effort towards better communication. One teacher who participated in the interview process has been able to use Spanish words in the place of English vocabulary when students do not understand. In addition, one interviewee indicated the oral language activities have made her more cognizant of the importance of using correct English.

Along cultural lines, all of the interviewees indicated that they were aware that different Hispanic cultures did

exist. Those participants who participated in the interview process eluded to such cultural differences as socio-economic status, family structure and educational systems. In addition, the interviewees spoke about how some of the Hispanics' lives have been influenced by famine, the fear of deportation, violence in their native lands, separation from some of their family members and their struggle to survive economically. It was the consensus of all of the interviewees that they felt more empathy and compassion for Hispanics and that they possess a better understanding of the kind of social medium from which Hispanics come. Table 18 shows that the majority, 68 or 93%, of the entire sample indicated that they were interested in learning more about Hispanics and their language and culture.

In analyzing the data obtained from the interviewees and the questionnaires, it is concluded that the program did have an impact on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture.

Research Question 5. What were the most beneficial and least beneficial aspects of the program as perceived by the participants?

Responses to questionnaire statements (Part II Course Information) numbers 20 and 21 were utilized to determine the most beneficial and least beneficial aspects of the training program as perceived by the program participants. The

Table 18
 Program Participants' Interest in Further
 Spanish Language and Culture Study

<u>Interest in Further Study</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
Yes	68	93
No	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

program participants were allowed to check as many statements as they wished.

Table 14 indicates that the majority of the program participants rated the discussions (62 or 85%), the oral language activities (69 or 95%) and the professors (trainers') experiences (54 or 74%) as the three most beneficial aspects of the training program. It is clear that the readings, the lectures, the learning log for Part II participants, and the "other" category were not perceived by the participants to be the most beneficial aspects of the training program. On the other hand, there appears to be mixed emotions about the benefit of the projects. Fifty-five percent of the participants (40) felt that the projects were among the most beneficial aspects of the program, while 33 or 45% of the participants did not view the projects as being amongst the most beneficial aspects of the program. All of the program participants' (73) perceptions about the most beneficial aspects of the program were confirmed in the interview process. Of the 24 program participants, twenty-one or 88% of them indicated that the discussions, the oral language activities and/or the trainers experiences were the most helpful activities.

Table 19 shows that no one aspect of the training program was overwhelmingly seen as being less beneficial than another aspect. One hundred percent of the program

Table 19

Program Participants' Identification of Least
Beneficial Aspects of Training Program

<u>Training Program Content Areas</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	No.	Percent
1. Readings		
Yes	19	26
No	<u>54</u>	<u>74</u>
Total	73	100
2. Discussions		
Yes	0	0
No	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	73	100
3. Lectures		
Yes	5	7
No	<u>68</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	73	100
4. Oral Language Activities		
Yes	2	3
No	<u>71</u>	<u>97</u>
Total	73	100
5. Trainer's Experiences		
Yes	2	3
No	<u>71</u>	<u>97</u>
Total	73	100
6. Learning Log		
Yes	13	18
No	<u>60</u>	<u>82</u>
Total	73	100
7. Projects		
Yes	5	7
No	<u>68</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	73	100
8. All of the Aspects		
Yes	36	49
No	<u>37</u>	<u>51</u>
Total	73	100
9. Other		
Yes	5	7
No	<u>68</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	73	100

Note. N=73

participants indicated that the discussions were not among the least beneficial aspects of the training program. It is interesting to note that the 13 respondents, who felt that the learning log was among the least beneficial aspects of the training program, were all Part II participants. This represents 57% of all Part II participants.

Research Question 6: What portion(s) of the program would the participants retain, modify, expand or delete?

The information to answer this question was obtained from the 24 program participants that were interviewed. The interviewees were asked the question, What activities/assignments would you change or add? Retain?

In analyzing the information provided by the interviewees, it was obvious that there was no clear consensus or majority of the participants who cited any one activity/assignment that they felt needed to be changed or added. However, all of the interviewees felt the language activities were crucial to the success of the program.

As with any program that involves people from different backgrounds with different personalities and interests, individual idiosyncrasies are inevitable. This program and its participants were no different. Many of those interviewed even prefaced their response to research question 6 with, "For me . . .," "In my opinion . . .," or "As far as I'm concerned . . ." Some of the individual concerns

expressed by the interviewees relative to the addition or modification of program activities, were the need for more work with verb conjugations, more cultural activities, the rearrangement of the sequence of the dialogues and additional direction in completing the interview project. Some others suggested the development and inclusion of some sort of cultural exchange program with a Spanish-speaking country and spending more time on the dialogues including more visiting speakers--maybe even students from Spanish-speaking countries. In addition, five of the Part II participants felt that the novel, Hunger of Memory by Richard Rodriguez, was not particularly enjoyable. One of the Part II participants had read the book before, another felt that the reflective writing in the learning log about the book was not congruent with her learning style and another person felt that Rodriguez's experience and success were atypical of the everyday Hispanic immigrant's experiences. There were also program participants who felt that three hours a day, one day a week was insufficient for real language learning. Lastly, a couple of the interviewees felt that there needed to be a basic Spanish textbook to supplement the dialogue manual.

