12-17-2009

ADULT LEARNING SATISFACTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Linda Jo Ryan
University of Missouri-St. Louis, ljryan816@verizon.net

Follow this and additional works at: https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation

Part of the Education Commons

ADULT LEARNING SATISFACTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

by

LINDA JO RYAN
M.A., French, Illinois State University, 1990
B.A., English, University of Missouri - Rolla, 1972
B.S., Education, University of Missouri - Columbia, 1972

A Dissertation Submitted to
The Graduate School of the University of Missouri - St. Louis
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education in Adult and Higher Education

December, 2009

Dissertation Committee
John A. Henschke, Ed.D., Chairperson
E. Paulette Isaac-Savage, Ed.D.
Deborah Baldini, Ph.D.
Wolfgang Althof, Ph.D.
Lloyd I. Richardson, Jr., Ph.D.

Abstract

Adult education literature suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning. In this study, the relationships between instructional perspective, satisfaction with language learning, and certain teacher and student characteristics were investigated. Study participants were adult students enrolled in noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program and their teachers.

Henschke's Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) was used to evaluate teacher-reported use of andragogical principles. The MIPI is comprised of seven subscales: Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners, Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Factor 6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process. The MIPI-S, an adaptation of the MIPI, was used to assess student perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective.

Students reported satisfaction with language learning on a Likert-type scale found on the Personal Information Form-Student (PIF-S). Each student used her/his own unique, subjective, internal, unarticulated definition of *satisfaction with personal language learning* in responding to this item.

The MIPI-S summative score as well as scores for Factors 1 through 6 were found to have significant positive relationships with satisfaction with language learning. As foreign language students perceived increased use of andragogical principles in the classroom, satisfaction with learning increased. MIPI-S Factor 1 was found to be the strongest significant

predictor of student satisfaction. MIPI-S Factor 7 had a significant negative relationship with satisfaction with language learning. As foreign language students' perceptions of Teacher-centered Learning Process decreased, satisfaction with language learning decreased.

When the relationship between satisfaction and certain student characteristics was examined, achievement of the foreign language student's primary goal was found to be the strongest significant predictor of satisfaction with learning, and second strongest was general experience with language study. The portrait of noncredit foreign language students and their teachers found in this study contributes to understanding a population and a learning environment which is not represented in the literature on adult education, language learning, educational satisfaction, or Continuing Education.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the members of my committee who provided important guidance, editorial suggestions, and encouragement as I moved through the dissertation process. In particular I am grateful for all the resources in adult education provided by Dr. John Henschke and made available through his Web site. I would also like to thank Ray Bacon and Lada Micheas at the Social Sciences Statistics Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia for their help. Several others also generously provided guidance and suggestions along the way, including Dr. Antje Carlson, Dr. Janet Rasmussen, Dr. Kyle Matsuba, the late Dr. Vic Battistich, Dr. Kathleen Haywood, Dr. Michelle Mathews, and the late Dr. Mary Cooper.

I would like to thank the friends and family who patiently listened and encouraged my work. In particular, I am grateful to my husband whose life has been defined by the dissertation process for a long time and still has been unfailingly optimistic and supportive. Finally, I am profoundly grateful to all who have believed in my abilities and possibilities even when I couldn't, including my parents and Dr. Carole Ann Ryan.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I: Introduction

Three years ago I was invited to observe an evening Advanced Conversational French class offered through the public school district in a Florida community. As a lifelong language learner and a former French teacher, I was interested in knowing more about adult foreign language teaching and learning in the context of an evening personal interest course. The course's instructor was a native speaker of French. The students were adults older than traditional college students. All had previously studied French. Most of the students were American; however, two or three were originally from other countries and also spoke languages other than English and French.

The class opened with a brief period of chatting in French between teacher and students. For the next hour, students read aloud sentences from a text and the instructor drew the students' attention to certain vocabulary and grammatical aspects of what had just been read. For the last half hour of the class, the instructor assigned a small group activity. The activity called for students to pair up and have one student draw a figure or scene that the other student was describing. The instructor provided no guidelines for the type of figures or pictures students could choose to describe. Neither was there a connection made between the activity and topics or ideas that students had been discussing either in the current class session or in previous class sessions.

Students appeared to be frustrated as they attempted to participate in the activity. Some consulted their dictionaries, groping for the vocabulary necessary to describe the image they had chosen. The students who were drawing from the oral description given to them also struggled to understand what was being described. One male student said quietly under his breath, "This is not what I wanted to get out of this class."

Time ran out before all students had the opportunity to both describe and draw. At the end of the class session, student pairs reported their degree of success with the activity. As each pair reported, the teacher wrote on the board the vocabulary that the students could have used to complete the activity. Nine o'clock arrived; good-byes were exchanged; students departed.

I had no previous experience with noncredit adult language classes. I was, therefore, left with several questions: "Is this the way that foreign language courses for adults are taught?," "What kind of educational preparation or experience do instructors teaching noncredit courses have for teaching a foreign language or teaching adults?," "Was this a satisfactory experience for the adult language learners in this class?," and "Would the type of learning experience which I observed satisfy me if I were a student in this class?"

My experience as a French teacher and a student of adult education led me to have certain expectations about how an adult language learning class would be organized and how students would be engaged in the language learning process. I expected the focus of an advanced conversation class to be on conversation not reading a written text aloud. I expected that the learning activities would be directly and clearly tied to certain lessons, goals, or objectives. I expected that it would be clear how these learning activities were relevant to those lessons, goals, or student interests and needs. I expected that the choice of learning activities would challenge but not overwhelm the students participating in them. I expected many things.

What was not clear to me, however, was what the teacher and learners in this class expected or wanted. What were the guiding principles that led the teacher to

organize the class in this way and choose these specific learning activities? What were the teacher's goals for the class? What were the students' expectations, goals, and interests in participating in this type of class? Were the adult learners satisfied with their experience? Did it meet their goals or needs?

Adult education literature suggests that a learner-centered approach creates an effective environment for adult learning. In my reading, however, I had not encountered studies or discussions of learner-centered approaches applied to the context of noncredit adult foreign language classes. There was no information available about the extent to which learner-centered approaches were used in the noncredit foreign language classroom or the extent to which they might be effective. Furthermore, a brief search of the literature revealed that data on adult learners in noncredit classes did not appear to be available. There was definitely no easily accessible information on noncredit foreign language classes, their teachers, or the students who participate in them.

The current study evolved from the questions and issues posed by my experience observing this advanced French conversation class as well as from a lifetime of professional experience and interest in language learning and teaching. The focus of this study was to better understand the population of teachers and adult learners engaged in noncredit foreign language learning and, particularly, to better understand the relationship between adult satisfaction with foreign language learning and instructional perspective in this context.

Background

A 2005 AP-AOL poll of 1,000 adults asked, "If you could do it all over again, to what [school] subject would you pay closer attention?" *Foreign language* was "the

overwhelming answer" ("The most unpopular," 2005, p. 15) to the question. As this response makes clear, there is an interest in, or perceived need for, foreign language (FL) learning among American adults.

There are four primary reasons why adults become language learners. One reason is work. In some fields foreign language proficiency has become not only an asset but a necessity. Overseas business contacts, communication with international employees, and suppliers or customers who live half a world away from each other are all reasons why "developing some fluency in foreign languages is getting to be as important as taking along a laptop on an overseas trip" (Finney, 2007, para. 1). Adults without foreign language skills may find themselves unprepared for work in the global economy (Fowler, 1991). The success of companies that provide language services to international corporations (Finney, 2007; "One World," n.d.) is evidence of adult language learning needs in the workplace. Other evidence is the increasing use of high-tech language learning programs like *Rosetta Stone* and *Berlitz Virtual Classroom* in government, military, and corporate sectors (Finney, 2007; Rosetta Stone, Ltd., 2009).

The 2000-2001 Adult Education and Lifelong Learning Survey, part of the National Household Education Survey (AELL-NHES 2001) and reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), indicates that 30% of adults participate in work-related educational programs or courses (Kim, Collins Hagedorn, Williamson, & Chapman, 2005; Kim, Hagedorn, Williamson, & Chapman, 2004). It seems logical that language learning courses taken to meet workplace needs would fall into this category. However, in the AELL-NHES 2001, English as a Second Language (ESL) courses are

the only adult language learning activities linked to workplace demands. The AELL-NHES 2001 identifies workplace needs as one of the purposes of ESL classes:

> to develop the English language skills necessary to pursue further education, to enter or advance in the job market, to enrich their personal and family lives, or to better adapt to American society. (Kim et al., 2004).

In this report, adult participation in learning other foreign languages is not reported in the work-related category but, rather, appears in the personal interest courses category.

A second reason for adult participation in language learning is immigration. Immigrating to another country imposes the need for a certain level of proficiency in the new language if one is to take part in everyday life. Adult immigrants participate in language learning to improve work opportunities and to avoid being dependent on children, grandchildren, or strangers for help navigating their new world. According to a the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (n.d.), "[ESL] programs are the fastest growing component of the state-administered adult education programs" (para. 4) and made up 48% of total program enrollments in 1997-1998.

A third reason that adults become language learners is because they are fulfilling a requirement related to a degree they are pursuing in a college or university program. The most recent NCES report on adult participation in educational activities notes that 4% of adults participate part-time in college or university degree programs; 5% of adults participate on a full-time basis (Kim et al., 2004). Some American postsecondary institutions have either dropped foreign language requirements for undergraduate or graduate degrees (Snyder, 2002) or offer options besides foreign language study for

degree completion. Graduate students at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, for example, have the option of satisfying either a foreign language requirement or research tool requirement for a Ph.D. degree in Education (University of Missouri-St. Louis, n.d.). Other educational institutions, however, do still require foreign language study (Illinois Association for College Admission Counseling, 2007; White, 2008).

A fourth reason adults become language learners later in life is not related to work, immigration, or the pursuit of an educational degree. Adults may choose to learn a foreign language later in life due to a personal interest in the language or a personal need to use the language. The desire to travel abroad or the need to search for genealogical information in records from a non-English speaking country are two reasons adults become interested in language learning later in life (Carlson, 2006a). For others, speaking another language is a dream for which they previously did not have the time or resources. Some adults were previously unsuccessful in secondary school or college language programs but have the desire to try again (Carlson, 2006a). In addition, American parents adopting a child from a foreign country often need to be able to communicate in the language of that country.

Foreign language courses are categorized as personal interest courses by the National Household Education Surveys (Kim et al., 2004). Kim et al. report that 21% of adults responding to a 2001 national survey participated in personal interest courses. Unfortunately, the authors do not report what percent of adults participated in personal interest foreign language courses.

Adults in the United States pursue language learning in response to workplace needs, for reasons related to immigration, in order to pursue an educational degree, or as

the result of an interest or need in their personal lives. Noncredit personal interest

courses represent over 20% of the educational activities pursued by adults in a given

year. Noncredit foreign language courses, other than ESL courses, are most often

included in this category (Kim et al., 2004). Yet there is relatively little information

available on the population of adults enrolled in noncredit personal interest courses or on

the segment of this population participating in noncredit foreign language learning. It

seems appropriate that adult educators take an interest in understanding the experience of

these adult learners.

<div align="center">Statement of the Problem</div>

A review of the current literature on adult learning and foreign language teaching,

presented in Chapter II, reveals that educational researchers have not adequately

investigated adult learning and satisfaction in noncredit personal interest courses or, more

specifically, adult learning and satisfaction in noncredit foreign language courses. In

addition, the learning climate of noncredit personal interest courses and the instructors

who teach them have also not been adequately examined or described. This section

identifies areas where the current study provides insight into the experience of adult

learners and the learning climate in the noncredit foreign language classroom.

With regard to research on adult learning in the foreign language classroom, there

have been three main strands of inquiry: (a) scientific research, (b) investigation of the

subjective experience of the language learner, and (c) educational research. The

scientific research strand focuses on the neurology and physiology of language learners.

These studies attempt to establish how the brain of the adult language learner operates

and in what ways the neurological processes involved in adult second-language learning

differ from the native-language and second-language learning of children (Bucuvalas, 2002). Neurological and physiological research on aging and the brain helps educators and learners distinguish between myths or stereotypes about aging and the actual effects of aging on learning ("Adults can," 2005; American Federation for Aging Research, n.d.; Hess, 2005; "Vision", 2006; "Studies suggest," 2003).

Information about adult brain activity, information processing, and aging related to language acquisition provides insight into new ways to support adult language learning. This type of research can identify possible barriers to a satisfactory learning experience for adults in the foreign language classroom. It can also suggest ways in which teaching practice could be improved for this population. Research in the scientific domain, however, does not directly address questions about the learning climate in the classroom or, more specifically, the influence of the teacher on adult satisfaction with learning.

Another strand of research on adult language learning focuses on the subjective experience of the adult language learner. Several studies have documented the language learning experience of teachers (Burden, 2004; Campbell, 1996; Carlson, 2006a; Ellis, 2006; Flowerdew, 1998; McDonough, 2002). They report changes in teacher attitudes and practice as the result of an adult language learning experience. McDonough (2002), however, notes that "direct studies of teachers as learners...are still quite few" (p. 411).

One example of this strand of language research is Carlson's (2006a) qualitative study. She describes her own experience as an adult language learner as well as the language learning experience of 13 adult learners who were her students in German courses at an American university. She chronicles her own and students'

positive and negative language learning experiences; learning motivations, incentives, and influences; and challenges unique to the process of language learning. Considering her own experiences and those reported by her students, Carlson concludes that the application of adult education principles and practices in the adult foreign language classroom "moves the *adults* as [foreign language] learners more prominently into the center of the methods and didactics that are appropriate, relevant, and motivating to who the adults are, what they want, and how they want their learning to unfold" (Carlson, 2006b, pp. 3-4).

Studying the experience of teachers as language learners and for-credit university students in the foreign language classroom provides some clues as to what factors may influence adult satisfaction with language learning in a noncredit environment. However, the experience of the American adult studying a foreign language in a noncredit context has not been addressed in the literature.

With regard to educational research on adult learning in the foreign language classroom, attention is focused primarily on two student populations. One population is made up of students in ESL, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) courses. Even research focusing on the application of adult education principles to language learning commonly takes place in ESL, ESOL, or EFL classrooms. The other major language learning population represented in the literature on adult language learning is composed of students taking a foreign language for academic credit.

Studies done with ESL, ESOL, EFL, or for-credit foreign language learning populations have examined the influence of adult student beliefs on language learning

(Conrad, 1998, 1999; Horwitz, 1988; Hsieh, 2005; Jernigan, 2001; Mills, 2004; Morris, 1998), characteristics of learners (Felder, 1995; Graham, 1994; Grognet, 1989; Joiner, 1981; Richter, 2004; Ringvald, 1999; Schleppegrell, 1987), the influence of the adult learners' previous language learning experience on the acquisition of a second language (Carlson, 1980; Elbaum, Berg, & Dodd, 1993; Jernigan, 2001; Lin, 1998; Mills, 2004; Thomas, 1984), and student attitudes and perceptions (Antes, 1999; Cadd, 1992; Conrad, 1999; Jorgensen, 1998; Saito & Samimy, 1996; Trylong, 1988; Wimmer, 1981). Another area of inquiry into language learning in ESL and for-credit postsecondary populations concerns teaching and learning variables such as the effect of different methodologies and strategies on adult language learning (Du-Babcock, 1987; Errington, 2005; Hope Southcott, 2004; Lewis, 1997; Longmore, 1997; Ozmen, 2004; Rossiter, 2002), the effect of strategies for teaching intercultural awareness (Cadd, 1992), the effectiveness of various language program structures on adult learning (Schoenfeldt, 1997), and teacher beliefs and attitudes (Baldini, 2003; Brosch, 1996; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Felder, 1995; Morris, 1998; Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001).

There is no comparable educational research on adult students in the noncredit foreign language classroom. Research on English-learning students and students in for-credit foreign language courses certainly contributes to our understanding of adult language learning. However, it does not directly address the particular interests and needs of the population of English-speaking adults who are learning a foreign language in noncredit courses.

Milam (2005) emphasizes the need for a more fully articulated portrait of adult learners in noncredit education. Demographic data on learners in noncredit personal

interest courses are limited. Reports on noncredit courses by educational institutions are sporadic and inconsistent (Grubb, Badway, & Bell, 2002; Milam, 2005; Voorhees & Milam, 2005). The primary source of demographics on adults in personal interest courses is the NCES, particularly the Adult Participation in Educational Activities and Lifelong Learning survey (Kim et al., 2004), and the Digest of Education Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2005). The survey reports on data collected over the phone from American civilians aged 16 and older who are not attending elementary or secondary school and who are not institutionalized. The second publication reports enrollment in all American educational institutions, from elementary through the post-secondary level.

These publications provide a description of learners participating in personal interest courses. Data are reported on age, sex, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, marital status, employment/occupation, percent of adults fulfilling a Continuing Education requirement in each category, household income, and percent of adults with children under 10 in the household. Foreign language courses are just one type of course included in the personal interest category. Unfortunately, these publications do not disaggregate the data for participants in specific types of personal interest courses (e.g. hobby courses, sports, dancing, music, Bible study, foreign languages). Data on adult language learners in ESL courses are not included in the personal interest category. Those data appear either in a separate category or are reported with developmental courses.

An investigation of the noncredit language learner population seems warranted given the information gap which exists in the literature. A closer examination of the

population of adult learners, adult learner experiences, and adult learner satisfaction in

the context of noncredit foreign language courses can contribute to the knowledge base

on noncredit learning. More importantly, it can also improve educators' understandings

of how to effectively address the learning needs and interests of adults enrolled in

personal interest foreign language courses.

Any attempt to understand learner satisfaction in noncredit foreign language

courses should consider the role of the instructor. The teacher is "a critical element"

(Apps, 1981, p. 66) in the adult learning environment. Knowles (1980) states that "the

behavior of the teacher probably influences the character of the learning climate more

than any other single factor" (p. 47). The decisions and actions of teachers of adults,

influenced by their "beliefs, values, and attitudes" (Zinn, 2004, p. 40), create the learning

climate in which adult learners pursue their learning goals. Carlson (2006a, 2006b)

documents the effect of the learning climate and, particularly the teacher, on adult

learning in the for-credit foreign language classroom.

Personal interest courses are often offered through community college programs.

Research is readily available on community college teachers (American Association of

Community Colleges [AACC], 2009c; Brewer, 1999; Cohen & Brawer, 2003;

Dougherty, 2003; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Kozeracki, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002;

McManus, 2008; Outcalt, 2002), and foreign language teachers (Chavez, 2006; den Brok,

Levy, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2005; Freeman, 1996; Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007;

Gundermann, 2000; Haley, 2000; Helms, 2005; Jaschik, 2007; Lambert, 2001; Turner &

Supko, 2000; Wood, 1999). However, a comprehensive description of instructors of

noncredit personal interest courses does not exist in the literature. Neither does there

appear to be a discussion of issues related to this population of teachers or their teaching practices. Instructors of noncredit personal interest foreign language courses are virtually invisible in the literature as well.

Studying the instructional perspective of teachers of noncredit foreign language courses provides the means to better understand one facet of the adult learning environment. Henschke (1989) uses the term *instructional perspective* to refer to "the beliefs, feelings and behaviors" (p. 83) that teachers of adults may possess or exhibit in the classroom. Henschke's modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory has been used to examine instructional perspective in nursing faculty (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; Rowbotham, 2007), school principals (Stricker, 2006), parent educators (Seward, 1998; Thomas, 1995), and math educators (McManus, 2008). Research on instructional perspective in these contexts suggests that certain teacher characteristics (e.g., gender, education, teaching experience, exposure to adult education principles) influence the overall learning environment and, in particular, the way teachers interact with adult learners. With regard to instructors of noncredit courses, these areas remain unexplained: (a) the instructional perspective of instructors of noncredit courses, (b) the relationship of teacher characteristics to instructional perspective in the adult noncredit learning environment, and (c) the extent to which instructional perspective influences adult satisfaction with learning in this context.

Data on noncredit courses, especially personal interest courses, are limited. Milam (2005) found that "most institutions are unable to provide estimates of noncredit data" (p. 62) and that "there is little previous research or data collection in this area" (p. 65). A study of noncredit education by Grubb, Badway, and Bell (2002) states that "no

systematic data" exists on noncredit programs (p. 14). Personal communications with others doing research on the community college and Continuing Education programs reveal that these findings are accurate (see Appendix A).

In cases where noncredit data are available from individual institutions or professional organizations, there is no single, consistent definition of noncredit used by reporting agencies and institutions (Milam, 2005; Voorhees & Milam, 2005). In addition, data on noncredit courses are not reported in a uniform or consistent manner (Milam, 2005; Voorhees & Milam, 2005). Furthermore, even when data on noncredit educational activities are reported, Milam (2005) found that only certain types of data are reported. He reports that data on head count, number of noncredit courses, number of hours, and course delivery method are the types of data most often collected by agencies and institutions offering noncredit programs.

Data on noncredit foreign language courses are particularly difficult to acquire. Sometimes data on language courses appear in reports of for-credit and noncredit programs (McPhee, 2004). Other times, for-credit foreign language courses in community colleges are reported but no reference is made to foreign language courses when noncredit formats are discussed (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Personal communications with educational researchers reveal that no comprehensive data specifically referring to noncredit foreign language courses appears to be available at this point in time (see Appendix A).

There is a gap in the literature with regard to noncredit foreign language courses, the adult learners taking noncredit foreign language courses, and instructors teaching noncredit foreign language courses. Identifying the instructional perspective of teachers

in noncredit foreign language courses and how that instructional perspective relates to adult learning satisfaction represents a preliminary step toward understanding the creation of an effective learning climate for adult language learning in the noncredit environment. In addition, the information on the characteristics of teachers and students in noncredit foreign language courses derived from this study contributes to a portrait of these two populations and noncredit foreign language instruction.

Purpose of the Study

Adult education literature suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning (Cassel, 1968; Knowles, 1980; Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Ralph, 2001; Viechnicki, Bohlin, & Milheim, 1990). The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of how adult learning satisfaction is affected by the teacher's instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom. Information derived from this study also provides a portrait of the learning environment in noncredit foreign language courses offered through Continuing Education programs at community colleges.

Research Questions

The primary question addressed in the study was: What is the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? Five sub-questions were also addressed in this study, including:

1.   Is there a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective?

2.   Is there a significant difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom?

3.   Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the Personal Information Form-Students (PIF-S), explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI-S)?

4.   Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S)?

5.   Which teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the Personal Information Form-Instructor (PIF-I), explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI)?

The related hypotheses for all research questions are found in the Research Questions and Hypotheses section of Chapter III. Null hypotheses for all research questions are found in the Footnotes (p. 525).

Delimitations

For the purposes of this study, research participants were limited to students aged 18 or older enrolled in beginning Continuing Education foreign language courses and the instructors of those courses. All research participants were drawn from the Continuing Education program at a large metropolitan community college in the Midwest. All

students and instructors were surveyed during the second half of the semester's
Continuing Education sessions.

Only students and instructors in beginning foreign language courses were invited
to participate in the study. For the purposes of this study, a beginning class is defined as
any foreign language course offered with the words *beginning* or *for first timers* in the
title, for example Croatian and Bosnian Language and Culture: Beginning;
Conversational Irish: Beginning, Level II; Spanish for First Timers. Limiting study
participants to courses designated beginning or for first timers was done for three
reasons: (a) to provide a way of standardizing the type of previous language learning
experiences which participants have with the language being studied, (b) to provide some
control for the level of difficulty of the material used in class, (c) to provide a large group
of potential research participants. Beginning foreign language classes represented the
largest number of the Continuing Education foreign language courses offered through the
host community college and therefore had the potential to yield the largest number of
research participants.

Students in ESL, American Sign Language (ASL), and foreign language for
special purposes courses were excluded from the study. Students in ESL courses were
excluded because the intended focus of the study was the adult English-speaking
population taking courses in a language other than English. Students in ASL courses
were excluded because this study concentrates on students taking languages where there
is the potential to develop oral and aural skills as well as reading, writing, and cultural
understanding skills. This study also excluded students in foreign language courses for
special purposes, for example courses for adoptive parents (e.g., Chinese for Adoptive

Parents), for travelers (e.g., French for the Traveler), or business courses (e.g., Business German). Special purpose foreign language courses are more narrowly focused on specific contexts and skills than the more general beginning language courses included in the study. For this reason they were outside the experiential norm sought for the present study.

Significance of the Study

Research on adult education and foreign language learning has not adequately considered noncredit foreign language courses, adult learners taking noncredit foreign language courses, or the instructors in those courses. In spite of this, every semester adult learners devote their time, money, and personal resources to the pursuit of language learning in noncredit courses. It therefore seemed appropriate to look more closely at learners and instructors in this unique context.

The present study may provide useful information or insights for students and teachers. For the adult language learner, the responses of participants in this study may validate his or her own learning experience in the foreign language classroom. For the student of adult education, this study provides insight into how adult education principles inform language teaching and learning in noncredit courses. For adult educators, the study provides information about the instructional perspectives of teachers in noncredit personal interest courses. For foreign language teachers, this study provides data on adult language learner satisfaction and describes the relationship between learning satisfaction and the instructional perspective students perceive to be present in their noncredit foreign language classrooms.

For teachers and administrators at educational institutions invested in providing adult language learning opportunities, this study generates a profile of noncredit language learners which includes their satisfaction with language learning. The study provides information about students' perceptions of the foreign language learning environment. A better understanding of how instructional perspective relates to adult satisfaction with learning in noncredit foreign language courses may lead program administrators and teachers to increased critical reflection on the impact of instructional perspective on the learning environment present in their other noncredit courses.

For administrators of noncredit Continuing Education programs, this study supplements the data available on noncredit programs. It also serves as a resource for faculty development in credit and noncredit Continuing Education programs. The data generated by this study provide a clearer portrait than is now available of adult language learners and instructors in noncredit courses. In addition, the new data should allow administrators and program managers to fine-tune the marketing of these courses and other noncredit Continuing Education courses. The study also provides information relevant to recruiting foreign language instructors to teach noncredit courses.

<div align="center">Definition of Terms</div>

The following terms and their definitions are used throughout this study.

Adult language learner. For the purposes of this study, the phrase adult language learner refers to any person age 18 or older who is pursuing foreign language learning. The adult language learners in this study were students enrolled in noncredit beginning foreign language courses.

Adult learner. The adult learner may be described by chronological age, social role and responsibilities, educational pursuits, or legal status. Manteuffel (1982) defines the adult learner as "an adult who has participated in formal or informal education and has emerged being able to do something he/she could not do before" (p. 15). For the purposes of this study, the adult learner is a person age 18 years or older who is or has been engaged in a learning activity or project.

Adult education activities. Adult education activities are "all education activities, except full-time enrollment in higher education credential programs. Examples of adult education activities include part-time college attendance, classes or seminars given by employers, and classes taken for adult literacy purposes, or for recreation and enjoyment" (NCES, 2005, Table 354). The two most common categories of adult education activities reported in the literature are activities related to work and activities not related to work (Creighton & Hudson, 2001).

Andragogy. This study uses Knowles' (1980) definition of andragogy: "the art and science of helping adults learn" (p. 43).

Beginning foreign language course. For the purposes of this study, a beginning foreign language course is any course with the words *beginning* or *for first timers* in the title. Excluded from this definition are special purpose courses (e.g. for travel, adoption, business), introductory or review courses, and literature or culture courses.

Community college. The NCES (2004) defines the community college as:

an institution of higher education that usually offers the first two years of college instruction and frequently grants an associate degree, but does not grant a bachelor's degree. It is an independently organized institution (public or non-

public), an institution that is part of a school district, or an independently

organized system of junior colleges. [Community/junior colleges] offer college

transfer courses and programs; vocational, technical, and semi-professional

occupational programs; or general education programs. (Chapter 6.6)

Community colleges also offer community education programs which provide lifelong

learning opportunities suggested by community interests and needs (Cohen & Brawer,

2003).

Continuing Education. The NCES (2004) defines a Continuing Education

program as "activities that develop knowledge and skills to meet immediate and long-

range educational objectives of adults, who, having completed or interrupted formal

schooling, have accepted adult roles and responsibilities" (Chapter 6.1). Continuing

Education programs typically respond to the needs of the community which they serve by

offering relevant programs, resources, and learning opportunities (Gollattscheck, 1991).

Foreign language. For the purposes of this study, the phrase *foreign language*

refers to a language, other than English, which is studied by English-speaking adults in

the U.S. However, when describing adult study participants whose native language is

not English, foreign language refers to a language other than the native language which is

being studied or has been studied by the participant.

Instructional perspective. Instructional perspective is comprised of "the teacher's

personal and contextual identification, actions and competencies in the classroom, and

philosophical beliefs for guiding practice" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81). It is "the beliefs,

feelings and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) which teachers of adults may possess or

exhibit in the classroom at a given point in time. In this study, instructional perspective

was assessed by two instruments, the MIPI and the MIPI-S. The seven subscales measured by the MIPI are Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), Teacher-centered Learning Process (Henschke, 1989). The MIPI-S is an adaptation of the MIPI for use with students in foreign language courses in the current study. The MIPI-S is composed of the same seven subscales with the same item content as the MIPI.

Instructor. The word instructor has two possible meanings: "1. a person who instructs; teacher. 2. a teacher in a college or university who ranks below an assistant professor" ("Instructor," 1996, p. 988). For the purposes of this study, instructor is a synonym for, and used interchangeably with, the word teacher. Instructor does not refer to an academic rank within the faculty of an educational institution.

Learning. The definition of learning used in this study is "the act or experience of one [who] learns" ("Learning," 2005). This definition refers to all levels of change, actions, and processes through which knowledge, attitudes, skills, or expertise are deliberately acquired (Apps, 1981; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998; "Learning," 1996) as well as all aspects of random learning which may occur incidentally during a learning experience (Apps, 1981). The definition of personal language learning in the context of this study is, therefore, the act or experience of one who learns a language.

Item 1 on the PIF-S asked participants in this study to indicate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning. The instrument did not provide a definition

of learning. Participants responded to Item 1 according to their individual understanding of what learning means.

Learning climate. The learning climate is the result of physical and psychosocial factors present during a learning activity or project (Knowles, 1980). Physical factors which influence the learning climate are the space available for learning and access to that space, furniture, lighting, acoustics, ventilation, control of heating and cooling, arrangement of furniture, and visual aids available in the learning site (Caffarella, 1994). The psychosocial factors which influence the learning climate are the psychological and social influences which learners and teachers bring to the learning situation, including: influences of culture, personality, experience, education, age, gender, race, class, language, abilities, self-concept, conscious and unconscious behaviors and attitudes, learning and teaching preferences, motivations, and needs (Gadbow, 2002; Knowles, 1980; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Wlodkowski, 1999).

Stricker (2006) reported that the words climate and environment "are used interchangeably in the literature" (p. 9). In this study, learning climate and learning environment are considered to be synonyms.

Noncredit. Noncredit refers to those educational activities, such as meetings, seminars, workshops, courses, and conferences, "which are instructional in nature" (State University of New York-Albany, Central Staff Office of Institutional Research, 1995, p. viii) and for which no academic or credential credit is awarded to participants.

Pedagogy. This study uses Knowles' (1980) definition of pedagogy: "the art and science of teaching children" (p. 43).

Personal interest courses. This study uses the definition of personal interest courses provided by the state of California's Chancellor's office: "those [courses] which students take for their 'physical, mental, moral, economic or civic development' and which are not taken to obtain degrees or to prepare for transfer" (McCurdy & Trombley, 1994, para. 3). Phrases which may be used by various agencies, associations, or educational institutions as synonyms for the term personal interest courses are: personal interest activities, personal development courses, personal enrichment courses, personal skills and avocational courses, hobby and recreation courses (McCurdy & Trombley, 1994; National Center for Education Statistics, 2005; Parnell, 1991; Voorhees & Milam, 2005).

Personal language learning. The definition of personal language learning in the context of this study is the act or experience of one who learns a language.

Satisfaction. Satisfaction is defined as "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education" (Elliott & Shin, 2002, p. 198) at a particular point in time.

Satisfaction with language learning. For the purpose of discussion in this study, satisfaction with language learning is defined as "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with [language learning]" (Elliott & Shin, 2002, p. 198) at a particular point in time. Item 1 on the PIF-S asked students to indicate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning. The instrument did not provide a definition of satisfaction. Students responded according to their own unique, subjective, internal, unarticulated definitions of satisfaction with personal language learning.

Organization of the Study

Roberts (2004) stated that, although dissertation documents may vary in format, "all researchers define a problem with researchable questions, conduct an exhaustive review of the literature, choose an appropriate methodology, collect and analyze data, and present the findings and conclusions" (p. 16). This chapter explained the motivation for the current study as well as providing a context for the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study. The primary research question and five sub-questions were identified. Delimitations or boundaries of the study were considered and the significance of the study was discussed. Definitions of terms related to the study population, adult satisfaction with learning, the learning climate, and noncredit educational activities were provided. Chapter I concludes with a summary of the organization of the study.

Chapter II reviews the literature related to adult teaching and learning and learning satisfaction in a noncredit context in four areas: andragogy, instructional perspective, satisfaction, and the community college. Chapter II begins with a description of the history and development of andragogy. The principles of andragogy provide the foundation for the instruments used to assess instructional perspective in this study. Characteristics of the adult learner, characteristics of the teacher of adults, and the teacher-adult learner relationship in the andragogical model are described. Physical and psychosocial factors that influence learning climate are examined, with special emphasis on the instructional perspective of the teacher. The effects of teacher beliefs, feelings, and behaviors on practice are reviewed as well as the means of assessing those beliefs, feelings, and behaviors. Next, satisfaction with learning in the context of adult educational activities is examined. Having established an understanding of andragogy,

instructional perspective, and satisfaction, the discussion then moves to the setting for the study, noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program. Chapter II concludes by identifying ways in which the study addresses gaps in the literature on adult satisfaction with language learning, instructional perspective, and noncredit educational activities.

Chapter III presents the research methodology. It begins with identifying the research questions and their related hypotheses. The research design is then presented, including descriptions of the population and sample, the sampling procedure, the instruments, the data collection procedure, and a brief description of the data analysis. Chapter III concludes with the limitations of the study.

Chapter IV reports on the data collected from study participants. It describes the data, the reliability of the instruments, and the selection of appropriate statistical procedures for each research question. Descriptive and quantitative test results are provided for each question considered in the study.

Chapter V presents an overview of the study and discusses the findings, including a description of study participants and the analysis of the research questions. In addition, the implications for practice are examined. Chapter V concludes with recommendations for future research and a brief summary of the study findings.

Chapter II: A Review of the Literature

Chapter I described the need for a better understanding of adult learning in noncredit educational activities. The current study focused on adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom. The literature on adult education suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning (Cassel, 1968; Knowles, 1980; Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Ralph, 2001; Viechnicki et al., 1990).

Chapter I discussed the evolution of the current study and provided a framework from which to understand the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study. Gaps in the research on noncredit foreign language students, noncredit foreign language courses, and instructors of noncredit foreign language courses were identified. The primary research question and five sub-questions were reported. Delimitations or boundaries of the study were considered and the significance of the study discussed. Definitions of terms related to the study population, adult satisfaction with learning, the learning climate, and noncredit educational activities were provided. Chapter I concluded with a summary of the organization of the study.

Chapter II begins with a review of andragogy, a model for helping adults learn. The discussion of the andragogical model includes a description of the roles of the adult learner and the teacher of adults, the teacher-adult learner relationship, and the optimal climate for adult learning. Second, instructional perspective is defined and the influence of teacher beliefs on behavior and practice is discussed. Measurement of instructional perspective is described, including the development of the Instructional Perspectives

Inventory and related research. Finally, influences on the instructional perspective of foreign language teachers are considered.

The third part of the review of literature examines the meaning of satisfaction in an educational context, the evaluation of student satisfaction, and influences on student satisfaction. This section then defines satisfaction with learning and the role of satisfaction with learning in student satisfaction research. Finally, influences on student satisfaction with foreign language learning are examined.

The fourth section of Chapter II considers the setting for the study: noncredit Continuing Education courses offered through a community college. The history and evolution of the community college are described. Information is presented on participation trends in adult learning and the role of the community college in providing adult learning opportunities. The literature on Continuing Education and noncredit educational activities is then reviewed with a particular emphasis on faculty and students engaged in noncredit Continuing Education programs. Finally, the opportunities for adult foreign language study through a community college are described.

Chapter II concludes by linking the review of literature to the present study. This section summarizes how the study addresses gaps in the research base on adult satisfaction with language learning, instructional perspective, and noncredit educational activities.

Andragogy

Andragogy is a model for helping adults learn. The andragogical model provides the framework from which instructional perspective is evaluated in this study. The MIPI is used in the present study to assess the extent to which teachers report using

andragogical principles in the noncredit foreign language classroom. This section discusses the history and development of the concept of andragogy. It also describes the roles of the adult learner and the teacher of adults, the teacher-adult learner relationship, and the learning climate in the andragogical model.

The first secular schools and universities in the Western world, including public schools in the United States, were organized according to a pedagogical model of teaching and learning based on basic and religious education for children in the Middle Ages (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Knowles, 1990). For several centuries this was the primary educational model in the West (Knowles, 1990). According to Hiemstra and Sisco (1990), the pedagogical model is still "the most dominant form of instruction in Europe and America….[and,] until very recently, has been applied equally to the teaching of children and adults" (p. 231).

The pedagogical model is characterized by a teacher-directed, subject-centered approach to instruction. In this model, teaching and learning most often take place in a formal, institutional setting. The teacher's role is to be the expert, a transmitter of content or knowledge (Knowles, 1975). The teacher is responsible for choosing the most appropriate strategies for teaching the subject matter and exerting sufficient pressure on the students for acquisition of content to occur. The student's role is to be the recipient of whatever content or knowledge the teacher, institution, or society deems important (Knowles, 1980).

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw the rise of industrialization, the movement of rural populations to work in urban settings, and the establishment of educational organizations to address workers' new learning needs (Draper, 1998).

Initially, traditional approaches to teaching children were applied to teaching adults. Warren (1989) characterizes that system of formal schooling for children as a model which "forced people up or out of the system in accordance with their success in emotionless logic and endless memorization channeled all too often through foreign Latinity" (p. 216). According to Warren, this was a system which educated students to conform using "an authoritarian and lecture approach" (Draper, 1998, p. 5).

Draper (1998) reports that traditional educational approaches were found to be irrelevant to the needs and experiences of "the [rural] labouring poor" (p. 5) moving into non-traditional employment in urban industrial settings. Ideas about educating adults evolved toward non-formal educational approaches and environments which recognized the humanity, dignity, and uniqueness of each learner. The first use of the term *adult education* in English was in 1814 in *A History of the Origin and Progress of Adult Schools.* The author, Thomas Pole, coined the term to describe the phenomenon of different kinds of adult learning taking place in rural and industrialized environments (Draper, 1998).

Alexander Kapp created the term *andragogy* to distinguish the lifelong learning of adults from pedagogy, the formal education of children (Draper, 1998; Knowles, 1989b). The word andragogy first appeared in 1833 in German educational articles written by Kapp (Knowles, 1989b). Draper (1998) indicates that adult education and andragogy appear to have been used as synonyms in this time period. Reischmann (2004), however, states that the term and concept were not widely used or accepted. Knowles (1989b) notes that it wasn't until the publication in 1957 of Poggeler's book, *Introduction into*

Andragogy: Basic Issues in Adult Education, that andragogy was accepted and used in adult education literature in Europe.

Andragogy appeared in the 1950s in European publications but "still the term was known only to insiders" (Reischmann, 2004, The Second and Third Invention section, para. 2). Reischmann (2004) reports that the state of adult education was such that

> there was no or little formal training for adult educators, some limited theoretical knowledge, no institutionalized continuity of developing such a knowledge and no academic course of study….As the reality [of the state of adult education] was unclear, the term could not be any clearer." (para. 2)

In the early twentieth century, the word andragogy was introduced in the United States through the work of E. C. Lindeman and M. L. Anderson (Cooper & Henschke, 2003; Draper, 1998). However, andragogy was still undeveloped as a concept, "hence the word had little apparent effect upon adult education theory and practice" (J. Davenport III & J. H. Davenport, 1985, p. 6) of the time.

American adult educator Malcolm Knowles is "the best-known modern interpreter and advocate of andragogy as both a word and a philosophically-rooted methodology" (Rachal, 2002, p. 210). Knowles was introduced to the term in the late 1960s by Dušan Savićević, a Yugoslavian adult educator. Knowles' 1970 book, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy*, popularized andragogy and defined it as "the art and science of helping adults learn" (p. 38). Originally, andragogy was depicted as inherently distinct from and antithetical to pedagogy, defined in this context as "the art and science of teaching children" (p. 37). However, Knowles added that he believed andragogy really meant "helping human

beings learn, and that it therefore [had] implications for the education of children and youth" (pp. 38-39). Knowles infused the concept of andragogy with "much of his own meaning garnered from his already extensive experience in adult education" (Cooper & Henschke, 2002, p. 4).

Engaging in dialogue with educators over the next decade, Knowles came to broaden his conceptualization of andragogy. As suggested by the sub-title of the 1980 edition of *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*, Knowles came to see andragogy and pedagogy as models representing the opposite ends of a continuum of educational assumptions and related learning processes (Knowles, 1980).

Six assumptions form the foundation of the andragogical model (Knowles, 1996). These assumptions relate to characteristics of the adult learner: the learner's readiness to learn, the learner's need to know, learner's need to be self-directed, the learner's breadth of experience, the learner's orientation to learning, and the learner's motivation.

The andragogical model assumes that the learner is ready to learn when acting on a real-life need to know or need to acquire certain skills or information (Knowles, 1980, 1990, 1995, 1996).   The developmental issues and transitions of adulthood which produce this need to know are related to the learner's evolving social roles. The most effective program or organization of adult learning is driven by the learner's changing needs and readiness for new learning.

In the andragogical model the learner is no longer dependent on a teacher for learning. The learner is characterized as becoming progressively more self-directed in

learning pursuits as she or he begins to identify with adult status, as maturation occurs, and as life experience accrues .

The andragogical model acknowledges the rich life experiences which adults bring to learning (Knowles, 1980, 1990, 1995, 1996). Experience shapes the perspective and identity of the learner. The positive and negative influences of experience are, in part, shaped by past educational experiences (Mahoney, 1991). In contrast to the limited life experiences of children, the reservoir of adult learning experience represents a deep personal resource for the individual learner. It also has the potential to contribute to the learning of all co-learners involved in a learning activity.

The andragogical model characterizes the learner's orientation to learning as "life-centered" (Knowles, 1990, p. 61). Adult learners tend to engage in educational activities which solve a problem or help them complete a task which exists in their real lives. A preference for learning which is immediately applicable is characteristic of this "performance-centered frame of mind" (Knowles, 1980, p. 53).

In the andragogical model, the incentive to learn is primarily the result of internal motivators. External motivation in the form of the need for improved job skills or credential completion certainly exists in adult education. Nevertheless, Knowles (1995) asserts that "the more potent motivators are internal—such as self-esteem, recognition by peers, better quality of life, greater self-confidence, self-actualization, and so on" (p. 2).

The andragogical model proposed by Knowles presents an alternate model to the traditional, pedagogical approach to learning. Where the pedagogical model is teacher-centered and subject-centered, the andragogical model is learner-centered. In the pedagogical model, the learner is dependent on the teacher for learning direction and

organization. The learner in the andragogical model is self-directed, ready to engage in learning when a real-life problem presents itself. In the pedagogical model, the learner's life experience is considered to be insufficient to inform the learning process. In contrast, the wealth of a learner's life experience is recognized and valued in the andragogical model. In the pedagogical model, external factors such as grades and diplomas are the primary learning motivators. Learners' internal motivation is the primary influence on real-life, problem-centered learning in the andragogical model.

Knowles emphasized that learning models should be chosen for their realistic fit with the characteristics of the learner. Educational models and approaches appropriate for children were no longer to be routinely applied to adult learners. On the other hand, the andragogical model was considered most appropriate in situations where it best suited the learner (Knowles, 1980, 1995), not just because the learning activity included adult learners.

With regard to choosing the most appropriate model for learners, Knowles (1980) explains:

> The [pedagogical and andragogical] models do not represent bad/good or child/adult dichotomies, but rather a continuum of assumptions to be checked out in terms of their rightness for particular learners in particular situations. If a pedagogical assumption is realistic for a particular situation, then pedagogical strategies are appropriate. For example if a learner is entering into a totally strange content area, he or she will be dependent on a teacher until enough content has been acquired to enable self-directed inquiry to begin. (p. 391)

In spite of the fact that Knowles and andragogy have had "such a pervasive influence in the field of adult education" (Rachal, 2002, p. 211), andragogy has also been the subject of significant debate and controversy among adult educators (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Houle (1996) states that the debate about andragogy initially concerned "the theoretical soundness and practical utility of the new term" (p. 27). Savićević (1999b) identifies several, additional key issues which became part of the continuing debate in American and Europe: "the criteria for constitution of the discipline, the subject and territory of its study, the historical and comparative establishment, its phenomenological basis, methodological rigor, etc." (p. 245). Cooper and Henschke's (2004) analysis of the debate about andragogy suggests that the focus of much of the controversy surrounding andragogy "is mainly on the pros and cons of Malcolm Knowles' treatment and interpretation of the concept" (p. 111). They argue that it should be focused, instead, on reaching beyond Knowles' presentation to issues that would afford a better understanding of the concept and its application.

One of the fundamental disagreements early in the debate on andragogy originated with the question of whether or not adults and children were really different in terms of learning. Cross (1981) states that one of main questions which needs to be answered about andragogy is: "Is it useful to distinguish the learning needs of adults from those of children? If so, are we talking about dichotomous differences or continuous differences? Or both?" (p. 228).

Houle (1996) did not recognize the need for different learning models or paradigms for adults and children:

Education is fundamentally the same wherever and whenever it occurs. It deals with such basic concerns as the nature of the learner, the goals sought, the social and physical milieu in which instruction occurs, and the techniques of learning or teaching used….Distinctions between childhood and adulthood are unnecessary. (p. 30)

On the other hand, Merriam and Caffarella (1999) conclude that there are important distinctions between adult and childhood learning, specifically differences in the characteristics of the learner, the context within which learning takes place, and the learning process. In addition, they contend that a fourth area of difference exists: the unique configuration created by interactions between adult learner characteristics, learning context, and learning processes.

Other educators also acknowledge the adult/child difference but frame the distinction differently. Yonge (1984) represents the difference between adults and children as developmental and based on the type of relationship between guide/authority and learner. In a pedagogical situation, the adult "is guiding a child with the aim of assisting the child himself to become an adult" (p. 162). An andragogical situation, on the other hand, occurs when "an adult [accompanies] another adult to a more refined, enriched adulthood" (p. 166). For Yonge, it is the guiding or accompanying aspect of the relationship which is crucial to distinguishing between pedagogy and andragogy.

Pratt (1988) frames the differences between child and adult learners as situational, due to degrees of learner dependency or self-directedness present in various situations. He asserts that "adult educators ought to acknowledge states of dependency as potentially legitimate because, like self-directedness, dependency is a situational attribute and the

product of a specific person-situation interaction" (p. 170).   On the other hand, for

Draper (1998) it is the intentional nature of adult learning that is at the heart of child-

adult differences.

Another question that has been raised in the debate about andragogy is whether or

not it is a learning theory. Knowles refers to andragogy as both a model of assumptions

(1980) and a theory of adult learning (1990). He states that a theory "is a set of principles

or propositions that attempt to explain and, it is hoped, predict phenomena. A theory can,

therefore, provide guidelines for action" (Knowles, 1989a, para. 11).

Knowles (1989a) notes, however, that because adult learning is a new area of

educational inquiry and still in the process of developing a knowledge base, "much of

what we think we know about it is based upon intuitive experience with adult learners"

(para. 24). For this reason, "the theoretical framework for thinking about adult learning

consists of 'assumptions' or 'concepts' rather than of 'knowledge'" (para. 24). From his

assumptions about adult learners Knowles derives principles of teaching which form the

basis of "a process for planning and operating educational programs" (Knowles, 1980,

p. 59).

Other adult educators have identified andragogy differently. Houle (1996)

characterized andragogy as "the most learner centered [sic] of all patterns of adult

educational programming" (p. 30). Briton (1996) refers to andragogy as a "cultural

practice" (p. 33) which should be critically examined for bias. Savićević (1999a)

identifies andragogy as a scientific discipline and a field of study. Draper (1998)

identifies it as a "field of practice and study…within the social sciences" (p. 24).

Finally, J. Davenport and J. A. Davenport (1985) suggest that greater attention to

definition and terminology in adult education research and writing would be an important step toward resolving classification issues.

Educational culture also plays a part in the debate about classification and terminology. According to Savićević (1999a), English-speaking countries and several European countries (e.g., Germany, Switzerland, France, Finland, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia) use the word andragogy for adult learning and education. Savićević identifies other terms for adult learning and education in use in Europe: adult pedagogy (e.g., Germany, the former USSR., Czechoslovakia), socio-pedagogy (e.g., France), social pedagogy (e.g., Netherlands), psycho-pedagogy and the sociology of adult education (e.g., France). Kulich (1984) notes that some European educators have used andragogy and adult pedagogy as synonyms "to denote the study of education, self-education and training of working youth and adults" (p. 128). Adding to the semantic confusion for students of adult education, Kulich also notes that in central and eastern European countries, pedagogy is "an all-embracing science of education" (p. 135). In this view, andragogy is subsumed under the science of pedagogy (Savićević, 1999a).

Knowles (1970) acknowledges that, in popular understanding, pedagogy refers to "the art and science of teaching. Period." (p. 37). In the United States, foreign language educators use the word pedagogy to refer to the teaching or instruction of students of all ages, as in the title "Taking Stock of Research and Pedagogy in L2 Writing" (Hedgcock, 2005). Even a text like *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice* (Weimer, 2002), which encourages learner-centered instruction of adults in postsecondary institutions, uses the term pedagogy as a synonym for teaching or

instruction. For the purposes of the current study, however, pedagogy refers to "the art and science of teaching children" (Knowles, 1980, p. 43).

Another dimension of the language issue related to andragogy has to do with whether or not andragogy is synonymous with adult education. Draper (1998) notes that andragogy and adult education have been used interchangeably as synonyms by some adult educators. Jarvis (1983) states that "the term 'adult education' carries specific connotations in the United Kingdom which imply that it is specifically liberal education, and this also has a stereotype of being a middle class, leisure time pursuit" (p. 29). Lindeman chose to use the term adult education (Draper, 1998). Draper, however, suggests that the title of Lindeman's 1926 publication, *Andragogik: The Method of Teaching Adults*, indicates that Lindeman perceived andragogy and adult education to be synonyms. On the other hand, Yonge (1984) finds the concept of adult education to be broader than andragogy and concludes that they should not be used interchangeably.

Even the definition of adult is problematic when comparing understandings of andragogy. The concept of what constitutes being an adult is dependent on cultural and historical perspective (Wlodkowski, 1999). Savićević (1999a) acknowledges the problem of identifying when adulthood begins. Similarly, Krajnc (1989) suggests that lack of agreement on the definition of adult across disciplines, cultures, countries, and educational systems is a complication in the andragogical debate among adult educators and researchers. Different cultures may have common legal or chronological definitions of adulthood but differ on work, family, social, or popular definitions of adulthood.

Another area of the debate on andragogy focuses on researching the concept. The analytical paradigm of Western scientific research requires a well-defined concept with

established principles that can be operationalized and examined using objective methods. Cooper and Henschke (2004) state that the definition of andragogy referenced in Krajnc (1989) is "the most succinct and pointed definition of andragogy to date, and perhaps the most beneficial" (p. 119). That definition is: "the art and science of helping adults learn and the study of adult education, theory, processes, and technology to that end (Titmus et al.,1979)" (Krajnc, 1989, p. 19).

With regard to empirical research on andragogy, however, Rachal (2002) concludes that current definitions of andragogy are not useful because they are neither operational nor researchable. He characterizes the definitions of Knowles and others as elusive and open to variable interpretations. Furthermore, Rachal finds that research has been "impeded by the absence of clear meaning as to what procedures constitute andragogical practice" (p. 211). He also notes that research is handicapped by the situation-specific use of andragogy recommended by Knowles. In addition, Rachal (2002) states that the objective measures on which quantitative educational research relies (i.e., testing or grades) would be, for Knowles, "anathema to the very idea of andragogy" (p. 211).

Other educators also question the lack an empirical base to andragogy. Cooper and Henschke's (2004) study of the foundational works on andragogy published in English revealed that six research themes currently exist: "evolution of the term andragogy; historical antecedents shaping the concept of andragogy; comparison of the American and European understandings of andragogy; popularization of the American concept of andragogy; practical applications of andragogy; and theory, research and definition of andragogy" (p. 119). Rachal (2002), however, suggests that empirical

studies of andragogy have been obscured by discussion of the philosophical foundations of the concept as well as "the extensive anecdotal, expository, and polemical writing on the subject" (p. 211). He notes that "empirical examinations of andragogy…have tended to be inconclusive, contradictory, and few" (p. 211).

Cross (1981) proposes that adult educators have not, in fact, adequately identified what they are actually seeking to establish with regard to andragogy: a theory about learning, a theory about teaching, or both. Agreeing that there is confusion about the purpose of inquiry into andragogy, Podeschi (1987) notes that "theoreticians who debate andragogy are caught often in an unconscious complexity about the kind of issue in which they are involved: empirical proof or philosophical premise?" (p. 14). In addition, Podeschi cautions that empirical proofs for andragogy are not the same as, and should not be confused with, establishing the philosophical premises of the concept.

Other educators have also expressed concerns about the state of research on andragogy. Beder and Carrea (1988) point out that not enough is yet known about the learning conditions or contexts in which the andragogical or pedagogical models are most effective. In addition, andragogy "has not been especially successful…in stimulating research to test [its] assumptions" (Cross, 1992, p. 228). Similarly, Pratt (1993) states that adult educators "cannot say, with any confidence, that andragogy has been tested and found to be, as so many have hoped, either the basis for a theory of adult learning or a unifying concept for adult education" (p. 21). Merriam and Caffarella (1999) agree that "relatively little empirical work has been done to test the validity of [andragogy's] assumptions or its usefulness in predicting adult learning behavior" (p. 276). Draper (1998) concludes that andragogy has not been proven to be a theory of learning in spite of

the fact that the study of adult education has produced "theories, principles, and assumptions which help to explain and understand (adult) learning" (p. 23).

Taking a different critical approach, Briton (1996) condemns the emphasis in adult education research, and in particular graduate programs, on inquiry which is framed by the empirical-analytical paradigm. He rejects the reduction of the individual in this paradigm to "a timeless, placeless being whose meaningful experience is limited to the tangible and measurable" (p. 87). He suggests that attempts to operationalize adult education within the scientific paradigm have actually restricted the concept instead of providing a more meaningful understanding of it.

The political aspect of andragogy is also part of this debate. Krajnc (1989) states that the concept of andragogy is 'based as much on ideological premises as on experience and research" (p. 21). She contrasts the European concept of adult education as a means of socializing the adult for the benefit of society with the American emphasis on "the development of the adult as an individual" (p. 21). To counterbalance these ideologies, Briton (1996) argues in favor of increased "interpretive, critical, and postmodern modes of inquiry" (p. 81) which "recognize that adult education is a cultural practice with moral and political consequences that reach far beyond the walls of the classroom" (p. 33). Cunningham (1993) also embraces a postmodern critique of adult education. She warns of the potential for adult education, if practiced without reflection, to uncritically perpetuate the "asymmetrical power relationships" (para. 23) present in the mainstream culture.

Andragogy developed originally in the context of Western nations. It has been widely analyzed and interpreted from within that context. Educators from non-Western

cultures, however, are actively engaged in examining how adult education as conceptualized and practiced in the West compares with the cultural orientations of their own communities. Considering adult education from this other perspective helps to better articulate the concept and examine how it fits within a global perspective. A consideration of the cultural perspective of teachers and learners is especially relevant to the present study.

Kabuga (1990) describes andragogy as an effective way to address power imbalances created by colonialism and Western educational models in Africa. He identifies the pedagogical model of education as "oppressive, silencing, and domesticating" (p. 233). He further states that andragogy liberates learners for thinking and creativity, opens a dialogue between teacher and learner, and recognizes all sources of knowledge as meaningful.

Another approach to examining understandings of Western and non-Western adult education is to consider the educational experiences of cultural sojourners, adults living for a time outside their native countries. In the context of informal education, Avoseh (2008) discusses the similarity of values between small rural communities in the United States and the traditional values of indigenous African communities. He suggests there are "universal values inherent in informal education across historical and racial boundaries…[which] align with the historical values of adult education as a process of social action for equity and social justice" (p. 23).

Mwaura (2008) explored the experiences of non-traditional international students from Africa attending predominantly white American universities. One of the themes that emerged from student interviews was the difficulty of coping with the

tensions created within international students when they are immersed in, and must try to succeed in, an educational culture very different from their own.

Ryu (2008) compares Confucianism to the humanistic orientation of Western adult education. He notes that Western adult education has paid scant attention to the values and principles represented by Confucianism, "even though [the teachings of Confucius] focus largely on education and adulthood" (p. 330). One criticism Ryu makes of Western humanistic adult education is that it ignores the social and ethical dimensions of human potential in favor of attending to psychological and intellectual potentials. In addition, the philosophical orientation of Western humanistic adult education privileges the concept of the learner as an autonomous individual. Ryu asserts that this view of human beings presents a much narrower representation of human potential than is found in the social, relational orientation of Confucianism.

The problem of establishing a common understanding of andragogy is further complicated by the identity of teachers and researchers. Their interpretations of educational models and research models are filtered through the interaction of complex historical, cultural, political, educational, philosophical, experiential, and personal influences (Amstutz, 1999; Amstutz & Sheared, 2000; Boucouvalas, 2005; Podeschi, 1987). Not recognizing or acknowledging the impact of these filters jeopardizes the usefulness of andragogical research.

Savićević (1999a) summarizes the state of understandings about andragogy in this way: "Despite the considerable amount of knowledge about adult education and learning gained through research work, there still remain uncertainties, controversial issues, a lack of understanding of the notion and subject of andragogy and of its scientific structure"

(p. 248). Merriam and Caffarella (1999) remind those studying adult education to be aware that "there is no single theory of adult learning" (p. 271). What currently exists, according to Merriam (2001), is "a vibrant model…a prism of theories, ideas, and frameworks that allows us to see the same phenomenon from different angles" (p. 96). It is clear that adult teaching and learning has had increasing importance and attention since the second half of the twentieth century and that andragogy has an important place in the dialogue about how "maturing human beings" (Knowles, 1975, p. 60) can best learn.

With regard to the current study of adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective, certain elements of the andragogical debate are relevant. First, the instrument used to assess instructional perspective evaluates the use of andragogical principles in the noncredit foreign language classroom. This aspect of the study offers a response to Beder and Carrea's (1988) criticism that not enough is known about the learning conditions or contexts in which andragogical or pedagogical models are most effective. The data from this study contribute to understanding how the presence of an andragogical instructional perspective in the context of a foreign language classroom relates to student satisfaction.

Second, Merriam and Caffarella (1999) note the lack of research on how useful andragogy is "in predicting adult learning behavior" (p. 276). The current study addresses the association between andragogical principles and a specific learning outcome—satisfaction.

Finally, this study assumed that in some classes diverse cultural backgrounds were present due to the fact that some of the teachers were native speakers of the language they were teaching to American students. By collecting data on the

characteristics of teachers and students, especially data on cultural background, the researcher was able to assess the extent to which cultural differences existed between teachers and students. In addition, the study investigated the extent to which cultural background influenced instructional perspective, perceptions of instructional perspective, and student learning satisfaction.

This section has provided a brief overview of the development and history of andragogy. Furthermore, a review of the critiques of andragogy has identified several issues around which debate has occurred: questions about existential differences between child and adult learners, the theoretical base of andragogy as proposed by Knowles, how adult education is interpreted and defined by other educators, choice of terminology, the state of research on andragogy, and the political and cultural implications of andragogy. The discussion of andragogy in this section concluded by identifying elements of the andragogical debate which are relevant to the current study. The next four sections examine specific elements of the andragogical model: the adult learner, the teacher of adults, the teacher-learner relationship, and learning climate.

Adult Learner

The andragogical model is learner-centered. This model may, depending on individual learner characteristics, be as appropriately applied to children and youth as to adult learners (Knowles, 1980). However, Knowles derived the assumptions which undergird andragogy from his experience teaching adults (Knowles, 1989b).

In the andragogical model, an adult is a person who identifies himself or herself as an adult in a specific cultural context and behaves as an adult in that context (Knowles, 1980). The adult has multiple social roles and responsibilities within the family,

workplace, State, and religious community (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). In contrast to children and youths, the adult learner has a larger volume of experience as the result of these roles and responsibilities (Knowles, 1996). The quality of that experience is also different in adults and children because of their different roles and responsibilities as well as the increased variety of adults' life experiences (Knowles, 1996). For this reason, Knowles (1989b) notes that any group of adults will represent a much wider variation in "background, learning style, motivation, needs, interests, and goals than is true in a group of youths" (p. 83). In the andragogical model, experience serves as the primary source of adult identity or self-concept (Knowles, 1996).

The learner-centered model values the store of experience which adult learners bring to any learning activity. Life experience develops from having fulfilled various social roles such as being an adult child of living parents, a parent to one's own children, an employee or an employer or both, a neighbor, friend, citizen, or retiree (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Life experience also comes from formal and informal learning experiences. While life experience represents a learning resource for learner and teacher alike, it can also have a negative effect on learning and choices about learning.

Mahoney (1991) identifies external and internal barriers, what he refers to as *baggage*, which may inhibit learning participation. External baggage refers to obligations, duties, and responsibilities related to the learner's various roles in society. Family, job, and community commitments can pull the learner away from focusing on learning goals. Mahoney uses the term internal baggage to refer to personal attitudes, expectations, and crises as well as cultural pressures which can interfere with learning. Furthermore, the stress of health problems, disability, or feelings of low self-worth

represent other significant barriers for learners. Adult learners often need the support of sensitive, inventive, and creative teachers to overcome these constraints.

Having assumed the cultural identity of an adult with its attendant roles and responsibilities, the adult learner prefers self-directed learning, being able to assume responsibility for her or his own learning needs (Knowles, 1975). Hiemstra (1991b) explains that self-direction has two components, (a) the external dimension, "the process in which a learner assumes primary responsibility for planning, implementing, and evaluating the learning process" (p. 24) and (b) the internal dimension, "the learner's desire or preference for assuming responsibility for learning" (p. 24).

Knowles (1990) acknowledges that in some cases, as in subject areas where learners have no knowledge base or prior experience, adults may benefit from a pedagogical approach to learning. As soon as they have acquired the necessary information or skill, however, the learner will be able to assume increased responsibility for the learning process. Pratt (1988) also suggests that adult learner dependency is situational and a legitimate concern when planning for adult learning.

Tough (1999) states that 80% of learning reported by adults is informal and that learners plan and direct their own informal learning 73% of the time. He reports that the top four reasons given by adults for preferring self-directed informal learning are: (a) "Desire to set my own learning pace," (b) "Desire to use my own style of learning," (c) "I wanted to keep the learning strategy flexible and easy to change," and (d) "Desire to put my own structure on the learning project" (para. 19). Tough concludes that control of learning is important to adult learners and that they will reject learning or a learning activity if it involves over-control by an institution or instructor.

Brockett (1994) cautions, however, that overzealous adult educators who promote self-directed learning as "the single best theory, method, or approach" ignore the diversity of adult learners and instructors. He also warns that this single-minded approach to adult learning can provoke resistance in those very learners and teachers who might benefit from experimenting with what self-directed learning has to offer.

In addition to having significant life experience and preferring self-directedness, adult learners are generally voluntary learners (Cross, 1992; Henschke, 1987; Sharma, 2006; Tough, 1979; Viechnicki et al., 1990). The learner's readiness to learn is driven by tasks or problems found in real-life (Knowles, 1980; Knowles et al., 1998). As past experience shapes how the adult approaches learning (Knowles et al., 1998), "current experiences [shape] the need to learn" (Knowles, 1980, p. 146). If the learning experience is not satisfying, adults will disengage or "simply disappear" (Knowles, 1970, p. 38). Long (2004) notes that, in spite of the physiological, psychological, and sociological variability present in the adult population, "the most common bond among adult learners is their 'problem' orientation….learning [which] is focused on some immediate perplexing conditions or circumstance" (p. 28). In the andragogical paradigm, learning is the means by which adults become more effective in their own lives (Knowles, 1972).

The external motivators of children and youth, such as parental approval or pressure, competition, grades, and diplomas (Knowles, 1996), are not as present in adults. Realistically, adults may be motivated in some situations by external factors, for example the desire for increased pay, promotion, or changes in work. According to Knowles (1989b), however, adult learners are more powerfully and persistently motivated by

internal factors such as "the desire for increased self-esteem, quality of life, responsibility, job satisfaction, and the like" (p. 84). Equally important intrinsic motivators are personal curiosity or interest (Donaghy, 2004; Perry, 2006). Ralph (2001) states that the achievement of personally important tasks results in the intrinsic reward of satisfaction and enhances motivation to learn.

Wlodkowski (1999) identifies three levels of learning motivation in adults: success + volition, success + volition + value, and success + volition + value + enjoyment. All three levels may operate simultaneously within the learner. At the first level of motivation, success + volition, "adult learners must experience choice or willingness along with their success in the learning activity" (p. 13) in order to sustain motivation. At the second level of motivation, success + volition + value, learning is taken seriously and is valued because it is meaningful even though it may not be easy or fun. The third level of motivation, success + volition + value + enjoyment, adds the element of pleasure to the learning experience. The difficult has been made desirable. Wlodkowski notes, "I have never found an adult to be dissatisfied with the level of instruction that engenders this level of emotional integration" (p. 14).

Wlodkowski's description of adult motivation includes self-direction, the element of individual choice and willingness to learn, at every level of motivation. This motivation model includes value or meaningfulness of learning in the second and third motivational levels. These factors relate to Knowles' assumptions that adults prefer self-direction and need learning to be meaningful and relevant to their life problems or situations.

Houle (1961) identified three sources of motivation for *continuing* learners, those "adults conspicuously engaged in various forms of continuing learning" (p. 13). These motivators are (a) meeting specific goals, (b) participating in social activities, and (c) learning for personal growth. The goal-oriented learner's learning is focused on a clear-cut purpose, is episodic, and is driven by specific objectives based on need or interest. Activity-oriented adult learners engage in a variety of learning activities for a variety of reasons, but principally because they value the social relationships which result. Learning-oriented learners, as Houle describes them, have been engaged in learning throughout their lives because they have a desire to learn and know. And because they find it fun. This type of learner makes learning decisions based on opportunities for certain kinds of new learning and the potential for individual growth that these opportunities present. According to Houle, all continuing learners are similar in that "they have goals; they enjoy participation; and they like to learn. Their differences are matters of emphasis" (p. 29).

