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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1940s the world has experienced an incredible growth in technological fields, international commerce, and immigration to the United States. English became the language for world communication, and the learning of English an unquestionable necessity rather than a pleasurable pastime for those involved in the world marketplace and United States work force. Each English language learner now requires knowledge of the language used in his or her particular niche of society (Hutchinson and Waters 1987). With this new need came a corresponding response from the language teaching community. And, the beginning of a well established movement from simply teaching these learners English as a Second/Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) to teaching them English for Specific Purposes (ESP) was strongly apparent by the 1960s.

As this happened, several branches of ESP were developed. The most often observed branches are English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Science and Technology (EST), and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP). While there is some variation in the arrangement and classification of the branches, most commonly these branches are all grouped under the general heading English for Specific Purposes (ESP), with English for General Purposes (EGP) as a separate offshoot of ESL/EFL, usually employed only for exam purposes (Hutchinson and Waters 1987 and Crandall 1979). Since a sub-division of EOP will be the focal point of this thesis, a more complete definition of this branch, along with a description of the actual EOP context for this thesis, will be provided before moving on to a review of the development of ESP as a subdivision of ESL/EFL in Chapter Two.
**VESL: A Branch of ESP**

Of the three most frequently encountered branches of ESP listed above, EOP differs substantially from the other two. EAP and EST are for English language learners who are planning to enter or have already entered occupations which demand strong cognitive skill development. For that reason, their outgrowth can be traced to the increased enrollment of international students in United States universities (Crandall 1979). On the other hand, EOP includes English instruction for highly skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled occupations. In accordance with occupational skills required in a specific field, EOP is further divided by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) into such branches as English for Technicians, English for Secretaries, and English for Teaching (17). English for “semiskilled, skilled, paraprofessionals, and technical employment” is categorized by Crandall (1979) as Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL). Crandall goes on to point out that the learners of VESL are most frequently adults who are in the United States as immigrants or refugees and have studied little or no English prior to VESL instruction, unlike EAP and EST university students who have studied English previously (3).

Crandall (1979), as well as Belfoire and Burnaby (1984), further separates VESL into two main categories. The first category Crandall describes as general-employment related or pre-employment English and labels it “Prevocational ESL” (2). Such courses teach the communication strategies of finding and maintaining employment. The second is what Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) label EWP or English in the Workplace. This type of VESL is for learners who are already employed in a particular job, and language instruction is directed toward that particular job. It is for
that reason others, such as Savage (1984), label this type of VESL "Occupation Specific." For practical purposes, this second type of VESL which is occupation specific, or EWP, will simply be identified as VESL throughout this thesis.

**Purpose of Thesis**

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute a documented profile of an occupation specific VESL program which will elevate VESL's currently low profile. As authors Belfoire and Burnaby suggest in the concluding section of *Teaching English in the Work Place* (1984), unless there is active promotion of VESL, potential sponsors will not become aware of the opportunities a VESL program would bring. Belfoire and Burnaby further suggest that such documentation would "provide a realistic picture of present EWP programs in the consulting, curriculum, development, and teaching functions" (148). Also, from this thesis, I hope to provide future VESL program coordinators and instructors with motivating and useful ideas. In a developing field like VESL, "information-exchange is the characteristic activity" (Coffey 1985, 78) which advances the field to a stage of maturity.

**Specific Context for Thesis**

The VESL context for this thesis is a bulk mailing company--Rees Associates--which functions 24 hours a day and employs approximately 400 people on the three eight-hour shifts. 70% to 80% of each shift are non-native speakers of English. Rees Associates, as do other bulk mailing companies, contracts to fill a certain number of envelopes by a specified date. This plant normally works five days a week; however, when work
load increases and there is a danger of not meeting important contract deadlines, it may operate for six or seven days a week. This creates extra working days, and the contract deadlines require a high level of plant efficiency. For the plant to work efficiently, all employees must accomplish their tasks with accuracy. Effective communication between employees and supervisors and among employees is an essential factor in plant efficiency.

To fill the large number of contracted envelopes this company uses big machines called "inserter machines." An inserter machine is operated by a team of four or five people. During a regular shift, there are as many as 30 inserting machines running. The machine operator is considered to be the team leader. He or she usually has seniority and receives higher pay than other plant workers. The main concern of this employee is to regulate the entire operation of the machine--that is, to make sure that the correct materials or 'inserts' are being placed in the correct envelopes or 'outers' and that the correct finished envelopes are being placed in the correct out-going mail bags. Also, he or she must know how and when to turn the machine on and off and how to help the other team members perform their job tasks efficiently and safely. The other four team members are the "loader," who is in charge of filling the pockets of the inserter machine with the material to be inserted in the envelopes; the "tier," who groups the finished envelopes according to postal routing information and ties them into bundles; the "bagger," who places the finished material into mailing bags and transports the bags to the out-going mail area; and the "stocker," who brings the boxes of inserts and envelopes to the machine operating area for the loader to insert into the machine. If only four team members are working on one machine, the
machine operator takes the place of the tier. While operators and loaders are consistently assigned to their respective positions for any given shift, the other positions may change daily or weekly. During one shift an employee may work as a bagger, and another shift as stocker.

There are two other machines which are necessary to complete the bulk mailing process. One is a machine which prints the address labels, and the other is a machine which pastes materials such as coupons and samples to inserts. Both machines are run by an operator and an assistant. The tasks of operating the machine are divided among these two workers. Again, the machine operator usually has seniority and receives higher pay. Other positions in the plant which do not work on one of the machine are janitor, cardboard bailer, forklift driver, and warehouse worker.

If one were to apply a hierarchy to the status of the positions available to workers at Rees Associates, operators and loaders would be at the top. However, these positions can be further divided: by employer and by shift. Employees can be temporary, employment-agency employees or Rees Associates employees. The operators and loaders employed by the temporary agency have a lower job standing than those employed by Rees Associates. First and second shift employees are considered to have a higher job standing than third shift employees.

Program Overview

My involvement in the program development project began when my husband, a former supervisor for the company, initiated the idea and began consulting with upper management in May 1996. A pilot English Language Training Program was developed during a period from July 1996
through September 1996, and a final seven-session program design was implemented, lasting from October 1996 through December 1996. An approximate total of 70 limited English proficient Hispanic adult immigrants participated in one or more class sessions of the program over the six month period. Over 20 of the program participants completed the program.

While the course design placed all language levels together, the great majority were at a beginning level with a few at an intermediate level. There were no students who could have been considered at an advanced level. My husband and I estimated the language ability level of the program participants in three ways: 1) casual conversations during plant visits, 2) informal interviews and 3) vocabulary identification pre-tests. (See Chapter Three for a more complete description of the program participants.)

Program participants were mainly mail-inserting machine operators; a few worked on the inserting machine in other positions, mainly as loaders. Over two-thirds of the program participants were employees of the temporary employment agency. Of these persons, half worked on the third shift—the least desirable shift of the three. When asked about their principal motivation for learning English, those that responded (nine out of ten) overwhelmingly agreed that their motivation was to better their job status.

While the design for the English Language Training Program for these employees will be under continual revision in use with future program participants, it will be referred to as the “final program” design in order to distinguish it from the “pilot program” phase during which materials were developed and changes were made to achieve the final program. Any future use of this program would, of course, require additional revisions.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

ESP is a field that has been under development and will continue to develop because "new discoveries are likely to be made and even felt to be required" (Coffey 1985, 78). From the description of EOP types in the previous chapter, it can be determined that who is learning the specific language is as integral a part of the instructional approach as is the purpose for the specific language learning. This understanding is reflected in the current, developing approach to ESP in that the language learner, rather than the language, is the central focus. The notion of the language learner being more important than the language learned is derived from other phases of ESP language-learning theory. As ESP continues to evolve, the current theoretical approach will no doubt be expanded to include any new theories and ideas (Johns 1991).

While the world-wide focus on specific communication skills evolved, there were complementary revelations in the area of language teaching and learning. Two general changes should be noted: First, with the new focus on specific communication skills, language teaching also changed its focus from grammar to communication skills. Second, language teaching began to emphasize greater cooperation between teacher and learner. That is to say, learners' needs are now given more emphasis (Hutchinson and Waters 1987). These two basic changes are reflected in the following description of the five general phases of ESP evolution. One should note that some feel that the field of ESP does not necessarily change or create phases in the area of language teaching and learning, but rather it "provides an important field for their application" (Coffey 1985, 81). However, most would agree that ESP has made significant contributions to the area of
language teaching and learning, as will be demonstrated in the following review of ESP development. Johns (1991) identifies work in needs analysis as the greatest contribution ESP has made to the field of language teaching and work in syllabus and course design as the second greatest contribution. A brief review of the phases of ESP evolution is pertinent because VESL is a result of ESP development, and literature on the exact area of VESL development is limited.

**Phases of ESP Evolution**

With the beginning of ESP--Coffey (1985) gives the year 1967 as the starting date of ESP--and through the early 1970s, a register analysis approach was prominent. The goal of this approach is to identify the grammar and lexicon of the specific English being taught. Or, as Palmer (1981) asserts the goal is to identify the "norm of language use" (64). One shortcoming of this approach is that the number of sub-registers within a specific register was so large that it was difficult to make a concrete division between a specific register and a non-specific or general register (Coffey 1985). As explained by Hutchinson and Waters (1987), this led to the realization that there is not a great distinction between the grammatical and lexical features of a scientific-specific register, for example, and those of a general English register. "It [register analysis] did not, for example, reveal any forms that were not found in General English" (Hutchinson and Waters 1987, 10). While this was found to be the case, it was also found that general English textbooks lacked some important features of a scientific specific register. Positive support for register analysis is also given by Carver (1984). He states that while it is restricted, register analysis is of "great utility to give learners practice in such well-
worn elements as the use of passive without agent, the production of complex nominals, etc." According to Johns 1991, one of the most notable publications of this phase is John Swales’s *Writing Scientific English* (1971). In this text, Swales describes the use of various grammatical structures as they are used in scientific writing. As ESP continued to evolve, curriculum developers moved from counting the frequency of grammatical forms within a specific language use situation to the analysis of the respective functions of the grammatical forms. Johns (1991) describes this transition as “modernizing influences” which “integrate grammatical form with rhetorical function” (68). This transition led to the clear realization that the frequency of the grammatical and lexical items used in the specific English being taught was insufficient information from which to design ESP curricula.

In the second phase of ESP development (late 1970s and early 1980s), the restrictive sentence-level view of language, which many felt a register analysis provided, was changed to a less restrictive, rhetorical or discourse analysis which allowed for incorporation of cohesive devices and textual patterns. Some, such as Hutchinson and Waters (1987) and Johns (1985), use the terms rhetorical analysis and discourse analysis interchangeably. Some, for example Coffey (1985), favor the use of the term discourse without explicitly differentiating it from rhetoric. Others, such as Palmer (1981) and Trimble (1985), make a clear distinction between the two terms. Louis Trimble’s 1985 publication *EST: A Discourse Approach* defines the distinction between rhetoric: he uses “the term rhetoric to refer to one important part of the broad communicative mode called discourse” (10). Rhetoric, he continues, is a writing process by which a writer organizes certain ideas for a specific purpose and audience.
By analyzing pieces of scientific discourse, Trimble developed the 'EST Rhetorical Process Chart' in which he divides a whole piece of scientific discourse into four rhetorical levels each with different rhetorical functions or techniques such as making a recommendation (Level A), stating purpose (Level B), defining (Level C), and ordering (Level D). The underlying idea is that, by defining these devices for the language learner, it would enable the learner to interpret and produce written discourse.

As in the case of register analysis, discourse analysts found that text did not differ greatly from one specific English purpose to another. Also similar to register analysts, discourse analysis discovered that "there are major discrepancies between advice in teaching manuals and expert text occurring in the real world" (Johns 1991, 70). While Hutchinson and Waters (1987) describe register and discourse approaches as two individual phases in the early evolution of ESP, others, such as Carver (1984), view them as approaches which are "widely current" (135). Carver believes that the register approach comprises the discourse approach and, therefore, the two exist concurrently. These approaches combined do provide valuable information about language for a curriculum developer, and the rhetorical approach encourages the language learner to consider purpose or function rather than sentence structure alone.

Within the third phase of ESP development, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) introduce target situation analysis, and they describe it as an attempt to relate the language analysis of the first two phases to the language learner's purpose for learning it. The principal researcher in this phase is Munby who developed a detailed process for analyzing the target situation in *Communicative Syllabus Design* (1978). Coffey (1985) suggests that Munby's book "offers not only an analysis of English into
communicative functions, in minutely organised categories on several levels, but directs the user into setting up a complete course design by creating profiles of student needs" (83). From this description, one can see that this approach is intended to discontinue the language-only approaches and replace them with a language and learner focused approach. However, the main criticism of Munby's suggested course design plan is that its complexity renders it "quite impractical for most program planners" (Schutz and Derwing 1981, 32). Coffey (1985) agrees with Schutz and Derwing (1981) about the difficulty of implementing Munby's approach. Coffey further suggests that combining the language needs analysis with the learner needs analysis into a "once-and-for-all process that apparently need not be amended as time goes on," really de-emphasizes the inherit characteristic of learners needs (83). He emphasizes that learner needs are dynamic, not relatively constant like language needs. The result is that this phase still lacks a clear focus on the learner which is overshadowed by its focus on the language itself. It is in the fourth phase that one sees a more genuine attempt to incorporate the learner as part of the methodology.

The fourth phase, called the skills and strategies phase or skills-centered approach, de-emphasizes the surface forms of the language and concentrates on the "common reasoning and interpreting processes" which take place during language use (Hutchinson and Waters 1987, 13). Although some (Coffey 1985 and Johns 1991) do not explicitly consider the skills and strategies phase to be a separate evolutionary phase in ESP, others (Hutchinson and Waters 1987) do. Similar to this phase, Carver (1984) describes the study skills methodology as that in which learners work to develop their own learning strategies from activities designed to
help them reflect on their own current strategies for learning (136).
Outside of the four phases described so far, it is interesting to note Philips's (1981) methodology for Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) in which "the first and crucial notion that gives LSP its identity as a distinctive area of language teaching activity is learner's purpose." A learner's-purpose approach to LSP, as Philips (1981) further describes, is not restrained to the language features in and of themselves, but also includes the learners' mastery of the skills which comprise language use (92). Perhaps this viewpoint, combined with the strategy and skills approach, is a close approximation of the fifth phase of ESP development. In this phase, the focus is not on language use but rather on language learning. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987), the central proponents of the learner-centered approach, describe this phase, it is the "starting point for all language teaching should be an understanding of how people learn" (39). Analysis of language use will help language teachers define course goals and objectives; however, language learning is what enables a learner to convert linguistic features into communication skills. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) provide a summary for this issue by contending that "A truly valid approach to ESP must be based on an understanding of the process of language learning" (14).

**VESL Program Design**
Both the development of the ESP and VESL methodologies, and the origins of current practices of interaction between teachers and students have been summarized. The reason for this is that to a large extent the way a program coordinator views language learning theory determines what will take place during a VESL program. This idea is clearly illustrated
by the division Widdowson (1983) (and later Wales, 1993) makes between a program oriented toward the *training* of students and a program oriented toward the *education* of students.

A training program strives to teach students a “range of stock responses” which, in turn, allow the student to react appropriately when prompted by a specific routine. In such a VESL program, students would learn a “particular repertoire of formulae” for a certain number of specified situations. (Widdowson 1983, 13). Widdowson observes that “effective language use requires the creative exploitation of the meaning potential inherit in language rules,” which he later defines as *communicative capacity* (13). According to Widdowson, this is the basis for an educational program in which students would “develop an understanding of principles in order to extend the range of their application” (17); emphasis in original. In the first orientation, wherein training the students is the focus, a coordinator is centered on teaching the *language*. In the second orientation, wherein educating the student is the focus, a coordinator is centered on teaching the *learner*. This distinction explains why a program coordinator’s view of language-learning theory dictates what will occur during a VESL program.

No matter which theoretical orientation a program designer follows, the VESL program design will include the stages of pre-program development, program development, and program maintenance and quality control (Mackay and Bosquet 1981, 3-4). These stages are described as follows:

*Pre-Program Development*

The pre-program development stage Mackay and Bosquet (1981) designate as the stage of “educational decision-making” (3). During this
stage, a VESL program sponsor determines to remedy a situation where break-downs in communication are caused by a lack of English language skills (Belfoire and Burnaby 1984). While Mackay and Bosquet (1981) imply that it is unlikely for an applied linguist—or someone familiar with the various ESP approaches—to be a participant in all aspects of the planning stages, Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) state that the responsibilities of a VESL instructor may encompass aspects at all stages. Therefore, the VESL instructor may or may not be involved at the pre-program development stage. Because it is at this stage that negotiations concerning such things as instructor working conditions and program support facilities are determined, in Belfoire and Burnaby's (1984) view, the VESL instructor is involved.

**Program Development Stage**

The program development stage is divided into many smaller phases, most if not all of which will include the VESL instructor and will rely on a theoretical orientation of language learning. Mackay and Bosquet (1981) point out that some of the phases at this stage may occur simultaneously, and others must be done in a certain order. From a compilation of several sources (Belfoire and Burnaby 1984, Hutchinson and Waters 1987, Mackay and Bosquet 1984, Schleppegrell and Bowman 1986, and West 1984) the program development stage can be divided into the following four phases: 1) needs analysis, also known by West (1984) as needs assessment and by Mackay and Bosquet (1981) as Basic Information-Gathering, 2) identifying goals and designing a syllabus, 3) materials development and evaluation of materials, and 4) teaching ramifications and classroom methodology. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) divide the phases into two. The first--course design--includes the first two
above listed phases while the second--application--includes the last two. Chapters Three and Four of this thesis will reflect this division. Included here are frequent recommendation made in VESL literature regarding each of the four above listed program development phases.

**Needs analysis.** Reflecting the current trend in VESL approaches, the first phase should include both an analysis of language needs and of learner needs. This idea is exemplified in the division Laylin and Blackwell (1983) make of the entire curriculum development process; the first three of the six stages they describe are focused on the learners' work situation. They are as follows: 1) preliminary orientation to the work setting, 2) visualizing the communications network, and 3) identifying work responsibilities. Stage four--identifying communication situations--bridges learners to language. It is not until the fifth stage, which moves into the lesson design, that language is the focus of the needs analysis. Prince (1984) also includes learners' work situation in the preliminary part of the needs analysis. He suggests analyzing the learner's work situation in terms of data (What information do the workers have to process?), people (With whom and how do the workers interact?), and things (With what tangible objects do the workers have to perform tasks?).

When language is the focus of the needs analysis, many sources recommend the use of a tape recorder to record typical dialogues used in the work place; in fact, Svendsen and Krebs (1984) give this as a fundamental technique. However, the limitations to this form, as Svendsen and Krebs continue, are that it does not capture context or nonlinguistic features. While tape recording is one frequently recommended needs analysis method, a second, possibly more frequently recommended method is interviews. This method can be limiting because the
interviewees may discover it difficult to identify specifically where communication breaks down because they "probably have made many accommodations over the years for poor communication. Using interpreters, miming, or gesturing may have become standard practice by now" (Belfiore and Burnaby 1984, 25). A third method of needs analysis is job site observation which West (1984) identifies as "an important ingredient of needs assessment research" (144) that starts with a tour of the entire work place and, then, moves to close observation of the workers. A fourth method is surveys. For surveys or questionnaires, as well as interviews, to be productive, it is important to ask very specific questions (West 1984 and Belfiore and Burnaby 1984). For example, asking "What do you do if the machine breaks down?" is more productive than asking general questions, such as "What do you want to learn?" (Belfiore and Burnaby 1984, 32). An additional "information gathering instrument" which is suggested by Mackay and Bosquet (1981) is a checklist. An advantage of a checklist is that it produces easily analyzable data. All of the above methods have both advantages and disadvantages. For a summary of the advantages and disadvantages, see Mackay and Bosquet (1981). Because there are disadvantages with each method, there is a strong agreement that it is important to use a variety of methods and to include a variety of people--all levels of management as well as the prospective learners.