Although the program participants interviewed discussed some of their personal wishes and needs, all of them felt that the activities and assignments were appropriate for

meeting the objectives of Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators Training Program.

Evaluative Comments

To supplement the information needed to answer the six research questions, the twenty-four interviewees provided the researcher with some additional insights.

When asked if they felt comfortable in the program, all of those interviewed cited the relaxed atmosphere set by the program trainers. They all felt that the trainers were not intimidating and made them feel like each person was special and could succeed. One participant said, "The instructors gave 1000 percent." The interviewees also felt that the program requirements were not too difficult and didn't demand a lot of their time outside of class. In addition, the location and length of the class sessions were seen as acceptable and appropriate, respectively.

With the exception of two Part I interviewees who had not taken Part II at the time this study was being conducted, all of the other interviewees indicated that other obligations or the lack of quality time prevented them from completing the second part of the program. However, many hope that they can pursue Part II at some time in the future.

Another interesting aspect that emerged from the interview process was the request for a Part III of the

training program. Five of those participants who had completed Part II of the program felt that a third part would keep them in touch with the language and provide the opportunity to increase their potential to be fluent as well as expand their cultural awareness.

When asked if they thought the training program should be made mandatory, only one interviewee indicated that it should. The remaining interviewees felt it should be highly recommended and strongly encouraged, but not mandated; especially for those educators who interact with a large Hispanic population.

Relationships Between Evaluative Concerns

While waiting for the return of the questionnaires and planning the layout and sequence for reporting the interview and questionnaire data, the researcher became interested in whether or not there were any systematic relationships that existed between the demographic variables and the evaluative concerns as written on the questionnaire. This interest sparked the need to perform chi-square (χ^2) analyses of selected questionnaire variables. The chi-square (χ^2) test was the nonparametric statistical test selected because it is the most frequently used statistical test a researcher uses when interested in the number of responses or people that

fall into certain categories. A .05 level of significance was selected to determine the relationship between variables.

There were a total of 178 cross-tabulations performed between demographic variables and evaluative concerns. Some of the cross-tabulations performed were age vs. part of program completed, race vs. previous college/in-service training in Spanish language and culture, years of experience in education vs. whether the training program met its objectives and race vs. reason for enrolling in the training program. Of all the 178 chi-square tests performed, there were no chi-square values that produced a "p" value of less than .05. Thus, it can be concluded that there were no significant relationships between the demographic variables and evaluative concerns.

Summary

This chapter presented a description of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program, Parts I and II. The respondents to the questionnaire were described by the personal characteristics of age, gender, race and nationality. In addition, the respondents were described based on their experience in education, position presently held, training experiences in Spanish language and culture, multicultural, ESL and bilingual education, and travel and teaching experiences in foreign countries. The findings of

this study with respect to each of the six research questions were presented. Additional evaluative concerns, obtained from the interview process, were also discussed. The chi-square (χ^2) analyses relative to the relationships between evaluative concerns were also examined.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of the purpose of this study, the evaluative strategies used, the research methodology employed, a restatement of the research questions with findings, and conclusions based on the findings and evaluative recommendations.

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program based on the perceptions of the seventy-three program participants, who completed Part I and/or Part II of the program. The analysis of the program data provided answers to six research questions that indicated whether or not the training program was of value and helpful as viewed by the participants.

Evaluative Strategies

Two evaluative research models were used for this study; Responsive Evaluation by Robert E. Stake (1975a) and Evaluability Assessment by Joseph S. Wholey (1979).

Responsive evaluation stresses the importance of being responsive to realities of a program and to the reactions, concerns and issues of its participants. A responsive

evaluator spends more time on observing a program, gathering judgments and learning client needs rather than on processing formal data, administering tests, preparing instruments and preparing formal reports. The responsive evaluation model can be viewed as a clock, where each hour represents an event. The events range from talking to clients to making observations of a program, to examining program proposals and documents. There is a great deal of interaction between the events and the events can proceed in a counter-clockwise, clockwise, or cross-clockwise mode.

Evaluability assessment is a preliminary evaluation of a program's design to determine if three standards are met: (1) the program objectives are well-defined, (2) the program assumptions or objectives are plausible, and (3) the intended uses of evaluation information are well-defined. This process includes on-site observations of a program, documenting program activities and documenting what the key actors have defined as the intended program activities and objectives. The evaluability assessment process seeks to determine if a viable program exists.