Endorf and McNeff (1991) provide a broader description of adult learners. Their study of adult learners in a Weekend College revealed five different types of adult learners: Type One: Confident, Pragmatic, Goal-oriented; Type Two: Affective; Type Three: Learner in Transition; Type Four: Integrated; and Type Five: Risk Taker.

The Confident, Pragmatic, and Goal-oriented learners are self-directed, are at ease with returning to the classroom, and have high expectations of themselves (Endorf & McNeff, 1991). They expect the educational institution to provide an efficient, organized learning experience and to respond effectively and respectfully to their needs. They are

active, collaborative learners whose top priority is the accomplishment of their own learning goals.

The Affective learner has what Endorf and McNeff (1991) characterize as a traditional relationship with the teacher. The teacher's expertise and knowledge is not questioned. The Affective learner willingly cooperates with the teacher's expectations. These learners have positive feelings about the school environment and co-learners with similar values. They pursue education for its own sake and will take responsibility for their own learning.

Learners in Transition do not yet have fully developed educational goals (Endorf & McNeff, 1991). Returning to school is a means to explore the utility and relevance of education. They regard teachers as equals and mentors. Not expecting teachers to be experts in every area, they see discussion and interactive learning as important learning activities. Learners in transition are evolving into independent learners.

Integrated learners have experienced academic success (Endorf & McNeff, 1991). They are stimulated by other learners and at ease with instructors whom they see as peers. Integrated learners have a holistic sense of life, career, and education. They value individual success and the opportunity to contribute to the learning process in a meaningful way. They can focus on learning because the educational environment is manageable, satisfying, and freeing.

According to Endorf and McNeff (1991), Risk Takers embrace life changes to achieve their learning goals. Although their educational purpose is often job-related, they welcome new learning and knowledge. Self-sufficient and independent, they appreciate learning support and guidance from the instructor and institution. Risk Takers undertake

learning challenges with hard work and energy. They are comfortable with the unexpected.

The descriptions of adult learners by Knowles, Tough, Wlodkowski, Houle, Endorf and McNeff, and others in this section provide a portrait of the diverse group of learners which may be present anywhere during any adult learning activity. Their self-concept is the result of the social roles they inhabit and their life experiences. They represent varying degrees of self-directedness. They have diverse motivations and learning goals. They represent different orientations to learning. Their previous experiences and self-concept shape their interactions with co-learners and the way they engage in learning.

The present study assesses voluntary adult learners' satisfaction with learning in noncredit foreign language courses and identified learners' goals. The study does not address learner motivation beyond individual goals.

This study also assesses learners' perceptions of instructional perspective in the classroom. The literature on andragogy suggests that the use of andragogical principles in the classroom creates an effective climate for adult learning and satisfaction with learning. On the other hand, Knowles (1980, 1995) states that the application of andragogical principles should be determined by the situation and characteristics of the learners. Ralph (2001) agrees that "individuals' past educational experiences and daily lives indicate that there *are* times when explicit, direct instruction can be delivered effectively...[and be] the best instructional method to apply" (p. 69). However, a student may perceive teacher direction differently depending on the learner's goals, past experiences, cultural orientation, and expectations (Brookfield, 2006).

In the context of a beginning level foreign language course where learners have no, or very limited, knowledge of the subject matter, it is possible that learners may be more satisfied with a pedagogical approach to teaching and learning. This study contributes a description of the extent to which andragogical principles are used by teachers in the noncredit foreign language classroom. In addition, the present study investigates how the use of andragogical principles is related to satisfaction with learning in this context.

Teacher of Adults

The environment within which adults pursue learning is an important factor in facilitating adult learning. According to Apps (1981), "in any planned learning situation the instructor is a critical element" (p. 66). Galbraith (2004) enumerates the desirable personal characteristics associated with effective teaching in adult education literature: "self-confidence, informality, enthusiasm, responsiveness,…creativity.…an interest in students,…an interest in the subject matter, the ability to make the subject interesting,.…a sense of cooperation, patience, optimism,…authenticity;…and creating an environment that is positive and conducive for learning" (p. 5).

Kidd (1967) states that good teachers identify themselves as co-learners in the classroom. They model the attitudes of lifelong learning. The "agent of adult learning" (p. 309) must also speak and write clearly, be enthusiastic, and have a sense of humor. The greatest teachers have "a rich experience of living" (p. 310) which leads to a patient and balanced approach to learning. Most importantly, Kidd says, a good teacher has imagination.

Long (2002) suggests that effective teachers are self-aware. They are aware of their own content knowledge. They have an understanding of learning and teaching processes. They have developed skills of observation and interpretation with regard to teacher-student interactions. Highly competent teachers understand their students.

In the learner-centered andragogical model, the teacher is a process facilitator and guide (Knowles, 1975; Weimer, 2002). The learning process is guided by the teacher rather than being directed and controlled by the teacher (Collins, 2004; Weimer, 2002). Responsibility for creating a learning plan and evaluating its results is shared by teacher and learner. In this model, the teacher's expert knowledge or experience serves as one learning resource among many in the classroom (Knowles, 1975).

Weimer (2002) notes that in traditional approaches to learning some teachers "see the role of standing alongside learners as inherently less important than the one [they] have standing in front of [learners]" (p. 78). The author contends that this attitude is the result of a distorted view of teacher importance. However essential to the learning process teachers might perceive themselves to be, students cannot be forced to learn. Because of this, according to Weimer, it is the students who "completely control the most central and important part of the educational enterprise" (p. 79).

In a learner-centered model, the teacher is not responsible for motivating learners directly. The teacher is, however, responsible for creating an environment in which learners' intrinsic motivations to learn can lead them toward their individual goals (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). In addition, a supportive learning environment helps students find ways to address external and internal learning barriers which are the result

of their life situations and life experiences and may inhibit learning processes (Collins, 2004; Mahoney, 1991).

The teacher of adults, in the andragogical model, ideally demonstrates personal characteristics and identifications which support a learner-centered environment. However, subject matter knowledge is also an important component in helping adults learn. Instructors in post-secondary educational institutions serving adult learners are chosen because they have an advanced knowledge of the content they are teaching (Henschke, 1987; Long, 2004). Instructors in adult programs may have an advanced degree in their field or they may have extensive life experience which makes them an expert in a particular area. In fact, Dean (2003) states that "having knowledge of the content is almost always associated with the characteristics of successful adult educators" (p. 98).

However, while post-secondary instructors and teachers of adults may be subject matter experts, they do not necessarily have formal teacher training or extensive teaching experience (Long, 2004). Henschke (1987) states that it is often "assumed by many that if one knows the content or subject matter, competence in teaching it to other adults is automatically included in that knowing" (p. 414). Effective teaching, though, does not necessarily proceed from advanced content knowledge (Long, 2004). Effective adult teaching is the result of a combination of subject matter competence, personal characteristics, and a practice which corresponds to an accurate understanding and consideration of the reality of the learners involved in a learning experience (Galbraith, 2004; Henschke, 1987).

In the absence of knowledge about effective teaching and learning practices for adults, teachers may fall back on the teaching and learning models they themselves experienced as students (Hiemstra, 1994; Weimer, 2002). Weimer (2002) notes that most students' formal education does not include learner-centered experiences. In addition, not having intentionally studied teaching and learning while becoming subject matter specialists in their field, teachers may not be able to measure their practice against standards for practice in the field of education. Weimar suggests that teachers may be conditioned through their own educational experiences to consider the study of teaching practice as less intellectual and rigorous than other avenues of educational inquiry.

The shift from a teacher-centered or content-centered learning model to a learner-centered model necessarily takes the emphasis off of the teacher and teaching and places it on learning (Weimer, 2002). Weimer (2002) states that "current instructional practice often finds [teachers] in the spotlight, at the center of the action, but [their] persistent position there compromises the learning potential of students" (p. 94). An emphasis on learning and learners shifts the focus of an educational activity to supporting "individual learner needs, capacities, experiences, and interests" (McCombs, 2001, p. 185).

Teacher resistance to moving toward a learner-centered approach may be the result of a desire to retain authority in the classroom (Hiemstra & Brockett, 1994). It may be the result of being emotionally invested in a teaching identity or having professional self-confidence threatened (Weimer, 2002). Furthermore, it may be caused by unchallenged myths and unexamined understandings of learner-centered approaches (Brockett, 1994). Teacher resistance may also be the result of a teacher just not being at

the developmental stage professionally where he or she is open to a shift in approach and practice (Weimer, 2002).

Some educators have suggested that a better understanding of learner-centered teaching and adult education among teachers or learning leaders would improve adult learning (Collins, 2004). For example, Stricker's (2006) study of the instructional perspective of principals recommends increased knowledge of andragogy for educational leaders who are responsible for planning teacher development activities. Weimer (2002) cautions, however, that an openness to moving toward a learner-centered instructional approach requires more than developing new teaching techniques. It also requires increased self-knowledge through reflection and self-assessment (Long, 2002; McCombs, 2001; Weimer, 2002).

Collins (2004) states that a change in teacher perceptions about adult learning does not necessarily produce a different teaching practice. For example, Gorham's (1985) study of public school and postsecondary teachers of adults and pre-adults found that formal training in adult education and knowledge of adult development did not significantly affect teaching practice. Even teachers who reported a learner-centered approach to teaching were not observed to actually practice learner-centered teaching or use learner-centered techniques. Gorham did find evidence, however, that using learner-centered instructional techniques was responsible for a change to more learner-centered student-teacher interactions in the classrooms studied.

The effective teacher of adults embodies a combination of personal and professional knowledge and characteristics which support and nurture student learning goals. This requires an understanding of the lived reality of learners. It also requires a

willingness to accept that it is the learner who necessarily holds the central role in the teaching-learning paradigm.

In this study, the MIPI assessed the extent to which teachers of adults report "beliefs, feelings and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) which reflect the use of andragogical principles. Student perceptions of instructional perspective, reported on the MIPI-S, were compared to teachers' MIPI scores to determine the extent to which there was congruence between students' points of view and teacher perceptions of their presence in the classroom. In addition, the PIF-I asked teachers if they had been exposed to information about adult learning and the source of that information. This study generates a portrait of teachers in the noncredit foreign language classroom, particularly with regard to instructional perspective.

Teacher-Learner Relationship

The importance of collaboration between teacher and students is a significant characteristic of the andragogical model (Brookfield, 1986; Knowles, 1990). While "learning remains the responsibility of the adult learner" (Daines, Daines, & Graham, 1993, p. 131) in the learner-centered model, learning is also the result of a collaboration between learner and teacher. This collaborative effort affects all areas of the learning experience, from assessment of needs and negotiation of goals to design of a learning plan, choice of learning activities, and evaluation of learning (Knowles, 1990).

However, in the andragogical model, the collaborative relationship between teacher and student extends beyond the student's learning plans. According to Henschke (1989), the teacher identifies himself or herself as one member of the classroom community of learners engaged in the learning process. Henschke states that the

identification of the teacher "as a co-learner with other learners" (p. 83) is important to establishing a dynamic context for adult learning.

Implicit in this concept of the teacher-learner relationship is a respect for the learner and the teacher's interest in "how learners experience learning" (Galbraith, 2004, p. 9). The teacher seeks to nurture and empower students toward greater self-direction. Additionally, the teacher's relationship with the student is a balancing act between guiding learners toward their own perceived learning needs and guiding learners toward critical reflection. The teacher encourages learners to see beyond their own individual view of themselves and the world by "analyzing assumptions, challenging previously accepted and internalized beliefs and values, [and] considering the validity of alternative behaviors or social forms" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 125). The teacher must also be willing, as part of the learning journey, to accept the learner's possible negative reaction and resistance to being guided toward self-direction or critical reflection (Weimer, 2002).

Conti (2004) states that trust is "the central element in a learner-centered approach" (p. 78). The learner must trust the teacher's guidance, even into areas of self-reflection that are uncomfortable and challenging. The teacher must trust the learner's ability to take responsibility for his or her own learning. In addition, the teacher and learner must trust their own abilities as they navigate personal growth, decision-making, experimenting, exploring choices, and self-evaluation (Conti, 2004).

Knowles (1990) states that the optimal conditions for adult learning include "mutual trust and respect" (p. 85) among co-learners in the classroom. It is the responsibility of the teacher to create an environment which builds "relationships of mutual trust and helpfulness among the students by encouraging cooperative activities

and refraining from inducing competitiveness and judgmentalness" (p. 85). In addition, the teacher of adults must establish a relationship with students that is based on shared power in order to counteract the influence of traditional pedagogical environments where the teacher is viewed as an authority figure. Knowles (1996) describes one way he addressed this aspect of climate setting: "in presenting myself I emphasize who I am as a human being rather than as an expert, and I urge them to call me by my first name" (p. 259).

Lack of trust between learning participants in the classroom represents a problem for learning and the learning climate. Ennis et al. (1989) found that "the absence of mutual trust contributed to a…lack of shared decision making" (p. 84) in elective university courses. The authors report that mutual trust was the foundation of shared decision making in this context because it created a rapport between all stakeholders in the social network within the classroom. The establishment of this rapport resulted in "open and fluid communication patterns [which] appeared to be a facilitating factor in shared decision making" (p. 85). In addition, the study noted that "by gently increasing the number and variety of shared decisions, the instructor can assist the student not only in learning and accepting the responsibility for the process but also in valuing the *ownership* of the product" (p. 86).

Rowbotham's (2007) study found that teachers who report feeling empathy for learners, trusting learners, and accommodating learners' uniqueness are perceived by students as demonstrating support and involvement in the classroom. Rowbotham uses the term *teacher responsiveness* to refer to this combination of teacher characteristics. This attribute encompasses "[recognizing] and [promoting] self esteem of students,

[expressing] confidence in the student's ability to learn material and [understanding] that students know their own needs and aspirations" (p. 85). Responsive teachers are willing to adjust their instructional approach to accommodate differences in student learning. Rowbotham also found that teachers reporting high responsiveness were perceived by students as demonstrating higher organization, clarity, and task-orientation.

Johnson (2006) uses the term mentor to describe those who facilitate student development and reflection. In the classroom, mentors focus on the learner's experience instead of content mastery. The mentor-student relationship provides the learner with ongoing support and dialogue. Johnson reports that this type of interaction actually has a neurological effect. It moves "[students'] thinking activity into the higher brain regions…where reflective activity and abstract thinking take place" (p. 64). The process of a learner evolving, socially and neurologically, from receiver of knowledge to creator of knowledge requires a learning climate "where the learner feels uniquely seen by the mentor, valued, and safe" (p. 66). The mentor has a critical role in creating a space which supports this evolutionary process.

In the andragogical model, the teacher-student relationship is collaborative. Teacher and students are co-learners in the classroom community where they all have valued contributions to make to the learning process. The teacher is responsible for creating the environment within which the interactions necessary for learning can take place.

The MIPI, used in the present study, assesses elements of the teacher-student relationship discussed in this section (e.g., collaboration, respect, trust, and empathy). The seven subscales which make up the MIPI are: Teacher Empathy with Learners,

Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating

Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning

Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), Teacher-centered Learning Process

(Henschke, 1989). The MIPI-S is an adaptation of the MIPI for use with students in

foreign language courses in the present study. The MIPI-S is composed of the same

seven subscales with the same item content as the MIPI. A detailed discussion of the

seven subscales which comprise the MIPI and MIPI-S is found in the Instructional

Perspectives section of this chapter.

Learning Climate

The learning climate is the result of the physical environment of learning and the

interconnected web of psychosocial elements which instructors and students bring to the

classroom. A learning climate which is appropriate to the needs of learners and supports

their efforts maximizes the potential for learning to occur (Rowbotham, 2007). Knowles

(1980) states that "the behavior of the teacher probably influences the character of the

learning climate more than any other single factor" (p. 47).

Physical environment. The physical environment for learning is comprised of all

material features of the learning space which impact learners' bodies and senses. The

physical environment in the adult classroom should be one which is comfortable for adult

bodies and welcoming for all learners (Caffarella, 1994). It should be "aesthetically

pleasing" (Knowles, 1980, p. 223). The furniture in the room as well as the lighting and

sound conditions should be appropriate to adults' physical needs (Caffarella, 1994; Kidd,

1967; Knowles, 1980). The learning facility should have adequate room temperature and

ventilation plus sufficient space for personal comfort and group work (Caffarella, 1994).

Since the arrangement of the learning space impacts what takes place in the classroom, attention should be paid to placement of furniture and teaching media (Gorham, 1985; Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990). The physical environment should support the amount and kind of interactions which will take place in the classroom.

Choice of an appropriate physical environment for adults should take into account that adults tend to have more health problems than children (Long, 2004; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Adult learners may have problems related to "fatigue, medication, disuse of abilities" (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 398), or actual physical disabilities. Thus, the physical facilities provided for a learning situation should allow room to move around safely and be accessible to persons of all abilities (Caffarella, 1994). Instructional design should also take into account the fact that, for some adult learners, sitting and focusing on one task for prolonged periods of time may be a problem (Grognet, 1989; Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Zemke & Zemke, 1984).

The physical environment in the adult classroom represents on a concrete level the assumptions and attitudes about learning of those who create the learning environment (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Kidd, 1967; Knowles, 1980). Adults learning in an environment designed and organized for children may find it physically uncomfortable. In addition, the distance and inequality represented by a classroom filled with "symbols of childishness" (Knowles, 1980, p. 47) may also represent an uncomfortable psychological climate (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990). Attention to the physical environment speaks to how much the learning facilitator values and respects the needs of the adult learner (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990).

The physical environment of learning is the concrete frame within which learning and learning relationships develop. As much as possible it should be organized to respect the physical and educational needs of adult learners. The present study investigates adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective in foreign language courses. Although the physical environment may have been a contributing factor to adult satisfaction in this context, the study does not include an evaluation of the physical climate for learning in these foreign language classrooms.

Psychosocial environment. The current study examines the relationship between adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective, one aspect of the psychosocial learning climate. The psychosocial environment of the adult classroom is a product of psychological and social characteristics which adult learners and instructors bring to the classroom. Four subscales of the instrument used in this study, the MIPI, assess aspects of the affective instructional climate (i.e., teacher empathy with learners, teacher trust of learners, accommodating learner uniqueness, and teacher insensitivity toward learners). In addition, the summative score on the MIPI assesses the extent to which the instructor uses andragogical principles in the classroom. This section reviews the literature on characteristics of the learning environment which influence the psychosocial climate for learning.

Adult education literature points to the learner-centered environment as the most effective context for adult learning. Learner-centered instruction can be found in formal, informal, and self-directed settings. Merriam and Caffarella (1999) note, however, that "[learner-centered instruction] is primarily used in the informal or self-directed context" (p. 44). Perry (2006) states that "optimal learning depends on…a cycle of curiosity,

exploration, discovery, practice, and mastery--which leads to pleasure, satisfaction, and the confidence to once again set out and explore" (p. 26). The optimal psychosocial learning environment, in whatever context learning occurs, promotes a positive attitude towards self and the cycle of learning Perry describes.

A supportive learning climate recognizes that adult self-concept is situational. (Wlodkowski, 1999). One example of how self-concept is situation-specific would be adults who are very confident in their professional work environment but have very low confidence in their abilities to learn a foreign language (B. Fritsche, personal communication, December, 2007). Another example would be adult learners who excel in math or science but feel intimated by the study of philosophy.

Long (2002) states that an environment which facilitates adult learning "emphasizes the uniquely personal and subjective nature of learning" (p. 70). An appropriate psychosocial environment for adults acknowledges that learner motivation can be affected by feelings of satisfaction and success or dissatisfaction and failure with regard to the learning experience (Long, 2002; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

Learning motivation in adults is enhanced by activities which are meaningful to the learner (Wlodkowski, 1999). To be meaningful, a learning activity should be relevant to the learner's life experience, concerns, interests, or needs (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Wlodkowski, 1999).

A psychosocial climate appropriate for adult learners should allow for the fact that sometimes previous educational experiences may interfere with feelings of well-being and ability to learn (Kidd, 1967; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Zemke & Zemke, 1984). The adult learner brings to the classroom "many experiences which have formed a body

of knowledge, strong feelings, prejudices, and probably some misconceptions"
(University of Nebraska-Lincoln Cooperative Extension, 2003, Section 6) about the self
in an educational context.

Perry (2006) notes that a learner who is alarmed by something in the learning
environment is seriously distracted from participating in learning. The cause for the
alarm response, while triggered by something in the present learning situation, may
actually be the result of previous negative learning experiences. The effects of alarm are
fear and anxiety. The presence of fear and anxiety mean that the learner, in the present
moment, "is less capable of concentrating, more anxious, and more attentive to nonverbal
cues such as tone of voice, body posture, and facial expressions – and may, in fact,
misinterpret such cues because of anxiety-induced hypervigilance" (p. 24).

Creating a safe space will, Perry (2006) suggests, improve participation in
learning. In a safe classroom climate students can take risks and make errors, activities
which Conti (2004) states are "a natural part of the learning process" (p. 81).

In addition to taking into account previous educational experiences and the
situated nature of adults' self-concept, the adult learning environment should be
particularly sensitive to the fact that all interactions in the learning space are filtered
through the cultural orientations of the co-learners (Zenhui, 1999, 2001). Concepts of
time, knowledge, purpose, space, communication, individuality, and learning are all part
of the complex cultural lens through which every individual views the world (Hall &
Hall, 1990). The teacher of adults should develop some awareness of the hidden cultural
codes operating within and among co-learners (Hall & Hall, 1990). Creating an

appropriate learning environment also requires taking into consideration what is culturally relevant to each learner (Wlodkowski, 1999) and co-learners as a group.

In addition, the teacher must be sensitive to the fact that any educational model selected for the classroom is itself a reflection of a very specific cultural orientation (Lingenfelter & Lingenfelter, 2003). Creating the most appropriate environment for learners requires that the teacher consider to what extent the model being used aligns with learner needs. Attention to cultural issues would seem to be particularly appropriate in a classroom where the teacher and students may come from diverse cultural backgrounds.

The psychosocial climate of the learner-centered model allows for students to change goals or learning plans as their learning proceeds. The teacher-facilitator recognizes that the adult learning process may be open-ended. Tough suggests that the self-directed learner cannot really know where a learning project will take him or her (Donaghy, 2004; Tough, 1979). Since the outcome of a learning project may be different from the learner's original intention or goal, Tough says that planning should concentrate primarily on providing for the learning step that comes next (Donaghy, 2004). This flexibility in design is not generally found in the more subject-centered model of pedagogy.

Kidd (1967) emphasizes that adult learners carry a stigma that does not affect the child learner: "the prevailing view that…adults are not efficient learners" (p. 95). Even if the teacher of adults is free of this stereotype, adults themselves may have internalized certain cultural stereotypes that their capabilities diminish as they grow older (Levy & Schlesinger, 2005). A learning climate appropriate for adults addresses beliefs of this

kind and encourages learners to understand that they "can be efficient and effective learners well into old age" (Wlodkowski, 1999, p. 17).

On the other hand, part of creating an appropriate psychosocial climate for adult learning includes taking into consideration any cognitive changes related to the aging process which may be present. Adults may have perceived or actual problems with memory (Justice & Dornan, 2001). Vision and hearing problems may be present (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Kidd, 1967). Physical stamina may be diminished (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Kidd, 1967). The teacher of adults can help learners discover and implement strategies to deal with these ability changes (Justice & Dornan, 2001). For example, with regard to concerns about memory, Wlodkowski (1999) reports that "when material is learned well, and new information is integrated with previously learned material, memory appears to remain stable during most of adulthood" (p. 20).

Learning activities which feel rushed, require rapid learner responses, or include quickly processing multiple visual aids may pose problems for adult learners (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990). Adults can be adversely affected by not having enough "time…to examine a problem or respond to a situation" (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 397). Adults may need a slower pace (Carlson, 2006b) and an increase in the time allowed for new learning to occur because 'they perceive, think, and act more slowly than younger learners" (Wlodkowski, 1999, p. 17). In addition, rapid processing of information in visual materials and media or in unusual or complex learning activities may pose a problem for some adult learners (Wlodkowski, 1999). Adults may also have problems processing rapid speech (Wlodkowski, 1999). The instructional climate and design of adult learning

activities should be flexible enough to accommodate the different needs of adult learners, especially in a class where many different age groups are represented.

Providing this type of support may be a challenge, especially for teachers who have limited experience with or training in how to evaluate or address special learning needs. Hiemstra and Sisco (1990) caution that "assessing the actual learning ability of adults is no easy task" (p. 23).

It is important to note that adult learners as a group are "more diverse than children" (Long, 2004, p. 25). As learners get older, there is greater variability within the group with regard to cultural orientation, experience, health, personal preferences, and motivation. Long (2004) recommends that teachers, planners, and administrators working in programs for adults strive to maintain a balanced stance with regard to the "recognition of individual idiosyncratic characteristics and identification of those normative characteristics that allow [them] to consider adult learners as a group" (pp. 25-26).

In summary, learning climate serves as the frame within which learning occurs. However, it also plays an integral role in enhancing the potential for learning in any educational setting. The learning climate which best supports the learning needs of students effectively respects and responds to their physical and psychosocial characteristics. While a consideration of the influence of physical learning environment is outside the reach of the present study, this study did examine how one aspect of the psychosocial environment, instructional perspective, affects adult satisfaction with learning.

Instructional Perspective

The classroom teacher exerts a powerful influence on learning climate. The current study investigates the relationship between adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective, one aspect of the psychosocial learning climate. Research on instructional perspective provides the framework from which to understand the beliefs, feelings, and behaviors of teachers in the noncredit foreign language classroom.

The instructor is "a critical element" (Apps, 1981, p. 66) in any learning activity. The instructional perspective of the teacher is one of the primary forces that shapes the learning environment and all learning activities which occur within it. According to Henschke (1989), instructional perspective is comprised of "the teacher's personal and contextual identification, actions and competencies in the classroom, and philosophical beliefs for guiding practice" (p. 81). Collins, Jarvis-Selinger, and Pratt (n.d.) describe teaching perspective as "an inter-related set of beliefs and intentions related to knowledge, learning and the role of a teacher" (para. 6). In addition, the teacher's perspective functions as a filter which "[gives] direction and justification" (Collins et al., n.d., para. 6) to all actions related to teaching and learning. It is through this filter that the teacher views his or her actions as well as all activities which take place in the classroom. The definition of instructional perspective used in this study is "the beliefs, feelings and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) which teachers of adults may possess or exhibit in the classroom at a given point in time. Instructional perspective informs educational practice and shapes teacher presence in the classroom.

Teacher Behavior, Beliefs, and Feelings

Teacher behavior is the result of multiple and complex influences. One of those influences is the unique set of beliefs and experiences which each teacher brings to the roles of facilitator, guide, and mentor (Zinn, 2004). Although behavior is overt and therefore observable, the "internal cognitive processes" (Ellis, 2006, p. 6) which inform teacher decisions and actions are "by nature unobservable" (Ellis, 2006, p. 7). Henschke (1989) emphasizes the need for adult educators to understand that "philosophical knowledge undergirds beliefs [about teaching and learning] which in turn guide professional practice" (p. 83). Speaking about the context of foreign language learning, Wyss (2002) also stresses the importance of instructor self-reflection: "It is essential that you, the language instructor, are conscious of why you do what you do" (para. 11). Teacher beliefs represent a lens or filter that teachers "look through, rather than at, when teaching" (Collins et al., n.d., p. 2).

According to Zinn (2004), educators have found that having a clear vision of the individual beliefs and philosophy underpinning teaching practice may benefit the teacher of adults in the following ways:

1. Provide guidelines for making decisions and setting policy (Merriam & Brockett, 1997).

2. Help separate what is worthwhile from what is trivial (Maxcy, 1980).

3. Develop methods of critical thinking (Phenix, 1958).

4. Expand vision; enhance personal meaning in the individual adult educator's life (Apps, 1973).

5. Assist in recognizing and resolving conflicts (a) within total life philosophy

and (b) between beliefs and actions (Phenix, 1958).

6. Provide insight into relationships (a) between teacher and learner, (b) between

learner and subject matter, and (c) between subject matter and the world at large

(Maxcey, 1980).

7. Clarify how the adult educator's work relates to important problems of

individuals and society (Apps, 1973).

8. Help the adult educator ask better questions and answer questions better about

educational programming (Apps, 1973).

9. Help the individual understand self in relation to vocation and

leadership (Apps, 1973). (pp. 44-45)

Finding a way to make explicit those feelings, attitudes, values, and beliefs which

shape behavior allows teachers to understand their own teaching and learning preferences

(Galbraith, 2004). It also helps them make more informed decisions about educational

practices and effective action in the classroom (Galbraith, 2004). Increased awareness of

this network of influences may lead teachers to re-consider their own instructional

perspective. Wegge (1991) found that instructional perspective can be influenced by

exposure to training in adult learning principles or concepts. Awareness of teacher

beliefs and behaviors can also be influenced by self-reflection (Apps, 1985; Davis, 1993;

Hiemstra, 1999; Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). Several self-reflective techniques and

instruments are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

Research on instructional perspective conducted by Stricker (2006), using the IPI,

found that a discrepancy exists between how those who facilitate learning perceive their

actions and attitudes and how they are perceived by learners. Other studies investigating learner-centeredness in postsecondary settings and using the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) had previously also found differences between educator and learner perceptions of instructional format (Hajduk, 2000; Wegge, 1991). Furthermore, in the context of higher education, Fraser and Treagust (1986) found a difference between instructor and student perceptions of the same learning environment.

A review of the literature in adult education indicates that it is important for the teaching and learning process that teachers are conscious of how their beliefs and feelings affect behavior in the classroom. This awareness has the potential to improve the learning climate.

Assessing Teacher Behavior, Beliefs, and Feelings

There are several ways in which teachers can become more aware of their behaviors, beliefs, and feelings. This can be done through observation techniques, informal self-reflective activities, or the use of formal instruments.

One means of obtaining information about teacher behaviors is through observation. Richards (n.d.) notes that observations of teacher behavior can be accomplished by a fellow teacher or colleague. Video or audio recordings of a class in progress are a means by which teachers can observe themselves while teaching. Teachers may also keep a teaching journal which records classroom actions and interactions (Richards, n.d.).

Students are another potential source of information on teachers' classroom behaviors. Richards (n.d.) cautions, though, that information about student perceptions are dependent on the type of instrument used to elicit feedback. In addition, student

perceptions are also influenced by their own subjective view of teaching, learning, and the particular learning situation in which they are engaged.

Observation techniques are one means by which teaching behavior can be documented and assessed. However, observation techniques do not contribute evidence as to the assumptions or intentions behind teacher behaviors in the classroom..

A second approach to clarifying the beliefs and feelings which influence teacher classroom behavior is through the use of self-reflective techniques. Teacher self-reflection may be motivated by formal professional or institutional assessment. It may also be motivated by an individual teacher's desire to inquire into his or her own teaching, by other personal learning needs, or some combination of these motivators.

Hiemstra (1999) states that articulating a personal philosophy benefits the adult educator in several ways:

1. A philosophy promotes an understanding of human relationships,

2. A philosophy sensitizes you to the various needs associated with positive human interactions,

3. A philosophy provides a framework for distinguishing, separating, and understanding personal values,

4. A philosophy promotes flexibility and consistency in working with adult learners. (para. 6)

Apps (1985) proposes that adult educators use a belief analysis to reflect on assumptions and judgments related to teaching practice. In this self-reflective process, the teacher creates a list of teaching beliefs by working through a list of tasks: (a) "identifying beliefs held" (p. 24) about adult learners and adult education, (b) "searching

for contradictions among beliefs" (p. 24), (c) "discovering sources of beliefs" (p. 24), and (d) "making judgments about the beliefs" identified (p. 25). Apps states that this reflective process creates a beneficial interaction between analysis and belief. Teachers' beliefs may influence how they go about analyzing those beliefs. At the same time, "the process of analysis influences what [teachers] believe" (p. 25).

A second example of a self-reflective technique is Hiemstra's (1999) Personal Philosophy Worksheet. The worksheet provides a framework for teachers to describe their own philosophical system. This exercise asks teachers to consider their philosophical orientation to life and learning: how meaning is created, what constitutes reality, what being human means, the aims and methods of education, appropriate learning content, possible criticisms of these beliefs, philosophers or educators who support these beliefs, and what programs or practices might be representative of these beliefs.

Other self-reflective activities which can be used by teachers are journal-writing, keeping a teaching log, or compiling a list of questions focused on concerns, issues, and perceptions related to teaching experience (Davis, 1993; Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). These techniques are also applicable to teacher education. Flowerdew (1998), for example, describes the use of journal writing in training pre-service foreign language teachers.

Besides using observation and self-reflective techniques, a third approach to understanding teacher assumptions and judgments about teaching and learning is to use a formal instrument. Several such instruments have been developed to identify, describe, or assess teaching attitudes, feelings, values, and beliefs.

The Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory (PAEI) developed by Zinn (2004) is a self-report instrument which helps adult educators "identify [their] personal philosophy of education and compare it with prevailing philosophies in the field of adult education" (p. 59). The adult educator can determine from the PAEI score how his or her own personal philosophy compares with the philosophies of Liberal (Arts) Adult Education, Behavioral Adult Education, Progressive Adult Education, Humanistic Adult Education, and Radical Adult Education.

Horwitz's (1988) Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) has been used with ESL and foreign language teachers (Horwitz, 1988; Peacock, n.d.), pre-service language teachers (Tercanlioglu, n.d.), and ESL and foreign language students (Horwitz, 1988) to explore various assumptions about language learning. The BALLI is a thirty-four item instrument which assesses language learning beliefs in five areas: "1) difficulty of language learning; 2) foreign language aptitude; 3) the nature of language learning; 4) learning and communication strategies; and 5) motivations and expectations" (Horwitz, 1988, p. 284). No score is derived from the instrument; however, responses to items within the five areas of interest are used to illuminate beliefs about learning a foreign language held by students and teachers.

Conti's (2004) research on teaching style produced another instrument for evaluating teacher beliefs and self-reported behaviors. The Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) evaluates

> the distinct qualities displayed by a teacher that are persistent from situation to situation regardless of content….the total atmosphere created by the teacher's views on learning and the teacher's approach to teaching….the overt

implementation of the teacher's beliefs about teaching, [which] is directly linked

to the teacher's educational philosophy. (pp. 76-77)

Like Zinn's instrument, PALS focuses on adult education. It "measures the frequency

with which [a teacher] practices teaching/learning principles that are described in the

adult education literature" (p. 79). Individual scores reflect whether a teacher's teaching

style supports learner-centered approaches, teacher-centered approaches, or "an eclectic

approach that draws on behaviors from each extreme" (p. 79).

Pratt and Collins (2001a; Pratt, Collins, & Jarvis-Selinger, 2001) also developed

an instrument which evaluates teacher perspective. Pratt's Teaching Perspectives

Inventory (TPI) assesses teachers' "orientations to teaching" (Pratt et al., 2001, p. 2). It

asks "structured questions about teachers' actions in the teaching setting, their intentions,

how they organize the learning situation, and their beliefs about fundamental principles

of teaching and learning" (Pratt & Collins, 2001a, para. 1). Scores on the TPI represent

how closely a teacher's answers are aligned with each of five different teaching

perspectives: Transmission, Apprenticeship, Developmental, Nurturing, and Social

Reform (Pratt et al., 2001). This instrument has been used with instructors, instructors in

preparation, and adult students as well as professionals in fields other than education. It

has also been used to assess teaching perspective in teachers and students in ESL

programs (Pratt & Collins, 2001b).

Teachers may become aware of beliefs, feelings, and behaviors which affect the

learning climate through a variety of observation and self-reflective techniques as well as

the use of self-report instruments. The present study uses a self-report instrument to

assess instructional perspective.

Instructional Perspectives Inventory (IPI). Henschke (1989) developed the IPI to provide a better understanding of "the beliefs, feelings, and behaviors adult educators need to possess to practice in the emerging field of adult education" (p. 83). The IPI assesses "the teacher's personal and contextual identification, actions in the classroom, competencies in the classroom, and philosophical beliefs for guiding practice" (p. 81). The IPI composite score represents the extent to which educators report the use of andragogical principles. High scores represent an orientation to a learner-centered instructional perspective; low scores represent a teacher-centered instructional perspective. Henschke notes, however, that the score does not represent "a constant, absolute attribute" (cited in Stanton, 2005, p. 111). The score only reflects a snapshot of a teacher's constantly evolving instructional perspective taken at one particular moment in time.

The IPI was intended to be "used as a critical reflection or self-evaluation and self-diagnostic instrument--providing clues for improvement" (Stanton, 2005, p. 110). This instrument has been used with adult educators, adult educators in preparation, graduate students, health care providers, nursing educators and students, mathematics faculty, school administrators, and University Extension workers (Henschke, 1994). The present study represents the first use of the modified IPI in the context of adult foreign language learning.

The IPI assesses seven factors related to teacher beliefs, feelings and behaviors. Those factors are: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity

toward Learners, Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and Teacher-centered Learning Process.

Factor 1 is Teacher Empathy with Learners. The definition of empathy is "the intellectual identification with or vicarious experiencing of the feelings, thoughts, or attitudes of another" ("Empathy," 1996, p. 638). This subscale is comprised of five questions. It assesses the extent to which the teacher demonstrates a connection to and understanding of the learner by noticing learner changes, acknowledging and appreciating learner participation, and supporting the development of positive self-esteem. Factor 1 also assesses the attitude of teachers toward creating a balance in the classroom between individual learner motivations to learn and acquisition of content knowledge.

The teacher who responds to Factor 1 questions from an andragogical perspective sees learners as capable of change. The teacher with an andragogical orientation acknowledges that both students' motivations to learn and their need to acquire content knowledge should be taken into consideration in the classroom.

The questions for Factor 1 are found in Table 1. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 1. Items for IPI Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners

Factor 1	Item	How frequently do you…
	4	feel fully prepared to teach?
	12	notice and acknowledge to learners positive changes in them?
	19	balance your efforts between leaner content acquisition and motivation?
	26	express appreciation to learners who actively participate?
	22	promote positive self-esteem in learners?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 1 = .63 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 2 is Teacher Trust of Learners. Trust is defined as "1. reliance on the integrity, strength, ability, surety, etc. of a person or thing; confidence. 2. confident expectation of something; hope" ("Trust," 1996, p. 2031). Factor 2 is comprised of 11 questions. The teacher who responds to these questions from an andragogical perspective sees learners as unique and worthy of having the power to make choices and decisions about what they need. Learners are seen as possessing dignity and integrity. They are capable of expressing their own learning needs and participating in the evaluation of their learning. The teacher who reports an andragogical perspective in Factor 2 items helps learners become aware of their feelings and communicate their goals, dreams, and realities. The teacher with an andragogical orientation supports learner individuality. His or her interactions with students show confidence in the learner, as well as respect and regard for the learner.

The questions for Factor 2 are found in Table 2. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 2. Items for IPI Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners

Factor 2	Item	How frequently do you…
	7	purposefully communicate to learners that each is uniquely important?
	8	express confidence that learners will develop the skills they need?
	16	trust learners to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like?
	28	prize the learner's ability to learn what is needed?
	29	feel learners need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?
	30	enable learners to evaluate their own progress in learning?
	31	hear what learners indicate their learning needs are?
	39	engage learners in clarifying their own aspirations?
	43	develop supportive relationships with your learners?
	44	experience unconditional positive regard for learners?
	45	respect the dignity and integrity of the learners?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 1 = .81 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 3 is Planning and Delivery of Instruction. Factor 3 is comprised of five questions. The teacher who responds to these questions from an andragogical perspective coordinates learning objectives, teaching techniques, and the use of instructional media in the classroom. He or she chooses techniques which are integrated with content knowledge. The teacher with an andragogical approach acknowledges that a variety of techniques and instructional formats is important. This instructor understands that there is more than one way to approach instruction. The andragogical teacher is interested in creatively improving ways to plan and deliver instruction.

The questions for Factor 3 are found in Table 3. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 3. Items for IPI Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction

Factor 3	Item	How frequently do you…
	1	use a variety of teaching techniques?
	9	search for or create new teaching techniques?
	22	establish instructional objectives?
	23	use a variety of instructional media? (Internet, distance, interactive video, videos, etc.) ?
	42	integrate teaching techniques with subject matter content?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 3 = .72 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 4 is Accommodating Learner Uniqueness. Definitions of the word unique which apply to this factor are "1. existing as the only one or as the sole example; single; solitary in type or characteristics: a unique copy of an ancient manuscript. 2. having no like or equal; unparalleled; incomparable….5. not typical; unusual" ("Unique," 1996, p. 2074). Factor 4 is made up of seven questions. The teacher who responds to Factor 4 questions from an andragogical perspective acknowledges the diversity of learners' abilities, ways of learning, and application of knowledge. The teacher with an andragogical orientation listens to learners and engages learners in the discovery of their individual abilities. He or she anticipates and accepts that frustration is part of the learning process.

The teacher with an andragogical approach acknowledges that learners can learn from one another and that learners have something meaningful to contribute to the learning process. In the andragogical model, all learners in the classroom have the ability to provide learning help to one another. This approach encourages collaborative learning.

The questions for Factor 4 are found in Table 4. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 4. Items for IPI Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness

Factor 4	Item	How frequently do you…
	6	expect and accept learner frustration as they grapple with problems?
	14	believe that learners vary in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge?
	15	really listen to what learners have to say?
	17	encourage learners to solicit assistance from other learners?
	37	individualize the pace of learning for each learner?
	38	help learners explore their own abilities?
	40	ask the learners how they would approach a learning task?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 4 = .71 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 5 is Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners. To be insensitive is to be "1. deficient in human sensibility, acuteness of feeling, or consideration; unfeeling; callous….4. not readily responsive or aware" ("Insensitive," 1996, p. 986). Factor 5 is comprised of seven questions. For the insensitive teacher, the learner is an enigma. The insensitive teacher does not understand the reasons for learner behaviors like asking numerous questions or needing an extended period of time to understand what is being learned. The insensitive teacher has feelings of impatience and frustration with perceived learner attitudes and needs. Unable to put himself or herself in the learner's place, the insensitive teacher cannot understand how the learner might have different ways of understanding content and communications. Because the learner's point-of-view is a mystery, the insensitive teacher may, therefore, interpret certain learner behaviors as inattentive, apathetic, or boring.

Factor 5 is reverse-scored as suggested by Stanton (2005). A high score on this factor represents an andragogical perspective. The questions for Factor 5 are found in

Table 5. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 5. Items for IPI Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners

Factor 5	Item	How frequently do you…
	5	have difficulty understanding learner point-of-views?
	13	have difficulty getting your point across to learners?
	18	feel impatient with learners' progress?
	27	experience frustration with learner apathy?
	32	have difficulty with the amount of time learners need to grasp various concepts?
	36	get bored with the many questions learners ask?
	41	feel irritation at learner inattentiveness in the learning setting?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 5 = .7787 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 6 is Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process). Factor 6 is comprised of five questions. The teacher who reports the use of experience-based learning techniques acts from a belief that learners benefit from interactive learning. He or she sees learning as an activity which can take place productively within a group or community of learners. In addition, the teacher using learner-centered processes acknowledges the importance of making learning relevant to the real life of learners. Teachers who report an andragogical approach involve the entire classroom community of learners in collaborative experiences based on real-life situations or simulations.

The questions for Factor 6 are found in Table 6. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 6. Items for IPI Factor 6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)

Factor 6	Item	How frequently do you…
	2	use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to discuss information from lectures)?
	10	teach through simulations of real-life?
	21	conduct group discussions?
	24	use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?
	35	conduct role plays?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 6 = .72 (Stanton, 2005)

Factor 7 is Teacher-centered Learning Process. Factor 7 is comprised of five questions. The teacher who reports a teacher-centered learning approach acts on the belief that the learner should receive the amount and kind of information which the teacher considers appropriate. Since the learner is not as knowledgeable as the teacher, the teacher's role is to determine the learning that is necessary and appropriate to a learning situation. In the teacher-centered approach, learners are passive recipients of information.

The teacher who reports a teacher-centered learning approach is focused on providing learners with as much information as possible, as efficiently as possible. The teacher-centered approach privileges the teacher's point of view, knowledge, and experience over that of the learners. The teacher chooses the most appropriate instructional plan for the learners. The teacher reporting a teacher-centered approach believes that he or she is a skillful teacher and therefore worthy of being the learning director in a classroom.

Factor 7 is reverse-scored as suggested by Stanton (2005). A high score represents high use of andragogical principles. The questions for Factor 7 are found in Table 7. The response options for each item are Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, Almost Always.

Table 7. Items for IPI Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process

Factor 7	Item	How frequently do you…
	3	believe that your primary goal is to provide learners with as much information as possible?
	11	teach exactly what and how you have planned?
	20	try to make your presentations clear enough to forestall all learner questions?
	25	believe that your teaching skills are as refined as they can be?
	34	require learners to follow the precise learning experiences which you provide them?

Note. Cronbach's alpha for IPI Factor 7 = .57 (Stanton, 2005)

The scores for each factor in the IPI are combined to provide one summative score (see Appendix D). This score places the instructor on a continuum between High Above Average use of andragogical principles and Low Below Average use of andragogical principles (see Appendix E). Henschke has noted, however, that the factor scores and summative score derived from this instrument only represent the teacher's instructional perspective at a particular point in time (cited in Stanton, 2005). Instructional perspective is a constantly evolving attribute.

The IPI was developed and refined by two rounds of testing with over 400 adult educators in the Chicago City Colleges and, subsequently, with over 200 adult educators at St. Louis Community College. With both populations, the two highest-rated subscales

were Teacher Empathy with Learners (called Teacher Sensitivity to Learner Differences in the second round of testing) and Teacher Trust of Learners.

IPI research and development of the modified IPI. Prior to the present study, the IPI has been used in eight studies (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; McManus, 2008; Rowbotham, 2007; Seward, 1998; Stanton, 2005; Stricker, 2006; Thomas, 1995). The IPI has been used to assess the instructional perspective of adult educators, adult educators in preparation, graduate students, health care providers and instructors, school administrators, and University Extension workers (Henschke, 1994). The present study is the first time that this instrument has been used in the context of noncredit foreign language courses.

Thomas (1995) used the IPI to study the instructional perspective of adult educators teaching parents. Results of his work indicate that teachers developed a more andragogical instructional perspective the longer they taught adults. With regard to the factor Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Thomas found that full-time teachers of adults were more likely than part-time teachers to include parents in the process of planning and implementing instruction.

Seward (1998) also examined the instructional perspectives of parent educators, (i.e., adult educators teaching parents). She found that parent educators' age had an effect on positive identification with andragogical perspective, specifically with regard to the subscales Teacher Trust of Learners and Planning and Delivery of Instruction. In Seward's study, the number of in-service hours of training and the parent educator's length of service had a positive correlation with one factor, Teacher Empathy for Learners.

Dawson (1997) studied the instructional perspective of nurse educators. This study determined that four IPI subscales (i.e., Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Teacher-centered Learning Process, and Experience-based Learning Techniques) were affected by the highest educational degree held by nurse educators. Three subscales (i.e., Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, and Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners) were influenced by amount of teaching experience.

Drinkard (2004) used the IPI with nurse educators teaching in distance learning formats. Drinkard's study found that increased teaching experience was associated with a more andragogical approach to teaching and learning. Level of education also influenced instructional perspective. Nurse educators with doctorates in fields other than nursing actually showed more trust in learners than did educators with nursing doctorates. Drinkard also found that nurse educators with Master's degrees in nursing were more trusting of learners than those with doctorates in nursing.

Stanton (2005) established the construct validity of the IPI. Using Cronbach's alpha, Stanton's study established that the overall reliability of the IPI is .8768. Factors 1 through 6 were found to be correlated with the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS); Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process was not significantly correlated with the SDLRS.

As a result of this study, Stanton (2005) recommended three changes to the IPI:

1. An increased degree of variance in the IPI response scale.

According to this suggestion, the number of possible responses to each item in the modified IPI should be increased from four to five.

2. A re-wording of IPI descriptors for the expanded response scale.

Stanton suggests that the modified IPI offer the following five possible responses

to each item: A – Almost Never, B – Not Often, C – Sometimes, D – Usually,

and E – Almost Always.

3. The use of reverse scoring on items in the two IPI subscales representing

teacher-centeredness: Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity towards Learners and

Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process.

Stanton's (2005) suggested modifications improve the instrument in two ways.

First, increasing the response scale's degree of variance and the necessary re-wording of

descriptors provide for more subtle distinctions in survey responses. Second, using

reverse scoring for participants' scores in Factors 5 and 7 provides a consistency of

direction in scores across all subscales. After incorporating the recommended reverse

scoring on Factors 5 and 7, high scores in all subscales represent learner-centeredness

(i.e., high use of andragogical principles); low scores represent teacher-centeredness (i.e.,

low use of andragogical principles).

The Stanton (2005) study also refined the understanding of IPI scores by grouping

teacher scores into category levels representing higher or lower degrees of andragogical

perspective: High Above Average, Above Average, Average, Below Average, and Low

Below Average (see Appendix E). A High or High Above Average score on the MIPI

indicates a perspective associated with the use of andragogical principles; a Low or Low

Below Average score on the MIPI indicates a perspective associated with pedagogical or

teacher-centered principles. Scores in the Average range represent a blended perspective

with teacher beliefs, feelings, and behaviors associated to varying degrees with

pedagogical and andragogical approaches. These categories provided descriptors for use of andragogical principles in future studies using the IPI.

A teacher's score on the IPI represents a point on the continuum between low use of andragogical principles and high use of andragogical principles. Henschke advises that the score should only be considered an indication of the teacher's place on that continuum at a particular moment in time. The score does not represent "a constant, absolute attribute" (cited in Stanton, 2005, p. 111).

Stricker (2006) used the IPI to assess the instructional perspective of principals-as-facilitators-of-teacher-learning. He also adapted the IPI to evaluate the perceptions of teachers-as-learners with regard to the instructional perspective of their principals. Stricker found that there was a gap between principals' reported instructional perspectives and teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional perspectives. Analysis of the subscales measuring Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners revealed that teachers' perceptions were not congruent with principals' reported beliefs and behaviors in this study. The gap between teacher perceptions and principal's self-reported instructional perspective found by Stricker led him to conclude that principals as learning leaders "have not learned how to create conditions conducive for learning and have not learned how to teach adults effectively" (p. 204).

Two more recent studies have used the modified IPI to examine nursing education (Rowbotham, 2007) and mathematics faculty (McManus, 2008). Rowbotham (2007) investigated the relationship between the instructional perspective of nurse educators, using the modified IPI, and student perceptions of the learning climate, using the Adult

Classroom Environment Scale (ACES). Her analysis of educators' IPI scores found that three subscales were highly correlated with summative IPI scores: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, and Accommodating Learner Uniqueness. Rowbotham combined these three subscales into one composite variable, Teacher Responsiveness.

> As described by Rowbotham (2007), teacher responsiveness encompasses educators who recognize and promote self esteem of students, express confidence in the student's ability to learn material and understand that students know their own needs and aspirations, and…[believe] each student learns [differently] and can adjust their teaching accordingly. (p. 85)

Rowbotham reports that teachers who scored high on the composite variable Teacher Responsiveness were also those that students rated higher on Teacher Support, Task Orientation, Organization and Clarity, and Involvement on the ACES.

McManus (2008) investigated the instructional perspectives of 34 full-time community college faculty teaching mathematics. Using the modified IPI, she found that the instructional perspective of mathematics faculty in her study fell in the Average to Below Average levels for the use of andragogical principles (see Appendix E).

McManus (2008) also determined that the demographic characteristics of age and highest degree attained were the most significant teacher characteristics associated with the use of andragogical principles. The youngest group of teachers had the lowest scores across all subscales except Teacher Insensitivity to Learners. Teachers with a doctorate or professional degree had the highest scores on the modified IPI, although their summative scores still fell in the Average range for use of andragogical principles. This

group also had the highest scores for Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners.

In summary, the instructional perspective of the teacher touches every aspect of teaching and adult learning. The instructional perspective of teachers in noncredit foreign language courses has not been investigated. The present study uses Henschke's modified IPI to assess instructional perspective in this context. An adaptation of the modified IPI was used by students to report perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective (see Instruments section, Chapter III). Previous research using the IPI provides part of the framework for evaluating the findings of the present study.

Instructional Perspective in the Foreign Language Classroom

As previously noted, the instructional perspective of the teacher shapes the learning environment. Instructional perspective is comprised of "the beliefs, feelings, and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 83) which adult educators possess and exhibit in the classroom. It represents the teacher's self-concept, actions and attitudes in the classroom, personal and professional competencies, and the personal philosophy which guides teaching practice (Henschke, 1994). Three influences on the instructional perspective of foreign language teachers are examined in this section: (a) professional knowledge and skills, (b) culture, and (c) language learning experience.

The instructional perspective of foreign language teachers is influenced by the professional knowledge and skills they have acquired (Burden, 2004; McDonough, 2002). Foreign language teachers may be subject matter specialists with a degree in a specific foreign language (Vélez-Rendón, 2002). They may have demonstrated a knowledge of language teaching by qualifying for teaching credentials (Vélez-Rendón,

2002). They may be native speakers of the language they teach or they may just speak that language with a certain level of proficiency (Vélez-Rendón, 2002). Some teachers may combine all three knowledge, skill, and credential areas.

The knowledge, skills, or credentials required for teaching a foreign language vary depending on the educational institution or organization which hosts the language program and hires the teacher (Richards, n.d.). However, no matter what professional knowledge, skills, or credentials have been acquired, foreign language teachers of adults do not necessarily have a background in adult education principles (Carlson, 2006b). Those engaged in teaching English as a foreign or second language are the one group of language teachers who may be professionally prepared to teach adult language learners (Crandall, 1993; Crandall & Sheppard, 2004). These language teachers can obtain professional credentials related to teaching adult students from programs like the University of Cambridge's Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults program (Richards, n.d.) or the University of Virginia's Certificate in Adult ESL (University of Virginia School of Continuing & Professional Studies, 2009).

Carlson's (2006a, 2006b) study of the formal language learning experiences of adult university students suggests that the application of adult education principles in the context of foreign language learning is beneficial. Carlson found that a lack of responsiveness to the needs and interests of adult learners compromises the effectiveness of the language learning experience for adults. This study produced a useful description of how to apply andragogical principles to help adults learn foreign languages and to create a foreign language learning environment beneficial to adult learners.

Carlson's (2006a, 2006b) research represents a bridge between the study of foreign language learning and the principles of adult learning. She, in fact, coined the term *foreign language andragogy* to refer to the integration of these two fields. There are, however, many questions that have yet to be addressed with regard to foreign language andragogy. It is unclear to what extent foreign language teachers of adults use andragogical principles. In addition, the question of what instructional perspective or perspectives result in the most satisfying adult learning experience in the foreign language classroom has yet to be investigated. The present study addresses both these questions.

Besides professional knowledge and skills, culture is a second influence on instructional perspective. Culture has been defined as "the shared values, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and language use within a social group" (Guy, 1999, p. 7). A broader definition of culture would include all the arts, institutions, and other creative products of a society (Guy, 1999). Culture infuses every aspect of human interaction, from personal relationships with family and friends to impersonal encounters with those who are *other* (Hall & Hall, 1990; Tannen, 1986). The foreign language classroom represents an intersection where the cultural orientations of the teacher and students, in particular the educational cultures of teacher and students, come face to face.

Educational culture exerts a particularly strong effect on people because "education has been a primary means of socializing individuals" (Guy, 1999, p. 5). When teacher and students come from different educational cultures, as in the case of a native speaker of Chinese teaching a group of English-speaking American adults in the United States, the potential for significant variance in understandings of all elements of the

educational paradigm exists. Teacher and students may have very different understandings about the nature and uses of knowledge, the purpose of learning, the evaluation of learning, the teacher-learner relationship, appropriate teacher and learner behaviors, suitable learning contexts, knowledge acquisition, the value of critical thinking, what constitutes intelligence and logic, and the role of emotion (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Guy, 1999; Richards, n.d.; Sternberg, 2002).

The educational culture in which a teacher has learned as a student and has learned how to become a teacher plays an important role in shaping teacher beliefs. It influences perceptions about what constitutes a credible or effective instructor (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Guy, 1999; Richards, n.d.; Sternberg, 2002). It also informs the learning environment a teacher creates (Ellis, 2006; McDonough, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2001; Zenhui, 1999, 2001). Roberts (1998) states that "language teacher behavior cannot be separated from pedagogic models inherited from the mother tongue culture (Koranic, Confucian, African, etc.)" (p. 97). The effects of a teacher's educational culture can be mitigated, however, by reflection (Richards, n.d.; Vélez-Rendón, 2002). It can also be affected by experiencing educational culture from a new vantage point, that of the learner.

In addition to professional knowledge and skills and cultural orientation, a third influence on instructional perspective is the foreign language teacher's own experiences as a language learner. These experiences exert a significant influence on teacher beliefs about language teaching and learning as well as on teaching practice. An examination of the literature on second language teacher education by Vélez-Rendón (2002) emphasizes "the crucial role of previous learning experiences in shaping [prospective] teachers'

personal theories and beliefs about language teaching and learning" (p. 459). The experiences of adult language teachers who have chosen to also become adult language learners, however, provide a fuller portrait of the effect of being simultaneously a language student and teacher.

When teachers become language students, a tension may be created between what teachers believe about teaching and their lived experience as a learner (Burden, 2004). McDonough (2002) reports that the learning strategies she used and the activities she enjoyed as a student of Greek were contrary to her teacher-persona's teaching preferences. Thinking that her experience perhaps represented only personal eccentricity, McDonough investigated learning preferences in a group of 19 English-speaking adult foreign language learners taking classes at night. Student responses confirmed McDonough's experience of finding "many activities that are currently unpopular in the broadly communicative ethos of [language teaching]…conducive to learning" (p. 409). Over half of the students liked "reading aloud" (p. 408) and depended on a bilingual dictionary. Over 80% of them thought "regular grammar practice" (p. 408) was necessary. The same number liked "copying from the board" (p. 408), regarded "translation as very important for their learning" (p. 408) and liked audio cassettes. One hundred percent of them liked "the teacher to talk about themselves" (p. 408). These preferences diverged considerably from what McDonough's teacher training told her was most effective and appropriate in the foreign language classroom.

Looking at language learning from the student point of view may result in the teacher reconsidering certain learning and teaching strategies. In addition, living the experience of a student sensitizes the teacher to the effects of being in a different position

of power in the classroom. Burden (2004) reports that EFL teachers living in Japan and studying Japanese recounted traumatic experiences of fear and embarrassment during activities in front of the class. They reported being spoken to as a child by the teacher, feeling lost when spoken to in Japanese by the teacher, being left out, and having their learning efforts misunderstood. These teacher-students, however, also came to understand the powerful effect of being shown respect, fairness, and recognition. Burden's study emphasizes the effects of being immersed in the target language culture and having a teacher who does not come from the same cultural orientation as the learners do.

Participating in new language learning as an adult student shapes the foreign language teacher's instructional perspective in surprising and unexpected ways. It has the potential to produce intense, personal insights not available through academic training, professional conferences, or the reading of educational journal articles (Ransdell, 1993). It can challenge teachers into reconsidering assumptions about effective language teaching and learning strategies. According to Campbell (1996) and Ellis (2006), this is an area of inquiry which has not been sufficiently investigated.

Although the present study does not directly address foreign language teachers' language learning experiences, the PIF-I collected data on the culture of teachers' educational experiences and the number of languages each teacher speaks. Furthermore, demographic data obtained from students allowed the researcher to identify classes where teachers and students came from divergent cultural backgrounds.

The use of observation or an instrument to assess instructional perspective results in a picture of certain teacher-reported beliefs and behaviors at a specific point in time.

Bell (2005) cautions, however, that the types of items on an instrument affect assessment. In educational research, the use of instruments without open-ended items "cannot provide a description or explanation of complex and interacting social, cultural, linguistic, and cognitive factors related to behaviors and attitudes of teachers" (p. 267). In addition, a formal, objective instrument is not capable of determining what specific personal and experiential factors resulted in a particular instructional perspective. Neither is it capable of determining to what extent those personal or experiential factors may have contributed to instructional perspective.

Still, data on teachers' personal and experiential characteristics and instructional perspective ratings can be compared to determine if there are any significant correspondences between certain types of teacher characteristics and various instructional perspectives. Bell's (2005) study of foreign language teacher behaviors and attitudes recommends continued research which would

> compare groupings of foreign language teaches by language, years of experience,
> degree of education, and when teacher certification was completed in order to
> investigate whether, for example, a German teacher's pedagogy is more
> traditional than a Spanish teacher's, or whether a teacher who has been teaching
> for more than 25 years would have different attitudes toward foreign language
> teacher [sic] than a teacher who has only been teaching for 2 years. (p. 267)

The current study investigates the relationship between adult learner satisfaction and instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom. Three influences on instructional perspective which are particularly relevant to this study are professional knowledge and skills, culture, and language learning experience. Research has suggested

that andragogical principles applied to the adult foreign language classroom may be beneficial. However, knowledge about adult education principles may be inadequately addressed in language teacher preparation. The culture of teachers and students, particularly the individual educational cultures from which they come, also plays an important role in shaping interactions in the learning environment. In addition, the personal language learning experiences of adult teachers have been reported to affect teacher beliefs, feelings, and behaviors in the foreign language classroom.

Instruments used in the current study assessed teachers' use of andragogical principles and students' perceptions of the use of andragogical principles by their teachers. The instruments also collected demographic data about characteristics of teachers and students, including participants' cultural identifications and the number of languages spoken or studied. The demographic data provided a broader portrait of noncredit language instructors and their students than is presently available. In addition, information on reported and perceived instructional perspective provided a more accurate description of the learning environment in adult foreign language classrooms than was previously available. The relationship between student characteristics and student perceptions of instructional perspective in foreign language classrooms that was examined in this study has enhanced the portrait of the adult learning environment. The relationship between the personal and educational characteristics of foreign language teachers and their instructional perspective also added to this portrait. The description of instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom derived from this study deepens the existing knowledge base in the areas of adult education, students' learning experiences, and foreign language learning.

Satisfaction with Learning

This section reviews the literature relevant to adult satisfaction with learning. It begins with a discussion of how satisfaction has been defined in educational contexts. The definition of satisfaction with learning used in the present study is identified. There follows a consideration of how student satisfaction is measured and an analysis of the credibility of student assessments of satisfaction. Finally research on satisfaction with learning, the measurement of satisfaction with learning, and satisfaction with language learning is reviewed. This section provides a foundation from which to assess adult learning satisfaction in the foreign language classroom.

Defining Satisfaction in an Educational Context

The verb satisfy means "to fulfill the desires, expectations, needs, or demands of (a person, the mind, etc.)" ("Satisfy," 1996, p. 1705). Satisfaction is "the act of satisfying" ("Satisfaction," 1996, p. 1705). Definitions of satisfaction in educational contexts have been influenced and shaped by insights from marketing and consumer satisfaction research. Marketing and consumer satisfaction research has also provided educational researchers with a framework from which to study and interpret student satisfaction.

In marketing and consumer satisfaction research, satisfaction has been conceptualized three ways: as a process, as an outcome, or as a synthesis of process and outcome (Parker & Mathews, 2001; Tse, Nicosia, & Wilton, 1990). According to the concept of satisfaction as a cognitive process, satisfaction is the result of expectations that are either confirmed or disconfirmed as the consumer experiences a product or service (Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988). Westbrook (1980) explains this interpretation of satisfaction:

The extent to which expectations are realized is assumed to be directly related to

the level of satisfaction experienced. If actual product outcomes meet or exceed

those expected, satisfaction results. If, however, product outcomes are judged

below expectations, dissatisfaction occurs. (p. 49)

This cognitive evaluation of satisfaction has been the traditional focus of consumer

satisfaction research (Parker & Mathews, 2001).

Research on consumer satisfaction as an outcome represents a different approach

to understanding satisfaction. This approach examines the nature of post-purchase

satisfaction, the feelings resulting from experience with a product or service (Oliver,

1993). This area of satisfaction research focuses on positive and negative affect, for

example feelings of arousal, joy, interest, surprise, anger, or contempt generated by the

consumer's experience with a product or service (Liljander & Strandvik, 1997; Mano &

Oliver, 1993; Oliver, 1993; Yu & Dean, 2001). Satisfaction is conceptualized as an "end-

point" (Parker & Mathews, 2001, p. 39), the feeling or feelings which result from a need

or goal fulfilled or a particular level of performance achieved (Oliver, 1993).

Satisfaction can also be viewed as a synthesis of process and outcome. Tse,

Nicosia, and Wilton (1990) report the emergence of the concept of "consumer

satisfaction as a subjective process of consumption experience through time" (p. 189).

Rust and Oliver (1994) note that "consumer researchers have moved away from the

literal meaning of fulfillment or satisfaction and now pursue this concept as the consumer

experiences it and describes it" (p. 4).

In one example of satisfaction research focusing on the consumer's subjective

experience, Parker and Mathews (2001) asked consumers to formulate their own personal

definitions of satisfaction based on a recent satisfactory experience with "the purchase, use or consumption of a good or service" (p. 40). Customer statements revealed that "the dominant interpretations [were] satisfaction as a feeling and an evaluation process" (p. 43). Parker and Mathews also found, however, that consumer responses included aspects of satisfaction not directly represented in definitions found in consumer satisfaction literature. Consumers reported that cost and quality were important antecedents of satisfaction. Furthermore, the study indicated that "in some instances, satisfaction is merely the result of 'things not going wrong'" (p. 43), a condition which Parker and Mathews call "the absence of dissatisfiers" (p. 42).

Bean and Bradley (1986) report that interest in student satisfaction began "during a period of student unrest in the late 1960s and the early 1970s" (p. 393). In this same time period, the fields of marketing and customer satisfaction research were also growing, resulting in an "overwhelming quantity of literature surrounding the concept" (Parker & Mathews, 2001, p. 38) of student satisfaction.

Thomas and Galambos (2004) note that the characterization of students as consumers of higher education means that the satisfaction of students becomes extremely important to the success of the institution. Because the environment of higher education has become more intensely competitive and sensitive to marketing, Shank, Walker, and Hayes (1995) conclude that not only do colleges and universities increasingly acknowledge their role as service providers but that "university students (especially non-traditional ones) expect to be treated like consumers, rather than students" (p. 86). Student satisfaction impacts recruiting and retention issues as well as solicitation of

alumni support (Anderson, 1981; Knox, Lindsay, & Kolb, 1992; Thomas & Galambos, 2004).

A significant amount of research on satisfaction with educational experiences characterizes the student as a customer, the consumer of a service or services provided by the educational institution (Aldridge & Rowley, 1998; Guolla, 1999; Jurkowitsch, Vignali, & Kaufmann, 2006; McCollough & Gremler, 1999; Oliver, 1993; Parker & Mathews, 2001; Patterson, Romm, & Hill, 1998; Scott, 1999; Shank et al., 1995; Szymanski & Henard, 2001). Student satisfaction research supports the synthesis of consumer satisfaction process and outcome approaches as a way to understand student satisfaction.

Wiers-Jenssen, Stensaker, and Grogaard (2002) studied the overall satisfaction of first-year university students in Norway. They report the necessity of including cognitive and affective aspects of satisfaction in student satisfaction research.