Identifying goals and designing a syllabus. Another aspect of program development which is agreed upon in the ESP and VESL literature is that instructors vary greatly in the procedures used for identifying goals and designing a syllabus. As Crandall (1979) and Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) advise, VESL program models vary greatly due to a number of
factors. These include learner factors--age, language ability level, and needs--and program factors--time limitations, financial arrangement, and instructor preferences. Therefore, no one set of program design procedures is applicable to all VESL situations. The following is by no means a complete description of all goal identification procedures and types of syllabus designs; it is intended to provide an insight into the variety that does exist.

Mackay and Bosquet (1981) believe that during the goal specification phase the question that needs to be addressed is: "What should the learner ideally be able to do after successfully completing the instructional program?" (11). They suggest that the resulting answer should be stated in an unambiguous and descriptive manner. Bachman and Strick (1981) state in the same publication that "at this point neither the client nor the designer can determine very precisely what resources will be necessary to achieve the objectives they have set" (45). These authors then describe a process by which objectives are reasonably matched with available resources and vice versa.

The same range of possibilities for goal identification is found in syllabus design. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) attribute this to the fact that the statement of what information will be learned advances through different stages before reaching its final target--the learner's mind. Each stage dictates a "further layer of interpretation" (80). The same authors give six different syllabus types and describe eight different manners to arrange the information in a syllabus. This creates an almost unlimited number of syllabus designs. Each is dependent on how the syllabus functions within the course design process. Belfiore and Burnaby (1984) simplify the syllabus types by stating that they can be "formal or informal,
fine-tuned or roughly outlined" (59). As stated at the start of this section, a program designer's views of language learning determines what will take place during a VESL program. This is especially true for syllabus design. While the above authors place syllabus design on a spectrum from informal to formal, Johns (1991) gives three design types which are as follows: 1) the task-based syllabus in which students must learn a number of tasks in the target situation, 2) the project-based syllabus in which students must produce a visible product—Herbolich’s 1979 “Box Kites” project is the most representative of this syllabus type—, and 3) the process-based syllabus in which the students are an integral part of determining what will be taught in the course. This last syllabus involves constant changes as the course progresses. While the last of John’s syllabus designs is included by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) under the name learner syllabus, they also include modified forms of other two. Other syllabus designs Hutchinson and Waters (1987) describe are as follows: the evaluation syllabus, which states what the successful learner should know by the end of the program; the organizational syllabus, which goes beyond the evaluation syllabus design in that it includes a description of the order in which information will be learned; the materials syllabus, which is interpreted by the materials writer when materials are designed; and the classroom syllabus, which is generated by the dynamic, interactive environment of the classroom.

*Materials development and evaluation of materials.* Hutchinson and Waters (1987) divide this phase—transforming course design into usable teaching materials—into three possible courses of action (96). The first is “materials evaluation” in which existing materials are evaluated by matching aspects of the proposed course to aspects of the existing
materials. The second is "materials development" in which the course
designer actually writes his or her own materials. The third is "materials
adaptation" in which the aspects of exiting materials not completely
matching those of the course design are modified to match more exactly.
The first step in "materials evaluation" and "materials adaptation" is to
identify which aspects or criteria one is to use for matching the intended
course design to the existing materials. Hutchinson and Waters (1987)
suggest the following criteria categories, acknowledging that other
possible criteria exist: audience, aims, content, methodology, and other
criteria (i.e. cost). Questions which define these categories in detail are
included in Appendix III. While some materials do exist that can be
adapted for certain work situations, Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) note that
the "individuality of each work place environment, the specific demands of
the sponsor(s) [and/or work place management] and the unpredictability
of the learners' needs and interests" make locating an existing textbook
quite hard (78). The result is that the majority of VESL courses demand
that the materials be produced specially for the work place environment.
These authors suggest using photographs, tape recorded conversations,
and printed material collected during the needs analysis as sources for
materials writing. All three of these sources agree with Coffey's (1985)
stressing of the importance of using authentic materials in ESP. This
second scenario, materials development, is related to the first two
scenarios, materials evaluation and adaptation, in that the materials are
designed to match the initial course lay out and should be evaluated
accordingly. As suggested by Crandall (1979), Hutchinson and Waters
(1987), Belfoire and Burnaby (1984), and Svendsen and Krebs (1984), it is
important to continue examining how the program is meeting learning
needs and to continue to revise accordingly. The materials are a central part of the program; therefore, they should also be examined to determine how they are meeting the program’s purpose. The same materials evaluation identified for the evaluation of existing materials would serve this purpose.

*Teaching ramifications and classroom methodology.* As is the case with goal identification and syllabus design, the teaching methods for VESL courses vary greatly from one VESL context to another. Likewise, the following is not intended to include all possible methods; it is intended to name the most current methods.

From the limited literature on VESL, it can be found that the current thinking on VESL methodology can be included in the previous description of ESP development. As the field of ESP has discarded a strong emphasis on language aspects for a strong emphasis on learning aspects, the field of VESL has evidenced the same. Evidence can be found in Prince (1984) who cites Widdowson’s (1981) two interpretations of VESL instruction. These interpretations make a critical point which emphasizes the importance of the language learner being as important as the specific language at hand. They are that consideration must be given to “what the learner needs to do with the language at the end of a course” and to “what the learner needs to do in order to acquire the language” (Prince 1984, 109). Prince continues with an explanation that places a *process-oriented* approach in distinction from a *goal-oriented* approach and states that both are applicable to VESL (109). The idea here is that the *manner* in which a student learns a language should be considered in addition to the *language* the student needs to learn.
Furthermore, there may be an additional reason in VESL for focusing more on learning and less on language. As noted by Prince (1984), because of VESL’s specificity to the particular work environment for which it is intended, approaches do vary among VESL programs. Nevertheless, in the majority of the cases the VESL learners are characteristically of a low level of English proficiency. For that reason, a register analysis approach, a discourse analysis approach, or any other approach which places a heavy emphasis on linguistic structures the VESL learners may not yet be able to process are not appropriate in the VESL classroom. While Coffey (1985) stresses the importance of authenticity in an ESP classroom, Schleppegrell and Bowman (1986) encourage teachers to carefully select texts which are challenging but not too difficult for the students. Related to language difficulty level in a VESL classroom, Crandall (1979) points out that in language content for VESL "the differences in 'acceptability' or 'appropriateness' for different situations, with different participants, topics, setting, and goals" may be of more significance than a good command of the language structures themselves (4).

A learner centered approach supports the following eight principles as listed by Hutchinson and Waters (1987). These eight principles, also reflected in the methods descriptions of any sound language instruction method, are as follows:

1) Second language learning is a developmental process. Language learning takes place when students use their existing knowledge to decode any new information. Teachers should try to exploit students existing state of knowledge.
2) Language learning is an active process. Learners must not only possess the necessary knowledge, they must also be able to put their knowledge to use. Teachers should try to use activities that make students use their cognitive capacities.

3) Language learning is a decision-making process. The process of changes the new information flow of the second language into an organized schemata requires learners to make their own decisions. Teachers should encourage students to become decision-makers.

4) Language learning is not just a matter of linguistic knowledge. Learners who do not possess mature levels of linguistic knowledge are still conceptually and cognitively mature. Teachers should encourage growth in both areas.

5) Language learning is not the learners' first experience with language. Learners are aware of modes of communication in their native tongues. Teachers should actively rely on their students knowledge of communication.

6) Learning is an emotional experience. Learners need to associate positive emotions with the language learning experience. Teachers should build on existing social relationships and avoid unnecessary pressures by placing more emphasis on the learning experience rather than the final outcome.

7) Language learning is to a large extent incidental. Language learning does not necessarily take place during a classroom activity which is intended to teach the language; problem solving activities which necessitate language use are often when learning takes place.
8) Language learning is not systematic. Learners must develop their own internal organization of the new language system. Presenting the language systematically does not automatically create information that is easy to learn.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) state that a teacher who moves from teaching General English to Specific English should be aware that he or she need not believe that an entirely new teaching method be acquired. The same basic principles underlie teaching the two.

Program Maintenance and Quality Control Stage

The program maintenance and quality control stage is described by Mackay and Bosquet as "less exciting and creative than the previous two" (4) and by Alderson and Scott as frequently being “perceived as threatening the interests of those involved" (27); however, it is an absolutely important stage. While this stage is often realized last, as suggested by Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) learner assessment and course evaluation are an ongoing process. The same is indicated by Hutchinson and Waters (1987). They suggest that there are really three types of learner assessment.

It is important to note the distinction between learner assessment and course evaluation is not always clear. Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) define evaluation as “the measurement of success of the entire program" and view “assessment as just one factor" of the evaluation (127). They note that learner assessment is often the only type of evaluation performed in work place English programs. Others view learner assessment, or the evaluation of the proficiency of the students, as a reflection of the effectiveness of the overall course. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) explain that learner assessment may indicate that some
aspect of the course design is inefficient. However, it is through a more precise course evaluation that the exact cause of the inefficiency can be found.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) divide learner assessment into three types. These three types are placement testing, achievement testing, and proficiency testing. Some, for example Brown (1996) and Bachman and Palmer (1996), divide test types according to the decisions made about the test takers based on the test results, and create varying terms for their divisions. The divisions made by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) are directed toward an ESP course and will be described here. Because the purpose of the first type is to determine the pre-course knowledge of the students, the results are usually used to group students of similar language ability level. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) caution that that placement tests are to be used only as an approximate guide for determining learner needs. It is for this reason that Brown (1996) adds a more specific pre-course test. He lists a diagnostic test for the purpose of determining the specific needs of the learners. The second type, achievement testing, occurs throughout the course in order to determine how the students are progressing. It is this type that represents the idea of assessment and evaluation being an on-going process and not just a course-final event. The third type is proficiency testing; this type Hutchinson and Waters (1987) describe as a test which should "be able to give a reliable indication of whether a candidate is proficient enough to carry out the tasks that will be required" (150). Besides providing a reliable indication, such tests must also possess a high level of face validity. They must "look as if they are reliable indicators" (Hutchinson and Waters 1987, 150).
These two qualities of a language test, whether it be a proficiency, achievement, diagnostic, or placement test, are important. However, Bachman and Palmer (1996) write that more qualities are needed in order to evaluate the usefulness of such a test. Test usefulness "provides a kind of metric by which we can evaluate not only the tests that we develop and use, but also all aspects of test development and use" (Bachman and Palmer 1996, 17). The qualities they include in their notion of test usefulness are as follows: reliability, construct validity, authenticity, interactiveness, impact, and practicality. These are explained in the checklist Bachman and Palmer (1996) provide for evaluating the extent to which the above qualities are met by a particular test which is included in Appendix VI. This type of test usefulness evaluation is especially important in ESP programs because the inherit specificity of the program creates a need for test development.

Notwithstanding that learner assessment and instructor reflection throughout the duration of the program are very useful, a more formal final evaluation involving all levels--students, teachers and employers--can provide qualitative feedback for a VESL program's further development. Such course-final assessment and evaluation have much broader uses for all involved than those performed throughout the course (Belfoire and Burnaby 1984). For example, they provide information which may be used to increase student performance on assessments. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) further suggest that an additional evaluation take place not only upon completion of the program, but also some time after the course when the learners are in contact with the situation for which the program intended to prepare them.
As stated above, final evaluations should include as many participants as possible (Alderson and Scott 1992). Various means can be used to collect data from program participants. Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) give example questionnaire forms for learners’ self-assessment and for work place supervisors’ evaluation of the course. They state that such questionnaires should include recommendations for future programs. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) give test results, discussions, and informal means such as ‘casual’ chats as other methods for collecting course evaluation data. They caution, however, that course evaluations are limited by one’s ability to collect such data and then, in turn, to use the data that is collected. One’s ability to collect such data is hindered by the fact that it is “time-consuming, complex and frustrating,” and by the fact that the situations and suggestions arising from such data may be too difficult to implement (Hutchinson and Waters 1987).
CHAPTER THREE
COURSE DESIGN

The topics for this chapter are language needs analysis, goal identification, and syllabus design for the Rees Associates English Language Training Program. In order to evaluate our procedure in accordance with recommendations from ESP and VESL literature, I will summarize the four step process—1) observing the workplace through immersion, 2) collecting surveys of learners' interests, 3) meeting with the Human Resource Manager, and 4) having pilot program students describe their language needs in the workplace—we used for investigating and identifying the specific language employed in this bulk mailing company. While the principal intention of the five steps was to assess language needs, we found it was impossible to separate syllabus design into a separate step. Therefore, syllabus design is included in the summary. Last, I will report on learner's needs analysis and on how this influenced the linguistic features selected for the final seven-session course design.

Goal Identification

I will start with comments on the topic of goal identification. As will be noted in the following paragraphs, an instrumental part of the course design procedure was my husband's involvement while he was working as a supervisor for the company. Because no experienced specific purpose language instructor was involved, the goals identified in the first weeks of the needs analysis were stated in very general terms. They did not include specific task related goals such as learning specific vocabulary lists or producing specific phrases for a particular situation. With no specific knowledge of the VESL context with which I would soon become familiar, I
wrote these goals to reflect the work place situation as my husband had described it to me. He explained that the employees speak little or no English, so there are frequent breakdowns in communication between supervisors and employees which create an inefficient working environment. As my husband was one of a few Spanish speaking supervisors, the employees confided in him that they were frustrated with the lack of efficient communication. At this point in the program development, it seemed that the management did not realize the impact the program would have and were content with the following generally stated goals.

To provide program participants with basic English language competencies in the following three areas:

1. English vocabulary and resources which are needed to properly carry out their duties as Rees Associates employees.
2. English communication skills which are needed to interact with English speaking peers in the work place.
3. English survival skills which are needed to deal with everyday problems which arise in the workplace.

Although the management did not request a formal written statement of goals--probably because it was their first experience with such a program and did not know exactly what to expect--, I feel, as Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) affirm, presenting them with such a statement helped to ensure that all parties were in agreement.
Needs Analysis

Our needs analysis consisted of four step process which was as follows: 1) observing the work place through immersion, 2) collecting surveys of learners' interests, 3) meeting with the Human Resource Manager, and 4) having pilot students describe their language needs in the workplace.

Step One: Work Place Environment to First Syllabus

The language needs analysis was initiated by my husband during his employment at Rees Associates. Due to the fact he was immersed in this specific language environment, he was easily able to define in general terms what aspects of the English language were needed by the non-native speaking employees to perform their respective tasks. My husband noted the recurring situation in which he was asked to translate directions for supervisors and to intervene in production problems--both mechanically related ones and employee related ones. With several weeks of notes accumulated, we found that the situations naturally grouped themselves into topic areas with identifiable, corresponding objective tasks. Therefore, my husband and I were able to compile the information into a topic/objective syllabus. The resulting syllabus thus far in the needs analysis is shown in Table 1.

This syllabus format was selected for two reasons. The main reason is that its primary purpose was to guide materials development. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987) explain, such a syllabus need not contain detailed language features which may hinder the creativity of the materials writer. Instead, the language features emerge from the materials themselves. The "materials-generated syllabus can then be checked by an
Table 1. First Draft of Topic/Objective Syllabus

1. People/Positions in the Work
   - working on a team
   - talking about work with others
   - receiving directions and instructing other employees

2. Places in the Work Place
   - working on a team
   - talking about work with others
   - receiving directions from supervisor

3. Mechanics and Machine Parts
   - requesting mechanical assistance from the mechanic
   - working with others on a team

independent syllabus produced by the needs analysis" (93). In our case, our materials were "checked against" other materials designed for the same language ability level. A secondary reason for selecting this syllabus type, is that I was not concerned that a small grammatical feature would be overlooked and that such an oversight would hinder the language learners' progress. Based the prospective students' low language ability level and on the short length of the program, I concluded that highlighting major aspects of basic English language without adding complicated linguistic detail would allow ample grammatical features for the students to practice for the objectives listed in our syllabus.
As stated earlier, this topic/objective syllabus was used to create materials and design lesson plans for the English Language Training Program pilot program and was later revised for the seven-session final program design. While loosely grouped categories of topics emerged during the first step in our needs analysis, revisions were made during the duration of the pilot program to arrive at the final syllabus. This is a common occurrence, as Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) state: Syllabus design is a “dynamic process” in which one lesson emerges from another lesson in a flexible sequence (128). During the pilot program this idea was followed; however, during the final seven-session program, a more directed syllabus was followed as much more was known about the learning environment and day-to-day learner needs.

Step Two: Surveys of Learners’ Interests

During the English Language Training Program pilot, the second step in the process was implemented. A survey was administered to program participants which solicited information regarding general English survival skills they desired to learn. The survey was developed by reviewing the workbook LifePrints: ESL for Adults (Podnecky, et. al. 1983) as a source for determining which general English survival skills would be relevant to adult ESL students such as ours. General English survival skills on the survey included such skills as asking for directions in a city, sending packages from the post office, buying food at the grocery store, and asking a landlord to make repairs along with such vocabulary lists as names of building in a city, names of foods, and parts of a house (See Appendix I for the actual survey).

Since an employee’s ability to use the English language to accomplish tasks outside of the work place is a separate issue from his or her ability
to use the English language to accomplish work related tasks, general English survival skills may seem unrelated to the specific language needs of non-native English speaking employees of a bulk mailing company. However, there is an important related purpose for such a survey. During the analysis of the specific language which the students need, it is important to also analyze the language which the students want (Hutchinson and Waters 1987). Using the program participants as decision makers of program content helps to increase motivation. As students are also stakeholders not only in the decisions based on program outcomes, but also in the program content and design, we felt their input was important.

As the results only affected a small portion of the total program design—providing one lesson in the program compared to the several work place related lessons in the program—, it is also only a small, but important, portion of our needs analysis. While the survey provided the option for the students to indicate that they did not want to learn any survival skills English, the results indicated a strong desire to learn health related topics (i.e. body parts, going to the doctor, etc.). Health related topics were then included as part of the program curriculum. For this particular topic, transforming the general survival English to work related English was not difficult as the employees of this company often have to report health problems and injuries to the supervisor.