Research Methodology

The research methodology for this study was the use of the interview process and a questionnaire. Of the seventy-three program participants, forty-nine participants were

mailed a questionnaire. The remaining twenty-four participants were interviewed and also requested to complete the same questionnaire immediately following their interviews. In addition, the three program trainers and the two program administrators were interviewed. The information obtained from the interviews was scrutinized for the specific information needed to answer the six research questions. The questionnaire data were analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical System. A frequency distribution for each questionnaire item was generated to describe the personal and professional experiences of the program participants, as well as to provide additional information to answer the research questions.

Research Questions Restated with Findings

Research Question 1. Is there agreement among the program administrators, program trainers and program participants about the purposes/objectives of the program?

When asked what the objectives/purposes of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program were, the unanimous response from the program administrators, program trainers and program participants who were interviewed was (1) to develop some basic Spanish communication skills and (2) to develop an awareness and appreciation of Hispanic cultures. Thus, there was agreement among the program administrators,

program trainers, and program participants relative to the purposes/objectives of the program.

Research Question 2. Did the program meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned?

In the interviews with the twenty-four randomly selected program participants, they all expressed support about the Spanish language skills they had acquired and the cultural awareness they had gained from participating in the program. In addition, they all recognized that they were by no means fluent in Spanish but they felt they could get a point across using the language. Of the total program participant sample (73) 90% of them felt the program met its objectives, and 79% of them felt the program met their expectations and would be helpful to them when dealing with Hispanic students and their parents. In addition, 92% of the program participants received a grade of B or better for Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program. Thus, the program did meet its stated objectives with regards to what the participants perceived they learned.

Research Question 3. What impact did the program have on altering the perceived attitudes of the participants about working with Hispanic students?

In the interviews with the 24 randomly selected participants, the questions "Do you feel you were prejudice or biased against Hispanic students prior to taking Part I/Part II of the program?" and "Do you feel your attitude or perceptions about Hispanic students have changed since completing Part I and/or Part II of the program?" were asked. Of the 24 interviewees, only five or 21% admitted to having a bias or being prejudiced against Hispanic students prior to enrolling in the program. Nineteen or 79% of the interviewees felt that their attitudes or perceptions had changed, and the change was due to the enlightenment they had received from the program and not because of any prejudices. Therefore, the program did have an impact on altering the perceived attitudes of the participants about working with Hispanic students. The participants now feel more empathy, compassion and a willingness to go beyond the normal to help Hispanic students to succeed.

Research Question 4. What impact did the program have on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture?

In analyzing the information provided by the 24 program participants that were interviewed, the program did have an impact on the participants' perceived understanding of Spanish language and culture.

Only two of the interviewees felt that they could hold a reasonably coherent conversation with a Hispanic person. However, the remaining interviewees who did not feel that they could hold a conversation with a Hispanic person did feel, however, that the Spanish they learned helped them to get a point across. In addition, the interviewees felt that their limited Spanish-speaking skills helped them spark more interest on the part of Hispanic students in their classes, aided them in establishing a more positive rapport with Hispanic students and assisted them in intervening in situations where Hispanic students were involved. The interviewees all felt that they now understood some of the trauma and difficulties experienced by their Hispanic students. From the survey questionnaire, 68 or 93% of all the program participants indicated their desire to learn more about Spanish language and culture.

Research Question 5. What were the most beneficial and least beneficial aspects of the program as perceived by the participants?

The seventy-three program participants, who completed the questionnaire, identified the oral language activities (69 or 95%), the discussions (62 or 85%) and the trainers' experiences (54 or 74%) as the three most beneficial aspects of the training program. Conversely, no one aspect of the

training program was overwhelmingly seen by all participants as being less beneficial than another aspect. However, more than half of the Part II participants (13 or 57%) felt that the learning log was among the least beneficial aspects of the program.

Research Question 6. What portion(s) of the program would the participants retain, modify, expand or delete?

During the interviews with the twenty-four randomly selected program participants, they were asked, "What activities/assignments would you change, add or retain?" All of the interviewees felt that the oral language activities were necessary in order for the program to be successful. Other than that one aspect, the majority did not cite any one activity/assignment as needing to be changed or added. Individual concerns were voiced by some participants. Some participants felt that some of the portions of the program such as the need for more work with verb conjugation, more cultural activities and the rearrangement of the sequence of dialogues needed improvement. Others suggested some sort of cultural exchange program and more speakers - maybe even student speakers from Spanish-speaking countries, as being possible enhancements to the program that would be beneficial.

Although the interviewed program participants discussed some of their personal wishes and needs for program changes, all of them felt that the activities and assignments were appropriate for meeting the objectives of Part I/Part II of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program.

Conclusions

The Intensive Spanish for Educators training program is a worthwhile and valuable program because it provides the opportunity for teachers, pupil personnel staff and administrators to acquire knowledge and skills in an area that can be used on a daily basis. Also, it is a possibility that this training program is successful because it is sanctioned and supported by the Area II Superintendent, who requested and received funds to allow two sections of Part I participants to enroll in Part II at no cost. In addition, the program has helped to improve the student/educator interactions. The program participants are extremely complimentary about the program trainers and the relevant dialogues that make up the bulk of the program curriculum.