Elliott and Shin (2002) examined the assessment of student satisfaction with overall educational experience at an American university. Their definition of student satisfaction is derived from the work of Oliver and DeSarbo (1988) on the cognitive process in consumer satisfaction. However, Elliott and Shin's definition includes the subjective experience of the student. They define student satisfaction as "the favorability of a student's subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education" (p. 198).

Also writing about student satisfaction with the college environment, Astin (1993) affirms that student satisfaction "covers the student's subjective experience … and perceptions of the value of the educational experience" (p. 273). Wiers-Jenssen et al.

(2002), Elliott and Shin (2002), and Astin (1993) frame satisfaction as the result of an evaluative process influenced by the student's judgments of educational experiences and outcomes.

Research has established that time is a factor in the evaluation of satisfaction (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Patterson et al., 1998; Tse et al., 1990). In the context of consumer satisfaction, Tse et al. report that "when satisfaction is conceptualized as a process, time becomes an important independent variable" (p. 185). Elliott and Shin (2002) report that student satisfaction is a subjective, evaluative process which evolves and changes during the time that a student is part of the educational environment. Research by Patterson, Romm, and Hill (1998) on the satisfaction of overseas students in an Australian university also concluded that "the satisfaction process is a function of time" (p. 152) in higher education. The overseas students interviewed by Patterson et al. reported "shifts in expectations, perceptions of service performance, and (dis)satisfaction" (p. 152) during the year or more that they attended the university.

With regard to improving student-customer satisfaction, Scott (1999) makes two recommendations. He suggests that educators request information on initial student expectations. In addition, he recommends that teachers or administrators "revisit student expectations during the course of [a program of study] since these may well have changed as a result of their experience in the subject to date as well as their direct experience in other subjects or by word-of-mouth" (p. 199). In the context of foreign language teaching, Schulz (1996) also recommends that teachers "explore student beliefs and instructional expectations" (p. 349) at the start of a course to determine if student expectations about successful learning and teacher beliefs and practice are congruent.

The definition of satisfaction used in this study is based on Elliott and Shin's (2002) description of student satisfaction with educational experience as a synthesis of both the cognitive process and subjective outcomes of the educational experience. In the present study, since time has been found to be an important aspect of satisfaction in both consumer and educational research, the phrase *at a particular point in time* has been added to Elliott and Shin's definition. Satisfaction is, therefore, understood to be "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education" (p. 198) at a particular point in time.

In keeping with the understanding of satisfaction as a synthesis of cognitive evaluation process and subjective outcome at a particular point in time, adult learners in the present study are asked for an evaluation of their own learning in the second half of a foreign language course session. The PIF-S used in this study asked learners to identify their level of satisfaction with personal language learning in the specific course being taken. Learners were also asked to rate their general experience with language study, past and present, on a continuum between *totally unsatisfactory* and *totally satisfactory* (see Appendix B).

Measuring Student Satisfaction

Postsecondary institutions measure student satisfaction in different ways. They may ask about student satisfaction with the overall educational experience in a graduating class or cohort (Knox et al., 1992). They may also ask all current students or alumni to evaluate their past or present satisfaction with specific features of the college environment. Those features might be a particular course (Guolla, 1999); an academic program (Hearn, 1985; Jurkowitsch et al., 2006; Morstain, 1977); a course delivery

method (Carlisle, 2003; DeBourgh, 1999; Jong, 2004); the quality of instruction (Astin, 1993; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002); university services (Aldridge & Rowley, 1998); "contacts with faculty and fellow students, curriculum, college administration, and facilities" (Astin, 1993, p. 273); or residence hall programs (Li, McCoy, Mack, & Whalen, 2005). The satisfaction of specific student populations may also be studied, for example medical students (Guarino et al., 2006), international students (Patterson et al., 1998; Wan, 2001), students in a particular discipline (Jurkowitsch et al., 2006; Yu & Dean, 2001), distance learners (DeBourgh, 1999), or Continuing Education students (Viechnicki et al., 1990).

According to Elliott and Shin (2002), survey instruments are the traditional means of soliciting student satisfaction information. They may reflect quantitative or qualitative approaches to data collection and interpretation.

One quantitative approach to assessing student satisfaction is to use a single global item. A rating scale with one global satisfaction item may ask either a yes-no question about satisfaction or ask students to report their level of satisfaction using a designated scale (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Elliott and Shin caution, however, that student satisfaction measures using a single-item scale generate information that "may not accurately reflect what educational attributes students consider critically important to their overall satisfaction or how they perceive the performance of each attribute" (p. 199). They also note that students' may only recall certain attributes or experiences that contributed to their overall satisfaction and base their satisfaction rating on those few traits or occurrences.

A second quantitative approach to assessing student satisfaction is to use a multi-dimensional scale (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Elliott & Shin, 2002; Hazell, 1994; Hearn, 1985; Marsh, 1984; Marsh & Roche, 1992; Shank et al., 1995; Viechnicki et al., 1990; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002; Yu & Dean, 2001). The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory is one such scale. It is a commercially available, multidimensional instrument for assessing student satisfaction. The inventory has been used by more than 1700 colleges and universities (Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2006). It is made up of 73 items which evaluate the college experience according to several factors (e.g., instruction, college services and facilities, and campus climate).

Because an existing instrument may not always address the particular needs of an institution, some colleges and universities choose to develop their own custom instrument (Hazell, 1994). A custom design allows an educational institution to obtain comprehensive information about "student demographics, reasons for enrolling, student preferences, and student satisfaction with course content, teaching and services" (Hazell, 1994, para. 9) which are directly relevant to that institution or educational system.

A third approach to assessing student satisfaction is to combine a global satisfaction item or items with a multidimensional scale. An established instrument measuring various aspects of the educational experience, a program, or a course may be used with a global item or items added at the end (Cashin & Downey, 1992; Guolla, 1999; IDEA Center, Inc., 1998). This approach combines the benefits of using a proven scale with global items customized for a specific institution.

Qualitative methods represent another way to obtain satisfaction data. Patterson et al. (1998) used interviews with 30 overseas students at an Australian university to

identify determinants of student satisfaction. Wan (2001) also used interviews in a case study examining the cross-cultural experience of two Chinese students at an American university.

Whether a highly customized multi-dimensional instrument, one or more global items, or an interview is used to measure student satisfaction, any instrument assessing satisfaction can only capture a snapshot of student perceptions taken at a particular pointing time (Aldridge & Rowley, 1998). Student perceptions of satisfaction with an educational experience change over time (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Patterson et al., 1998; Tse et al., 1990). The criteria by which students evaluate satisfaction may also change over time. Aldridge and Rowley's (1998) study of service delivery in an American university suggests that "students may become more discriminating and critical of service delivery as their relationship with a higher education institution develops" (p. 200).

At the classroom level, teachers can obtain information about current student satisfaction through formal and informal means or a combination of both. Teachers may use a formal instrument developed by the institution or department where they teach. They may also develop their own instruments for use in their own classes. For example, an instructor might provide a written checklist of statements for students to rate or ask students to write a brief in-class response to a question about learning satisfaction (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). In addition, teachers may conduct formal interviews with students. On the other hand, teachers might assign specific reflective tasks like a learning audit, a learning journal, or a critical incident questionnaire (Brookfield, 2006) to be done periodically throughout the semester.

Besides relatively formal measures of satisfaction, teachers may informally solicit information about student satisfaction in face-to-face conversations with current students outside of class (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). Using methods made possible by electronic communications technology, teachers might also communicate with students via e-mail, ask them to post comments on an interactive electronic discussion board, or suggest they comment anonymously in a course's chat room. (Brookfield, 2006).

Former students or alumni are in a particularly good position to provide teachers with beneficial information about satisfaction with educational experiences. Their status as former students distances them from the original teacher-student relationship. Having completed a course or a degree program, former students have "an independent stance from which they may supply more objective opinions" (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989, p. 174) than current students.

The manner in which student ratings of an educational experience are obtained, particularly when instruments are administered in a classroom setting, may affect satisfaction ratings (Cashin, 1995; Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). Current students may feel that expressing opinions about their experience in a classroom, even anonymously, is a risky act which could invite an adverse reaction from the instructor (Brookfield, 2006). In order for administrative variables not to influence student ratings, Marsh (1984) suggests that satisfaction ratings be anonymous and that instructors be absent when ratings are completed and submitted.

The present study uses the PIF-S to solicit satisfaction information (see Appendix B). The PIF-S contains two global items with Likert-type response scales asking about student satisfaction. In the first item, students are asked to *Circle the number which best*

indicates your level of satisfaction with your personal language learning in this course using a scale of 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest possible satisfaction*). In the second item, students are asked to respond to the question *How would you rate your general experience with language study, past and present?* using a scale of 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) to 10 (*Totally satisfactory*).

In response to concerns in the literature about administrative variables in the use of satisfaction instruments, students who voluntarily participated in the present study were asked to fill out the research instruments outside of class and return them directly to the researcher. Instructors were not intended to be present during the completion of the instruments nor did instructors know which students actually completed and returned instruments that they took home. Results of this study represent a snapshot of student satisfaction during the second half of noncredit foreign language class sessions.

Credibility of Student Assessments of Satisfaction

Rachal (2002) states that "satisfaction with the learning experience should be measured in all settings" (p. 222) where adult educational activities take place. However, Astin (1993) notes that "contemporary discussions of the 'outcomes' of higher education or of improved 'assessment' in higher education frequently overlook student satisfaction" (p. 273). Astin emphasizes the credibility of student satisfaction reports and the need to include satisfaction as a legitimate outcome of higher education:

> Given the considerable investment of time and energy that most students make in
> attending college, their perceptions of the value of that experience should be
> given substantial weight. Indeed, it is difficult to argue that student satisfaction
> can be legitimately subordinated to any other educational outcome. (p. 273)

Wiers-Jenssen et al. (2002) also assert that "student perceptions of their institution should not be ignored. Students are important stakeholders in higher education" (p. 186).

Some sources describe learners as being the best judges of the personal value of a particular learning activity or experience (Carlson, 2006a; Jurkowitsch et al., 2006; Syracuse University, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, n.d.). This is because "[learners] evaluate the worth of the activity from their points of view and from their immediate needs and corresponding costs" (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989, p. 161). The costs of participation in learning include "time, energy, effort, and convenience" (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989, p. 161) in addition to the monetary cost learners incur.

The credibility of students' assessments of satisfaction with educational experiences does not derive solely from the fact that they have made personal and financial investments in higher education. Student judgments, especially adult student judgments, are shaped by the extensive experience which they have in learning environments. Fraser (2001) estimates that university graduates "have spent 20,000 hours in educational institutions by the time [they] complete" (p. 1) a degree program. Students may even "consider themselves expert consumers of the service experience since they have taken numerous courses" (Guolla, 1999, p. 91). In addition, Aldridge and Rowley (1998) suggest that the longevity of a student's relationship with an educational institution may influence the degree of discrimination and criticism which a student brings to the evaluation of an educational experience at that institution.

It should be noted that ratings of personal satisfaction with an educational experience are not a direct measure of any other aspect of that experience (Syracuse University, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, n.d.). Satisfaction ratings do

not represent the effectiveness of a course, the teaching activities employed, the relevance of course content, or the means used to assess learning. Multiple means of evaluation can, and should, be used with regard to assessing a course or instruction (Seaman & Fellenz, 1989). Student opinions about their own experience, however, should be considered a legitimate factor when considering educational outcomes (Astin, 1993; Syracuse University, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, n.d.).

The community college where this study was conducted provides teachers in Continuing Education classes with a satisfaction survey to distribute to students at the end of each course session. One of the four sections of this student satisfaction survey has an item which directly addresses learning. Students are asked to indicated the degree to which they agree or disagree with the statement: *I'll be able to use the things I learned in this course*. Because the college's satisfaction survey does not directly address overall satisfaction with either learning or learning in foreign language classes, it was not considered useful for the purposes of the present study. The researcher created two items for the PIF-S which specifically address satisfaction with foreign language learning (e.g., Circle the number which best indicates your level of satisfaction with your personal language learning in this course, How would you rate your general experience with language study, past and present?).

Influences on Student Satisfaction

The present study examines adult students' satisfaction with personal language learning in a noncredit foreign language course. The literature on student satisfaction indicates that certain characteristics of the learner and the learning climate may affect

students' perceptions of satisfaction. Research has shown that ratings of student satisfaction with educational experiences may be influenced by gender, age, learner personality, cultural background or ethnicity, level of educational attainment, expectations, and learning environment.

Gender. Bean and Bradley (1986) found that "the causes of satisfaction differ for men and women" undergraduates (p. 410). In addition, Beer and Darkenwald (1989) state that "examining adult student perceptions of the classroom environment [must include an investigation of] the possibility that men and women may have dissimilar perceptions of the environment that lead them to respond differently" (p. 34).

Some studies have noted specific gender differences in college students' reports of satisfaction with educational experiences. A survey of British Columbia College and Institute outcomes found that former women students were somewhat more satisfied than male students with their overall educational experience ("Understanding," 2003). With regard to specific learner characteristics, satisfaction ratings of women undergraduates have been related to their academic performance . A study of student satisfaction and academic performance among university students by Bean and Bradley (1986) notes that academic difficulty, "perceiving one's academic program as difficult and too competitive" (p. 396), influenced undergraduate women's satisfaction with their educational experience.

Certain characteristics of the overall learning environment have also been shown to be more significant for women students than for men: social support (Hearn, 1985), institutional fit (Bean & Bradley, 1986), campus climate (Helmich, 2000), and support services (Helmich, 2000; Sauer, 2003). Investigations of the learning climate within the

classroom have also found associations, for women students, between satisfaction and certain factors such as whether or not a course was perceived as stimulating (Hearn, 1985), faculty-student interaction opportunities (Hearn, 1985), and perceived involvement in the social environment of the class (Beer & Darkenwald, 1989). According to Hearn (1985), "college women's outcomes are somewhat more strongly affected by certain aspects of faculty contact" (p. 429) than are outcomes for college men. Additionally, Beer and Darkenwald's (1989) study of social relationships within the classroom environment reported that women perceive more affiliation and involvement in the classroom than do men. Furthermore, Sauer (2003) found that "concern for the individual [and] instructional effectiveness" (p. iv) were more important for women than men students. Finally, Sauer noted that women were "more likely to be satisfied with…student centeredness than male students were" (p. iv).

With regard to male students, Bean and Bradley (1986) found that academic integration, defined as "being interested, motivated, and confident as a student, and perceiving that one 'thinks like faculty'" (p. 405), had the most impact on undergraduate men's satisfaction. Bean and Bradley also report that men's level of satisfaction had less effect on their academic performance than it did for women. The authors state that "men seem to perform well or poorly regardless of their level of satisfaction" (p. 409). While there may be evidence of differences in male and female student perceptions of satisfaction with the learning environment, Hearn (1985) cautions that the processes by which male and female students "weight various specific domains in arriving at their overall satisfaction levels.…are not uniform across [gender and field] groupings" (pp. 415, 430).

Student ratings of instructors may also be influenced by gender. In a study of student satisfaction with Basic/Developmental Math courses, Davis (2000) found that women undergraduates rated their instructors consistently lower than male students did. In addition, Feldman (1993) reviewed ten studies of college students' teacher evaluations and noted a general "pattern of same-gender preference" (p. 169) by students. He found, however, that this explained "only a little of the variance in student ratings" (p. 169). The results of these studies suggest that satisfaction with instruction could be indirectly influenced by the gender of the rater and student preferences for same-gender instructors.

Viechnicki, Bohlin, and Milheim (1990) examined the instructional motivation of adult students in credit and noncredit Continuing Education courses. The authors reported gender differences in perceptions of instructional strategies. Female students ratings for course relevance and instructional satisfaction were higher than males' ratings.

Male and female students appear to value differently various aspects of an educational experience, although not all studies support this position. C. Cheng (2000), for example, found there were no gender differences in adult student satisfaction with the university learning environment. Knox, Lindsey, and Kolb (1992) also report no direct effect of gender on student satisfaction ratings with regard to educational experiences at college. The preponderance of evidence suggesting a relationship between gender and certain aspects of satisfaction, however, led this researcher to include gender as a variable in the present study.

Age. Besides gender, age may affect student satisfaction reports. The survey of British Columbia College and Institute outcomes reported students aged 40 and older had the highest satisfaction scores ("Understanding," 2003). As the age group of student

participants in the study increased in years (from *under age 25* to *age 40 and older*), the satisfaction scores reported by male and female students also increased. C. Cheng (2000) also found that older students (i.e., adult students aged 45 or more) were more satisfied with the university learning environment than younger adult students.

On the other hand, Sauer's (2003) study of satisfaction and characteristics of university students found no significant effect on satisfaction related to age. Similarly, in a study of perceptions of social environment in the community college classroom, Beer and Darkenwald (1989) reported surprise in discovering "the absence of within-gender variability [among adult women students] in the findings on age" (p. 39). The authors concluded that "age cohort differences [among women students] appear to be irrelevant to perceptions of the relationship dimensions of classroom environments" (p. 39).

Age appears to be potential factor in student satisfaction. However, in examining certain aspects of the learning environment, Beer and Darkenwald's (1989) study suggests that gender may be more important than age. Age and gender were both variables considered in the present study of adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom.

Personality. Some studies suggest that student personality characteristics affect satisfaction (Biner et al., 1997; Grayson, 2004; Logue, Lounsbury, Gupta, & Leong, 2007; Lounsbury, Saudargas, Gibson, & Leong, 2005). For example, in the context of interactive telecourses, Biner et al. (1997) linked satisfaction to specific personality characteristics of undergraduate and graduate students. The authors report that "certain types of individuals do indeed tend to be more satisfied than others with aspects of their telecourses, as well as with their telecourses in general" (p. 29). Students in this study

who reported high overall satisfaction were "both mature and outgoing while at the same time practical, steady, and relatively relaxed" (p. 29).

Other studies have also found that personality influences satisfaction. Lounsbury, Saudargas, Gibson, and Leong's (2005) study of undergraduates in an American university reports that "personality traits account for large portions of the variance in overall life satisfaction as well as satisfaction with college" (p. 724). A study of college business majors by Logue, Lounsbury, Gupta, and Leong (2007) also found a personality effect on satisfaction. These authors report that almost half the variance in satisfaction with the major is accounted for "by a combination of vocational interest themes and personality traits" (p. 269). Similarly, Grayson's (2004) research on undergraduates at a commuter university suggests the personality probably accounts for differences in satisfaction with educational experiences and faculty. However, he notes that additional research is needed in this area.

On the other hand, Propst's (1992) study of graduate nursing students did not find a relationship between student personality type and their level of satisfaction with graduate nursing education. Huang (2005) examined personality type and student satisfaction in the context of a Web-based instructional format. He also found that temperament had no effect on overall student satisfaction when attitude and participation were included in the model. The author did find, however, that student attitudes about online technology and online participation affected satisfaction.

Measurement of personality traits or temperament is not within the scope of the present study. The fact that this variable is not included in the study may represent a limitation of this research.

Culture and ethnicity. In addition to age, gender, and personality, cultural and linguistic differences have the potential to influence student satisfaction with an educational experience. According to Cheng and Tam (1997), definitions of what constitutes satisfaction with an educational experience, particularly educational quality, may be shaped by the competing, and perhaps contradictory, needs of various constituencies within a particular culture, including "policy makers, parents, school management committee, teachers, students, etc." (p. 23). Satisfaction with education or learning may be understood differently in a culture which requires that teacher authority and preferences be given priority over student needs and preferences than it is in a culture which gives priority to the learner.

For minority and marginalized student populations, a significant mismatch may exist between the educational environment created by the dominant culture and the cultural perspective of the learners. When a mismatch between existing and preferred learning climates is suspected, Guy (1999) emphasizes that "educational norms, processes, and goals must be re-evaluated for their potential to assist learners whose individual and group identities are most at risk" (p. 13).

Hazell's (1994) study of Continuing Education classes in Ontario, Canada examined "student demographics, reasons for enrolling, student preferences, and student satisfaction with course content, teaching, and services" (para. 9). Hazell found differences in student satisfaction ratings based on cultural diversity. Students educated in a country other than Canada or those whose first language was not English "were less likely to rate their experiences as 'excellent' (para. 27) than were students educated in Canada and whose first language was English. Perceptions of the instructor were also

affected. Students with cultural and linguistic differences were less likely to rate the instructor's subject knowledge as excellent. Hazell concludes that there is a need to pursue questions about the effect of "cultural traditions and mores….[and] language and context differences….[upon students'] expectations and perceptions" (para. 29) of educational experiences.

For students whose cultural perspective is different from the dominant culture, satisfaction may be influenced by features of the learning environment which correspond to unique "value patterns" (Rovai & Gallien, 2005, p. 60) held by their cultural or ethnic community. Rovai and Gallien (2005) examined the perceived learning of African American and Caucasian students in online courses. The authors concluded that the social interaction and collaborative aspects of a combined online and face-to-face format were more important to African American students' sense of classroom community and achievement than they were for Caucasian students.

Sauer (2003) used the Noel-Levitz survey to evaluate student satisfaction with the environment at an American university. He noted differences in satisfaction between minority students and non-minority students. At this university, "students of color were more likely to be dissatisfied with instructional effectiveness and student centeredness" (p. iv).

Patterson et al. (1998) examined four aspects of satisfaction (i.e., economic well-being, personal well-being, social well-being, and learning well-being) in a population of overseas university students who were predominantly Chinese. This Australian study found that, for these students, "the outcome, i.e., skill/knowledge acquisition of the learning dimension, was far more important as a determinant of ultimate

satisfaction/dissatisfaction than the process (social, personal, and economic dimensions)" (p. 154). Patterson et al. hypothesize that culture was one influence on the Asian students' satisfaction in this study. Many of the students in this study were from collectivist cultures where "the individual's achievements have value only when they are seen as contributing to the welfare of the family and/or the larger society" (p. 154). For this reason, Patterson et al. suggest that learning, defined as the acquisition of desired or necessary skills and knowledge, had the highest priority in this sample of students. In fact, the authors note that for these students "all other dimensions become secondary in importance and are not allowed to significantly affect [the students'] overall post-purchase satisfaction" (p. 155).

On the other hand, C. Cheng's (2000) study of 352 adult university students' satisfaction with their learning environment reports no difference between ethnic groups on the social life scale of the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. Donohue and Wong (1997) used the same satisfaction questionnaire with traditional and non-traditional university students. The authors also found no significant differences in satisfaction between ethnic groups on the instrument's other scales which relate to satisfaction with "the results of academic efforts….the physical conditions of college life….aspects of instruction….[and] attitudes and behaviors of faculty and students (p. 240).

Knox et al. (1992) report no prominent effect of race, gender, or socioeconomic background on student satisfaction ratings with regard to educational experiences at the postsecondary level. They do caution, however, that background characteristics may exert indirect effects and that methods of "predicting educational satisfactions clearly ought to take [them] into account" (p. 319).

Some educators may hold assumptions about cultural differences in certain student populations. Littlewood (2000) cautions that differences in attitudes and behaviors of diverse student populations may be more the result of "the educational contexts that have been or are now provided for them, than of any inherent dispositions of the students themselves" (p. 33). Educators should not assume that a student's particular cultural or ethnic background actually reflects the behaviors and roles which that student "would like to adopt" (p. 33) in the classroom. Littlewood (2001) notes that, when reporting on educational experience, educators need to recognize the "considerable variation between the responses of individual students" (p. 22) within cultural or ethnic groups.

Culture and ethnicity are potential influences on student perceptions of the educational environment and, therefore, satisfaction. Some studies have shown that students' cultural and linguistic differences affect student educational priorities as well as perceptions of satisfaction with the educational and social environment. Other studies have found no such effects on satisfaction with educational experiences. In fact, Littlewood (2000, 2001) warns that educators should be cautious about making assumptions about students' cultural differences. This author suggests that understanding individual student's needs and preferences is a more effective strategy for dealing with student diversity.

The present study asked participants to provide information about their ethnic identity as well as the country or countries of their educational experiences. By identifying the cultural background which has shaped participants' identity and educational experiences, this study provides a broader portrait of noncredit adult learners

and their teachers than was previously available. In addition, including culture as a variable in the current study adds an important element to the investigation of learner satisfaction and perceptions of instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom.

Educational experience. The level of education attained is a factor which has been related to high satisfaction with educational experiences. Knox et al. (1992) conducted a longitudinal study of educational outcomes for the 1972 cohort of high school graduates in the U.S. They found that "the more education one has, the more one is satisfied with the academic aspects of the higher educational milieu and the more positive one is about educational experiences there" (p. 320). In the Knox et al. study, the attainment of a bachelor's or advanced degree was associated with especially high satisfaction ratings with regard to the overall educational experience.

Cumulative educational experience may also contribute to student satisfaction. C. Cheng (2000) evaluated the satisfaction of adult university students with their learning environment. This study reports that adults, aged 25 and over, who were graduate students reported more satisfaction with the learning environment than undergraduate adults. On the other hand, Sauer (2003), found that undergraduates' satisfaction with several campus life factors, including campus climate, decreased as student standing increased.

Some studies suggest that educational experience, whether degree attained or amount of time in an educational environment, may influence student satisfaction. The present study included Highest Degree/Diploma among the variables examined with regard to student satisfaction and perceptions of instructional perspective. In addition,

the PIF-S asked students to provide information about the number of years spent studying

the language of the course they are taking. This variable was also used in the analysis of

how student characteristics may relate to student satisfaction with learning and

perceptions of instructional perspective.

Expectations. In addition to gender, age, personality, and educational experience,

student and teacher expectations represent another influence on student satisfaction

(Horwitz, 1988). Viechnicki et al. (1990) state that "learners must perceive the rewards

gained as appropriate and consistent with his/her expectations" (p. 11).

Cook's (2004) study of university students participating in 20 service-learning

programs in developing countries found that discrepancies between expectations relating

to growth and the actual learning experience had a significant effect on satisfaction. In

fact, of all the variables considered in Cook's study, expectation-experience discrepancies

explained the most satisfaction variance (i.e., 12%). Cook's study found that program

and participant characteristics explained only 2% of satisfaction variance.

Other researchers also emphasize the effect of student and teacher expectations on

satisfaction. Marsh (1984) cautions that "student ratings, like all psychological

impressions, are relativistic and based on some frame of reference. For students in

university classes the frame of reference is determined by their expectations for that class

and by their experience in other courses" (p. 745). Wyss (2002), Zenhui (1999, 2001),

Patterson et al. (1998), and Horwitz (1988) all conclude that previous educational

experiences may lead learners to expect certain approaches to instruction. In addition,

Horwitz states that a mismatch between student and teacher expectations in a learning

situation can result in lack of satisfaction.

Cultural orientation has an important influence on what teachers expect and perceive as beneficial to learners (Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005). Definitions of teaching and learning, as well as which teaching and learning approaches are considered to be effective or appropriate, are shaped by the cultural perspectives of teachers and students (Brookfield, 1995; Liu & Littlewood, 1997; Wyss, 2002; Zenhui, 1999, 2001). On the one hand, it would appear that educators' understanding of the cultural diversity of learners present in the classroom would result in the creation of an appropriate learning climate for all students. On the other hand, overgeneralizations or stereotypes about learning attitudes and behaviors present in certain cultures may lead educators to create educational environments which do not adequately respond to individual learner preferences and needs (X. Cheng, 2000; Tsui, 1996).

Educators' expectations may be influenced by cultural stereotypes. For example, the work of Liu and Littlewood (1997) addresses the perception of Asian ESL/EFL students as passive learners. This study of Asian students learning English proposes that it is not the learners' inherent cultural reluctance to communicate orally which has led to some educators to see Asian students as passive. This stereotype is, rather, the result of students' educational experiences that have trained them to be more passive than Western teachers in ESL/EFL university-level courses expect.

Expectations about student learning preferences may also influence how educators structure the learning environment. Littlewood (2001) surveyed students learning English in 11 countries in Asia and Europe. He focused specifically on student attitudes toward learning English in upper secondary and post-secondary settings. Littlewood reports that students from different cultural backgrounds are not as different

as educators might expect. Comparing the attitudes of Asian and European students with regard to teacher authority, participation in learning, and working in groups, Littlewood found "a striking degree of similarity in the pattern of responses" (p. 23). The study suggests that, while students of the same culture might hold similar deep attitude structures, "there may still be significant differences in how [these attitudes are] realized through specific reactions and behaviors" (p. 23).

Littlewood (2001) emphasizes the need "to distinguish carefully between the tendency of a particular culture to exhibit particular features and the wide range of differences that will exist between individuals within that culture" (p. 6). In classrooms where the cultural orientation of the teacher is different from that of the students, Littlewood's work has important implications for the psychosocial learning environment and learner satisfaction. If teachers' are unaware of their culturally-induced expectations and the extent to which these attitudes may feed misconceptions about students, then they will not able to produce satisfactory learning environments for the real needs and preferences of adult students (X. Cheng, 2000; Tsui, 1996).

The educational expectations of students and teachers are influenced by previous educational experiences. Culture is one element which shapes student and teacher expectations and, therefore, can influence satisfaction. Some research suggests, however, that teacher awareness of individual differences is more important to student satisfaction than awareness of cultural differences.

In the present study, the PIFs used with instructors and students asked each group to identify the *primary* and *other* goals they had for the course in which they were engaged. In addition, the PIFs asked participants to report the country or countries in

which they had attended school and attained their highest degree or diploma. The inclusion of information about course goals and the cultural orientation of educational experiences added two important factors to this investigation of the dynamic between student and teacher characteristics, student satisfaction, and instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom.

Physical learning environment. Besides age, gender, culture, personality, educational experiences, and expectations, learning environment also influences perceptions of satisfaction. Beer and Darkenwald (1989) state that "a climate that is not appropriate for adults will not facilitate learning or lead to satisfaction with the learning experience" (p. 33). In fact, Astin's (1993) study of college students found that students' satisfaction and perceptions of the educational experience depend less on the characteristics of entering freshmen students than on "actual environmental experience" (p. 310).

Student satisfaction may be influenced by the physical aspects of the learning environment. The importance of providing a physical environment which is appropriate to adult learners has been emphasized by Caffarella (1994), Knowles (1980), Gorham (1985), Hiemstra (1985), Long (2004), Merriam and Caffarella (1999), Grognet (1989), Zemke and Zemke (1984), and Kidd (1967). Satisfaction surveys done by postsecondary institutions often focus heavily on campus services, technology, and physical facilities. The physical environment of the individual classroom, however, is not always considered.

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, for example, is a commercial product which was used in 425 post-secondary institutions in 2004-2005 (Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2006). It is made up of 73 items related to

> instruction, academic advising, campus safety, course registration, admissions, tuition and financial aid, campus support services, campus climate, campus facilities, campus responsiveness to diverse populations, campus level of student-centeredness, campus level of concern for the individual, [and] campus level of service excellence. (p. 2)

Six items directly address campus physical facilities. None of these six items, however, directly address the physical environment of individual classrooms.

On the other hand, an instrument designed by an individual institution to measure student satisfaction with certain features of specific courses, may include items about the physical environment in the classroom. The Continuing Education Participant Satisfaction Survey of the community college hosting the present study is comprised of 11 total items in four categories: The Course's Learning Environment, The Course's Content, The Course's Value, and The Overall Experience. This survey contains two items related to the physical learning environment. Students are asked to rate their satisfaction with *the geographic location of the course* and *the room in which the course was held*.

Satisfaction with college services and physical facilities are outside the realm of the present study and the instruments used. Their impact on adult satisfaction with learning in the foreign language classroom were not considered in this research. The

physical environment may, however, be a contributing factor to student learning satisfaction and, as such, represents a potential limitation of the current study.

Psychosocial learning environment. The current study examined the relationship between satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective, one aspect of the psychosocial learning climate. Several authors have noted that the beliefs and actions of faculty influence the learning climate and student perceptions of the learning climate (see Apps, 1981; Burden, 2004; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Collins et al., n.d.; Ellis, 2006; Galbraith, 2004; Guy, 1999; Hall & Hall, 1990; Henschke, 1989, 1994; McCombs, 2004; McDonough, 2002; Richards, n.d.; Vélez-Rendón, 2002; Watson, 1998; Wlodkowski, 1999).

The psychosocial learning climate is the result of all the psychological and social characteristics which students and instructors bring to shared interactions and perceptions within the classroom (Beer & Darkenwald, 1989). Beer and Darkenwald (1989) report that "the perceptions and reactions of students to their educative experiences are especially salient [to understanding the learning environment], particularly as they relate to the social and psychological characteristics of the classroom" (p. 34).

Educational research has identified certain characteristics of the psychosocial learning environment which influence student satisfaction. Wiers-Jenssen et al. (2002) note that one of the two most important factors influencing overall satisfaction with university education in Norway is social climate. They state that "the social climate is a factor of considerable significance to the well-being of students" (p. 193).

Student perceptions of the social learning environment are influenced by the type of class they are evaluating. Beer & Darkenwald (1989) examined perceptions of the

classroom's social climate among men and women adult community college students. The authors found that the type of class being taken produced significant differences in perceptions of the social environment. This study examined the Relationship dimension of Darkenwald's Adult Classroom Environment Scale (ACES). The Relationship dimension assesses Affiliation, "the extent to which students like and interact positively with each other" (p. 36), and Involvement, "the extent to which students are satisfied with the class and participate actively and attentively in class activities" (p. 36). Beer and Darkenwald report that students perceived more Affiliation in classes in the social sciences and humanities as compared to classes in math and science. The authors propose that differences in perceptions related to class type are due to "the structure of the disciplines included in the two categories" (p. 40).

Hearn's (1985) study of college seniors' evaluation of their academic programs also found support for discipline differences in the qualities students value to in the educational environment. He reports a "heavy emphasis on teaching ability among students in the arts and humanities" (p. 428) in contrast to a greater value placed on teacher competence and knowledgeability among science students. Hearn attributes these differences to the diverse "values, cognitive styles, and organizational characteristics" (p. 429) represented in different disciplines.

Feeling a part of the classroom community is another element of the psychosocial climate which exerts an influence on satisfaction. Rovai (2002) and Rovai and Gallien (2005) examined the relationship between sense of community and perceived learning for students taking online graduate courses. Rovai suggests that student perceptions of perceived learning reveal their "feelings about the ability of the classroom community to

satisfy educational goals" (p. 328). Both studies used the same instrument, the Classroom Community Scale developed by Rovai. This scale characterizes classroom community as having two parts: (a) the social community of the classroom, "the feelings of students regarding their cohesion, spirit, trust, safety, interdependence, and participation" (Rovai & Gallien, 2005, p. 59); and (b) the learning community, "student feelings regarding the degree to which the classroom learning environment is aligned with their educational needs, goals, and values" (Rovai & Gallien, 2005, p. 59). Rovai comments that "online learners who have stronger sense of community and perceive greater cognitive learning should feel less isolated and have greater satisfaction with their academic programs" (p. 328). In addition, Rovai and Gallien, studying perceptions of Caucasian and African-American students in two graduate course sections with different formats, found that cultural perspective influenced perceptions of both social and learning communities.

Manteuffel's (1982) review of the literature on training, instructional design, and satisfaction in adult learners led her to conclude that "affective aspects [of the learning climate] are the primary determinant of learner satisfaction" (p. 18). An appropriate affective climate produces satisfied adult learners who are "involved, challenged, self-directed, rewarded, and safe" (p. 18). Involved learners "feel that the instruction is targeted to them and that they are valued participants in the teaching/learning process" (p. 16). According to Manteuffel, individualized instruction and active engagement must be part of the learning experience if the learner is to feel involved. Knowles (1980) also notes the importance of the active involvement of the adult learner in the process of learning and its effect on learner willingness to commit to a learning experience.

Manteuffel (1982) states that satisfied learners are challenged. They "feel that their educational investment is worthwhile because they understand and/or are able to apply something new" (p. 16). The learning process is of interest to them. Satisfied learners are stretched intellectually by the pleasurable nature of the challenge. They do not, however, feel overwhelmed by the challenge.

Manteuffel (1982) argues that satisfied learners are self-directed. They "feel that they have had some degree of control in the teaching/learning process" (p. 17). They participate in the process of choosing what to learn and how to learn it. Self-directed learners participate in educational activities because the activities result in a personal, intrinsic reward. Manteuffel distinguishes between self-direction and involvement. Self-direction is a combination of learner involvement and learner choices with regard to instruction or learning activities. The andragogical model described by Knowles (1996) also assumes the importance of self-directedness for the adult learner.

Rewards such as instructor feedback or evidence of success in completing learning tasks result in the learner being motivated and enthusiastic about continued learning (Manteuffel, 1982). Satisfied learners "feel a sense of accomplishment upon completion of instruction, and this often prompts the learners to seek further instruction" (p. 17).

Finally, satisfied learners feel safe, according to Manteuffel (1982). They do not feel threatened by the processes of teaching or learning. Testing represents one potential threat for adult learners (see also Perry, 2006; Young, 1991). Adult learners may also fear appearing ignorant because of the questions they ask. Manteuffel contends that a

learning environment which promotes feelings of safety, involvement, challenge, self-directedness, and appropriate rewards will result in adult learner satisfaction.

Perry (2006) also notes the importance of the instructor creating a learning climate in which the learner feels safe. He states that "the invisible web of relationships that effective educators create between themselves and learners, and between and among learners, is crucial to an optimal learning environment" (p. 27). According to Perry, a safe learning environment is created by educators "attending to the learner's internal state" (p. 27). It also includes the teacher demonstrating predictably consistent behavior within a context that is structured and familiar to the learner. Creating a climate in which optimal learning can take place leads to "pleasure, satisfaction, and the confidence to once again set out and….explore, discover, and learn" (p. 26).

In addition to the influence of affect on satisfaction, research also indicates that the influence of the teacher and instruction are significant for educational satisfaction. Astin (1993) notes that a student-oriented faculty resulted in higher satisfaction levels among college students than did a research-oriented faculty.

The study of Norwegian university students by Wiers-Jenssen et al. (2002) found that, along with social climate, the other most important factor influencing overall satisfaction was the instructor, in particular the quality of teaching. Similarly, Elliott and Shin's (2002) study of postsecondary students' satisfaction with educational experience found that excellence of instruction and quality of instruction "directly impact overall satisfaction" (p. 207). Grayson (2004) also reports that "good teaching" (p. 30) enhances student satisfaction.

Hearn (1985) found that the primary criteria for college seniors' overall satisfaction with academic programs "appeared to relate to teaching style" (p. 428). This study reports that teaching ability and course stimulation were more important to satisfaction than student-to-student interactions and availability of faculty.

Morstain (1977) examined student satisfaction with academic programs and educational orientation in a public university in the U.S. He defines educational orientation as attitudes about and preferences for certain educational purposes, teaching and learning processes, the locus of power in the student-faculty relationship, types of peer relationships, and the college-society relationship. Morstain found that congruence between student and faculty educational orientation was a potent influence on student satisfaction. Students who reported the most satisfaction were most closely aligned with the educational orientation of their instructors. Satisfied students

> expressed more preference for more formal/traditional lectures modes of
> teaching-learning arrangements, placed more value on grades and external
> evaluations by faculty, and attached higher import to a vocational/practical and a
> 'learning for its own sake' purpose of a college education. (p. 11)

Students in this study who reported the highest dissatisfaction expressed more preference for "individually-tailored/independent study learning arrangements and desired more of a collegial role with faculty in educational decision-making" (p. 11).

Knox et al. (1992) used 1972, 1979, and 1986 data from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 to evaluate satisfaction with educational experiences. They report that the most powerful factors related to student

satisfaction were Quality of Instruction, Quality of Teachers, Courses and Curriculum, My Intellectual Growth, and Development of Work Skills.

Other studies report the effect of classroom interaction on student satisfaction. A study of the relationship between satisfaction and students' perception of classroom climate in 11 public and private universities by Watson (1998) notes that perceptions of "showing personal interest and faculty/student interaction were the two most important [classroom climate] variables" (p. 5) related to undergraduate students' satisfaction. Astin (1993) also reports that "satisfaction is enhanced by frequent interaction both with faculty and with fellow students" (p. 311).

Parkinson, Greene, Kim, and Marioni (2003) examined the influence of classroom climate on satisfaction in university courses offered in traditional and blended distance learning formats. In this study, the quality of faculty/student interactions was cited by a quarter of the study participants as being critical to learning. Students in the traditional classroom setting revealed the importance they placed on "a sense of community in the classroom or a feeling of psychological comfort…[which included] safety, warmth, high degree of comfort, and even fun" (p. 25). Other learning climate factors which related to positive learning satisfaction in this study were clear teacher expectations, minimal stress and pressure, a non-competitive atmosphere, sharing and collaboration among learners. One student reported that "allowing free thought and discussion makes the class seem more bonded, and creates a safer environment" (p. 26).

Viechnicki et al. (1990) investigated the perceptions of instruction by adult students in credit and noncredit Continuing Education courses offered through a university. The authors asked students to rate how motivating they found various

instructional strategies. The two most important motivating factors reported by students were perceptions of course relevance and course satisfaction. This study suggests that instructional strategies which "[provide] appropriate recognition for success, [give] regular informative and corrective feedback, and [support] intrinsic motivation" (p. 11) create an atmosphere where the learner is more likely to feel satisfied. In addition, this learning climate sustains motivation to learn.

Finaly-Neumann (1994) found that two course characteristics, both related to teacher behavior, best predicted students' instructional satisfaction in two university programs for health professionals in Israel. The primary determinant of satisfaction in this study was *Feedback derived from professors*, described as "the degree to which students receive information [from their professors] as they are studying which reveals how well they are performing in their course work" (para. 9). The second best predictor of satisfaction was *Task clarity*, defined as "(1) the predictability of the outcomes of or the responses to students' behavior, and (2) the existence of clarity of behavioral requirements to guide behavior and provide knowledge that the behavior is appropriate" (para. 9).

Hines, Cruickshank, and Kennedy (1985) investigated satisfaction and teacher clarity. They examined various clarity behaviors demonstrated by pre-service teachers in the context of peer-teaching activities. Some of the behaviors included were

> use of relevant examples, explaining content so the students could understand, providing students with sufficient examples of how to do the work, explaining content and then stopping so that students could think about it, repeating things when students did not understand, asking questions to find out if students

understood, answering students' questions, teaching in a step-by-step manner,

teaching the lesson at a pace appropriate for understanding, presenting material in

a logical manner, providing sufficient time for practice, and informing students of

the lesson objectives so that they knew what would be expected of them at lesson

completion. (p. 92)

This study found that "student perceptions of whether or not a teacher is clear influences

students' degree of satisfaction with the learning experience" (p. 97).

Finally, Guolla (1999) provides a snapshot of satisfaction with teaching in one

specific learning environment. Guolla studied satisfaction with dimensions of teaching

quality in several sections of a marketing course taken by MBA and undergraduate

students. Using Marsh's Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality, Guolla created an

Action Report to help articulate student priorities for that learning environment and their

level of satisfaction with various characteristics of the environment. Guolla describes the

following characteristics as having high importance for satisfaction and also receiving

high student satisfaction ratings in this course:

Students perceived valuable learning had taken place

Students found the instructor enthusiastic and well-prepared

Students were invited to ask questions and share ideas

Students found case studies helpful. (p. 95)

Other characteristics of the marketing courses also had high importance for

students but received low satisfaction ratings (Guolla, 1999). The characteristics

important to satisfaction in this quadrant of the Action Report were:

Course is intellectually challenging and stimulating

Interest in the subject has increased

Instructor was dynamic and energetic

Instructor enhanced course with humor

Instructor's style held your interest

Instructor's explanations were clear

Consistent course objectives so direction was clear. (p. 95).

Guolla recommended that instructors of this marketing course focus on improving these dimensions of the learning environment since they were highly important to student satisfaction but were not being perceived as present in the classroom.

The review of literature suggests that certain aspects of the psychosocial climate have an effect on student satisfaction. Satisfaction may be influenced by social climate and sense of community, field of study, students' affective responses to a learning situation, perceived quality of teaching, interactions within the classroom, the presence of teacher feedback, and teacher clarity. The present study investigated the extent to which learning satisfaction is related to various instructional perspectives. The instruments used in this study, the MIPI and the MIPI-S, contain items that assess teacher behaviors, beliefs, and values relevant to many features of the learning environment shown to influence satisfaction. Both instruments are comprised of seven subscales which appraise Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning (Learner-centered Process), and Teacher-centered Learning Process.

In summary, perceptions of satisfaction with a product or experience are only a snapshot, taken at a particular point in time. Satisfaction with an educational experience is understood as a synthesis of cognitive evaluation and subjective outcomes. Research on student satisfaction has found that certain characteristics of the learner and learning climate may influence satisfaction reporting. Student satisfaction may be influenced by age, gender, personality, culture, educational experience, and expectations of students and teachers as well as features of the physical and psychosocial learning environment. Aspects of the psychosocial learning climate which have been shown to affect student satisfaction are social climate and sense of community, students' feelings about a learning situation, the teacher and quality of teaching, interaction within the classroom, the presence of teacher feedback, and teacher clarity. The present study examines the relationship between adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective, one aspect of the psychosocial learning environment.

Defining Satisfaction with Learning

In the current study, adult learners were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with personal language learning in the second half of a noncredit foreign language course. Research on satisfaction with educational experiences supports the conceptualization of satisfaction as a synthesis of cognitive evaluation and subjective outcomes at a given point in time (Astin, 1993; Elliott & Shin, 2002; Parker & Mathews, 2001; Patterson et al., 1998; Peterson & Wilson, 1992; Rust & Oliver, 1994; Scott, 1999; Tse et al., 1990; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002). For the purposes of this study, satisfaction is defined as "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and

experiences associated with education" (Elliott & Shin, 2002, p. 198) at a particular point in time.

Learning, in the context of this study, is understood holistically. Kidd (1967) characterizes learning as an "active, growing, changing, painful, or exhilarating experience" (p. 16) which "may go on with or without conscious plan or direction" (p. 17). He emphasizes that learning is a dynamic, multi-faceted process involving the whole person. According to Kidd, learning results in both anticipated and unanticipated change.

Rogers (1983) also argues that learning involves "the whole person in both feeling and cognitive aspects" (p. 20). Even if the stimulus for learning comes from some external force or entity, Rogers contends that the essential elements of learning, "the sense of discovery, of reaching out, of grasping and comprehending" (p. 20), arise from within the learner. Furthermore, learning is an experience which has meaning for the learner. It involves all the learner's capacities. Learning is driven by the learner's needs and, according to Rogers, "the locus of evaluation…resides definitely in the learner" (p. 20).

Apps (1981) makes a distinction between two types of learning, random learning and planned learning. He defines random learning as what is learned "through the process of living" (p. 54). Planned learning, on the other hand, is deliberately designed and organized. It may be self-designed or designed by someone else for the benefit of the learner. According to Apps, participation in a class is planned learning. Random learning may occur as part of a planned learning experience but what is learned randomly is not the explicit goal of the planned experience.

The definition of learning applied in this study is "the act or experience of one [who] learns" ("Learning," 2005). This definition refers to all levels of change, actions, and processes through which knowledge, attitudes, skills, or expertise are intentionally or randomly acquired (Apps, 1981; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998; "Learning," 2005).

Given that the evaluation of personal learning is inherently subjective (Rogers, 1983), this researcher chose not to define learning for the participants in the present study. Item 1 on the PIF-S is a single, global item which asked students to indicate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning. Participants responded to this item according to their individual understandings of learning and their own criteria for satisfaction with language learning.

Measuring Satisfaction with Learning

A review of surveys used by institutions to evaluate individual courses or overall educational experience reveals that satisfaction with learning is generally addressed in one of two ways. First, the word *learning* may actually appear in items on student satisfaction surveys or course evaluations. Second, survey items may address certain aspects of the learning experience (e.g., instruction, assignments, testing, classroom interactions) without specifically using the word learning.

Direct references to learning may appear in items on student satisfaction surveys or course evaluations. These items typically ask students the extent to which they agree with statements such as: *I have learned a lot from this instructor* (Richland Community College, 2002), *The assignments and/or projects in this course facilitated my learning* (Strachota, 2006, Table 1), *I learned something that I consider valuable* ("Instructor/course evaluation," n.d., Item 2), *I learned and understood the subject*

materials of this course ("Instructor/course evaluation," n.d., Item 4), *The extent to which*

I am learning how to learn (Selkirk College, Department of Strategic Planning and

Institutional Research, 2008, Section 1), or *Overall, I learned a great deal in this course*

(Cashin & Downey, 1992, p. 572). These items mention learning directly in the context

of certain features of the classroom experience, for example materials or assignments.

They do not, however, speak to the issue of whether the student is satisfied with his or

her learning.

A second type of item on satisfaction surveys or course evaluations addresses

specific aspects of the learning experience without directly mentioning the word learning,

as in: *I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating* or *My interest in the*

subject increased as a consequence of this course ("Instructor/course evaluation," n.d.,

Items 1 and 3). Selkirk College's (2008) Student Satisfaction Survey does not mention

the word learning but does ask students to indicate their satisfaction with certain aspects

of the learning experience:

The quality of instruction in my program

The amount of knowledge that I have gained

The quality of course content

The clarity of course objectives

The level of instructional expertise in my program,

The availability of courses I need

The availability of instructors during office hours. (Section 1)

The literature review did reveal a scale which assesses the learning environment,

has more than one item related to satisfaction, and directly mentions satisfaction with

learning. Viechnicki et al. (1990) revised an existing course evaluation instrument in order to investigate instructional strategies which motivated adult learners in a variety of for-credit and noncredit Continuing Education courses offered through a university. One of four subscales on the Course Interest Survey Revised contains 10 items related to course and instructional satisfaction, including one item which specifically asks about satisfaction with learning. The authors note that "the lack of emphasis for [sic] satisfaction in the adult learning literature is surprising" (p. 13).

Seaman and Fellenz (1989) state that soliciting student ratings of learning satisfaction is particularly important because "dissatisfaction can occur even when progress is being made on course objectives" (p. 158). Positive responses to items such as "*Overall, I learned a great deal in this course*" (Cashin & Downey, 1992, p. 572) or reports of high levels of satisfaction with the quality of instruction and the clarity of course objectives may suggest student satisfaction with learning. However, asking the student directly if he or she is satisfied with learning is one certain way to gain insight into the student's perception of an educational experience (Santhanam, Ballantyne, Mulligan, de la Harpe, & Ellis, 2000).

Fraser and Treagust (1986) report that consulting students about their perceptions of the learning environment has two advantages. First, it results in a description of the class as the actual learning participants see it. Secondly, student perceptions reveal information that is not necessarily accessible to the outside observer. Student reports of satisfaction with learning allow the researcher a window into the perceptions of the learner which objective observation techniques may not reveal.

Guolla (1999) notes another reason to solicit student satisfaction ratings. He states that student perceptions of satisfaction "[reflect] outcomes of reciprocity that occur between students and an instructor" (p. 91). While direct observation may document interactions in the classroom, student satisfaction reports, according to Guolla, reveal a dimension of affective consequence which may not necessarily be observable.

Some of the student satisfaction surveys and course evaluations reviewed for this study contain items which refer to learning but don't address satisfaction with learning. Other surveys include items which assess specific facets of the learning experience but don't ask explicitly about satisfaction with learning. Only one survey was found which directly addressed satisfaction with learning.

The present study used one global item to measure adult satisfaction with personal language learning. Item 1 on the PIF-S asked students to rate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning. In addition, item 18 on the PIF-S asked participants to rate the level of satisfaction with their general experience of language study, past and present.

Satisfaction with Language Learning

The current study was conducted in the context of noncredit adult foreign language classes. The PIF-S asked participants to rate their satisfaction with personal language learning. In the context of this study, personal language learning was defined as the act or experience of one who learns a language. Research on satisfaction indicates several potential influences on student satisfaction with learning experiences: gender, age, personality, culture or ethnicity, educational experiences, expectations, and learning climate.

As discussed in Chapter I, research on language learning has focused on (a) the neurology and physiology of language learners and the language learning process, (b) the subjective experience of the language learner, and (c) learning and teaching variables in the language classroom. The two adult populations which appear most often in language learning research are students in postsecondary for-credit language classes and students in ESL, ESOL, and EFL classes. There is no comparable research base for English-speaking adults studying a foreign language in a noncredit context. Reports of the subjective experience of adult language learners do, however, provide some insight into what may lead to satisfaction with language learning in a noncredit course.

Motivation and goals. The criteria for satisfaction with learning may vary significantly depending on the learners and learning context (Jurkowitsch et al., 2006). Carlson (2006a, 2006b) examined the language learning experiences of adult students in her university German classes and her own experiences as a lifelong language learner. Carlson's study emphasizes the importance of understanding students' reasons for learning a foreign language.

Motivation to learn a second language for adults may be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation for the adult language learner may be the result of a personal educational goal, for example completing a degree program which requires foreign language study (Carlson, 2006a). Intrinsic motivation for adult language learners may also derive from the personal interests, social interests, perception of future educational needs (Carlson, 2006a; Eoyang, 1989), or even "personal taste and temperament" (Eoyang, 1989, para. 5). Some adult language learners may want to learn a language in order to research family history. Others may want to learn a language to interact more

comfortably with business clients from other countries. Some just love the sound of a certain language (Carlson, 2006a). Students with the goal of attending school outside the United States may anticipate needing to read or speak a foreign language.

In addition, adults may have extrinsic language learning motivations which are the result of educational program requirements, work responsibilities or professional development mandates (Carlson, 2006a). The decision to learn a foreign language may be related to employment opportunities or an employer that prefers employees to have some degree of foreign language proficiency (Carlson, 2006a).

Motivation leads to the setting of very specific learning goals. Houle (1961) describes the motivations and goals of three types of learners: the goal-oriented, the activity-oriented, and the learning-oriented. The goal-oriented learner uses "education as a means of accomplishing fairly clear-cut objectives" (p. 15). For goal-oriented language learners, goals may be limited to being able to accomplish certain communicative tasks such as ordering a meal, writing a letter, or asking directions. On the other hand, according to Carlson (2006a), some adult learners set a goal of achieving an advanced level of language proficiency. Students whom Carlson's study describes as "goal-oriented" (p. 132) were motivated to persist in language learning even after experiencing negative learning experiences. They understood that learning a foreign language is "a lifelong commitment" (p. 141).

For Houle's (1961) activity-oriented learner, satisfaction may depend on whether or not the expectations of social interaction or development of social relationships are met. Activity-oriented learners participate in education "primarily for reasons unrelated to the purposes or content of the activities in which they engage" (p. 19). Rovai's (2002)

study of perceptions of community and online learners concludes that those "who have stronger sense of community and perceive greater cognitive learning should feel less isolated and have greater satisfaction with their academic programs" (p. 328). The activity-oriented learner who does not find the anticipated social interactions or sense of community in the foreign language classroom may not find the learning experience satisfying.

The desire for sense of community may also extend outside the classroom to establishing a stronger cultural identity. Carlson (2006a) indicates that the study of genealogy and family history "appeared to create a desire to establish a sense of belonging, seeming like an identity anchor" (p. 112). Similarly, Houle (1961) also notes that the activity-oriented learner may participate in learning activities to perpetuate a family or cultural tradition. Another reason related to social relationships is the desire to learn a foreign language in order to participate in the culture of the country in which that language is spoken (Carlson, 2006a).

The learning-oriented learner, on the other hand, is most satisfied if he or she feels individual growth or a new type of learning has taken place. According to Houle (1961), the learning oriented learner is motivated by "the itch to learn" (p. 25) and the perception that education is fun. For the learning-oriented learner, satisfaction with language learning could be the result of planned or random learning. Apps (1981) includes taking a foreign language course in examples of planned learning. For the learning-oriented learner, planned learning which results in a student's awareness of growth in certain language skill areas may result in satisfaction.

What Apps (1981) calls random learning may result in individual growth, new learning, or even fun for all types of learners. Random learning can occur in the context of planned learning. Random learning in a foreign language class might result from being exposed to the art, music, cooking, architecture, literature, films, or fashion of countries where the language is spoken.

Carlson (2006a) documents unanticipated learning reported by foreign language students. Some students in this study reported taking pleasure in the sound of the language being learned. One student stated that she enjoyed learning German "'because German, depending on the word, has a tendency to sound like people are sneezing and I thought it is just such a hilarious language…compared to the Latin languages that are so soft and flowing'" (p. 111). Another student who did not have access to travel in other countries reported that learning a foreign language was "prestigious and glorious" (p. 113) because it meant escape and access to knowledge which other people did not have.

Carlson (2006a) emphasizes the importance of teachers recognizing and helping learners achieve their very specific and personal goals. The discrepancy between expectation and experience has been shown to affect satisfaction (Cook, 2004). Carlson's study suggests that unrealistic language learning goals and expectations can result in dissatisfaction with language learning. For example, adult language learners may set goals for themselves that are not consistent with what is possible in the timeframe of one course. Also related to goals and time, there may be a mismatch between learning activities that teachers plan for a class and the amount of time adult learners have to complete these activities. In addition, according to Carlson, learner goals may be

unrealistic because students, in particular beginning language students, may not be able to accurately assess their own language learning needs.

Carlson (2006b) cautions that "learning a [foreign language] is…a time-consuming effort, especially if a communicative competence is a personal goal" (p. 5). Going one step further, Eoyang (1989) questions whether the goal of mastering a language is indeed appropriate for all language learning situations, particularly for beginning-level students. He suggests that what beginning learners really intend to achieve, when they engage in foreign language learning, "is the ability to sustain a useful and relevant dialogue in the native language, to survive in a foreign culture in the foreign language without recourse to the use of one's native language" (para. 9). Although learning language survival skills may not result in language mastery, they can "provide the foundation for developing authentic, if not native, participants in that language" (para. 9). Eoyang suggests that "[the goal of language mastery] raises false expectations" (para. 9) for beginning language learners. Having language mastery as a goal may result in student dissatisfaction with language learning.

On the other hand, adults bring certain strengths to learning language that would seem to promote a satisfying learning experience. Adult language learners are more likely than children to have already had the experience of studying a foreign language (Bucuvalas, 2002) and, therefore, know what to expect of that learning experience. They have the experience of using language in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes (Bucuvalas, 2002; Schleppegrell, 1987). Adults possess well-established learning strategies and skills (Carlson, 2006a; Horwitz, 1988). They have "practiced with the linguistic capacities that speed language acquisition" (Bucuvalas, 2002, para. 4). In

addition, they are "typically better at intentional learning" (Bucuvalas, 2002, para. 4) than children are. Adults have been shown to be more efficient language learners who learn faster than children in the early stages of second language learning (Kramsch, 1995; Marinova-Todd, Marshall, & Snow, 2000; Schleppegrell, 1987).

The language learning goals and language learning needs of adult learners are highly individualized (Carlson, 2006a). They may be focused on achieving language mastery; they may be focused on more short-term, personal goals. Previous educational experiences and the match between student and teacher expectations have been shown to affect satisfaction with learning experiences (Brookfield, 1995; X. Cheng, 2000; Fraser & Treagust, 1986; Horwitz, 1988; Littlewood, 2001; Patterson et al., 1998; Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005; Tsui, 1996; Wyss, 2002; Zenhui, 1999, 2001). Furthermore, Carlson's (2006a, 2006b) work suggests that understanding learner motivations and helping learners achieve realistic goals will influence students' satisfaction with language learning.

Rachal (2002) states that "satisfaction with the learning experience should be measured in all settings" (p. 222) where adult educational activities take place. Achievement may take precedence over learner satisfaction as a goal in contexts where content mastery is primary. However, Rachal (2002) argues that "learner satisfaction is paramount" (p. 218) in a context where "the goal is self-fulfillment rather than content mastery, and when grade, certification, or credential is not involved" (p. 218). Noncredit courses do not normally include formal measurements of achievement such as testing or grading. For this reason it would seem that measurements of achievement are not the most appropriate learning outcomes to consider in noncredit foreign language classes.

Learner satisfaction seems to be a more appropriate measure of successful learning in this particular context.

Carlson (2006a) suggests that the highest satisfaction for adult language learners is generated by reaching personal language learning goals. A learning environment which helps language learners discover realistic expectations and recognize their strengths would seem to promote learning satisfaction.

The PIF-S used in this study asks participants to rate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning. It also asks them to identify their primary and other goals for the language course in which they are engaged. In addition, they are asked to rate the extent to which they feel they have achieved these goals. Identifying specific learner goals and the extent to which learners achieved those goals enhances the understanding of learner satisfaction in the noncredit foreign language classroom derived from the present study.

Age. Age may influence satisfaction with language learning in two ways. It may affect the degree to which a language learner can become proficient in a foreign language. It may also be the cause of certain barriers to language learning.

The literature on language acquisition indicates that age influences the degree to which most adult learners can acquire native-like language proficiency. The Critical Period Hypotheses refers to the time period in a human life in which optimal language acquisition occurs (Ioup, 2005). The critical period for language acquisition has been defined as "a period of time when learning a language is relatively easy and typically meets with a high degree of success" (Marinova-Todd et al., 2000, p. 9). This time

period ends "at or before the onset of puberty" (Marinova-Todd et al., 2000, p. 9). After the critical period, the learner's acquisition of language will not achieve native standards.

If adult learners expect, or desire, to acquire native-like proficiency in a foreign language, then the critical period hypothesis suggests that they may not be satisfied with what they are able to learn. Specifically, for both older teenagers and adult learners, second language learning after childhood often results in deficiencies in second language grammar acquisition or processing or both (Ullman, 2005).

While some researchers contend that "the ability to acquire language deteriorates with age" (Bowden, Sanz, & Stafford, 2005, p. 109), this is not proof of inability to acquire language later in life. Healthy adults can generally expect learning abilities to remain relatively stable at least until the 60s, with some people never experiencing important reductions in learning ability (American Federation for Aging Research, n.d.; Grognet, 1989).

Grognet (1989) argues that "there is no research evidence which suggests that older adults cannot succeed in learning another language" (p. 1). Furthermore, Ullman (2005) reports that

> it does not appear to be the case that late [language] learning precludes nativelike attainment….Rather, a number of studies have suggested that such attainment is not in fact all that rare, given sufficient exposure to the [language being learned] (Birdsong, 1992; Birdsong and Mollis, 2001; Cranshaw, 1997; Van Wuijtswinkel, 1994; White and Genesee, 1996)." (p. 151)

Schleppegrell (1987) also reports that usually "the age of the adult learner is not a major factor in language acquisition" (para. 1). She suggests that any language learning

problems that do exist for older adults are not the result of age itself but the result of affective factors, health problems, or declines in certain specific abilities. She emphasizes, however, that not all adults experience these problems. Schleppegrell identifies the learning context as "the major influence on [adults'] ability to acquire the new language" (para. 1).

Palmunen (1995) cites "certain physiological changes associated with aging, such as slower reaction time and changes in hearing, and, to a lesser extent, short-term memory" (p. 350) as factors which influence language learning for older adults. She cautions that even small changes in abilities can result in older learners' heightened anxiety and insecurity.

With regard to personal anxiety and insecurity, Perry's (2006) work on fear and the adult learning process emphasizes that stress, fear, and anxiety may inhibit learning. If learning is inhibited, according to Perry, then the satisfaction, pleasure, and confidence learning can bring is also inhibited.

Some learners who choose to learn a foreign language as adults may have to contend with physical or cognitive abilities that have changed with age. Twyford (1987/1988) cautions, however, that generalizing about the effect of age on language learning is treacherous because "first, people of the same age do not share all the same characteristics" (para. 2) and "second, there is no uniform pattern of development that everyone follows" (para. 2). In addition, Twyford notes that, even if all humans were known to eventually arrive at common levels of reduced ability, "there is no common route to be followed. Knowledge and skill are acquired by each of us according to a highly individual map" (para. 2).

Age may be a factor in language learning satisfaction because it may influence the extent to which adult learners can achieve their language learning goals. In addition, for some adult students, physical and cognitive changes related to aging may result in an affective or cognitive states which adversely affects learning and satisfaction.

For the purposes of this study, the adult language learner was defined as any person age 18 or older who is pursuing foreign language learning. The PIF-S asked participants to report the age group to which they belonged. Physical or cognitive changes related to those age groups or individual participants and which may affect satisfaction with learning were outside the purview of this study. With regard to age, this study examined only the extent to which age group is related to satisfaction with language learning and perceptions of instructional perspective.

Learning climate. According to Beer and Darkenwald (1989), a learning climate appropriate to adults facilitates learning and results in learner satisfaction. The current study addressed learner satisfaction and one specific aspect of the psychosocial learning climate, instructional perspective. Instructional perspective was defined as "the beliefs, feelings and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) that teachers of adults may possess or exhibit in the classroom at a given point in time. Certain aspects of the learning climate related to the instructor and instructional perspective have been shown to influence student satisfaction: characteristics of the teacher (Guolla, 1999; Knox et al., 1992; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002), quality of teaching (Hearn, 1985; Knox et al., 1992; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002), teaching style (Hearn, 1985), a student-oriented faculty (Astin, 1993), type of instructional activities (Guolla, 1999), challenging and stimulating course work (Guolla, 1999; Hearn, 1985), faculty-student and student-student interactions in the

classroom (Astin, 1993; Guolla, 1999; Parkinson et al., 2003; Watson, 1998), congruence between student and faculty educational orientation (Morstain, 1977), showing personal interest in students (Watson, 1998), feedback from the teacher (Finaly-Neumann, 1994), as well as teacher and task clarity (Finaly-Neumann, 1994; Guolla, 1999; Hines et al., 1985).

Some of these influences on learning satisfaction have also been shown to be important in the learning climate created for the adult foreign language classroom. Carlson (2006a) identifies several characteristics of the positive adult language learning environment, for example active participation in learning activities, the importance of feeling like a serious contributor to a collaborative learning experience in the language classroom, and timely and appropriate feedback on language learning.

Carlson (2006a) suggests that certain teacher behaviors and attitudes improve the adult language learning process. She recommends that communications between teacher and students include a respectful way of addressing students. Teachers also need to be available and approachable. Moreover, teachers should demonstrate empathy when students are communicating concerns or questions.

With regard to professional competence, Carlson (2006a) suggests that teachers select "adult-suitable and meaningful teaching methods" (p. 208). In addition, teachers need to make a variety of learning resources available to students. Teachers should also "[engage] in critical reflection and evaluation of [their] teaching perspective and practices" (p. 208). Finally, Carlson notes the importance of teacher curiosity and being willing to consider changes.

Carlson (2006b) reports that adult students' experiences as language learners, as well as her own language learning experiences, have led her to conclude that an andragogical approach to foreign language learning is "a useful orientation applicable for an instructional framework that clearly differentiates between the child and the adult [foreign language] learner" (p. 3). Furthermore, she states that an andragogical approach to foreign language instruction

> moves the *adults* as [foreign language] learners more prominently into the center of the methods and didactics that are appropriate, relevant and motivating to who the adults are, what they want, and how they want their learning to unfold. This andragogical approach is mindful and considerate of the adult [language learner] as the individual who is life-experienced, self-directed, and autonomous. (p. 4)

Palmunen (1995) also emphasizes that adult learning principles play an important role in designing an effective learning environment for the adult language program. The Weekend College program for elementary French described by Palmunen incorporated "effective distance-learning tools and also fostered regular personal interaction in the target language, along with prompt teacher feedback on student performance" (p. 349). The program design chosen as most appropriate for this two-semester for-credit French program was a flexible format which allowed significant self-directed learning nurtured and supported by guidance from instructors. Program goals included establishing a partnership for learning between students and teacher, using task-oriented learning activities which were relevant to students' interests and experiences, and eliciting input from students with regard to the learning pace and process.