Step Three: Discussion with the Human Resource Manager

Based on the above two steps—work place observations by my husband and surveys results from the students—, a tentative outline of a final seven-session program design was established and presented to Rees Associates management for evaluation and feedback. At this point
the outline included four basic topic categories (three topics that were, as
described earlier, compiled from by husband's observations and one topic
that was provided from the survey) which were as follows: 1)
people/positions in the work place, 2) places in the work place, and 3)
mechanics and machine parts, and 4) health problems and injuries. The
result of feedback received from the management, in particular through a
discussion with the Human Resource Manager, these four categories were
revised to focus more on the "team player" attitude of the company by
adding safety rules as a fifth topic for the topic/objectives syllabus.
Adding these safety rules incorporated the quality of supporting problem
solving which Rees Associates management deemed as an important
communication based quality because the employees not only need to be
made aware of the rules but also need to be able to communicate them to
the English speaking employees. Supporting problem solving is an
essential quality of a "team-player." The corresponding objective for the
topic of safety rules is educating team members about the safety rules.
One interesting aspect of this discussion with the Human Resource
Manager is that he did not feel that health and injury related situations
were as important as the other situations, while the students had selected
that topic through the interest survey. After completing the first three
steps of our need analysis, the five topics were arranged with their
corresponding objectives in the syllabus shown in Table 2. This is the final
syllabus draft which was used for materials development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Final Topics/Objectives Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. People/Positions in the Work Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• working on a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• talking about work with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• receiving directions and instructing other employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Places in the Work Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• working on a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• talking about work with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• receiving directions from supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Health Problems and Injuries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communicating health problem in order to receive assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reporting an injury in the work place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• calling in sick to work/sick child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Safety Rules</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• educating team members about the safety rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Mechanics and Machine Parts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• requesting mechanical assistance from the mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• working with others on a team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step Four: Students Describe their Work Place Language Needs

The fourth step in gathering information about the specific language used in this bulk mailing company is related to the second in that the students' language needs and wants were being addressed; however, it is more directly related to the actual development of program materials and subsequent tests than the second because their actual responses were used to develop class activities and test items. Pilot program participants were given index cards and asked to describe in writing (in their native language of Spanish) situations they have encountered while working at the company in which they had needed to or wanted to communicate in English. Although the students were briefly prompted to think of situations related to working on a team, communicating with the supervisor, and requesting mechanical assistance from a mechanic, of 21 situation descriptions collected from these program participants, eight were related to health problems and injuries. Two of these eight were telephone calls to the supervisor regarding the same. I view this outcome as parallel to the results of the survey given in step two. The students viewed health related issues as an important aspect of their lives as Rees Associates employees.

Interestingly, sub-categories for the situations related to working on a team emerged from the seven responses about team work. One sub-category which emerged is requesting that a team member get more supplies. Of the seven team-work related responses, four were requests for more supplies. The other three team-work related responses were written by operators who needed to direct other team members for various reasons. Included in the remaining six responses were four
situations in which employees wanted to address a supervisor, but these situations were not appropriate for use in class activities or on a formal test because they involved personal situation applicable only to the student who wrote them and not to all students in the program. The two remaining descriptions were in the category of requesting mechanical assistance from a mechanic.

_Evaluation Project's Needs Analysis_

From the above description, it can be seen that the needs analysis was still in progress during the pilot program. As noted in Chapter Two, some of the phrases of the production stage often occur simultaneously. The primary reason that the two phases overlapped was because a needs analysis is not a "once-for-all-activity" which is not continually monitored (Hutchinson and Waters 1987, 59). Literature regarding ESP needs analysis consistently recommends the use of a variety of sources; an additional reason that the needs analysis continued into the pilot program was the realization that we had a lack of variety. While my husband gathered a wealth of invaluable information, this information only provided the program with one perspective. Obtaining the perspectives of the students and management was also essential. Furthermore, the health problems and injuries topic which was input by the students and the safety rules topic which was input by the management would not have been included in the final seven-session program design had we relied on only one method of needs evaluation.

On the other hand, collecting the bulk of our information through immersion in the work environment had innumerable benefits. My husband was immersed in the language environment eight hours a day for
approximately three months before the classes of the pilot program began. He began gathering materials and taking notes approximately one month after starting his work at Rees Associates. When the development of an English language was approved by the management, he had an ample start on a strong collection of notes and materials. These benefits can be identified when the limitations of several needs analysis methods such as those suggested in the literature review of this thesis. Many situations from which our information was gathered were production problems which several events and/or communication breakdowns had led up to. In these cases, the frequently recommended needs analysis method of tape recordings would not have sufficed, and, therefore, were not used. Interviews also have limitations in that the managers and students found it difficult to identify the language needs. This can be seen in the situation where the student gave a personal situation which was not applicable to the entire group of students as a language need. The same limitation may also be true with the administration of surveys.

The limitations of tape recording, interviewing, and surveys can be overcome by using a variety of methods; however, this can be a very time-consuming task. Another limitation is that most needs analyses because of time constraints, are interested in determining the language necessities without realizing that this is only provided a part of the total picture. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987) suggest, it is more advantageous to examine “the target situation in terms of necessities, lacks and wants” (55). Because the immersion allowed for determining the necessities and lacks, we were able to allow time during the pilot program for examining the learner's wants as described earlier in this chapter. This is an important issue because, as described in the literature review of this thesis,
analyzing the learners' work situation is often done prior to analyzing language analysis. In our needs analysis, we were performing both analyses simultaneously.

An additional note regarding the above summary is that the information gathered was not only used for revisions of course materials and methods of the final program version but also for course test development procedures.

**Description Program Participants**

Following an ESP approach which focuses on the learners and what objectives they are to perform and de-emphasizes the actual linguistic features, establishing which, if any, linguistics features to teach the program participants took place after meeting with them, collecting their personal data, and performing some informal language 'lacks' assessments. We needed to confirm that our perception of their English ability level was accurate. The idea here is that our syllabus was wholly objective oriented with no reference to linguistic features; however, to prevent the limited English proficient students from learning pure stimulus response type phrases through rote memory, some language in the form of grammar or linguistic features is often needed.

To convey the general characteristics of the program participants, I will present the personal data statistics collected from 21 of the 23 program participants who completed the final seven-session program either by presenting the final assessment tests, having good attendance, or both. Ten of these students also participated in all or part of the pilot program, as well. Table 3 summarizes their general characteristics.
Table 3. General Characteristics of the Program Participants

1. Age: wide range of ages from early 20s to middle 40s (Specific ages were not asked.)
2. Sex: 10 male and 11 female
3. Nationalities: 20 from Mexican and one from El Salvador
4. Immigrant Status: unknown (Immigration status was not asked.)
5. Native language: Spanish
6. Level and type of general education: Six had primary school education, nine had junior high school level education, five had completed high school, and one had some college education. Only three had studied English at another location—with a community action group who provides free adult ESL classes—after their arrival to the United States.
7. Additional Experience: Amount of time in the United States ranged from three months to 12 years with an average of two and a half years. The following table shows the distribution of time in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Time</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months to 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or more years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides collecting the above personal data, I also performed informal individual interviews with each student before the pilot program began. These informal interviews consisted of two parts. The first part was a warm-up exercise in which I had a sheet with various pictures; as I
pointed to a picture the interviewee was asked to name it in English. The second part of the interview consisted of personal questions. These personal questions began with present tense questions such as "Where are you from?," "How old are you?," and "Where do you live?," which could be answered in one word or with a complete sentence. Also, the last two examples above were intended to indicate if the student knew numbers in English. If the student confidently and accurately answered the picture naming and the first three or four questions, the interview was continued with questions in the past tense and then with questions about the future. (See Appendix I for interview prompt questions.)

In most of the interviews, students were unable to name all the pictures in English and answered the present tense questions with one word or phrase; communication broke down before arriving at the past and future questions. If the past and future questions were presented and the student understood the content of what was being asked, he or she did not answer in complete sentences with accurate use of past and future. According to the Inverted Pyramid of Spoken Language Proficiency developed by American Council on the Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL), these interview results suggest that our perception of the students' ability level as being low was confirmed. The majority of students were at a novice or beginning level with speech limited to memorized phrases. While a few were intermediate level students as they were able to give basic information about themselves, no one student was identified at an upper intermediate or advanced level because they failed to show ability to narrate or describe past or future events. These findings were generalized to the population of students who participated in the
final course program, as similar student data regarding education and additional experience was collected.

To supplement these interviews, at the start of the pilot program and final seven-session program I administered a low-stress vocabulary identification test. (An example of this test is included in Appendix 1.) These two measures--informal interviews and low-stress vocabulary identification tests--were used for two reasons. First, there was no pressure from the management to produce quantitative measurements at this point in the program development, and we felt a formal testing procedure would be too intimidating for the program participants. As Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) confirm, when this is the case, an “informal procedure is often successful” (40). Second, the topic/objective syllabus for the course was still under construction at that time. While we had a strong general idea of what was to be covered during the pilot program, the fear of creating a test which was not representative of future program content and activities which would dishearten the students motivation persuaded us to use a general vocabulary test instead of a test specific to the bulk mailing context.

An additional important note about assessing the students' language ability is that at the start of the final seven-session program ten students volunteered to take a listening and a speaking tests designed from the topics and objectives of the final course design. These tests, along with the outcomes of both the pre-program and post-program administrations of the tests, will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five.
Learners' Needs and Linguistic Features

Upon realization that many of these limited English proficient students had not obtained a high school education and had not studied English prior to participation in this program, I reviewed several textbooks designed for adult beginning English (See Appendix I for a listing of these sources). From this I established that the following eight linguistic features (structures) are commonly taught at this level, present tense forms of the verb be, present tense verbs, present continuous verbs, present tense questions, use of not, commands, and present tense forms of the verbs can and have. Additional features along with these are alphabet and numbers. I also reviewed several detailed language analysis from other ESP courses similar to this one--ranging from textiles to health care occupations (See Appendix I for a listing of these sources). From this I found that the above listed language structures also reflect many basic on the job functions. They were also included in many speech acts provided by our language analysis.

Furthermore, general English skills like those listed above serve as building blocks for specific English skills. As Wales (1993) describes, general ESL instruction assists workers to participate normally in the workplace. He suggests that not only are there linguistic relationships between general and specific English, as I have indicated above, there are also two other factors. One is that the learners' perception of their needs often involves general English skills. This idea is reflected in these learners' desire to learn health problem and injury related English. The other is that "learners' L2 proficiency levels may require general skill development" (3). Although I have titled this VESL program an English Language Training Program, my ideas of this title do not coincide with
Wales’s (1993) idea of *Training Program*. In the literature review, it was stated that Widdowson (1983) and Wales (1993) claim that a training program is a program which develops limited systematic formulae which relate to linguistic and communicative competencies while education develops the students’ ability to interpret—"make inferences, resolve ambiguities, make sense of or produce novel utterances" (Wales 1993, 9). The program title I have chosen may be misleading because my aim is to do the former in Wales definition—to teach what Widdowson (1983) termed *communicative capacity*. The main objective which influenced my inclusion of these eight grammatical structures is to allow students to creatively construct language for a variety of situations—both work place specific situations and general life situations.
CHAPTER FOUR
APPLICATION

As mentioned in Chapter Three Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) view syllabus design as a "dynamic process" in which one lesson emerges from another lesson in a flexible sequence (128). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) point out the same about converting a syllabus into usable materials. Our situation proved to support this assumption. Later in their book, Hutchinson and Waters advise that, as materials design is the most time consuming task of an ESP instructor, it should be "regarded as a last resort" when other possible materials fail to meet students' specific needs. (79) As the context supplied by a bulk mailing company is so unique, no materials for our purpose could be found, and my husband and I compiled our own through adaptation and design. In Chapter One, a description of the program context was given. This chapter opens with a few additional details about the program context to prompt a description of materials development. Subsequent to this is an evaluation of the materials. The evaluation is divided into the two categories of content and methodology. Please note that the English Language Training Program materials, along with a list of pedagogical activities, are included in Appendix II.

Materials Development

The initial class plan--used during the pilot program--was to have two two-hour class meetings on the weekend for 12 weeks. Different groups of students attended each meeting. One hour of each meeting was devoted entirely to general English. The linguistic structures listed in Chapter Two were presented in very general life skills contexts through
exercises from the workbook *LifePrints: ESL for Adults* (Podnecky, et. al. 1983) which was recommended to me by a colleague for this purpose. The second hour of each meeting was devoted to practicing the same linguistic structures in the specific context of the students' work place.

The fact that the pilot program lasted for a rather extending period had both advantages and disadvantages. One advantage is that we were provided with ample time and opportunities to collect, design, and adapt materials for the specific language of the bulk mailing company. Not only were materials collected before the program began, but also they were collected during the pilot program. Over the 12 weeks of the pilot program we collected a large amount of work-related materials--forms, manuals, and vocabulary terms--and were able to be selective about what was to be included in the final course program materials packet. Another advantage is that we were able to test the materials on two different groups of students and revise accordingly for the final materials packet.

However, the disadvantages were also a factor. One disadvantage was that student interest decreased as the weeks passed, and, for that reason, attendance also decreased. This decrease was also due to an extra work demand being unexpectedly placed on the students during the weeks of the pilot program. As Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) point out, irregular attendance is a common problem in small industry ESP programs. Another disadvantage is that after some weeks the students had lost most of their materials because they did not have folders for them. Most students had purchased notebooks for the course, but few had purchased folders. With some students attending sporadically and no guarantee the students would come to class with their materials, we realized that shortening the duration of the course and providing students with a bound
materials packet would solve these instructional obstacles. Therefore, each student was provided with his or her own materials packet for the final seven-week program.

Besides aiding students in keeping their materials together when transporting them to and from class each weekend, the materials packet also aided in increasing interest in the program. One recommendation Hutchinson and Waters (1984) provide for ESP instructors faced with designing their own materials is to "pay careful attention to the appearance of your materials," so that dull looking materials will not create a dull attitude toward them and the program. By providing the students with pleasant looking materials which contained photographs and pictures of familiar people and things around their work place, I feel that the enthusiasm level toward the program was raised.

The final program design consisted of a seven week session which met once a week for three hours of general linguistic structures set in a specific bulk mailing context. While the health-related, life skills materials were maintained, following the suggestion made by Hutchinson and Waters (1984, 126) to not "re-invent the wheel" and use already designed materials as an idea source, other life skills exercises used during the pilot program were revised to fit the bulk mailing context. Omitting the general life skills content was not only prompted by the need to shorten or intensify the program design, but by the management's encouragement that the course be aimed more directly at the adult learner's need for satisfying immediately relevant needs, which in this situation is his/her need to communicate in English in the work place and not in general non-work related situations. This encouragement was also supported by the results of student questionnaire about motivation for learning English. When
asked about their principal motivation for learning English, nine out of ten student responses were directly related to the workplace advancements.

An additional important feature of our materials development is the fact that my husband was both an "insider" in the company and a resource for the VESL course during materials development meant that many advantages were at hand for the development of this project. As the following quote details, this is not always the case:

For the instructor or curriculum developer the major difficulty usually lies in his "outsider" status. That is, he is not part of the learner's environment and, therefore, does not come to the situation with an understanding of their needs in the work context. He does not "know" the workplace. (Laylin 1983)

Because the curriculum development included someone who was not an "outsider" this major difficulty was overcome. From informal comments from the students, I am confident that they felt the materials closely matched the details of their workplace.

Materials Evaluation

As I proposed in Chapter Two of this thesis, the materials evaluation intended for existing materials would serve as evaluation guidelines for the materials developed for a specific curriculum actually perform their purpose. This division of Chapter Four will follow the materials evaluation procedure which "matches needs to available solutions" through a subjective and objective analysis provided by Hutchinson and Waters (1984, 97-105). The subjective analysis refers to the findings which resulted from the steps taken during the course design stage, and the objective analysis refers to the resulting materials. The purpose of such
an evaluation is to determine to what extent the materials match their intended purpose. While these questions are directed more toward evaluating others' materials in order to determine if they meet a program's specific needs, they are useful questions for our purpose as well. For our discussion, the subjective analysis will consist of pre-final program responses, while the objective analysis will consist of post-final program responses. This evaluation procedure is comprised of 21 sets of questions—one subjective and the other objective—in five categories. These five categories are audience, aims, content, methodology and cost/availability. An example of a subjective question in the category of content is "What language points should be covered?" The answer to this question reflects the teaching theories held by the program designer. The objective question for the above is "What language points do the materials cover?" The answer to this question comes from an objective review of the textbook's content.

In my materials evaluation, the first two categories—audience and aims—seem to prove to be almost a complete match. When the audience is examined, it is clear that the materials were designed for the program participants—Hispanic non-native speakers of English employed at Rees Associates. The category of aims also shows an almost complete match. The main objective of the course is to provide the learners with basic English language competencies needed to properly carry out their duties as Rees Associates employees. The learners' language ability level and common workplace situations were used as the basis for developing materials. The last category in which there was also a complete match pertains to cost and availability. The estimated cost per packet was not exceeded, and Rees Associates management agreed to purchase as many
packets as needed. The third and forth categories--content and methodology--demonstrate some interesting "misses" and "matches" which are explained below. The actual questions and answers are supplied in Appendix III.

**Content**

My concern about the content of the course materials I designed for this program is that an ESP instructor assigned to a bulk mailing company such as Rees Associates would use them as they are included in Appendix II without realizing that many supplemental activities are needed to achieve their intended purpose. This concern can be divided into two categories. The first is that the language descriptions included in the materials need to be supplemented to achieve the intended variety; the second is that the amount of practice in the macro-skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing is unbalanced. A list of pedagogical activities which were used with these materials follows the program materials in Appendix II.

As described in the answer to question #3A--what types of language description is required?--, a variety of language description should be used in order to fit the varying ranges of learning styles present in this, as well as any other, language program. This is especially important in this particular situation because these learners possess varying levels of language skills and learning/study skills. Variety in a language program should guide "the development of autonomy and independent learning strategies that will take learners beyond the classroom" (Belfoire and Burnaby 1984, 80). Language description variety is included in this materials packet, but more could appropriately be added. For example, the first pages of the materials packet include a functional language description which teaches the task of talking about work to others and a notional
language description which explains number (singular versus plural). Later in the course these same concepts are reviewed through a structural language activity in which the students ordered individual words written on index cards into sentences and questions. Many learners appeared to be actively engaged during this hands-on language manipulation activity, and no such structural activity is included within the course materials.

Another possible drawback about the variety of language description included in these materials (also prompted by question #3) is that much of the linguistic description is presented in the students' native language of Spanish before it is presented in English. As Belfoire and Burnaby (1984) discuss, in an adult learning course of such short duration, it is important to build on the knowledge and experience that the learners already hold in order to help them develop their own learning style. However, to make use of this set-up the instructor of the course must know Spanish.

The second concern is that practice in the macro-skills most important for this context—listening and speaking—is needed, but is provided for the most part through supplemental materials; therefore, as much practice as is needed is not explicitly included in the materials packet. Capturing listening practice and speaking practice on paper is really not possible; therefore, as pointed out in the answer to question #5B of the materials evaluation—What is the proportion of work on each skill? Is there skills-integrated work?—, the materials focus on reading and writing. This aspect is a "miss" because, while there is some level of skills-integrated work within the first unit, there seems not to be correct amounts of practice in the macro-skills important for this context throughout the packet. Question #10—about organization within the units
of the course--also brings up this issue. As the first unit--People and Places at Rees Associates--includes more varied practice than the other units because speaking activities are included in this unit, the materials packet seems unbalanced when evaluated according to the amount of practice in each macro-skill for each linguistic feature within a unit. The other three units--Safety Rules at Rees Associates, Machines at Rees Associates, and Putting it All Together--are strictly reading and writing. An important aspect of this, however, is that while speaking and listening is the main concern, for many students reading and writing provide skills-integrated work which can reinforce these skills. If I were to rewrite these materials, I would incorporate more speaking activities within the last three units of the materials packet and add authentic listening tapes for the students to practice this macro-skill between class meetings.

While the above describes how these course materials may have missed their intended purpose, the following describes how these materials seem to have matched their intended purpose in an important way. This is brought up by question #11 about the content sequencing throughout the course. The intention was to move from guided “skill-getting” activities to less guided “skill-using” activities. In order to aid the students in the transition from the knowledge they demonstrated pre-program of isolated words and phrases to becoming more productive in their language use and begin to develop individualized learning styles. An example of this is found in the presentation of vocabulary terms. Vocabulary used in the texts on pages 11, 12 and 13 of the packet is presented explicitly to the students on page 10--before reading the tests. Later on page 22, the learners are encouraged to determine the meaning of words in the text from the context provided by the pictures. Finally, in the
second unit, *Safety Rules at Rees Associates*, the students are encouraged to read and write using the vocabulary list at the end of the unit as a reference. The same type of content sequencing throughout the course can be found when we look at the use of authentic versus non-authentic texts within the packet. As explained in the answer to question #7B of the materials evaluation, the first reading texts of the packet on pages 11 through 13 are non-authentic while the last reading texts of the packet on pages 36 through 39 are authentic. The authentic texts are more difficult than the non-authentic ones written at these students language ability level.