Another reason for the success of this training program is that the program was developed because educators saw a need to grow professionally. They were not forced to enroll in the program. Thus, a sort of halo effect was created.

All of the program participants felt that the program achieved its objectives and met their expectations. They also indicated that the program had been helpful in assisting them in getting the attention of and establishing a positive rapport with Hispanic students. In addition, those participants who were interviewed felt that the activities/assignments were relevant and of appropriate quantity and quality. The interviewed participants also indicated that they enjoyed the class sessions and the majority (93%) of all of the participants indicated a desire to learn more about Spanish language and culture. It is obvious from analyzing the perceptions of the program participants that this program has had an impact on their relations with and understanding of the Hispanic students they encounter.

Recommendations

1. The school division should utilize the information contained in this study to design other training programs.
2. The program administrators should develop a Part III of the Intensive Spanish for Educators training program.
3. The school division should never consider making this a mandatory training program but should strongly recommend and encourage its employees to enroll and consider free or reduced tuition waivers. The researcher feels that

making the program mandatory would have an adverse effect on the participants' morale and high level of enthusiasm.

4. The program administrators and program trainers should design specific activities/assignment for meeting the third objective of Part I, i.e., to provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities.

5. The school division should provide the necessary funds to develop a Part III of the program and for Part I and Part II revisions and updates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, S.B., Ball, S., Murphy, R.T., & Associates. (1975). Encyclopedia of educational evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Bass de Martinez, Bernice. (July, 1986). Perspectives in multicultural education: Developing multicultural understanding through the expansion of the refinement of cultural experiential knowledge. Paper presented at the 33rd World Assembly of the International Council on Education for Teaching. Kingston, Jamaica.
- Brandenburg, Dale C. (1982). Training evaluation: What's the current status? Training and Development Journal, 36, 8, 14-19.
- Broad, Mary L. (1982). Management actions to support transfer of training. Training and Development Journal, 36, 5, 124-130.
- Fairfax County Public Schools. (October 1988). Statistical Report: Student Membership by Ethnic Groups. Fairfax, Virginia: Department of Management Information Services; Office of Records and Reporting Services.
- Foreign Service Institute. (1980). FAST: The Step Approach. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State.
- Grant, Donald A. & Anderson, Scarvia B. (1977). Issues in the evaluation of training. Professional Psychology, 8, 4, 659-673.
- Guba, Egon G. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. (1987). Fairfax County: Its educational system in context. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc.
- Hubert, John A., et al. (1982). Project Adelante: Final evaluation report. Hartford, CT: Hartford Public Schools.
- Kelly, Helen Bryman. (1982). A primer on transfer of training. Training and Development Journal, 36, 11, 102-106.

- Muller, Thomas & Espenshade, Thomas. (1985). The fourth wave. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- National Coalition of Advocates for Students. (1988). New voices: Immigrant students in U.S. public schools. Boston, MA: NCAS.
- Rutman, Leonard. (1980). Planning useful evaluations: Evaluability assessment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sims, William and Bass de Martinez, Bernice. (Eds.). (1981). Perspectives in multicultural education. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, Inc.
- Stake, Robert E. (1975a). Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Stake, Robert E. (1975b). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation (Occasional paper no. 5). Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Stake, Robert E. (Spring, 1976). A theoretical statement of responsive evaluation. Studies in Educational Evaluation, (2), 1, 19-22.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1985). Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 396, Persons of Spanish origin in the United States: March 1982. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987) Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 416, The Hispanic population in the United States: March 1986 and 1987 (Advance Report). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Wholey, Joseph S. (1979). Evaluation: Promise and performance. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Wholey, Joseph S. (1983). Evaluation and effective public management. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and company.
- Worthen, Blaine R. & Sanders, James R. (1973). Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, OH: Jones Publishing Co.

Worthen, Blaine R. & Sanders, James R. (1987). Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Zenger, John H. & Hargis, Kenneth. (1982). Assessing training results: It's time to take the plunge! Training and Development Journal, 36, 1, 10-16.

APPENDIX I
SYLLABUS PART I
FALL, 1987

Intensive Spanish for Educators, Part I
Becky Peck/Linda Bigler
Adjunct Instructors
Debbie Corkey, Consultant

George Mason University

3 Graduate Credits

Fall 1987 Class Sessions

Monday, September 14, 1987 - December 14, 1987
3:30 - 6:45 p.m.

Bailey's Elementary School

Tuesday, September 15, 1987 - December 15, 1987
3:30 - 6:45 p.m.

Glasgow Intermediate School

Course Description

This course will focus on practical oral and aural skills necessary to conduct conversations with students and parents in Spanish. In addition to the acquisition of conversational skills, the cultural backgrounds of Hispanic students will be discussed and researched.

Course Objectives

1. Introduce basic conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community.
2. To gain an awareness and understanding of the different cultural backgrounds of Spanish speaking students.