Schleppegrell (1987) states that an environment which encourages adult learning takes into account adult learners' motivation, self-doubt, anxiety, stereotypes that older adults may hold that they are not good language learners, and stress created by some teaching methodologies. Like Carlson (2006a, 2006b) and Palmunen (1995), Schleppegrell recommends using "adult learning strategies" (para. 12) which respect the self-directedness of adult learners, adults' life experience, adult independence, and adult learning motivation.

The approaches to adult language learning and teaching described by Carlson, Palmunen, and Schleppegrell incorporate andragogical principles as well as many of the factors that have been shown to influence satisfaction with learning. The MIPI, one of the instruments used in the present study, assessed the extent to which teacher participants used andragogical principles in the classroom. The MIPI-S documented language students' perceptions of the use of andragogical principles in their classrooms.

The portrait of noncredit teachers provided by the MIPI and MIPI-S scores contributes to a better understanding of the learning climate in the foreign language classroom. In addition, a comparison of the MIPI and MIPI-S scores with student satisfaction ratings provided information on the extent to which the use of andragogical principles influenced adult satisfaction in this context.

Beyond teacher and instructional influences, research has shown that other aspects of the psychosocial learning environment affect student satisfaction: social climate (Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002), sense of community (Parkinson et al., 2003; Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005), affective responses to the learning climate (Manteuffel, 1982; Parkinson et al., 2003; Perry, 2006), personal intellectual growth (Knox et al.,

1992), developing work skills (Knox et al., 1992), increased interest in the course's subject matter (Guolla, 1999), and the type of class being evaluated (Beer & Darkenwald, 1989; Hearn, 1985). According to Manteuffel (1982), the "affective aspects [of the learning climate] are the primary determinant of learner satisfaction" (p. 18).

Manteuffel (1982) states that an appropriate affective climate produces satisfied adult learners who are "involved, challenged, self-directed, rewarded, and safe" (p. 18). Perry (2006) also emphasizes that the most satisfying and enjoyable adult learning environment is one in which learners feel safe to follow where their curiosity and their desire to learn take them. In addition, Rovai (2002) and Rovai and Gallien (2005) indicate that a climate which satisfies learning goals is associated with students' perceived learning.

In the context of the foreign language classroom, Carlson (2006a) provides evidence to support Manteuffel (1982), Perry (2006), Rovai (2002), and Rovai and Gallien (2005). One of the themes which emerges from Carlson's interviews with adult language learners is the importance of teacher-student rapport. Carlson found that students "who had experienced a nurturing, caring and exciting teacher who loved teaching, exerted enthusiasm, and made the learning applicable, relevant, and challenging, held fond memories that made them commit to learning more German" (p. 140). In particular, the reduction of inhibiting fears and the creation of a safe space in which to learn were noted by students as qualities which had a positive influence on learning and led them to persist. The unexpected enjoyment of being challenged by language learning was another positive influence on learning reported by Carlson's

students. Even having had a negative experience with a particular teacher only served to provide students with increased motivation to persevere with their language learning.

Carlson (2006a) identifies several additional characteristics of the adult language learning experience related to the affective environment. Her student interviews show that adult learners prefer to have some control over the pace their work. Furthermore, the learning activities and interactions planned by the instructor should also take into account students' feelings of vulnerability. Adult language learners may feel vulnerable when dealing with the frustrations of learning a new language. They may also have fears about speaking in class, making a mistake, feeling humiliated, saying something stupid, or appearing ignorant.

In addition, Carlson's (2006a) interviews showed that self-concept is important for language learners. Learners need to feel like serious contributors to the learning experience of all learners in the language classroom. Some adults, in fact, fear that the pace of language learning which best fits them will be perceived by other learners as holding the class back.

Carlson (2006a) found that a supportive learning environment is one in which teachers challenge beliefs that adult learners may have about themselves or their abilities as language learners. Many of these beliefs about themselves as language learners derive from past experiences with language teachers. Other beliefs come from unfavorable comparisons students make of themselves to other language learners.

Writing about a Weekend College French program, Palmunen (1995) emphasizes the relationship between affect and learners' ability to influence some aspects of the learning process. According to Palmunen, being able to influence pace or learning

activities reduces language learning anxiety for adult students. Reducing anxiety is important because Palmunen finds anxiety to be a significant impediment to self-direction in the foreign language classroom.

In addition to affective climate, class composition is another aspect of the psychosocial learning environment which can affect language learning satisfaction and is relevant the present study. Loughrin–Sacco (1991) reported on the effects of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary-level French courses offered at a university. The author took part in two studies of beginning French students. The initial, ethnographic study followed university students in an elementary French class for one year and involved observations, student interviews, and documentation of student work. The second study, four years later, had a quantitative-qualitative design which included the administration of Horwitz's Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and student interviews. The second study followed 63 students, 19 true beginners and 44 false beginners, in three elementary French courses with three different instructors during one semester.

In Loughrin-Sacco's (1991) studies, beginners were defined as those university students with less than two years of previous language study; false beginners were students with two or more years' prior French study. Loughrin-Sacco reports that, according to various estimates, false beginners make up between 56% and 92% of students enrolled in elementary-level foreign language classes. The problems related to the integration of these two groups of learners in one class permeate "all aspects of learning and teaching behavior" (p. 92).

According to Loughrin–Sacco (1991), beginners are at a distinct disadvantage in the mixed-experience classroom with regard to affective aspects of their language learning experience, ideas about the extent to which they are successful at language learning, class performance, and language learning persistence. The author reports that beginners felt intimidated, inadequate, inferior, anxious, overwhelmed, and embarrassed at their inadequate performance. Beginners compared themselves unfavorably to false beginners in the foreign language classroom and generally attributed their lack of comparable success to lack of aptitude. They reported understanding only 10% to 30% of what the instructor said in the target language, compared to false beginner reports of understanding 75% to 90% of the teachers' communications.

In terms of classroom behaviors, beginners tended to volunteer quite a bit less than false beginners, often avoiding eye contact with the instructor to avoid being called on. Furthermore, observers in Loughrin-Sacco's (1991) initial study reported that beginners tended to physically segregate themselves from false beginners in the classroom in order to avoid participating in small group exercises with the more-experienced students.

Beginners expressed resentment that false beginners were not enrolled at a more experience-appropriate level. Beginners had to spend inordinately more time than false beginners in studying and preparing for class. However, beginners achieved lower grades than did the false beginners. Loughrin-Sacco (1991) reports that only 7% of beginners received an A and 49% received a B for the classes in the initial study. By comparison, 23% of false beginners received an A and 49% received a B. In addition, beginners in the first study did not tend to continue to the next level of French. Loughrin-Sacco notes

that only one of the beginner students in the initial study chose to enroll in the second year of French.

With regard to false beginners in the first study, Loughrin-Sacco (1991) states that the integration of experience levels in elementary French "did no apparent harm, though doubtless they could have made more progress in a class designed for them" (p. 96). False beginners reported being as uncomfortable as beginners with speaking in class but had lower anxiety and higher participation rates. They understood the teacher speaking the target language the majority of the time. They were often called on to serve as models in learning activities. They reported expending little effort to get a good grade.

Previous discussions of learning climate in this chapter stress the critical influence of the instructor on the learning environment. According to Loughrin-Sacco (1991), class observations revealed that the presence of a polarized classroom population affected instructional activities and teacher behavior. In an attempt to compensate for the experience deficit of beginners, the teacher in the original study provided them with additional learning resources and support. Beginners were allowed to retake quizzes on which they received a poor grade and were able to earn extra credit. Instructors slowed the pace of the class. They discovered learning activities at which beginners succeeded such as "reading comprehension, creative writing exercises, and contextual listening comprehension exercises" (p. 102). Beginners were called on only when they seemed ready to speak. On the other hand, the teacher in the first study "admitted relying more on false beginners because they ensured the smooth flow of class drill and exercises and lessened periods of dead silence" (p. 94). Teacher efforts did not appear to be able to

adequately compensate for the experience difference between groups as evidenced by the lower grades and low rate of persistence of beginners.

Palmunen (1995) incorporated Loughrin-Sacco's research into the design of the Weekend College French program at her institution. However, Palmunen modified the definitions of true and false beginners used by Loughrin-Sacco. Palmunen defined false beginners as "students who may have already studied the language for one or more years or have life experience in the language through work or family contacts" (p. 350). A true beginner, on the other hand, was a student "with little or no prior knowledge of the target language" (p. 350).

The consequences of mixing true and false beginners in the beginning language classrooms has significance for the present study. The literature shows that perceptions of learning climate differ for these two groups depending on the amount of language experience a student brings to the classroom. Interviews conducted by Loughrin-Sacco (1991) suggest that satisfaction with learning must have been hard to realize for the true beginners in a class of predominantly false beginners. In addition, Loughrin-Sacco found that true beginners did not persist in their language learning to the extent that false beginners did.

In the present study, the PIF-S asked participants what language they were studying in the present course and the number of years they had been studying this language. Students were also asked to identify all languages which they spoke. Information collected with the PIF-S allowed the researcher to determine to what extent student participants in the entire sample and in individual classes had prior language

study experience. The PIF-S data also revealed the extent of participants' overall language learning persistence.

Palmunen's definitions of true and false beginners informed the description of the participants in the current study. Identifying the extent to which this distinction existed in the sample broadened the portrait of the learning climate for adults in noncredit foreign language courses made possible by this study.

There are three influences on satisfaction with language learning that were particularly relevant to the present study. Research on the experience of adult language learners indicates that one potential influence on learning satisfaction is helping students establish realistic goals and expectations as well as recognizing their learning strengths. Second, age may play a role in adult learning satisfaction by influencing learning abilities and the potential for language mastery. Third, research shows that the climate of language learning has the potential to influence adult satisfaction. Important aspects of the learning climate are teacher beliefs, feelings, and behaviors; social interaction and sense of community; and student affect. Furthermore, the effect of grouping students of mixed language learning experience together in beginning-level foreign language classes has been shown to affect perceptions of the learning climate.

In summary, the literature on student satisfaction with educational experiences seldom addresses satisfaction with learning. The present study investigated adult satisfaction with language learning and how learning satisfaction related to instructional perspective in the context of noncredit foreign language courses. Satisfaction with language learning was defined as "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective

evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with [language learning]" (Elliott & Shin, 2002, p. 198) at a particular point in time.

The research design of the present study included variables that had the potential to influence adults' satisfaction with language learning: gender, age, culture, education, language learning experience, goals, and instructional perspective, one aspect of the learning climate. The PIFs were used to collect data on the demographic characteristics of noncredit foreign language students and their teachers. The PIF-S was also the source of data on student reports of satisfaction.

In the context of foreign language learning, certain authors have proposed that the use of andragogical principles creates the most effective and satisfying learning climate for adult learners. The current study assessed teachers' self-reports of instructional perspective, using the MIPI, and students' perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective, using the MIPI-S.

The data provided by the PIFs and MIPIs in the present study produced a portrait of a small segment of foreign language teachers and their students. In addition, this study evaluated the relationship between satisfaction with language learning and instructional perspective. The present research contributes to better understanding what is the most effective learning environment for adult learners in noncredit foreign language courses. The results of this study also contribute to the knowledge base in the areas of adult education, language learning, student satisfaction, and noncredit education. The next section of this chapter describes the setting for the present study, noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program.

The Community College

A community college provides the setting for the present study. The following definition of community college was used in this study:

> an institution of higher education that usually offers the first two years of college instruction and frequently grants an associate degree, but does not grant a bachelor's degree. It is an independently organized institution (public or non-public), an institution that is part of a school district, or an independently organized system of junior colleges. [Community/junior colleges] offer college transfer courses and programs; vocational, technical, and semi-professional occupational programs; or general education programs. (NCES, 2004, Chapter 6.6)

This section of the literature review begins with a description of the growth of junior and community colleges. The functions of the community college are then identified. Next, participation trends in adult learning and the significant role that the community college plays in providing adult education opportunities are described.

The present study focuses on noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program. The section on Continuing Education and Noncredit Courses will first define noncredit education. Second, the sources of data on noncredit courses and the impact of funding on noncredit data collection will be examined. Third, current knowledge about teachers and students involved in noncredit courses will be discussed. Finally, the types of foreign language courses available to adult learners through community colleges and Continuing Education programs will be identified.

Growth of Junior and Community Colleges

Junior colleges and community colleges in the United States developed along parallel paths in the first half of the 20th century. In the early 20th century, two-year postsecondary institutions did not have a single, common mission. The programs they offered depended on the character of the individual institution.

Joliet Junior College, founded in 1901 in Joliet, Illinois, is "the oldest public junior college in the nation" (AACC, 2009f). The primary, official function of the junior college in the early years of its existence was to provide courses which would allow transfer to a four-year institution. Occupational training programs were part of the junior college curriculum but they always included general education coursework required by the college (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Knowles (1994) states, however, that most junior colleges "served as 'finishing schools' for young women or 'prep schools' for young men and women" (p. 303). Research, a function traditionally associated with the university, was not part of the junior college mission (Knowles, 1994).

Community colleges were neighborhood postsecondary institutions which developed simultaneously with junior colleges. The community college was originally conceptualized in the late 19th century as an "upward [extension] of secondary schools" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 8) necessary to prepare high school graduates for college studies. The community college provided courses for transfer to four-year institutions but also provided career or vocational training and their related degrees, the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Knowles, 1994). Public universities had initiated the ideas of "access for a wider range of the population" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 2) and "service to the broader community through their agricultural

and general extension divisions" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 2). Community colleges

incorporated into their mission the service component of the university extension concept

"but with a more diversified program of noncredit adult education activities" (Knowles,

1994, p. 303).

In the 1950s and 1960s, the number of public community colleges grew

dramatically and their mission expanded in response to the 1947 Higher Education for

American Democracy report. Commonly called the Truman Commission Report, this

publication

> called for…the establishment of a network of public community colleges that
>
> would charge little or no tuition, serve as cultural centers, be comprehensive in
>
> their program offerings with emphasis on civic responsibilities, and would serve
>
> the areas in which they were located. (AACC, 2009f, para. 11)

The designation *community college* was popularized by the Truman Commission Report

and the publication of the book *The Community College* by Jesse Bogue in 1950 (AACC,

2009f). As a result, the word community was added to the name of many new and

existing two-year postsecondary institutions.

The 1960s saw the establishment of a national network of "457 community

colleges–more than the total in existence before that decade" (AACC, 2009b, para. 3).

Local community colleges provided postsecondary educational opportunities which were

lower in cost than the college or university. They also provided an open-door admissions

policy for all high school graduates with continuing learning needs (Knowles, 1994).

Moreover, they responded to the educational needs of non-students: minorities, rural

residents, the disadvantaged, veterans, and those unable or unwilling to engage in more

formal, traditional study (Palinchak, 1973). Primarily, however, the mission of the community college was, and continues to be, "to relate earnestly to its local community" (Palinchak, 1973, p. 135). This mission is accomplished by identifying community needs, providing educational and social services (Palinchak, 1973), and becoming a cultural and intellectual community focal point and source of pride (Knowles, 1994).

A distinction between the junior college and the community college continued to exist through the 1960s. By the next decade, however, the term junior college became synonymous with community college and junior college was dropped from general usage (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). There are currently 1,177 community colleges in the United States, of which 988 are public institutions, 158 are independent institutions, and 31 are tribal institutions (AACC, 2009e, Number and Type of Colleges section).

Functions of the Community College in the 21st Century

The present-day community college serves four functions. The community college provides transfer credit, degree programs, developmental courses, and community education opportunities (Foote, 2001).

First, the community college provides academic programs for students who will transfer to a four-year college or university to work toward a baccalaureate degree. Cohen and Brawer (1987) call the community college a "connecting institution" (p. 1). It is connected to four-year postsecondary institutions through a shared liberal arts curriculum and through the students who begin their studies at the community college level and continue in "senior institutions" (p. 1). According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC; 2009g), "half of the students who receive a

baccalaureate degree attend community college in the course of their undergraduate

studies" (para. 2).

Second, community colleges provide students with the opportunity to earn an

Associate of Arts or Science degree or a certificate in vocational and occupational

programs. At a small number of public and independent community colleges students

can even earn a Bachelor's degree (AACC, 2009e, Degrees and Certificates section).

Community college degree programs generally prepare students to enter the work force.

In addition, they provide on-going career development opportunities for those already

employed or re-training for employment changes. According McPhee (2004), the AACC

reports that the top five programs "for which there is a large market demand for

graduating [community college] students" (p. 1) are in the areas of allied health, skilled

trades-industrial, public services, information technologies, and business.

A third function of current community college education is developmental

education. Developmental and remedial programs help students prepare "to enter degree

or certificate programs by improving their communication or mathematical skills" (Foote,

2001, para. 1). Developmental education may be considered for-credit or noncredit

depending on the institution providing the programming.

A fourth function of the community college is community education, a broad

category which embraces a variety of programs and learning opportunities. Various

terms are commonly used when defining community education:

> *Adult education*: Instruction designed for people who are beyond the age of
>
> compulsory school attendance and have either completed or interrupted their
>
> formal education

Continuing education: The learning effort undertaken by people whose principal

occupation is no longer student—those who regard learning as a means of

developing their potential or resolving their problems

Lifelong learning: Intermittent education, undertaken in school and other settings

Community services: The broadest term--whatever services an institution

provides that are acceptable to the people in its service area

Community-based education: Programs designed by the people served and

developed for the good of the community

Contract training: Collaborations between the community colleges and business

and industry to train workers in specific fields (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, pp. 287-

288)

The concept of community education includes elements of the academic,

vocational, and developmental functions of the community college. Community

education, however, also expands beyond the traditional frames of age and credit

programs to provide lifelong learning opportunities to adult students and non-students

alike. Community education is comprised of courses or programs which generally have a

less formal approach to teaching and learning, are shorter in duration than traditional

semester-long courses, are less likely to be graded or taken for credit, are funded to a

large extent through grants or participant fees, and are more flexible in responding to

changing community interests (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Examples of community

education courses offered through a Continuing Education program are painting, belly

dancing, foreign language for travel purposes, courses for renewing a license or

upgrading work skills, courses for improving writing skills, and ESL (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

The four functions of the community college are providing transfer credit, providing work-related degree or certification programs, providing developmental education, and providing community education. Community education is the function which is most relevant to the present study of noncredit adult foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program.

Participation in Adult Learning

Adults participate in educational activities primarily for work-related or personal interest reasons. Adult foreign language learning is generally reported in the personal interest category of adult learning activities.

Over 44% of adults surveyed for the Adult Education Survey of 2005 reported participation in adult education activities (NCES, 2006). Adults under the age of 54 (i.e., in the age groups 16 - 24, 25 - 34, 35 - 44, and 45 - 54) had the highest overall participation rates, ranging from 48% to almost 53% (NCES, 2006, Table 11-2). The highest participation was reported in the youngest groups: 52.9% of participants in the 16-24 age group, 52.2% of participants in the 25-34 age group. The lowest participation was reported in the oldest age group. Only 22.9% of those aged 65 and older reported participation in adult education activities (NCES, 2006, Table 11-2).

The current growth sectors in adult education are programs which are related to work, personal interest, or personal need (Kim et al., 2005; NCES, 2006). Other programs such as developmental courses, ESL, and apprenticeships represent a much smaller percent of adult education activities (Kim et al., 2005; NCES, 2006).

Depending on the data source, between 27% (NCES, 2006) and 30% (Kim et al., 2004, 2005) of adults who participate in educational activities do so for reasons related to work. Between 1995 and 2005, participation in work-related courses increased by 6% (NCES, 2006, Table 11-1).

In the area of personal interest courses, 21% of adults reported participation in 2000-2001 (Kim et al., 2004, 2005; NCES, 2006). Participation in personal interest courses between 1995 and 2005 showed a small gain of 1.2% (NCES, 2006).

Other adult educational activities in the combined areas of "basic skills training, apprenticeships, and [ESL]" (NCES, 2006, Table 11-2) accounted for approximately 3% of adult participation in 2005. From 1995 to 2005 participation in these areas showed only a modest growth of 0.3 % (NCES, 2006, Table 11-1).

The study of a foreign or second language could, logically, be part of any of these three categories: work-related courses, personal interest courses, and other courses related to developmental needs or training. In the literature reviewed for the present study, foreign language learning is usually recorded with personal interest courses (see Kim et al., 2005, Table B). ESL courses are either reported separately (Kim et al., 2005) or reported in the category *Other activities* with developmental programs (NCES, 2006, Table 11-2). ESL courses are usually the only language learning activities directly linked to work-place needs (Kim et al., 2004).

Foreign language study is not generally included in descriptions or examples of work-related courses or programs. The need for foreign language study for work-related reasons, however, obviously does exist as proven by the presence of language training businesses in this country. This need can also be seen in the number of postsecondary

academic majors in the United States that include either requirements or recommendations that students study a language other than English. Nursing and the allied health professions, law enforcement and criminal justice, business, education, and social work are examples of academic programs preparing students to work in areas where there is a need for speaking a language other than English.

While the work-related sector has the largest percent of adults participating in educational activities, personal interest courses make up over 20% of adult educational activities. The literature suggests that foreign language courses are generally reported in the personal interest category. The extent to which adult foreign language study may be part of work-related programs is unclear at this time. Although ESL programs are sometimes associated with work needs in adult education literature, the study of other languages is rarely mentioned in this context.

Providers of Adult Learning Opportunities

Opportunities for adult learning are offered through public school districts, postsecondary institutions, business and industry, government agencies, professional organizations, community service providers, and private tutors or instructors. For both work-related and personal interest courses, postsecondary institutions are the second most important provider of educational courses for adults (Kim et al., 2004).

Postsecondary institutions and professional organizations each provide approximately 20% of work-related courses offered for adults. Business or industry provides 49% of work-related courses for adults (Kim et al., 2004).

Postsecondary schools provide 20% of adult personal interest courses (Kim et al., 2004). Approximately 50% of personal interest courses are provided through religious

organizations, community organizations, tutors and private instructors, or other

organizations (Kim et al., 2004).

In summary, the community college is a significant source of learning

opportunities for adults. Community colleges respond to the learning needs of the

communities in which they are established while at the same time providing academic

credit for degree or credential programs. The next section explains why community

colleges may offer a richer and more diverse selection of learning opportunities than

other postsecondary educational institutions.

Continuing Education and Noncredit Courses

The current study focused on foreign language teaching and learning in the

context of noncredit Continuing Education courses at a community college. For the

purposes of this study, Continuing Education was defined as "activities that develop

knowledge and skills to meet immediate and long-range educational objectives of adults

who, having completed or interrupted formal schooling, have accepted adult roles and

responsibilities" (NCES, 2004, Program code 600). Continuing Education programs may

include activities to foster the development of fundamental tools of learning;

prepare students for a postsecondary career; prepare students for postsecondary

education programs; upgrade occupational competence; prepare students for a

new or different career; develop skills and appreciation for special interests; or

enrich the aesthetic qualities of life. (NCES, 2004, Program code 600)

In the current literature on adult participation in postsecondary educational

activities, the terms *adult education* and *continuing education* are often used either

interchangeably or combined together, as in Adult and Continuing Education or

Adult/Continuing Education. The way in which the terms adult education and continuing education are applied in postsecondary institutions depends on the individual institution. For colleges and universities, whose missions are traditionally academic and professional, Continuing Education usually refers to adult education activities for professional development (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). However, the emphasis on *community* in the community college mission suggests that Continuing Education programs at community colleges are designed to respond to the whole spectrum of adult needs and interests in human communities (Gollattscheck, 1991). The spirit of community college Continuing Education programs is represented in the slogan of one Texas institution: "'We will teach anyone, anywhere, anything, at any time whenever there are enough people interested in the program to justify its offering'" (Bogue, 1950 as cited in Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 22).

Voorhees and Milam (2005) report that "the proportion of the noncredit program that is recreational in nature is highest in public 2-year and 4-year institutions" (p. 15). They state that "recreational noncredit activity in the non-profit sector is less significantly less [sic] than what is found in the public sector. It is negligible in the for-profit sector" (p. 15). A review of actual Continuing Education courses offered at community colleges suggests that community college programs may actually provide a larger number of adult learning courses for a greater variety of needs and interests than do the Continuing Education courses supported by colleges and universities. In the area of foreign language study, the community college chosen for this study offers the largest number of Continuing Education foreign language courses in the greatest variety of languages in the

region, despite the fact that the region is home to several public and private universities and private colleges.

The trend in Continuing Education for the last decade or more has been for postsecondary institutions to give higher priority to professional development and "workplace training and retraining" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 305). Emphasis on professional and vocational development is often at the expense of personal interest courses, the category in which most Continuing Education foreign languages courses are found. In fact, according to a 1994 California Higher Education Policy Center publication, California's Chancellor of Community Colleges at the time stated that "personal interest students 'are not a high priority for [the California community colleges]…[and] have been pretty much flushed out of the system'…by the colleges setting priorities which favor transfer and vocational education students" (McCurdy & Trombley, 1994, para. 5). In another example of this trend, the University of New Hampshire dropped personal interest courses from its Continuing Education program in 2004 because they were inappropriate for the university's mission: "to bring the expertise and knowledge of faculty…to people for professional development" (Stewart, 2004).

Recent research on noncredit programming also privileges workforce development courses. Milam's (2005) study of data on noncredit courses in state agencies and educational institutions makes no mention of noncredit personal interest courses, except in one statement: "[AACC] staff report that noncredit activity is too often associated with leisure studies such as basket weaving" (p. 59). Voorhees and Milam (2005) found that critics of noncredit programs often characterize recreational courses as the courses most representative of the noncredit environment. In fact, a review of

noncredit data by these authors revealed that the largest segments of the noncredit arena are focused on courses for customized workforce development, occupational training, employment retraining, and upgrading skills "on the cutting edge of employment markets" (p. 3).

Noncredit foreign language courses are most often categorized as personal interest courses. It is unclear to what extent they may also be considered a part of professional development, vocational, or workplace training offered through Continuing Education programs. A report by the Joint Board Task Force on Noncredit and Adult Education in California (1998) does specifically mention foreign languages being offered for work-related purposes: "Foreign language can currently be offered under the categories of high school diploma and short-term vocational programs" (p. 24). In another example of foreign language learning mentioned for work purposes, the Iowa Industrial New Jobs Training Programs, noncredit vocational programs which "meet a variety of training and employee development needs" (Iowa Department of Education, 2006, p. 33), list one of the programs as *Foreign Language, Literatures and Linguistics*. These two sources indicate that language courses are, in some states and educational institutions, considered to be part of vocational programming.

Online Continuing Education courses are a significant source of competition for community colleges' face-to-face Continuing Education programs. Online courses represent "about a fifth of all continuing- and professional-education enrollments at the typical college or university" (Ashburn, 2006, para. 1). According to a 2005 report by the Sloan Consortium, online Continuing Education courses are projected to continue growing by approximately 20% annually "for the next few years" (Ashburn, 2006, para.

2). The community college which provides the setting for this study offers online foreign language courses for credit. However, it does not offer noncredit online foreign language courses.

The term Continuing Education refers to a range of adult educational activities undertaken for reasons related to work, personal interest, and personal development. Community colleges may offer the most Continuing Education opportunities of all post-secondary institutions. Foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program are generally offered as personal interest courses rather than as vocational courses.

Defining noncredit. The term noncredit is not defined consistently across educational institutions and agencies. Noncredit courses, however, represent an important component in work, developmental, and personal interest programs. The present study drew its participants from noncredit foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program.

Of the 11.5 million students enrolled in community colleges, 5 million are enrolled in noncredit courses or programs (AACC, 2009e). Milam (2005) reports that "the definition of *noncredit* varies by the control of the institution" (p. 60). In fact, only 42.6% of the state agencies represented in the Milam study reported that "they have a uniform definition of noncredit for their state" (p. 60). Milam found that "the only definition [of noncredit] consistently held by both states and institutions is that noncredit courses are not applicable to a degree" (p. 60).

For the purposes of this study, noncredit courses are defined as those educational activities, such as meetings, seminars, workshops, courses, and conferences, "which are

instructional in nature" (State University of New York-Albany, Central Staff Office of

Institutional Research, 1995, p. viii) and for which no academic or credential credit is

awarded to participants. Noncredit courses enable "those who are enrolled to further

their knowledge in a particular field or area of expertise" (Stewart, 2004, para. 11)

without the need to meet grading or credential criteria.

　　　　Noncredit courses are often part of a postsecondary institution's Continuing

Education program. Some institutions use the term noncredit to refer exclusively to

professional development or work-related courses (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). Noncredit

courses are also "increasingly used to gain a certificate awarded by a vendor such as

Microsoft, Novell, or Cisco Systems" (Phillippe & Valiga, 2000). However, not all

vendor certification programs are noncredit. Milam (2005) notes that "these certification

programs are offered for credit in some states and not for credit in others, even though the

curriculum and award are identical" (p. 61).

　　　　The 2004 *Noncredit Hot Programs* report shows that community colleges offer

noncredit courses in the fields of allied health, public services, information technologies,

skilled trades for services and industry, information and engineering technologies,

environmental sciences, languages, and education (McPhee, 2004, Appendix B). The

two languages mentioned in this report are ESL and Spanish.

　　　　In addition to noncredit courses related to work, the term noncredit may also be

paired with the term adult education to refer only to courses that provide students with an

opportunity to address academic and life skills needs or deficiencies. A 1998 report by

the joint task force of the California State Board of Education and the Board of

Governors of the California Community Colleges assessed issues common to "the two

major segments providing noncredit and adult education: community colleges and adult

schools" (Joint Board Task Force on Noncredit and Adult Education, 1998, p. 1). An

examination of the report reveals that the noncredit and adult education programs

reviewed addressed the need "to earn a diploma or general equivalency diploma (GED),

increase literacy skills, learn English, read and write, gain American citizenship, become

effective parents, and learn a specific job skill" (p. 3). The report characterizes the adult

population served by these noncredit and adult education courses as "under-educated, low

income, limited English proficient, immigrants, adults with substantial disabilities, older

adults, parents, and the incarcerated" (p. 3). Noncredit courses in this context may serve

a very different population than do noncredit courses in a professional development

program.

The word noncredit can also be used to refer to courses taken for personal

enrichment or because of personal need, for example square dancing, Italian cooking, Tai

Chi, Russian for the traveler, Chinese for adoptive parents, landscape design. Depending

on the agency, institution, or research, these courses may be variously called personal

interest activities, personal development courses, personal enrichment courses, personal

skills and avocational courses, hobby and recreation courses, or leisure studies depending

on the agency, institution, or researcher (McCurdy & Trombley, 1994; Milam, 2005;

NCES, 2005; Parnell, 1991). For example, Grubb, Badway, and Bell's (2002) review of

noncredit education refers to these courses as "avocational or hobby-related courses" (p.

5). However, the state of Illinois uses the designation Personal and Social Development

as one of the four categories of noncredit coursework. The other three categories are

Business and Industry Contract, Professional/Vocational, and Youth Programs (Illinois

Community College Board, 2007). On the other hand, in the *Condition of Iowa Community Colleges 2005* report, one of the noncredit program categories used is Leisure/Recreational, defined as "courses that provide instruction in leisure, recreation, casual culture, wellness, and/or self-enjoyment subjects" (Iowa Department of Education, 2006, p. 60).

The community college represented in this study uses the term personal development for courses taken for reasons of personal interest or need (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007). At this institution, personal development courses, including the foreign language classes surveyed in this study, are administered through the college's Office of Continuing Education.

The present study uses the term *personal interest courses* to mean "those which students take for their 'physical, mental, moral, economic or civic development' and which are not taken to obtain degrees or to prepare for transfer" (McCurdy & Trombley, 1994, para. 3). The term personal interest courses was chosen because it is the term which appears most often in the Continuing Education literature (Kim et al., 2004, 2005; NCES, 2006).

Noncredit courses generally have an open admission policy with few, if any, prerequisites for participation. Courses are offered at times of the day or night when interested learners are best able to attend. For learners, noncredit courses generally represent less of a time commitment than credit courses (McPhee, 2004). Courses may meet for a few hours, an entire day, a weekend, or on a regular schedule for a set amount of time over a period of several weeks. The course schedule for noncredit courses is only loosely tied to the college's semester calendar (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). Courses are

offered as Fall or Spring or Summer courses but they typically run for a shorter time than traditional, semester-long courses (McPhee, 2004). There are usually no grades or formal evaluation involved in noncredit courses.

Noncredit course offerings respond to community interest and need (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). For example Polish or Bosnian-Croatian language courses might be offered in a region with a significant immigrant population from Eastern Europe. Changes in noncredit course offerings and additions or deletions to the noncredit catalog do not generally have to go through the formal approval procedures of institutional review characteristic of the formal college curriculum (Grubb et al., 2002; Voorhees & Milam, 2005).

Noncredit courses offered through the community college may meet on campus. However, they often also meet at sites throughout the local area such as in community centers, facilities provided by community organizations, churches, and elementary or secondary schools. The noncredit foreign language courses examined in this study are offered both at sites on the community college's main campus as well as in local high schools and middle schools.

What constitutes a noncredit program or noncredit course depends on the individual agency, institution, or state (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). Noncredit courses can be separate from, or a part of, a postsecondary Continuing Education program. However, there may be "considerable overlap between for-credit and noncredit offerings, even at the same institution" (McPhee, 2004). In addition, programs recognized as noncredit in one state may not be noncredit in another, depending on the learner population served by the program (Grubb et al., 2002). Adding to the confusion, the noncredit concept is used

in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes: "in some institutions there are noncredit courses, not-for-credit courses, zero-credit components of other courses (e.g., workshops and labs), credit courses that count for community college credentials but not for four-year college transfer, and credit courses that count for everything" (Grubb et al., 2002, Footnote 4, p. 30).

In summary, noncredit courses generally fall into three categories: workforce or professional development, personal interest, and personal development. Noncredit courses meet at times convenient for adult schedules. The course offerings reflect community interests and tend to be offered at a variety of sites in the community. Noncredit courses do not usually include formal measurements of participants' learning. The current study examined one type of noncredit course, the foreign language course taken for reasons of personal interest.

Sources of data for noncredit courses. Grubb, Badway, and Bell (2002) found that "no systematic data" exists on noncredit programs (p. 14). Voorhees and Milam (2005) note that "noncredit programs operating under the aegis of traditional higher education institutions" (p. 1) in fact constitute a *hidden college.* Voorhees and Milam report that "[noncredit] programs purportedly serve million [sic] of learners each year, but no one knows their full scope. No national data exists that traces the types of programs that attract learners nor what that volume may be" (p. 1). Other sources confirm these findings.

Milam (2005) states that his research is "a first-of-its-kind national study and portrait of noncredit course activity" (p. 57). Milam found that, even for noncredit workforce development courses, "there is little previous research or data collection" (p.

65) in the area of noncredit activity. The author adds that "there is no national statistical portrait of the impact of noncredit classes in the United States" (p. 57). He reports that some states have consistently reported noncredit activity for many years; others never have or have reported noncredit data erratically. Milam's study focuses on workforce development programs. He does not investigate noncredit personal interest programs.

The most recent national study of noncredit programs by the Community College Research Center (CCRC) also focused on workforce development (Van Noy, Jacobs, Korey, Bailey, & Hughes, 2008). The purpose of the 2007 study was "to document the empirical landscape of noncredit workforce education and identify issues that warrant attention from state policymakers, community college leaders, and policy advocates" (p. 1). No data were reported on noncredit personal interest courses. Like Milam (2005), the authors of the CCRC study conclude that there is a scarcity of data on noncredit programs.

Van Noy, Jacobs, Korey, Bailey, and Hughes (2008) summarize the state of noncredit workforce programs' data collection on student outcomes in this way:

> Colleges without state noncredit reporting requirements rarely collect noncredit data for their own purposes, though a few case study colleges seek to measure student outcomes from noncredit courses through program reviews….More data would be of use to community colleges and policymakers in providing a fuller understanding of the characteristics and needs of individuals and employers who seek noncredit workforce education. (p. 3)

A search of articles published by ERIC in the last ten years and using the keywords *community colleges* and *noncredit* reveals a mix of enrollment data from

various states, organizations, or institutions as well as articles or reports focused on remedial or work-related programs. There does not appear to be research interest in noncredit personal interest courses at this point in time.

Personal communications with educational researchers currently studying the community college agree with Milam (2005) and Van Noy et al. (2008) that data on noncredit continuing education are not collected with any degree of consistency. According to K. Farnsworth at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, there is "no central repository for data on continuing education – at least in Missouri" and data on noncredit courses are not kept in any uniform way across states or institutions (personal communication, January 5, 2007). In addition, a Research Associate for Academic Affairs at the Missouri Department of Higher Education informed this researcher that the agency only collects data on noncredit vocational and technical education programs and collects no data on noncredit foreign language courses, (L. Vedenhaupt, personal communication, January 17, 2007). V. Smith Morest at the CCRC also confirms that "data on noncredit students are poor to non-existent" (personal communication, January 9, 2007). Communication with the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) also confirms the lack of data on the type of noncredit personal interest course that is examined in the current study (J. Isaac, personal communication, January 23, 2007). All personal communications referenced here can be found in Appendix A.

A review of the literature that exists on noncredit educational activities reveals a focus on work-related or developmental programs. Noncredit programs, especially noncredit personal interest courses, represent the hidden educational activities of higher education. The available data on noncredit programs are limited. Data reporting appears

to be most often done by individual institutions for their own review purposes. Increased

data on student characteristics, needs, and outcomes would benefit all constituencies

involved in this type of learning situation.

Impact of funding on noncredit data. The previous section has shown that data on

noncredit Continuing Education courses are limited. The lack of data and data reporting

for noncredit courses offered through Continuing Education programs can be tied directly

to issues of funding. One of the reasons for the lack of data on noncredit courses,

especially noncredit personal interest courses, is that institutions are not required to report

data for programs not receiving state or federal funding (Van Noy et al., 2008).

Understanding the funding structure of the public community colleges helps in

understanding the lack of data for noncredit Continuing Education programs. According

to the AACC (2009a), funding for public community colleges comes from five sources:

state funds (38% of revenues), tuition and fees (17% of revenues), local funds (21% of

revenues), federal funds (15% of revenues), and other sources (9% of revenues). The

community college is economically, as well as philosophically, tied to state and local

interests. It derives 76% of its revenue from a combination of state and local funds plus

the tuition and fees of community participants. It should be noted, however, that the

percentage of revenue derived from state, local, and tuition and fees sources varies

considerably by state (Center for Community College Policy, 2003).

With regard to federal and state support for Continuing Education, a significant

difference exists in the funding of credit and noncredit programs. Noncredit funding has

been described as having "a poor 'step-child' relationship" (Warford, 2002, p. 18) with

funding for credit programs. Overall, noncredit programs do not receive the same level

of external and internal institutional funding as credit programs do (Grubb et al., 2002; Warford, 2002). If some states do provide full-time equivalent reimbursement funds to noncredit programs in any way, the funding is usually at a much lower level than for credit programs (Warford, 2002). The 2007 CCRC study (Van Noy et al., 2008) reported no state funding for noncredit occupational programs in community colleges in 22 states: Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Kansas, Colorado, Nevada, Wyoming, Washington, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, and Hawaii. Voorhees and Milam (2005) note that "Arizona, New York, and Illinois limit all noncredit funding to the remedial and developmental area" (p. 12).

Many noncredit programs, and therefore those they serve, are virtually invisible in the literature because there is no reliable data, either nationally or from state to state, on enrollments and other education issues related to these programs (Warford, 2002). Warford (2002) reviewed three separate studies which examined funding of noncredit programs for lifelong learning. The author's analysis revealed that "no one knows how many people enroll in America's community colleges for noncredit, lifelong learning programs because many states do not ask colleges to report noncredit enrollment statistics" (p. 17).

Warford (2002) also found that state support for noncredit learning is very limited and, where it does exist, limited generally to work-related training or developmental programs. One of the three surveys Warford reviewed reports that only six states provide any level of funding for "general interest courses such as investments, languages, etc."

(p. 17) and that no state provides funds for "hobby, avocational and recreation noncredit classes" (p. 17). In addition, financial aid is not an option for noncredit students because it is not usually available for noncredit courses (Warford, 2002).

According to Grubb, Badway, and Bell (2002), community college noncredit programs may cost the student nothing or, at least, may cost significantly less than credit programs, depending on the individual state, the program, and the population for which the program is intended. Noncredit personal interest courses, sometimes referred to as "avocational or hobby-related courses" (p. 5), have a fee attached and the student fees generally support the full cost of these courses. In fact, some states mandate that "noncredit offerings, community instructional services, and leisure-time courses" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 306) be self-supporting.

Noncredit personal interest courses are generally paid for by the individual learner. The AELL-NHES 2001 survey found that 60% of those taking personal interest courses reported spending their own money (Kim et al., 2005). According to Kim, Hagedorn, Williamson, and Chapman (2005), 48% of adult learners reported spending less than $500. Another 12% reported spending between $500 and more than $3,000. On the other hand, 40% of adults taking personal interest courses reported no personal expenses for participation.

Not surprisingly, work-related courses are more often paid for by employers (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). In work-related programs, only 26% of adults reported spending any of their own money for courses (Kim et al., 2005, Table B). Of those, 20% spent $500 or less. However, 73% of adults in this group reported spending no money for tuition, fees, books, or other materials.

In summary, data on noncredit courses are limited because these programs do not generally receive state or federal funds. Therefore, institutions are not required by any outside authority or agency to report on noncredit programming. When noncredit activities are funded by state or federal agencies, it is at a lower rate than credit programs. Noncredit activities also tend to receive fewer funds overall than for-credit activities do. The inequities in funding between credit and noncredit programs have, Warford (2002) suggests, created a situation where "noncredit programs tend to be operated in the 'shadow' of the 'real' college thus creating the phrase 'shadow college' which has become the label for the noncredit ventures of many community colleges" (p. 18).

The data that do exist on noncredit activities are primarily held by the individual educational institutions that collect noncredit data for their own purposes (Voorhees & Milam, 2005). There is no national database for noncredit activities. Noncredit data appear to be available only if individual institutions choose to publish or grant access to that information.

Personal interest courses tend to be supported by participant fees. In the context of adults participating in noncredit foreign language courses for personal interest, the data suggests that this population is more likely to pay the expenses of this learning activity themselves than if they were taking a foreign language course for work-related reasons (Kim et al., 2005).

Faculty teaching noncredit Continuing Education courses. Information on full-time and part-time community college faculty is readily available in the literature (Brewer, 1999; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Kozeracki, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; McManus, 2008; Outcalt, 2002; Palmer, 2002; Schuetz, 2002).

There is much less information, however, available on Continuing Education instructors or noncredit instructors. Grubb, Badway, & Bell's 2002 study of noncredit education found "no systematic data" (p. 14) on noncredit programs. Milam (2005) reports that noncredit data are reported inconsistently when they are reported at all.

The majority of faculty in community colleges are part-time (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Grubb, Badway, & Bell (2002) report that the percent of instructors teaching part-time in noncredit programs is higher than that of part-time instructors teaching in credit programs. However, the literature does not provide a portrait of noncredit faculty. For this reason, it is unclear if part-time instructors in noncredit programs are similar to part-time community college instructors in credit programs with regard to age, gender, educational background, teaching experience, or attitudes toward students and teaching.

Postsecondary faculty are, as a rule, considered experts in their field and have the appropriate degrees to prove it. The AACC (2009d) reports that 74% of part-time faculty at community colleges have attained a Master's degree while 12% hold a Bachelor's degree and 10% hold doctorates. This organization, however, reports no data on degree attainment for teachers of noncredit courses.

The primary criteria for teaching in a Continuing Education program is usually having expertise or specialized knowledge (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007). The AACC (2009c) indicates that adjunct community college faculty are hired "because they possess technical skills and knowledge that are beneficial to students" (para. 3) and because "their expertise and workplace experiences help keep curricula fresh" (para. 3).

The means by which administrators assess expertise or specialized knowledge for noncredit instructors is, however, unclear. Having expertise or specialized knowledge may or may not include having an academic degree. In fact, having a degree may not matter, depending on the noncredit Continuing Education course being taught. An accomplished cook or gardener with established local success may not need an academic degree to effectively teach a Continuing Education course in cooking or gardening. In Continuing Education foreign language programs, a native speaker's language and cultural proficiency may be considered a more meaningful qualification to teach that language than an academic degree in the language. According to the Director of Continuing Education at the community college which hosted the current study, the evaluation of expertise or specialized knowledge is based on the judgment of Continuing Education administrators, community recommendations, and evaluations of former students, when possible.

Most teachers of adults, whether educators or trainers, are not required to have any type of teacher training (Henschke, 1987, 1994). Furthermore, instructors "usually have little preparation in the instructional process of helping adults learn" (Galbraith, 2004, p. 4). From the available literature, it is unclear the amount or type of teacher training or teaching experience Continuing Education and noncredit instructors may possess. Grubb, Badway, and Bell (2002) found that adjunct faculty in noncredit programs were usually hired "with no preparation in teaching methods" (p. 14). The *Continuing Education Instructor Handbook* for St. Louis Community College (St. Louis Community College, n.d.) states that Continuing Education teachers are "adults who have

skills or knowledge they would like to share…[and] should be experts in their field, but are not required to have teaching degrees or current certification" (p. 4).

Lack of explicit teacher preparation may have implications for the ability of instructors to create the most effective learning environment for adult learners. Crookes (1997) reports that teachers are influenced by, among other things, the type of instruction they receive as students, being exposed to new information and ideas, and personal views about the nature of learning and learners. Unless exposed to other teaching and learning approaches, Howell (2001) acknowledges that teachers "teach as we were taught" (para. 10). There is no readily available data on the extent to which noncredit faculty have been exposed to adult learning principles or learner-centered educational experiences.

The cultural perspective of the teacher may also have a unique influence on the teaching and learning environment. One administrator of a Continuing Education program confirmed that many instructors teaching noncredit foreign language courses are native speakers of the languages they teach (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007). Given this situation, it seems reasonable to assume that native speakers and foreign language teachers who have been taught or trained in the educational system of one culture (e.g., in Algeria, Mexico, China, Poland) and who teach classes in the U.S. will be teaching many students who come from a different cultural orientation (e.g., the U.S.).

The extent to which cultural perspective influences the instructional perspective of the teacher in noncredit foreign language classes is unclear. The extent to which differences in the cultural perspective of teacher and students influences student perceptions of instruction and satisfaction with learning is also unclear. The literature on

foreign language teaching (Hashemi, 1992; Lin, 1998; Shannon, 2006; Wyss, 2002; Zenhui, 1999, 2001) and on educational missionary work (Lingenfelter & Lingenfelter, 2003) offers some insight into cross-cultural teaching and learning. This research, however, has been done mainly in the context of EFL and ESL courses.

In the present study, the PIF-I collected data on the culture or cultures in which teachers received their education and had teaching experience. Since students also reported on the culture of their educational experiences, this study was able to identify the degree to which students and teachers shared common educational experiences. Culture of Education Match was one of the variables included in the investigation of the relationships between certain student characteristics and perceptions of instructional perspective and between student characteristics and satisfaction with learning.

Community colleges may address the issue of untrained or inexperienced instructors by providing development and guidance for instructors of adults. St. Louis Community College's *Continuing Education Instructor Handbook* (n.d.) includes a brief, one-page *Tips for Teachers* section which provides guidelines for teaching adult learners. The West Virginia Adult Basic Education Program provides an instructor handbook which includes a lengthy section on understanding and meeting learning needs of adult learners of all backgrounds and abilities (West Virginia Adult Education and Literacy Information Network, 2007). Other community colleges provide help and support to full-time and part-time instructors through centers within the institution, for example the Center for Teaching Excellence at Pueblo Community College (Griffith, 1998) or the Teaching and Learning Center at North Seattle Community College ("North Seattle," 2007). Finally, agencies like the Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence (2007), "a

statewide professional development resource for community and technical college faculty" (para. 1), offer online teaching and learning resources and professional development modules for new faculty (Starke, 2007).

Grubb, Badway, and Bell(2002) suggest that the isolated nature of part-time noncredit teaching at locations off-campus and spread throughout the community means that part-time noncredit faculty have few opportunities for reflecting on teaching practice, attending staff development events, or interacting with their teaching peers. The authors conclude that conditions necessary for teaching improvement in noncredit programs are "simply absent" (p 14).

There is insufficient data available to produce a description of the professional development of noncredit foreign language teachers. These teachers may be hired because of their expertise in or special knowledge of a particular language. They do not necessarily have teacher training, extensive teaching experience, or an understanding of adult learners. The PIF-I asked teachers if they had been exposed to information on adult learning and, if so, the source of that information. Data generated by the PIF-I in the present study provided a portrait of a specific group of noncredit foreign language teachers with regard to demographic characteristics, the culture of educational experiences, teaching experience, and knowledge about adult learning. In addition, the MIPI assessed the instructional perspective of educators teaching this particular type of personal interest course.

Students in noncredit Continuing Education courses. The AACC (2009e) reports that there are 5 million students enrolled in noncredit programs or courses. Warford

(2002) found, however, that "many practitioners feel [that the AACC estimates are] very low and could easily be double" (p. 15) the figure reported.

The population served by noncredit Continuing Education programs is diverse and dynamic. Some learners come from socially and economically marginalized segments of the general population. Referring to California community colleges, Cohen and Brawer (2003) found that

> adult and noncredit education serve an especially versatile population:
> parents, older adults, disabled adults, homeless adults, out-of-school youth and
> dropouts, special needs adults, unemployed and underemployed adults, adults
> receiving public assistance and welfare recipients, persons involved with the
> penal system, and new immigrants (California State Board of Education and
> California Community Colleges, 1998). (p. 294)

On the other hand, noncredit programs also serve learners with academic degrees and professional credentials: administrators with an M.B.A. upgrading certain professional skills, licensed real estate agents preparing for appraisal credentials, technicians updating computer knowledge, professional engineers learning new computer programs for design or construction, employees taking customized training developed for a local employer (Voorhees & Milam, 2005).

One of the few sources of information on noncredit students is the report by Phillippe and Valiga (2000). They examined the first Faces of the Future survey, a national survey of credit and noncredit community college students sponsored jointly by the AACC and ACT, Inc. Their report focused on several aspects of the educational experience of certain special populations, "single parents, first-generation students, and

students aged 40 or older" (p. 2). Phillippe and Valiga reported that noncredit students older than 40 "were more likely than others to take classes for personal enrichment," (p. 8). The survey revealed that "28 percent of the noncredit students had already attained a bachelor's degree or higher" (p. 1). The authors also found that, contrary to the popular stereotype that many adult learners in noncredit courses are retired, only 5% of the respondents taking noncredit courses "reported that they had retired in the last two years" (p. 7). This study reported that the motivation for taking a noncredit class for one-third of the over-40 age group "was to gain computer/technology skills" (p. 8). It is unclear from the report how important other noncredit activities, for example foreign language study, were for this population.

Voorhees and Milam (2005) state that "precious little is known about the demographic characteristics of noncredit learners much less their motivation to enroll in noncredit classes" (p. 11). Also unclear, according to the authors, are the kinds of learning activities in which noncredit learners choose to enroll. The authors reference Phillippe and Valiga's (2000) report but acknowledge that "we don't know from this work…what types of learning experiences attracted these learners to noncredit classes and whether a similar pattern exists among baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral/research institutions that provide noncredit programs" (p. 11).

Voorhees and Milam's (2005) review of existing noncredit data provides some additional insight into noncredit student characteristics. They report that "in general, a wider range of ages are found in community college noncredit programs than credit programs" (p. 11). In addition, their data review found that "one in 10 noncredit learners had a master's degree or higher, a proportion significantly larger than was found in credit

classes" (p. 11). They also note that some institutions report that up to one third of students at community colleges are either enrolled in noncredit courses or are taking credit and noncredit courses at the same time. Finally, they state that for a large portion of community college students, the noncredit course can be the beginning step toward the achievement of an associate degree or other postsecondary degrees at four-year institutions.

Additional data on noncredit students come from the 2006 Faces of the Future report (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006). This report states that the Faces of the Future survey was created to address the lack of data on noncredit students and the diverse population of students attending community colleges. The goals of the collaborative efforts of the AACC and ACT, Inc. in conducting this national survey were to "provide a tool for colleges to better understand their student populations [and to] provide [a] national snapshot of who is attending community colleges" (p. 4)

The 2006 Faces of the Future report summarizes data collected from 2003 through 2005 in over 49,500 records of credit students and over 5,000 records of noncredit students in 32 states. The study reports on four areas of information: (a) general student background characteristics, (b) employment characteristics, (c) students' educational background, and (d) the current educational experience. Unfortunately, it is not possible to tell from this report what percentage of noncredit students described for any factor took courses for work, for developmental reasons, or due to personal interest.

The noncredit students represented in the Faces of the Future survey were about 60% female. The age group reporting lowest participation in noncredit programs was the 46 - 49 group. The age groups with the highest participation rates (reporting more than

10% but less than 15% participation) were those in the 50-59 group, the under 20 group, and the 40-45 group. However, the report groups students disproportionately. Students aged 50-59 are reported as one group but data on previous decades of life are broken into two groups (e.g., 21 - 24 and 25 - 29, 30 - 34 and 35 - 39, 40 - 45 and 46 - 49). If the data on students are combined by decade of life, noncredit students in their 20s had the highest participation rate (almost 20%), followed by those in their 40s (approximately 18%) and 30s (approximately 17%).

The Faces of the Future report shows that the noncredit population is primarily white with approximately 15% reporting their race as Black/African American and just over 10% reporting their race as Hispanic or Latino. Eighty percent of noncredit students identified themselves as a native English speaker.

According to the Faces of the Future's survey, over 40% of noncredit students reported being employed full-time with more than 15% employed part-time. Over half of the noncredit students identified themselves as employed, whereas to just under 20% identified themselves as a student. The top five jobs represented in the noncredit student population surveyed were in the health professions, the hospitality industry, customer services, business or marketing, and education.

Over 30% of noncredit students in the Faces of the Future study reported having attained a high school diploma with approximately 18% reporting a four-year degree. Almost half of noncredit students reported having completed one to three noncredit courses. Eighty percent of noncredit students were enrolled in no other educational activity at a post-secondary institution.

The 2006 report states that the primary purpose for taking a noncredit course was self-improvement (approximately 37% of students). Preparation for work (almost 34%) or the needs of current employment (approximately 24%) were the next two most important reasons cited by students for taking a noncredit course. This finding appears to contradict Voorhees and Milam's (2005) data review which claims that "career and technical noncredit activity dominates all noncredit programming" (p. 15). It is possible that the self-improvement category in the Faces of the Future report may, in fact, include work-related self-improvement. Unfortunately, the available data do not define or describe what activities are considered to be part of the self-improvement category.

Voorhees and Milam (2005) found that "noncredit learners are more satisfied with the instruction they [receive]" (p. 11) than credit students. In the Faces of the Future report, approximately 38% of noncredit students indicated they were *very satisfied* with their educational experience while 35% reported being *satisfied*. Just under 10% selected the Neutral category. Only in the Very Satisfied category did noncredit students report being more satisfied than credit students.

The PIF-S used in the present study collected data on several noncredit student characteristics discussed in this section: gender, age, race or ethnicity, context of educational experiences, native language, education, goals for taking the course, and level of satisfaction. The PIF-S did not solicit information on current or past employment; neither did it ask for employment status.

There is no national data base on noncredit learning. In order to gain some insight into the demographic characteristics, motivation, and learning activities of noncredit students it is necessary to patch together the available information from a variety of

 "Ryan, Linda, 2009, UMSL, p. 201"

sources. Several researchers acknowledge the limited and limiting nature of the current picture of noncredit learners. The current study contributes to the picture of noncredit learning in the area of personal interest courses, specifically noncredit foreign language courses. From the information provided by this study, a portrait of the adult foreign language learner in noncredit courses can begin to take shape.

In summary, the setting for the present study was noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college Continuing Education program. Among postsecondary providers of adult education, community colleges offer the most diverse learning opportunities, among them personal interest courses. Noncredit foreign language courses are most often identified in the community college curriculum as personal interest courses. Some authors suggest that noncredit personal interest courses have a kind of second-class citizenship in education, operating in the shadow of academic or professional development courses.

Noncredit programs are invisible in many ways and therefore data are limited. Many noncredit programs are supported primarily by participant fees. These programs are therefore not included in the data reported by agencies and institutions receiving government funds to support noncredit educational activities.

Noncredit programs employ primarily part-time instructors who are not necessarily considered part of the community college faculty. They are generally not present on campus because their classes are held in area high schools or middle schools. Although they may have special expertise in a certain content area, they may not necessarily be trained teachers. The extent to which they may have knowledge of adult learning principles or adult teaching and learning approaches is unclear.

Noncredit programs serve a population that is diverse and diffused across all demographic categories. However, due to the hidden nature of noncredit courses, information on their participants is meager compared to what is known about K-12 students (Voorhees & Milam, 2005) or even postsecondary students in credit programs. The data available on noncredit learners are uneven across different noncredit areas. Research frequently privileges work-related or developmental programs. Participants in personal interest courses have not received serious research attention. The present study provides a snapshot of adult learners in noncredit foreign language courses.

Adult Foreign Language Courses

Foreign language courses for adult learners can be divided into two categories, courses for credit (i.e., courses taken for academic credit toward a degree or certificate program) and noncredit courses. As the previous section noted, research interest and data collection have not been strong for noncredit courses, particularly in the case of personal interest courses like foreign languages.

Foreign language courses for credit. The general trends in foreign language study for credit in American postsecondary institutions is well-documented. A 2002 Modern Language Association (MLA) survey of foreign language learning in the U.S. indicated that enrollments in all foreign languages in institutions of higher education (including two-year institutions) had increased for the first time in 35 years (Welles, 2004). The most recent 2006 MLA survey of American colleges and universities reported a broad and significant increase of 12.9% in foreign language enrollments since 2002 (Furman et al., 2007). With regard to two-year postsecondary institutions, the 2006 survey found that enrollments in for-credit foreign language courses have increased

continuously since 1986. Growth of all language enrollments at two-year colleges in that time frame was reported to be 124.9%. In addition, enrollments in beginning-level foreign language courses were five times greater than in more advanced courses for all American postsecondary institutions.

The amount of growth across languages, however, has been uneven. According to most recent MLA survey (Furman et al., 2007), Spanish enrollments in two-year colleges were seven times greater than French enrollments and 18.5 times greater than German enrollments in that year. In fact, since 1986 Spanish enrollments at two-year colleges have surpassed enrollments in all other languages. Enrollments in Spanish, French, and German account for over 70% of enrollments in postsecondary foreign language programs but enrollments have increased dramatically since 2002 in languages such as Arabic (126.5%), Chinese (51%), Korean (37.1%), and other less commonly taught languages (31.2%) such as Armenian, Persian, and Vietnamese.

Cohen and Brawer (2003) noted a consistent increase in the number of community colleges offering foreign languages for credit from 1986 through 1998. Ninety-six percent of community colleges offered foreign languages for credit in 1998 (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). However, foreign languages are not the largest language programs at community colleges. The AACC's report, *Hot Programs at Community Colleges,* suggests that Interpretation-ASL accounts for two-thirds of language study for credit in community colleges (McPhee, 2004). ESL accounts for one-third of for-credit language study, according to this report.

The community college hosting the present study includes eight foreign languages in its catalog. Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish

can all be taken for credit. At this school, foreign languages are included among the Transfer Programs. Career programs do not directly include foreign languages although some career programs specifically include a foreign language elective option. In other career programs, a foreign language could be taken as part of the Humanities elective option.

The host community college has in the past offered distance learning courses for credit in Spanish, French, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. It currently offers no online credit course options in any foreign language.

For-credit foreign language study at the community college level has increased since the mid-80s. Almost all community colleges now offer foreign language study for credit, although programs in ASL and ESL account for the majority of language study in these institutions.

Noncredit foreign language courses. Like other noncredit courses, very little nation-wide data are available on the state of noncredit foreign language courses in community college Continuing Education programs. Data on language study in community colleges that are available often do not distinguish between foreign languages and ESL or ASL. The 2004 *Hot Programs at Community Colleges* (McPhee, 2004) does indicate that one foreign language, Spanish, accounts for approximately one-third of noncredit language study in community college programs. ESL represents the other two-thirds of noncredit language courses reported for community colleges. When credit and noncredit language programs are combined, ESL accounts for 61% of language study at community colleges, followed by Spanish (28%) and Interpretation-ASL (11%).

Online foreign language courses are not usually profitable enough to offer for noncredit, according to one Continuing Education director (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007). This is especially true in light of the number of commercial language learning software programs available to students for home study.

The community college that served as host to the present study offers the possibility of studying 12 foreign languages each semester through noncredit Continuing Education in addition to courses in Sign Language. In the semester in which the present study was conducted, 18 Spanish classes were offered. The college also offered Italian (8 classes), French (7 classes), Chinese (6 classes), German (6 classes), and Russian (5 classes). Two Arabic courses were offered. One class each was offered in Bosnian-Croatian, Japanese, and Polish. There were no distance learning options available for noncredit foreign language courses.

Noncredit foreign language courses appear to be part of the hidden college that Voorhees and Milam (2005) describe. Although data do exist on community college language courses taken for credit, the extent to which this information could be helpful in understanding noncredit foreign language courses, teachers, or learners is unclear. The present study provides information on the demographic characteristics of noncredit teachers and their students. It also contributes to an understanding of student satisfaction with language learning. In addition, the instructional perspective of the teacher participants and student perceptions of instructional perspective in the classroom were investigated. This study provides a description of the use of andragogical principles in noncredit foreign language courses.

Summary of the Review of Literature

The present study examined adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom. The literature on adult education suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning (Cassel, 1968; Knowles, 1980; Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Ralph, 2001; Viechnicki et al., 1990). The instrument chosen to investigate instructional perspective in this study, the MIPI, assessed the extent to which teachers reported using andragogical principles in their teaching practice. For this reason, Chapter II began with a review of andragogy, a model for helping adults learn.

The andragogical model provides the framework for evaluating instructional perspective in this study. Andragogy is a learner-centered model for facilitating adult learning. This model developed when traditional teacher-directed and subject-centered approaches used in teaching children proved inadequate for the learning needs of adults. Knowles (1970) defined andragogy as "the art and science of helping adults learn" (p. 38) and interpreted this concept in the context of American adult education.

Although Knowles originally conceptualized andragogy as antithetical to traditional pedagogical teaching approaches, he later came to describe andragogy and pedagogy as opposite ends of a continuum of teaching and learning approaches. The choice of an instructional model from that continuum should depend on the model's ability to respond to the characteristics of the learner or learners in a particular learning situation (Brookfield, 2006; Knowles, 1980, 1995; Pratt, 1988; Ralph, 2001). Discussion of the andragogical model in Chapter II included a description of the roles of the adult

learner and the teacher of adults as co-learners, the collaborative teacher-adult learner relationship, and the optimal climate for adult learning.

Instructional perspective shapes the learning climate present in the classroom. Instructional perspective is comprised of "the teacher's personal and contextual identification, actions and competencies in the classroom, and philosophical beliefs for guiding practice" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81). It represents "the beliefs, feelings and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) that adult educators may possess or exhibit in the classroom at a particular point in time. The section on instructional perspective in this chapter discussed instruments that help teachers to become aware of the behaviors and beliefs that influence their presence in the classroom and shape the learning climate. Three influences on instructional perspective in the specific context of foreign language classrooms were identified: professional knowledge and skills, culture, and language learning experience.

Instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom has not been investigated with the MIPI. In fact, the review of noncredit data shows that no comprehensive portrait of instructors teaching noncredit foreign language courses currently exists. The present study identifies the instructional perspective of one group of noncredit foreign language teachers at a community college. The MIPI-S assessed student perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective and compared them to the instructional perspective actually reported by teachers. Data from the MIPI, MIPI-S, and the demographic data collected on the PIF-I, allowed the researcher to develop a portrait of this population of teachers.

After laying the foundation for understanding andragogy and instructional perspective, the review of literature examined satisfaction in an educational context and the evaluation of student satisfaction. The literature identified various influences on student satisfaction relevant to the present study (e.g., age, gender, personality, culture and ethnicity, educational experience, expectations, the physical and psychosocial learning climate of the classroom). The discussion of satisfaction also defined satisfaction with learning and the role of satisfaction with learning in student satisfaction research. Finally, three influences on satisfaction with foreign language learning were examined: student motivation and goals, age, and learning climate.

A review of student satisfaction surveys revealed that they tend to either assess satisfaction with the overall educational experience at an institution or focus on certain aspects of the educational experience such as instruction, assignments, testing, or classroom interactions. Some surveys may ask students to agree with a single statement about learning in a particular course, such as *I learned a great deal in this class.* Most student satisfaction surveys reviewed for this study, however, did not address how satisfied the student was with personal learning in a particular class.

Informed by research on factors that influence student satisfaction, the researcher created the PIF-S (described in the Participant Information Form section of Chapter III) to gather data on noncredit student characteristics (i.e., age, gender, race or ethnicity, educational experience, language learning experience, learning goals). The PIF-S also asked students to report the extent to which they were satisfied with their personal language learning. In addition, students were asked to report the extent to which their experience with past and present language study was satisfactory. This data, combined

with student perceptions of instructional perspective from the MIPI-S, allowed the researcher to construct a portrait of adult students in noncredit foreign language classes and their satisfaction with learning in those classes. Since the literature review revealed that this student population is not represented in the knowledge base on adult language learners, the present study makes an original contribution to the fields of adult education, foreign language study, and noncredit education.

The fourth section of Chapter II considered the setting of the study: noncredit Continuing Education courses in the community college. The history and evolution of the community college is described as well as participation trends in adult learning and the role of the community college in providing adult learning opportunities. The literature on Continuing Education and noncredit educational activities was then reviewed with a particular emphasis on faculty and students engaged in noncredit Continuing Education programs. Finally, the opportunities for adult foreign language study in credit and noncredit courses in this setting were described.

A review of the data on noncredit education revealed that there is a gap in the research with regard to noncredit personal interest courses, the adult learners taking these courses, and the instructors teaching them. The PIF-I and PIF-S used in the present study provided data to develop a portrait of teachers and adult learners in one type of personal interest course, the noncredit foreign language course. The MIPI and MIPI-S assessed the instructional perspective of teachers and students' perceptions of instructional perspective in the classroom. The data collected through the MIPI, MIPI-S, and PIF-S were used to investigate the relationship between instructional perspective and adult learning satisfaction in the context of noncredit foreign language courses. This study

represents a preliminary step toward better understanding noncredit personal interest

courses. In particular, the current study helps articulate what constitutes an effective

learning climate for adults in noncredit language courses.