**Methodology**

As described in response to question #13A, the theory/ies of language learning on which the course should be based is a cognitive approach which draws on the language knowledge the learners bring to the class should be used, according to my analysis of the learners’ needs. Also, implicit language instruction should be preceded by an ample amount of explicit language instruction. An inductive approach might be frustrating for adult learners (Shrum 1994). As these students demonstrated some command of isolated words and phrases, a deductive approach might speed up the learning process. These are the same theories that underlie the materials and the class activities. However, at the end of the program some students in the class were making requests for repetition of isolated words and phrases which may indicate that some influence from the behaviorist approach may have been helpful for them as noted in the response to question #14B about the learners’ attitudes to/expectations about learning English.
Under the discussion of content, I noted that my intentions were to include as much variety as possible and to move from guided exercises to free exercises over the duration of the program. These same ideas came up when answering question #15A under methodology. This question deals with the kinds of exercises/tasks which are needed for the program. I responded by stating that a variety of exercises/tasks are needed; furthermore, the expected responses for the exercises/tasks should range from discrete point to open-ended. In the first unit of the materials packet, several types of discrete point exercises (fill-in-the-blank, circling and matching) are included; in the last unit, the photographs on pages 44 through 49 provide a context for which students can write descriptive paragraphs or conversations. This is a very open-ended exercise in which the students can apply their newly learned language skills.

Questions #16A and #16B bring up another “miss” for these materials. This question asks about the teaching-learning techniques which are to be used. My goal initially was to include a variety of techniques which would mean both individual, pair and small group work. Upon evaluating my materials through these questions, I noted that the goal of aiding the students in developing their own learning/study styles had lead me to create more individual work than pair and small group work. I agree with Belfoire and Burnaby’s (1984) view that the development of healthy peer dependence to be equally as important as the development of independent learning styles. For that reason, adding more pair and small group work is advised for any future revisions of these materials.

As noted at the beginning of the discussion about the content, I am concerned that the course materials I designed for this program are not
planned for an ESP instructor assigned to a bulk mailing company such as Rees Associates to use them as they are included in Appendix II without supplementing them with various activities to achieve their intended purpose. This same idea was brought up by question #18--what guidance/support for teaching the course will be needed? There are three types of information needed to teach this course from these materials.

The first is that although there are instructions for the students to complete the exercises in the materials, instructions for converting the exercises into speaking activities and/or pair work needs are not included within the materials. An experienced ESL instructor would be able to find that such pages as 18, on which the students are instructed to write a conversation between employees, include opportunities for role-playing exercises. An inexperienced instructor would need to be provided with additional information.

The second is that while much of the vocabulary needed to teach this course is included in the materials packet, knowledge of other work procedures, such as postal regulations, is needed. For example, page 23 is included for a class activity where the Quality Control Supervisor presents the students with the vocabulary needed to correctly sort the out-going mail into mailing carrier routes. The fact that this supervisor at Rees Associates is also bilingual, brings up the third type of information necessary to teach from these course materials.

This third type of information was mentioned earlier under the content section of this chapter. To make use of the set-up of this materials the instructor of the course must not only speak Spanish, but also be able to make comparisons between English and Spanish. Also, the materials contain several vocabulary lists which the instructor aids the
students in filling in the Spanish equivalent and vice versa. While for most terms, my husband and I were able to establish correct translations, in several instances throughout the program, the bilingual Quality Control Supervisor was used as a reference to verify the correct use of the technical terms in Spanish and English.
CHAPTER FIVE
TESTING

This chapter is dedicated to the issue of testing. While testing—especially ESP testing—is such a large topic that this entire thesis could have been devoted to it, I am containing it here as it truly exists within an ESP program. It is a part of the whole program; therefore, this chapter discusses only the most important topics for the development of tests for this program. The first four of the seven testing discussion topics included in the chapter are those that are the resulting product of the design stage as outlined by Bachman and Palmer (1996). They are as follows: 1) a description of the purpose of developing a test in the context of Rees Associates English Language Training Program, 2) a description of the Target Language Use (TLU) domain and task types and 3) a description of the test takers 4) a definition of the constructs to be measured. The fifth and sixth topics included in this section are actually included in what Bachman and Palmer (1996) refer to as the operationalization stage of test development. They are as follows: 5) a description of the language test tasks and 6) a description of the scoring method for these testing procedures. The concluding section of this chapter is a summary of the evaluation of the qualities of test usefulness.

Test Purpose

As will be described in the following section of this chapter about the Target Language Use domain, it was determined that two tests were needed for testing the English language ability of the non-native speakers of English at Rees Associates. One test is a listening test, and the second is an oral test. The purpose of the listening test is to make inferences
regarding the ability level of a Rees Associates employee to understand short spoken phrases in English (short speech acts) which he or she would typically hear and need to understand while working in the company. The purpose of the oral test is to make inferences regarding the ability level of a Rees Associates employee to produce short spoken phrases in English (short speech acts) which he or she would need in order to function successfully as a Rees Associates employee.

These inferences together (listening ability and oral ability inferences) are part of an assessment of the ability of each employee to work as a “good team player.” Rees Associates management defines a “good team player” as an employee who possesses four essential qualities. These four qualities are that the employee is 1) easy to work with, 2) easy to train, 3) easy to direct and assign, and 4) someone who supports problem solving. The main characteristic which links these four qualities is the need to understand (listening comprehension) and communicate (speaking ability) with English speaking employees and English speaking supervisors.

The purpose of the inferences made from these two tests, then, is to assess an employee’s ability to understand and communicate with English speaking persons in his/her work place which emphasizes a “team player” attitude. When it is inferred from these tests that an employee possesses communication skills which may enable him or her to actualize the four communication based qualities of a “team player,” along with the three work related criteria of 1) high productivity, 2) good attendance, and 3) high quality of work, Rees Associates management will review the employee for two possible reasons.
One possible reason is that the employee is not actually a full-time Rees Associates employee; he or she is actually an employee of a temporary agency. In this case, an employee who demonstrates the four communication based qualities via the English language tests, along with the three work related qualities during his/her employment through the temporary agency, is a candidate for full-time Rees Associates employment. While the temporary employment agency employees often work 40 or more hours in a week, they do not receive the benefits that the full-time Rees Associates employees receive.

To understand the second possible reason, one should understand the hierarchy of employment at Rees Associates. As mentioned earlier, "team player" qualities are important at Rees Associates. A team is a group of usually five people. These five people receive differing pay depending on their positions on the team. For example, the "team captain" or the operator receives higher pay than the stocker or bagger. The higher paid positions are filled by employees who possess more communication based qualities. Therefore, the second possible reason is that the employee can be promoted from one position to a higher position on the team, either within Rees Associates or within the temporary agency. (Team positions are described in Chapter One.)

For the test takers, the decisions made based on results of these tests are semi-high stakes. I define them as semi-high stakes because the purpose of this test is not to pinpoint employees who are lacking in communication based skills in order to fire or demote them. Furthermore, employees must also display the three work related characteristics listed above, so the employment decisions are not based on test results alone. However, hiring as a Rees Associates employee or promotion within the
company or temporary agency will result in greater job stability, more overtime availability, and higher wages for the employee, all of which, for many reasons, are of high importance to these non-native speaking employees. An additional aspect of employment decisions is that, as is the case with any employment decisions, Rees Associates hires and promotes employees according to overall company needs and position openings.

Besides the above purpose of assessing communication skills, these tests have a second purpose. The combined scores of these tests, along with other evaluative methods, will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the English Language Training Program. For example, one issue which will be examined is how students performed as a group on the different sections of the oral test. If students performed poorly on a particular section, than the instruction materials and methods used when teaching the information contained in that section will be revised accordingly. The combined test scores will also allow the management to decide to continue or to discontinue the English Language Training Program.

**Target Language Use (TLU) Domain**

Bachman and Palmer (1996) define Target Language Use (TLU) Domain as “a set of specific language use tasks that the test taker is likely to encounter outside the test itself, and to which we want our inferences about the language ability to generalize” (44). As mentioned in the last section, the inferences to be made from the results of the tests which were to be developed for this program were semi-high stakes. In order to develop a test which contains language use tasks that closely correspond to the actual language use tasks of the work place situations which the
program participants encounter, I found it necessary to review the results of the language needs analysis done during the pilot program. To review the results in a productive manner I followed the TLU Task Checklist provided by Bachman and Palmer (1996). Their TLU Task Checklist is divided into four sections: 1) characteristics of the setting, 2) characteristics of input, 3) characteristics of expected response and 4) relationship between input and expected response. Though this systematic activity, I was able to gain more specific insight into the language needed to perform the generally described tasks in the topics/tasks syllabus used for the materials development. Table 4 is the resulting description of the TLU tasks.

Two important findings resulted from this analysis. One was that reading and writing tasks were minimal to non-existent. Signs posted around the plant are in both English and Spanish. Only mechanics are required to fill out forms, and they must be able to do so before being hired as a mechanic. The second finding was that when the expected response is language, the input is non-language as described above. When the expected response is non-language, the input is language as described above. An exception to this is when employees call on the telephone to speak to a supervisor. In this case, input and expected response are both language. The amount of speaking done over the telephone is small when compared to the amount of speaking done on the production floor.
Table 4. TLU Tasks Description

Characteristics of the setting:

Physical Setting—The majority of language use takes place on the production floor. The production floor has a high level of background noise which can easily interfere with communication. A small exception to this physical setting would be when employees call on the telephone to speak to a supervisor.

Participants—The employees communicate with three groups of people which are as follows 1) other employees, 2) supervisors, and 3) mechanics.

Time of task—Any time while working on one of three shifts. Rees Associates works 24 hours a day.

Characteristics of input:
Format:
Channel—aural (if input is language)
Form—both language and non-language
Language—English
Type—When input is language it consists of commands and questions from other employees and supervisors who speak English. When input is non-language it consists of mechanical, health/injury, or team-player problems which need attention.

Characteristics of expected response:
Format:
Channel—spoken (if expected response is language) and action (if expected response is non-language)
Form—both language and non-language
Language—English
Type—limited production response or action

Relationship between input and expected response:
Reactivity—Non-reciprocal (except for telephone call)
Scope—Narrow
Directness—Indirect
Description of Test Takers

While a thorough description of the program participants was provided in Chapter Three, because taking a test causes different emotional reactions than does participating in regular class activities, more information is needed about them for test development. First, the target language use (TLU) tasks are those needed for real-life, work-related performance, both tests used for this program solidly reflect the content of the program. Both program content and TLU tasks were selected from our language needs analysis as described in Chapter Three. This aspect could cause these students to value the test results more than if the tests were not related to their immediate circumstances.

Related to the above is the program participants' topical knowledge. As all test takers were working at Rees Associates in one position or another either for the company itself or for the temporary agency at the time of the testing, they all possessed a relatively homogeneous topical knowledge of work-related tasks. Such knowledge includes that of the appropriate responsibilities of employees and basic knowledge of how an inserter machine functions. Furthermore, three fourths of the students who took the tests worked at the same position--machine operator. As Bachman and Palmer (1996) point out, "We would generally expect that test takers who have the relevant topical knowledge will have positive affective responses to the test and test tasks..." (114). I believe that this statement is true for this particular case because the test takers generally appeared confident and prepared on test day.
Test Constructs

As mentioned earlier, it was determined that two tests—one test for listening and a second for speaking—were necessary for a satisfactory representation of the TLU tasks: a listening test for measuring comprehension of commands and questions from other employees and supervisors who speak English, and a speaking test for mechanical problems, health/injury related problems, or team-player related problems which need attention through speech acts like commands, requests and statements. I have defined the construct for the listening test as “listening comprehension of short speech acts in work related situations” and the construct for the speaking test as “production of effective speech acts to accomplish work related functions.”

While the listening test construct is relatively straightforward, the speaking test construct is a bit problematic. The main reason for this is that the test takers possess a low English proficiency level. While some spoken English used to accomplish work related tasks may be interactive, these test takers are not likely to participate in interactive conversations in English. This observation is based on conversations with Rees Associates management and on data collected from student data sheets used for the learner needs analysis discussed in Chapter Three. On the data sheets students were asked how often they have conversations in English in a typical day. Of 13 student reported data, five students responded zero to two times per day, five students responded three to five times per day, two students responded six to ten times, and only one student responded 11-15 times per day. For one reason or another, eight students did not respond to this question on their data sheets.
In addition, a speech act, while it may be too formal or informal, is still effective for accomplishing the work related functions we will be using on the speaking test. Another aspect which should be noted here is that the general environment of the company is one in which a speech act would rarely be considered too informal. Furthermore, the program participants are not lacking in politeness in their own language. Simple phrases such as "excuse me," "please," and "thank you" are used frequently by them in both their native language and their attempts at English.

**Description of Language Test Tasks**

In the same book which includes the above TLU Task Checklist, Bachman and Palmer (1996) also provide a useful framework for describing the language task characteristics within a language test. They emphasize that the purpose of such a framework is to provide a basis for the following three activities:

1. describing TLU tasks as a basis for designing test tasks,
2. describing test tasks in order to insure their comparability and as a means for assessing reliability, and
3. comparing the characteristics of TLU and test tasks to assess authenticity (47).

This framework is divided into five categories. These categories, which are as follows, are almost identical to those of the TLU task checklist: 1) characteristics of the setting, 2) characteristic of the test rubrics, 3) characteristics of the input, 4) characteristics of the expected response, and 5) relationship between input and response. Table 5 includes the resulting description of language test task characteristics.
Table 5. Language Test Tasks Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the setting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical setting--same as instruction setting (the lunch room of the company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants--myself as test administer--I am also the main instructor for the English Language Training Program. Listening test is administered in group and speaking test is administered individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Task--Saturday or Sunday afternoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the test rubric:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions: Language--test takers' native language (Spanish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel--aural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications of procedures and tasks--tests are included in Appendices II and III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure: The listening test includes 16 multiple choice items. Eight of these items are speech acts by a supervisor and eight are by an employee. The speaking test includes six situation categories and is divided into three parts. There is a total of ten items--five in part one, two in part two, and three in part three. The first part contains two items randomly selected from four “team player” situations, one item randomly selected from four commands containing “turn-off” or “turn-on,” one item randomly selected from four situations related to obtaining more supplies, and one item randomly selected from five health problem/injury situations. The second part is concerned with safety rules. Two items are selected randomly from five safety rules situations. The third part is concerned with requesting mechanical assistance from mechanics; three items are selected randomly from five situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allotment: Students are given eight minutes to read the multiple choice sheet for the listening test. The listening tape lasts approximately seven minutes. For the speaking test, time allotment will vary. If no attempt to respond to a test item is made within approximately 30 seconds, the next item is given. For the trial administration of the test, each test taker finished the speaking test in approximately five to ten minutes including instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring method: For the listening test the score will be calculated from the number correct out of the number possible. The scoring rubric and rating scale for the speaking test are included in Appendix V. A two rater system should be used for scoring the speaking test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. (continued)

**Characteristics of the input:**

**Format:**
Channel--aural for both tests (multiple choice sheet is visual)
Form--language
Language--native language (Spanish)
Length--varies
Type--items

Degree of speededness for both input and expected response)--For the listening test, students are given eight minutes to read the multiple choice sheet before the tape is played. During the tape the speech acts are repeated twice with approximately 15 seconds after the second for the students to process the input and select a response. Because the students are given time to read the multiple choice sheet, there is a relatively low degree of speededness. A relatively high degree of speededness is apparent in the speaking test in that if no attempt to respond to a test item is made within approximately 30 seconds, the test administer goes on to the next item.

**Vehicle--**listening test--live instructions, reproduced test items
speaking test--live instructions, live test items

**Language of Input:**
Language characteristics: Due to the low proficiency level of the test takers, all language input is in the test takers' native language except for the speech acts contained in the listening test. For that reason, I will examine in this section the speech acts of the listening test. The 16 speech acts included on the listening test are as follows: five questions from supervisor, three commands from supervisor, seven commands from employees, and one statement from employee. All are spoken with minimal quickness (close to normal speech rate) with no reductions or contractions. For example, the one statement included is “You are doing a good job.” and not “You’re doing a good job.” or simply “good job.”

Topical characteristics (for both input and expected response): As described earlier, these tests assume that the test takers possess knowledge of the appropriate responsibilities of team members and basic knowledge of how an inserter machine functions. This knowledge is essential for completing these two tests.

**Characteristics of expected response:**

**Format:**
Channel--spoken (if expected response is language) and select multiple choice response (if expected response is non-language)
Table 5. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>both language and non-language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>For listening test: selected response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For speaking test: limited production response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of speededness</td>
<td>see above under characteristics of input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of expected response</td>
<td>for the limited production responses the test takers are asked to produce effective one or two sentence speech acts which perform the function of command/request and in a limited number of items statements. For the limited number of statements, the response does not necessarily need to be in sentence form to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical knowledge</td>
<td>see above under characteristics of input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship between input and expected response:**
- Reactivity: Non-reciprocal
- Scope: Narrow
- Directness: Indirect

An explanation of how the TLU domain tasks match and differ from the test tasks is provided in the last section of this chapter. One note about the above description is that the characteristics of the test setting changed. They were predicted to be as follows: 1) The physical setting would be the same as instruction setting which was the lunch room of the company. 2) The participants would be myself as test administer; the listening test I would be administered to the whole group, and the speaking test I would administer to students individually. And, 3) the time of task would be Saturday or Sunday afternoon. While the participants basically stayed the same--another tester for the speaking portion was added to save time--the physical setting and the time of the test changed drastically. The fact that the bulk mailing company worked overtime on the particular weekend testing was scheduled, combined with the management's increased interest in obtaining quantitative results of the
final course design, changed the testing location to outside the plant itself and to Saturday and Sunday morning. Half of the test takers met on Saturday morning in a nearby church basement, and half of the test takers met on Sunday morning in a large, community reception hall. Another affect of this change was that the Sunday morning test takers had left their third shift work only minutes before taking the test which resulted in them being tired and perhaps not as focused as they would have been had the test been administered at a different time.

**Scoring Methods**

The listening test is scored number correct out of number possible. There is no partial credit scoring for two reasons. The first is that the speech acts are short and straight-forward; there is no allowance for interpretations and opinions. Secondly, many of the multiple choice possibilities are written so that a test taker must focus their listening as to hear the slight, yet often times important differences. For example, there are two items (#3 and #13) which involve commands of “turn-off” and “turn-on.” In item #2 a key word is “light” and in the responses there is a rhyming word—“night.” This is also true in item #8 with the words “glue” and “blue.” Phonological clues along with the context provided by the other words in the speech act allow test takers to determine the meaning of the speech act. While the phonological difference of the pairs of words included in the above examples may be small to a non-native speaker of English, it is important that they are able to identify the difference in order to accomplish what is being asked of them.

Although a strategic listening competence of focused listening may be functioning for these test takers to complete some test items, the
speech acts are so short that, as demonstrated with the above examples, it is almost a necessity that the test takers understand all the words in the short speech act, rather than focusing on just the key words as is the case in extended discourse. Another example of this is found in item #15. In this item a supervisor is asking an employee “Can you work second shift?” Among the multiple choice selections is “Do you work second shift?” In such a case a misunderstanding can result in either the employee not understanding that the supervisor wants him or her to work second shift or the employee missing an opportunity to work second shift.