Course Materials

Text - "Intensive Spanish for Educators"

Tapes - Student must provide three 30 minute blank cassette tapes

Course Format

Class will consist of a variety of listening and speaking activities in Spanish. Active student participation will be an integral part of each class session.

Course Requirements

1. Class attendance.
2. Active participation.
3. Mid-term exam.
4. Final project.
5. Readings.

Outline of Sessions

1. September 14 and September 15: "Getting Started"
2. September 21 and September 22: "New Student"
3. September 28 and September 29: "In the Classroom"
4. October 5 and October 6: "Finding Music Class"
5. October 13: Tertulia (both classes will meet together on Tues, Oct. 13th.)
6. October 19 and October 20: "Learning the Class Schedule"
7. October 26 and October 27: Mid Term Exam
8. November 2 and November 3: "Learning the Class Schedule"
9. November 9 and November 10: "In the Cafeteria"
10. November 16 and November 17: "In the Cafeteria" - readings due
11. November 23 and November 24: "Delayed Opening"
12. November 30 and December 1: Final projects due
13. December 7 and December 8: Final projects due
14. December 14 and December 15: Final projects due - Final Exam

APPENDIX II
SYLLABUS PART I
FALL, 1988

Intensive Spanish for Educators, Part I
FRLN 600 Section 3767
Linda Bigler, Adjunct Instructor
Debbie Corkey, Consultant
George Mason University

3 Graduate Credits

Fall 1988 Class Sessions

Monday, September 19 - December 19, 1988
4:00 p.m. to 7:15 p.m. (14 class sessions)
Stuart High School
Room 227

Course Purpose and Intended Audience

To instruct Fairfax County Public Schools educational personnel in practical Spanish communication skills and to sensitize class participants to the special needs of the Hispanic population of the area.

Course Description

This course will focus on practical oral and aural skills necessary to conduct conversations with students and parents in Spanish. In addition to the acquisition of conversational skills, the cultural backgrounds of Hispanic students will be discussed and researched.

Course Objectives

1. To introduce basic conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community.
2. To share ideas that promote a personal awareness and understanding of the different cultural backgrounds of Spanish-speaking students.
3. To provide strategies for involving Hispanic students in classroom and school activities.

Course Materials

Text - "Intensive Spanish for Educators"

Course Format

Class will consist of a variety of listening and speaking activities in Spanish. Active student participation will be an integral part of each class session.

Course Requirements

1. Class attendance
2. Active participation
3. Mid-term exam
4. Final project
5. Readings

CRITERIA FOR GRADING

1. Class participation.....25%
2. Mid term exam:.....25%
3. Readings..(2).....10%
4. Final Project.....20%
5. Final exam: oral interview.....20%

Readings

- Abstracts: Give
- A) a reaction to a reading (50%)
 - B) the implications and/or applications for Fairfax County Public Schools' students. (50%)

This abstract is to be type written (maximum 2 pages, double-spaced). Please attach a copy of the article with the abstract.

Sources

Newspapers, professional journals, or papers presented at professional conferences dated after 1985. A file of articles will be available in the classroom for overnight use.

Topics

- a) One article on the Spanish-speaking population in the United States.
- b) One article related to your specialty field.

Final Projects

Choose one of the following projects:

A. Interviews: These interviews with native speakers of Spanish will focus on educational issues, attitudes toward their homelands, and the cultural adjustments they have made while living in the United States.

- 1) Two community members from the same country OR
- 2) Three students in Fairfax County Public Schools from the same country OR
- 3) One student and one adult from the same country.

Submit a summary of the interview (maximum - 2 pages, double-spaced).

B. Hispanic Heritage Week Work Plan

Submit an outline of activities, approximately 7 to 10, that could be used in your school during the September, 1989 Hispanic Heritage Week.

For two of the activities, include a detailed work plan of exactly what will be done and how Hispanic students will be involved in the activities. The detailed work plan should be approximately one typewritten page, double-spaced, and should include a time-line for the implementation in your school. Explain how teachers, administrators, counselors, and students will participate.

Sample activities might include:

- P. A. Announcements about famous Hispanics
- Serving Hispanic food in the cafeteria
- Playing Hispanic games during P.E. classes or during recess
- Bulletin boards
- Show cases
- Arts and crafts activities
- Spanish songs

All final projects will be summarized and presented to the class. (A maximum of 10 minutes)

Outline of Sessions

September 19	"Getting Started"
September 26	"New Student"
October 3	"In the Classroom"
October 17	"Finding Music Class"
October 21	"Tertulia"
October 24	Finish "Finding Music Class" Review for mid-term exam
October 31	"Learning the Class Schedule"
November 7	"Learning the Class Schedule", cont.
November 14	Mid-term "In the Cafeteria"
November 21	"In the Cafeteria", continued
November 28	"Delayed Opening": Readings due
December 5	Final Projects Due
December 12	"Delayed Opening": Readings due Review for final exam
December 19	Final Exam

APPENDIX III
SYLLABUS PART II
SPRING, 1988

Intensive Spanish for Educators, Part II
 PRLN 600 Section 6234
 Maria Montalvo
 Adjunct Instructors
 Debbie Corkey, Consultant

George Mason University

3 Graduate Credits

Spring, 1988 Class Sessions

Monday, January 25, 1988 - May 2, 1988
 4:00 - 7:15 p.m. (14 class sessions)
 Stuart High School

Course Purpose and Intended Audience

To instruct Fairfax County Public Schools educational personnel in practical Spanish communication skills and to sensitize class participants to the special needs of the Hispanic population of this area.