Chapter III: Methodology

Chapter I introduced the need for additional research on two populations, adult students learning a foreign language in a noncredit context and instructors of noncredit foreign language courses. Adult satisfaction with learning in the specific context of noncredit foreign language courses has not been examined in the adult education or foreign language teaching literature. Neither has the instructional perspective of foreign language teachers working in noncredit Continuing Education courses been investigated. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between adult learning satisfaction and one feature of the learning environment, the teacher's instructional perspective.

Chapter II reviewed the principles of andragogy which provide the foundation for the instrument used to assess instructional perspective in this study. Characteristics of the adult learner, the teacher of adults, and the teacher-learner relationship in the andragogical model were discussed. The literature on learning climate was reviewed with particular emphasis on the influence of instructional perspective and the effect of teacher behavior, beliefs, and feelings on the learning climate. Instruments used to assess teacher behavior, beliefs, and feelings were identified.

Chapter II also considered satisfaction with learning, including the definition of satisfaction, measuring satisfaction, the credibility of student assessments of satisfaction, and influences on satisfaction and satisfaction with learning in the foreign language classroom. Several influences on satisfaction with learning which are reported in the literature were found to be relevant to the present study: gender, age, culture or ethnicity, educational experiences, goals, expectations, and the psychosocial learning climate.

Finally, Chapter II concluded with a description of the setting for this study: noncredit foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program at a community college. The history and development of the community college and its present-day functions provide a background for understanding participation in adult learning, Continuing Education, and noncredit programs. Problems related to data collection on noncredit programs were identified. The chapter concluded by linking the present study to gaps in the research on noncredit personal interest courses, adult learners taking these courses, their instructors, and adult foreign language learning.

Chapter III presents the methodology for the present study. The research questions, and their related hypotheses are identified. The research design is described, including the population and sample, the sampling procedure, the instruments, data collection, and data analysis. The chapter concludes with a description of the study's limitations.

<p style="text-align:center">Research Questions and Hypotheses</p>

Adult education literature suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning (Cassel, 1968; Knowles, 1980; Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Ralph, 2001; Viechnicki et al., 1990). The primary research question addressed in the present study is: What is the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? The hypothesis was: There is a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as reported on the Personal Information Form-Student (PIF-S), and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign

language classroom, as measured by the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory

(MIPI).[1]

Five sub-questions and their related hypotheses were also addressed in this study,

including:

1. Is there a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and

    students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective?

H_1 There is a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as

    reported on the PIF-S, and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional

    perspective, as measured by the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory--

    Adapted for Students (MIPI-S).[2]

2. Is there a significant difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective

    and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective in the

    noncredit foreign language classroom?

H_2 There is a significant difference between the teacher-reported instructional

    perspective, as measured by the MIPI, and students' perceptions of the teacher's

    instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI-S, in the noncredit foreign

    language classroom.[3]

3. Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified

    on the PIF-S, explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher

    ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S?

H_3 There is one student characteristic or a combination of student characteristics,

    identified on the PIF-S, which explains students' perceptions of High Above

Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S.[4]

4.   Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S)?

H[4]   There is one student characteristic or a combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, which explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S).[5]

5.   Which teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the Personal Information Form-Instructor (PIF-I), explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI?

H[5]   There is one teacher characteristic or a combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the PIF-I, which explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI.[6]

Research Design

Descriptive research approaches are typically concerned with "the assessment of attitudes, opinions, preferences, demographics, practices, and procedures" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 275). Surveys are a typical means of collecting quantifiable descriptive data (Gay & Airasian, 2000). The instruments employed in the present study, the MIPI and MIPI-S, provide data on instructor attitudes, values, and behaviors and learner feelings of satisfaction in noncredit foreign language classes. In addition, the

demographic information provided on the student and instructor PIFs contributes to a description of instructors and adult learners in these classes.

The data analysis in the present study used correlational research techniques. According to Gay and Airasian (2000), "correlational research involves collecting data in order to determine whether or to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables" (p. 321). While the existence of a correlational relationship between two or more variables cannot be used to prove a cause-effect relationship, "the existence of a high correlation [between variables] does permit prediction" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 322).

This study used two survey instruments to gather data on the relationship between two quantifiable variables, instructional perspective and learner satisfaction. Because the noncredit foreign language classroom has not been previously studied with regard to adult learner satisfaction or instructional perspective, the current study sought to discover if a relationship exists in this context. The investigation of the relationship between learner satisfaction and instructional perspective contributed to better understanding what constitutes a satisfying learning environment for adult foreign language learners.

Rachal (2002) examined empirical research on the effectiveness of adult education and concluded that certain design criteria for future studies would be important to contribute to a better understanding of adult teaching and learning. Rachal suggests seven design criteria which, he says, would broaden the base of adult education research and enable educators to more effectively compare research results in the field:

1. Voluntary participation [of adult learners in learning situations]
2. Adult status [of research subjects]

3. Collaboratively-determined learning objectives [in the learning situation]

4. Performance-based assessment of achievement [relative to learner goals]

5. Measuring satisfaction [with the learning experience]

6. Appropriate adult learning environment

7. Technical issues [related to selection of subjects, facilitators' involvement in treatments for different groups, "adequate numbers of participants, equal and appropriate treatment duration, informed consent, comparability of groups." (pp. 224, 219-224)

The design of the present study included several of Rachal's recommended criteria. With regard to the study population, the participants were all adults, age 18 or older. As Rachal (2002) recommends, the students were all voluntarily participating in learning for "personal fulfillment or some other internal motivator" (p. 219), but not for academic or professional credit.

Rachal (2002) also suggests that

andragogy researchers would do well to examine situations such as noncredit continuing education programs where the great majority of the learners want to be there, are motivated to learn the material because it is intrinsically interesting or useful to them, and are inclined to see the learning activities as inherently valuable and not solely valuable as a means to some end. (p. 220)

The foreign language courses in which the students in this study were enrolled were all noncredit, offered through a Continuing Education program, and identified by the community college as personal development courses (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007). While some participants were in the 20 – 29 age group and might have

been engaged in a traditional college program of study, they received no college credit

for the classes examined in the current study. Given that personal development courses

at this school are developed to attract lifelong learners (C. Jaeger, personal

communication, May 21, 2007) and that there were no real data available on the actual

learning environment, it was assumed, until proven otherwise, that the foreign language

courses included in the study represented an "appropriate adult learning environment"

(Rachal, 2002, p. 220).

The present study did not meet Rachal's (2002) *collaboratively-determined*

learning objectives criterion. Due to a lack of data, it is unclear the extent to which

noncredit foreign language teachers include collaboratively-determined learning

objectives in their teaching approach. The study, therefore, was not limited to courses

with collaboratively-determined objectives.

The present study also did not include a performance-based assessment of

achievement because formal measurements of achievement are not generally part of the

course design in noncredit courses. Furthermore, it seemed improbable that a formal

measurement of proficiency would detect significant changes in language ability within

the accumulated 16 - 24 hours of class time which were spread out over the eight- to

twelve-week course sessions (Omaggio, 1986). Moreover Rachal (2002) reports that "a

measure of perceived achievement such as a self-report questionnaire relative to the

objectives" would be appropriate "in a nongraded, learning-for-its-own-sake situation"

(p. 222). The PIF-S asked students to state their primary goal and other goal(s) for the

foreign language class in which they were enrolled as well as the extent to which they

had achieved those goals (see Appendix B).

Rachal (2002) emphasizes that "satisfaction with the learning experience should be measured in all settings" (p. 222). Assessing student satisfaction with language learning in the context of noncredit foreign language courses was one of the purposes of this study. The PIF-S asked students to indicate their level of satisfaction with personal language learning in the course of enrollment and their general experience with language study, past and present.

In the discussion of technical research issues, Rachal (2002) recognizes that, in adult education research, "in situ groups [of participants] are the norm and should be considered acceptable" (p. 223). The present study targeted the entire population of students enrolled in existing noncredit foreign language courses at one community college. The community college serving as the host for this study offered a total of 55 courses in 10 different languages during the fall semester in which the research took place. Thirty-seven of those courses were beginning-level courses (i.e., courses whose titles included the words *beginning* or *for first timers*).

In summary, the descriptive research design of this study incorporated correlational research techniques to evaluate the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective in the context of noncredit foreign language courses. Participants were drawn from in situ groups within the population of adult learners and their teachers engaged in noncredit foreign language courses during one semester at a community college. All students and teachers participated voluntarily

Population and Sample

The population for this study included all adult learners, aged 18 or older, enrolled in a beginning noncredit foreign language course and the instructors of those

courses. The courses were offered through the Continuing Education program at one of the four main campuses of a large metropolitan community college in the Midwest.

The Continuing Education program in this community college system offers noncredit personal development courses in the arts, foreign languages, fitness, finances, and various hobbies. Another part of the Continuing Education program includes a variety of professional and workforce development courses in areas such as allied health, small business development, child care, the digital arts, and management. The third component to Continuing Education in this community college system is community education which offers courses in ESL, literacy, GED preparation, as well as courses designed to appeal to youth, children, and their parents. When all credit and noncredit programs are combined, the community college serves over 100,000 students annually.

Noncredit foreign language courses at this institution provide a greater number of foreign language choices and a much larger number of classes than are offered through credit courses. During the semester when the research was conducted, the largest number of noncredit foreign language courses offered were in Spanish, where beginning-level courses accounted for 15 of the 18 Spanish courses offered. The other foreign languages offered had a smaller number of noncredit course choices: Italian (8), French (7), Chinese (6), German (6), Russian (5), Arabic (2), Bosnian-Croatian (1), Japanese (1), and Polish (1). By comparison, during the same academic semester, this college offered courses for credit in seven languages: Spanish (11 classes including 3 through Distance Learning), French (6 courses including 1 through Distance Learning), German (4 classes), Japanese (2 classes), Chinese (1 course through Distance Learning), Russian (1 class through Distance Learning), and Arabic (1 class through Distance Learning). The

Distance Learning option does not exist for noncredit foreign language courses at this institution.

Only beginning foreign language courses were included in the study. A beginning foreign language course was defined as any course with the words *beginning* or *for first timers* in the title. One reason beginning language courses were chosen for this study was because, at this particular community college, they represented the largest group of Continuing Education foreign language courses in terms of number of classes offered and number of students enrolled. For the semester during which research was conducted, there are 55 foreign language courses offered with a potential enrollment of 1,156 in 10 different languages and taught by 31 different instructors. Beginning-level foreign language courses represented over 67% of all noncredit foreign language courses offered during that semester.

For beginning foreign language courses at this community college, there was a potential enrollment of 778 students in 33 beginning foreign language sections with 21 different teachers in nine different languages. Actual enrollment figures (n = 524; see Table 8, p. 247) were less than 778 because not all classes filled the 20 to 23 places available in each class. Some classes had significantly fewer than 20 to 23 students since the college's policy is to proceed with a Continuing Education course if a minimum of 8 students enroll (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007).

A second reason that this study was limited to beginning foreign language courses was the need to establish a fairly homogenous population with regard to language learning experience. Restricting the study population to students in beginning foreign language classes resulted in a population which had relatively limited language learning

experience with the language currently being studied. Noncredit intermediate- and advanced-level foreign language courses were excluded from the sample for this reason. Also excluded from the study were courses for special purposes such as courses for travel, courses for adoptive parents, or courses on culture. In addition, literature courses were excluded from the study.

Students taking ESL were not included because the focus of the study was on adult Americans learning a language other than English. Students in ASL courses were not included in the study population because this study concentrated on students taking languages in which the focus is on developing oral and aural skills as well as reading, writing, and cultural understanding skills.

Sampling Procedure

The study sample was comprised of all voluntary respondents from the target population: adult students enrolled in beginning noncredit foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program at a large metropolitan community college in the Midwest during the fall semester and the instructors of those courses. Soon after the fall sessions began, instructors received a letter and e-mail from the researcher explaining the study. The letters and e-mails asked teachers to consider participating in the study and to encourage their students to participate.

The administration of the community college's Continuing Education program stipulated that no class time could be taken by the researcher to promote or administer the survey. Therefore, research packets were delivered to the community college's Continuing Education Manager in mid-October for distribution to all instructors. A note on each instructor's packet asked that the research instruments be made available to

students in their classes during the last two weeks of the course session. The study

sample was limited to students and instructors who completed the survey instruments

outside of class and returned them to the researcher.

Instruments

Four instruments were used for the collection of data in this study. The PIFs were

used to collect demographic and educational data on instructors and students. The MIPI

was used to assess the instructional perspective of instructors; the MIPI-S was used with

students to assess perceptions of instructional perspective.

Participant Information Form (PIF). Each instructor and student completed a PIF

providing demographic information as well as information on language learning and

educational experiences. The PIF was developed for the current study. There were two

versions of this instrument, the PIF-I for instructors (see Appendix C) and the PIF-S for

students (see Appendix B).

Instructors and students were asked to provide information about gender, age,

race or ethnicity, in what country or countries their formal education had taken place, the

highest diploma or degree earned, and languages spoken. Items about the country or

countries where formal education had taken place were included on the PIFs to elicit data

about the cultural context of previous learning experiences of instructors and students.

Information on languages spoken was requested to determined the extent of each person's

prior language learning experience. Previous learning experience and cultural influences

are factors that have been shown to affect interactions which take place in the adult

foreign language classroom (Brookfield, 1995; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Loughrin-Sacco,

1991; Wlodkowski, 1999).

Instructors were asked to provide information about their teaching experience, if they had been exposed to information on adult learning, and the source of that information. Previous research had determined that length of teaching experience influences instructional perspective (Dawson, 1997). In addition, Stricker (2006) found that the sources for adult learning information and understandings of adult learning principles varied greatly among teachers and principals in a PK - 12 school setting.

Instructors and students were asked to report their goals for the class in which they were engaged. All participants were asked to report the primary goal and other goals they had for the class. All participants were also asked to report the extent to which they felt they had achieved their goals. Rachal's (2002) recommendations for andragogical research support the consideration of personal goals in the evaluation of adult learning experiences.

In addition to goals, students were also asked to report their level of satisfaction with personal language learning in the course they were taking. Furthermore, they reported their level of satisfaction with past and present experience with language study. Motivation and self-concept as well as previous language learning experiences have been shown to influence subsequent learning experience (Bucuvalas, 2002; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Loughrin-Sacco, 1991; Schleppegrell, 1987). The review of literature confirmed Horwitz's (1988) assertion that satisfaction with language learning and students' language learning experiences have been largely unexplored.

The design of the PIFs was informed by previous research. The data obtained in the present study contribute new information about characteristics of noncredit foreign

language teachers and students to the knowledge base in the areas of adult education, language learning and teaching, satisfaction research, and noncredit education.

Instructional Perspectives Inventory (IPI). The present study used the MIPI to assess teachers' instructional perspective (see Appendix C). The MIPI is a revised version of the IPI developed by Henschke (1989, 1994). The IPI was designed to be "a critical reflection or self-evaluation and self-diagnostic instrument--providing clues for improvement--rather than as a screening device" (Stanton, 2005, p. 110).

The IPI is a 45-item self-report survey which gauges a teacher's orientation toward the use of andragogical principles (Henschke, 1989, 1994). Henschke (1994) states that

> the idea for the instrument originated from the observation that although the
> literature of adult education provides a broad spectrum of characteristics
> necessary for adult educators to practice in this emerging field, an assessment
> instrument was needed which emphasizes the teacher's philosophical beliefs as
> well as personal and contextual identification, actions and competencies for
> guiding her/his conduct. (p. 74)

Other influences on the development of this instrument were Henschke's own research and extensive experience in adult education as well as "the known practice of a variety of adult educators" (Henschke, 1989, p. 83).

The IPI assesses seven factors related to teacher beliefs, feelings and behaviors: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and

Teacher-centered Learning Process. All factors have been described in detail in Chapter II.

Stanton (2005) created descriptors for different levels of use of andragogical principles as reported on the IPI (see Appendix E). According to these category levels, the summative IPI score places the instructor on a continuum between High Above Average use of andragogical principles and Low Below Average use of andragogical principles. Henschke has noted, however, that the factor scores and summative score derived from this instrument only represent the teacher's instructional perspective at a particular point in time (as cited in Stanton, 2005). Instructional perspective is a constantly evolving attribute.

The IPI was developed and refined by two rounds of testing with over 400 adult educators in the Chicago City Colleges and, subsequently, with over 200 adult educators at St. Louis Community College. Stanton (2005) established the construct validity of the IPI and reported the reliability of the IPI to be .88. The reliability of the IPI is discussed in detail in the Reliability of the MIPI and MIPI-S section of Chapter IV.

Stanton (2005) suggested three modifications to the IPI: (a) an increased degree of variance in participant responses, (b) re-wording of the five response descriptors for each question, and (c) reverse scoring of questions in Factors 5 and 7. The IPI has been used in eight studies (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; McManus, 2008; Rowbotham, 2007; Seward, 1998; Stanton, 2005; Stricker, 2006; Thomas, 1995). Studies in progress or completed prior to Stanton's 2005 study used the original IPI. Studies begun after Stanton's study have used the modifications to the IPI suggested by Stanton.

Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI). The instrument used in the present study is identified as the *Modified* Instructional Perspectives Inventory, or MIPI, in order to make clear that this instrument incorporates Stanton's modifications to the IPI. All questions in all subscales of the original IPI remain the same in the MIPI (see Tables 1 through 7, pp. 81 - 87). No additional questions were added to any factor of the MIPI.

The present study is the first time the IPI or the MIPI has been used in the context of an adult noncredit foreign language learning. This study is also the first time that the modified IPI has been adapted to gather foreign language students' perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective.

Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory--Adapted for Students (MIPI-S).

The MIPI-S (see Appendix B) is an adaptation of the MIPI. The MIPI-S was used in this study to elicit student perceptions of their foreign language teachers' instructional perspective. The MIPI-S retains all 45 original items from the MIPI and includes all modifications to the IPI suggested by Stanton (2005). The most common modification made to the MIPI was to insert the words *appear to* in MIPI-S items that require students to assess the instructor's feelings, experience, or perception (e.g., MIPI-S Item 4: How frequently does the instructor appear to be fully prepared to teach?). Re-wording items from the MIPI which address instructor feelings, attitudes, beliefs or values was necessary because students can only draw conclusions about instructor feelings or beliefs from observation of the instructor's actions or through what the instructor expresses verbally or nonverbally in the students' presence.

A second group of changes made for the MIPI-S were the result of changing the original MIPI prompt from *How often do you…* to *How often does your instructor….* As

a result of the prompt change, the pronouns *you* and *your* in the original instrument were changed to *he/she* and *his/her*. Stricker's (2006) adaptation of the IPI for use by teachers assessing the instructional perspective of their principals included a similar re-wording of the prompts. All modifications of the MIPI are documented in Appendix F.

In summary, the PIFs were created to collect demographic and educational data on the study's participants. The PIF-S also asked students to rate their satisfaction with personal language learning and general language learning experience, past and present. Henschke's (1989, 1994) MIPI was used to assess the use of andragogical principles by noncredit foreign language teachers. The MIPI-S, an adaptation of the MIPI, was used to obtain information from students about their perceptions of instructional perspective in their foreign language classrooms.

Procedure

The research procedure began with a peer review of the study instruments. After examining the feedback from the peer review, the final forms of the two sets of instruments, the MIPI/MIPI-S and the PIFs, were established. Once university approval of the study was received, research packets were distributed to the target population. An incentive to participate in the study was included in the research packets. Data analysis began after all data were recorded and interpreted.

Peer review. A peer review of the instruments was conducted. The instruments evaluated in the peer review were the PIF-S and the MIPI-S, the student instruments. The teacher instruments, the PIF-I and MIPI, were not included in the peer review.

One purpose of the peer review was to assess the potential for problems with misunderstanding items or wording of items on two of the research instruments. The peer review was also intended to identify other problems that might occur during the completion of those instruments. A third concern was the amount of time that would be required to complete both instruments. A pilot study was not done due to organizational difficulties.

For the peer review, the researcher requested participation from adults known to her who had participated in at least one adult foreign language learning experience. Three of the peer review participants reported participating in at least one foreign language learning experience as an adult. Two participants had studied a foreign language in college and one, a woman who reported being in the 80+ age group, was currently studying a foreign language.

The peer review participants were different from the population in the present study in that the peer review group reported on adult learning activities already completed; the study's population was made up of adults currently participating in foreign language learning. The peer review population and the study's population, however, were all voluntary participants.

The peer review used instruments which were administered electronically. The study used printed instruments which were returned to the researcher by mail.

Van Teijlingen and Hundley (2001) identify nine procedures for improving a questionnaire's internal validity:

1) administer the questionnaire to pilot study subjects in exactly the same way as it will be administered in the main study

2) ask the subjects for feedback to identify ambiguities and difficult questions

3) record the time taken to complete the questionnaire and decide whether it is reasonable

4) discard all unnecessary, difficult or ambiguous questions

5) assess whether each question gives an adequate range of responses

6) establish that replies can be interpreted in terms of the information that is required

7) check that all questions are answered

8) re-word or re-scale any questions that are not answered as expected

9) shorten, revise and, if possible, pilot again. (para. 6, Table 2)

In spite of not being a pilot study, the peer review did accomplish several of the procedures recommended by van Teijlingen and Hundley: feedback on ambiguous and difficult questions, assessing the range of responses for each item, rewording or revising items, establishing that the replies produced the information required, and recording of the time required for instrument completion. Reviewer responses to the PIF-S and MIPI-S did not result in any items being discarded or re-scaled.

Two reasons that the peer review was done were (a) to assess the potential for problems with misunderstanding items or wording of items and (b) to identify other problems that might occur in the completion of the instruments. The potential for the misunderstanding of items and wording or other problems on the PIF-S and the MIPI-S was a concern since the PIF-S is an original instrument designed by the researcher and the MIPI-S was adapted by the researcher from Henschke's IPI. It was important to discover if the wording of any of the items on either instrument would cause problems

with participants understanding or completing the instruments. In addition, since the MIPI had not previously been adapted for use with foreign language students, there was no information available on potential problems with that population of learners.

Participants in the peer review made two suggestions about PIF-S items. One suggestion was to include one or more items which would allow the respondent to provide narrative comments to explain his or her learning experience. The researcher added two write-in items to gain information on primary and other goals for the class. In conjunction with the two write-in items, PIF-S Items 14 and 16 were added to assess the extent to which participants felt they had achieved their primary and other goals for the class (see Appendix B).

A second suggestion made by peer reviewers was to provide an explanation of what was meant by *speaking a language* in PIF-S Item 7: Languages that I *speak* are.... The researcher believed that providing a definition of what it means to speak a language would have required that respondents understood the definition used by the researcher and agreed to respond according to that definition. Just as respondents used their own subjective definition for *satisfaction with personal language learning* in answering PIF-S Item 1, the researcher concluded that study participants should respond to the item about the number of languages spoken according to their own personal understanding of what it means to speak a language.

After studying the peer reviewed PIF-S instruments, it was determined that the instruments' items did provide "an adequate range of responses" (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001, para. 6) and did produce the information required. The researcher made two refinements in the PIF-S:

1. PIF-S items with the same types of responses were grouped together for ease of completion. For example, check-off items were grouped together and qualitative-response items were grouped together.

2. The researcher created two items to identify the cultural environment of education at two different levels, postsecondary and elementary-secondary educational experiences. The original item had covered all educational experience.

3. Due to peer review participants' comments, one item was added to the PIF-S: How would you rate your general experience with language study, past and present?

The second instrument included in the peer review was the MIPI-S. The MIPI-S is Henschke's modified IPI, adapted by the researcher for foreign language learners. Peer review participants identified seven items from the MIPI-S in which they were uncertain of the meaning of the wording or found the wording confusing. After consulting with John Henschke, the author of the modified IPI, it was concluded that it was best to retain the original wording of those items from the MIPI. Changing or re-wording those items about which peer review participants had questions would be difficult to do without compromising the ability of the study to match items on the MIPI, used for instructors, with items on the MIPI-S.

Besides assessing potential misunderstandings of item wording and other possible problems related to the PIF-S and MIPI-S, a third reason for conducting the peer review was to gain an estimate of the time required to complete the PIF-S and MIPI-S. Volunteer reviewers were asked to record the amount of time it took to complete both

instruments. They indicated that completion of the instruments took from less than 10 minutes to about 15 minutes. The researcher considered this an acceptable amount of time for completing the instruments, given that all participants of the main study would voluntarily complete the instruments outside of class.

Organizational problems prevented the PIF and MIPI-S from being tested more completely. While the peer review participants did not match the study's target population and concerns about seven items on the MIPI-S did not result in item re-wording, the process did result in a refinement of the PIF-S. The peer review also established approximately how much time it would take for participants to complete the study instruments.

Data collection. The community college which served as the research site for the present study was chosen because it offers the most diverse selection of foreign languages and the largest number of noncredit Continuing Education foreign language courses in the region. Depending on the semester, this community college offers courses in most or all of the following languages: Arabic, Bosnian-Croatian, Chinese, French, German, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Polish, Russian, and Spanish. There were a total of 55 noncredit foreign language courses offered at this community college in the semester during which data were collected. The present study only concerns the 33 beginning foreign language courses offered.

At the beginning of the semester, the researcher notified instructors about the study by mail and e-mail. The Office of Continuing Education of the community college supplied the researcher with the contact information for all instructors of beginning foreign language courses. The letters and e-mails sent by the researcher provided an

overview of the study and encouraged instructors to consider participating (see Appendix G). Instructors were also asked to encourage their students to participate.

Research packets and all instruments were coded in order to track teacher and student participation within classes and across languages. The codes also allowed the researcher to identify and evaluate data from individual participants participating in the same courses.

Research packets were distributed to instructors of beginning foreign language classes through the college's Office of Continuing Education. Instructors received the research materials during the second half of the fall course sessions. Each research packet contained one of each of the following:

1) Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities,

2) Instructions: Instructor or Instructions: Student,

3) MIPI or MIPI-S,

4) PIF-I or PIF-S,

5) Gift Card Information & Coupon sheet with attached Gift Card Drawing
   envelope,

6) Stamped, self-addressed envelope for the return of all completed documents.

Instructors were asked to make the research packets available to students in the last two weeks of the class session. Participation by students and instructors was voluntary. Instructors and students who chose to participate in the study completed the instruments at a time and place outside of class. Return of the research instruments constituted consent to participate in this study. Completed research instruments were

returned by mail to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided in each research packet.

 Incentive to participate. As an incentive to participate in this study, all participants who completed and returned the research instruments were eligible to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card. Instructors participating in the study were eligible for a $50 gift card; student participants were eligible for one of two $50 gift cards.

 Instructors and students who choose to participate completed the Gift Card Coupon on the Gift Card Information & Coupon sheet in the research packet. The coupon was sealed in the small envelope provided in the research packet and labeled Gift Card Drawing-Student or Gift Card Drawing-Instructor. Participants returned the Gift Card Drawing envelope to the researcher with the completed research instruments in the addressed, stamped envelope provided in each research packet.

 A person not connected with the research study separated the Gift Card Drawing envelopes from the completed research instruments when they arrived at the researcher's office. This same person retained custody of all Gift Card Drawing envelopes throughout data collection.

 After all data collection was completed, the person in custody of the Gift Card Drawing envelopes drew one envelope from the group of Gift Card Drawing--Instructor envelopes and two envelopes from the group of Gift Card Drawing--Student envelopes. The person conducting the drawing opened the winning envelopes, contacted the winners to verify mailing addresses, and mailed the gift cards to them. All Gift Card Information coupons and their envelopes were then destroyed. The researcher had no access to the

Gift Card Drawing envelopes or the identities of the winners at any time during the research project.

Protection of human rights. Student participants were anonymous throughout data collection and analysis process unless they chose to contact the researcher and disclose their identify. Instructors who contacted the researcher and requested to be informed of the study's results were sent an abstract and information about accessing the study once it was completed. After the dissertation was completed, all participant information was destroyed.

Data analysis. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between adult learning satisfaction and instructional perspective. Survey instruments were used to construct the data base for this study. All quantifiable data on the MIPI, MIPI-S, PIF-I, and PIF-S were entered into an SPSS Statistics 17.0 software data base. Quantifiable descriptive data provided on the PIF-Is and PIF-Ss were assigned categories with numerical values and entered into the SPSS data base.

Qualitative data provided by the open-ended items on the PIFs regarding instructor and student goals for the course (PIF-S Items 13 and 15, PIF-I Items 16 and 18) were examined to identify key words and ideas. Student responses which had key words and ideas in common were grouped into five categories. Teacher responses were examined. The five categories of goals found in the student data were found to be also appropriate for representing teachers' goals. These data were used to provide insight into the different motivations and expectations which students and teachers brought to the foreign language classroom. Student and teacher goals are discussed at length in Chapters IV and V.

Teacher responses to PIF-I Item 21 about sources of information on adult learning were also examined to find key words and ideas. The sources of adult learning information found in teacher responses are discussed in detail in Chapters IV and V.

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient and the Spearman-Brown prophecy coefficient were calculated for the MIPI and MIPI-S to determine internal consistency, as recommended by McManus (2008). The results of this calculation are discussed in Chapter IV.

The choice of appropriate statistical procedures was guided by the nature of the research questions, the level of measurement of the data, and the extent to which data in the key variables were normally distributed. The relationships between (a) student satisfaction with learning and teachers' instructional perspective and (b) satisfaction with learning and student perceptions of instructional perspective were investigated using correlation and ordinal logistic regression analysis. The relationships between (a) specific student characteristics and satisfaction with learning and (b) specific student characteristics and MIPI-S scores were also analyzed using ordinal logistic regression. A description of teacher characteristics organized by instructional perspective was created from the data provided by the PIF-I and MIPI. Differences between teacher instructional perspective and student perceptions of instructional perspective were evaluated using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs, signed-ranks test. Reports of all results of the data analysis are present in Chapter IV and discussed in Chapter V.

Limitations of the Study

There are five areas of limitation for the present study. These limitations relate to the population and sample, the data collection process, the instruments, the nature of the data collected, and the generalizability of the findings.

The first area of limitation relates to the population and sample size. The target population in this study was estimated to be 524 students and 19 instructors in 33 beginning-level courses representing 9 languages. Participation by instructors and students was totally voluntary. Not all instructors or students chose to participate.

The participating community college stipulated that the researcher could take no class time to introduce the study to instructors and students or to respond to any questions about the study. In addition, no class time was to be taken for instrument completion. The office of Continuing Education preferred to distribute the research packets to all classes instead of having the researcher distribute the research packets. Because of these restrictions, the researcher was unable to make personal contact with potential participants when the instruments were made available to classes. In order to address these restrictions, the researcher contacted instructors by mail and e-mail prior to their receiving the research materials. By doing this, instructors were introduced to the type of research in which they were going to be asked to participate and were encouraged to ask their students to participate. In the letters and e-mail contacts, the researcher suggested that instructors contact her to ask questions or discuss the study. Three instructors contacted the researcher with questions about the study. A total of eight instructors returned completed study instruments.

The number of student participants in the study was influenced by student persistence and attendance. Not all students who enrolled in a class persisted to the end of the class session. In addition, not all students who persisted were necessarily present when the research instruments were made available.

Persistence and attendance can be influenced by lack of satisfaction. Seaman and Fellenz (1989) state that "dissatisfaction…interferes with the learning process [and] frequently leads adults to remove themselves from the learning situation" (p. 158). Other factors which may affect persistence and attendance are problems related to family, health, work, or transportation; however, these factors were outside the scope of the present study.

Students who had already stopped attending class or were absent when research packets were made available were automatically eliminated as study participants. Input from all these students, especially the ones who did not persist to the end of the class session, would have added an important dimension to understanding the participation and learning experience of noncredit foreign language students.

An additional problem with the study population was the uneven rate of return for the research instruments within individual classes. While not all instructors returned their surveys, some of their students did. On the other hand, there was one instructor who chose to participate but had no students who returned the research instruments. This problem limited the number of classes within which the teacher's instructional perspective and student perceptions of instructional perspective could be compared.

A second limitation of the study relates to the data collection process. The study was designed as a summative study comprised of teacher reports of instructional

affect student satisfaction. It is possible, therefore, that the items included on the PIF do not adequately cover the full range of influences relevant to learning satisfaction.

Student reports of satisfaction with learning were based on one single, Likert-type scale item on the PIF-S. The inclusion of open-ended items relevant to satisfaction might have produced data which resulted in a deeper understanding of how students evaluated satisfaction with learning or the specific influences on the ratings they reported in the context of these noncredit foreign language courses.

Students' ratings of their general experiences with language study, past and present, were reported in the same way as satisfaction with language learning. Some students included notes on the PIF-S to explain their ratings. Eliciting more information through one or more open-ended items might have produced a clearer picture of students' previous language study experiences.

The MIPI-S, an adaptation of the MIPI was used to elicit student perceptions of the instructional perspective of their teachers. The pattern of non-responses for individual items (see Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data section, Chapter IV) suggested that some items on the MIPI-S were either misunderstood or found not applicable by students in the context of the noncredit foreign language classroom. Given the number of non-response items in the student sample, future research using the MIPI in the context of foreign language study should consider carefully how the relevance of some item content might affect student responses.

A fourth limitation in the present study is the nature of the data collected. The data on instructional perspective from the MIPI and MIPI-S were the result of instructor self-reports and student perceptions of their instructors beliefs, values, and behaviors.

Both the process of self-reporting and the process of interpreting another person's beliefs, values, and behaviors allow for responses that are biased by the conscious and unconscious perspectives of the person reporting (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 156). Some of the influences or biases which may exist with the students and teachers toward the end of a course are: the subjective nature of individuals' memory, individual beliefs about language learning ability and language teaching (Carlson, 2006a; Horwitz, 1988; Peacock, n.d.), emotional reactions to memories of previous language learning experiences which are triggered by experiences in the present class (Carlson, 2006a), the presence of unrealistic learning expectations (Wyss, 2002), the nature of the relationship between student and teacher (Conti, 2004; Weimer, 2002), the affective response to learning in a particular environment (Koch & Terrell, 1991; Loughrin-Sacco, 1991; Price, 1991), and features of the learning climate which do no match well with student or instructor needs or preferences (Caffarella, 1994; Conti & Welborn, 1986; Knowles, 1980). These influences were outside the design of the present study and the instruments which were used.

Data collection in this study was limited to questionnaires and surveys. The data collected were primarily quantitative in nature, with the exception of open-ended items about learning goals and sources of adult learning information. Some qualitative information from students or teachers in any foreign language classes was provided by those participants who chose to add a note to the instruments. Therefore, there were limited subjective data to supplement the objective data collected from the instruments. In addition, there were no objective data with which to compare participants' subjective reports of satisfaction and instructional perspective. Observation of teachers and students

or interviews with selected participants could have verified instructional perspective reports and supplemented the data on satisfaction with learning.

A fifth limitation of the study relates to the generalizability of the findings. With the small number of paired instructor and student responses in the sample, the findings for the primary research question and Sub-question 2 could not be considered generalizable to the entire sample. Almost half of the student sample could not be included in the analysis of these research questions because there were no corresponding teacher data. In addition, despite the larger student sample available for the analysis of Sub-questions 1, 3, and 4, the findings of the present study could only be said to be generalizable to a population similar to the sample, i.e., adult language learners participating in noncredit Continuing Education courses through a community college.

Furthermore, there was a very small sample of teachers. For this reason Sub-question 5 could only be answered with a description of the teacher data. Even where it was possible to include teachers in a statistical procedure (i.e., the analysis of the primary research question and Sub-question 2), the findings were based on only nine teacher instruments. Findings related to teacher participants in the present study are not necessarily generalizable to the noncredit foreign language teacher population teaching at the community college hosting the study much less to the larger population of noncredit foreign language teachers in the region or nation.

Finally, the findings of this study should not be considered generalizable to other types of noncredit Continuing Education programs. The present study only contributes to understanding students or teachers engaged in noncredit foreign language study.

The limitations to this study are related to the population and sample, the data collection process, the instruments, and the nature of the data collected. In addition, there are strict limitations on the extent to which the findings of this study can be considered generalizable.

This chapter began with a summary of the purpose of this study. The research questions and corresponding hypotheses were identified. The research design was described with regard to the population and sample, instruments, data collection, protection of human rights, and data analysis. The chapter concluded with a description of the limitations of the study.

Chapter IV presents the demographic and educational data collected on study participants. The nature of the data, the reliability of the instruments, and the choice of statistical tests are discussed. Finally, the results of the analyses for each research question are reported.

Chapter IV: Results

The first three chapters provided an introduction to the present study. In Chapter I, the need for research on noncredit students and their teachers was discussed and the purpose of the study was identified. Chapter II reviewed the literature relevant to this study with regard to adult education, instructional perspective, satisfaction with learning, and the community college. Chapter III presented the methodology, including the population and sample, the research design, and the study limitations.

Chapter IV begins with a brief summary of the purpose of the study. The target population and sample are then described. Next, a portrait of student and teacher participants is developed using the data collected with the PIFs, the MIPI, and the MIPI-S. The last section of the chapter reports on analysis of the MIPI and MIPI-S data. Examination of the raw data, the reliability of the MIPI and MIPI-S, and the statistical procedures appropriate to the research questions are discussed. Finally, the results of the analysis for each individual research question are reported.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of how teacher instructional perspective may affect adult students' satisfaction with learning in noncredit foreign language classes. The data collected for the present study provide a more complete description than is currently available of the learning environment in noncredit foreign language classes. Additionally, although the study sample represents only a small slice of the total population participating in noncredit foreign language courses, the present study creates a portrait of those adult learners and their teachers. A description of

noncredit foreign language students and teachers has not, until now, existed in the literature.

Population and Sample

This study focused on the population of 524 students enrolled in 33 noncredit beginning foreign language classes offered through the Continuing Education program of a community college and the 19 instructors teaching those courses. Of the potential student participants, 110 returned study instruments. Two returned instruments for one class indicated that these students were participating in an intermediate-level class instead of a beginning-level class. The instructor's returned MIPI for this class indicated that the study instruments had, in fact, been distributed to an intermediate-level language class. The seven students from this class who had returned study instruments were eliminated from the student sample. The teacher's return for the intermediate class was also eliminated from the teacher sample.

The elimination of the intermediate-level student returns resulted in a student sample size of 103 students from 22 different classes. The student response rate was 19.65% of the total number of students enrolled at the beginning of class sessions. One instructor indicated to the researcher that several students had dropped out of his class by the second half of the class session, the time period when the study instruments were made available. Because the number of students in each class who persisted into the second half of the class session was not available to the researcher, the true student response rate could not be determined.

Of the 19 instructors teaching beginning-level noncredit foreign language courses at the community college during the Fall, 2007 semester, eight teachers returned the

study instruments. Since the teacher who submitted a return for an intermediate class had also returned instruments for her beginning-level class, the teacher sample size remained at eight. The eight beginning-level teacher returns represent a teacher response rate of 42.10 %. These teachers taught in 9 of the 22 beginning-level classes for which students returned instruments. There were no teacher returns for the other 13 beginning classes in which at least one student returned the study instruments.

Two beginning-level teachers returned a survey for each of the two beginning classes they taught. For one of those teachers, both classes had student returns and therefore both classes were included in the sample. For the other teacher, only one of the classes had student returns, therefore, this was the only class included in the sample.

Table 8 shows class enrollments and participant returns for all beginning-level foreign language classes included in the target population.

Table 8. Class Enrollments and Participant Returns

| Class | Class enrollment | Participant returns | |
		Students	Teacher
C1	18	2	1
C2	11	1	0
C3	21	8	1
C4	11	4	1
C5	14	1	0
C6	6	0	0
C7	10	0	0
C8	23	0	0
C9	7	3	1
C10	9	0	0
C11	23	0	0
C12	15	8	0
C13	20	10	1
C14	13	7	1
C15	15	4	1
C16	11	1	0
C17	20	4	0
C18	13	2	0
C19	20	0	0
C20	15	4	0
C21	20	10	0
C22	13	0	0
C23	21	0	0
C24	16	1	0
C25	22	0	0
C26	19	6	0
C27	23	9	0
C28	15	5	1
C29	14	3	0
C30	23	1	0
C31	19	9	1
C32	17	0	0
C33	7	0	0
Total	524	103	9

Characteristics of Student Participants

The PIF-S was used to collect demographic and educational experience data from the 103 participants who made up the student sample. Students were asked to provide information on several personal characteristics: age, gender, race or ethnicity, highest

degree or diploma earned, the country or countries in which they had attended

educational institutions, native language, languages which they speak, the number of

years spent studying the language of the class in which they were enrolled, and other

languages they were currently studying or had studied in the past. Students were asked to

identify their primary and other goal(s) for the course in which they were enrolled and the

extent to which those goals were achieved. In addition, the PIF-S asked students to

report their level of satisfaction with language learning for the class in which they were

enrolled and satisfaction with their general experience of language study, past and

present.

Age

       The PIF-S asked students to indicate their age group: 18 - 19, 20 - 29, 30 - 39,

40 - 49, 50 - 59, 60 - 69, 70 - 79, and 80+ years. Learners aged 40 and older accounted

for over 80% of the student sample. Table 9 shows student participants grouped by

gender within age groups.

Table 9. Student Gender Grouped by Age

	Age group								
Gender	18-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Total
Male	0	5	3	3	13	10	1	1	36
Female	0	9	3	12	24	17	1	1	67
Total	0	14	6	15	37	27	2	2	103

Gender

       Of the 103 student participants, 36 were male and 67 were female.

Approximately 78% of all male student participants (n = 28) reported being in the

40 - 49 age group or older. Eighty-two percent of female students (n = 55) reported being in the same age range. Women outnumbered men in four of the seven age groups represented in the student sample (see Table 9).

Race or Ethnicity

Item 4 on the PIF-S asked students to identify their race or ethnicity. This was a free-response item. Of the 103 students participating in the study, 81 identified themselves as white or Caucasian. In the white or Caucasian group, 53 were female and 28 were male. Two women students identified themselves as Black/African American and one woman student identified herself as Asian. The rest of the students identified themselves as: American (n = 2), European/American (n = 1), Irish American (n = 1), Hispanic (n = 1), American Indian/Western European (n = 1), Indian (n = 1), and Italian (n = 1). Eleven students did not respond to this item.

Education

Item 3 on the PIF-S asked students to indicate their highest degree or diploma earned. The largest number of student participants reported having earned either a Bachelor's degree or a Master's degree. These two groups combined accounted for almost 71% of students in the sample. Students who reported holding high school diplomas or associate degrees accounted for over 22% of the sample. Table 10 shows the highest degree or diploma earned by student participants.

Table 10. Student Highest Degree or Diploma

Highest degree or diploma	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
High School	14	13.6	13.6
Associate	9	8.7	22.3
Bachelor's	37	35.9	58.2
Specialist	1	1.0	59.2
Master's	32	31.1	90.3
Master's + Specialist	4	3.9	94.2
Doctorate	6	5.8	100
Total	103	100.0	

Culture of Educational Experience

Most student participants reported that their educational experiences had taken place solely in the United States. Ninety-five students reported elementary and secondary school experience only in the United States. Four students reported having attended elementary and secondary schools in the United States and in one (n = 3) or two (n = 1) other countries, i.e. Canada, Austria, Guam, India, and Italy. Three students had attended elementary and secondary schools only in countries outside the United States (i.e., Argentina, Brazil, and Ireland). One student did not respond to this item.

Eighty-nine of the 103 students reported attending post-secondary institutions solely in the United States. Seven students had attended post-secondary institutions in the United States and in one other country (i.e., in Brazil, Chile, Spain, Austria, Canada, and France) and one student had attended a post-secondary institution in two other countries (i.e., Mexico and Spain). One student had attended a post-secondary institution only in a country outside the United States, in Argentina. Three students responded "not applicable" to this item. There was no response from two students.

One hundred students reported having earned their highest degree or diploma in the United States. Two students reported having earned a degree or diploma outside the USA, one in Ireland and one in Argentina. One student responded with a "not applicable."

There were 52 pairs of students and teachers in the same classes in the data base. Table 11 shows the culture of education match for the student-teacher pairs.

Table 11. Culture of Education Match: Student-Teacher

Culture of education match: Student-Teacher	N	Percent	Valid percent
Both Student, Teacher: Only US	18	17.5	34.6
Student only US, Teacher only Other	8	7.8	15.4
Student only US, Teacher Other + US	17	16.5	32.7
Both Student, Teacher: US + different Other	6	5.8	11.5
Teacher only US, Student US + Other	2	1.9	3.8
Teacher only Other, Student US + different Other	1	1.0	1.9
Total Student-Teacher pairs	52	50.5	100.0
Missing	51	49.5	
Total	103	100.0	

An examination of the educational experience of these pairs revealed that nine student-teacher pairs had educational experiences in different cultural contexts and that the teachers in these pairs had not attended an American educational institution. There were 20 student-teacher pairs where the teachers had experience only in American educational institutions. The students in these pairs had all attended school in the U.S., although two students in this group also had experienced education in another culture.

Languages Spoken

Of the 103 students in the sample, 99 reported English as their native language.

Four students reported a language other than English as their native language (i.e.,

Spanish, Gujarati, Vietnamese, and Portuguese).

Item 10 on the PIF-S asked students to identify the languages they speak. This

was a free-response item. No definition was provided on the PIF-S for what it means to

speak a language. Student participants reported the languages they could speak

according to their own definition of what it means to speak a language. Table 12 shows

the number of foreign languages (i.e., languages other than their native language) that

student participants reported speaking.

Table 12. Number of Foreign Languages Spoken by Students: Frequencies

Number of foreign languages spoken by students	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
0	57	55.3	55.3
1	32	31.1	86.4
2	11	10.7	97.1
3	2	1.9	99.0
8	1	1.0	100.0
Total	103	100.0	

The majority of students reported speaking no language other than their native

language. On the other hand, almost 45% of students reported speaking at least one

language other than their native language. One student reported speaking eight languages

beyond her native English: French, Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese, Persian, Arabic,

Croatian, and German.

Table 13 shows the number of foreign languages, in addition to the native

language, spoken by student participants, grouped by reported native language.

Table 13. Number of Foreign Languages Spoken by Students, Grouped by Native
Language

Number of foreign languages spoken	Student native language					
	English	Spanish	Gujarati	Vietnamese	Portuguese	Total
0	57	0	0	0	0	57
1	30	1	0	1	0	32
2	9	0	1	0	1	11
3	2	0	0	0	0	2
8	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	99	1	1	1	1	103

Of the 99 student participants whose native language was English, almost one-

third reported speaking one other language. Twelve native English-speaking students

reported speaking two or more languages beyond their native language. As a group,

student participants reported that they spoke 13 different languages beyond their native

language: Arabic (n = 2), Bosnian-Croatian (n = 3), Chinese (n = 1), English (n = 4),

French (n = 16), German (n = 14), Hindi (n = 1), Italian (n = 4), Japanese (n = 1), Persian

(n = 1), Portuguese (n = 1), Spanish (n = 20), and Vietnamese (n = 1).

Language Study

At the beginning of the semester in which the study took place, there were 524

students enrolled in 33 foreign language courses with the words *beginning* or *for first*

timers in the title. Spanish was the language with the highest enrollment. Total

enrollment in beginning Spanish classes was 264 in 15 class sessions compared to the

260 students enrolled in the 18 beginning-level classes in all the other languages offered

that semester. After Spanish, Italian and French courses had the largest enrollments.

With regard to the student sample, the number of returns were highest for students

in Spanish (n = 48) and Italian (n = 22) classes. The percentage of student returns was

largest for Bosnian-Croatian (38.1%) and Italian (37.3%) classes, followed by German

(21.2%) and Japanese (20.0%) classes. Because the researcher did not have access to the

number of students who persisted into the second half of each class session (i.e., the time

period when study instruments were made available), it was impossible to determine the

true student participation rate for each class and each language. Table 14 shows student

participation data sorted by language.

Table 14. Student Participation by Language of Enrollment

Language	Number of courses	Number of students enrolled	Number of student returns	Percent return
Spanish	15	264	48	18.2
Italian	4	59	22	37.3
French	4	49	3	6.1
German	2	38	8	21.1
Chinese	3	31	5	16.1
Arabic	2	29	3	10.3
Bosnian-Croatian	1	21	8	38.1
Japanese	1	20	4	20.0
Russian	1	13	2	15.4
Total	33	524	103	19.7

Real and False Beginners. Item 12 on the PIF-S was a free-response item which

asked students to report the *number of years spent studying the language I am studying in*

this course. The majority of students reported having studied the language in which they

were currently enrolled for less than one year. Over 43% of students reported having

studied the current language for more than one year. Table 15 summarizes the time

students reported studying the language in which they were currently enrolled.

Table 15. Years Studying Language of Enrollment

Years studying	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
< 1	58	56.3	56.3
1	24	23.3	79.6
1.5	3	2.9	82.5
2	4	3.9	86.4
3	10	9.7	96.1
4	2	1.9	98.0
6	1	1.0	99.0
10	1	1.0	100.0
Total	103	100.0	

Item 12 was included in the present study because a review of the literature

suggested that integrating novice language learners and more advanced beginning

students in the same class can influence the learning experience of the novice language

learners as well as teaching choices related to activities, pace, and assessment. In a study

of the composition of beginning-level foreign language classes in a university, Loughrin-

Sacco (1991) defined the beginner as a student having less than two years' prior study of

the language being studied. Palmunen (1995) modified Loughrin-Sacco's definition for

use in organizing a Weekend College program. She used the term true beginner for the

student with "little or no prior knowledge of the target language" (p. 350).

The wording of Item 12 on the PIF-S did not elicit the types of responses which

could adequately identify which students would fall into the beginner category as defined

by Palmunen (1995). Being a free-response item, student answers for Item 12 did not indicate whether students included in their response the time spent studying the language in the current course. In addition, Palmunen provided no guidelines as to how *little prior knowledge* was defined. Some students in the present study reported taking a course or "short courses." It was unclear, however, how many days, weeks, or months of study constituted a short course. For these reasons, the researcher chose to create a new term, Real Beginner, for students with less than one year experience studying the language in which they were enrolled.

Table 16 shows the distribution of Real Beginners and more experienced beginning language students in the study sample.

Table 16. Language Learning Experience: Real and False Beginners

Language learning experience	Frequency	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Real Beginner[a]	58	56.3	56.3
False Beginner 1[b]	27	26.2	82.5
False Beginner 2[c]	18	17.5	100.0
Total False Beginners	45	43.7	
Total	103	100.0	

[a] Real Beginner = less than 1 year of language study
[b] False Beginner 1 = 1 year or more, less than 2 years of language study
[c] Corresponds to Loughrin-Sacco's (1991) definition: two years or more of previous language study

Real Beginner students (n = 58) accounted for over 56% of all student participants. Of the Real Beginners, five students wrote that this course was their first exposure to the language being studied. Fourteen additional students in this category reported experience with the current language of between one and three months. Some students reported studying the current language for one semester (n = 2), 6 months (n = 3), or by the number of courses taken: one course (n = 1), three short courses (n = 1).

Item 12 did not elicit information on the educational context within which the language study took place (e.g., high school course, university course, Continuing Education course, or personal tutoring).

Loughrin-Sacco's (1991) study of less-experienced and more-experienced beginning language students defined false beginners as students with two or more years of previous study of language. Revising this definition for the Weekend College program at her institution, Palmunen (1995) defined the false beginner as a student with one year or more of language study or *life* experience with the language being studied. Item 12 on the PIF-S in the present study referred explicitly to studying the foreign language of enrollment and did not ask about life experience with the language either in the context of work or family.

The current study identified two levels of more experienced beginning language learners present in the sample, False Beginner 1 and False Beginner 2 (see Table 16). False Beginner 1 refers to student participants with one year or more, but less than two years, of study experience with the language in which they were currently enrolled. False Beginner 2 refers to student participants with two years or more of study experience with the language in which they were currently enrolled. The category False Beginner 2 corresponds to Loughrin-Sacco's (1991) definition of false beginners, students with two or more years of previous study of language.

It may appear that the combined total for the categories False Beginner 1 and False Beginner 2 corresponds to Palmunen's (1995) definition of false beginners. However, Palmunen included having life experience with the language in her definition of false beginners. The present study only elicited information about the number of years

spent studying the language in which the student was currently enrolled. By using the categories False Beginner 1 and 2, this study provides a more precise way of emphasizing the levels of experience with language study present in the data than would the terms used by Palmunen or Loughrin-Sacco (1991).

False Beginners accounted for almost 44% of student participants in the sample (see Table 16, 256). Almost all of the students in the False Beginner 1 category reported having 1 year experience with the language being studied (see Table 15, p. 255). False Beginner 2 students account for over 17% of the more experienced beginning students. They reported a range of between 2 and 10 years of prior language study experience with the language in which they were currently enrolled. Ten False Beginner 2 students reported 3 years of experience with the language they were studying in their beginning-level courses (see Table 15, p. 255).

In summary, Real Beginners accounted for over half of the students taking beginning-level foreign language classes in this sample. However, the number of students with 1 to 10 years of experience with the language currently being studied suggests that beginning-level foreign language classes in this sample were a mix of novice and more experienced language learners.

Other languages studied. Eighty-nine student participants responded to free-response Item 17 on the PIF-S: *Other languages I am currently studying or have previously studied.* More than two-thirds of the student sample reported experience with learning other languages. Table 17 shows the number of other languages students reported having studied or currently studying, other than the language of enrollment.

Table 17. Number of Other Languages Studied or Studying, Other than Language of Enrollment

Other languages studied/studying	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
0	19	18.4	22.9	22.9
1	42	40.8	50.6	73.5
2	11	10.7	13.3	86.8
3	7	6.8	8.4	95.2
4	2	1.9	2.4	97.6
5	1	1.0	1.2	98.8
8	1	1.0	1.2	100.0
Total	83	80.6	100.0	
"Not applicable"	6	5.8		
Missing	14	13.6		
Total	103	100.0		

The 83 students who responded to this item reported that, in addition to the language in which they were currently enrolled, they had studied or were also currently studying French (n = 35), Spanish (n = 21), and German (n = 16). Ten students reported studying Latin. Other languages which students reported studying were Italian (n = 7), Japanese (n = 4), Greek (n = 2), and Bosnian-Croatian (n = 2). One student each reported having studied or currently studying Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Russian, Gaelic-Irish, Malagasy, Persian, Portuguese, and English in addition to the language in which they were currently enrolled.

Student Goals

Items 13 and 15 on the PIF-S were open-ended items which asked student participants to identify their primary and other goals for the course in which they were

enrolled. Students' responses were analyzed according to key words and ideas present in the data. Five categories of goals were identified: Language Learning, Language Knowledge, Specific Language Skills, Use of the Language being studied, and goals related to Personal Motivation. Table 18 summarizes student responses about primary and other goals within each of the five categories identified.

Table 18. Student Goals

Goal	Primary	Other
Language Learning		
Learn another/new language	2	5
Begin process of language learning	2	0
Explore a new language	1	0
Introduction to/familiarity with language	7	0
Feel comfortable with learning new language	0	1
Advance in language learning		
Advance, continue language study	5	4
Build on what has been learned	1	0
Supplement telecourse learning	0	1
Total	18	11
Language Knowledge		
Basic knowledge/understanding of language	17	2
Understanding/comprehension of language	2	3
Good foundation for language learning	1	1
How the language works	1	0
Structure of language	2	1
Improve/develop language skills	7	2
Refresher course in language	2	1
Grammar		
Declensions of nouns	0	1
Conjugation of verbs	0	2
Vocabulary		
Learn vocabulary	1	2
Understand words	1	0
Learn common expressions, idioms, words	1	2
Increase vocabulary	2	1
Reading vocabulary	0	1
Form simple sentences	0	1
Alphabet	1	1
Survival language	1	1
Compare different languages	0	1
Total	39	23
Specific Language Skills		
Reading		
Reading	3	2
Read signs and menus	1	1
Writing	1	0

Table 18, continued

Goal	Primary	Other
Listening		
Understand conversation	1	0
Understand spoken language	1	1
Understanding/comprehension of language	2	3
Speaking		
Speaking/conversation skills	29	8
Speak and understand language	8	2
Speak with native speakers of language	3	2
Pronunciation	1	2
Learn about Culture of Language	1	6
Total	51	27
Use of Language		
Use the language	1	1
Limited aural [sic] communication	1	0
Communicate with relative/spouse/in-laws	2	1
Speak with native language speakers	3	3
Fluency/proficiency		
Fluency/move toward fluency in language	4	0
Proficiency at elementary level	1	0
Work/job skills	1	2
Business	1	0
Retirement/Move to country of language	1	0
Travel	16	4
Missions trips	1	0
Genealogy research	0	1
Adoption	1	0
Total	33	12
Personal Motivation		
Get out of the apartment	0	1
Fun	0	5
Pleasure	1	1
Recreation	2	0
Confidence	0	1
New learning	0	2
Intellectual stimulation/brain and mind active	1	7
Individual challenge/goal	1	0
Language of ancestors	1	0
Total	6	17

Note. Goals were organized according to key words and ideas in student responses. Some student responses contained more than one key word or idea. For this reason, the total number of goals represented in this table exceeds the number of student participants.

With regard to students' *primary* goals for the course being taken, responses referring to specific language skills accounted for the largest group of responses. Speaking outweighed reading, writing, and listening as the most important student goal in this category. Only one student response about the primary goal included learning about the culture of the language being studied.

Beyond certain specific language skills, the other most important groups of responses for primary goals were related to knowledge of the language being studied and using the language. Language learning was the fourth most important group of goals identified. A small number of students mentioned personal motivation, the fifth group of responses identified, as all or part of their primary goal for the course in which they were enrolled.

An examination of responses about *other* goals for the course being taken indicated that learning specific language skills was again the most important group of student responses, as it had been for the primary goal responses. Within this group, speaking was the most important *other* goal when compared to reading, writing, and listening, as it had been for the primary goal responses. Culture was mentioned by six students responding to the *other goal(s)* item on the PIF-S.

Language knowledge represented the second most important group of *other goal(s)* responses. Personal Motivation and Language Learning were the third and fourth categories with the most responses for *other* goals. Using the language being studied was the group with the least number of responses for this item.

In addition to identifying their primary and other goals for the language course in which they were enrolled, students were asked to report the extent to which they felt they

had achieved their primary and other goals on a scale of 0 (*Goal not achieved)* to 10

(*Goal achieved 100%).* Table 19 shows the response patterns for students' achievement

of primary and other goals.

Table 19. Achievement of Student Goals: Frequencies

Achievement of goal	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Primary Goal Achieved[a]				
1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
2	4	3.9	3.9	4.9
3	12	11.7	11.7	16.5
4	13	12.6	12.6	29.1
5	16	15.5	15.5	44.7
6	9	8.7	8.7	53.4
7	13	12.6	12.6	66.0
8	17	16.5	16.5	82.5
9	5	4.9	4.9	87.4
10	13	12.6	12.6	100.0
Total	103	100.0	100.0	

Table 19, continued.

	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Other Goal(s) Achieved[a]				
1.00	1	1.0	1.7	1.7
2.00	0	0	0	1.7
3.00	5	4.9	8.3	10.0
4.00	5	4.9	8.3	18.3
5.00	3	2.9	5.0	23.3
6.00	9	8.7	15.0	38.3
7.00	5	4.9	8.3	46.7
8.00	14	13.6	23.3	70.0
9.00	5	4.9	8.3	78.3
10.00	13	12.6	21.7	100.0
Total	60	58.3	100.0	
"Not applicable"	9	8.7		
Missing	34	33.0		
Total	103	100.0		

[a] Achievement of goals reported on a scale from 0 (*Goal not achieved*) to 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*)

For the primary goal, reports of achievement at 7 or above accounted for over 46% of total responses (see Table 19). Almost 62% of students gave the achievement of other goals a rating of 7 or above .

The mean for achievement of primary goals (6.15) was lower than the mean rating for achievement of other goals (7.12). Table 20 presents the descriptive statistics on student responses for achievement of primary and other goals.

Table 20. Achievement of Student Goals: Descriptive Statistics

	Achievement of goal	
	Primary goal	Other goal(s)
N Valid	103	60
Missing	0	43
Median	6.00	8.00
Mode	8.00	8.00
Mean	6.15	7.12
Std. Deviation	2.42	2.37
Range (min. – max.)	1 – 10	1 – 10

Note. Achievement of goals reported on a scale of 0 (*Goal not achieved*) to 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*)

Satisfaction with Language Learning

Table 21 reports the distribution of student ratings for satisfaction with language learning. Over 75% of students in the sample reported high satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above, as defined in Sub-question 4).

Table 21. Satisfaction with Language Learning: Frequencies

Satisfaction with language learning	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
2.00	2	1.9	2.1	2.1
4.00	4	3.9	4.2	6.3
5.00	7	6.8	7.4	13.7
6.00	10	9.7	10.5	24.2
7.00	12	11.7	12.6	36.8
8.00	25	24.3	26.3	63.2
9.00	16	15.5	16.8	80.0
10.00	19	18.4	20.0	100.0
Total	95	92.2	100.0	
Missing	8	7.8		
Total	103	100.0		

Note. Satisfaction with language learning reported on a scale of 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest possible satisfaction*)

Table 22 presents the descriptive statistics on student satisfaction with language learning.

Table 22. Satisfaction with Language Learning: Descriptive Statistics

	Satisfaction with language learning
N Valid	95
Missing	8
Median	8.00
Mode	8.00
Mean	7.72
Std. Deviation	1.89
Range (min. – max.)	2 – 10

General Experience with Language Study

Students were asked to rate their general experience with language study, past and present, on a scale of 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) to 10 (*Totally satisfactory*). One hundred student participants responded to this item. Seventy-one percent of the responses were at the level of 7 or above. Table 23 shows the frequencies for student ratings of General Experience with Language Study, past and present.

Table 23. General Experience with Language Study: Frequencies

General experience with language study	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
2	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
3	3	2.9	3.0	4.0
4	4	3.9	4.0	8.0
5	6	5.8	6.0	14.0
6	15	14.6	15.0	29.0
7	14	13.6	14.0	43.0
8	25	24.3	25.0	68.0
9	19	18.4	19.0	87.0
10	13	12.6	13.0	100.0
Total	100	97.1	100.0	
Missing	3	2.9		
Total	103	100.0		

Note. General experience with language study reported on a scale of 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) - 10 (*Totally satisfactory*)

Table 24 presents the descriptive statistics for students' general experience with language study, past and present.

Table 24. General Experience with Language Study: Descriptive Statistics

General experience with language study	
N Valid	100
Missing	3
Median	8.00
Mode	8.00
Mean	7.46
Std. Deviation	1.87
Range (min. – max.)	2 – 10

Perception of Instructional Perspective

Students in noncredit foreign language courses reported their perceptions of beginning-level teachers' instructional perspective on the MIPI-S. High scores on the MIPI-S indicate that students perceive a high degree of the use of andragogical principles in their classrooms. Descriptive statistics for MIPI-S summative and subscale scores revealed that the summative score and all subscale scores, except one, were negatively skewed. A more detailed discussion of MIPI-S scores is found in the Research Questions, Sub-question 1 section of this chapter. Table 25 shows the descriptive statistics on MIPI-S subscale and summative scores.

Table 25. MIPI-S: Descriptive Statistics

MIPI-S Factor	N	Min. possible	Max. possible	Mean	*SD*	*SE*	Skew	Kurtosis
1	103	5	25	22.47	2.51	.28	-1.26	1.69
2	103	11	55	47.25	6.19	.61	-.68	-.04
3	103	5	25	18.69	3.82	.38	-.43	-.09
4	103	7	35	26.23	4.28	.42	-.29	-.03
5	103	7	35	32.08	3.24	.32	-1.16	.51
6	103	5	25	14.67	3.86	.38	.24	-.15
7	103	5	25	11.13	2.89	.28	-.07	-.69
Sum	103	45	225	172.52	17.75	1.75	-.59	-.00

Stanton (2005) created categories for MIPI scores to describe teachers' use of andragogical principles (see Appendix E). The categories established by Stanton were adopted in this study to describe student perceptions of instructional perspective as reported on the MIPI-S. Over 60% of students (n = 62) rated their teachers in the Average category for use of andragogical principles. The number of students who rated their teachers in the Above Average (n = 24) and High Above Average (n = 4) categories combined was more than twice the number of students rating their teachers in the Below Average category (n = 13) for use of andragogical principles. Table 26 presents the MIPI-S summative scores by category.

Table 26. MIPI-S Summative Scores by Category

MIPI-S summative score by category	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
Below Average	13	12.6	12.6
Average	62	60.2	72.8
Above Average	24	23.3	96.1
High Above Average	4	3.9	100.0
Total	103	100.0	

In summary, students participating in this study were predominantly women. The majority of students reported being white/Caucasian and aged 40 or over. Almost all students reported English as their native language. While the majority of students reported speaking no language other than English, almost 45% reported speaking one or more languages in addition to their native language. Student participants tended to be well-educated with most holding either a Bachelor's or Master's degree. For most students, their educational experience in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools was solely in American educational institutions.

The majority of students had previously studied or were currently studying at least one foreign language in addition to the language in which they were currently enrolled. French, Spanish, and German were the languages which the largest numbers of students reported studying or having studied.

Students identified speaking as the most important primary goal they had for their current language course. Knowledge of the language being studied and using the language in a specific context were other important goals. The majority of students reported above average satisfaction ratings for achievement of their goals.

The majority of students reported high satisfaction with language learning and with their general experience with language study, past and present. Over 60% of student ratings of their teachers' use of andragogical principles fell in the Average category level on the MIPI-S, while 27% of ratings fell in or above the Above Average category.

<div align="center">Characteristics of Teacher Participants</div>

The teacher sample for this study was comprised of eight teachers of beginning-level noncredit foreign language courses. The PIF-I was used to collect demographic, educational, and teaching experience data from teachers. Teachers were asked to provide information about age, gender, race or ethnicity, highest educational degree or diploma earned, the country or countries in which they had taught, and languages spoken. In addition they were asked about amount of teaching experience, exposure to adult learning information, and goals for the class being taught.

Age

The PIF-I asked teachers to indicate their age group: 18 - 19, 20 - 29, 30 - 39, 40 - 49, 50 - 59, 60 - 69, 70 - 79, and 80 + years. Seven of the eight teachers reported being age 40 - 49 or older, accounting for 87.5% of the teacher sample. As expected, no teachers reported being in the 18 - 19 age group. At least one teacher was represented in each of the other age groups, except in the 30 - 39 group. Table 27 shows data on the teacher sample grouped by gender and age.

Table 27. Teacher Gender Grouped by Age

	Age group								
Gender	18-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Total
Male	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
Female	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Total	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	8

Gender

Female teachers (n = 5) made up 62.5% of the teacher sample. All male teachers (n = 3) reported being in the 40-49 age group or older age groups. All female teachers, except one, reported being age 40-49 or older (see Table 27).

Race or Ethnicity

Item 3 on the PIF-I asked teachers to identify their race or ethnicity. This was a free-response item. Two teachers reported being white/Caucasian. Other teachers reported their race or ethnicity as: white/Hispanic (n = 1), Hispanic (n = 1), Asian (n = 1), Italian (n = 1). Two teachers did not respond to this item.