Due to the fact that the expected response for the speaking test is limited production response, the responses are rated on a scale of four to one according to four criteria. The first criterion--effective communication in the context--can only be fulfilled if the second and third criteria are properly executed. The second and third criteria are satisfactory structure of response with regard to function and correct, appropriate vocabulary for the context. The fourth criterion is pronunciation intelligibility. Table 6 gives the scoring rubric for the speaking test.

An example of how this rating scale is interpreted is that if the function of the response is to command an employee not to do something the structure of the response would start with “don’t” and be followed by the correct lexicon (verb and possibly an object). Such a response would receive a #4 rating. However, if the same response type starts with “no” and is followed by the correct lexicon, communication has taken place but can not considered as effective as a response which starts with “don’t.” Such a response would receive a #3 rating. Another example is that if the function of the response is to request more supplies, the structure can
Table 6. Rating Scale for Speaking Test Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #4: Effective communication in the given context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct, appropriate vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation easily intelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating #3: Generally effective communication in the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct, appropriate vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation intelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating #2: Somewhat effective communication in the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of response not apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some attempt at correct vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation not easily intelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating #1: No effective communication in the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No knowledge of correct vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response for pronunciation rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

either be a statement (i.e. We need more glue.), a request (Can you get more glue please?), or even a command (Get more glue). For this response simply stating the correct vocabulary without structure (i.e. more glue or glue), does not effectively convey the function of requesting more supplies as it could be interpreted as asking where more glue is located, asking if the listener wants or needs more glue, or asking if the speaker should go get more glue. Such a response would receive a #2 rating.

A crucial element of the above listed criteria is the fourth criterion of pronunciation intelligibility. For a rater to be able to identify structure of response with regard to function and correct, appropriate vocabulary the test taker must be able to speak intelligibly. This fourth criterion, like the others, does not make predictions about pronunciation or communication ability in other contexts; it only assesses these abilities within the context of a given test item.
An additional note about scoring for the speaking test is that I used a two-rater system in which the test takers responses were tape recorded, and a second rater evaluated them without knowledge of the ratings I gave as the first rater. When the two ratings varied greater than two points, the individual test items were examined for a third time. If they did not, the average of the two was taken to arrive at the final score.

**Test Usefulness**

When evaluating the usefulness of any test, it is important to remember that the intention is to maximize the overall usefulness of the test and not simply the individual qualities of reliability, construct validity, authenticity, interactiveness, impact, and practicality. Bachman and Palmer (1996) further emphasize that these qualities “cannot be evaluated independently, but must be evaluated in terms of their combined effect on the overall usefulness of the test” (18). Included in Appendix VI are answers to the questions for logical evaluation of test usefulness as outlined by Bachman and Palmer (1996). This section describes some important aspects of this evaluation.

The answer to the first reliability question concerning how the test setting varies in unmotivated ways from one test to another is that there are no notable variations. However, as mentioned above, there actually were changes in the test setting from one administration to the next. In fact, all of the three test administrations were in different settings. As noted in the practicality section of these questions, authenticity was sacrificed to achieve higher practicality.

The most authentic test would have been to have employees on the production floor carrying out various work related tasks. For example,
one employee could train another employee. During the logical evaluation it was determined that this would not be practical because not only would it have been time consuming to administer, it would have also been difficult to score. However, after a full scale administration of the test, another aspect is added. It would have been impossible to administer a highly authentic test outside of the company itself in the setting where the test was actually administered.

Although the most authentic test was not developed for practicality concerns, I still view the correspondence between test tasks and TLU tasks to be high. The main reason for this is that the speech acts of both tests are preceded by explanations which give the location of the speech acts as the production floor of the work place. From the description of the TLU domain, it was found that the majority of language use occurs in this setting. A second reason I feel there is a high level of correspondence between the two is found in the relationship between input and expected response.

In the majority of the TLU tasks, when the expected response is language, the input is non-language, and when the expected response is non-language, the input is language. The same is true for the majority of the test tasks. For most test tasks on the speaking test, the input is explanations of situations (non-language) in which the test taker is required to respond with language. For example, the second section of the test includes descriptions of situations in which another employee is breaking a safety rule--running on the production floor, blocking the aisles, etc. The responses to these situations are language such as “Don’t run” or “No running” The same can be found on the listening test. For example, the response to the listening prompt “Turn-off the yellow light” would be the
non-language response or action of turning off the light. The fact that the answer sheet for the listening test, as well as the prompts for the speaking test, are in the students' native language ensures that the students understand the non-language aspects of the test tasks.
CHAPTER SIX
TEST RESULTS AND EVALUATION ANALYSIS

This chapter discusses two topics. The first topic is the analysis of the testing results. While this discussion is interesting, as it is based on only two sets of 10 students or 20 total final scores, not many absolute conclusions can be made. Further statistical analysis would require at least ten more student subjects to have taken the tests. The second discussion topic is the results of the student course evaluations. A total of 14 student course evaluations were collected.

Testing Results and Analysis

As mentioned in Chapter Three, at the start of the final course program ten students volunteered to take the listening and speaking tests as a pre-test. Fortunately, these same ten students had exceptionally good attendance for the seven week session. They took the same tests as post test during the last class meetings. The results and answers for their pre-tests were not presented to them until after they took their post-tests. During the same time, the tests were administered to ten other students as an exit test for the program. These three test groupings will be labeled pre-test, post-test and exit test groups. The class period before the post-test/exit-test was administered, the students were told which sections of their materials packet to concentrate on for the tests.

I felt that in general the test results were highly representative of each student's work related English language ability. Those who had been generally good language learning students (high beginning to low intermediate students) performed better than those who had demonstrated lower language ability levels (low beginning students).
Before presenting the test results for these 20 students, I will point out that no strong relationship between the number of class meetings attended and the score on test can be identified. One exception may be that two extremely low speaking test scores—percentages correct of 39% and 27.5%—are from students who only attended two or three class meetings respectively other than the testing session. On the other hand, two student attending only two sessions besides the testing session scored high on both tests. The average number of classes attended for the entire group of test takers (not including test day) is four out of six class meetings. Not including the four students mentioned above the average moves up to five out of six class meetings.

On the listening test, there was no indication that the incorrect answers selected by the students were due to the item being confusing. Only one item was missed by eight of ten students on the pre-test who all selected the same incorrect response. This test item (#13) involved the difference between “turn-off” and “turn-on.” The correct answer was “Turn-off the red light,” and the consistently mistaken answer was “Turn-on the red light.” On the post-test exactly half made the same error. And four of the ten students who took the test as an exit test only did the same.

There were two other listening test items missed by several students on each of the three test groupings (pre-test, post-test, and exit-test groups); however, for these items they did not consistently select the same incorrect responses or supplied no repose at all. These two items were #12 and #15. Table 5 shows the number correct out of 16 possible along with the percentage correct for the three test groupings. Figure 1 is a graphic display of the data for the pre-test and post-test. Figure 3 is a graphic display of the data for the exit listening test.
Table 5. Listening Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Pre-test Score</th>
<th>Pre-test Percent</th>
<th>Post-test Score</th>
<th>Post-test Percent</th>
<th>Exit-test Score</th>
<th>Exit-test Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Pre-test and Post-test Listening Scores
The mean score for the pre-test is 12.9 (or 81%), and the mean score for the post-test 14.3 (or 89%). While the mean score for the post test is only 1.4 points higher than the pre-test mean score, this translates into 8 percentage points because there was not a large number of items on the test. The mean score for the exit test group is 14 (or 87.5%). This is almost equivalent to the post-test mean score. There was some concern that the listening test was too easy of a test as the pre-test mean score is rather high. A more difficult test would have been developed and administered as an exit test for both the post test and exit test groups. However, with the change in the physical setting of the testing site, it was decided that the listening test would function as an excellent warm-up activity for the more difficult oral test. Getting the students mentally prepared and oriented for the oral test when their surrounding environment may have been causing them extra unwanted stress was important. The results (both scores and percentages) for the three groups on the oral test with 40 possible points are shown in Table 6. A graphic display of the pre- and post-test groups is shown in Figure 2. Figure 4 is a graphic display of the data for the exit speaking test.

The mean score for the pre-test is 23 (or 58%), and the mean score for the post-test 31 (or 77.5%). This translates to an eight score point (or 20%) increase. As each test task is worth four points, this translates to each student achieving an average of two tasks fully correct on the post-test and not on the pre-test. For the exit test group the mean score is 27.2 (or 68%). Without 007 and 009, which are scores the two students mentioned in the introduction to this section who attending few sessions of the program, the mean score of the exit test group increases to 30.7 (or 76.7%) which is 3.2 points (or 8%) above the total mean score for all
Table 6. Oral Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Pre-test Score</th>
<th>Pre-test Percent</th>
<th>Post-test Score</th>
<th>Post-test Percent</th>
<th>Exit-test Score</th>
<th>Exit-test Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Pre-test and Post-test Speaking (Oral) Scores
Figure 3: Exit Test Speaking Scores

Figure 4: Exit Test Listening Scores
ten students in the exit test group. This revised mean score is almost equivalent to the mean score of the post-test group.

A summary of the descriptive statistics for the three test groupings is included in the Table 7. In the table, the listening test is labeled with a #1; the speaking test is labeled with a #2.

As described with the actual test results, the mean for the exit test group on the speaking test increases by approximately 8% when the test scores of two students with poor class attendance are omitted. Since the reason for their poor performance is known, they can reasonably be considered outliers which negatively effect the data and be omitted from the data. Table 8 provides the descriptive statistics for the exit group with the two scores omitted. Also, included in this table are the descriptive statistics for the combined results of the post and exit groups. Again, the listening test is labeled with a #1, and the speaking test is labeled with a #2.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Pre #1</th>
<th>Post #1</th>
<th>Pre #2</th>
<th>Post #2</th>
<th>Exit #1</th>
<th>Exit #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Items</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-High</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>17-35.5</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand. Dev.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Revised Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Revised Exit #2</th>
<th>Combined #1</th>
<th>Combined #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Items</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>29.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-High</td>
<td>24-37.5</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>11-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand. Dev.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for the combined test scores for the listening test is 14.15 or 88%; the mean for the combined test scores for the speaking test is 29.15 or 72%. It can be interpreted from this that the group as a whole passed both tests. More indicative of this interpretation are that the medians of 14 and 30.25. These statistics suggest that the upper half of the score were over 87.5% for the listening test and over 75.6% for the speaking test. Although higher combined statistics for the speaking test would have been desirable, a comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores on the speaking test gives desirable results. One can find a noticeable increase in the mean, median, and high-low scores while the range and the standard deviation remain constant. This indicates that the group as a whole improved. All scores showed some improvement.
Course Evaluation Results

Course evaluations forms were developed for both students who participated in our program and managers. These forms are included in Appendix VII. As indicated in Chapter Two, course evaluations may be limited by one's ability to collect data. I found this to be true when attempting to collect completed course evaluations. While many student evaluations were distributed, only those who successfully completed the course returned their surveys, and some were not completely filled out. Some students wrote on their evaluations that they did not have enough time to answer all the written questions because they were working. However, all 14 which were returned had the rating questions completed. The averages of the rating questions responses are shown in Table 9. Students who successfully completed the course returned their evaluation forms because upon turning the forms in, they received a certificate for completing their studies. This provided an incentive for completing and returning the evaluation form.

Forms from management have not yet been collected. While their feedback would have added to this discussion, it will be collected concurrently with a needs analysis for further English instruction. In Chapter Two it was stated that evaluations performed some time after the course when the learners are in contact with the situation for which the program intended to prepare them can often be useful. Hopefully, this will prove to be the case for this course evaluation as well.

The 15 rating questions on the student evaluation form were on a scale of five to one--five representing strongly agree, four representing agree, three representing agree slightly two representing disagree and one representing strongly disagree.
### Table 9: Course Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Throughout the program the class met regularly, on time, and for the entire period.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher responded appropriately to students' questions.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher clearly explained the purpose and what you were to do for each class activity.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher presented material to the class in a clear and helpful way.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Class discussions and activities helped you improve your English language ability.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The teacher appeared to enjoy teaching the English language.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You were glad you had this teacher.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>By the end of the program you improved your English language ability.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The teacher showed respect for students' opinions, feelings, and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>You were glad that the teacher communicated frequently in your native language/Spanish.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You wished the teacher had spoken more English during classes.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>You are more confident about speaking English to other employees.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>You are more confident about speaking English to supervisors.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>You are more confident about speaking to mechanics.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Your listening skills have improved.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lowest responses are for questions eleven, twelve and thirteen. Question eleven is of a different type than questions twelve and thirteen; it is consistent with question relatively high rating for question ten. While I tried to speak more English during the final course program than I did during the pilot program, the students were pleased with the course being presented mainly in their native language. However, the disadvantage to this is that the students' response to question fifteen about the improvement of their listening skills is slightly low.

Questions twelve and thirteen are interesting when compared to fourteen. From these results, it appears that the students feel more confident speaking to mechanics than to other employees and supervisors. This same feeling is expressed in the written comments as well. These comments were directly mainly toward wanting to improve communication with supervisors. While this is the case, when the results from each section of the speaking test are compared, the performance is not higher for the section on speaking to mechanics. In fact, the average score for all three sections--speaking to other employees, speaking to supervisors, and speaking to mechanics--is the same. The average score for each section was approximately three out of five possible points.

An interest survey was distributed and collected along with the student course evaluation as a means of collected needs analysis data for any future English programs. However, the data collected from this survey is beneficial for evaluating this program. This survey asked students to rank topics according to their perceived need for more practice in the topic area and assign numbers according to their importance. They were asked to assign three points to the most important, two points to the second most important, and one point to the third most important. The
survey was divided into two parts. The first part asked the students to rank the topics covered during the program. The second part asked the students to rank some topics not covered during the program that may be covered during future programs. Table 10 shows the results from these rankings. All 14 students completed this ranking. Some students marked more than three choices.

Table 10. Interest Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part One</th>
<th>Combined Ranking Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 names of positions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 names of places in the plant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 names of machines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 postal regulations information</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 health problems and injuries</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 safety rules of the plant</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 machine parts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 mechanical problems</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Ranking Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 quality control issues</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 conversations of personal nature</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 grammatical correctness</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 intelligibility of pronunciation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 fill-out work related forms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 read work related forms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results for part one of this survey suggest that the students feel they learned more about names of positions, names of places in the plant, and names of machines than they learned about postal regulations and safety rules of the plant. These last two topics would be ones to cover in any future English programs for this company. It is interesting that mechanical problems ranked relatively high when one considers these students responses to the course evaluation in which they indicated they felt more confident speaking to mechanics.

The highest result for part two of this survey suggests that the students are very interested in learning more about pronunciation. The lowest results are in the two categories pertaining to filling-out and reading work related forms. These results are consistent with are initial needs analysis in that speaking and listening skills are more important to these students’ work at Rees Associates than reading and writing skills.
For the specific VESL context of this thesis, program development began with a needs analysis done mainly through immersion in the students' work place. While this method provided us with a much clearer picture of these learners' needs than any other method would have provided, it was combined with other methods to ensure input from all levels of participants--both students and management.

During the needs analysis and the pilot program, work place forms, maps, manuals and photographs were collected which could be transformed into program materials. These were combined with basic English language structures applicable to adult beginning English students to form the resulting materials packet. Special attention was given to including a variety of language description, exercises, and macro-skills practice in the materials. The students native language was used as a reference for much of the language description. Should these materials be revised, they should be revised to include more listening and speaking activities. A tape recording accompanying each student's packet would be helpful.

Besides developing a materials packet from our needs analysis results, two tests were developed. One test is to assess "listening comprehension of short speech acts in work related situations," and second is to assess "production of effective speech acts to accomplish work related functions." In the development of these two tests, authenticity was lowered in favor of practicality. While the situations prompted by test tasks are authentic, for practicality the test can be given outside the production floor of the company. One purpose of developing
these tests is that the results will be used as part of an assessment concerning these students' employment with this company. The second purpose is an overall evaluation of the program. The second, combined with student course evaluation results, provides some interesting insight into the effectiveness of the program.

The scores of the pre- and post-test group showed improvement, and the scores of the exit test group, when revised to eliminate outliers, are above average. However, the course evaluation results indicated that the students did not feel they had improved a large amount in speaking with other employees and with supervisors. While the scores on all three sections of the speaking test--speaking with other employees, supervisors, and mechanics--were similar, the students did feel they improved in speaking with mechanics. The students generally did not feel that their listening skills had improved a large amount. These results support my suggestion to include more speaking and listening practice within the materials packet.

Another factor which should be considered in any future program is that the class should meet more than just once a week and for more than just seven weeks. With more class contact time, additional speaking and listening practice could be achieved. This is important for two reasons. First, the interest survey given at the end of the program suggested that the students still desired to learn about some topics which were covered during the duration of the program. These topics were postal regulations and safety rules of the plant. Second, the same survey indicated that the students were interested in improving their pronunciation. With more class time, these topics could be included.
While the test and course evaluation results are interesting, perhaps the most encouraging form of feedback came through casual conversations with students and management. Both expressed to my husband and me that they were anxious to continue with future English programs.

As summary, the intent of this VESL program was to educate rather than train these students in basic English language skills needed to carry out their duties as Rees Associate employees. The idea here being that these students learn to construct appropriate language within the context of the work place and not simply respond with a formulaic phrase. Special concern was taken to use a learning centered approach. Due to the fact that all students worked at the same company and had the same first language, as materials developer and instructor, I explicitly capitalized on these two factors. Although these learners did not possess advanced levels of English language knowledge, they possessed well-developed knowledge about work place procedures. In this course they were encouraged to learn more about their work place along with the language. Furthermore, the language structures were taught in Spanish before being presented in English in order to draw on the existing linguistic knowledge of these students.
APPENDIX I
PROGRAM DESIGN INSTRUMENTS
Learner Interest Survey (Translated from Spanish)

Think of situations that you have encountered in the street, the store, the restaurant, or in any other place where English is spoken. Select from the list three situations for which you would like to learn more English. Number your selection 1 for the most important, 2 for the second most important, and 3 for the third most important.

_____ greetings  
_____ emergencies  
_____ sending things by mail (post office)  
_____ asking for directions (in the city and in buildings)  
_____ expressing emotions to American friends  
_____ comparing prices and buying things in a store (like Wal-mart)  
_____ speaking with the doctor in the hospital  
_____ making repairs to your house (how to ask for help)  
_____ buying food at the supermarket (like Hy-vee)

Vocabulary—Select three from the list of vocabulary term categories and order the same as you did above.

_____ names of buildings (school, bank, etc.)  
_____ people in a family (mother, cousin, etc.)  
_____ days of the week and months (Thursday, July, etc.)  
_____ methods of transportation (bus, car, etc.)  
_____ emotional states (happy, mad, etc.)  
_____ parts of the body (arm, leg, etc.)  
_____ names of parts of the house and furniture (dinning room, lamp, etc.)  
_____ names of food (lettuce, ham, etc.)
Pilot Program Interview Prompts

What is your last name? 

What is your first name? 

Where are you from?

(numbers) How old are you?

(Present) Where do you live?

(Present) Who do you live with?

(Past) What did you do last weekend?

(Future) What will you do next weekend?

(Past continuous) How long have you been working for Rees Associates?
Pilot Program Vocabulary Identification Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Ropa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hat</td>
<td>español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shirt</td>
<td>español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gloves</td>
<td>español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Boot</td>
<td>español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pants</td>
<td>español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encierra en un círculo las palabras que corresponden a la categoría dada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meat</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>pants</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apple</td>
<td>movie</td>
<td>sister</td>
<td>boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cake</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>sweater</td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>moon</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chair</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>room</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td>mouse</td>
<td>fix</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>run</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>wall</td>
<td>bed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for Program Ideas


APPENDIX II
PROGRAM MATERIALS
This course materials packet for Rees Associates English Language Training Program was designed by Miguel and Janese Ceron. October, 1996
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What is your name?