Course Description

This course will focus on practical oral and aural skills necessary to conduct conversations with students and parents in Spanish. The autobiography of Richard Rodriguez, a Mexican-American who has "made it" in American society, will be read and discussed. What is the price he paid to be assimilated into middle class America? Was it worth the price?

Course Objectives

1. Develop conversational skills for more effective communication with the Spanish-speaking community.
2. Recognize the differences in the various Spanish-speaking cultures represented in the Fairfax County Public Schools.
3. Become familiar with the organizations that seek to serve the Spanish-speaking community of Northern Virginia.

Course Materials

Text - "Intensive Spanish for Educators, Part II"

Tapes - Student must provide two 30 minute blank high quality cassette tapes

Supplemental Reader - Hunger for Memory, Richard Rodriguez, \$4.50

Course Format

Class will consist of a variety of listening and speaking activities in Spanish. Active student participation will be an integral part of each class session.

Course Requirements

- 1. Class attendance
- 2. Active participation
- 3. Mid-term exam
- 4. Final exam
- 5. Learning Log

Grading Criteria

- 1. Class participation. 25%
- 2. Mid-term exam. 15%
- 3. Final exam. 15%
- 4. Learning Log. 25%
- 5. Final project. 20%

Learning Log

Keep a learning log in which you record your thoughts about second language learning, about class discussions, and about selected course books and articles. Students will write in their logs each week and will have the chance to read entries with other students. Students will turn in self-selected entries for the instructor's responses twice during the semester.

Final Project

Either:

- 1. Prepare a 20 minute presentation on the concerns and challenges facing the Spanish-speaking community in Northern Virginia OR
- 2. Interview someone from a community or service organization that serves the Spanish-speaking population of Northern Virginia. A brief presentation of information gathered is to be presented to the class.

Outline of Sessions

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. | January 25 and January 26 | Getting Acquainted
"Feeling Sick" |
| 2. | February 1 and February 2 | "Innoculations" |
| 3. | February 8 and February 9 | "Field Trips"
Chapter 1, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 4. | February 16* | Tertulia
Chapter 2, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 5. | February 22 and February 23 | "Elementary School Library"
Chapter 3, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 6. | February 29 and March 1 | "High School Library" |
| 7. | March 7 and March 8 | Mid-term Exam
Selected Learning Log entries due |
| 8. | March 14 and March 15 | "Making an Appointment"
Chapter 4, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 9. | March 21 and March 22 | "A Pleasant Parent-Teacher Conference"
Chapter 5, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 10. | March 28 and March 29 | "A Problem Parent-Teacher Conference" |
| 11. | April 11 and April 12 | "Absenteeism"
Chapter 6, <u>Hunger of Memory</u> |
| 12. | April 18 and April 19 | "A Fight"
Selected Learning Log entries due |
| 13. | April 25 and April 26 | Final Projects Due
Review |
| 14. | May 2 and May 3 | Final Exam |

* All students in both the Monday and Tuesday classes will attend the Tertulia on Tuesday, February 16, 1988.

APPENDIX IV
RESPONSIVE EVALUATION MODEL

Talk
with clients,
program staff,
audiences
1

Assemble
formal reports
if any
12

Identify
program
scope
2

Winnow, format
for audience
use
11

Overview
program
activities
3

Validate
confirm, attempt
to disconfirm
10

Discover
purposes
concerns
4

Thematize;
prepare portrayals,
case studies
9

Conceptualize
issues,
problems
5

Observe designated
antecedents, transactions
and outcomes
8

Identify
data needs
re, issues
6

Select
observers,
judges,
instruments,
if any
7

Prominent events in a responsive evaluation.

APPENDIX V
EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT MODEL

Evaluability Assessment ModelEight-step Procedure

1. Defining the program to be evaluated by determining what federal, state or local activities constitute the program to be evaluated;
2. Collecting information on the intended program by documenting intended program activities, objectives and assumptions linking activities with objectives. This can be accomplished by using information from program documentation and from interviews with key actors in the development, implementation, overseeing, etc. of the program operations;
3. Developing a concise description of the program by capturing the intended program activities and objectives as defined by key actors that clearly present the logic of causal assumptions linking the intended program inputs, activities and objectives;
4. Documenting the extent to which key actors in charge of the program have defined intended program activities and objectives in measurable terms;
5. Collecting information of program reality by actually making contact with the actual program operations and using information from program documentation;
6. Synthesizing information on program reality to clarify which program performance measurements are feasible and

which objectives are plausible given the activities underway;

7. Identification of realistic objectives, feasible measurements of program performance, comparisons that could be made based on those measurements and possible uses of the resulting information; and
8. Provide feedback to management about the results of the analysis and determination of the next steps to be taken based on management's need for and intended uses of the information that could be collected.