Education

Of the eight teacher participants, four reported having a Master's degree. The other teachers reported having earned the following degrees: Associate degree (n = 1), Bachelor's degree (n = 2), doctorate (n = 1). The PIF-I did not ask teachers to report the field or discipline in which they received their highest earned degree.

Culture of Educational Experience

Teachers reported diverse educational experiences. Six of the eight teacher participants reported elementary and secondary school experience in Bosnia-Herzegovina (n = 1), Cuba (n = 1), China (n = 1), Italy (n = 1), Lebanon (n = 1), and Peru (n = 1). The other two teachers reported attending elementary and secondary schools solely in the United States.

With regard to postsecondary education, five teachers reported attending post-secondary institutions in one country only: the United States (n = 2), Italy (n = 1), Cuba (n = 1), and Bosnia-Herzegovina (n = 1). Three teachers had attended postsecondary

institutions in the United States and one other country: Lebanon (n = 1), Peru (n = 1), and China (n = 1).

Five of the eight teachers reported that the country of their highest degree or diploma was earned in the United States. The other three teachers had received their highest degrees from educational institutions in Cuba, Italy, and Peru.

Culture of Education Match between Teachers and Students

A comparison between teacher and student cultures of education was possible for over 50% of the student sample (see Table 11, p. 251). The culture of previous education or learning was the same for more than one-third of students and teachers. For this group, both teachers and students had been educated solely in the United States. Another important group in the sample was comprised of students who had been educated solely in the U.S. and teachers who had been educated in the U.S. and a country outside the U.S. Almost one-third of the students and teacher matches fell in this group. Student-teacher pairs where both had some experience with the other's culture of educational experience or learning made up over 82% of the sample.

Nine students had a teacher whose only educational experiences were in a country other than the U.S. Of these students, all but one had been educated solely in the U.S. That one student had been educated in the U.S. and Canada while his teacher had been educated solely in a Western European country. For each student-teacher pair in this group, neither the student nor the teacher had experience attending school in the educational culture in which the other had been educated.

Languages Spoken

Of the eight teacher participants in the present study, two reported English as their native language. The other six teachers reported that their native language was the language of the class which they were teaching: Arabic, Bosnian/Serbo-Croatian, Italian, Chinese, or Spanish.

All teachers reported being at least bilingual. Table 28 shows the number of languages (other than the native language) spoken by teachers in the sample.

Table 28. Number of Foreign Languages Spoken by Teachers

Number of foreign languages spoken	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
1	5	62.5	62.5
3	2	25.0	87.5
4	1	12.5	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

For five of the 6 teachers whose native language was not English, the only other language they spoke was English. The sixth teacher whose native language was not English reported speaking French, ancient Greek, and Latin in addition to his native Italian. The languages teachers reported speaking, other than their native language and English, were Greek/ancient Greek, Latin, French, German, and Russian.

Teaching Experience

Teachers reported teaching experience ranging from 3 to 62 years. Three teachers reported spending their entire teaching career teaching foreign language. Only two teachers reported spending their entire teaching career teaching foreign language to adult students. Table 29 shows the amount and type of teaching experience reported by teacher participants.

Table 29. Teaching Experience

Teacher	Total teaching	Teaching foreign language	Teaching foreign language to adults
		Years of teaching experience	
T1	3	2	2
T2	13	5	5
T3	25	15	3
T4	3	3	0.5
T5	3	3	3
T6	22	22	22
T7	62	35	26
T8	25	8	6

Language teaching experience. Foreign language teaching experience in the teacher sample ranged from 2 to 35 years. Six teachers reported they were currently teaching their native language. The other two teachers in the sample were native English-speakers teaching the only foreign language they reported speaking.

With regard to the number of languages teachers had experience teaching, four teachers reported having taught no other language than the language they were currently teaching. Three teachers teaching their native language reported also having taught English (n = 2) and French (n = 1). One native English-speaker reported having taught ESL in addition to the foreign language she was presently teaching.

Culture of teaching experience. The PIF-I included a free-response item asking teachers about *the country/countries in which I have taught*. Five of the eight teachers in the sample had experience teaching outside the United States. Five of the six teachers teaching their native language had teaching experience in a country where their native

language was spoken in addition to experience teaching in the United States. The sixth teacher in this group had taught only in the United States. Both native-English speaking teachers had only taught in the United States.

Exposure to Adult Learning Information

Item 20 on the PIF-I asked teachers if they had been exposed to information on adult learning. Item 21 was a free-response item which asked for the source of any adult learning information to which they had been exposed.

Three teachers reported no exposure to adult learning information. The five teachers who had been exposed to adult learning information reported the following sources of that information: "random lectures and seminars on adult education;" "students' evaluations;" "seminars, college classes;" "the Internet, books, and my own experience as a student in ESL (many years ago) classes (what really I need to learn the new language);" and the coordinator of the Continuing Education foreign language classes at the community college hosting the study.

Teacher Goals

Open-ended items 16 and 18 on the PIF-I asked teachers to identify their primary and other goals for the course they were teaching. All eight teachers reported their primary goals for the nine classes represented in the sample. In addition, six teachers reported *other* goals for their classes. Teachers' responses were analyzed according to key words and ideas present in the data. The same categories of goals found in the student responses were found to be applicable to the teacher data: Language Learning, Language Knowledge, Specific Language Skills, Use of the Language being studied, and

goals related to Personal Motivation. Table 30 summarizes the data on teacher primary

and other goals.

Table 30. Teacher Goals

Goal	Primary	Other
Language Learning		
Introduction to/familiarity with language	1	0
Helping everyone learn language	2	0
Affective environment of learning		
Make class interesting	0	1
Make class fun	0	2
Make students feel comfortable being in class	0	1
Make students feel comfortable speaking language	0	1
Total	3	5
Language Knowledge		
Teach the language	1	0
Good foundation for language learning	1	0
Grammar		
Basic grammar	2	2
Understand verb conjugations	1	0
Alphabet	1	0
Total	6	2
Specific Language Skills		
Speaking		
Speaking/conversation skills	3	0
Pronunciation of alphabet	1	0
Learn about/appreciate culture/history of language	1	5
Total	5	5
Use of Language		
For everyday use	1	0
For work	1	0
For pleasure/travel	1	0
Total	3	0
Personal Motivation		
Teach to best of my ability	1	0
To make friends	0	1
Push down barriers of misunderstanding	0	1
Total	1	2

Note. Goals were categorized according to key words and ideas in teacher responses. Some teacher responses contained more than one key word or idea. For this reason, the total number of goals represented in this table exceeds the number of teacher participants.

Teachers' responses about primary goals focused on language knowledge and specific language skills. As with the student primary goals, speaking was the skill most often mentioned. Personal motivation factors were the least important category for teachers.

Specific language skills, notably learning about culture, accounted for one of the two largest groups of teacher responses about *other* goals. Equally important for teachers was shaping the affective learning environment. No teacher responses fell in the Use of Language category for other goals.

Table 31 compares teacher and student responses by category of goal.

Table 31. Comparison: Teacher and Student Goals

Goals	Responses	Percent	Responses	Percent
	Teachers (n = 9)		Students (n = 103)	
Primary Goal				
Language Learning	3	33.3	18	17.5
Language Knowledge	6	66.7	39	37.8
Specific Language Skills	5	55.6	51	49.5
Use of Language	3	33.3	33	32.0
Personal Motivation	1	11.1	6	5.8
	Teachers (n = 6)		Students (n = 69)	
Other Goal(s)				
Language Learning	5	83.3	11	15.9
Language Knowledge	2	33.3	23	33.3
Specific Language Skills	5	83.3	27	39.1
Use of Language	0	0	12	17.4
Personal Motivation	2	33.3	17	24.6

Note. Goals were categorized according to key words and ideas in student and teacher responses. Some student and teacher responses contained more than one key word or idea. For this reason, the total number of goals represented in this table exceeds the number of student and teacher participants.

The two most important primary goals for both teachers and students fell in the Language Knowledge and Specific Language Skills response categories. Language Knowledge was the highest priority for teachers where it was only second in importance for students (see also Table 18, p. 261 and Table 30, p. 278) Both groups had an equal interest in students being able to use the language. The least important primary goal response category for teachers and students was Personal Motivation.

For teachers, the two most important categories for other goals were Language Learning and Specific Language Skills. Specific Language Skills was also the most important category for students' other goals with Language Knowledge being the second most important category of student response. Teachers and students both indicated that Personal Motivation was more important as an *other* goal than it was as a *primary* goal.

In addition to identifying their primary and other goals for the language course(s) which they were teaching, teachers were asked to report the extent to which they felt they had achieved these goals on a scale of 0 (*Goal(s) not achieved)* to 10 (*I fulfilled this goal/these goals 100%).* All eight teachers reported the extent to which they achieved their primary goal in the nine classes represented in the teacher sample. Ratings for achievement of primary goal ranged from six to ten. Six teachers reported on the extent to which they achieved their other goals in the seven classes they taught. Ratings regarding achievement of other goals ranged from seven to nine. Table 32 summarizes the data on teacher responses about achievement of primary and other goals.

Table 32. Achievement of Teacher Goals: Frequencies

Achievement of goal	N	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Primary Goal Achieved				
6.00	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
7.00	3	33.3	33.3	44.4
8.00	2	22.2	22.2	66.8
9.00	2	22.2	22.2	88.9
10.00	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	
Other Goal(s) Achieved				
7.00	2	22.2	28.6	28.6
8.00	1	11.1	14.3	42.9
9.00	4	44.4	57.1	100.0
Total	7	77.8	100.0	
Missing	2	22.2		
Total	9	100.0		

Note. Achievement reported on a scale of 0 (*Goal not achieved*) to 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*)

As with student responses, the mean rating for teacher achievement of other goals was higher than the mean rating for teacher achievement of the primary goal. Table 33 shows the descriptive statistics for teachers' achievement of primary and other goals.

Table 33. Achievement of Teacher Goals: Descriptive Statistics

	Achievement of goal	
	Primary goal	Other goal(s)
N Valid	9	7
Missing	0	2
Median	8.00	9.00
Mode	7.00	9.00
Mean	7.89	8.29
Std. Deviation	1.27	.95
Range (min. – max.)	6 – 10	7 – 9

Note. Achievement reported in a range from 0 (*Goal not achieved*) to 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*)

Instructional Perspective

Eight teachers returned the MIPI for nine different classes. The MIPI is a self-report instrument measuring the use of andragogical principles. The higher the score on the MIPI, the higher the teacher's reported use of andragogical principles. An examination of MIPI data revealed that MIPI summative scores were not normally distributed (see Table 48, p. 325) and negatively skewed. In addition, five MIPI subscale scores were negatively skewed. Table 34 shows the descriptive statistics for MIPI subscale and summative scores. A more detailed discussion of MIPI scores is found in the Research Questions, Sub-question 2 section of this chapter.

Table 34. MIPI: Descriptive Statistics

MIPI Factor	N	Min. possible	Max. possible	Mean	*SD*	*SE*	Skew	Kurtosis
1	9	5	25	21.78	2.49	.83	-.74	.18
2	9	11	55	47.90	6.14	2.05	-.62	-.60
3	9	5	25	19.49	2.56	.85	.08	-1.77
4	9	7	35	28.67	4.27	1.42	-.72	.38
5	9	7	35	27.69	3.80	1.27	.10	-1.36
6	9	5	25	15.58	3.76	1.25	-.98	-.03
7	9	5	25	9.78	2.86	.95	-.41	-1.20
Sum	9	45	225	170.89	11.91	3.97	-1.93	5.44

Stanton (2007) created categories for MIPI summative scores to classify teachers' use of andragogical principles (see Appendix E). Seven of nine teacher MIPI summative scores fell in the Average category for use of andragogical principles. No teacher score fell in the High Above Average category. Table 35 reports teachers' summative MIPI scores by category.

Table 35. MIPI Summative Scores by Category: Frequencies

MIPI summative scores by category	N	Percent	Cumulative percent
Below Average	1	11.1	11.1
Average	7	77.8	88.9
Above Average	1	11.1	100.0
High Above Average	0	0	
Total	9	100.0	

In summary, female teachers outnumbered male teachers in the teacher sample. Most teachers reported being age 40 - 49 or older and having earned a Master's degree or higher. Teachers in the sample came from a variety of racial, ethnic, and educational cultures. All teachers reported being at least bilingual.

Most of the teachers in the sample were teaching their native language and had taught no language other than their native language. The majority of teachers had experience teaching in two different countries. More than half of the teachers had taught foreign language for part of their teaching careers and three teachers reported all their teaching experience in foreign language teaching. Two teachers had spent their entire teaching careers teaching foreign language to adults.

Teachers' primary and other goals for their class were generally similar to student goals. Teacher and student primary goal responses gave priority to speaking skills and language knowledge. The teaching of culture and the affective learning environment were equally important other goals for teachers. Teachers gave the achievement of their primary and other goals above-average ratings.

Over half of the teachers had been exposed to adult learning information. The majority of teacher scores on the MIPI were found to be in the Average category for use of andragogical principles.

MIPI and MIPI-S Results

The MIPI and MIPI-S Results section discusses the examination and evaluation of the data collected from these two instruments. The type and amount of missing values in the sample are described and the treatment of missing values is explained. The presence of outliers in the data set is examined. Next, the reliability of the instruments is reported. The criteria for selecting the statistical tests for data analysis is then discussed. Finally, the application of the appropriate statistical tests and the results of those tests are reported for each research question.

Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data

One of the assumptions of statistical procedures is sound measurement (Garson, 2009f). Sound measurement requires that data entry and coding be free of errors. Before entering the data for this study into a statistical software program, all returned instruments were first examined to ensure that they were from the target populations, students in beginning language courses and their teachers. As discussed in the Population and Sample section of this chapter, seven students returned study instruments which had been distributed in an intermediate-level class. The instructor for this intermediate class had also returned study instruments. All student and teacher instruments for this intermediate-level class were eliminated from the data base.

Having ensured that all data were from the appropriate target populations, the MIPI, MIPI-S, PIF-S, and PIF-I data were entered into the statistical software program SPSS Statistics 17.0. Each case with missing values was examined to identify the type of data found to be missing. All missing data in the student and teacher samples were the result of a student or teacher participant failing to provide a response to an item on one of the instruments.

Instances of missing data were also examined to determine the amount of missing data for the key variables in this study: student satisfaction with language learning, student perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspectives (as represented by MIPI-S scores), and teachers' instructional perspective (as represented by MIPI scores). With regard to student satisfaction, eight returns were missing a response on the PIF-S item which asked about satisfaction with language learning. These eight cases represented 7.77% of student participants (n = 103). There was no attempt to replace

these missing values since there were no other items related to satisfaction with language learning from which the missing values for individual students could be imputed. The total number of satisfaction ratings available for analysis of satisfaction with language learning was, therefore, 95.

An examination of responses on the MIPI-S showed that there were 74 complete MIPI-S returns. Twenty-nine of the 103 student returns were missing at least one item response on the MIPI-S. A total of 98 items were left blank on the 103 instruments in the student sample. These non-response items represented 2.11% of the total number of possible responses (n = 4635) on the returned student instruments.

An item analysis by subscale was conducted on the missing data in the returned MIPI-S instruments (n = 103). Factor 1 had a missing response on one the five items. Factor 2 had missing responses on eight of its eleven items. Factor 4 had missing responses on five of its seven items. Factor 5 had missing responses on two of its seven items. Factors 3, 6, and 7 had missing responses on all five items which made up these subscales. Factors 6 and 7 were found to be the subscales with the highest percentage of total missing responses. Table 36 shows the number of missing responses by MIPI-S Factor and the percentage of all possible responses these missing values represent.

Table 36. MIPI-S: Missing Responses by Factor

MIPI-S Factor (N items)	N missing responses	N possible responses[a]	Percent missing responses
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners (5)	6	515	1.2
2: Teacher Trust of Learners (11)	16	1,133	1.4
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction (5)	10	515	1.9
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness (7)	19	721	2.6
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners (7)	3	721	0.4
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process) (5)	23	515	4.5
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process (5)	21	515	4.1

[a] Student sample = 103

Overall, 14 of the 45 items on the MIPI-S had no missing data. For the 31 items with missing values, the number of missing student responses per item ranged from 1 to 11. Table 37 shows the number of missing MIPI-S responses per item.

Table 37. MIPI-S: Missing Responses per Item

MIPI-S item	N missing responses per item
4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 26, 32, 33, 36, 43, 45	0
1, 14, 17, 30, 31, 41, 44	1
3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 38	2
29, 35, 42	3
34, 39	4
2, 20	5
19	6
37	7
25, 40	8
24	11

Seven items (i.e., items 2, 20, 19, 37, 25, 40, 24) accounted for 51% of the missing responses. Table 38 shows the percentage of missing values for these seven MIPI-S items.

Table 38. MIPI-S: Items with the Highest Number of Missing Responses

MIPI-S Factor	Item	*How frequently does your instructor…*	N missing responses	Percent missing responses
6	24	use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?	11	10.7
7	25	appear to believe that his/her teaching skills are as refined as they can be?	8	7.8
4	40	ask the learners how they would approach a learning task?	8	7.8
4	37	individualize the pace of learning for each learner?	7	6.8
1	19	balance his/her efforts between learner content acquisition and motivation?	6	5.8
6	2	use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to discuss information from lectures)?	5	4.9
7	20	make her/his presentations clear enough to forestall all learner questions?	5	4.9

Note. Student sample = 103

Looking at individual student returns, nine students did not complete one item of the 45 items on the MIPI-S. Seven students did not complete two items on the MIPI-S. Nine students left between three and five items blank on the MIPI-S. One student left nine items blank and another student left fourteen items blank.

The student who left nine items blank enclosed a note with his returned instruments. He wrote that he did not respond to certain items because he did not believe

the items were applicable or "did not understand/properly interpret" (personal communication, December 3, 2007) the items left blank. No other students noted their reasons for not responding to MIPI-S items.

An examination of student returns by class found that 12 of the 22 classes had between one and five students whose MIPI-S returns were incomplete. The returns of students from the same classes who failed to respond to one or more MIPI-S items were examined.

Two students from one class failed to respond to the same five items. The two MIPI-S instruments returned by these students were also the two instruments missing the most data. There were some indications in the demographic information from the PIF-S that the two students with the largest number of non-responses may have been a husband and wife pair. Some areas of the MIPI-S had enough similar responses as to suggest that these two students had completed their instruments together or discussed their answers. On the other hand, there were enough differences in responses that it was clear that their instruments were not duplicates of one another. The two MIPI-S returns for these students were retained in the sample.

Having examined missing data for the student instrument, missing data in the teachers' MIPIs (n = 9) were also examined. Three of the nine returned MIPIs were incomplete. An item analysis by factor was conducted on MIPI missing data. The four MIPI items with missing values appeared in four different subscales: Factors 2, 3, 5, and 6. These four non-responses represented approximately 1% of the total number of possible responses (n = 405) on all returned teacher instruments. Table 39 shows the percent of MIPI missing responses by factor.

Table 39. MIPI: Missing Responses by Factor

MIPI Factor (N items)	N missing responses	N possible responses	Percent missing responses
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners (5)	0	45	0
2: Teacher Trust of Learners (11)	1	99	1.0
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction (5)	1	45	2.2
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness (7)	0	63	0
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners (7)	1	63	1.6
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process) (5)	1	45	2.2
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process (5)	0	45	0

Note. Teacher sample = 9

The four missing MIPI responses appeared in four different items. One teacher failed to respond to both Item 21 in Factor 6 (How frequently do you conduct group discussion?) and Item 23 in Factor 3 (How frequently do you believe that your primary goal is to provide learners with as much information as possible?). One teacher each failed to respond to Item 5 in Factor 5 (How frequently do you have difficulty understanding learner point-of-views?) and Item 28 in Factor 2 (How frequently do you prize the learner's ability to learn what is needed?). There were no notations on the returned instruments that indicated the reasons for teachers' failure to respond to these four items.

The question of how to address the absence of data in the MIPI-S and MIPI data sets was next considered. Case deletion was one option; however, eliminating all MIPI-S returns which were incomplete would have resulted in a loss of 28% of the student sample. More importantly, eliminating all MIPI returns which were incomplete would

have resulted in the loss of one-third of the teacher sample. Case deletion was rejected in order to preserve a maximum amount of student and teacher data.

Two methods of imputing the value of the missing MIPI-S and MIPI data were then investigated: mean-substitution and the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm approach. In the mean-substitution method, "the mean of the total sample for a variable is substituted for all of the missing values in that variable" (Saunders et al., 2006, p. 22). This approach to data replacement used to be the preferred method of dealing with missing data (Garson, 2008a) but is no longer recommended in the literature (Karanja, 2008). However, mean-substitution does continue to be used and is part of the missing data debate in research literature (Saunders et al., 2006).

The EM algorithm approach to imputing missing data "is based on iterating the process of regression imputation" (von Hippel, 2004, p. 163). This approach

is a common method for obtaining [maximum likelihood] parameter estimates and is an iteration process in two stages. Stage 1 entails estimating the missing data and state 2 involves estimating the parameters. The missing data is estimated and the parameters computed using the maximum likelihood procedure in the first iteration stage of this method. At this level, the estimates are based on the actual and missing data. In the second iteration process, the missing data is re-estimated based on the new parameter estimates and the new parameters are recalculated based on actual and re-estimated missing data. The process is repeated until convergence is achieved in the parameter estimates. (Karanja, 2008, p. 3704)

According to Garson (2008a) and Karanja (2008) this approach is currently the most widely-used and recommended method for estimating missing values. The EM

algorithm calculation for imputing missing MIPI-S values used the SPSS Statistics 17.0

software's add-in module Missing Values Analysis (MVA).

A comparison of imputed MIPI-S values produced by mean-substitution and the

EM algorithm method found that the EM algorithm approach resulted in 7 replaced

MIPI-S values which were beyond the range of the instrument's one- to five-point

response values. Table 40 compares the out-of-range EM algorithm-replaced values with

values imputed using mean-substitution.

Table 40. MIPI-S: Imputation of Missing Data by EM Algorithm and Mean Substitution

MIPI-S item	Imputation of missing data	
	EM algorithm	Mean substitution
2	0.20	2.32
24	0.28	1.97
24	0.82	1.97
19	5.02	3.99
29	5.03	4.04
16	5.05	4.53
29	5.16	3.99

Note. MIPI-S item response values: 1 - 5 points

Use of the EM algorithm method in this study produced data problems that could

only be surmounted by altering the replaced values so that the extreme values fell within

the MIPI-S's one- to five-point response range. This alteration was rejected since it

would have created an additional level of change to the original data set.

Although a less statistically sophisticated approach to missing data imputation

than the EM algorithm method, mean-substitution did not result in the out-of-range

values that the EM algorithm method produced. It was decided to apply the mean-

replaced values to the student data set. In addition, the mean-substitution approach to missing data was used to replace the four missing values in the teachers' MIPI data set.

Once the missing data were replaced, descriptive statistics were used to identify outliers in the student and teacher data sets. An outlier is "a score in a set of data which is so extreme that by all appearances it is not representative of the population the sample represents" (Sheskin, 1997, p. 174). An exploration of the descriptive statistics for satisfaction with learning, MIPI-S summative and subscale scores, and MIPI summative and subscale scores showed the presence of outliers. The values for the data in these variables were converted to z-scores for a more detailed assessment of the outliers.

Field (2005) explains that the creation of z-scores is a method for "expressing [data] in terms of a distribution that has a known mean and standard deviation" (p. 76). A normal distribution of absolute z-scores (z-scores without a positive or negative sign), would have "95% of [data cases] with absolute value less than 1.96, 5% (or less) with an absolute value greater than 1.96, and 1% (or less) with an absolute value greater than 2.58." (Field, 2005, p. 77). According to Field, any data with absolute z-scores over 3.29 would be considered "significant outliers" (p. 77).

Two outliers were identified in the data for student satisfaction with language learning. The two student cases were from different language classes with different teachers. Z-scores for both cases were -3.03. These values were above the absolute value of 2.58 value for 2 standard deviations beyond the mean but below 3.29, the absolute value for the extreme edge of 3 standard deviations in a normal distribution (Field, 2005; Garson, 2009d, 2009f). Since both outliers were within the range of a normal distribution and there was no evidence that these ratings were not accurate

representations of the students' satisfaction, both cases were retained in the student

sample.

The initial examination of MIPI and MIPI-S scores found a group of outliers

which resulted from errors in calculations of the MIPI and MIPI-S scores. These scores

were re-calculated and the data entries were corrected.

A second group of MIPI and MIPI-S outliers represented extreme scores on the

instruments. The returned instruments were examined for instrument errors, indications

that participants collaborated when completing their instruments, and coding or scoring

errors by the researcher. This group of extreme scores were not the result of instrument

errors or researcher error. It did not appear that the extreme scores were the result of

collaboration on the part of the study participants.

Table 41 shows the distribution of outliers in MIPI-S summative and subscale

scores by using absolute z-scores.

Table 41. MIPI-S: Outliers

MIPI-S	> 3.29		> 2.58		> 1.96		< 1.96	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Factor 1	1	0.97	2	1.94	6	5.83	97	95.17
Factor 2	0	0	2	1.94	5	4.85	98	95.15
Factor 3	0	0	1	0.97	3	2.91	100	97.09
Factor 4	0	0	1	0.97	5	4.85	98	95.15
Factor 5	0	0	2	1.94	7	6.80	96	93.20
Factor 6	0	0	1	0.97	7	6.80	96	93.20
Factor 7	0	0	0	0	5	4.85	98	95.15
Sum	0	0	1	0.97	5	4.85	98	95.15

One student was found to have an outlier score for the summative MIPI-S score.

This outlier had a value of > 2.58, but was within 3 standard deviations from the mean.

Nine students had outlier scores > 2.58 on one or more MIPI-S subscales. One student outlier, found in Factor 1, was -3.768. This outlier's value was over the 3 standard deviation limit of 3.29 for a normal distribution (Field, 2005). However, this student's MIPI-S summative and other subscale scores were not outside the normal distribution range. All other outliers for the student sample on the MIPI-S had z-scores < 3.29.

Using Field's (2005) criteria for normal distribution of absolute z-scores, the summative MIPI-S scores fell within the acceptable range of 95 percent of the student cases with an absolute value of less than 1.96, not more than 5 percent of student cases with absolute values above 1.96, and not more than 1 percent of the cases with absolute values larger than 2.58 (Field, 2005). Field identifies "significant outliers" (p. 77) as those z-scores above 3.29. No summative MIPI-S scores had absolute values above 3.29.

Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998) suggest that researchers retain outliers unless there is proof that the outliers "are truly aberrant and not representative of any observations in the population" (p. 66). The outliers for MIPI-S subscales were found to be accurate representations of individual participants' responses. In addition, students' summative scores were found to be within the range of a normal distribution. The cases with outliers for the MIPI-S were retained in the student sample.

When the teachers' MIPI returns were examined, only one summative score was found to have an absolute z-value above 1.96. This score, however, was below the 2.58 threshold for 2 standard deviations. There were no absolute z-scores on any of the seven MIPI subscales which were > 1.96. According Field's (2005) criteria for identifying outliers, there were no significant outliers in the teachers' MIPI data.

In summary, once the data were determined to be from the appropriate target populations, missing data were evaluated. Over 7% of PIF-S returns were missing a response for satisfaction with language learning. The missing values for satisfaction were not replaced.

The MIPI-S data set was found to have over 2% missing responses. The MIPI data set had approximately 1% missing responses. All missing values on the MIPI-S and MIPI were replaced using the mean-substitution approach. An examination of distribution revealed that Z-scores for the MIPI-S summative scores fell within 3 standard deviations of the mean for a normal distribution. All z-scores for the MIPI summative scores fell within 2 S.D of the mean for a normal distribution. Outliers in the MIPI-S and MIPI data were found to be accurate representations of student and teacher responses. Cases with outliers in the MIPI-S and MIPI data sets were retained.

Reliability of the MIPI and MIPI-S

In quantitative research, the reliability of the instrument is an important consideration in evaluating research results and estimating their repeatability (Shrout, 1998). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is most often used as a measure of an instrument's reliability (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). This statistic represents an instrument's internal consistency, the extent to which 1) the items in a given scale "all measure the same concept" (Cramer & Howitt, 2004, p. 3) and 2) the observations are free from random error (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), "the major use of reliability coefficients is to communicate the repeatability of the results. The reliability coefficient is one index of the effectiveness of an instrument" (p. 256).

The value of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 (Gliem &

Gliem, 2003). Nunnally (1967) accepted a range of .50 to .60 as satisfactory for basic

research. Stanton (2005) used the benchmarks suggested by Landis and Koch (1977) to

describe the reliability of IPI subscales. Landis and Koch proposed the following

descriptors for different ranges of reliability: poor ($<$ .00), slight (.00 - .20), fair (.21 -

.40), moderate (.41 - .60), substantial (.61 - .80), and almost perfect (.81 - 1.00).

More recent research suggests other descriptors for evaluating reliability. Shrout

(1998) proposed a revision of the Landis and Koch (1977) benchmark descriptors and

shifted the ranges of reliability: virtually none (.00 - .10), slight (.11 - .40), fair (.41 - .60),

moderate (.61 - .80), and substantial (.81 - 1.0). Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) consider

a reliability of .70 to be modest. Furthermore, they suggest that efforts to increase

reliability for basic research beyond .80 may not be an efficient use of researcher's

resources.

According to Garson (2009e), values of .70 or above represent an "'adequate'

scale" (Internal consistency reliability section, para. 3), while values of .80 and above

would represent a "'good' scale" (Internal consistency reliability section, para. 3).

However, Garson also reports that a lenient interpretation of Cronbach's alpha coefficient

would allow values of .60 or above when establishing scale reliability "in exploratory

research" (Internal consistency reliability, para. 3).

In the current study, the teacher instrument, the MIPI, is a modified version of

Henschke's original IPI. The modifications incorporated into the MIPI were suggested

by Stanton (2005).

Stanton's (2005) study established the internal consistency of the IPI. Stanton reported a Cronbach's alpha of .88 for the IPI, stating that this value is "within the accepted range for a new measurement tool" (p. 211). Stricker (2006) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .81 for the IPI.

Stanton (2005) noted that, while the standards for acceptable reliability are based on "strict, well-defined" (p. 210) psychological scales, the IPI is not a psychological scale. Stanton argued that the constructs covered by the IPI "are more diffused than in psychological tests" (p. 210) and that the boundaries between some constructs "such as planning and accommodating are less clear" than in well-defined psychological tests. For this reason, Stanton cautioned that the application of the reliability standards for psychological tests to an instrument like the IPI could be considered unrealistic.

When an instrument is composed of different subscales, Cronbach (1951) states that it is appropriate to calculate alpha for each subscale. The reliabilities of the MIPI's seven subscales, called *factors* in the literature on the IPI, were established by Thomas (1995) and Stanton (2005), using the original IPI. McManus's 2008 study reported the reliability of the modified IPI's subscales.

Table 42 shows Cronbach's alpha for all IPI subscales as reported in previous studies.

Table 42. Cronbach's Alpha (Spearman-Brown): IPI and Modified IPI in Previous
Studies

IPI Factor	Cronbach's Alpha (Spearman-Brown)		
	IPI Thomas (1995)	IPI Stanton (2005)	Modified IPI McManus (2008)
1	.21	.63	.68 (.81)
2	.49	.81	.78 (.88)
3	.78	.72	.53 (.70)
4	.60	.71	.55 (.71)
5	.62	.78	.69 (.82)
6	.71	.72	.71 (.83)
7	.40	.57	.47 (.64)

For four of the seven subscales of the IPI, Thomas (1995) found alpha reliability

values $\geq$ .60, within Garson's (2009e) lenient interpretation of alpha $\geq$ .60 for

exploratory research. Stanton (2005) reported that six of the IPI subscales had a

reliability value of $\geq$ .60. Stanton's study found that all of the subscales had an alpha of $\geq$

.50, within Nunnally's (1967) satisfactory range of .50 - .60 for basic research.

McManus (2008), working with the modified IPI, found that four of the subscales had a

reliability of $\geq$ .60 and that six of the subscales had an alpha reliability value of $\geq$ .50.

Stanton (2005) noted that Factor 7 "was the only factor with an alpha level below

the acceptable value for new measurement tools" (pp. 217-218). The alpha level for

Factor 7 in the Thomas (1995) study (.40) would be considered fair by Landis and Koch's

(1977) benchmark but only slight by Shrout (1998). Factor 7's reliability in the

McManus (2008) study (.47) would be considered moderate by Landis and Koch but

slight by Shrout. Factor 7 reliability in all three studies was below both Garson's (2009e)

"lenient" interpretation of alpha $\geq$ .60 for exploratory research; however, the value of .57

in Stanton's study fell within Nunnally's (1967) satisfactory range of .50 - .60 for basic research.

In addition to examining Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the modified IPI, McManus (2008) also calculated the split-half reliability coefficient for all modified IPI subscales (see Table 42, p. 299). The Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient, also known as the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, is "the correlation between two halves of a test…corrected to full test length" (Cortina, 1993, p. 99). It is a test of reliability which takes into consideration the length of the test instrument. Instruments or instrument subscales "with more items are…more likely to have higher alpha values" (Cramer & Howitt, 2004, p. 80).

The seven MIPI subscales are made up of between 5 and 11 items (see Tables 1 through 7, pp. 81 - 87). Kline (1993) states that "in the applied setting, there is a trade-off between brevity and reliability" (p. 37). An instrument with a large number of homogenous items may produce high reliability coefficients but be impractical for researchers and subjects due to the time required for completion (Kline, 1993). Kline suggests that ten is the minimum number of homogenous items required for a good test. Raykov (1997), on the other hand, concludes that a scale composed of four or more items with a "well-defined underlying common construct" (p. 344) can produce a useful alpha estimate.

When interpreting the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient, Garson (2009e) states that "a common rule of thumb is .80 or higher for adequate reliability and .90 or higher for good reliability. However, for exploratory research, a cutoff as low as .60 is not uncommon" (Garson, 2009e, Split-half reliability section, para. 3). McManus

(2008) found that the split-half reliability coefficient for all subscales of the modified IPI was > .60. Four subscales had a split-half reliability coefficient of > .80.

The MIPI-S, used in this study to evaluate language students' perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspectives, is an adaptation of the MIPI. The Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory--Adapted for Students section in Chapter III discusses the wording changes made to the MIPI in order to create the MIPI-S (see also Appendix F). The content of all MIPI items, the composition of all seven MIPI subscales, and item scoring were retained in the creation of the MIPI-S.

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient and Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient were calculated for both the MIPI and the MIPI-S. Table 43 reports the reliability coefficients for MIPI and MIPI-S Factors 1 through 7.

Table 43. Reliability: MIPI-S and MIPI

MIPI/MIPI-S	N items	Cronbach's alpha (Spearman-Brown)	
		MIPI	MIPI-S
Factor 1	5	.76 (.88)	.78 (.85)
Factor 2	11	.88 (.73)	.87 (.87)
Factor 3	5	.42 (.48)	.78 (.73)
Factor 4	7	.65 (.34)	.74 (.67)
Factor 5	7	.53 (.15)	.73 (.68)
Factor 6	5	.68 (.61)	.67 (.71)
Factor 7	5	.78 (.86)	.54 (.45)

On the MIPI, five subscales produced a Cronbach's alpha level > .60, within Shrout's (1998) moderate range of reliability and above Garson's (2009e) lower limit for exploratory research. Factor 2 had an alpha > .80, in the substantial range for Shrout and indicative of a good scale (Garson, 2009e) with internal consistency (Cramer & Howitt,

2004). Factor 3 was found to have the lowest alpha level (.42), within Shrout's fair range but not satisfactory for basic research according to Nunnally (1967).

For five MIPI-S subscales, the Cronbach's alpha level was found to be in Shrout's (1998) moderate range (.61 - .80). As with the MIPI, Factor 2 for the MIPI-S had a reliability of over .80, indicating substantial reliability (Shrout, 1998). In results similar to Stanton's (2005) and McManus's (2008) studies, MIPI-S Factor 7 was found to have the lowest alpha level of all subscales. The Factor 7 alpha level of .54, however, would still be considered fair by Shrout and within Nunnally's (1967) satisfactory range of .50 to .60 for basic research.

The Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient was also calculated for both the MIPI and the MIPI-S. Four subscales on the teachers' MIPI were found to have a split-half reliability coefficient > .60, which Garson (2009e) states is the lower boundary accepted for exploratory research (see Table 43, p. 301). Factors 1 and 7 had an alpha level > .80, an indicator of "adequate reliability" (Garson, 2009e, Split-half reliability section, para. 3) but below the .90 level of "good reliability" (Garson, 2009e, Split-half reliability section, para. 3). Factor 1 in both the present study and McManus's (2008) study had a reliability coefficient >.80. MIPI Factor 5 had the lowest alpha level, .15.

For six subscales of the students' MIPI-S, the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient was found to be > .60, the lowest limit acceptable for exploratory research (Garson, 2009e). As in McManus's (2008) study, Factors 1 and 2 had coefficients > .80, an indication of "adequate reliability" (Garson, 2009e, Split-half reliability section, para. 3). The weakest Spearman-Brown coefficient was for MIPI-S

Factor 7 (.45). McManus also found Factor 7 to have the lowest split-half reliability

coefficient (see Table 42, p. 299).

Sample size is a consideration in the calculation of scale reliability (Shrout, 1998).

Saunders and Huynh (1980) state that "the precision of a reliability estimate varies

inversely with the number of examinees (sample size)" (p. 2). Due to the small sample

size for teachers in the present study (n = 9), the reliability coefficients calculated for

MIPI subscales may be inflated and only suggest instrument reliability. While the 103

cases in the student sample provides a better size for reliability calculation, sample size

may still be less than optimal since all key variables were measured at the ordinal or

categorical level (Saunders & Huynh, 1980; Shrout, 1998). Shrout states that "when

distinctions are investigated with binary or categorical ratings, provisions for much larger

samples must be made" (Shrout, 1998, p. 308). The reliability statistics calculated for

MIPI-S subscales may also, therefore, only be suggestive of the instrument's reliability in

this population.

In summary, Cronbach's alpha levels for all MIPI subscales, except Factor 3,

were found to be acceptable for exploratory (Garson, 2009e) or basic (Nunnally, 1967)

research. All MIPI-S subscales were found to have alpha levels acceptable for

exploratory or basic research. Calculation of the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability

coefficient revealed that four MIPI subscales were acceptable for exploratory research

(Garson, 2009e). Due to the small number of teacher instruments (n = 9), however, the

reliability coefficients for the MIPI can only suggest reliability. For the MIPI-S, all

subscales except Factor 7 produced split-half reliability coefficients acceptable for

exploratory research.

Appropriate Statistical Procedures

The selection of appropriate statistical procedures in the present study was guided by the level of measurement of data, the characteristics of the data, and the nature of the research questions. The relevance of these three factors to the research questions considered in the present study are discussed in this section.

The level of measurement in the research design is one factor which informs the choice between parametric or nonparametric statistical procedures (Sheskin, 1997). Levels of data measurement can be categorized as being nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio data (Sheskin, 1997). These categories indicate the amount of information which data numbers provide as well as the "meaningful mathematical operations that can be performed on those numbers" (Sheskin, 1997, p. 2). The dependent and independent variables in this study were identified as being categorical, measured either on an ordinal scale or assigned to categories.

For variables measured at the ordinal level, participants are asked to choose one response within a range of ranked responses on an instrument. Numbers assigned to the participants' responses indicate the position of a response in relation to the order of magnitude of all possible responses (Cramer & Howitt, 2004) but those numbers "do not give any information regarding the differences between adjacent ranks" (Sheskin, 1997, p. 2).

In the present study, the scales measuring the key variables in all the research questions (i.e., satisfaction with learning, MIPI-S scores, MIPI scores) were ordinal. For example, to identify satisfaction with language learning (Item 1, PIF-S), students were asked to circle the number which best indicated their level of satisfaction with their

personal language learning in the course being taken. Possible satisfaction responses ranged from 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest possible satisfaction*).

The data collected with the MIPI and MIPI-S were also ordinal data. These instruments used Likert-type scales with five possible ranked responses: Almost Never, Not Often, Sometimes, Usually, and Almost Always. Values assigned to these responses ranged from 1 (*Almost Never*) to 5 (*Almost Always*).

Background data on students and teachers collected from the PIF-S and PIF-I for use as independent variables in the present study were assigned to either ordinal or nominal categories. Three items on the PIF-S related to student satisfaction with learning and used an ordinal scale. Item 18: *How would you rate your general experience with language study, past and present?* offered students a set range of possible responses, from 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) to 10 (*Totally satisfactory*). Students and teachers were also asked about the extent to which they felt they had achieved their primary and other goals for the course. These PIF-S and PIF-I items offered an ordered range of responses from 0 (*Goal not achieved*) to 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*).

Demographic and educational background items on the PIF-S and PIF-I were categorical. In the categorical level of measurement, "numbers are employed merely to identify mutually exclusive categories, but cannot be manipulated in a meaningful mathematical manner" (Sheskin, 1997, p. 2). The demographic and education items on the PIF-S and PIF-I asked participants to place themselves within a group of two or more nominal or ordinal categories for gender, age, and educational background.

Items on the PIF-S and PIF-I related to culture of education, language learning experience, teaching experience, and current course goals were free-response items.

Participants' responses to these items were grouped according to common response categories. Those response categories were then assigned numerical values for the purpose of data analysis.

Cramer and Howitt (2004) state that "without assessing the characteristics of the data, it is not possible to select an appropriate test" (p. 101). The two categories of statistical procedures, parametric and nonparametric tests, rely on different levels of measurement. Most parametric procedures assume an interval level of measurement or a ratio level of measurement (Garson, 2009f). However, variables using an ordinal level of measurement may be used in parametric tests if a normal distribution of data is established (Garson, 2009f) or if the parametric procedure allows for categorical variables (Field, 2005).

The distribution of the data for the key variables in the present study (i.e., satisfaction with learning, MIPI-S scores, and MIPI scores) was first examined for outliers. As discussed in the Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data section of this chapter, all outliers in the data were retained.

Data on satisfaction with learning, MIPI scores, and MIPI-S scores were then examined for normality of distribution. A detailed discussion of the evaluation of normality for the dependent variable in each research question is found in the Research Questions section of this chapter. Satisfaction data were found to be non-normally distributed and negatively skewed (see Sub-question 1 section). When the mean-by-class for satisfaction was calculated, that variable was found to be normally distributed (see Primary Research Question section). MIPI scores were found to be non-normal and negatively skewed (see Sub-question 2 section). MIPI-S scores were also found to be

non-normal and negatively skewed (see Sub-question 3 section). When averaged by

class, MIPI-S scores were found to be normally distributed (see Sub-question 2 section).

In addition to normal distribution, many statistical tests assume that data from

participants represent independent observations (Field, 2005; Garson, 2009f). Student

responses in the sample could not be considered independent observations because all

students within the same class shared a common teacher. It was therefore important that

the data analysis take into consideration that interactions between students as the class

session progressed might have influenced student satisfaction ratings and MIPI-S scores.

The issue of independence of student responses is addressed in the discussion of Sub-

questions 1, 3, and 4 in the Research Questions section of this chapter.

Beyond level of measurement and characteristics of the data, a third factor in

choosing the appropriate statistical procedures for this study was the type of research

question being addressed. The primary research question and Sub-question 1 asked about

the relationship between two variables. Questions about relationship examine the extent

to which one variable changes as another variable changes (Williams, Bower, & Newton,

2004).

The primary research question was analyzed using a bivariate correlation to

investigate the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional

perspective of the teacher. Spearman's rho was selected because the dependent variable,

Satisfaction with Learning, was ordinal (Williams et al., 2004). Due to the small number

of teacher instruments ($n = 9$), no further statistical procedures could be performed for

this question. A more detailed discussion of the statistical analysis for this research

question, as well as each of the sub-questions, can be found in the Research Questions section of this chapter.

Sub-question 1 asked about the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective. Ordinal logistic regression was used to analyze Sub-question 1. Ordinal logistic regression is appropriate to investigate the relationship between two variables when the dependent variable data are not normally distributed, have an ordinal level of measurement, and come from related samples (Garson, 2009b; Menard, 2002).

The choice of statistical procedures for questions about differences between groups depends "on the type of data that you are comparing, the number of groups, whether the groups are related (or paired) and whether the data are normally distributed" (Williams et al., 2004, p. 71). Sub-question 2 investigated the difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective and students' perceptions of teachers' instructional perspective. The analysis of this question involved a comparison of ordinal data (i.e., the MIPI and MIPI-S scores) taken from two related groups, students and the teachers of their classes. The student MIPI-S scores and the teacher MIPI scores were non-normally distributed. For these reasons, the nonparametric Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used.

Questions about explaining variance in the dependent variable based on certain predictors can be answered using multiple regression analysis (Garson, 2009c; Gay & Airasian, 2000). Multiple regression "determines not only whether variables are related, but also the degree to which they are related" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 501). Sub-question 3 asked which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics

explained students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles.

Logistic regression is used "to determine which predictor variables are most strongly and significantly associated with the probability of a particular category in the [dependent] variable occurring" (Cramer & Howitt, 2004, p. 93). Ordinal logistic regression was considered appropriate for Sub-question 3 because the dependent variable, MIPI-S scores, was multinomial (Cramer & Howitt, 2004). The dependent variable was composed of the five ordered categories for describing modified IPI scores established by Stanton (2005): High Above Average, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Low Below Average. Ordinal logistic regression was also considered appropriate for Sub-question 3 because it allows for ordinal or categorical predictor variables. The student characteristic predictor variables in this study were all measured at the ordinal or categorical level.

Ordinal logistic regression was also used to answer Sub-question 4 (i.e., Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics explains high learning satisfaction?). The dependent variable, satisfaction with learning ratings, had three ordered categories: High Satisfaction, Average Satisfaction, and Low Satisfaction. The predictor variables were all measured at the ordinal or categorical level.

The research design had anticipated that an ordinal logistic regression analysis would be used to answer Sub-question 5 (i.e., Which teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics explain(s) High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI?). However, the number of

teacher instruments (n = 9) precluded any statistical analyses being run for this research question. Frequency counts for each of the five MIPI categories (High Above Average, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Low Below Average) in the dependent variable, MIPI category, were tabulated for all teacher characteristic variables.

In summary, the statistical procedures used in answering the research questions were parametric and nonparametric tests which allowed for the non-normal distribution of the dependent variable, categorical level of measurement, multinomial variables, and related samples. For research questions investigating a relationship between variables, correlation and ordinal logistic regression were used. For the questions examining variance in the dependent variable based on certain predictors, ordinal logistic regression was also used. For the question evaluating differences between the two groups represented in this study, students and teachers, the nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-ranks test was used. A detailed discussion of data, statistical analysis, and results for each research question is found in following section.

Research Questions

This study addressed one primary research question: What is the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? In addition, five sub-questions related to student satisfaction and instructional perspective were also investigated. This section describes the data, the statistical procedure used, and the results obtained for each research question.

Primary research question.

H_{primary} There is a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as

reported on the PIF-S, and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the

noncredit foreign language classroom, as measured by the MIPI.[1]

The primary research question addressed in this study was: What is the

relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of

the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? In order to answer this

question, student satisfaction with learning ratings, the dependent variable, were averaged

by class and correlated with MIPI scores, the measure of teachers' instructional

perspective in this study.

Of the 103 student instruments returned, eight students failed to respond to the

satisfaction with learning item. The sample size for student satisfaction was therefore 95.

In the original student data set, satisfaction ratings ranged from 2 to 10, on a scale of 0 to

10 (see Table 21, p. 267). As discussed in the Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data

section, z-scores for satisfaction ratings revealed two outliers. The two outlier z-scores

were within 3 standard deviations of the mean of a normal distribution. Since there was

no evidence that these scores were not true representations of the students' responses, the

two satisfaction scores were retained in the student sample.

Satisfaction with learning was measured on an ordinal, Likert-type scale. In order

to answer the primary research question, satisfaction ratings had to be paired with the

teacher's MIPI summative score. Since there were only nine teacher instruments in the

sample, the analysis for this question only included the students whose teacher completed

the MIPI. To avoid the problem of teacher scores being constant within the student-teacher pairs from the same class, satisfaction ratings were averaged by class.

Table 44 shows the descriptive statistics for the dependent variable, mean-by-class satisfaction with learning.

Table 44. Satisfaction with Learning, Mean-by-Class: Descriptive Statistics

	Satisfaction with learning, mean-by-class
N Valid	9
Missing	0
Median	7.70
Mode	5.50[a]
Mean	7.35
Std. Deviation	1.03
Range (min. – max.)	5.50 – 8.67

[a] Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Because every class score (n = 9) for mean-by-class satisfaction was different and the score for each class occurred only one time in the data set, the report of multiple modes in the descriptive statistics was not unexpected.

A cursory comparison of mean-by-class satisfaction with learning ratings and teachers' MIPI scores did not suggest a relationship between satisfaction and instructional perspective in the context of the study. Table 45 compares individual teachers' MIPI summative scores, category of MIPI score, and mean-by-class satisfaction with learning.

Table 45. Comparison: MIPI Summative Scores, Mean-by-Class Satisfaction with Learning

Teacher/Class ID	MIPI score	MIPI category	Satisfaction (class mean)	N student returns
T1/C1	174.00	Average	7.00	2
T2/C3	172.00	Average	7.88	8
T3/C4	175.70	Average	5.50	4
T4/C9	173.00	Average	8.67	3
T5/C13	168.00	Average	7.70	10
T5/C14	142.00	Below Av.	8.50	7
T6/C15	186.20	Above Av.	6.50	4
T7/C28	172.00	Average	6.60	5
T8/C31	175.10	Average	7.78	9

When comparing teacher MIPI scores and their classes' mean satisfaction, it is clear that the teacher scoring highest on the MIPI (T6/C15) did not have the highest rating for class satisfaction with learning (see Table 45). In fact, this teacher had the second lowest class satisfaction rating. Classes C9 and C14 had the highest class satisfaction ratings (i.e., 8.67 and 8.50). Their teachers rated themselves Average (T4/C9) and Below Average (T5/C14) with regard to use of andragogical principles. The teacher with the lowest class satisfaction rating (T3) had an MIPI score which fell in the Average category, the same category as the teacher with the highest satisfaction rating (T4).

Teacher T5 returned instruments for both the beginning sections she taught (i.e., C13 and C14). Teacher T5's MIPI scores were in two different MIPI categories for the two different class sections. Class C14, where the teacher rated herself Below Average in

use of andragogical principles, had a higher class satisfaction rating than did class C13, where the teacher rated herself Average on the use of andragogical principles.

A test of bivariate correlation was run to statistically investigate the relationship between mean-by-class satisfaction and teacher MIPI summative scores. Spearman's rho was used as the correlation coefficient since both variables were measured at the ordinal level and the MIPI-S scores were not normally distributed.

The correlation test confirmed what the preliminary examination of data had suggested. There were no significant correlations found between mean-by-class satisfaction with learning and teachers' MIPI scores, either for the MIPI summative score or in individual Factor scores. Table 46 shows the correlations between satisfaction with learning, as averaged by class, and teachers' MIPI summative and subscale scores.

Table 46. Correlation: MIPI Scores, Mean-by-Class Satisfaction with Learning

	Satisfaction with learning, mean-by-class		
MIPI Factor	Spearman's rho	Sig. (2-tailed)	N class-teacher matches
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	-.40	.29	9
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	-.52	.15	9
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	.02	.97	9
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	-.52	.15	9
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	-.37	.32	9
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)	-.14	.72	9
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	.64	.06	9
Sum	-.59	.10	9

In summary, a correlation test confirmed that there was no significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and teachers' instructional perspective, as represented by MIPI scores, in the context of this study. The hypothesis was, therefore, rejected and the null hypothesis (see Footnote 1, p. 525) was accepted. Because the size of the teacher sample was so small (n = 9), no additional statistical analysis of the data for the primary research question could be performed.

Sub-question 1.

H[1]   There is a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as reported on the PIF-S, and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI-S.[2]

The first sub-question considered in this study was: Is there a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective? In order to answer this question, the characteristics

of the data for satisfaction with learning and MIPI-S scores, the measure of students'

perceptions of teachers' instructional perspective, were first examined.

Of 103 students in the sample, 95 responded to the PIF-S item about satisfaction

with learning, the dependent variable in Sub-question 1. There was no attempt to replace

missing satisfaction ratings and the two outlier ratings in the data set were retained, as

explained in the Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data section in this chapter.

Satisfaction with learning was measured on an ordinal, Likert-type scale. The

distribution of Satisfaction with Learning data was examined with descriptive statistics

(see Table 22, p. 267), boxplots, p-plots, q-q plots, z-scores, and Kolmorogov-Smirnov

tests of normality. The data for satisfaction with learning were found to be non-normal

and negatively skewed. Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality (0.191, $p < .00$) also

indicated a non-normal distribution. Satisfaction with Learning was treated as a

categorical variable.

In order to retain as much of the variability in the data as possible, the outcome

variable Satisfaction with Learning was divided into three ordered categories: Low

Satisfaction, Average Satisfaction, and High Satisfaction. High Satisfaction, in the

context of this study and, specifically, Sub-question 4, is defined as ratings of 7 and

above on a scale of 0 to 10. Satisfaction ratings of five and six were assigned to the

Average Satisfaction category. Ratings of zero to four were assigned to the Low

Satisfaction category.

MIPI-S scores, the independent variable in Sub-question 1, were measured on an

ordinal, Likert-type scale. There were 103 students in the sample who returned MIPI-S

instruments. Missing values in the MIPI-S were replaced by mean-substitution, as explained in the Examination of MIPI and MIPI-S Data section in this chapter.

For analysis of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more predictor variables, multiple regression is an appropriate statistical technique (Cramer & Howitt, 2004; Hair et al., 1998; Williams et al., 2004). However, multiple regression requires that the dependent variable be measured at the interval level and that the range of values for that data not be truncated (Garson, 2009c).

The dependent variable for Sub-question 1, Satisfaction with Learning, was measured at the ordinal level with a limited, ordered range of possible values (0 - 10). Ordinal logistic regression is the appropriate technique when a dependent variable is ordinal, polytomous (i.e., composed of more than two categories), and has ranked categories (Garson, 2009b; Peng, Lee, & Ingersoll, 2002).

In addition to accommodating polytomous ordinal outcome categories, ordinal logistic regression allows for independent variables that are either interval or categorical (Field, 2005). For Sub-question 1, MIPI-S scores, the independent variable, were measured at the ordinal level and were therefore considered categorical data.

Beyond the ordinal nature of the dependent and independent variables, the choice of a statistical procedure with which to analyze this question had to accommodate the fact that the satisfaction with learning data were not normally distributed, as previously discussed in this section. General linear models, like regression models, require a dependent variable whose distribution is normal (Garson, 2009a). A generalized linear model (GZLM), on the other hand, allows for a non-normally distributed dependent variable and provides several choices, or link functions, as to how the dependent variable

is predicted (Garson, 2009a). The analysis of Sub-question 1 used the GZLM module

available in SPSS Statistics 17.0 software.

Finally, the regression analysis for this sub-question had to take into account that

student data were clustered or nested within classes. Nine different classes had student

MIPI-S returns which could be matched to a teacher return. The number of student

returns per class ranged from 2 to 10 (see Table 8, p. 247). The observations of students

in the same class could not be considered independent of one another because they were

all reporting observations of the same teacher teaching the same class. For this reason,

the statistical procedure chosen for this question had to allow for non-independent

observations of the predictor variables.

The Generalized Estimating Equation (GEE), an extension of GZLM, is a

procedure which supports non-independent observations such as clustered or repeated

measures data (Agresti, 2007; Garson, 2009a). The cumulative logit function is the

default link function in SPSS and "the usual link function for multinomial (ordinal)

logistic regression" (Garson, 2009a, Multinomial distributions section). Analysis for this

sub-question used the ordinal logistic option for GEE in SPSS Statistics 17.0.

Sample size raised questions about the number of independent variables which

could be used in the regression equation for Sub-question 1. According to Hair et al.

(1998), a desirable sample size "is between 15 to 20 observations for each independent

variable" (p. 166). Field (2005) states that sample size is commonly calculated at a ratio

of either 10 or 15 data cases per independent variable. Green (1991), however, notes that

rules-of-thumb for the number of study participants per predictor that have been accepted

in the literature include ratios of 5-to-1, 15-to-1, 30-to-1 or, in the case of Schmidt

(1971), at least 200 participants for any study using regression analysis. Green concludes that "researchers who use traditional rules-of-thumb are likely to design studies that have insufficient power because of too few subjects or excessive power because of too many subjects" (Green, 1991, p. 509). For optimum results, when developing the research proposal, the calculation of an appropriate sample size should specify values for alpha, power, and effect size (Green, 1991).

Requiring the optimum sample size was not relevant for this study. The research design for this study targeted the entire population of students in noncredit Continuing Education foreign language courses offered through a particular community college during one semester. The sample size was also constrained by the number of foreign language teachers in the Continuing Education program who made the research instruments available to their students as well as by the number of students in this population who voluntarily completed the research instruments. The sample size for this study could not be controlled or increased since the study targeted an entire population at a specific community college at a specific time.

Due to constraints on sample size, the number of independent variables possible for regression analysis in the present study was estimated using the guidelines suggested by Hair et al. (1998). Allowing for 15 to 20 students per predictor variable, this research question's sample of 95 students would accommodate five or six predictors. Using all seven MIPI-S subscales in the regression model would have resulted in too many independent variables for the sample size (n = 95). Regression analyses were therefore run on Satisfaction and each of the MIPI-S subscales individually as well as on Satisfaction and the MIPI-S summative score.

In summary, ordinal logistic regression analysis was used to answer Sub-question 1 because this technique allowed for a polytomous ordered categorical dependent variable which was not normally distributed as well as categorical independent variables. The GEE model for ordinal logistic regression was used to accommodate the clustered nature of the student data. Regression analysis was run on each individual independent variable, the MIPI-S summative score and the seven MIPI-S subscale scores, since it was not appropriate, given the sample size of 95, to include the summative and subscale scores in one regression model.

Ordinal logistic regression calculates the log odds of a subject being in a certain category of the dependent variable given the values of the independent variable or variables (Field, 2005; Snedeker, Glynn, & Wang, 2002). In other words, for Sub-question 1, using ordinal logistic regression allowed for estimating the log odds of a student being in a higher satisfaction category, given the values of his or her MIPI-S scores. Table 47 shows the results for the ordinal logistic regression analysis run on Satisfaction with Learning and MIPI-S scores.

Table 47. Ordinal Logistic Regression: Satisfaction and MIPI-S Scores

	Satisfaction			
			Wald	
MIPI-S Factor	B	*SE*	chi-square	Sig.
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	.58	.13	19.02	.000
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	.16	.04	14.74	.000
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	.34	.08	19.11	.000
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	.18	.05	11.82	.001
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	.18	.07	6.24	.013
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques				
(Learner-centered Learning Process)	.14	.06	4.72	.030
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	-.36	.11	10.37	.001
Sum	.06	.01	22.30	.000

The Wald statistic "is a test statistic with a known probability distribution (a chi-square distribution) that is used to test whether the b-coefficient for a predictor in a logistic regression model is significantly different from zero" (Field, 2005, p. 745). The Wald statistics and the p values for the regression analyses indicated that all MIPI-S subscale scores and the MIPI-S summative score had a b-coefficient significantly different from zero (see Table 47).

In Table 47, B represents the ordered log odds, or logit, regression coefficient for the regression model. The "standard interpretation of the ordered logit coefficient is that for a one-unit increase in the predictor, the [outcome] variable level is expected to change by its respective regression coefficient in the ordered log-odds scale while the other variables in the model are held constant" (University of California-Los Angeles, Academic Technology Services, n.d., Parameter Estimates section, para. 4).

An examination of the ordered log odds regression coefficients for the MIPI-S summative score and MIPI-S subscale scores indicated that the MIPI-S summative score was a weaker influence on student satisfaction than individual Factor coefficients in the present study. For every unit increase in the student's summative MIPI-S score, the log odds of satisfaction would be expected to increase by .06.

The ordered log odds coefficients for MIPI-S subscales indicate that all subscales except one had a positive association with satisfaction. Snedeker, Glynn, and Wang (2002) state that "a positive coefficient indicates an increased chance that a subject with a higher score on the independent variable will be observed in a higher category" (p. 3) of the dependent variable. Factor 1 proved to be the strongest predictor of satisfaction. The log odds of satisfaction were positively related to student perception of Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners. For every point by which a student's perception of teacher empathy increased, or moved in the direction of increased learner-centeredness, the odds of that student's satisfaction increased by .58.

Factor 7 was the only factor found to have a negative coefficient for student satisfaction. According to Snedeker et al. (2002), "a negative coefficient [in the ordinal logistic regression procedure] indicates…the chances that a subject with a higher score on the independent variable will be observed in a lower category" (p. 3) of the dependent variable. In this study, for every unit increase in the student score for MIPI-S Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process, the log odds of student satisfaction would be expected to decrease by .36. A high score on Factor 7 indicates increased use of andragogical principles or learner-centeredness. The negative regression coefficient for

Factor 7 indicates that as a student's perception of the teacher's learner-centeredness increased, the log odds of student satisfaction decreased.

In order to evaluate the influence of student data being clustered in classes, each ordinal logistic regression analysis was run using subject effects and between-subjects effects (i.e., with student scores considered individually and with student scores considered within class clusters). The regression analyses using subject effects and between-subjects effects produced the same fit and parameter estimates. The researcher therefore concluded that the variability in assignment to the High Satisfaction category was due mostly to the variability among students rather than variability due to being in the same class with the same teacher.

In summary, the hypothesis for Sub-question 1 was accepted. The data analysis revealed that the MIPI-S summative score and all factor scores had a significant influence on predicting satisfaction with learning. Increased student perceptions of learner-centeredness for all subscales of the MIPI, except one, had a positive influence on satisfaction with learning. Increased student perceptions of learner-centeredness in the classroom for Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process had a negative influence on satisfaction with learning.

Sub-question 2.

H_2 There is a significant difference between the teacher-reported instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI, and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI-S, in the noncredit foreign language classroom.[3]

The second sub-question considered in this study was: Is there a significant difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom? In order to answer Sub-question 2, student MIPI-S scores had to be matched to the MIPI scores of their teachers. However, not all teachers who returned the study instruments had students in their classes who also returned instruments. Furthermore, not all students who returned study instruments had a teacher who returned the instruments. Therefore, of the 103 student returns, there were only 52 student-teacher paired scores within nine different classes in the data set (see Table 8, p. 247).

Pairing students and teachers within classes resulted in no variability in the teacher scores for each group of students in the same class. To avoid the problem of teacher scores being constant within student-teacher pairs from the same class, student MIPI-S scores were averaged by class and then paired with their teacher's score.

MIPI and MIPI-S scores were measured on an ordinal, Likert-type scale. The distributions of MIPI (n = 9) and mean-by-class MIPI-S scores (n = 9) were examined with histograms, q-q plots, z-scores and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality. The z-score for skewness for teachers' MIPI summative scores (-2.69) indicated that the scores were negatively skewed and above the range of 2.58, the upper limit of 2 standard deviations around the mean of a normal distribution. All z-scores for skewness for MIPI Factors were < 1.96, the upper limit for 1 standard deviation beyond the mean of a normal distribution. Factors 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were negatively skewed.

A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality with significance < .05 indicates the variable being tested deviates from normality (Field, 2005). The Kolmorogov-Smirnov

test confirmed that MIPI summative scores were not normally distributed. All MIPI

Factor scores were normally distributed. Table 48 shows the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests

of normality statistics for MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S scores.

Table 48. Tests of Normality: MIPI, Mean-by-Class MIPI-S Scores

| MIPI, MIPI-S Factors | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | | | | | |
| | MIPI | | | Mean-by-class MIPI-S | | |
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	.25	9	.13	.26	9	.10
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	.14	9	.20	.21	9	.20
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	.17	9	.20	.21	9	.20
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	.22	9	.20	.15	9	.20
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	.21	9	.20	.14	9	.20
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)	.22	9	.20	.23	9	.20
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	.22	9	.20	.17	9	.20
Sum	.32	9	.01	.18	9	.20

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality indicated that both mean-by-class

MIPI-S summative and individual Factor scores were normally distributed (see Table 48).

The z-score for skewness for mean-by-class MIPI-S summative scores (- 0.178) was

found to be within 1 standard deviation of the mean of a normal distribution. Z-scores

for skewness for all MIPI-S Factors were found to be within a normal distribution range

although Factors 1 through 5 and 7 were negatively skewed (see Table 25, p. 270).

The ordinal level of measurement of the MIPI and MIPI-S variables and the skewed, non-normal distribution of the MIPI summative scores indicated that a nonparametric test would be appropriate for analyzing Sub-question 2 (Williams et al., 2004). In addition MIPI and MIPI-S variables to being ordinal and the MIPI-S summative scores having a non-normal distribution, the MIPI and MIPI-S scores also represented related samples. Questions which evaluate differences between ordinal data for two related groups also require a nonparametric test (Williams et al., 2004).

The appropriate nonparametric test for differences between two related samples with non-normal, ordinal data is the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, the nonparametric equivalent of the paired or dependent t-test (Sheskin, 1997; Williams et al., 2004). The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests is an expansion of the single-sample Wilcoxon signed-ranks test (Sheskin, 1997). The matched-pairs test computes and then ranks the differences between the scores of matched or related subjects. According to Sheskin (1997),

> the hypothesis evaluated with the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test is whether or not in the underlying populations represented by the samples/experimental conditions, the median of the difference scores…equals zero. If a significant difference is obtained, it indicates there is a high likelihood the two samples/conditions represent two different populations. (p. 291)

For Sub-question 2, the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests assessed the differences between matched teacher MIPI and student MIPI-S factor scores as well as matched teacher MIPI and student MIPI summative scores. Table 49 shows the results of the matched-pairs test for MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S differences.

Table 49. Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test: MIPI - MIPI-S Differences

MIPI – Mean-by-class MIPI-S by factor	Z	Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)	Effect
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	-0.18 [a]	.86	-.04
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	-0.65 [a]	.52	-.15
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	-1.48 [a]	.14	-.35
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	-1.60 [a]	.11	-.38
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	-1.60 [b]	.11	-.38
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)	-1.13 [a]	.26	-.27
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	-1.84 [b]	.07	-.43
Sum	-0.42 [a]	.68	-.10

a. Based on negative ranks

b. Based on positive ranks

The Wilcoxon matched-pairs test found that the median of the difference between MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S summative and Factor scores was not significantly different from zero. In other words, class perceptions and teacher perceptions of the use of andragogical principles were not found to be significantly different from one another in the context of this study.

Table 50 shows the Wilcoxon test ranks for MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S summative and subscale scores.