My name is _______________.

Where are you from?

I am from _______________.

Some positions in my work place:

- operator = _______________
- tyer = _______________
- loader = _______________
- bagger = _______________
- catcher = _______________

What is your position?

I am a _______________.

What shift do you work?

I work ________ shift.

First Shift (1st)  Second Shift (2nd)  Third Shift (3rd)
Find the people in the class who...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>...work first shift.</th>
<th>...work second shift.</th>
<th>...work third shift.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork-lift drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard bailers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Que son "pronouns"?

"Pronouns" (o pronombres) son palabras que sustituyen a nombres de personas y cosas.

Singular pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>yo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>tú/usted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>él</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>ella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>eso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>we</th>
<th>nosotros/nosotras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>Uds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>ellos/ellas/eso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTA: it refiere a cosas-no a personas. they es el plural de it.

Circle the pronouns:

1) Maria is from Mexico. She is an operator.

2) Ted and Manuel work together. They work first shift.

3) The inserter is a machine. It is a big machine.

4) The inserters are machines. They are big machines.

5) John is from the United States. He works at Rees Associates.

1 inserter machine

"it"

3 inserter machines

"they"
"To be" es un verbo importante.
"to be" es equivalente a "ser" y "estar" en español.

Escriba 3 frases en español que usan "ser" (soy, eres, es, somos, son) o que usan "estar" (estoy, estás, está, estamos, están).

1. 

2. 

3. 

En inglés hay tres formas del verbo "BE":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is.</td>
<td>El es.</td>
<td>El está.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is.</td>
<td>Ella es.</td>
<td>Ella está.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is.</td>
<td>Eso es.</td>
<td>Eso está.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are.</td>
<td>Nosotros somos.</td>
<td>Nosotros estamos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are.</td>
<td>Tu eres/Ud. es/Uds. son</td>
<td>Tu estás/Ud. está/Uds. están</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are.</td>
<td>Ellos/Ellas son.</td>
<td>Ellos/Ellas están.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My Work Place

I work at a bulk mailing company. The name of the company is Rees Associates. It is a big company. My work place is divided into many areas. There are three big buildings in the company—the Main Building, the Annex, and the Bell Warehouse. All buildings have a production floor, a lunch room, several offices, and a parking lot.

Many people work with me in this company. Rees employs 300 people every day. Some people work in the Main Building, and some others work in the Annex. Not very many people work in the Bell Warehouse. I have many friends in my work place. We like working at Rees because there is a lot of work to do.

Names of places:

main building

annex

warehouse

production floor

workshop

machine shop

lunch room

office

production office

reception area

computer room

dock

parts room

glue room

parking lot

employee entrance

vending machines

scale

post office

meeting room

aisle
How many places can you identify on this map of the Main Building?
Label the places.
How many places can you identify on this map of the Annex?
Label the places.
Write questions that correspond to the following answers:
Escriba las preguntas que corresponden a las siguientes preguntas:

1. **Who is she?**
   - She is an operator.

2. __________
   - It is an inserter machine.

3. __________
   - They are in the warehouse.

4. __________
   - He is Jaunito.

5. __________
   - It is an envelope (un sobre).

6. __________
   - They are bins (canastas).

**NOTA:** Todas oraciones en inglés se necesitan sujetos.

A. **He is a good worker.**

B. **Is a good worker.**

¿Cuál de estas dos oraciones tiene sujeto?
1. Who are they? (workers) They are workers.

2. What is it? (a box)

3. Where are they? (in the meeting room)

4. Who is she? (Lolita)

5. Where is it? (in the lunchroom)

---

**Names of the Machines**

Multi-Inserter Machine

Jumbo Inserter Machine

Small Inserter Machine

Ga-Veren

Label-Aire

Eckta-Jet
### Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>team</th>
<th>bags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sort</td>
<td>inserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stacks</td>
<td>bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubber bands</td>
<td>pound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bundles</td>
<td>bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glue</td>
<td>coupons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper</td>
<td>catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins</td>
<td>trays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pennies</td>
<td>keep up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puts</td>
<td>boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labels</td>
<td>prints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td>addresses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you see in these pictures?
Oralia, Paula, Tania and Chang Vo work together in the production floor. They are a team. They are working in a multi inserter machine.

Oralia is an operator. She operates the machine, and right now she is sorting the stacks.

Paula is a tyer. She takes the stacks of finished material and ties them with rubber bands in small bundles. She puts the small bundles in big bags.

Tania is a loader. Her work is important. She loads the inserts in the machine and makes sure that the material is running okay. She needs to work the material and bend it, fan it, and pound it.

Chang Vo is a bagger. He takes the full bags of finished material and puts them in the bins. When the bins are full, he takes them to the warehouse.
This is the Ga-veren. The Ga-veren is a machine. It uses white glue to paste objects to the material. With the Ga-veren we can paste almost anything to the material—from paper to coins. Last week we were pasting pennies to coupons in the Ga-veren.

Ted and Manuel run the Ga-veren together. Ted is the operator and Manuel is the catcher. Ted needs to load the machine with material and make sure that the machine is running okay. Manuel needs to catch the finished material and put it in boxes or trays. The machine runs very fast. Manuel needs to move faster than the machine to keep up with it.
My name is Suzy. I am from the United States. I am an operator. I work first shift. I operate a Label-Aire. The Label-Aire is a machine that puts labels on material. When all the material has labels, I put it in boxes and send it to the warehouse.

This is Lisa. She works in the production floor. She operates the Eckta-Jet. The Eckta-Jet is a machine that prints addresses on material. Lista puts the material in boxes when it is printed and ready to go to the inserter machines.
**VERBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Present</th>
<th>Present Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

En español, ¿cuántas formas tiene un verbo en el tiempo "presente simple"?
Tiene _____ formas. 

En inglés, hay solamente 2 formas de un verbo en tiempo "presente simple".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I work.</th>
<th>He works.</th>
<th>She works.</th>
<th>It works.</th>
<th>We work.</th>
<th>You work.</th>
<th>They work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work.</td>
<td>He works.</td>
<td>She works.</td>
<td>It works.</td>
<td>We work.</td>
<td>You work.</td>
<td>They work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cuáles son las dos formas del tiempo "presente simple" en inglés?

---

El tiempo "presente continuo" es parecido en los dos idiomas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am working.</th>
<th>Yo estoy trabajando.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is working.</td>
<td>El está trabajando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is working.</td>
<td>Ella está trabajando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is working.</td>
<td>Eso está trabajando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are working.</td>
<td>Nosotros estamos trabajando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are working.</td>
<td>Tú estás trabajando/Ud. está trabajando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are working.</td>
<td>Ellos/Ellas están trabajando.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿En qué se parecen el tiempo presente continuo en inglés y tiempo presente continuo en español?
Identify the verb form in the following sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Simple Present</th>
<th>Present Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lolita is writing a letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marco lives on 14th Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maria's children are going to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sonia is having a baby.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Blanca speaks English and Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ann and Thomas have two daughters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write three sentences using "simple present".

1. 

2. 

3. 

Write three sentences using "present continuous".

1. 

2. 

3. 

[Images of a spoon, dumbbell, and bicycle]
Hacer

"Do" y "Does" son palabras importantes.

"Do" y "Does" tienen dos significados.

1) Significan "hacer"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do</th>
<th>Yo hago.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He does</td>
<td>El hace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She does</td>
<td>Ella hace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does</td>
<td>Eso hace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do</td>
<td>Nosotros hacemos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do</td>
<td>Tu haces/Ud. hace/ Uds. hacen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do</td>
<td>Ellos/Ellas hacen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nota: En algunas situaciones, "hacer" se traduzca como make y makes.

2) Funcionan como "auxiliar" o ayuda los verbos en preguntas
(y no se traduzca al español)

Como se indica en el cuadro arriba:

- do se usa con I, we, you, y they.
- does se usa con he, she, e it.

¿Trabaja Thomas hoy? = Does Thomas work today?
El verbo en esta pregunta es "work".

¿Dónde trabaja tu esposo(a)? = Where does your husband (wife) work?
El verbo en esta pregunta es "work".

¿Qué comes para el almuerzo? = What do you eat for lunch?
El verbo en esta pregunta es "eat".

¿Qué arregla ella? = What does she fix?
¿Cuál es el verbo en esta pregunta? _______________________

Telephone conversation:
Begin each question with do or does.
Janet: "I'm going to Mexico City. ______ your mother live there?
Anita: "Yes. She lives with my brother. ______ you want their address?
Janet: "Yes, thanks. ______ they speak English?
Anita: "No. ______ your husband speak Spanish?"
Conversations between Employees

Fabiola: Hello. How are you today?

Heather: I'm fine. How are you?

Fabiola: Okay. Where do you work today?

Heather: I am doing handwork today? What are you doing today?

Fabiola: I am doing handwork, too.
More Conversations between Employees

With another student in the class and/or with the help of your teacher, write more conversations between employees.
More Positions in my Work Place

fork lift driver

cardboard bailer

janitor

stocker

postal inspector

Vocabulary

fork-lift

metal wires

out-going mail

tie

trailers

throw away

cardboard

empty

compactor

break

bails

jack-mule

construction worker

cleans

buildings

builds

storage room
This is a photo of Jorge. Jorge is the fork-lift driver. In this photo, he is at the west dock. He is taking the outgoing mail to the trailers.

This is a photo of Guadalupe. He is a janitor and a construction worker in the company. He works a lot. He does many things. He cleans the buildings and builds rooms and walls. In the photo, he is building a storage room in the warehouse. Erazmo is helping him build the storage room.
Pedro is a very nice person. He is always smiling. He operates the cardboard compactor and makes big bails of cardboard. He uses metal wires to tie the bails. In the photo, he is taking the pieces of cardboard out of the bin and putting them inside the cardboard compactor.

The cardboard comes from all the boxes that the loaders throw away on the production floor. The loaders put the empty boxes in bins. Then, the baggers break them and take them to the warehouse where Pedro works. Pedro moves the bins close to the cardboard compactor. He uses a jack-mule to move the bins.
Terry is an inspector from the post office. He does not work for Rees Associates. He doesn't work for Western either. He works for the United States Postal Service. His office is inside the company, but it is part of the post office. Terry checks all of our work, and if there are any mistakes, he rejects it. And we have to do it again. Terry knows a lot about postal regulations—like zip codes, addressing, and carrier routes.

Are there words above that you don't know?
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Notes about Health Problems and Injuries
Employee: I have a doctor's appointment tomorrow morning. Can I come to work for a half day?

Supervisor: What time is your appointment?

Employee: It is at nine o'clock.

Supervisor: Please come to work by noon.

With another student in the class and/or with the help of your teacher, write more conversations between employee and supervisor.
Una manera de formar una oración negativa es añadir "NOT" a a la oración.

Examples:
1) Anita is not an operator.
2) Thomas and Marco are not working today.
3) Anita does not work at Rees Associates.
4) Paula and Lolita are not in the luchroom.
5) Thomas and Marco do not work third shift.
6) Anita does not load the machine correctly.

¿Cuáles de estas oraciones usan "BE" + Not? __1__, __2__, y __3__.

¿Cuáles de estas oraciones usan Do o Does + Not? __4__, __5__, y __6__.

En inglés se usan "Contractions" para decir cosas en una manera más corta.

| I am = I'm | Do + not = Don't |
| He is = He's | Does + not = Doesn't |
| She is = She's |
| It is = It's |
| We are = We're |
| You are = You're |
| They are = They're |
| Is + not = Isn't |
| Are + not = Aren't |

Rewrite the six sentences above using "contractions."

1. Anita isn't an operator. O She's not an operator.

2. __________________________

3. __________________________

4. __________________________

5. __________________________

6. __________________________
TO HAVE = TENER

Escriba 3 frases en español que usan el verbo "tener" (tengo, tienes, tiene, tenemos, o tienen).

1. ____________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________

En inglés hay dos formas del verbo "tener":

have    has

has se usa con he, she, e it.
have se usa con I, we, you y they.

Complete the sentences with have or has.

1. My son _______ an earache.

2. My daughter is sick too. He _______ the flu.

3. My husband says, "I think I'm getting sick. I _______ a sore throat."

4. We sure _______ a lot of problems this week.

Complete the sentences with don't have or doesn't have.

Carol is talking to her friend Elita.

1. "We _______ any aspirin. Can I get some from you?"

2. "Fred feels sick, but he _______ a fever."

3. "At least my son _______ an earache like my daughter."

4. "I feel fine." I _______ any problems with my health."
CAN = PODER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>She</th>
<th>It</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>They</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Can't</td>
<td>bag the material.</td>
<td>study English</td>
<td>work second shift.</td>
<td>speak Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cuál es la diferencia en significado entre can y can't?

Examples:

When can you fix the leak?              We can fit it tomorrow.
Can you work nights?                   I can't work nights this week.

Answer the following questions with "Yes, I can." or "No, I can't."

1. Can you operate a fork-lift?  
2. Can you work next Saturday?  
3. Can you do hand work?        
4. Can you drive a car?         
5. Can you take me to the doctor today?  

What more can you do?  
\textit{I can learn English.}  
What more can't you do?  
\textit{I can't speak Chinese.}
More Conversations

Between Employees:

Loader: Can you please ask for some more material?

Stocker: Yes, I can.

Loader: Thank you.

Between Employees:

Operator: Can you please fill the water jug?

Loader: Yes, I can.

Operator: Thank you.

Between Supervisor and Employee:

Supervisor: Can you paint this wall?

Janitor: Yes. What color?

Between Supervisor and Employee:

Supervisor: Can you work overtime?

Employee: Yes, I can.

Between Operator and Mechanic:

Operator: Can you please fix this machine?

Mechanic: Yes. What is wrong?

Operator: It is jamming.
What do you see in this picture?

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

(Vocabulary list on page 33.)
If a safety rule is broken, a supervisor says the following:

A. Clean and dry the floor.

B. Stack full boxes.

C. Throw away trash. (Put trash in the trash can.)

D. Clear the walkway (Clear the aisles.)

E. No food or drink on the production floor.

F. Report burned-out light bulbs.
   Report burned-out fluorescent lamps.

G. Put tools in their place.

H. Always have materials available.

Always = Siempre  Never = Nunca

Always tie long hair back.

Never wear loose jewelry.
Do and Don’t

Which is correct? Circle the correct sentence.

1. Do block the aisles. 
   Don't block the aisles.

2. Do run in the production floor. 
   Don't run in the production floor.

4. Do wear a name tag. 
   Don't wear a name tag.

5. Do tie long hair back. 
   Don't tie long hair back.

6. Do wear loose jewelry. 
   Don't wear loose jewelry.

7. Do walk on pallets. 
   Don't walk on pallets.

8. Do know where the fire extinguisher is. 
   Don't know where the fire extinguisher is.

9. Do know how to turn off the machine. 
   Don't know how to turn off the machine.
Safety Rules Vocabulary

available = disponible
block = bloquear
clear = desalojar
drink = bebida
fire extinguisher = extinguidor de incendios
floor = piso
fluorescent lamps = lámparas florescentes
full = lleno
jewelry = joyas (collares, pulseras, etc.)
light bulbs = focos
loose = suelto
name tags = gafete de nombre
report = reportar
stack = estaquear
tools = herramientas
trash = basura
trash can = bote de basura
turn-off = apagar
turn-on = prender
walkway = camino
wear = vestir, llevar

Notes about Safety
Notes about Machine Parts
Notes about Machine Parts
b. If ONE OF THE HOPPERS IS EMPTY, re-load the hopper with care.

Do the following:

1) PICK UP AND FAN (B) the required materials.

2) Be sure the materials are properly positioned.
   a) The envelope should have the flap up and toward the back of the hopper.
   b) The inserts should have folds in the proper position.

3) Neatly stack the INSERTS (C) in the proper INSERT HOPPER (D) if the hopper is empty.

4) Neatly stack the ENVELOPES (E) in the ENVELOPE HOPPER (F) if the hopper is empty.
c. If the RESET LIGHT (A) is on and:

1) An INSERT STATION LIGHT (D) is on, one of the following things may have occurred:
   a) Double inserts were pulled. (Check separator screw and insert station adjustments.)
   b) No insert was pulled. (Check to see if the hopper is low, or whether the insert station is adjusted, or whether the sucker cup is operating.)

2) The TURNOVER LIGHT (C) is on, one of the following things may have occurred:
   a) There is a jam at the TURNOVER (C).
   b) There is a jam on the TAKEAWAY RACEWAY (E).
   c) There is a jam at the POSTAGE METER (F), causing a jam on the takeaway raceway.
d. If only the reset light is on:
   1) The ENVELOPE STACKER A (if used) is not stacking properly.
   2) The INSERTION JAM DETECTOR B has been tripped because the inserts are not being put into envelopes properly.
   3) The envelope detector has been tripped because the ENVELOPE HOPPER C did not feed or the FLAP OPENER KNIFE D did not open the envelope.

e. Clear the jam and make adjustments.

f. Press the RESET PUSHBUTTON E.

g. Restart the machine. If the machine will not run, call your supervisor.
h. If the address piece hopper is empty and there are no additional address pieces to load, the JOB IS COMPLETED.

NOTE:
If the address piece is an INSERT, the INSERT HOPPER furthest from the INSERTION AREA is the address piece hopper. If the address piece is an ENVELOPE, the ENVELOPE HOPPER is the address piece hopper.

SHUTDOWN THE MACHINE by doing the following:
1) Turn off the POWER SWITCH.
2) Empty the remaining hoppers of all extra materials.
3) Put away the extra materials.
4) Report to your supervisor for further instructions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACHINE</th>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Downtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Downtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SORTATION</th>
<th>Postal Tier</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Downtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Downtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPERVISOR: If above accurately describes problem, check YES / / If not, give reason

MECHANIC COMMENTS, if needed
# Point Check

**Main**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPER.</th>
<th>SHIFT</th>
<th>MACH. NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>JOB NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME OF FIRST POINT CHECK</th>
<th>TIME OF SECOND POINT CHECK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECKED BY:</td>
<td>CHECKED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POCKET</th>
<th>STOPS FOR MISS</th>
<th>STOPS FOR DOUBLES</th>
<th>FIXED BY</th>
<th>POCKET</th>
<th>STOPS FOR MISS</th>
<th>STOPS FOR DOUBLES</th>
<th>FIXED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE RETURN TO ** AT THE END OF EACH SHIFT! THANKS !!
Conversations between Workers and Mechanics

With another student in the class and/or with the help of your teacher, write a conversation between a worker and a mechanic.
### Letters of the Alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>sixth</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>seventh</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>eighth</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>nine</td>
<td>ninth</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>tenth</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>eleven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>twelve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>thirteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>sixteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>seventeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>eighteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>nineteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>twenty</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>thirty</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>fourty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>fifty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>sixty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>seventy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>eighty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Lesson for Final Program Design

Match the left column in English with the correct right column in Spanish.

1. I cut my finger.  
   I need a bandage.       A. Mi hijo/a está enfermo/a.

2. I have a headache.  
   I need some aspirin.    B. Me duele la espalda.  
                           No puedo levantar cajas.

3. My back hurts.     
   I can not lift boxes.  C. Tengo una cita con el doctor mañana.

4. I have a doctor's appointment tomorrow.    D. Me corté el dedo.  
                                                   Necesito una curita.

5. My son/daughter is sick today.   E. Me duele la cabeza.  
                                         Necesito unas aspirinas.

   I can not walk.       F. Me duele la rodilla.  
                           No puedo caminar.

Frases útiles:
• My ________ hurt(s). = Me duele ________.
• My ________ ache(s). = Me duele ________.