APPENDIX VI
EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

- (7) Number of Years of Spanish Coursework You Took in Elementary, Junior and/or Senior High School.
1. None
 2. 1 - 5
 3. 6 - 10
 4. more than 10
- (8) Previous College Coursework/In-service Training in Spanish Language?
1. yes
 2. no
- (9) Previous College Coursework/In-service Training in Spanish Culture?
1. yes
 2. no
- (10) Previous College Coursework/In-service Training in Multicultural, Bilingual or ESL Education?
1. yes
 2. no
- (11) Travel Experience to a Spanish-speaking country?
1. yes
 2. no
- (12) Teaching Experience in a Spanish-speaking country?
1. yes
 2. no
- (13) Living, Travel or Teaching Experience in a country other than a Spanish-speaking country?
1. yes
 2. no
- (14) Did you speak, read or write Spanish to any degree, prior to taking this course?
1. yes
 2. no

Part II: Please circle the number of the appropriate response(s) for each statement.

Course Information

- (15) Parts of "Intensive Spanish for Educators" taken
1. Part I only!
 2. Part II only!
 3. Parts I & II

(16) "Intensive Spanish for Educators met its objective(s)/purpose(s)

1. yes
2. no
3. somewhat

Comments (optional):

(17) The "Intensive Spanish for Educators" course met my expectations and will be helpful to me when dealing with situations that involve Hispanic students and their parents.

1. yes
2. no
3. somewhat

Comments (optional):

(18) I am interested in learning more about Hispanics and their language and culture.

1. yes
2. no

Comments (optional):

(19) I enrolled in the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" course for the following reason(s). Check all that apply!

1. to get the credit for certification purposes
2. to learn to speak Spanish
3. to learn how Hispanics may behave in certain situations
4. to learn about the different Spanish cultures
5. to learn how to effectively communicate with my Hispanic students and their parents
6. Other, please specify _____

(20) The most beneficial aspect(s) of the course was (were):

Check all that apply!

1. the readings
2. the discussions
3. the lectures
4. the oral language activities
5. the professor's experiences
6. the learning log
7. the projects
8. other, please specify _____

Comments (optional):

(21) The least beneficial aspect(s) of the course was (were): Check all that apply!

1. the readings
2. the discussions
3. the lectures
4. the oral language activities
5. the professor's experiences
6. the learning log
7. the projects
8. other, please specify _____

Comments (optional):

APPENDIX VII
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

Protocol for Evaluation Interviews of Program Administrators

1. Establishment of rapport (15 minutes)
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Identify purpose ". . . to obtain information regarding the aims, purposes, intents and structure of the Intensive Spanish for Educators course."
 - c. Answer questions and discuss concerns regarding the study.
 - d. Have participants sign consent and confidentiality form.
2. Introduction to Interview (5 minutes)
 - a. "I would like to learn about how the 'Intensive Spanish For Educators' training program was conceived, developed, implemented, etc."
3. Interview Questions (45 minutes)
 - a. How did the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" course come into being? (Why was the course developed? On what philosophy was the course based? How did you go about developing the course- i.e., how did you choose the content and who decided what content would be taught?)
 - b. What population was the course developed for? (How was that population chosen?)
 - c. Once the course was approved and developed, in your judgment, what were the objectives of the course? (What specific skills, knowledge and behaviors did you want the participants to achieve upon completing the course?)
 - d. What would you consider acceptable measures/evidence of progress toward these objectives? (How did you know whether the program was accomplishing its objectives? What were the program priorities from you point of view? How did you know if the program was a success? What information did you need relative to problem areas that developed or may be developing?)

- e. What mechanisms (policies, guidelines, activities, etc.) exist to achieve the course objectives?
- f. What would you like to learn from an evaluation of this course? (How would you use the evaluation information?)

APPENDIX VIII
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR PROGRAM TRAINERS

Protocol for Evaluation Interviews of Program Trainers

1. Establishment of Rapport (15 minutes)
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Identify purpose ". . . to obtain information regarding the aims, purposes, intents and structure of the 'Intensive Spanish for Educators' course."
 - c. Answer questions and discuss concerns regarding the study.
2. Introduction to Interview (5 minutes)
 - a. "I would like to ask you some questions about the objectives, activities, curriculum of the 'Intensive Spanish for Educators' training program."
3. Interview Questions (45 minutes)
 - a. What part (i.e., I or II) of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" course did you teach?
 - b. How did you know what content to cover in that part? (Who made the decisions? In teaching Part II, how did you know what to review from Part I?)
 - c. In your judgment, what were the objectives of the course? (What specific skills, knowledge, behaviors did you want the participants to possess upon completion of the course?)
 - d. What mechanisms (activities) did you provide for the participants to achieve the objectives? (Who decided what activities should be included?)
 - e. What would you consider acceptable measures/evidence of progress toward accomplishing those objectives? (How did you know whether the program was achieving its objectives?)
 - f. What problems did you encounter while teaching the course? (What events occurred that might have prevented you from achieving an objective or implementing a part of the course?)