Table 50. Wilcoxon Ranks: MIPI - Mean-by-Class MIPI-S Scores

MIPI – Mean-by-class MIPI-S by factor	Number of ranks			
	Negative[a]	Positive[b]	Ties[c]	Total
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	5	4	0	9
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	3	6	0	9
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	2	7	0	9
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	2	7	0	9
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	7	2	0	9
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)	4	5	0	9
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	6	3	0	9
Sum	5	4	0	9

[a] Teacher MIPI score < Student MIPI-S score
[b] Teacher MIPI score > Student MIPI-S score
[c] Teacher MIPI score = Student MIPI-S score

An examination of the ranks for the Wilcoxon test shows that the majority of teacher MIPI scores were higher than student mean-by-class MIPI-S scores for Factors 2, 3, 4, and 6. In other words, teachers rated themselves higher on the use of andragogical principles than their students did for Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process).

The majority of teacher scores were lower than student scores for Factors 1, 5, and 7. Teachers rated themselves lower on use of andragogical principles than their students rated them for Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, and Teacher-centered Learning Process. On the summative score, five of nine teachers rated themselves lower on use of andragogical principles than their students rated them.

In summary, the hypothesis for Sub-question 2 was rejected and the null hypothesis (see Footnote 3, page 525) was accepted. Data analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between teacher and student perceptions of the use of andragogical principles in the context of this study. However, by examining the Wilcoxon test ranks for MIPI and MIPI-S summative and subscale scores, it was possible to identify the extent to which teachers rated themselves lower or higher than their students on the MIPI.

Sub-question 3.

H$_3$ There is one student characteristic or a combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, which explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S.[4]

The third sub-question considered in this study was: Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S? The choice of an appropriate statistical procedure for analysis of this question was based on the level of measurement of the data, the nature of the data distribution, the number of categories in the dependent variable, and the research question.

All independent variables considered in this analysis were measured at the ordinal or categorical level. The PIF-S asked students to provide personal information about gender, age, education, language learning experience, the culture(s) of their educational experience, achievement of primary and other goals, and general experience with

language study, past and present. The demographic and educational information

provided by students were examined and placed in categories representing the range of

responses found in each characteristic being considered. Other variables (e.g., Primary

Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, General Experience with Language Study) were

measured on an ordinal scale. Table 51 shows characteristics of the student sample,

grouped by MIPI-S category.

Table 51. Student Characteristics and MIPI-S Scores, Grouped by Category

Student characteristics	MIPI-S category[a]				
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High Above Average	Total
Gender					
Male	1 (1.0)	24 (23.3)	8 (7.8)	3 (2.9)	36 (35.0)
Female	12 (11.7)	38 (36.9)	16 (15.5)	1 (1.0)	67 (65.0)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)
Age Group (years)					
20 - 29	2 (1.9)	10 (9.7)	2 (1.9)	0	14 (13.6)
30 - 39	1 (1.0)	3 (2.9)	2 (1.9)	0	6 (5.8)
40 - 49	5 (4.9)	6 (5.8)	3 (2.9)	1 (1.0)	15 (14.6)
50 - 59	1 (1.0)	27 (26.2)	8 (7.8)	1 (1.0)	37 (35.9)
60 - 69	4 (3.9)	14 (13.6)	8 (7.8)	1 (1.0)	27 (26.2)
70 - 79	0	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	0	2 (1.9)
80 +	0	1 (1.0)	0	1 (1.0)	2 (1.9)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)
Highest Degree/Diploma					
High School	0	11 (10.7)	3 (2.9)	0	14 (13.6)
Associate	2 (1.9)	2 (1.9)	5 (4.9)	0	9 (8.7)
Bachelor's	6 (5.8)	23 (22.3)	6 (5.8)	2 (1.9)	37 (35.9)
Specialist	0	1 (1.0)	0	0	1 (1.0)
Master's	5 (4.9)	21 (20.4)	5 (4.9)	1 (1.0)	32 (31.1)
Master's + Specialist	0	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	4 (3.9)
Doctorate	0	2 (1.9)	4 (3.9)	0	6 (5.8)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)

Table 51, continued

| Student characteristics | MIPI-S category | | | | |
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High Above Average	Total
Beginner Group[b]					
Real Beginner	9 (8.7)	35 (34.0)	13 (12.6)	1 (1.0)	58 (56.3)
False Beginner 1	2 (1.9)	20 (19.4)	7 (6.8)	2 (1.9)	31 (30.1)
False Beginner 2	2 (1.9)	7 (6.8)	4 (3.9)	1 (1.0)	14 (13.6)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)
Number FL Studied					
0	2 (2.3)	12 (13.5)	4 (4.5)	1 (1.1)	19 (21.3)
1	7 (7.9)	24 (27.0)	8 (9.0)	3 (3.4)	42 (47.2)
2	0	8 (9.0)	3 (3.4)	0	11 (12.4)
3 or more	2 (2.3)	7 (7.9)	2 (2.3)	0	11 (12.4)
No response	1 (1.1)	2 (2.3)	3 (3.4)	0	6 (6.7)
Total	12 (13.5)	53 (59.6)	20 (22.5)	4 (4.5)	89 (100)
Number FL Spoken					
0	6 (5.8)	33 (32.0)	17 (16.5)	1 (1.0)	57 (55.3)
1	6 (5.8)	21 (20.4)	3 (2.9)	2 (1.9)	32 (31.1)
2	0	7 (6.8)	3 (2.9)	1 (1.0)	11 (10.7)
3 or more	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	0	3 (2.9)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)

Table 51, continued

Student characteristics	MIPI-S category				
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High Above Average	Total
Culture of Education:					
Student, Teacher					
Both S, T: only US	2 (3.8)	9 (17.3)	5 (9.6)	2 (3.8)	18 (34.6)
S only US,					
T only Other	4 (7.7)	3 (5.8)	1 (1.9)	0	8 (15.4)
S only US,					
T Other + US	2 (3.8)	9 (17.3)	6 (11.5)	0	17 (32.7)
Both S, T:					
US + different Other	1 (1.9)	4 (7.7)	1 (1.9)	0	6 (11.5)
S US + Other,					
T only US	0	2 (3.8)	0	0	2 (3.8)
S US + Other,					
T only diff Other	1 (1.9)	0	0	0	1 (1.9)
Total	10 (19.2)	27 (51.9)	13 (25.0)	2 (3.8)	52 (100)
Goal Achieved [c]					
Primary Goal					
0 – 2	1 (1.0)	2 (1.9)	2 (1.9)	0	5 (4.9)
3 – 4	4 (3.9)	15 (14.6)	4 (3.9)	2 (1.9)	25 (24.3)
5 – 6	2 (1.9)	14 (13.6)	9 (8.7)	0	25 (24.3)
7 - 8	4 (3.9)	20 (19.4)	6 (5.8)	0	30 (29.1)
9 – 10	2 (1.9)	11 (10.7)	3 (2.9)	2 (1.9)	18 (17.5)
Total	13 (12.6)	62 (60.2)	24 (23.3)	4 (3.9)	103 (100)

Table 51, continued

Student characteristics	MIPI-S category				Total
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High Above Average	
Other Goal(s)					
0 – 2	0	0	1 (1.5)	0	1 (1.5)
3 – 4	1 (1.5)	6 (8.7)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.5)	10 (14.5)
5 – 6	2 (2.9)	8 (11.6)	2 (2.9)	0	12 (17.4)
7 - 8	2 (2.9)	11 (15.9)	6 (8.7)	0	19 (27.5)
9 – 10	3 (4.4)	10 (14.5)	4 (5.8)	1 (1.5)	18 (26.1)
No response	1 (1.5)	5 (7.3)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.5)	9 (13.0)
Total	9 (13.0)	40 (58.0)	17 (24.6)	3 (4.4)	69 (100)
General Experience with Language Study [d]					
0 – 2	0	0	1 (1.0)	0	1 (1.0)
3 – 4	0	5 (5.0)	2 (2.0)	0	7 (7.0)
5 – 6	2 (2.0)	15 (15.0)	4 (4.0)	0	21 (21.0)
7 - 8	5 (5.0)	26 (26.0)	7 (7.0)	1 (1.0)	39 (39.0)
9 – 10	5 (5.0)	15 (15.0)	9 (9.0)	3 (3.0)	32 (32.0)
Total	12 (12.0)	61 (61.0)	23 (23.0)	4 (4.0)	100 (100)

[a]MIPI-S categories reported as Frequency (%)

[b]Beginner Group: Real Beginner (< 1 year), False Beginner 1 ($\geq$ 1 year, < 2 years),
  False Beginner 2 ($\geq$ 2 years)

[c]Goal Achieved range: 0 (*Goal not achieved*) – 10 (*Goal Achieved 100%*)

[d]General Experience with Language Study range: 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) – 10 (*Totally Satisfactory*)

The data for the dependent variable, MIPI-S category, were originally measured at the ordinal level on a 5-point Likert-type scale. According to Garson (2008b), the "use of ordinal variables such as 5-point Likert scales with interval techniques is the norm in contemporary social science" (Garson, 2008b, Frequently Asked Questions section). An examination of descriptive statistics for MIPI-S scores indicated that the MIPI-S scores were not normally distributed. Summative MIPI-S scores were negatively skewed; six of the seven subscale scores were negatively skewed as well (see Table 25, 270).

Table 52 reports the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality for MIPI-S scores.

Table 52. Tests of Normality: MIPI-S Scores

MIPI-S	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
1: Teacher Empathy with Learners	.17	103	.000
2: Teacher Trust of Learners	.11	103	.007
3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction	.11	103	.005
4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness	.07	103	.200
5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners	.18	103	.000
6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process)	.07	103	.200
7: Teacher-centered Learning Process	.11	103	.004
Sum	.09	103	.038

Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality revealed that MIPI-S summative scores, as well as five subscale scores, deviated significantly from normality. Since the MIPI-S data proved to be non-normally distributed, MIPI-S scores were treated as a categorical variable.

Sub-question 3 asked which student characteristic or characteristics explain student perceptions of High Above Average use of andragogical principles by their

teachers. Multiple regression analysis is an appropriate statistical procedure for explaining variance in the dependent variable based on one or more predictors (Garson, 2009c; Gay & Airasian, 2000; Leeper, 2000). Multiple regression "determines not only whether variables are related, but also the degree to which they are related" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 501). However, multiple regression requires that the dependent variable be measured at the interval level (Garson, 2009c).

Ordinal logistic regression is a parametric multiple regression technique used when a dependent variable is categorical and composed of more than two ranked categories (Garson, 2009b; Peng et al., 2002). The dependent variable in Sub-question 3, MIPI-S category, was created by classifying student perceptions of instructional perspective according to Stanton's (2005) five categories for the use of andragogical principles: Low Below Average, Below Average, Average, Above Average, and High Above Average (see Appendix E). No teacher in the study was perceived by students as being in the Low Below Average category for use of andragogical principles (see Table 26, p. 271 and Table 51, p. 331). The regression model, therefore, included only the four categories for which there were student MIPI-S scores.

GZLM allows for a non-normally distributed dependent variable with several link functions for transforming the dependent variable being modeled. The cumulative logit function is the "usual link function for multinomial (ordinal) logistic regression" (Garson, 2009a, Multinomial distributions section). Since the MIPI-S scores were not normally distributed, Sub-question 3 was analyzed using the GZLM module in SPSS Statistics 17.0 software.

As with the analysis of Sub-question 1, the analysis of Sub-question 3 had to take into account nested or clustered data. The observations of a teacher from students in the same class could not be considered independent observations. The GEE is a procedure which supports non-independent observations such as clustered or repeated measures data (Agresti, 2007; Garson, 2009a). The ordinal logistic regression option for the GEE in SPSS Statistics 17.0 software's GZLM module was used in the analysis of Sub-question 3.

Sample size is a consideration when determining the number of independent variables which may be included in a regression model. Hair et al. (1998) suggest a rule-of thumb of 15 to 20 participants or observations for every predictor variable included in a regression equation. Field (2005) reports that 10 or 15 cases per predictor are the rules-of-thumb most commonly used. Other ratios suggested in the literature range from 5-to-1 to 30-to-1 (Green, 1991). Calculation of the appropriate sample size by specifying values for alpha, power, and effect size for the regression analysis produces a sample size more relevant to a specific study than using rule-of-thumb guidelines (Green, 1991).

The research design for this study, however, targeted the entire population of students in noncredit foreign languages in a particular community college during one specific semester. The student sample size was, therefore, limited to the number of students who voluntarily participated in the study (n = 103). Given that the student sample size could not be increased outside the population of this particular community college, obtaining what would be the optimal sample size was not possible in this study. For this reason, the number of independent variables possible for this regression analysis was estimated using the guidelines of Hair et al. (1998). These guidelines suggest that

the sample size (n = 103) for this research question could only support five or six independent variables related to student characteristics.

There were ten student characteristic variables used in the analysis of this question: Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or Diploma, Beginner Group, Number of FL Studied or Studying, Number of FL Spoken, Culture of Education Match, Primary Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, and General Experience with Language Study. Since including all ten predictors in the regression analysis was not appropriate for the sample size, each predictor variable was analyzed individually. Results of the ordinal logistic regression models, reported in Table 53, indicated that there were no student characteristics which were significantly associated with the perception of teachers' high use of andragogical principles.

Table 53. Ordinal Logistic Regression: Student Characteristics and MIPI-S Category

| Student characteristics | MIPI-S Category | | | |
| | | | Wald | |
	B	*SE*	chi-square	Sig.
Gender	.67	.38	3.01	.083
Age Group	.24	.14	2.73	.098
Highest Degree or Diploma	.07	.11	.40	.525
Beginner Group	.36	.27	1.80	.179
Number FL Studied	.01	.01	.56	.452
Number FL Spoken	.07	.19	.15	.698
General Experience with Language Study	.02	.11	.03	.867
Culture of Education Match: Student, Teacher	-.26	.20	1.76	.185
Primary Goal Achieved	-.00	.09	.003	.959
Other Goal(s) Achieved	.00	.01	.16	.686

Each simple regression analysis was run using subject effects and between-subjects effects (i.e., with student scores considered individually and with student scores considered within class clusters). Parameter estimates and fit for both models were the same. The variability of student perceptions of use of andragogical principles by their teachers was, in the context of this sample, due to individual student differences and not the influence of students being in the same class with the same teacher.

In summary, descriptive data on the distribution of student MIPI-S scores for each student characteristic variable were reported in this section. The hypothesis for Sub-question 3 was rejected and the null hypothesis (see Footnote 4, p. 525) was accepted. The regression analysis found no student characteristics among the independent variables

examined which explained student perceptions of High Above Average use of andragogical principles by teachers in the sample.

Sub-question 4.

H$_4$ There is one student characteristic or a combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, which explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S).[5]

The fourth sub-question considered in this study was: Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S)? The choice of an appropriate statistical procedure for the analysis of this question was based on the level of measurement of the data, the number of categories in the dependent variable, and the research question.

The same independent variables used for Sub-question 3 were applied to Sub-question 4: Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or Diploma, Beginner Group, Number of FL Studied or Studying, Number of FL Spoken, the Culture of Education Match, Primary Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, General Experience with Language Study. These predictor variables were all measured at the ordinal or categorical level. Demographic and educational information from the PIF-S was categorized according to the range of responses provided by students for each variable. The variables Primary Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, and General Experience with Language Study were measured on ordinal scales. Table 54 shows student characteristics grouped by category of reported satisfaction.

Table 54. Student Characteristics and Satisfaction, Grouped by Category

Student characteristics	Satisfaction category[a]			Total
	Low	Average	High	
Gender				
Male	2 (2.1)	5 (5.3)	24 (25.3)	31 (32.6)
Female	4 (4.2)	12 (12.6)	48 (50.5)	64 (67.4)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)
Age Group (years)				
20 - 29	3 (3.2)	3 (3.2)	8 (8.4)	14 (14.7)
30 - 39	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)	5 (5.3)
40 - 49	2 (2.1)	0	9 (9.5)	11 (11.6)
50 - 59	0	7 (7.4)	28 (29.5)	35 (36.8)
60 - 69	0	5 (5.3)	21 (22.1)	26 (27.4)
70 - 79	0	0	2 (2.1)	2 (2.1)
80 +	0	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.1)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)
Highest Degree/Diploma				
High School	0	3 (3.2)	10 (10.5)	13 (13.7)
Associate	2 (2.1)	1 (1.1)	5 (5.3)	8 (8.4)
Bachelor's	2 (2.1)	6 (6.3)	28 (29.5)	36 (37.9)
Specialist	0	0	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)
Master's	2 (2.1)	7 (7.4)	20 (21.1)	29 (30.5)
Master's + Specialist	0	0	4 (4.2)	4 (4.2)
Doctorate	0	0	4 (4.2)	4 (4.2)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)

Table 54, continued

Student characteristics	Satisfaction category			Total
	Low	Average	High	
Beginner Group[b]				
Real Beginner	2 (2.1)	11 (11.6)	39 (41.1)	52 (54.7)
False Beginner 1	3 (3.2)	5 (5.3)	18 (18.9)	26 (27.4)
False Beginner 2	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	15 (15.8)	17 (17.9)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)
Number FL Studied				
0	1 (1.2)	3 (3.7)	14 (17.1)	18 (22.0)
1	3 (3.7)	10 (12.2)	25 (30.5)	38 (46.3)
2	2 (2.4)	2 (2.4)	5 (6.1)	9 (11.0)
3 or more	0	1 (1.2)	10 (12.2)	11 (13.4)
No response	0	0	6 (7.3)	6 (7.3)
Total	6 (7.3)	16 (19.5)	60 (73.2)	82 (100)
Number FL Spoken				
0	5 (5.3)	8 (8.4)	41 (43.2)	54 (56.8)
1	1 (1.1)	6 (6.3)	22 (23.2)	29 (30.5)
2	0	2 (2.1)	7 (7.4)	9 (9.5)
3 or more	0	1 (1.1)	2 (2.1)	3 (3.2)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)

Table 54, continued

Student characteristics	Satisfaction category			Total
	Low	Average	High	
Culture of Education Match:				
Student, Teacher				
Both S, T: only US	0	2 (4.1)	15 (30.6)	17 (34.7)
S only US,				
T only Other	1 (2.0)	2 (4.1)	3 (6.1)	6 (12.2)
S only US,				
T Other + US	2 (4.1)	3 (6.1)	12 (24.5)	17 (34.7)
Both S, T:				
US + different Other	1 (2.0)	2 (4.1)	3 (6.1)	6 (12.2)
S US + Other,				
T only US	0	0	2 (4.1)	2 (4.1)
S US + Other,				
T only different Other	0	0	1 (2.0)	1 (2.0)
Total	4 (8.2)	9 (18.4)	36 (73.5)	49 (100)
Goal Achieved[c]				
Primary Goal				
0 – 2	2 (2.1)	0	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)
3 – 4	4 (4.2)	8 (8.4)	13 (13.7)	25 (26.3)
5 – 6	0	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	23 (24.2)
7 - 8	0	3 (3.2)	25 (26.3)	28 (29.5)
9 - 10	0	0	16 (16.8)	16 (16.8)
Total	6 (6.3)	17 (17.9)	72 (75.8)	95 (100)

Table 54, continued

Student characteristics	Satisfaction category			Total
	Low	Average	High	
Other Goals				
0 - 2	0	0	1 (1.6)	1 (1.6)
3 - 4	2 (3.1)	1 (1.6)	7 (10.9)	10 (15.6)
5 - 6	2 (3.1)	7 (10.9)	3 (4.7)	12 (18.8)
7 - 8	1 (1.6)	1 (1.6)	15 (23.4)	17 (26.6)
9 - 10	0	2 (3.1)	15 (23.4)	17 (26.6)
No response	0	2 (3.1)	5 (7.8)	7 (10.9)
Total	5 (7.8)	13 (20.3)	46 (71.9)	64 (100)
General Experience with Language Study [d]				
0 - 2	0	0	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)
3 – 4	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	3 (3.3)	7 (7.6)
5 – 6	3 (3.3)	5 (5.4)	13 (14.1)	21 (22.8)
7 - 8	1 (1.1)	6 (6.5)	26 (28.3)	33 (35.9)
9 – 10	0	3 (3.3)	27 (29.3)	30 (32.6)
Total	5 (5.4)	17 (18.5)	70 (76.1)	92 (100)

[a]MIPI-S categories reported as Frequency (%)
[b]Beginner Group: Real Beginner (< 1 year), False Beginner 1 ($\geq$ 1 year, < 2 years),
 False Beginner 2 ($\geq$ 2 years)
[c]Goal Achieved range: 0 (*Goal not achieved*) – 10 (*Goal Achieved 100%*)
[d]General Experience with Language Study range: 0 (*Totally unsatisfactory*) – 10 (*Totally Satisfactory*)

The dependent variable for Sub-question 4, Satisfaction with Language Learning, was reported on the PIF-S and measured on an ordinal scale of 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest possible satisfaction*). There were nine students who did not respond to the satisfaction with learning item on the PIF-S. There were no additional survey items which addressed individual student satisfaction with language learning in the course of enrollment. There was, therefore, insufficient information on which to base an imputation of missing satisfaction values for individual students. The variable Satisfaction with Language Learning was comprised of 95 student responses.

Two outliers were identified in the Satisfaction with Language Learning variable. The two responses were from students in different language classes with different teachers. An examination of the two students' surveys found no evidence that the outliers were not accurate representations of student satisfaction. Since both outliers fell within the range of 3 standard deviations from the mean of a normal distribution, both scores were retained in the data set.

The analysis of Sub-question 4 focused on explaining high satisfaction. High satisfaction with language learning was defined in this study as satisfaction ratings of seven and over. After examining the raw satisfaction data, student ratings were transformed into three categories: Low Satisfaction (ratings of 0 to 4), Average Satisfaction (ratings of 5 to 6), and High Satisfaction (ratings of 7 to 10).

Multiple regression is an appropriate statistical procedure for explaining variance in the dependent variable based on one or more predictors (Garson, 2009c; Gay & Airasian, 2000; Leeper, 2000). However, multiple regression could not be applied to Sub-question 4 because the dependent variable in this question was not measured at the

interval level (Garson, 2009c). Ordinal logistic regression, a parametric multiple regression procedure, allows for a dependent variable which is categorical and comprised of more than two ranked categories (Garson, 2009b; Peng et al., 2002).

Satisfaction ratings from students in the same class taught by the same teacher could not be considered to be independent observations. The GEE is an extension of the GZLM module which supports non-independent observations such as clustered or repeated measures (Agresti, 2007; Garson, 2009a). The ordinal logistic regression option for the GEE in SPSS Statistics 17.0 software was used in the analysis of Sub-question 4.

Although Sub-question 4 sought to explain student characteristics related to high satisfaction with learning, the sample size precluded including all ten independent variables in the regression model. The sample size for this study was limited to voluntary participants of the adult student population who were enrolled in noncredit foreign language classes at one community college during a specific semester. The number of participants could not be increased, except by going to other community colleges during another semester. The researcher, therefore, estimated the number of independent variables which the sample size could support for a regression equation. Hair et al. (1998) propose 15 to 20 participants or observations per predictor variable for regression equations. These guidelines suggest that a logistic regression using the student sample's satisfaction ratings (n = 95) as the dependent variable could support five to six independent variables.

Since it was not statistically appropriate to include all ten predictor variables (i.e., Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or Diploma, Beginner Group, Number of FL Studied or Studying, Number of FL Spoken, Culture of Education Match, Primary Goal,

Other Goal(s) Achieved, and General Experience with Language Learning) in the

regression model, each predictor variable was analyzed individually. Table 55 reports the

results of the ordinal logistic regression analyses on the ten independent variables.

Table 55. Ordinal Logistic Regression: Student Characteristics and High Satisfaction

Student characteristics	B	SE	Wald chi-square	Sig.
Gender	-.12	.52	.06	.814
Age Group	.31	.18	3.12	.078
Highest Degree/Diploma	.09	.14	.40	.529
Beginner Group	.21	.30	.48	.488
Number FL Studied	.18	.16	1.17	.280
Number FL Spoken	.08	.21	.13	.714
General Experience with Language Study	.37	.12	9.73	.002
Culture of Education Match: Student, Teacher	-.21	.21	.97	.324
Primary Goal Achieved	.67	.15	19.50	.000
Other Goal(s) Achieved	.00	.01	.08	.783

The Wald statistics and p values show that General Experience with Language

Study and Primary Goal Achieved were the only two variables significantly associated

with satisfaction (see Table 55). The regression coefficients indicate that the log odds of

satisfaction are positively related to both General Experience with Language Study and

Primary Goal Achieved. Primary Goal Achieved is a stronger predictor of satisfaction

than General Experience with Language Study. For every unit increase in a student's

rating of his or her General Experience with Language Study, past and present, the log

odds of satisfaction would be expected to increase by .37. As a student's rating for

Primary Goal Achieved increased by one unit, the log odds of satisfaction would be expected to increase by .67.

Since two predictor variables were significantly associated with satisfaction, these two variables were entered into a regression model together. Table 56 reports the results of the ordinal logistic regression model with the predictors General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved.

Table 56. Ordinal Logistic Regression: Satisfaction Predicted by General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved

| | Satisfaction | | | |
| | | | Wald | |
Student characteristics	B	*SE*	chi-square	Sig.
General experience with language study	.24	.14	3.25	.07
Primary goal achieved	.56	.14	16.43	.00

The regression coefficients in the two-predictor regression model revealed that Primary Goal Achieved was again the stronger predictor of satisfaction. In addition, Primary Goal Achieved was the only variable significantly associated with satisfaction, when the variable General Experience with Language Study was held constant. The regression coefficient for Primary Goal Achieved in the two-predictor model (.56, $p < .00$) was smaller, when the other variable was held constant, than it was in the simple regression equation (.67, $p < .00$; see Table 55, p. 347). Although shown to be a significant influence on satisfaction in a simple regression model (see Table 55, p. 347), the variable General Experience with Language Study was not found to be significantly associated with satisfaction in the two-predictor regression model, when Primary Goal Achieved was held constant.

Collinearity statistics were examined for the variables General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved. Garson (2009c, Multicollinearity section) states that the collinearity statistics for tolerance < .20 indicate the presence of multicollinearity. Tolerance statistics for both variables in the regression model were > .80. Collinearity statistics for variance-inflation factor (VIF) > 4 also suggest multicollinearity (Garson, 2009c, Multicollinearity section). VIF values for General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved were both < 2. Tolerance and VIF statistics suggested that there was no collinearity present. In addition, the condition indices were both < 15. According to Garson, a condition index value < 30 confirms no collinearity. There was no evidence that multicollinearity contributed bias to the regression model using the predictors General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved.

In summary, the hypothesis for Sub-question 4 was accepted. Two student characteristics, General Experience with Language Study and Primary Goal Achieved, were found to be significant predictors of Satisfaction with Learning. Primary Goal Achieved was found to be the strongest predictor of Satisfaction with Learning. These variables were then entered into a ordinal logistic regression model together to explore their influence on predicting satisfaction. In this model, Primary Goal Achieved was the only student characteristic which proved to be significant in predicting students' satisfaction with learning in the context of a noncredit foreign language class.

Sub-question 5.

H$_5$ There is one teacher characteristic or a combination of teacher characteristics,

identified on the PIF-I, which explains High Above Average teacher ratings on

the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI.[6]

The fifth sub-question considered in this study was: Which teacher characteristic

or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the PIF-I, explains High Above

Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI?

Due to the small number of teacher instruments in the sample (n = 9), it was not possible

to answer Sub-question 5 using a statistical procedure. However, it was possible to

examine teacher characteristics for each MIPI category by using the demographic,

educational, and teaching experience information provided on the PIF-I.

It should be noted that no teacher score in the sample fell in either the High

Above Average or the Low Below Average categories for the use of andragogical

principles. The description of the use of andragogical principles by the teacher sample is

therefore limited to teachers whose MIPI scores fell in the Below Average (n = 1),

Average (n = 7), and Above Average (n = 1) categories. Table 57 reports teacher

characteristics and MIPI summative scores, grouped by category.

Table 57. Teacher Characteristics and MIPI Scores, Grouped by Category

| Teacher characteristics | MIPI category[a] | | | |
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Gender				
Male	0	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)
Female	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	0	6 (66.7)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)
Age Group (years)				
20 - 29	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
30 - 39	0	0	0	0
40 - 49	0	2 (22.2)	0	2 (22.2)
50 - 59	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	0	2 (22.2)
60 - 69	0	2 (22.2)	0	2 (22.2)
70 - 79	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
80 +	0	0	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)
Highest Degree/Diploma				
Associate	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
Bachelor's	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	0	3 (33.3)
Master's	0	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)
Doctorate	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)

Table 57, continued

| Teacher characteristics | MIPI category | | | |
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Number FL Spoken				
1	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	0	6 (66.7)
3	0	2 (22.2)	0	2 (22.2)
4	0	0	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)
Years Teaching Experience				
Total Teaching Experience				
≤ 5	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	0	4 (44.4)
6 - 10	0	0	0	0
11 - 15	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
16 - 20	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)
26 - 30	0	0	0	0
≥ 31	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)

Table 57, continued

| Teacher characteristics | MIPI category | | | |
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Teaching Foreign Language (years)				
≤ 5	1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	0	5 (55.6)
6 - 10	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
11 - 15	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
16 - 20	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	0	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
26 - 30	0	0	0	0
≥ 31	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)
Teaching Foreign Language to Adults (years)				
≤ 5	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	0	6 (66.7)
6 - 10	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
11 - 15	0	0	0	0
16 - 20	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	0	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
26 - 30	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
≥ 31	0	0	0	0
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)

Table 57, continued

| Teacher characteristics | MIPI category | | | |
	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Goal Achieved [b]				
Primary Goal				
6	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
7	0	3 (33.3)	0	3 (33.3)
8	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)
9	0	2 (22.2)	0	2 (22.2)
10	0	1 (11.1)	0	1 (11.1)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)
Other Goal(s)				
7	0	2 (28.6)	0	2 (28.6)
8	1 (14.3)	0	0	1 (14.3)
9	0	4 (57.1)	0	4 (57.1)
Total	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	0	7 (100)
Exposure to Adult Learning Information				
Yes	0	4 (44.4)	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)
No	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	0	4 (44.4)
Total	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	9 (100)

[a] MIPI categories reported as Frequency (%) of returned teacher instruments (n = 9). See Characteristics of Teacher Participants section in this chapter for data on teachers (n = 8).
[b] Goal Achieved range: 0 (*Goal not achieved*) – 10 (*Goal achieved 100%*)

In the teacher sample, the teacher with the highest summative MIPI score (T6) was in the Above Average category for use of andragogical principles (see Table 45, p. 313). Teacher T6 reported being a male in the 80 years and over age group and having a Master's degree. This teacher also had spent all of his career teaching foreign language to adult students (see Table 29, p. 276). Teacher T6 gave the achievement of his primary goal a rating of 8, on a scale of 0 (*Goal not fulfilled*) to 10 (*I fulfilled this goal 100%*). This teacher did not report having any secondary goals. Teacher T6 reported having been exposed to adult learning information through the Coordinator of the Continuing Education courses for foreign languages at the community college where he was teaching.

In contrast, the teacher with the lowest summative MIPI score (T5/C14) was in the Below Average category (see Table 45, p. 313). Teacher T5 was a female in the 50 - 59 age group and had a Bachelor's degree. This teacher reported having three years of teaching experience (see Table 29, p. 276). Teacher T5 also reported having spent all of her teaching career teaching foreign language to adults. Teacher T5 gave the achievement of her primary goal for class C14 a rating of 8 on a scale of 0 to 10. This teacher also gave the achievement of her secondary goal for class C14 a rating of 8. Teacher T5 reported she had not been exposed to adult learning information.

The group of teachers whose summative MIPI scores fell in the Average range for use of andragogical principles were predominantly female. Six of the seven Average teachers were between 40 and 79 years old.

The Average group of teachers were well-educated. Four of the seven had either a Master's degree ($n = 3$) or a doctorate ($n = 1$). Only one of the Average teachers had a degree below the Bachelor's degree.

Teachers in the Average group reported having more general teaching experience than they had experience teaching foreign language or experience teaching foreign language to adults. Three of the Average teachers reported having less than five years of teaching experience (see Table 29, p. 276). However, four of them reported five years or less of experience teaching foreign language and five of them reported five years or less of experience teaching foreign language to adults. Four Average teachers reported that they had been exposed to adult learning information.

Four of the seven Average teachers gave the achievement of their primary goal a rating of 6 or 7. Three of the Average teachers rated their achievement of primary goal at 9 or 10.

Teacher goals across all MIPI categories for use of andragogical principles were very similar. Teachers' primary goals focused on basic language knowledge and skills. The teacher who scored in the Above Average MIPI category, however, did report a primary goal for his beginning-level class ("Teach language, customs, history") that seemed more ambitious than the other beginning-level teachers' goals. Teachers' secondary goals focused on cultural understanding and the affective learning environment. Table 58 lists all teachers' primary and other goals, identified by their MIPI category.

Table 58. Teacher Goals and MIPI Category

Teacher goals	MIPI category
Primary Goal:	
The knowledge of and the correct pronunciation of the alphabet	Average
To teach language for everyday use	Average
Conversational language skills	Average
To provide a solid language foundation	Average
Teach basic grammar	Average
Introduce students to the language and teach them basic grammar	Below Average
Teach language, customs, history	Above Average
Teach to the best of my ability to help people to learn how to speak for their work or for pleasure (traveling, etc.)	Average
That everyone learn and speak some and understand verb conjugations	Average
Other Goal(s):	
Some cultural distinctives and rudimentary grammar	Average
Add grammar as it is possible	Average
Culture	Average
Expose students to some culture	Average
Teach students some culture	Below Average
Make the classes interesting and fun. Help students to appreciate another culture, Push down barriers of misunderstanding. For me: end up with friends.	Average
That everyone have fun and feel comfortable speaking and also being in my class.	Average

It was not possible to confirm or reject the hypothesis for Sub-question 5 with

statistical procedures due to the small number of returned teacher instruments ($n = 9$).

This research question could only be answered with a description of teachers whose MIPI

summative scores fell in the three categories for use of andragogical principles present in the data.

In summary, after data collection for the present study was complete, all returned instruments were examined for errors and abnormalities. Participants who were not part of the target population were excluded from the data set. A description of the sample student and teacher populations was derived from the demographic, educational, and instructional perspective data provided by the PIF-S, PIF-I, MIPI, and MIPI-S. Satisfaction with learning, MIPI-S data, and MIPI data were evaluated for outliers and missing data. The mean-replacement method was chosen to impute the missing values found in the MIPI-S and MIPI. The researcher then assessed the reliability of the MIPI and MIPI-S instruments.

The level of measurement in the data, the distribution of the data, and the nature of the research questions guided the selection of appropriate statistical procedures for the research questions. SPSS Statistics 17.0 software was used for all data analysis in this study. The choice of statistical tests and the results of those tests were reported for each individual research question.

The analysis of the primary research question found that there was no significant correlation between adult satisfaction with learning and teacher's instructional perspective. However, a significant relationship was found between students' perceptions of instructional perspective and satisfaction with learning in the analysis of Sub-question 1.

The analysis of Sub-question 2 revealed no significant difference between teacher's self-reported instructional perspective and class perceptions of their teachers'

instructional perspectives. An examination of ranked scores, however, did reveal the extent to which teachers rated themselves lower or higher than their classes rated them on the MIPI summative score and subscale scores.

With regard to the influence of student characteristics on perception of instructional perspective, none of the student variables examined in Sub-question 3 were found to explain student perceptions of High Above Average use of andragogical principles by their instructors. On the other hand, the analysis of Sub-question 4 found that two student characteristics, Primary Goal Achieved and General Experience with Language Study, were significant predictors of satisfaction with learning, with Primary Goal Achieved having the strongest regression coefficient. When both variables were entered into the same regression model, only Primary Goal Achieved was a significant predictor of satisfaction.

No analysis of Sub-question 5 was possible due to the small number of teacher instruments. A description of teachers scoring in the Below Average, Average, and Above Average categories for use of andragogical principles was reported.

Chapter V provides a brief overview of the present study and a discussion of the findings within the context of the literature reviewed in Chapter II and the data analyses reported in Chapter IV. Several implications for practice are identified. The chapter ends with recommendations for future research and a concluding summary of the findings.

Chapter V: Conclusions

Chapter V summarizes the purpose and design of the study. The discussion of the findings in this chapter is based on data analysis results reported in Chapter IV and framed by the literature reviewed in Chapter II. This chapter identifies several implications for practice suggested by the findings. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how adult satisfaction with learning is related to teachers' instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom. A review of the literature in the fields of adult education, student satisfaction, and language learning revealed that virtually no research is available on students and teachers in noncredit foreign language courses. Noncredit foreign language courses are part of a hidden college described by Voorhees and Milam (2005). Although data do exist on community college language courses taken for credit, it is unclear to what extent this information could be helpful in understanding noncredit foreign language instruction, teachers, or learners. This study provides a description of noncredit foreign language students and their teachers in one Continuing Education program at a metropolitan community college in the Midwest.

The literature review also found that, prior to this study, there has been no formal investigation of either adult satisfaction with learning in the context of noncredit foreign language courses or of how satisfaction with learning might be influenced by the teacher's use of andragogical principles in this particular context. Carlson's (2006a) study of foreign language students in a for-credit university setting concluded that, for

these learners, satisfaction is linked to the use of andragogical principles. The present study examined adult foreign language students' satisfaction with learning in a noncredit context. In addition, the present study provided insight into one aspect of the learning environment, instructional perspective, and the extent to which the use of andragogical principles influences student satisfaction in noncredit language courses.

Research Questions

The research questions in this study explored adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective, as reported by teachers and as perceived by students in their classrooms. The primary research question in this study was: What is the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? Five sub-questions were also addressed, including:

1. Is there a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective?

2. Is there a significant difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classes?

3. Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S?

4. Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S)?

5. Which teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the PIF-I, explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI?

Methodology

This study targeted all students enrolled in noncredit beginning-level foreign language classes offered through the Continuing Education program of a metropolitan community college in the Midwest during a fall semester. Satisfaction with learning was reported by language learners on the PIF-S (see Appendix B). The PIF-S was also the source of information on students' gender, age, race or ethnicity, highest degree or diploma earned, language learning experience, culture of educational experience, achievement of primary and other goals, and general experience with language study, past and present. A similar information form for teachers, the PIF-I, provided data on teachers' gender, age, race, highest degree or diploma earned, culture of educational experience, language learning experience, teaching experience, achievement of primary and other goals for the course, and exposure to adult learning information (see Appendix C).

The MIPI was used to investigate teachers' instructional perspective (see Appendix C). The MIPI is a self-report instrument with a Likert-type response scale. It is composed of 45-items in seven subscales: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and Teacher-centered Learning Process. The MIPI was adapted by the researcher for use by students to report

observations and perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective. The MIPI-S retained the item content, factor composition, and scoring of the MIPI (see Appendixes B, D, and F).

Research packets for teachers and students containing instruments and return envelopes were distributed to teachers through the office of Continuing Education of the community college participating in the study. Teachers made the research packets available to students in their beginning-level classes. All participating teachers and students voluntarily completed the instruments outside of class and returned them by mail to the researcher. As an incentive to participate, teachers who completed instruments were offered the opportunity to be included in a gift card drawing. Students who completed instruments were offered the opportunity to be entered into a drawing for two gift cards. Gift cards were awarded upon completion of data collection.

A total of 103 students in 22 different classes participated in the study. This represented 19.5% of the total number of students enrolled in noncredit beginning-level foreign language classes at the community college that fall. The instrument return rate for teachers was 42.10%. Eight teachers teaching nine different beginning classes participated in the study.

Data from the instruments were analyzed using SPSS Statistics 17.0 software. Reliability for summative MIPI and MIPI-S scores was established using Cronbach's alpha and the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Reliability was also calculated for individual MIPI and MIPI-S subscales. Data analysis for the six research questions included an examination of descriptive statistics and tests of normality for key variables; a bivariate correlation test for the Primary Research Question; ordinal logistic regression

for Sub-questions 1, 3, and 4; and a Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test for Sub-question 2. A description of the teacher sample was developed in response to Sub-question 5.

<div align="center">Discussion of the Findings</div>

The discussion of findings in this section begins with the description of students and teachers in noncredit beginning-level foreign language classes which evolved from the study. Second, influences on student participants' satisfaction with learning are discussed within the context of the literature in adult education, student satisfaction research, and language learning. Third, the instructional perspective of noncredit foreign language teachers and the perceptions of instructional perspective reported by their beginning-level students are examined with reference to adult education and language learning literature. Finally, the study's limitations are considered.

Description of the Population

Although students enrolled in community colleges and participating in Continuing Education courses are represented in the literature on higher education, students taking noncredit Continuing Education courses and their teachers are generally absent in the available data. Where information on noncredit students does exist, it is most often reported for work-related programs receiving state or federal funding and not for noncredit programs offering personal interest courses. Data on noncredit Continuing Education classes taken for personal interest, noncredit students, and noncredit teachers are often only kept by individual educational institutions for the purposes of internal review and assessment (see Appendix A). This study provided a portrait of a group of adult learners in beginning-level noncredit foreign language classes and their teachers.

Students in noncredit foreign language courses. The literature on students in noncredit Continuing Education courses emphasizes the diverse population served by these programs. There is, however, "precious little…known concerning the demographic characteristics of noncredit learners" (Voorhees & Milam, 2005, p. 11).

Voorhees and Milam (2005) state that students in noncredit courses represent a wide range of age groups. Students in their 20s have been reported to have the highest participation rate (almost 20%) in all types of noncredit courses, followed by those in their 40s (15%), and 30s (17%; AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006). However, noncredit students older than 40 have been found to be most likely to take noncredit personal interest courses (Phillippe & Valiga, 2000).

The student participants (n = 103) in this study of personal interest foreign language courses ranged in age from the 20s to older than 80. Learners in the 50-59 age group had the highest participation rate in beginning foreign language courses (almost 36%), followed by learners in the 60-69 age group who made up over 26% of the student sample (see Table 9, p. 248). Students in their 20s accounted for 13.6% of foreign language learners, less than the participation rate for all noncredit courses reported by the AACC and ACT, Inc. (2006). It should be noted, however, that the 2006 AACC and ACT, Inc. survey did not distinguish between noncredit courses related to work, developmental reasons, or personal interest. Students aged 40 and over made up 80.6% of learners in the present study, confirming the findings of Phillippe and Valiga (2000) that learners older than 40 are most likely to participate in noncredit personal interest courses. With regard to age, participants in the present study were relatively representative of what previous research has revealed about noncredit students.

Contrary to the stereotype that adult students in personal interest courses are generally retired, Phillippe and Valiga (2000) found that only 5% of the noncredit students they surveyed had retired in the last 2 years. The present study did not ask about students' work or retirement status. Students who were 60 years and older made up 30% of the student sample (see Table 9, p. 248). Even though these learners fall within what might be considered traditional retirement age groups, it was not possible to establish how many may have considered themselves retired.

The Faces of the Future survey (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) is a survey intended to address the lack of data on the diverse population of students attending community colleges. The most recent national survey (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) of community college students found that noncredit students were predominantly female (60%). Eighty-percent of the noncredit students participating in this survey reported their native language as English. With regard to race or ethnicity, the noncredit students surveyed were found to be primarily white, with 15% of the survey's sample identifying themselves as Black/African-American and 10% identifying themselves as Hispanic or Latino.

The student sample for the present study was 65% female (see Table 9, p. 248). Ninety-six percent of the students reported English as their native language. Of the students responding to the PIF-S item about race or ethnicity (n = 92), 88% identified themselves as white or Caucasian. Two students reported being Black/African American, one student reported being Hispanic, and the remaining students responded with an ethnic identifier (e.g., American, European/American, Irish American, American Indian/Western European, Indian, and Italian). With regard to gender, native language,

and race or ethnicity, noncredit student participants in this study were a less diverse group than the students who participated in the 2006 AACC survey.

According to the literature, students in adult and noncredit education make up a "versatile population" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 294). Some are marginalized by age, family situation, physical or intellectual abilities, education, employment, economic resources, incarceration, or medical problems (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Others are working in positions which require academic degrees and/or professional credentials (Voorhees & Milam, 2005).

When examining the education of noncredit students, the Faces of the Future report (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) noted that 30% of those surveyed reported having a high school diploma; 18% reported a four-year degree. Twenty-eight percent reported having a Bachelor's degree or higher. Voorhees and Milam's (2005) review of existing noncredit data reported that 1 in 10 community college students taking a noncredit course reported having a Master's degree or higher.

While the present study did not solicit information about employment, economic class, or social status, it did ask students about the highest degree or diploma earned. More than 13% of students in the sample reported having a high school diploma and almost 36% reported having earned a Bachelor's degree (see Table 10, p. 250). Approximately 77% of student participants reported having a Bachelor's degree or higher. Students reporting a Master's degree or higher accounted for 40.8% of the sample. Compared to the literature available on the educational achievement of noncredit students, the students in this study had attained a higher level of education, with over three-fourths of the students having earned at least a Bachelor's degree.

The study did not ask specifically if students had previously taken other noncredit courses, were currently taking other noncredit courses, were also enrolled in for-credit courses, or were taking the current foreign language course in preparation for participating in a degree program (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006; Voorhees & Milam, 2005). One student did report that his goal was "to prepare myself for intensive course work," which might suggest preparation for taking a for-credit course.

Some students in the study did indicate on the PIF-S that they had taken other "short courses" in foreign language. Responses about student goals (see Table 18, p. 261) revealed that some beginning students (n = 10) were participating in the current class in order to advance previous foreign language learning. Student responses did not indicate, however, if other short courses or previous foreign language learning were in noncredit Continuing Education courses.

Two students reported taking two different courses in the same language the semester they were surveyed. For one, the current noncredit course was being taken to supplement another foreign language course: "I am also taking a telecourse in Spanish so I have no opportunity to speak in that class. The Continuing Education course was to make up for what the other one lacked." Surprisingly, the other beginning-level student reported: "I am also taking an advanced Spanish class for conversation." There was no indication if the telecourse and conversation course were for-credit or noncredit. Telecourses are not usually offered in the noncredit environment (C. Jaeger, personal communication, May 21, 2007).

With regard to student interest in noncredit learning, Voorhees and Milam (2005) state that there is a lack of information about learners' motivation for enrolling in

noncredit classes. Phillippe and Valiga (2000) note the importance of personal

enrichment for adult learners. In addition, they found that skills related to computers or

technology were a motivation for one-third of noncredit students over the age of 40.

The most recent Faces of the Future survey (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) found that 37%

of learners taking a noncredit course were motivated by self-improvement. It is unclear if

self-improvement is similar to *personal enrichment* in these studies or if the two terms

have different motivational emphases. To what extent computer or technological skills

constitute personal enrichment or self-improvement in reports of Phillippe and Valiga's

2000 Faces of the Future survey and the 2006 Faces of the Future survey is also unclear.

The present study did not directly ask about student motivation but it did ask

students for their primary and other goals for taking the current foreign language course.

From their responses, some aspects of student motivation can be inferred. Acquiring

specific foreign language skills and general foreign language knowledge were the

primary and other goal categories which had the most responses (see Table 18, p. 261).

Specific ways students wanted or needed to use the language were the third most

important category of primary goal responses. Only four students mentioned work or

business as a use of the language being studied. Using the language for travel and

communicating with people met during travel were the most common responses in this

category. However, students also wanted to use the language being studied for

communicating with family, friends, or community members; adoption plans; an interest

in family history; and mission work.

Personal motivation, motivational factors related to students' personal well-being

or challenging the self, represented the third most-mentioned *other* goal for students.

These students listed keeping the brain and mind active as well as fun, pleasure, and recreation as important personal goals. One student was motivated by the social aspect of the course: "get out of the apartment." Another mentioned confidence as an *other* goal, although it was unclear from the response whether this was self-confidence, confidence in language learning, both, or some other type of confidence. These findings are supported by authors who have reported that adults participate in adult education for reasons related to personal enrichment (Philippe & Valiga, 2000), self-improvement (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006), social interaction (Houle, 1961; Carlson, 2006a), intellectual challenge (Manteuffel, 1982), fun (Parkinson et al., 2003), as well as pleasure and confidence (Perry, 2006).

Students reporting that they achieved their primary goal at the level of 7 or above (on a scale of 0 - 10) accounted for 46.6% of the sample (see Table 19, p. 264). Students reporting they had achieved their other goal(s) at the level of 7 or above made up 61.7% of the sample. The reason for the difference in goal achievement ratings between primary and other goals was unclear. Were there differences in the type of goals designated as *primary* and *other*? Did students apply a more rigorous standard of evaluation to certain types of goals or to goals that they considered most important? Were the only students to report on other goals also the ones who were most satisfied with the achievement of those goals?

The two most important categories of student goals were the same for primary and other goals: specific language skills and language knowledge. The type of goals or level of difficulty of the goals in these two categories, therefore, would not seem to be a valid reason for the difference in reported achievement of primary and other goals.

However, the third most important category for *other* goals was related to personal well-being and challenge. Student goals in the Personal Motivation category are primarily affective and highly subjective (e.g., pleasure, fun, recreation, confidence, intellectual stimulation, individual challenge or goal) rather than linguistic or functional.

It is possible that students used a different standard to assess the achievement of affective and highly subjective goals than they used in assessing the achievement of goals related to acquisition of certain kinds of knowledge or functional skills. It is also possible that students were more critical of the achievement of what were their most important goals and more relaxed about secondary goals, goals that may not have been as important as the primary goals.

Of the students who reported having other goals in the present study, 18% of them reported low satisfaction (i.e., ratings of $0 - 4$) and 23% reported average satisfaction (ratings of $5 - 6$; see Table 19, p. 264). This would seem to suggest, at least, that the students who reported other goals were not solely students who were highly satisfied.

The present study gives a more detailed picture than is presently available of student goals in a very specific type of noncredit course. Students in the context of this study desired acquisition of a specific type of knowledge or skill, the opportunity to learn something new and challenging, as well as the ability to use language knowledge or skills in specific and very personal contexts. Personal well-being and challenge also played a role in students' motivation for participation. Without a more in-depth investigation into the process by which students judge the achievement of their goals, it is not possible to explain the difference in reports of achievement for primary and other goals in this study.

Voorhees and Milam's (2005) review of existing noncredit data concluded that "noncredit learners [were] more satisfied with the instruction they received than credit students" (p. 11). Noncredit students who reported being satisfied with their educational experience on the Faces of the Future survey (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) accounted for 35% of the sample while 38% of surveyed students reported being very satisfied.

In the present study, 75.8% of students who reported satisfaction with language learning (n = 95) were in the High Satisfaction category, ratings of 7 or above on a scale of 0 to 10 (see Table 54, p. 341). Students reporting average satisfaction (ratings of 5 or 6) made up 17.9% of the sample while students reporting low satisfaction (ratings of 0 to 4) accounted for 6.3% of respondents. Beginning-level students were, in general, highly satisfied with the language learning accomplished in their noncredit course. These students reported at least the same amount, if not more, satisfaction with their language learning experience than the general population of noncredit students in the Faces of the Future survey did with their educational experience.

The literature on language learning suggests that previous language study influences participation in and perception of future language learning experiences (Bucuvalas, 2002; Carlson, 2006a; Horwitz, 1988; Kramsch, 1995; Loughrin-Sacco, 1991; Marinova-Todd et al., 2000). The PIF-S asked students to report their general experience with language study, past and present. Of students responding to this item (n = 100), 71% reported high satisfaction (ratings of 7 or above) with their general experience with language study (see Table 23, p. 268). Students with average satisfaction responses (ratings of 5 or 6) accounted for 21% of the sample while students with low satisfaction (0-4 ratings) made up 8% of the sample. Overall, experience with past and

present language study for the students in the sample was reported to be highly satisfactory. This would seem to suggest that past experience with language study may have influenced continued language learning for the students in the present study.

There was other evidence in the present study that previous language study may have influenced the participation of students in the sample. Over 77% of the students reported having studied or currently studying at least one foreign language other than the one for which they were enrolled (see Table 17, p. 259). In addition, over 43% of students reported having spent between 1 and 10 years studying the language in which they were currently enrolled (see Table 15, p. 255).

The evidence of student satisfaction with language study experience, persistence in language study in general, and persistence in the study of the current foreign language, could be interpreted to mean that students in the present study had been encouraged by previous positive experiences to continue foreign language study. Carlson (2006a) found that students "who had experienced a nurturing, caring and exciting teacher who loved teaching, exerted enthusiasm, and made learning applicable, relevant, and challenging, held fond memories that made them commit to learning more [foreign language]" (p. 140).

Another interpretation of the data on language study persistence in the present study could be that this group of students were by nature persistent learners, persisting in language learning in spite of past experience. There is evidence in Carlson's (2006a) study that, for some adult language learners, negative language learning experiences can be the source of increased motivation for continued foreign language learning.

In the present study, one student reported a previous unsatisfactory language study experience among the three language study experiences she rated. This student gave her four years of high school Spanish courses a satisfaction rating of 2 due to "rote, tapes, no way to practice speaking." However, her three years of high school Latin courses, taken simultaneously with Spanish, received a satisfaction rating of 10, as did her current Bosnian-Croatian class. Commenting on the Bosnian-Croatian course, she noted: "This course has been BEST, most well taught." This student, having had an unsatisfactory experience with language study, persisted in future language study, although the influence of the highly satisfactory Latin learning experience may have counterbalanced the unsatisfactory Spanish experience with regard to her desire to persist in language learning.

There is evidence in the present study that past language study experience does affect persistence and participation in continued language study. A large group of students reported highly satisfactory experiences with present language learning (75.8%) and with general experiences with language study, past and present (71%). A larger portion of the student sample (77%) reported experience with studying at least one other foreign language and 43% of students had spent one year or more studying the language for which they were enrolled. This evidence offers support to the suggestion in existing literature that previous language study experience is a factor in persistence in and perceptions of future language learning.

Loughrin-Sacco (1991) found that the composition of a beginning foreign language class had consequences for learners in the areas of persistence with language study, self-concept as a language learner, and perceptions of the language learning

environment. The author examined differences between beginners and false beginners in beginning-level foreign language classes.

The present study included the variable Beginner Group in the analysis of Sub-questions 3 and 4. The ordinal logistic regression model used to answer Sub-questions 3 and 4 showed that the beginner group to which a student belonged (i.e., Real Beginner, False Beginner 1, or False Beginner 2) was not a statistically significant predictor of student membership in the High Satisfaction category (i.e., Sub-question 4) or of student perceptions of High Above Average use of andragogical principles (i.e., Sub-question3). In the context of the noncredit foreign language classes examined in this study, class composition was not found to influence adult satisfaction with learning or student perceptions of instructional perspective.

The review of literature indicated that differences in cultural orientation between students and their teachers may affect students' educational experience and their perceptions of the learning environment (Cheng & Tam, 1997; Guy, 1999; Hazell, 1994; Knox et al., 1992; Littlewood, 2000, 2001; Patterson et al., 1998; Rovai & Gallien, 2005; Sauer, 2003). With regard to foreign language students and their teachers, the literature review did not reveal any studies which investigated differences between student or teacher cultures of origin or, more specially, between students or teachers who had been educated in different cultural environments. Neither did the literature reveal evidence, other than anecdotal evidence, that cultural differences, particularly differences in educational culture, between student and teacher influence teaching and learning in the foreign language classroom.

In the present study, the majority of the students had experience primarily with American educational culture (see Table 11, p. 251). Most of the teachers in the sample had experience, either as learners or as teachers, in American educational culture as well as the educational culture of at least one other country.

With regard to differences in educational culture, there were only 52 student-teacher pairs which could be examined in the data set. In order to compare data across classes, students' ratings of satisfaction with learning and their summative MIPI-S scores were averaged by class. Some anecdotal differences were noted between classes where students and teachers all had educational experiences in the same culture and classes where students and teachers had no experience with the other's culture of education. Table 59 reports the MIPI and MIPI-S summative scores and mean-by-class Satisfaction ratings for classes where the student-teacher culture of education match were the same, different, or *mixed* (i.e., students and teachers had educational experiences in diverse cultures but had experience in at least one common educational culture).

Table 59. Summary Comparison: Culture Match, MIPI and MIPI-S Summative Scores, Mean-by-Class Satisfaction

Teacher/Class	Culture match	MIPI (Category)	Mean MIPI-S (Category)	Mean satisfaction	Number of students
T1/C1	Mixed	174 (Average)	146 (Below Average)	7.0	2
T2/C3	Mixed	172 (Average)	176.4 (Average)	7.88	8
T3/C4	Mixed	175.7 (Average)	159 (Average)	5.50	4
T4/C9	Same	173 (Average)	178.5 (Average)	8.67	3
T5/C13	Same	168 (Average)	169.5 (Average)	7.70	10
T5/C14	Same	142 (Below Average)	189.1 (Above Average)	8.50	7
T6/C15	Different	186.2 (Above Average)	150.3 (Average)	6.50	4
T7/C28	Different	172 (Average)	159.7 (Average)	6.60	5
T8/C31	Mixed	175.1 (Average)	178.1 (Average)	7.78	9

In the two classes labeled *different* for cultural match (i.e., C15 and C28) students and teachers attended school in different educational cultures and no one in either group had formal experience with the other's culture of learning (see Table 59). All students in these two classes (n = 9) had been educated in the U.S., with only one student having some additional educational experience in Canada. The teachers in both these classes had been educated solely in countries outside the U.S. The mean student satisfaction with

learning ratings for these classes C15 and C28 put them among the three classes with the lowest mean satisfaction ratings. In addition, the mean MIPI-S summative scores for both C15 and C28 fell in the low end of the Average category for use of andragogical principles (see Appendix E). These mean MIPI-S summative scores were the second and third lowest mean MIPI-S summative scores for the nine classes within the student-teacher paired data set.

Teachers in C15 and C28 reported MIPI summative scores in the Above Average and Average categories (see Table 59). Teacher T6/C15, in fact, had the highest MIPI score in the teacher sample. When individual students' MIPI-S summative scores and their teachers' MIPI summative scores were compared, seven of the nine students in classes C15 and C28 rated their teachers lower on the use of andragogical principles than the teachers rated themselves, as reflected in the class MIPI-S means.

The three classes labeled *same* for cultural match were comprised of students and teachers whose only educational experiences were in the U.S. Mean student satisfaction scores for these classes (i.e., C9, C13, C14), were in the high satisfaction range, ratings of 7 or above (see Table 59). In fact, classes C9 and C14 were the two classes in the sample with the highest mean satisfaction. C14 also had the highest mean MIPI-S summative score in the sample. Classes C9 and C13 had mean MIPI-S summative scores in the Average range and C9 was among the three classes with the highest mean MIPI-S scores.

The teachers in classes C9, C13, and C14 had MIPI scores in the Average category (n = 2) and Below Average category (n = 1). It should be noted that classes C13 and C14 had the same teacher, T5, who turned in a completed MIPI for each of the two classes she taught. Teacher T5's summative MIPI scores were different for each class.

When individual students' MIPI-S scores were examined, 11 of the 20 students in classes C9, C13, and C14 rated their teachers higher on use of andragogical principles than the teachers rated themselves.

The examination of classes where students and teachers had educational experiences in different cultures and classes where students and teachers had educational experiences in the same culture provided anecdotal evidence that differences between students and teachers with regard to culture of education may have an influence on student satisfaction and perceptions of instructional perspective in the foreign language classroom. However, the ordinal logistic regression model used to answer Sub-questions 3 and 4 revealed that, in the context of the study sample, the culture of education match was not a statistically significant predictor of student membership in the High Satisfaction category (i.e., Sub-question 4) or of student perceptions of High Above Average use of andragogical principles (i.e., Sub-question3).

The small number of student-teacher pairings within the sample and the small number of classes with student-teacher pairings represent a limitation of this study and a limitation for a full exploration of the influence of differences in the cultural perspective of learners and teachers in the entire sample. Future research with larger student and teacher samples could come to a different conclusion as to whether or not the culture of education match is an important influence on satisfaction with learning or the learning climate in the foreign language classroom.

Given the absence of a national data base on noncredit learning, what is known about noncredit learners and their teachers comes from disparate bits and pieces of information cobbled together from educational institutions which make their noncredit

data public, a few national surveys, government agencies which collect data on programs with state or federal funding, and a few authors interested in the subject. This study supplements the rather sketchy picture of students in noncredit classes that does exist by describing a group of students participating in noncredit Continuing Education foreign language courses. Students in the sample were found to be fairly representative of what is known about the noncredit population in age and gender. The student sample was less diverse than the population described in the 2006 Faces of the Future survey (AACC & ACT, Inc., 2006) with regard to gender, native language, and race or ethnicity. A larger number of students in this study had attained higher levels of education than the noncredit population described in the literature.

Student participants' primary and other goals for learning focused on the acquisition of specific foreign language skills and general foreign language knowledge. Use of the language being studied for specific, personal needs or interests was the third most important category of primary goals while personal motivation was the third most important category of other goals. The percentage of students who rated the achievement of their other goal at the level of 7 or above (on a 0 to 10 point scale) was 15% larger than the percentage of students who rated the achievement of their primary goal at the level of 7 or above. It was not possible to explain this difference in achievement ratings with the data available in the present study.

Three-fourths of students reported high satisfaction with language learning. Students reported that their general experience with language study, past and present, was also highly satisfactory. There is an indication in the data for the present study that

positive general experiences with language study are a factor in language learning persistence and satisfaction.

The mix of less-experienced and more-experienced language learners in the beginning foreign language classroom has been shown to have consequences for language learning persistence, students' self-concept as language learners, and perceptions of the learning environment. The present study did not find that the level of experience with the language being studied influenced either student satisfaction with learning or student perceptions of instructional perspective.

There was some anecdotal evidence in the data supporting differences in satisfaction with language learning and perception of instructional perspective when comparing classes where students and teacher came from the same educational culture and classes where students and teacher had no experience with the educational culture of the other. However, the culture of education match was not found to be a statistically significant influence on satisfaction with language learning or perception of instructional perspective.

Teachers in noncredit foreign language courses. Descriptions of full-time and part-time community college faculty appear in the literature and community college teachers continue to be the subject of research interest (Brewer, 1999; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Kozeracki, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; McManus, 2008; Outcalt, 2002; Palmer, 2002; Schuetz, 2002). Teachers in noncredit Continuing Education programs offered through community colleges have received much less research attention, in part, perhaps, due to the fact that there is "no systematic data" on noncredit programs (Grubb et al., 2002). Information that does exist on noncredit

programs is not necessarily reported outside the institution which collects it nor, when it is reported, is it reported with any consistency (Milam, 2005; see also Appendix A).

Approximately 65% of community college teachers are employed part-time (Leslie & Gappa, 2002) and there is a higher percentage of part-time teachers in noncredit programs than in credit programs (Grubb et al., 2002). It is unclear, however, to what extent existing information on part-time community college faculty teaching for-credit courses is applicable to teachers in noncredit programs offered through Continuing Education programs at community colleges. It is also unclear the extent to which data on foreign language teachers are applicable to the noncredit foreign language teacher. What is clear is that a comprehensive portrait of instructors of noncredit foreign language courses, especially with regard to demographic characteristics and teaching practices, does not exist in the literature. The present study provides a description of one group of teachers in this population.

In the current study, all foreign language instructors, except one, were in the age 40-49 age group (see Table 27, p. 272). Five of the eight were females. The six teachers who reported their race or ethnicity identified themselves variously as white or Caucasian (n = 2), white/Hispanic (n = 1), Hispanic (n = 1), Asian (n = 1), and Italian (n = 1).

The requirements for education, professional credentials, and teacher preparation for instructors in elementary, secondary, or post-secondary foreign language programs may be very different from criteria used in hiring foreign language teachers for noncredit Continuing Education programs (AACC, 2009c; Grubb et al., 2002; Henschke, 1987). Typically, the primary criteria for hiring teachers in Continuing Education and noncredit

programs are subject expertise, work experience, specialized knowledge and skills in a particular field, or a combination of all three (AACC, 2009c).

With regard to the level of education of teachers in the present study, seven of the eight teachers had at least a Bachelor's degree. Four had Master's degrees; one reported having a doctorate. The PIF-I did not ask teachers to identify the field in which they had earned their degrees. Nor did it ask about teaching credentials. It was not possible, therefore, to determine from the information available if teachers in the sample held degrees in education, in a field related to foreign language learning, or in the language they were teaching.

Teacher data did provide evidence that some teachers may have been hired to teach a specific language due, at least in part, to their native fluency in that language. Six of the eight teachers in the sample were teaching the language that they reported as their native language. The same six teachers also reported attending elementary and secondary schools in cultures where their native language was the primary language. Two of these teachers reported having attended a post-secondary institution in the native language culture; four had attended post-secondary institutions in their native language culture and the U.S. Three teachers had earned their highest degree from educational institutions in their native language culture. Six of the eight teachers in the sample clearly had a deep experiential background in the language and culture of the language they were teaching.

The educational culture in which a teacher has learned as a student influences the teacher's understanding of all elements of the educational paradigm (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Guy, 1999; Richards, n.d.; Roberts, 1998; Sternberg, 2002). It also influences the learning environment which the teacher creates in the classroom (Ellis,

2006; McDonough, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2001; Zenhui, 1999, 2001). Information

provided by the present study contributes to a better understanding of the educational

cultures which shaped one group of noncredit foreign language teachers.

As previously discussed, six of the eight teachers in the sample had educational

experiences in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary schools outside the U.S. All

but one of the six teachers educated outside the U.S. had also experienced the educational

context within which American students had learned. Furthermore, five of these six

teachers had experience teaching in educational institutions in the U.S. as well as another

country.

The variable Culture of Education Match: Students, Teachers was included in the

analysis of the influence of student characteristics on learning satisfaction and

perceptions of instructional perspective in the present study. This variable did not prove

to be a statistically significant predictor of either satisfaction or perceptions of

instructional perspective in the context of the small study sample. Given the little

information available on the influence of culture of education similarities or differences

between students and teachers in the adult foreign language classroom, this aspect of the

learning climate would be worthy of further research.

A review of the literature provided no information on the teaching experience of

noncredit foreign language teachers. The teaching sample in the present study was

composed of less-experienced teachers and teachers with extensive teaching experience.

The range of total teaching experience in the teacher sample was from 3 to 62 years (see

Table 29, p. 276), with teachers reporting a range of 2 to 35 years of experience teaching

foreign language. Only three teachers, however, had taught foreign language for their

entire teaching careers. Half the teachers had taught no language other than the one they were currently teaching.

Four teachers reported that they had only taught adults during their foreign language teaching experience (see Table 29, p. 276). Two of the three teachers with the most total teaching experience also had the most experience teaching foreign language to adults. However, only two teachers had taught foreign language to adults for their entire teaching career. These same two teachers (i.e., T5 and T6) reported the highest and lowest summative scores on the MIPI (see Table 59, p. 377). The teacher with the least experience reported a score in the Below Average category; the teacher with the most experience reported the highest MIPI score.