Las palabras hurt y ache quiere decir doler (como verbo)  
y cuando el sujeto es singular se añade “s” al final.

Plural                  Singular
My knees hurt.          My back hurts.
My arms ache.           My shoulder aches.

I have a earache/headache/backache/toothache. =

Me duele el oído/la cabeza/la espalda/el diente.
Congratulations on the successful completion of the Rees Associates English Language Training Program presented by Rees Associates Management and Janese and Miguel Cerón.

Company President
Human Resource Manager
English Instructors

December 23, 1996

English Program Certificate
Pedagogical Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Unit/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>People and Places at Rees Associates</strong> Students will use the expressions on page 1 to identify the names, positions, and shifts of the students in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Students will use question construction (taught on pages 8 and 9) to identify locations on work place maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>Students will read the passages and understand their content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>Students will identify subjects and verbs in the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students will write and role play conversations using the language learned thus far in the program. (Questions, simple present, present continuous, do/does and vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>Students will read the passages and understand their content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>Students will identify verb tense (simple present and present continuous) in the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Students will take notes about language relating to health problems and injuries from overhead transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Students will write and role play conversations using the language relating to health problems and injuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Students will memorize and role play these short conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>Safety Rules at Rees Associates</strong> Students will work in small groups to describe the picture based on existing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td><strong>Machines at Rees Associates</strong> Students will take notes about language relating to machine parts as presented on the production floor by a mechanic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-41</td>
<td>Students will work in small groups and use their machine parts notes to identify vocabulary in the authentic texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Students will write and role play conversations using language relating to machine parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-49</td>
<td><strong>Putting it all Together</strong> Students will write passages describing the photographs or conversations relating to the photographs based on all language covered in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first question in each set (designated A) is the subjective question; the second question (designated B) is the objective one.

Category 1: Audience

1A. Who are the learners?

1. Age: wide range of ages from early 20s to middle 40s (Specific ages were not asked.)
2. Sex: 10 male and 10 female
3. Nationalities: 20 from Mexican and one from El Salvador
4. Immigrant Status: unknown (Immigration status was not asked.)
5. Native language: Spanish
6. Level and type of general education: Six had primary school education, nine had junior high school level education, five had completed high school, and one had some college education. Only three had studied English at another location--with a community action group who provides free adult ESL classes--after their arrival to the United States.
7. Additional Experience: Amount of time in the United States ranged from three months to 12 years with an average of two and a half years. The following table shows the distribution of time in the United States.

1B. Who are the materials intended for?

The materials were designed for these particular students.
Category 2: Aims
2A. What are the aims of your course?
The aims of this course are to provide program participants with basic English language competencies needed to properly carry out their duties as Rees Associates employees which include interacting with English speaking peers in the work place and dealing with everyday problems which arise in the work place.
2B. What are the aims of the materials?
The aims of the materials are to supply students with the basic building blocks of the English language from which they can interpret and build meaningful utterances in the context of their work place.

Category 3: Content
3A. What types of language description do you require? Should it be structural, notional, functional, discourse-based, some other kind, a combination of one or more of these?
A combination of language descriptions should be used. Due to the fact the students' educational backgrounds are not strong--very few have studied English prior to participating in this program, the majority do not possess highly developed learning/study skills. Presenting the same linguistic description in a variety of ways will increase student understanding.
3B. What types of linguistic descriptions is/are used in the materials?
Most linguistic descriptions are presented in Spanish before being presented in English in order that the students start thinking about the structure as it exists in their own language. Differences and similarities between the two language are identified by the students which provides
for a confidence building warm-up exercise. While both functional and notional descriptions are provided within the packet, structural linguistic descriptions can be provided with supplemental activities. Another factor related to the presentation of linguistic descriptions is that formulaic expression are provided in the materials for students to practice.

4A. What *language points* should be covered?
Those considered relevant for adult ESL students of this level.

4B. What *language points* do the materials cover?
The materials include the same basic English language structures as many other adult ESL books for both general and for specific purposes.

5A. What proportion of work on each macro-skill is desired? Should there be skills integrated work?
The two most desired macro-skills are listening and speaking. Skills integrated work is also desirable for the same reason listed in answer 3A; presenting the same information in various manners will be of help to these students.

5B. What is the proportion of work on each skill? Is there skills-integrated work?
The material packet itself focuses on reading and writing; however, the exercises included can be converted to listening and speaking exercises for in-class activities. Supplemental activities are needed to achieve the desired level of skills integration.

6A. What micro-skills do you need?
Students need to practice metalinguistic skills which help them move from isolated words and phrases to producing and interpreting their own language. Using their native language as a resource for this practice would be an appropriate starting place.
6B. What micro-skills are covered in the material?
As described in answer 3B, most linguistic descriptions are presented in Spanish before being presented in English in order that the students start thinking about the structure as it exists in their own language. An additional note is found in the sequencing explanation in answer 11B.

7A. What text-types should be included?
While authentic texts would be most appropriate, most authentic text are too advanced for these students. Authentic materials should be revised for the students' English proficiency level.

7B. What kinds of texts are there in the material?
Most texts included in the materials are non-authentic texts which are written at the students' ability level--pages 11-13 of the course packet for example. Others, however, are non-revised authentic material texts--pages 36-39--and are difficult for some of these students.

8A. What subject matter area(s) is/are required? What level or knowledge should be assumed? What types of topics are needed? What treatment should the topics be given?
See topics/tasks syllabus in Chapter Three. Furthermore, it should be assumed that all students are very familiar with their work as Rees Associates employees. Topics should be treated with some amount of humor in order to make a division between actual work which goes on daily and work related English learning which is separate from the routine. In other words, the materials should aid in creating a friendly learning environment.
8B. What is/are the subject-matter area(s), assumed level of knowledge, and types of topics in the materials? What treatment are the topics given? The subject matters are the same as indicated in the topics/tasks syllabus. All employees who participated in the program are current Rees Associated employees and are familiar with their work at the company. Also, some humor is added to the materials packet through illustrations.

9A. How should the content be organized throughout the course? The content should be organized by work related topics and tasks.

9B. How is the content organized throughout the materials? It is organized by topic and topic related tasks. The first three topics are combined in order to provide more contextual support for the linguistic descriptions; linguistic descriptions are clustered within the first unit. The last two topics provide a context for review of the linguistic features.

10A. How should the content be organized within the course units? Extensive and varying practice—in all macro-skills—should be provided after each new piece of linguistic information. Each unit should contain warm-up and closing activities.

10B. How is the content organized? The first unit is larger than the others three because it contains the majority of linguistic descriptions. Also, the first unit includes some speaking activities. This factor may cause the material and course to seem unbalanced. While plenty of reading and writing practice is provided throughout the materials packet, equal amounts of each macro-skill is not provided for all language aspects presented. However, many exercises within the packet can be converted into speaking activities for further practice.
11A. How should the content be *sequenced throughout the course*? The content should be sequenced from guided to free. Basic English language structures given explicitly at first and then given implicitly with less-guided practice later.

11B. How should the content be sequenced throughout the book? The first unit of the materials packet contains a sufficient amount of guided practice. The second unit attempts to depart from over supplying information. For example, almost all vocabulary in the first unit is provided for the student before he or she attempts to do any reading or writing; vocabulary in the second unit is provided on the last page of the unit. Students are encouraged to read and write while using the vocabulary only as a reference.

12A. How should the content be *sequenced within a unit*? Units should be well structured in order to aid these students who do not possess highly developed learning/study skills.

12B. How is the content sequenced within a unit? While there are three clear units in the materials packet, the content within the units is structured differently from unit to unit. The first unit perhaps should have been divided further into two or three separate units in order to provide more structured organization.

Category 4: Methodology

13A. What *theory/ies of language learning* should the course be based on? Should it be behaviorist, cognitive, affective, some other kind, a combination of one or more of these?

A cognitive approach which draws on the language knowledge the learners bring to the class should be used. Also, implicit language
instruction should be preceded by ample amount of explicit language instruction. An inductive approach might be frustrating for these adult learners; a deductive approach might speed up the learning process.

13B. What theory/ies of language learning are the materials based on? The same theories underlie these materials. Some students in the class were still asking for repetition of set phrases at the end of the course which may indicate that some type of behaviorist approach may have been helpful for them.

14A. What aspects of the learners' attitudes to exceptions about learning English should the course take into account? While this question was not directly asked of the students, the fact that they continually attempted to memorize phrases without breaking them into the basic components demonstrated that they may hold a behaviorist attitude toward language learning.

14B. What attitudes to/expectations about learning English are the materials based on? While their possible attitude is addressed by the fact that the materials include set phrases for them to memorize, the main feature of these materials is that they address the basic components of these phrases.

15A. What kinds of exercises/tasks are needed? A variety of exercises/tasks are needed. The expected responses for the exercises/tasks should range from discrete point to open-ended. All macro-skills should be practiced and used.

15B. What kinds of exercises/tasks are included in the materials? A variety of reading and writing exercises/tasks are included ranging from discrete point to open-ended. Speaking and listening exercises which emphasize use are not explicitly included in the materials packet.
16A. What teaching-learning techniques are to be used?  
A variety of techniques are needed, including individual and pair work.  

16B. What teaching-learning techniques can be used with the materials?  
Most exercises included in the materials packet are intended to be done individually, but they can be converted into pair work.  

17A. What aids are available for use?  
An overhead projector and tape player are available.  

17B. What aids do the materials require?  
The same as above are required.  

18A. What guidance/support for teaching the course will be needed?  
The use of this materials packet requires several supplemental activities and instructions for converting the exercises into speaking activities and/or pair work. While much of the vocabulary needed is included in the materials packet, knowledge of other work procedures, such as postal regulations, is needed.  

18B. What guidance do the materials provide?  
No guidance on such aspects of using this materials packet are currently included. More guidance would need to be provided to any future user of these materials.  

19A. How flexible do the materials need to be?  
As the program classes only meet once a week, the materials should be set-up with flexible stopping and starting points so that as much material can be covered each class meeting.  

19B. In what ways are the materials flexible?  
The first unit is large enough that it is very flexible; however, the second and third units should be completed each within its own class meeting.
Category 5: Other criteria

20A. What price range is necessary?
The price range was quoted to be between $2.00 and $3.00 per student packet which includes copies, cover, and binding.

20B. What is the price?
The actual price was $2.30 per packet.

21A. When and in what quantities should the materials be available?
Each student should receive his or her own materials packet.

21B. When and how readily can the materials be obtained?
The management supplied funds to make as many student materials packets as necessary.
APPENDIX IV
LISTENING TEST
Listening Test--Tapescript included
Duration approx. 7 minutes
16 items in two categories
   8 speech acts by workers
   8 speech acts by supervisor

Instructions (given orally in Spanish): This is a test of your ability to understand short sentences and questions spoken in English which are typical of what you hear during your work at Rees Associates. There are sixteen phrases on the listening tape. Each phrase is preceded by a short explanation in Spanish. After the explanation, you will hear a sentence or question spoken in English. It will be repeated twice. There will be a pause after each sentence or question. During this pause, select the correct response on your answer sheet.

Let's look at an example.
First you will hear a short explanation--
You hear a Mexican employee speaking with a supervisor. The employee says to the supervisor: "Please speak slower."
"Please speak slower."

You read on your answer sheet the following--
The employee is saying:
a) I don't speak English.
b) Please speak slower.
c) I speak Spanish.
d) Please speak with the operator.

NOTE: Students will be given 8 minutes to read the answer sheet before the tape is played.
Listening Test Instructions:


Después de haber escuchado las situaciones en español, escucharás una frase o pregunta en inglés. Esta frase será repetida 2 veces. Habrá una pausa entre cada frase. Durante la pausa tendrás que elegir la respuesta correcta en tu hoja de respuestas. Al decidir cual es la respuesta, todo lo que tienes que hacer es encerrar en un círculo el inciso que escojas.

Por ejemplo:
Escuchas que un empleado hispano está hablando con el supervisor.
El empleado le dice al supervisor.

"Please speak slower."

En tu hoja de respuestas tienes:

El empleado está diciendo:

a) Yo no hablo inglés.
b) Por favor, habla más despacio.
c) Hablo español.
d) Por favor habla con el operador.
1. Te cortaste el dedo con un sobre. Cuando el supervisor se da cuenta, te dice:
   "Do you want a band aid?"
2. Un supervisor te dice:
   "Can you work Saturday?"
3. Eres el operador de una máquina, y otro empleado te dice:
   "Turn on the yellow light."
4. Estás trabajando como el operador de una máquina. Tu cargador está atrasado y la máquina queda sin papeles. Le dices:
   "You need to keep up with the machine."
5. Estás trabajando y oyes al supervisor decir:
   "Don't run in the production floor."
6. Hablas por teléfono para decirle al supervisor que vas a llegar tarde. El supervisor te pregunta:
   "What time will you be here?"
7. Eres el cargador de una máquina, y el material está defectuoso. La máquina está teniendo problemas con él. El operador te dice:
   "You need to work the material."
8. Estás trabajando in el piso de producción. Otro empleado te dice:
   "Please go get more glue."
9. Le dijiste al supervisor que tienes una cita con el doctor mañana. El supervisor te dice:
   "What time is your appointment?"
10. Estás trabajando in el piso de producción y le escuchas decirle al estaqueador:
    "We need more material."
11. Estás trabajando en una máquina con otras dos personas, y lo estás haciendo muy bien. Otro trabajador del equipo te dice:
    "You are doing a good job."
12. Estás trabajando como bolsero en la planta. El supervisor te dice:
    "Don't block the aisles."
13. Eres el operador de una máquina y otro empleado te dice:
    "Turn off the red light."
14. Estás trabajando y le escuchas decir uno de tus compañeros a un tercero.
    "You need to work harder."
15. El supervisor te dice:
    "Can you work second shift?"
16. Durante tu trabajo, le escuchas decir al supervisor:
    "Don't walk on the pallets."
Para cada uno de los siguientes escoge la respuesta correcta según lo que oyes en la cinta:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. El supervisor quiere saber... | A. cómo te cortaste el dedo.  
  B. si quieres una curita.  
  C. con qué te cortaste el dedo.  
  D. si quieres dejar de trabajar. |
| 2. El supervisor quiere saber... | A. qué piensas hacer el sábado.  
  B. quién va a trabajar el sábado.  
  C. si puedes trabajar el sábado.  
  D. si sabes que trabajas el sábado. |
| 3. El otro empleado quiere... | A. que prendas la luz amarilla.  
  B. saber si te divertiste anoche.  
  C. saber si trabajaste anoche.  
  D. que apagues la luz roja. |
| 4. El operador está diciendo que | A. el cargador necesita venir temprano mañana.  
  B. le gusta la camisa del cargador.  
  C. el cargador tiene que mantenerse al ritmo de la máquina  
  D. necesita ir al baño. |
| 5. El supervisor está diciendo que... | A. trabajas en el piso de producción.  
  B. no corren en el piso de producción.  
  C. corren hacia la salida.  
  D. trabajan mucho durante la noche |
| 6. El supervisor quiere saber... | A. por qué vas a llegar tarde.  
  B. a qué hora vas a llegar al trabajo.  
  C. si vas a llegar tarde mañana  
  D. si llegaste tarde ayer. |
| 7. La operadora está diciendo que... | A. necesitas más material.  
  B. tienes que trabajar más rápido.  
  C. tienes que trabajar el material.  
  D. necesitas cargar más material |
| 8. El otro empleado quiere... | A. que vayas a buscar más pegamento  
  B. saber dónde hay más pegamento  
  C. una camisa azul  
  D. saber si hay más material azul. |
9. El supervisor está preguntando...
   A. a qué hora vienes al trabajo
   B. a qué hora es tu cita
   C. si necesitas que alguien te viene a buscar
   D. si necesitas hacer una

10. La empleada dice al estaqueador que...
    A. necesitamos más
    B. tenemos que trabajar más rápido.
    C. tenemos que trabajar el material.
    D. Necesita cargar más material.

11. El trabajador te dice que...
    A. es bueno que tengas empleo.
    B. lo estás haciendo muy bien.
    C. es bueno que vengas a trabajar
    D. tienes que trabajar mejor.

12. El supervisor quiere que...
    A. el bolsero no bloquee los pasillos.
    B. los pasillos no estén bloqueados
    C. el bolsero trapee el piso
    D. el bolsero no trapee el piso.

13. El empleado quiere que...
    A. apagues la luz roja
    B. te descanses esta noche
    C. lleves una camisa roja
    D. prendas la luz roja.

14. Tu compañero dice al tercero que...
    A. necesita trabajar mañana.
    B. mañana hay un partido de futbol
    C. tiene que trabajar en otra máquina
    D. tiene que trabajar más duro.

15. El supervisor quiere saber...
    A. en qué turno trabajas.
    B. en qué turno trabaja tu pariente.
    C. si puedes trabajar el segundo turno.
    D. si trabajas el segundo

16. El supervisor está diciendo...
    A. que no caminen en las paletas
    B. que no caminen tan despacio
    C. que caminar es buen ejercicio
    D. que va a comer una paleta.
APPENDIX V
SPEAKING TEST
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART ONE: (given orally in Spanish)
For the first part of this test, I am going to briefly explain five situations in which you, as a Rees Associates employee, are going to have to say something to an American employee or an American supervisor. I, as the instructor, will say a situation, and you, as the student, will have to say a sentence/phrase that corresponds to the given situation. For example, I say "The supervisor is talking to you and you don’t understand very well. You think that if he would speak slower that you would be able to understand. How would you ask him to speak slower?" And you respond, "Speak slower, please."

TWO FROM THESE FOUR:

You are working with other employees on the production floor and you want to congratulate an American employee because he is working well. What would you say to the other employee?

You are working with other employees on the production floor and you want to tell an American employee to work harder. What would you say to the other employee?

You are working as an operator on the production floor and you want to the American loader that he needs to work the material. What would you say to the other employee?

You are working as an operator on the production floor and you want to the American loader that he needs to keep up with the machine. What would you say to the other employee?
ONE FROM THESE FOUR:

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to turn off the yellow light. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to turn on the red light. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to turn on the yellow light. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to turn off the red light. What would you say to the employee?

ONE FROM THESE FOUR:

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to go get more glue. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to go get more material. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to go get more water. What would you say to the employee?

You are working on a team in the production floor and you want to ask an American employee to go get more addressing. What would you say to the employee?
ONE FROM THESE FIVE:

You cut your finger with an envelope and you want to request that the supervisor bring you a bandage. What would you say to the supervisor?

You have a headache and need to ask the supervisor for some aspirin. What would you say to the supervisor?

You hurt your back. You want to tell the supervisor that you hurt you back so you are unable to lift boxes. What would you say to the supervisor?

You have a doctor appointment. You need to call the supervisor and tell him that you are going to be late. When the supervisor answers the telephone, What would you say?

You have to take a relative to the doctor tomorrow, so you need to leave work early. How would you explain this to the supervisor?

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART TWO: (given orally in Spanish)

All employees know that there are safety rules in the plant. When you see an American employee break one of the safety rules, it is better that you advise him so that he doesn't get into problems with the management of the company. In the second part of this test, I am going to tell you what an American employee is doing. And you have to tell me what you would say in these cases.

There are two.

TWO FROM THESE FIVE:
1. He is walking on a pallet.
2. He is running in the production floor.
3. He is blocking the aisles.
4. His (long) hair is down (loose).
5. He is wearing loose jewelry and clothing.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART THREE:
It is inevitable that employees of Rees have to ask the mechanics to repair the machines. I am going to tell you what is wrong with a machine. And you have to tell me what you would say to the mechanic in these cases. There are three.