- g. What aspects of the program (curriculum, instructional techniques, activities, etc.) do you feel need to be changed, added or retained? Why?
- h. Do you feel that the course objectives were met in the eyes of the participants? (Do you feel the course helped participants understand and communicate effectively with Hispanic students and their parents?)
- i. Did you and the other instructors ever coordinate course activities or talk about course concerns?

APPENDIX IX
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Protocol for Evaluation Interviews of Program Participants

1. Establishment of Rapport (15 minutes)
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Identify purpose ". . . to evaluate the worthiness of the Intensive Spanish for Educators course from the participants perspective."
 - c. Answer questions and discuss participants concerns regarding the study.
 - d. Have participants sign consent and confidentiality form.
2. Introduction to Interview (5 minutes)
 - a. "I would like to ask you some questions about how you viewed certain aspects of the 'Intensive Spanish for Educators' training program. Please keep in mind that this interview is strictly confidential and your honesty is appreciated."
3. Interview Questions (45 minutes)
 - a. Prior to taking the course, did you have any contact with a Hispanic student? If so, in what capacity? (have you ever had an experience with a Hispanic student or his/her parents and you did not feel comfortable in the situation? Did you know or feel you knew how to respond to the situation? If yes, what was the situation and how did you respond?)
 - b. In your judgment and as specific as possible, what were the objectives of Part I of the course (if applicable) of Part II of the course (if applicable)?
 - c. Do you feel the activities/assignments for Part I were appropriate for meeting those objectives? For Part II? (What activities/assignments would you change or add? Retain?)
 - d. Were you comfortable taking the class? (Did you encounter problems such as the course being too far away, too long, too demanding of your time outside of class? Do you feel the course was geared toward you and your needs?)

- e. Can you hold a conversation in Spanish with a Hispanic person? (Do you feel comfortable speaking Spanish?)
 - f. Are you aware that there are different Hispanic cultures? (Did the course address the differences in Hispanic cultures. If so, please tell me a little about those difference.)
 - g. Since taking the course, how was your attitude or perceptions about Hispanic students changed? (What were your feelings about Hispanic students prior to the course? Do you feel the course has helped you understand and communicate effectively with Hispanic students and their parents? If yes, how?)
 - h. Which activities/assignments did you find helpful? A waste of time?
4. Questionnaire (5 minutes)
- a. Ask interviewee to complete a questionnaire.

APPENDIX X
LETTER OF CONSENT AND CONFIDENTIALITY



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION — NORTHERN VIRGINIA GRADUATE CENTER

November 28, 1988

Dear Program Participant:

The enclosed questionnaire is a part of my doctoral dissertation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. This questionnaire is designed to evaluate the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" training program, based on the perceptions of the program participants. In addition there is a consent and confidentiality form enclosed that must be completed.

While doing my research, it became apparent that educators are faced with the task of educating the ever-increasing number of Hispanics, who speak a different language and bring with them a different culture. In order to meet this challenge, much of the research suggests Spanish culture and language training as a start. Therefore, your input is important in this evaluative study, which will provide feedback as to the effectiveness and value of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" training program.

Your responses will remain confidential. There is, however, a control number to be used in keeping a record of the responses received. This will help eliminate the planned follow-up letters, cards and phone calls to non-respondents.

I understand the importance of your time, since I, too, am an educator. I urgently request that you complete the questionnaire and consent form. Perhaps this study will prove to be valuable as states and local school systems consider various strategies for enculturating their new and veteran educators.

Please return the questionnaire and consent form via the FCPS pony to: Dr. John F. Schreck, Walnut Hill Center.

Thank you very much for your cooperation, time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Carlton Lampkins

CL:kc
Enc.

P.S. This study has been approved by the FCPS's Division Superintendent, Dr. Robert Spillane, through the Office of Planning, Staff Development, and Evaluation.



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION — NORTHERN VIRGINIA GRADUATE CENTER

"Intensive Spanish for Educators"

Consent and Confidentiality Form

I, _____, give my permission for the researcher, Carlton Lampkins, to use the interview/questionnaire information in his dissertation, provided all of the information I provide is kept confidential.

Signature _____

Date _____

As a program participant, I give my permission for the researcher, named above, to obtain my grade(s) for Part I and/or Part II of the "Intensive Spanish for Educators" training program from the program trainers or the FCPS Office of Staff Development.

Signature _____

Date _____

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**