THREE FROM THESE FIVE:

1. The machine is taking two papers instead of one.
2. The machine isn't even taking one paper.
3. The machine is jamming.
4. The water is leaking.
5. You need a little blue suction cup.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART ONE:
Para la primera parte de esta prueba, voy a explicar brevemente cinco situaciones en las que tú, como empleado de Rees Associates, vas a tener que decir algo a un empleado americano o a un supervisor americano en inglés. Yo, como instructor, diré una situación, y tú, como estudiante, tendrás que decir una frase que corresponde a la situación dada. Por ejemplo, yo digo "El supervisor te está diciendo algo y no entiendes muy bien lo que está diciendo. Piensas que si hablara más despacio podrías entender. ¿Cómo le pedirías que hable más despacio?" Y tú repondes "Speak slower please."

TWO FROM THESE FOUR:

Estás trabajando con otros empleados en el piso de producción y quieres felicitar a un empleado americano porque está trabajando bien. ¿Qué le dirías al otro empleado?

Estás trabajando con otros empleados en el piso de producción y quieres decir a un empleado americano que tiene que trabajar más duro. ¿Qué le dirías al otro empleado?

Estás trabajando como operador en el piso de producción y quieres decirle a un cargador americano que tiene que trabajar el material. ¿Qué le dirías al cargador?

Estás trabajando como operador en el piso de producción y quieres decirle a un cargador americano que tiene que mantenerse al ritmo de la máquina. ¿Qué le dirías al cargador?
**ONE FROM THESE FOUR:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One from these four:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedirle a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que apague la luz amarilla.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedirle a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que prenda la luz roja.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedirle a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que apague la luz roja.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE FROM THESE FOUR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedir a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que vaya a buscar más pegamento.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedir a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que vaya a buscar más material.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedir a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que busque más agua.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estás trabajando en equipo en el piso de producción y quieres pedir a un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empleado americano que vaya a buscar más direcciones.</td>
<td>¿Qué le dirías al otro empelado?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONE FROM THESE FIVE:

Te cortaste el dedo con un sobre y lo quieres reportar al supervisor. Y quieres pedir que el supervisor te traiga un curita. 
¿Qué le dirías al supervisor?

Te duele la cabeza y se lo tienes que decir al supervisor para poder pedir una aspirina.
¿Qué le dirías al supervisor?

Te lastimaste la espalda. Quieres decir al supervisor que no puedes levantar cajas porque te duele la espalda.
¿Qué le dirías al supervisor?

Tienes una cita con el doctor. Necesitas llamar por teléfono para decirle al supervisor que vas a llegar tarde. Cuando el supervisor conteste el teléfono, ¿Qué le dirías?

Tienes que llevar a un pariente tuyo al doctor mañana. Y por eso tienes que salir temprano del trabajo. ¿Cómo explicarías esto al supervisor?

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART TWO:
Todos los empleados saben que hay reglas de seguridad en la planta. Cuando ves a un empleado americano romper con una de las reglas es mejor que le avises para que no se meta en problemas con la gerencia de la planta. En la segunda parte de esta prueba Te voy a decir lo que está haciendo un empleado americano. Y tú tienes que decir lo que dirías en estos casos.

Hay dos.

1. Está caminando sobre una tarima (paleta).
2. Está corriendo en el piso de producción.
3. Está bloqueando los pasillos
4. Está suelto su cabello.
5. Lleva ropa o joyas colgando
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART THREE:

Es inevitable que los empleados de Rees tengan que pedir a los mecánicos que reparen las máquinas. Te voy a decir lo que una máquina tiene mal. Y tú tienes que decir lo que dirías al mecánico en estos casos. Hay tres.

1. La máquina está agarrando dos papeles en vez de uno.

2. La máquina no está agarrando ni un papel.

3. La máquina está atascada/atorada.

4. El agua se está tirando.

5. Necesitas una gomita azul (las chiquitas).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #4: Effective communication in the given context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct, appropriate vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation easily intelligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #3: Generally effective communication in the given context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct, appropriate vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation intelligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #2: Somewhat effective communication in the given context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure of response not apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some attempt at correct vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation not easily intelligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #1: No effective communication in the given context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No structure of response with regard to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No knowledge of correct vocabulary for the given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response for pronunciation rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part One: Team Player

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1.</th>
<th>Rating #4</th>
<th>Rating #3</th>
<th>Rating #2</th>
<th>Rating #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category 1: Imperatives (context: working on a team)
Category 2: "turn off" and "turn on"
Category 3: Requests (context: getting more supplies)
Category 4: Speaking to a Supervisor (context health related issues)

Part Two: Safety Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Rating #4</th>
<th>Rating #3</th>
<th>Rating #2</th>
<th>Rating #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Three: Talking to Mechanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Rating #4</th>
<th>Rating #3</th>
<th>Rating #2</th>
<th>Rating #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score: _____________ / 40
APPENDIX VI
TEST USEFULNESS EVALUATION
Questions for Logical Evaluation of Test Usefulness
as Outlined by Bachman and Palmer (1996)

Reliability

--) To what extent do the characteristics of the 1) test setting, 2) test rubric, 3) test input, 4) expected response, and 5) relationship between input and response vary in unmotivated ways from one part of the test to another, from one task to another, or on different forms of the test? Qualities satisfied for all five characteristics groups.
Explanation--For test setting there are no notable variations. For the other four characteristics all variations are motivated by function of the speech act and context in which the speech act occurs. In order to create different forms of the speaking test, items are selected from various situations within a category grouping. All items in the same part/category of the test are of equal difficulty level expect for category four of part one (speaking to the supervisor about health/injury related situations). Some situations in this category are naturally more difficult than others. After examining the TLU domain no more than two at an easy level, one at a medium level, and two at a difficult level could be established. To ensure different forms of the test, I wanted to include more than two situations at a particular level for each category and part; however, such situations could not be established for part four of part one.

Construct validity

6) Is the language ability construct clearly and unambiguously defined?
Yes.
Explanation--One exception is that the construct definitions include "work related situations" and "work related functions" without stated specifically that these are work related situations and functions at Rees Associates--a bulk mailing company. I feel that this is an understood implication of the test project itself. Furthermore, the construct definition was used to develop the scoring rubric.

7) Is the language ability construct for the test relevant to the purpose of the test? Quality completely satisfied.

Explanation--The speech acts included on the two tests are for work related situations and to accomplish work related functions and the purpose of the test is to assess how the test takers perform such tasks in order to make employment decisions.

8) To what extent do the test tasks reflect the construct definition? Quality satisfied.

Explanation--All test tasks are devised from speech acts in work related contexts.

9) To what extent do the scoring procedures reflect the construct definition? Quality completely satisfied.

Explanation--Scoring for the listening test is based on if the speech act was understood or not understood. Scoring for the speaking test is based on the effectiveness of the speech act (with consideration for the low proficiency level of the test takers).

10) Will the scores obtained from the test help us to make the desired interpretations about test takers' language ability? Quality satisfied.

Explanation--While it is not possible to predict and test every English language situation which a Rees Associate employee encounters during a
work day, our needs analysis was detailed and included the majority of these situations.

11) What characteristics of the test setting are likely to cause different test takers to perform differently? Very few.
Explanation--The listening test is administered to test takers as a group. As the speaking test is administered individually, time of day will vary slightly for each test taker. Furthermore, the order in which the test takers proceed will cause slight variations. For example, the test taker who go first and last may be a little more nervous than the others. While the speaking test items are random to ensure different forms of the test, it may be possible that the first test takers provide the last test takers with some hints about the content of the test.

12) What characteristics of the test rubric are likely to cause different test takers to perform differently? Very few.
Explanation--Most questions require the topical knowledge of appropriate responsibilities of team members and basic knowledge of how an inserter machine functions, some test takers who hold positions outside the team player setting may perform differently. Only two possible test takers of the 22 who filled out student data sheets fall into this category.

13) What characteristics of the test input, 14) expected response, and 15) relationship between input and expected response are likely to cause different test takers to perform differently? None.
Explanation--While test takers literacy level in their native language of Spanish is a concern here, as well as for the characteristics of the test rubric, I do not anticipate any program participant who is illiterate in Spanish obtaining an English ability level at which it is plausible to administer the test to him/her. While it is true that many possible test
takers have only a primary education level, I have seen little evidence of complete illiteracy.

*Authenticity*

16) To what extent does the description of tasks in the TLU domain include information about the setting, input, expected response, and relationship between input and response? Complete.

Explanation--Description of the TLU domain is presented on pages eight and nine of this project report.

17) To what extent do the characteristics of the test tasks correspond to those of the TLU tasks? Relatively high correspondence.

Explanation--Input from stakeholders in the test and language program (management, students, and program designers) was the main source for creation of actual test tasks. This input was very representative of the actual TLU domain as initially defined.

*Interactiveness*

18) To what extent do the tasks presuppose the appropriate area or level of topical knowledge, and to what extent can we expect test takers to have this area or level of topical knowledge? Very high extent.

Explanation--See explanations for question 12 and question 13 through 15 on pages 23 and 24 of this report.

19) To what extent are the personal characteristics of the test takers included in the design statement? Included in sufficient detail.

Explanation--A variety of personal characteristics were collected from possible test takers. (Personal characteristics are explained on pages 10 and 11 of this report.)
20) To what extent are the characteristics of the test tasks suitable for test takers with the specified personal characteristics? Relatively highly suitable.
Explanation--See explanations for question 12 and question 13 through 15 on pages 23 and 24 of this report.
21) Does the processing required in the test tasks involve a very narrow or a wide range or areas of language knowledge? Narrow.
Explanation--Understanding and producing short speech acts requires a narrow range of language skills when compared to extended interactive discourse especially when register is considered.
22) What language functions, other than the simple demonstration of language ability, are involved in processing the input and formulating a response? None.
Explanation--When the term "speech acts" is used to include commands, requests, questions and statements, all possible language functions are included in the construct definition of the language ability.
23) To what extent are the test tasks interdependent? Not interdependent.
Explanation--All test items are set in independent contexts/situations.
24) How much strategy involvement is provided? High in the area of topical knowledge. Low in other strategies.
Explanation--Comprehending short speech acts requires little ability to listen in a focused manner for identifying key words only. As there is no interactive discourse on the speaking test, discourse level strategies are not involved. One strategy which is involved in the speaking test is ability to use circumlocution when a specific vocabulary word is not known.
25) Is the test task likely to evoke an affective response that would make it relatively easy or difficult for the test takers to perform their best? Relatively easy. Explanation—Because the test tasks require a high use of topical knowledge, a positive affective response is highly probable. However, any test taking situation creates a varying affective response from each student according to their past experience with and opinions of language tests.

**Impact**

26) To what extent might the experience of taking the test or the feedback received affect characteristics of test takers that pertain to language use? Varies from considerably to very little. Explanation—Good test results might motivate participants to continue learning English either in the real-life setting of the company or in community sponsored classes outside the company. Frustration created from poor test results may limit or halt completely such a motivation. However, the first is probably a more likely situation.

27) What provisions are there for involving test takers directly, or for collecting and utilizing feedback from test takers in the design and development of the test? Considerable. Explanation—See step two on page five and step five on pages six and seven in part two (Defining and Describing of Tasks in the TLU Domain) of this report.

28) How relevant, complete and meaningful is the feedback provided to test takers? Not highly.
Explanation--Test takers will be provided with one score for each test which will be encouraging or discouraging scores. The two scores compared may indicate to the test takers in what area (listening or speaking) they are stronger or weaker. There may be a possibility to go over the listening test results; however, this will not be highly meaningful feedback for the test takers because it does not show them what specific areas they need to work on.

29) Are decision procedures and criteria applied uniformly to all groups of test takers? Yes.

Explanation--The same procedures and criteria are used for all test takers.

30) How relevant and appropriate are the test scores to the decisions to be made? Highly relevant and appropriate.

Explanation--All test tasks are developed from work related situations and the construct defined as speech acts is appropriate for both language ability level of the test takers and language ability level needed to perform necessary job tasks at Rees Associates.

31) Are the test takers fully informed about the procedures and criteria that will be used in making decisions? Somewhat.

Explanation--Test takers from the trial administration of the tests were fully informed about the testing procedures and scoring criteria. However, they have not been fully informed regarding the employment decisions which are related to the test results. This will take place closer to the actual exam date when an official set of test takers has been established.

32) Are the procedures and criteria actually followed in making the decisions? Yes for testing procedures and criteria for scoring. Unknown for decisions regarding the test purpose of employment decisions.
Explanation—As I am only involved in the testing and not in employment decisions, at this point I am not fully informed to answer this question accurately.

33) How consistent are the areas of language ability to be measured with those that are included in teaching materials? Very highly consistent.
Explanation—Test and teaching materials were designed simultaneously.

34) How consistent are the characteristics of the test and test tasks with the characteristics of teaching and learning activities? Highly consistent.
Explanation—All teaching and learning activities are based on the specific English needed to work at a bulk mailing company such as Rees Associates. While reading and writing activities are also included in the learning activities, the purpose these is to reinforce the speaking and listening activities.

35) How consistent is the purpose of the test with the values and goals of teachers and of the instruction program? Highly consistent.
Explanation—A global value and goal of the company is the promotion of a "team player" attitude. Due to the fact the main qualities of a "good team player" are strongly related to communication, the purpose of this test is consistent with this value and goal. Furthermore, a global goal of the instruction program is to promote future English learning. Test characteristics such as affective response of test takers are consistent with this goal.

36) Are the interpretations we make of the test scores consistent with the values and goals of society and the education system? Yes.
Explanation—see explanation for the previous question.
37) To what extent do the values and goals of the test developer coincide or conflict with those of society and the education system? Almost complete agreement.
Explanation--The only disagreement which can be seen is that I, as the test developer and language program designer, feel it is very important to include the health/injury unit on the test and in the language program because the test takers/program participants indicated they view this unit as important, and they are central stake holders in both. The management felt that the health/injury unit should not be included on the test. It was included on the test with the compromise that safety rules would also be included.

38) What are the potential consequences, both positive and negative, for society and the education system, of using the test in this particular way? None can be predicted at this point.

39) What is the most desirable positive consequence, or the best thing that could happen, as a result of using the test in this particular way, and how likely is this to happen?
Test takers demonstrate team player related communication skills via these tests and also possess the necessary work related qualities and, therefore, are hired or promoted. The possibility of this happening is dependent on overall company needs and position openings. Because most language program participants are enthusiastic, they are also those which possess the necessary work related qualities.

40) What is the least desirable, negative consequence, or the worst thing that could happen, as a result of using the test in this particular way, and how likely is this to happen?
Because Rees Associates management will be not be using the test for firing or demoting, no negative consequences can be defined at this point.

**Practicality**

41) What type and relative amounts of resources are required for a) the design stage, b) the operationalization stage, and c) the administration stage? 42) What resources will be available for carrying out a), b) and c) above?

At the design stage and operationalization stage, the main concerns were the resources of time availability for myself as test designer and cooperation on the part of Rees Associates management. A crucial element for carrying out these two stages was the time and effort of my husband—the former supervisor at the company mentioned in this thesis and an assistant instructor in the English Language Training Program, as well. Additionally, he played an essential role in opening up avenues for communication and cooperation on the part of Rees Associates management.

While few actual materials are needed for the listening test administration (listening tape and tape player are already available and photocopies of the multiple choice sheet are easily attainable), an important resource for the speaking test is time. If many program participants actually take the test, many hours will be need to administer the individual tests. Additional persons to administer the speaking test may be needed.

One additional note related to the above is that test authenticity was sacrificed slightly for practicality reasons. The most authentic test would have been to have employees on the production floor carrying out
various work related tasks. For example, one employee could train another employee. However, not only would this have been time consuming, it would have also been difficult to score.
APPENDIX VII
PROGRAM EVALUATION FORMS
### Student Program Evaluation (Translated from Spanish)

**INSTRUCTIONS**

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to evaluate the Rees Associates English Language Training Program. All feedback will be reported anonymously to the program coordinators/instructors. This questionnaire will provide information for improving the program. Therefore, you should try your best to answer the questions thoughtfully and to write informative comments.

For each of the below, indicate which rating best fits your judgment according to the following scale:

1. **Strongly Disagree**
2. **Disagree**
3. **Agree Slightly**
4. **Agree**
5. **Strongly Agree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Throughout the program the class met regularly, on time, and for the entire period.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teacher responded appropriately to students' questions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The teacher clearly explained the purpose and what you were to do for each class activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teacher presented material to the class in a clear and helpful way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Class discussions and activities helped you improve your English language ability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The teacher appeared to enjoy teaching the English language.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You were glad you had this teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. By the end of the program you improved your English language ability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The teacher showed respect for students' opinions, feelings, and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You were glad that the teacher communicated frequently in your native language/Spanish.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You wished the teacher had spoken more English during classes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You are more confident about speaking English to other employees.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. You are more confident about speaking English to supervisors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More =>>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. You are more confident about speaking to mechanics.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Your listening skills have improved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the back of this sheet to comment on any of the above ratings and to respond in writing to the following questions. These questions are especially important, so please be as clear and complete as possible.

1. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the language program.

2. Please describe specific instances in which communication between you and an English speaking employee has improved.

3. Describe specific instances in which communication between you and an English speaking supervisor has improved.

4. Describe specific instances in which communication between you and an English speaking mechanic.

5. What is your principal motivation for learning English?

6. Are you interested in continuing your English studies at Reej Associates at a more advanced level?
Needs Assessment for further English language training
Interest Survey (Translated from Spanish)

The Rees Associates English Language Training Program currently includes the following communication based topics as components of the introductory/beginning level instruction:

- names of positions
- names of places in the plant
- names of machines
- some postal regulations information
- health problems and injuries
- safety rules of the plant
- machine parts
- mechanical problems

Think about the language needs of Rees Associates employees. From the list above please select and rank the top three topics in which you would like to see further communication improvements. Rank them as 3 = most important to you, 2 = second most important to you, and 1 = third most important to you. Place your rankings in the boxes provided. Feel free to make comments about the topic area to the right of the boxes.

Please do the same with the list below.

- quality control issues
- conversations of personal nature
- grammatical correctness
- intelligibility of pronunciation
- fill-out work related forms
- read work related forms

Over Please ==>
Please respond in writing to the following questions. These questions are especially important, so please be as clear and complete as possible.

1. What specific situations in your workplace cause communication difficulties? Please give some examples.

2. What kinds of specific changes would you like to see (in terms of language skills and communication issues) as a result of further English language training?

3. Are there any other topics and/or language skills areas you would like to see included in further English language training?

4. Are there any questions you would like to ask us about the components of the introductory/beginning language program? About further language instruction?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
YOUR INPUT IS CRITICAL TO SUCCESS.

Janese Cerón
English/Spanish Instructor
Manager/Supervisor Evaluation of Rees Associates
English Language Training Program

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to evaluate the Rees Associates English Language Training Program. All feedback will be reported anonymously to the program coordinators/instructors. This questionnaire will provide information for improving the program. Therefore, you should try your best to answer the questions thoughtfully and to write informative comments. For each of the below, indicate which rating best fits your judgment according to the following scale.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Agree Slightly  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You are aware an English language training program has been taking place.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You know some employees which have been participating in the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have noticed improvements in these employees' ability to understand spoken English in work related situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have noticed improvements in these employees' ability to speak English in work related situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, you feel that this program achieved the objective of increasing work place participation by non-native speakers of English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This English language training program has helped ease communication difficulties between you and your non-native speaking employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the back of this sheet to comment on any of the above ratings and to respond in writing to the following two questions. These questions are especially important, so please be as clear and complete as possible.

1. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the language program.
2. Please describe specific instances in which communication between you and a non-native speaking employee has improved.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.  
YOUR INPUT IS CRITICAL TO SUCCESS.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