The literature does not provide any insight into the goals of instructors teaching noncredit foreign language classes. In the present study, teachers' primary goals for the courses they taught (see Table 30, p. 278) were language knowledge and specific language skills, reflecting the same primary goals as their students (see Table 18, p. 261 and Table 31, p. 279). As with their students, speaking was the language skill most often mentioned by teachers as a primary goal. Learning about the culture and history of target language countries and producing an interesting, fun, and comfortable learning environment were the two most important *other* teacher goals. Three teachers mentioned goals related to using the language in a specific context: work, pleasure or travel, and everyday use. In addition, three teachers had personal goals related to teaching ("teach to the best of my ability"), creating interpersonal understanding ("push down barriers of misunderstanding"), and social interaction ("to make friends").

Teachers reported more interest in helping students learn about culture than students reported interest in learning about culture. This may have been due to the fact that these beginning-level students were focused on acquiring the new language. In addition, since over half the students were Real Beginners and had a limited foreign language learning experience (see Table 16, p. 256), it is possible that these novice language learners did not have an understanding of the extent to which language and culture are intertwined. Perhaps they also did not have an understanding of how crucial cultural awareness is when using a foreign language to interact with native speakers, especially in the context of business, travel, or simply living in another culture. In contrast, most of the teachers in the sample had experience attending school and working in at least two different cultures. The teachers were perhaps in a better position to judge the value of learning about culture than were their beginning-level students.

Eight of the nine teacher instruments in the sample reported achievement of the teacher's primary goal at the level of 7 or above on a scale of 0 to 10 (see Table 32, p. 281). All teachers who had *other* goals reported achieving those goals at the level of 7 or above. As with their students, teachers reported achieving *other* goals at a higher level than they did for their primary goals (see Table 32, p. 281). *Other* goals of helping students learn about culture and making the learning environment interesting, fun, and comfortable may have been evaluated more subjectively by teachers than were primary goals related to the acquisition of certain specific skills or knowledge. The nature of these *other* goals may also mean they were easier to achieve in a class period or over the course of a twelve-week course than were goals related to producing speech or acquiring an understanding of new grammatical structures.

Over the years, the literature on adult education has suggested that a learner-centered environment is the most appropriate setting for adult learning (Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Hiemstra, 1991a; Knowles, 1975, 1989a, 1996; Mahoney, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Tough, 1999). Adults are best served by a learning environment which supports their needs (Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Knowles, 1980; Knowles et al., 1998; Long, 2004; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Perry, 2006; Wlodkowski, 1999) as well as their learning intentions, motivations, and goals (Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Donaghy, 2004; Endorf & McNeff, 1991; Houle, 1961; Knowles, 1972, 1989b; Perry, 2006; Wlodkowski, 1999). The effective teacher of adults creates an environment which reflects an accurate understanding of adults and adult learning (Galbraith, 2004; Hall & Hall, 1990; Henschke, 1987; Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990; Justice & Dornan, 2001; Kidd, 1967; Long, 2002; McCombs, 2001; Wlodkowski, 1999; Zenhui, 1999, 2001), meets adult learner needs (Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Collins, 2004; Kidd, 1967; Mahoney, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Zemke & Zemke, 1984), supports a collaborative student-teacher relationship based on mutual trust (Brookfield, 1986; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Conti, 2004; Knowles, 1990, 1996), and helps learners accomplish their goals (Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; McCombs, 2001; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

Teachers of adults are not generally required to have teacher training (Grubb et al., 2002; Henschke, 1987, 1994) or even "preparation in the instructional process of helping adults learn" (Galbraith, 2004, p. 4). Information is lacking on the extent to which teachers of adults in noncredit courses have been exposed to information on adult learning. One study found that an understanding of what constitutes adult learning

principles was limited in educational administrators responsible for organizing teacher development experiences (Stricker, 2006).

Teachers in the present study were asked if they had been exposed to information on adult learning and, if so, the source of that information. Five teachers reported having been exposed to information on adult learning. Two teachers reported the source of that information to be in formal educational settings: "random lectures and seminars on adult education," "seminars, college classes." The coordinator of the Continuing Education foreign language classes at the community college hosting the study was reported by one teacher as his source of adult learning information.

A fourth teacher cited student evaluations as a source of adult learning information. Student evaluations could certainly be considered a legitimate source of information on adult learning for a specific group of students. Unfortunately, neither the type of evaluation to which students were responding nor the type of information about learning that these student evaluations provided was made clear in the teacher's response.

The fifth teacher's source of information on adult learning was her own personal investigation of the field using the Internet and "books" as well as her own experience as a language learner. Her experience as a native Spanish-speaker from Peru learning English as a second language provided a sense of her own adult learning process: "what really I need if to learn the new language."

The literature reports that teacher experiences as language learners, particularly as adult language learners, shape beliefs about learning, teaching, and teaching practice in unexpected ways (Burden, 2004; McDonough, 2002; Ransdell, 1993; Vélez-Rendón, 2002). Only one teacher in the present study cited personal language learning experience

as a source of information on adult learning in spite of the fact that all teachers reported being at least bilingual (see Table 28, p. 275). One teacher, in fact, reported speaking four foreign languages.

The PIF-I items which produced the teacher responses (i.e., Have you been exposed to information on adult learning? If yes, indicate the source of that information.) were intended to elicit information about which teachers had received formal training in or information about adult learning. However, a re-phrasing of these items might have elicited different and more meaningful responses about the source of adult learning information, knowledge, or understanding. Better questions might have been: *Do you have a knowledge or understanding of adult learning or adult learning principles? If yes, what is the source of that knowledge or understanding?* Teacher responses to these questions could have provided more insight into the range of sources, including subjective experience, which shape beliefs about learning and teaching in the adult foreign language classroom.

The literature reveals that there are limited resources available for noncredit teacher development or support (Grubb et al., 2002). In addition, opportunities for faculty development experiences for noncredit teachers either within an institution or through outside workshops or conferences are rare (Grubb et al., 2002). This study did not investigate teacher development opportunities. One teacher response about the source of his information on adult learning did suggest, however, that some information about teaching adults had been available to teachers in the sample through the coordinator of Continuing Education foreign language classes at the community college hosting the study.

The teacher is a critical element in any learning activity (Apps, 1981).

The instructional perspective of the teacher shapes the learning climate and the

interaction between teacher and student, co-learners in the classroom (Henschke, 1989).

Instructional perspective is the unique set of beliefs, feelings, behaviors, and experiences

which a teacher brings to the roles of learning facilitator, mentor, guide, and co-learner

(Henschke, 1989; Zinn, 2004). Instructional perspective not only shapes the learning

climate and classroom interaction, it serves as a filter through which the teacher perceives

what happens in the classroom (Collins et al., n.d.).

In the foreign language classroom, instructional perspective is influenced by: (a)

professional knowledge and skills (Burden, 2004; McDonough, 2002; Vélez-Rendón,

2002); (b) proficiency in a particular language, a specialized knowledge of a language, or

both (Vélez-Rendón, 2002); and (c) personal language learning experience (Burden,

2004; McDonough, 2002; Vélez-Rendón, 2002). Bell's (2005) study of postsecondary

foreign language teacher behaviors and attitudes recommends continued research

comparing the teaching experience, education, teacher certification, and differences in

teaching approaches of teachers of different languages in order to better understand

foreign language teacher beliefs, effective teaching practice, and the influence of those

teacher beliefs on practice in the classroom. The present study investigated noncredit

foreign language teachers across several languages with regard to teaching experience,

level of education, culture of educational experience, and the use of andragogical

principles.

Carlson (2006a, 2006b), Palmunen (1995), and Schleppegrell (1987) suggest that

the application of learner-centered or andragogical principles in the context of foreign

language learning is beneficial to the adult language learning process. However, Carlson's study emphasizes that it is unclear what the instructional perspective of foreign language teachers is, the extent to which foreign language teachers may use andragogical principles, and whether the use of andragogical principles does result in satisfactory learning experiences for adult foreign language students.

The present study used the MIPI to assess the instructional perspective of noncredit foreign language teachers. Henschke (as cited in Stanton, 2005) has noted that a score on the MIPI only represents a teacher's awareness of instructional perspective captured at a particular point in time. Instructional perspective is a fluid, evolving attribute. Additional teaching experiences, learning, or reflection can contribute to increased awareness of instructional perspective (Galbraith, 2004; Long, 2002; McCombs, 2001; Wegge, 1991; Weimer, 2002; Wyss, 2002), although they do not guarantee a change in those beliefs, values, and behaviors (Collins, 2004; Gorham, 1985).

The present study assessed the instructional perspective of a group of teachers who taught six different languages. The summative score for seven of the nine teacher MIPIs fell in the Average range for use of andragogical principles. No evidence was found in the small teacher sample that there were important differences in how teachers of different languages perceived their instructional perspective. Furthermore, this study found no statistically significant correlation between teachers' use of andragogical principles and mean-by-class satisfaction with learning (see Table 46, p. 315). In addition, no statistically significant differences were found between the teachers' use of andragogical principles, as reported on the MIPI, and students' perceptions of their

teachers' instructional perspective, as reported using mean-by-class MIPI-S scores (see Table 49, p. 327).

Previous research has found that teachers may see themselves differently than their students see them (Fraser & Treagust, 1986; Stricker, 2006; Wegge, 1991). There does appear to be anecdotal evidence in the present study that teacher perceptions of their own instructional perspective were different from students' observations of instructional perspective when individual subscales of the MIPI and the MIPI-S are examined (see Table 50, p. 328). A majority of teachers reported less use of andragogical principles than their students observed for Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, and Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process. In other words, teachers reported being less learner-centered for these subscales while students perceived greater learner-centeredness. A majority of teachers rated themselves higher than their students did on Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners, Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Factor 6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process). Thus, teachers perceived themselves as being more learner-centered in these areas while their students reported them to be less learner-centered.

With regard to summative MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S scores, five teachers rated themselves lower on the use of andragogical principles than their classes' did. The differences were small for four classes (e.g., 1.5, 3.0, 4.4, and 5.5 points). However, one teacher's MIPI summative score was 47.1 points below the mean of her class.

In classes where teachers rated themselves higher than their classes did, larger differences between the summative MIPI and mean-by-class MIPI-S scores were found

(e.g., 12.3, 16.7, 28, 35.9 points). Among the languages being studied in the classes which composed this group were Arabic and Chinese, two languages which could be considered among the more difficult languages to learn of all the languages in the sample and languages which required learning a new alphabet. There was no indication in the data, however, that the language being studied influenced instructional perspective or perceptions of instructional perspective.

One teacher, teacher T5, proved to be of particular interest since she returned separate instruments for the two beginning-level classes (i.e., C13 and C14) that she taught (see Table 59, p. 377). For class C14 her summative MIPI score fell in the Below Average range, while her MIPI score for class C13 was 26 points higher and fell in the Average range (see Appendix E). The fact that the same teacher would report two different instructional perspectives for two different classes raises the question of whether or not there was a fundamental difference between the two classes which would cause the teacher to report her beliefs, values, and behaviors differently.

The present study can only suggest a possible answer to this question: class composition. A comparison of classes C13 and C14 across several student and teacher factors (i.e., age, gender, race, education, culture of education, language learning experience, teaching experience, satisfaction with learning, achievement of goals, and general experience with language study) revealed a difference in class composition. Class C13 was composed entirely of Real Beginners (n = 10), what this study defines as language students with less than one year of study experience with the language of enrollment. Class C14, on the other hand, was divided between Real Beginners (n = 4)

and students in the False Beginner 2 category (n = 3; i.e., students with two or more years of study experience with the language of enrollment).

Loughrin-Sacco (1991) found that the integration of beginners and more experienced false beginners had consequences for teachers as well as learners in for-credit elementary-level university foreign language courses. According to Loughrin-Sacco, in a class of mixed-experience students, the teacher could be faced with beginners who perceive lack of success, intimidation, feelings of inadequacy, anxiety, embarrassment, and less comprehension of the instructor's use of the target language when comparing themselves to the more experienced, false beginners, in their class. The author describes beginners as reluctant volunteers who avoid being called on and attempt to segregate themselves from the more-experienced false beginners. Feeling discouraged by the easy success of their more experienced co-learners, most beginners in Loughrin-Sacco's study did not continue to the next level of language study.

False beginners, on the other hand, presented a different challenge to the instructor (Loughrin-Sacco, 1991). False beginners were described by Loughrin-Sacco as active, willing participants in class who experienced success in speaking and understanding the teacher. They were often called on or used to model language production in certain activities but, the author suggests, false beginners were not necessarily challenged to progress by the work of the class.

Teachers in the Loughrin-Sacco (1991) study attempted to make adjustments for the uneven nature of language experience in the classroom by adjusting instructional activities and assessment plans. Loughrin-Sacco reports that teachers in the classes studied were faced with a frustrating dilemma with regard to class pace, use of the target

language for teaching, and choice of appropriate group activities. In spite of teacher efforts, interviews with study participants suggested that satisfaction was hard to realize for beginners in mixed-experience classes. Not surprisingly, these learners did not persist in language learning to the extent that false beginners did.

In the present study, students in the Real Beginner class (i.e., C13) and their teacher, T5, had similar perceptions of the instructional perspective exhibited in the classroom. Teacher MIPI score and mean MIPI-S score for class C13 were 1.5 points apart; both scores fell in the Average range for use of andragogical principles.

In the mixed-experience class C14, on the other hand, students rated teacher T5 47.1 points higher on use of andragogical principles than the teacher rated herself. The students in C14 perceived much more learner-centeredness in teacher T5's classroom than she did herself. Additionally, the mixed-experience class reported a higher mean satisfaction (8.50) than the Real Beginner class did (7.70; see Table 59, p. 377).

The literature on adult education suggests that the appropriate model for any learning situation is the one which best fits the characteristics of the learners (Brockett, 1994; Knowles, 1980, 1990, 1995). Knowles (1980) states that "the [pedagogical and andragogical] models do not represent bad/good or child/adult dichotomies, but rather a continuum of assumptions to be checked out in terms of their rightness for particular learners in particular situations" (p. 391). Teacher T5's perception of greater teacher-centeredness for the mixed-experience class may represent her response to the challenge of this particular group of learners. Trying to help two very different groups of learners achieve their learning goals in class C14, the teacher may have felt she took a more directive role in the classroom than she did in class C13, the Real Beginner class.

In contrast to the teacher's perception of her own efforts, however, the students in C14 reported higher use of andragogical principles in teacher T5's classroom than any other class in the sample reported. Moreover, the class mean for satisfaction with learning for the mixed-experience class was the second highest in the sample.

Teacher T5 reported no exposure to adult learning information. This distinguished her from teacher T6 who had the highest score for use of andragogical principles and had been exposed to adult learning information. However, since teacher T5's score for the Real Beginner class fell in the Average category, lack of exposure to adult learning information alone does not seem to account for her low report of andragogical perspective in the mixed-experience class, C14.

The data available in the present study cannot adequately explain the reason for the dramatic difference between teacher T5's perception of instructional perspective in the mixed-experience class and her students' observations. Class composition may be one component of the learning climate that produced such a striking difference between how the teacher saw herself and how her students saw her. On the other hand, there could well be other factors related to the teacher, the students, or the learning situation which have yet to be identified and which account for this difference in perception. Whatever the reasons for the difference, the learning climate created by teacher T5 in both her classrooms resulted in high satisfaction with language learning for the students. The anecdotal evidence in the present study suggests that the effect of class composition on teaching and learning and the extent to which teacher perceptions of instructional perspective may be situation-specific are areas that could benefit from future research.

In summary, the portrait of teachers of noncredit foreign language class in the present study revealed that, like their students, these teacher were primarily female and aged 40 and over. Seven of the eight teachers had a Bachelor's degree or higher. The teachers represented a more diverse sample than did their students in terms of native language, race or ethnicity, and culture of education. Most teachers had a deep linguistic and cultural experience with the language which they were teaching; however, there were insufficient data to determine the extent to which teachers also had academic preparation for teaching or for teaching a foreign language. Five of the eight teachers had been exposed to information on adult learning.

Seven of the nine MIPI scores fell within the Average range for use of andragogical principles. The question of why teachers saw themselves as more learner-centered than their students saw them in some areas and less learner-centered than their students saw them in other areas could not be answered given the type of data in the present study. Further investigation of teacher behaviors, beliefs, and feelings in noncredit foreign language classrooms using qualitative methods, however, could suggest some answers.

The teacher sample was a mixture of less-experienced teachers and teachers with extensive teaching experience. There were only two teachers in the sample, however, who could be said to have extensive experience teaching foreign language to adults. Only two teachers reported teaching foreign language to adults for their entire teaching career and these two teachers reported very different instructional perspectives.

Both teachers and students had similar goals for the course in which they were engaged: language knowledge and specific language skills, particularly speaking skills.

Teachers, however, included the teaching of culture in their goals more often than their students did. Most teachers reported having achieved their goals at a level of 7 or above on a 10-point scale.

Neither differences between the culture of education of teachers and students nor class composition were shown to be statistically significant predictors of student satisfaction or perceptions of instructional perspective. However, anecdotal evidence in the present study suggests that the culture of education match between students and teachers and the integration of more-experienced and less-experienced learners in the same beginning-level foreign language class are aspects of the learning climate which should be explored further. In addition, the extent to which instructional perspective may differ for the same teacher with different groups of learners has not been adequately addressed in the literature.

There are many unanswered questions about teachers in noncredit foreign language courses and about perceptions of the learning climate by adult learners and their teachers in those courses. This study contributes to the literature on foreign language study and adult learning by describing a small slice of these two populations with regard to teacher and student demographic and educational information, adult satisfaction with language learning, teacher instructional perspective, and students' perceptions of instructional perspective.

Primary Research Question

The primary research question considered in this study was: What is the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom? For the purposes of this study,

the adult language learner was defined as any person, aged 18 and older, who was pursuing foreign language learning. Learning was defined as "the act or experience of one [who] learns" (*"Learning,"* 2005) and referred to all levels of change, actions, and processes through which knowledge, attitudes, skills, or expertise are deliberately acquired (Apps, 1981; Knowles et al., 1998; "Learning," 1996). The definition of adult satisfaction with learning used in the present study was "the favorability of [an adult learner's] subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with [language learning]" (Elliott & Shin, 2002, p. 198) at a particular point in time.

Satisfaction with learning was measured by a single, Likert-type item on the PIF-S: Circle the number which best indicates your level of satisfaction with your personal language learning in this course. The range of possible responses were from 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest satisfaction possible*).

A review of satisfaction research found that reports of satisfaction are highly individual and subjective (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Rogers, 1983). They represent a synthesis of cognitive processes which evaluate the extent to which a person's expectations are met and the feelings resulting from a particular outcome, the subjective experience (Astin, 1993; Elliott & Shin, 2002; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002).

The literature on satisfaction in an educational context revealed that student satisfaction is influenced by certain aspects of the psychosocial learning climate: social climate (Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002), type of class or discipline (Beer & Darkenwald, 1989; Hearn, 1985), feeling a part of the classroom community (Parkinson et al., 2003; Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005), an engaging affective environment (Knowles, 1980; Manteuffel, 1982), feelings of safety (Manteuffel, 1982; Parkinson et al., 2003;

Perry, 2006), student-oriented faculty (Astin, 1993), quality of teaching (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Grayson, 2004; Guolla, 1999; Knox et al., 1992; Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002), teaching style (Hearn, 1985), congruence between student and faculty educational orientation (Morstain, 1977), intellectual stimulation or growth (Guolla, 1999; Knox et al., 1992), faculty-student interactions (Parkinson et al., 2003; Watson, 1998), clear teacher expectations (Finaly-Neumann, 1994; Guolla, 1999; Parkinson et al., 2003), a non-competitive and collaborative atmosphere (Guolla, 1999; Parkinson et al., 2003), teacher feedback (Finaly-Neumann, 1994), and teacher clarity (Finaly-Neumann, 1994; Guolla, 1999; Hines et al., 1985). The psychosocial learning climate is the result of all psychological and social characteristics which students and teachers bring to shared interactions and perceptions within the classroom (Beer & Darkenwald, 1989).

The present study examined the extent to which adult satisfaction is related to instructional perspective, one aspect of the psychosocial climate. Instructional perspective is the "beliefs, feelings, and behaviors" (Henschke, 1989, p. 81) which teachers of adults may possess or exhibit in the classroom at a given point. Instructional perspective was assessed in this study by using Henschke's (1989) modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI).

The MIPI evaluates a teacher's self-reported use of andragogical principles. It is made up of seven subscales: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Teacher Trust of Learners, Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and Teacher-centered Learning Process. Higher summative and subscale scores on the MIPI indicate higher use of andragogical principles.

Previous studies using the IPI or MIPI have examined the instructional perspective of teachers or other learning facilitators (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; McManus, 2008; Rowbotham, 2007; Seward, 1998; Stanton, 2005; Stricker, 2006; Thomas, 1995) and learners' perceptions of instructional perspective (Stricker, 2006). Rowbotham (2007) investigated the relationship between teacher instructional perspective and student perceptions of the learning climate. However, no previous research has investigated the relationship between instructional perspective and student satisfaction. Neither has any study investigated this relationship in the context of noncredit personal interest classes, foreign language classes, or noncredit foreign language classes.

For the primary research question, student satisfaction ratings were averaged by class and matched with their teachers' summative MIPI scores, resulting in nine class-teacher pairs. A preliminary comparison of MIPI scores with mean-by-class satisfaction indicated that teacher MIPI scores were not associated with mean-by-class satisfaction (see Table 45, p. 313). The teacher with the highest MIPI score had a class which reported one of the lowest mean satisfaction ratings; the teacher with the lowest MIPI score had a class which reported one of the highest class satisfaction ratings.

A bivariate correlation test was used to statistically analyze the relationship between satisfaction with language learning and instructional perspective (see Table 46, p. 315). The summative MIPI score proved to have a negative correlation with satisfaction with learning. As teachers reported higher use of andragogical principles, mean-by-class satisfaction ratings decreased. With regard to individual MIPI subscales, five of the seven subscales were negatively correlated with satisfaction ratings. For these

five subscales, as teachers reported more learner-centeredness, satisfaction decreased. Only Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners and Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process had a positive correlation with satisfaction ratings. As teachers reported being more learner-centered in these two subscales, student satisfaction increased.

The analysis found no statistically significant correlation between satisfaction with learning and teacher-reported instructional perspective. There was no significant correlation between satisfaction with learning and summative MIPI scores. Neither was there found a significant correlation between satisfaction with learning and any subscale of the MIPI.

One limitation in the analysis of this research question was the size of the sample. There were a very small number of student returns in some classes as well as a small number of classes where teacher MIPI scores and their students' satisfaction ratings could be compared (see Table 8, p. 247). Three classes had only two or three students who reported satisfaction with learning on their returned instruments. For the three classes with the highest student response rate, the number of student satisfaction responses only numbered between 8 and 10. This meant that the mean-by-class satisfaction ratings used in the analysis were based on a very limited number of cases.

In addition to the small number of student returns in some classes, there were only nine teacher returns for the 22 beginning-level classes represented in the student data base. Of the 95 satisfaction ratings reported by students, 43 cases had to be excluded from the data analysis for this research question due to lack of a teacher return. The fact that not all student data were available for this research question raises the question of

how representative the nine classes with student-teacher pairs were of the entire student sample.

It should be noted that all but two of the eight teachers in the sample reported themselves in the Average range for use of andragogical principles (see Table 35, p. 283). The instructional perspective of this group of Average teachers placed them in the middle on a continuum between learner-centered teaching process and teacher-centered teaching process. Lacking returns from the 13 other teachers whose students returned instruments in this study, it is not possible to make an inference about the learning climate or instructional perspective present in these other classrooms. Furthermore, data which do exist on teacher instructional perspective for the 13 classes with no teacher return are one-sided, only representing students perceptions of teacher instructional perspective.

It should also be noted that one teacher who turned in two instruments, one for each of the classes she taught, had two different MIPI scores. One score was in the Average range; one was in the Below Average range. This suggests that teachers may view their instructional perspective differently depending on the students and circumstances of each individual class they teach. There were 33 beginning-level classes offered the semester during which data was collected. Of the 19 teachers in the target population, 9 teachers taught multiple course sections, with the number of sections ranging from two to six. Four of those teachers participated in the study. If teachers had completed instruments for each section of each beginning-level course they taught, would their reported instructional perspective for these different classes have been as divergent as the one example that exists in the data set?

According to Henschke (as cited in Stanton, 2005), teacher reports of instructional perspective on the IPI do not represent "a constant, absolute attribute" (p. 111) and should only be considered an indication of the teacher's place on the continuum between low use of andragogical principles and high use of andragogical principles at a particular point in time. The findings of the present study indicate that teacher instructional perspective may also only be indicative of a teacher's use of andragogical principles with a particular group of learners at a particular time. The extent to which instructional perspective is situational, however, has not been adequately investigated in the literature, particularly in the context of noncredit foreign language courses.

Given the literature in the areas of adult education, satisfaction research, and language learning research which suggests that adults are most satisfied in learner-centered learning environments, it seemed reasonable to hypothesize that students would be satisfied in an environment where teachers reported learner-centered approaches based on andragogical principles. In the context of this study and the student and teacher samples, student satisfaction with language learning was not found to be correlated with the use of andragogical principles as reported by teachers on the MIPI.

Sub-question 1

Sub-question 1 addressed the question: Is there a significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective? Satisfaction with learning was measured by a single, Likert-scale item on the PIF-S: Circle the number which best indicates your level of satisfaction with your personal language learning in this course. Possible responses ranged from 0 (*No satisfaction*) to 10 (*Highest satisfaction possible*). Each student used her/his own unique,

subjective, internal, unarticulated definition of *satisfaction with personal language learning* in responding to this item.

Student perception of instructional perspective was assessed using the MIPI-S. The MIPI-S is a version of the MIPI adapted by the researcher for use with students in foreign language classes. The MIPI-S retained the same item content, factor composition, and scoring as in the MIPI (see Appendix F).

Only one previous study using the IPI has investigated learner perceptions of instructional perspective (Stricker, 2006). No previous studies have examined the relationship between perceptions of instructional perspective and satisfaction with learning. In addition, no previous studies have used the MIPI in the context of noncredit foreign language courses.

An ordinal logistic regression analysis of the relationship between satisfaction with learning and perception of instructional perspective in the student sample (n = 95) revealed that the summative MIPI-S score was positively associated with student satisfaction (see Table 47, p. 321). As student perceptions of their teacher's instructional perspective became more learner-centered (i.e., as the MIPI-S score increased), student satisfaction increased. The regression coefficient for the summative MIPI-S score (.06) was statistically significant (p < .01).

When MIPI-S subscales were examined individually, Factors 1 through 6 were found to be positively associated with student satisfaction (see Table 47, p. 321). However, for Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process there was a negative association between student perceptions of learner-centeredness and satisfaction with learning. An examination of the regression coefficients for MIPI-S subscales revealed

they were all statistically significant ($p < .05$). MIPI-S Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners was the subscale which had the most influence on satisfaction ($b = .58$, $p < .01$) in the regression model (see Table 47, p. 321). Factor 7 had the second strongest regression coefficient ($b = -.36$, $p < .01$).

Factor 7 was the only subscale which had a negative relationship with satisfaction. As students perceived more learner-centeredness in their teacher on Factor 7 items, satisfaction scores decreased. This result could be interpreted to mean that beginning-level foreign language students may be more satisfied with teacher-centeredness in the beginning-level foreign language classroom. It should be noted that Stanton (2005) found that respondents in her study "did not perceive Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process as having a negative association with andragogical principles" (p. 280).

Several authors have emphasized that differences in learner dependency and attitudes toward teacher direction are situational, the result of interactions between the learner with the specific learning situation (Brookfield, 2006; Knowles, 1980, 1995; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Pratt, 1988; Ralph, 2001). Adult students in beginning foreign language classes may rely more on teacher authority or expertise than they normally would in other types of learning situations where they have more knowledge or life experience from which to draw. For this reason, beginning foreign language learners in the present study may have found that increased teacher-centeredness resulted in increased satisfaction with learning.

Another aspect of Factor 7 should be considered, however. The evaluation of missing values in the data found that Factor 7 had the second highest number of items with no student response (n = 21). An examination of the item content (see Table 7, p. 87) revealed a potential weakness in the adaptation of the MIPI for use with students. The MIPI was designed as a self-report instrument for teachers. The item content of Factor 7 asks about teachers' beliefs, plans, and intentions with regard to their role in the classroom. In the adapted MIPI-S, students were asked to assess their teacher's goal of providing learners with as much information as possible, intentions for lesson planning, intentions regarding clarity of presentations, expectations about adhering to planned learning experiences, as well as the extent to which the teacher felt his or her teaching skills had been refined.

Ellis (2006) notes that the "internal cognitive processes" (p. 6) which inform teacher decisions and actions are "by nature unobservable" (p. 7). Teachers are in a much better position to report on their own beliefs, intentions, and classroom strategies than an outside observer can be (Apps, 1985; Richards, n.d.). Teacher beliefs, plans, and intentions may be difficult for students to accurately interpret (Richards, n.d.). Students in the foreign language classroom may find interpreting teacher beliefs, plans, and intentions particularly difficult since the teacher may be speaking, at least part of the time, in a foreign language.

The extent to which student observations and understandings of teacher beliefs, plans, and intentions may also be affected by differences in cultural perspective could not be established by this study (see Sub-questions 3 and 4 in Chapter IV). Nevertheless, the literature in adult education suggests that differences in cultural orientation between

students and teachers may represent a barrier to mutual understanding in the classroom (Cheng & Tam, 1997; Guy, 1999; Hazell, 1994; Knox et al., 1992; Littlewood, 2000, 2001; Patterson et al., 1998; Rovai & Gallien, 2005; Sauer, 2003).

Factor 7 may represent a significant challenge for researchers wanting to adapt the MIPI to assess student perceptions of instructional perspective. This challenge may be especially meaningful in foreign language courses. In this learning situation teachers may be communicating part of the time, if not all of the time, in the language being studied. Additionally, the present study found that the majority of teachers in the sample were teaching their native language to students who were the products of different educational or learning cultures. Some elements of teacher-student interactions in this situation may be open to misinterpretation (Mwaura, 2008; Ryu, 2008).

When considering the effectiveness of adapting the MIPI, and particularly Factor 7, for use with students, it should also be noted that Stanton's (2005) study of the construct validity of the IPI found that Factor 7 was not associated with the summative IPI score and that the items in this factor were not related. In addition, Stanton found the Cronbach's alpha for Factor 7 (a =.57; see Table 42, p. 299) to be "below the acceptable value for new measurement tools" (pp. 217-218). The factor "was shown to need some work" (p. 281).

The present study found the Cronbach's alpha for students' perceptions of their teachers' Factor 7 beliefs, plans, and intentions (a =.54) to be slightly lower than the value Stanton found (see Table 43, p. 301). The .54 value for Factor 7 was below the lenient range for exploratory research (Garson, 2009e) but still within Nunnally's (1967) satisfactory range for basic research.

The Cronbach's alpha for teacher MIPI Factor 7 scores in the present study was found to be .78 (see Table 43, p. 301). It is possible that the difference in value of Factor 7's reliability coefficient for teachers and their students, however, is more related to the differences in sample size for teachers (n = 9) and students (n = 103) than it is to the difficulty of students evaluating or interpreting their teacher's beliefs, intentions, and strategies in the classroom.

The findings of the present study with regard to Factor 7 suggest that students were more satisfied when they perceived that their teachers were more teacher-centered. However, Factor 7 item content raises questions about the ability of students to interpret teacher intentions, beliefs, and expectations in the foreign language classroom. In addition, according to Stanton, Factor 7 may be less reliable than the other subscales in the instrument.

The positive relationship between satisfaction with learning and perceived learner-centeredness in Factors 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners, Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Factor 6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process) is supported by the adult education literature on learner-centered adult education (Collins, 2004; Conti, 2004; Daines et al., 1993; Ennis et al., 1989; Galbraith, 2004; Knowles, 1975, 1980, 1990; Knowles et al., 1998; Long, 2004; Weimer, 2002). Furthermore, Rowbotham's study (2007) using the modified IPI suggests that when teachers report empathy with learners, trust of learners, and accommodating learners' uniqueness (identified by the author as *teacher*

responsiveness), students report "higher teacher support…higher involvement and satisfaction" (p. 84).

The positive relationship between satisfaction with learning and Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners also indicated that satisfaction increased as student perceptions of teacher attitudes (see Table 5, p. 85) moved in the direction of learner-centeredness. In the present study, satisfaction increased with the perception of higher use of andragogical principles in the classroom for the first six MIPI-S subscales. Only in Factor 7 was teacher-centeredness associated with increased student satisfaction.

Factor 6 had the weakest regression coefficient in the model (b = .14, p < .05; see Table 47, p. 321). Data for Factor 6 also contained the largest number of student non-responses (n = 23; see Table 36, p. 287). The number of missing values for this subscale could suggest that students did not find the item content relevant or understandable in the context of their foreign language courses (see Table 6, p. 86). Students may also not have observed the activities mentioned in Factor 6 items in their language classrooms.

The items in Factor 6 ask students about five different types of classroom activities: buzz groups, real-life simulations, group discussions, role plays, and listening teams (see Table 6, p. 86). Item 24: *How frequently does your instructor use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?* had the most non-responses (n = 11) in the student sample (see Table 38, p. 288). Item 24 is also one of two items in this subscale which specifically refer to lectures. The other item referring to lectures is Item 2: *How frequently does your instructor use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to information from lectures)?*.

The experience-based learning techniques which comprise the item content for Factor 6 are appropriate to collaborative, interactive learning activities. Real-life simulations and role play are often used in the foreign language classroom at all levels to help students practice using their knowledge of a foreign language and their listening and speaking skills. However, some of the activities assessed in Factor 6, especially those directly related to teacher lectures in the item content, may not have been activities which students observed in their foreign language courses.

Lectures are not a type of learning activity commonly associated with beginning-level language learning. In addition, buzz-groups, group discussions, and listening teams are activities which generally focus on discussing and evaluating ideas or concepts. These activities, when conducted in the target language, are not appropriate for beginners who are in the process of acquiring the most basic communication skills (Illinois State Board of Education, n.d.; Omaggio, 1986). Discussion and evaluation of ideas and abstract concepts in the target language are more appropriate for students beyond the beginning-level.

Although two items in Factor 6 are relevant to activities which would be appropriate for beginning-level foreign language students, three other activities are not as appropriate for language learners at this level. For this reason, the relevance of the item content for Factor 6 should be carefully considered if the instrument is used again in the context of foreign language learning.

In summary, for all MIPI-S subscales except one, learner-centeredness and the use of andragogical principles were found to be related to increased satisfaction. The results of the analysis of Factor 7 suggest that increased teacher direction and

organization of the learning experience may be more satisfactory than a learner-centered

approach in the beginning-level foreign language classroom. The analysis of this Sub-

question 1 raised questions about the adaptability of MIPI Factors 6 and 7 for use to

report foreign language students' perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective.

Sub-question 2

The second sub-question considered in this study was: Is there a significant

difference between teacher-reported instructional perspective and students' perceptions of

the teacher's instructional perspective in the noncredit foreign language classroom? For

the analysis of this sub-question, student MIPI-S summative scores were averaged by

class and paired with their teachers' MIPI summative scores. Due to the categorical

nature of the variables, the non-normal distribution of MIPI summative scores (see Table

48, p. 325), and the fact that the student and teacher summative scores represented related

samples, a Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used.

The analysis of differences between summative MIPI scores and mean-by-class

summative MIPI-S scores from this study's sample found no statistically significant

differences in teacher and student scores (see Table 49, p. 327). An examination of the

ranks for the Wilcoxon test (see Table 50, p. 328) did reveal that teachers reported a

higher use of andragogical principles than their students perceived for Factor 2: Teacher

Trust of Learners, Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Factor 4:

Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Factor 6: Experience-based Learning

Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process). Teachers reported a lower use of

andragogical principles than their students perceived for Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with

Learners, Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, and Factor 7: Teacher-centered

Learning Process. However, since the differences between teacher and student scores were not statistically significant, it cannot be said that an important difference existed between teacher reports of learner-centered instructional perspective and their students' perceptions in the class-teacher pairs analyzed.

Only one previous study using the IPI investigated learners' perceptions of instructional perspective. Stricker (2006) found that the instructional perspective of principals, as organizers of teacher development opportunities, and teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional perspective as learning leaders differed on four subscales: Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners, Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, and Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners. Stricker identified a gap between what teachers believe about their principals' efforts to create "conditions conducive for learning in school-based staff development" (Stricker, 2006, p. 199) and what principals said they did in these four areas. Principals reported greater insensitivity toward learners than teachers believed they demonstrated. However, teachers did not perceive that principals were as learner-centered in the areas of empathy with learners, trust of learners and accommodating learner uniqueness as principals reported they were.

In both the present study and Stricker's (2006) study, learning leaders (i.e., foreign language teachers and principals) reported higher learner-centeredness in the areas of trust of learners and accommodating learner uniqueness than learners (foreign language students and teachers in staff development activities) reported. Also in both studies, learning leaders reported that they were less learner-centered in the area of teacher insensitivity toward learners than learners perceived them to be. However, in the

present study, no statistically significant difference was found between teacher reports of

instructional perspective and class perceptions of teacher instructional perspective.

As sample size was a limitation for the analysis of the primary research question,

so sample size was also a limitation for the analysis of Sub-question 2. Because the

analysis used mean-by-class summative MIPI-S scores paired with teachers' MIPI

summative scores, the number of student returns in each class was a concern. The

number of student scores available to calculate the mean-by-class MIPI-S summative

score ranged from 2 to10 per class (see Table 8, p. 247). Mean-by-class perceptions of

instructional perspective were consequently based on a very limited number of scores in

some classes. In addition, there were only nine teacher instruments with which to pair

class MIPI-S scores. The findings for this sub-question are an accurate representation of

the student returns where the pairing of class-teacher scores was possible. On the other

hand, there were 13 classes with student data where teacher instruments were not

returned. The findings for this sub-question cannot, therefore, be said to be

representative of the entire student sample.

It is important to note that the present study found satisfaction with learning to be

positively influenced by student perceptions of instructional perspective (see the

discussion of Sub-question 1), not by the instructional perspective reported by teachers

(see the discussion of the Primary Research Question). These findings suggest that there

was a difference between what teachers reported and what students perceived in the

foreign language classrooms in this study, even though the analysis of Sub-question 2

found no statistically significant evidence of a difference. The present study can only

suggest, therefore, that further investigation of differences in teacher and student

perceptions of instructional perspective in the context of noncredit foreign language

classes would be productive.

Sub-question 3

The third sub-question addressed in this study was: Which student characteristic

or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains students'

perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles,

as measured by the MIPI-S? This question examined the extent to which certain student

characteristics could predict perceptions of a teacher's instructional perspective. The

predictor variables included in the analysis were Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or

Diploma, Beginner Group, Number Foreign Languages Studied, Number Foreign

Languages Spoken, Culture of Education Match, Primary Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s)

Achieved, and General Experience of Language Study (see Table 51, p. 331).

An ordinal logistic regression analysis revealed that none of the predictor

variables were significantly associated with student perceptions of the use of

andragogical principles by their teachers (see Table 53, p. 339). Previous studies using

the IPI provide no useful information with which to compare these results.

Most previous studies using the IPI have examined the instructional perspective

of educators. Rowbotham's (2007) study examined undergraduate nursing students'

perceptions of the learning environment. Student perceptions of the learning environment

were reported, however, using the Adult Classroom Environment Scale.

Stricker (2006) assessed perceptions of instructional perspective by teachers-as-

learners using the IPI and the Respect for Partner Scale (RPS). This study, however, only

analyzed demographic factors with regard to how much congruence teachers-as-learners found between andragogical principles represented in the IPI and the RPS.

The present study found that no one student characteristic or combination of student characteristics could explain perceptions of teacher instructional perspective. If there are student characteristics which significantly influence perceptions of instructional perspective in the classroom, those characteristics were outside the scope of the present study. An alternate interpretation of these results would be that the student characteristics analyzed for this sub-question don't influence perceptions of instructional perspective in the context of the study, noncredit foreign language classes, but may well exert an influence in a different learning context.

Sub-question 4

Sub-question 4 addressed the question: Which student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S)? The literature on satisfaction in an educational context suggests that several student characteristics may influence satisfaction: gender (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Beer & Darkenwald, 1989; Davis, 2000; Feldman, 1993; Hearn, 1985; Helmich, 2000; "Understanding," 2003; Sauer, 2003), age (C. Cheng, 2000; "Understanding," 2003), personality (Biner et al., 1997; Grayson, 2004; Logue et al., 2007; Lounsbury et al., 2005), values associated with cultural perspective or ethnicity (Cheng & Tam, 1997; Guy, 1999; Hazell, 1994; Patterson et al., 1998; Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005; Sauer, 2003), level of education (Knox et al., 1992), cumulative educational experiences (C. Cheng, 2000), expectations (Cook, 2004; Horwitz, 1988; Marsh, 1984; Patterson et al., 1998; Wyss,

2002; Zenhui, 1999, 2001), and the congruence between student and teacher culturally-influenced educational perspectives (Brookfield, 1995; Liu & Littlewood, 1997; Wyss, 2002; Zenhui, 1999, 2001). Furthermore, Houle (1961) suggests that the nature of learner motivation and goals and the achievement of those goals are associated with learner satisfaction.

Research on foreign language learning indicates that adult satisfaction with language learning can be influenced by several factors: the specific motivation for language learning (Carlson, 2006a; Eoyang, 1989), the type of goals (Carlson, 2006a), the realistic nature of those goals (Carlson, 2006a; Eoyang, 1989), and the extent to which personal goals are achieved (Carlson, 2006a). Other influences on adult satisfaction with language learning are age and age-related changes in the learner (American Federation for Aging Research, n.d.; Bowden et al., 2005; Ioup, 2005; Marinova-Todd et al., 2000; Palmunen, 1995; Schleppegrell, 1987; Ullman, 2005), previous experience with language learning (Bucuvalas, 2002; Carlson, 2006a; Horwitz, 1988; Kramsch, 1995; Marinova-Todd et al., 2000; Schleppegrell, 1987), the mix of beginners and false beginners in the same beginning-level classroom (Loughrin-Sacco, 1991), and affective factors such as stress or anxiety (Carlson, 2006a; Palmunen, 1995).

In the present study, the literature on satisfaction in educational contexts and satisfaction with language learning guided the creation of the PIF-S, the instrument used to collect student demographic and educational data. The 10 independent or predictor variables derived from the PIF-S and used in the analysis of Sub-question 4 were Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or Diploma, Beginner Group, Number Foreign Languages Studied, Number Foreign Languages Spoken, Culture of Education Match, Primary Goal

Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, and General Experience with Language Study. Student characteristics were reported by category of satisfaction in Table 54 (see p. 341).

Data collected on student race or ethnicity were not used as a variable in this analysis. There were not enough students outside the white/Caucasian group to allow a statistical analysis of differences in satisfaction with learning based on race or ethnicity. Data on student race or ethnicity were included in the description of the student sample.

An ordinal logistic regression analysis of the relationship between satisfaction with language learning and individual student characteristics revealed that the log odds of satisfaction were found to be significantly related to only two predictor variables: General Experience with Language Study ($b = .37$, $p < .01$) and Primary Goal Achieved ($b = .67$, $p < .01$; see Table 55, p. 347). When these two variables were entered into a regression model together, the log odds of satisfaction with language learning were found to be significantly related to only one variable: Primary Goal Achieved ($b = .56$, $p < .01$; see Table 56, p. 348). General Experience with Language Study ($b = .24$, $p = .07$) was not found to be a significant predictor of satisfaction with language learning in this model.

The importance of achieving learning goals is supported in the literature on adult learning and foreign language learning. Learning is driven by learner needs (Rogers, 1983). The adult's decision to learn a foreign language evolves from specific intrinsic or extrinsic motivators (Carlson, 2006a). From these motivators student goals develop.

According to Houle (1961), the type of goals set for a particular learning activity are related to the type of learner. The goal-oriented learner focuses on well-defined learning objectives which meet a specific need. The activity-oriented learner is motivated by the social interaction or the development of social relationships which

results from participating in a learning activity. The learning-oriented learner anticipates individual growth or participating in a new type of learning.

In the present study, all three types of goals identified by Houle (1961) were found in the student sample (see Table 18, p. 261). Well-defined learning objectives for specific needs were evident in the importance of the Specific Language Skills, Language Knowledge, and Use of Language categories derived from responses about students' primary goals for the course. Specific Language Skills and Language Knowledge were also the two most important categories of response for students' other or secondary goals. Evidence that some student goals related to participating in the process of learning something new was seen in the Language Learning and Personal Motivation categories for primary and other goals. In addition, a small number of students reported the importance of the social aspects of participating in a foreign language course, specifically an interest in connections to and the traditions of family, culture, or community (Carlson, 2006a; Houle, 1961).

Carlson (2006a) argues that it is important for teachers to help adult students reach their goals. She suggests that reaching personal language learning goals will generate the highest satisfaction with adult learners. Discrepancies between student learning expectations and the actual learning experience significantly affect satisfaction (Cook, 2004; Marsh, 1984). A mismatch between student and teacher expectations can also affect satisfaction (X. Cheng, 2000; Horwitz, 1988; Littlewood, 2001; Patterson et al., 1998; Rovai, 2002; Rovai & Gallien, 2005; Viechnicki et al., 1990; Wyss, 2002).

In the present study, a congruence was found between student goals and teacher goals (Table 31, p. 279). For both students and teachers the two most important

categories for primary goals were Language Knowledge and Specific Language skills. The same two categories were also the two most important areas of *Other* goals for both groups. The fact that students and teachers had similar learning goals seems to indicate that at least some learning expectations were similar for both groups. In addition, the finding that satisfaction has a significant positive relationship with the achievement of the primary goal suggests that student learning expectations were met by the actual learning experience.

Carlson (2006a) and Eoyang (1989) report that the setting of realistic learning goals may be another influence on student satisfaction with language learning. An evaluation of whether student had unrealistic learning goals was not within the scope of the present study. However, student reports of satisfaction with learning imply that the goals set were realistic and achievable within the context of the noncredit course being taken. Over 75% of students reported high satisfaction with their personal language learning (see Table 21, p. 267). Furthermore, the fact that teachers tended to have the same goals for the learning experience as students supports the conclusion that student goals were realistic.

Previous experience with language study has been suggested as an influence on satisfaction with language learning (Bucuvalas, 2002; Carlson, 2006a, 2006b; Horwitz, 1988; Kramsch, 1995; Marinova-Todd et al., 2000; Schleppegrell, 1987). When all predictor variables in the present study were examined individually, the variable General Experience with Language Study (b = .37, p < .01) resulted in the second largest significant regression coefficient (see Table 55, p. 347). However the influence of General Experience with Language Learning on predicting satisfaction was not found to

be significant when analyzed in a regression model with Achievement of Primary Goal (see Table 56, p. 348).

The literature on satisfaction in an educational context and satisfaction with language learning suggests that certain student characteristics like gender, age, education, the mix of learners in the beginning-level language classroom, and the culture of education match between students and teachers influence satisfaction. In the context of the present study, these characteristics were not found to have a statistically significant relationship with satisfaction.

Some student characteristics found to influence satisfaction with learning were outside the scope of the present study. The influence of student personality, age-related changes in cognitive or language learning abilities, and affective factors such as stress or anxiety were not part of the present study. It is possible that these factors exerted additional direct or indirect influences on adult satisfaction with language learning for the learners in this study. It is also possible that some factor or factors unique to the noncredit foreign language course environment and not present in the literature may have exerted an influence on adult satisfaction with learning in this context.

In the context of noncredit foreign language courses, achievement of the learner's primary goal was found to have a significant relationship with adult satisfaction with language learning. Other influences on satisfaction suggested in the literature either did not have a significant relationship with satisfaction with language learning or were outside the scope of the study.

Sub-question 5

The fifth sub-question addressed in this study was: Which teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the PIF-I, explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI? The findings of several previous studies using the IPI and modified IPI were relevant to the present study. Studies using the IPI have found certain characteristics of adult educators to be associated with the use of andragogical principles: length of service as an adult educator (Seward, 1998; Thomas, 1995), age (McManus, 2008; Seward, 1998), gender (Stricker, 2006), being a full-time teacher as opposed to teaching part-time (Thomas, 1995), number of hours of in-service training (Seward, 1998), an adult education course (Dawson, 1997), exposure to information on adult learning (Stricker, 2006), highest educational degree (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; McManus, 2008; Stricker, 2006), field of degree (Drinkard, 2004), and teaching experience (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; Stricker, 2006).

Creation of the PIF-I was guided by previous research using the IPI as well as other teacher characteristics relevant to the target population. Eleven variables were derived from the teacher characteristics reported on the PIF-I: Gender, Age Group, Highest Degree or Diploma, Culture of Education Match, Number of Foreign Languages Spoken, years of Total Teaching Experience, years of Teaching Foreign Language experience, years of Teaching Foreign Language to Adults, Primary Goal Achieved, Other Goal(s) Achieved, Exposure to Adult Learning Information. No data were collected on whether teachers' taught adult or foreign language courses on a full-time or

part-time basis, on whether teachers had received any type of in-service training, or on the field of the teacher's highest degree.

The small number of teacher instruments in the sample (n = 9) precluded any statistical analysis. However, a description of the teachers in the sample was derived from data collected on the PIF-I (see Table 57, p. 351 and Table 58, p. 357). A comparison of the teachers in the Below average and Above average MIPI categories provided a snapshot of differences between two individuals teaching two different noncredit foreign languages in the same semester who reported very different instructional perspectives.

Teacher T6 was a male over the age of 80 whose native language was not English. He reported speaking four languages beyond his native language. Educated completely in a western European country, this teacher held a Master's degree and had 22 years of teaching experience. He had received information on adult learning from the Continuing Education coordinator for foreign languages at the community college hosting the present study.

While teacher T6 had been educated outside the U.S., three of his four students had been educated solely in the U.S. One student had experience attending schools in the U.S. and in Canada. All students in this class were at least 20 to 30 years younger than their teacher. The mean satisfaction for this class was 6.50, the second lowest class score in the group of nine classes (see Table 59, p. 377). The mean MIPI-S score for students in this class was 150.25 and in the Average category, compared with their teacher's MIPI score of 186.22 which was in the Above Average category (see Appendix E).

Teacher T5 was a female in the 50-59 age group whose native language was English. This teacher was bilingual, teaching the only foreign language she spoke. Educated solely in the United States, teacher T5 held a Bachelor's degree and reported three years of teaching experience. She reported no exposure to information on adult learning.

All the students in teacher T5's class reported being educated solely in the U.S., thus having experienced an educational culture similar to that of their teacher. Students in this class were either contemporaries of the teacher or older than the teacher, with one student being in the 80+ age group. The mean satisfaction rating for this class was 8.50 (see Table 59, p. 377). The mean MIPI-S score for students in this class was 189.07, in the Above Average category, compared with their teacher's MIPI score of 142, in the Below Average category (see Appendix E).

Both teachers T6 and T5 had taught only in the U.S. and both had spent their entire teaching careers teaching foreign language to adults. Both teachers had the same goals for their classes (i.e., teaching the language and culture) and reported the achievement of those goals at an 8, on a scale of 0 to 10 In addition, both teachers were teaching the same language.

For both teachers there was a gap between how they saw themselves with regard to use of andragogical principles and students' perceptions of their instructional perspective. Teacher T6 rated himself 35.9 points higher on the use of andragogical principles than his students did. Teacher 5 rated herself 47.1 points lower on the use of andragogical principles than the students in class C14 did.

An examination of the class composition for teachers T6 and T5 revealed that teacher T6 had a class composed completely of Real Beginners. Teacher T5's class C14 was a mixed-experience class with four students being Real Beginners (i.e., having less than one year of study for the language of enrollment) and three students in the False Beginner 2 category (i.e., having two years or more of study for the language of enrollment). Teacher 5's reported a MIPI score in the Average category for her other beginning-level class (i.e., class C13) which was composed totally of Real Beginners.

Comparison of these two teachers and the two MIPI scores which teacher T5 reported for two different classes raises a question about the effect of class composition on teachers' and students' perceptions of instructional perspective. Loughrin-Sacco (1991) reported that the integration of inexperienced and more-experienced language learners in beginning-level foreign language had consequences on learner perceptions of self and the learning climate. Teachers in Loughrin-Sacco's study were faced with the frustrating challenge of creating a learning environment where the least-experienced learners could succeed and the most-experienced learners would be challenged to progress.

In the present study, did having a class composed entirely of learners with the same general language study experience result in teachers perceiving their instructional perspective to be more learner-centered? In fact, is learner-centeredness easier to achieve when all learners have the same level of foreign language study experience? Does the integration of students of mixed experience with language study influence a teacher to create a more teacher-centered learning climate? The type of information necessary to answer these questions was not available in the present study. Anecdotal evidence

suggests, however, that class composition and its effect on teaching and learning could be a subject worthy of further investigation in the noncredit language learning environment.

The small number of teacher instruments limited the investigation of Sub-question 5 to a description of the data. Differences noted in the portraits of the teachers in the Below Average and Above Average MIPI categories should not be considered generalizable to the larger population of noncredit foreign language teachers in this particular community college or in other Continuing Education programs. While differences in the personal descriptions of these two teachers seem to anecdotally confirm that gender (Stricker, 2006), age (McManus, 2008; Seward, 1998), highest educational degree (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; McManus, 2008; Stricker, 2006), exposure to adult learning information (Dawson, 1997; Stricker, 2006), and number of years of teaching experience (Dawson, 1997; Drinkard, 2004; Stricker, 2006) may be associated with higher reported use of andragogical principles, it was not possible to confirm this anecdotal evidence by inferential statistics.

<div align="center">Implications for Practice</div>

Students, teachers, and administrators may benefit from the portrait of noncredit teaching and learning present in this study. The findings of the present study have several implications for teaching and learning in the noncredit Continuing Education foreign language classroom.

First, differences between how teachers perceive their instructional perspective and how students perceive the instructional perspective of the teacher may represent a barrier to the creation of a learning climate which is most satisfactory for students. It is appropriate for teachers to reflect on the beliefs, values, and behaviors they bring to the

classroom. However, understanding how students perceive the instructional perspective which the teacher brings to the classroom provides valuable insight into the learning climate experienced by students. In the case of explaining satisfaction with learning in the noncredit foreign language classrooms represented in the present study, understanding student perceptions of instructional perspective was more important than identifying teachers' perceptions of their own instructional perspective.

Second, an approach to teaching and learning which considers how learners may best achieve their learning goals should increase the possibility of student satisfaction with learning. Students in the present study reported being generally satisfied with language learning. However, satisfaction with language learning was found to be influenced by the achievement of student goals. The findings of the present study suggest that is appropriate and important for teachers to solicit information on individual student goals at the beginning of the course or, at least, to allow some class time for discussing the goals of the collective community of learners in the classroom at the beginning of the course session. The literature on satisfaction also suggests that soliciting information on the extent to which students feel they are achieving their goals as the course progresses provides important feedback for the teacher.

The present study found a congruence between student and teacher primary learning goals. This would suggest that student goals and expectations for the courses in the sample were realistic since teachers reported the same types of primary goals. It also suggests that teacher planning and instruction were focused on helping students achieve the types of knowledge and skills which they found most important and which were associated with student satisfaction with language learning. However, in the present

study teacher and student goals were compared within the sample and not matched within classes. In individual foreign language classrooms, a teacher analysis of student goals and the extent to which those goals match teacher goals for the course might produce a different result with regard to the congruence of teacher and student learning goals. In order to create a learning climate which is conducive to satisfaction with language learning, the teacher of adult foreign language students would do well to address any significant disparity between her/his goals for the course and student goals.

Third, class composition may be an influence on satisfaction with learning. While Real Beginners made up more than 56% of the foreign language students who participated in the study, False Beginners accounted for almost 43% of student participants. The literature suggests that being in a class with more-experienced language learners can have negative effects on inexperienced Real Beginners. While the administrators of educational programs offering noncredit foreign language courses may not find it cost-effective to segregate beginners and more-experienced language learners in beginning-level courses, it would seem appropriate for teachers to solicit information from Real Beginners on how the learning climate in a particular class supports or inhibits their learning. This will not necessarily eliminate the problems which Real Beginner students face in a mixed-experience class. It may, however, provide an opportunity for those students to be heard and allowed to contribute to the creation of a learning climate which responds to some of their particular needs.

Fourth, educational institutions or programs which ask students to evaluate their educational experience at the end of a course, even a noncredit course, should consider including an item or items asking about student satisfaction with personal learning. The

literature on satisfaction in an educational setting revealed that most student satisfaction surveys focus on facilities, services, policies, personnel, or other elements of the learning climate which are external to the student. Asking for ratings of the students' subjective experience (e.g., satisfaction with learning) would provide a broader picture of educational satisfaction than is currently available.

Fifth, although this study only provides a snapshot of one segment of noncredit student and teacher populations, the information contained here may provide administrators of Continuing Education programs which offer noncredit foreign language programs a profile against which to compare their students and teachers. In addition, information contained here on student satisfaction, instructional perspective, and sources of adult learning information may generate a discussion between administrators and teachers about the best support for teaching, learning, and teacher development in the noncredit foreign language environment. Furthermore, this study may provoke reflection on the criteria for hiring and evaluating foreign language teachers who will be teaching adults in noncredit programs.

Sixth, the portrait of noncredit beginning-level foreign language students and their teachers in the present study provides teachers with information about their peers. Given the fact that most teachers rarely have the opportunity to observe on a regular basis their colleagues in the process of teaching, this study offers some insight into the beliefs, values, and behaviors of other noncredit foreign language teachers. Teachers in noncredit foreign language programs may use the information found in the present study to reflect on their own instructional perspective and how they are perceived by their students.

Seventh, the demographic information on adult learners provided by the present study may benefit those responsible for planning and marketing noncredit personal interest courses through a Continuing Education program, a school district, or another type of educational institution or program.

Eighth, students of adult education may find that the present study provides a resource for information on an area of noncredit learning which has not previously been investigated. The findings of the present study provide new information on adult learning for reasons of personal interest or enrichment.

Finally, reports of student satisfaction, perceptions of instructional perspective, goal achievement, and general experience with language study in the present study may provide other adult students in noncredit foreign language courses a measure against which to compare their own learning experience. The adult studying foreign language in a noncredit environment may find that the experiences of the students in this study resonate with his or her own experiences. Furthermore, other adults who aspire to begin learning a new language or to re-acquaint themselves with a language previously studied may be encouraged by the knowledge that there are other learners of all ages engaged in foreign language learning and reporting a highly satisfactory experience.

The implications of the present study extend to noncredit foreign language students, their teachers, the administrators of Continuing Education programs which offer noncredit foreign language courses, and students of adult education. Although only representing a small portion of the adult students and their teachers in the noncredit environment, this study creates an opportunity to better understand a population of teachers and learners in an environment which has not previously been investigated.

Recommendations for Future Research

The review of literature and the findings of the present study suggest several directions for future research. Further research on noncredit student and teacher populations is warranted given the lack of information available. Additional research on personal interest courses could provide a broader understanding of adult learning outside academic and work-related environments. Furthermore, more research on noncredit foreign language learning environments would contribute to the knowledge base in the areas of adult education, language learning, and Continuing Education.

Sample size was a limitation in the analyses of the primary research question and Sub-question 2. More studies with larger numbers of students and teachers would allow researchers to tease out the nature of the relationship between teacher instructional perspective and satisfaction with learning as well as possible differences between teacher-reported instructional perspective and student perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective. In addition, the present study suggests that instructional perspective may be situational, perceived differently by the teacher depending on the different learners with whom he or she interacts in different courses. However, the nature of this evidence is anecdotal. Additional quantitative or qualitative studies could provide meaningful insights into how teacher interactions with different groups of learners might affect instructional perspective.

Within the student and teacher samples a congruence was found between student and teacher goals. However, it was not possible to determine the extent to which this congruence of goals actually existed within entire classes due to the small number of student-teacher matches possible in the data set. In addition, almost half of the student

instruments in this study did not have a teacher return to which they could be compared. The missing teacher data for these students and classes might have produced a different portrait of student and teacher goals. The extent to which adult foreign language students and their teachers have similar learning goals is an area which merits further research attention in a setting where the goals of entire classes of students and their teachers can be investigated.

The present study found that students and teachers reported the achievement of secondary goals at a higher level than the achievement of primary goals. The process by which students and teachers evaluate language learning goals in noncredit courses would benefit from future exploration. Further research on satisfaction with learning in the noncredit context is also recommended since the available information is limited in the areas of both noncredit education and educational satisfaction.

With regard to foreign language learning, the influence of different teacher and student cultural perspectives in the foreign language classroom has been insufficiently explored. Further research on the effect on beginning foreign language students of participating in mixed-experience classes also seems to be warranted.

Finally, there is little information available on teachers of noncredit courses, particularly noncredit foreign language courses. Several areas for future research on noncredit foreign language teachers are suggested by the present study: the amount and kind of teacher preparation which these teachers bring to the classroom, how personal language learning experiences shape their beliefs about teaching and learning, how adult learning principles are understood, and the extent to which adult learning principles guide teacher choices and practice in the noncredit foreign language classroom.

The present study opens a small window into the world of noncredit foreign language learning. Further exploration of personal interest courses and noncredit foreign language courses could shed light on other aspects of noncredit foreign language teaching and learning which are outside the scope of the present study.

Conclusion

Adult education literature suggests that the instructional perspective of the teacher has an important effect on adult satisfaction with learning (Cassel, 1968; Knowles, 1980; Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Ralph, 2001; Viechnicki et al., 1990). In this study, the relationships between instructional perspective, satisfaction with language learning, and certain teacher and student characteristics were investigated. Study participants were adult students enrolled in noncredit foreign language courses offered through a community college's Continuing Education program and their teachers.

Henschke's Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) was used to evaluate teacher-reported use of andragogical principles. The MIPI is comprised of seven subscales: Factor 1: Teacher Empathy with Learners, Factor 2: Teacher Trust of Learners, Factor 3: Planning and Delivery of Instruction, Factor 4: Accommodating Learner Uniqueness, Factor 5: Teacher Insensitivity toward Learners, Factor 6: Experience-based Learning Techniques (Learner-centered Learning Process), and Factor 7: Teacher-centered Learning Process. The MIPI-S, an adaptation of the MIPI, was used to assess student perceptions of their teachers' instructional perspective.

Students reported satisfaction with language learning on a Likert-type scale found on the Personal Information Form-Student (PIF-S). Each student used her/his own

unique, subjective, internal, unarticulated definition of *satisfaction with personal language learning* in responding to this item.

The adult student's *perception* of instructional perspective was found to be more significant for predicting satisfaction with language learning than the extent to which the teacher reported using andragogical principles. The MIPI-S summative score as well as scores for Factors 1 through 6 were found to have significant positive relationships with satisfaction with language learning. As foreign language students perceived increased use of andragogical principles in the classroom, satisfaction with learning increased. MIPI-S Factor 1 was found to be the strongest significant predictor of student satisfaction. MIPI-S Factor 7 had a significant negative relationship with satisfaction with language learning. As foreign language students' perceptions of Teacher-centered Learning Process decreased, satisfaction with language learning decreased.

When the relationship between satisfaction with language learning and certain student characteristics was examined, achievement of the foreign language student's primary goal was found to be the strongest significant predictor of satisfaction with language learning. The second strongest significant predictor of satisfaction with language learning was general experience with language study, past and present.

The present study evolved from the researcher's observation of an adult foreign language class and the personal and professional questions born of that experience. The portrait of noncredit foreign language students and their teachers found in this study contributes to understanding a population and a learning environment which is not represented in the literature on adult education, language learning, educational satisfaction, or Continuing Education. This study contributes to the literature on foreign

language study and adult learning by describing a small slice of these two populations

with regard to teacher and student demographic and educational characteristics, adult

satisfaction with language learning, teacher instructional perspective, and students'

perceptions of instructional perspective.

References

Acock, A. C. (2005). Working with missing values. *Journal of Marriage and Family,*
67(4), 1012-1028.

Adults can be retrained to learn second languages more easily, says UCL scientist.
(2005, June 15). *Science Daily*. Retrieved September 26, 2005, from http://
www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2005/06/050615060545.htm

Agresti, A. (2007). *An introduction to categorical data analysis* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ:
Wiley.

Aldridge, S., & Rowley, J. (1998). Measuring customer satisfaction in higher education.
Quality Assurance in Education, 6(4), 197-204.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009a). *Community college facts at a*
glance. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/
AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009b). *Community colleges past to*
present. Retrieved September 12, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/
AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009c). *Faculty and staff at community*
colleges. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/
AboutCC/Trends/Pages/facultyandstaffatcommunitycolleges.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009d). *Faculty degree attainment*.
Retrieved September 9, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/
Trends/Pages/facultydegreeattainment.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009e). *Fast facts*. Retrieved September
16, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009f). *Significant historical events in the development of the public community college*. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/significantevents.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009g). *Students at community colleges*. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/ Pages/studentsatcommunitycolleges.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges & ACT, Inc. (2006). *Faces of the future: Findings from the 2006 national comparison data report*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved October 10, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/ Resources/aaccprograms/facesfuture/Documents/0305surveyresults.pdf

American Federation for Aging Research. (n.d.). *What cognitive changes take place with age?* Retrieved Feb. 11, 2007, from http://www.healthandage.com/html/min/ afar/content/other6_1.htm

Amstutz, D. D. (1999). Adult learning: Moving toward more inclusive theories and practices. In T. C. Guy (Ed.), *Providing culturally relevant adult education: A challenge for the twenty-first century* (pp. 19-32). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Amstutz, D. D., & Sheared, V. (2000, October). Making space: Context, content and culture. In M. Day (Ed.), *The Jackson Hole Proceedings* (pp. 131-134). Symposium for the discussion of graduate study in adult education and instructional technology. Jackson Hole: University of Wyoming. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://www.uwyo.edu/altsupport/docs/history/jackson2000/ proceedings.pdf

Anderson, K. L. (1981). Post-high school experiences and college attrition. *Sociology of Education, 54*, 1-15.

Antes, T. A. (1999). But will I ever use this foreign language? Student perceptions of the applicability of foreign language skills. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(2), 219-233.

Apps, J. A. (1981). *The adult learner on campus*. Chicago: Follett.

Apps, J. A. (1985). *Improving practice in Continuing Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ashburn, E. (2006, December 1). Growth fueled by online courses. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53,* 36-36.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avoseh, M. B. M. (2008). Values and informal education: From indigenous Africa to 21st century Vermillion. In S. L. Lundry & E. P. Isaac (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Forty-ninth Annual Adult Education Research Conference: Gateway to the future of learning* (pp. 19-24). St. Louis: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Baldini, D. (2003). The influence of paradigm on teacher beliefs and curricular activity: Implementing the standards for foreign language learning. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*(05), 1523.

Bean, J. P., & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education, 57*(4), 393-412.

Beder, H., & Carrea, N. (1988). The effects of andragogical teacher training on adult students' attendance and evaluation of their teachers. *Adult Education Quarterly, 38*(2), 75-87.

Beer, C. T., & Darkenwald, G. G. (1989). Gender differences in adult student perceptions of college classroom social environments. *Adult Education Quarterly, 40*(1), 33-42.

Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: Results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*(2), 259-270.

Biner, P. M., Summers, M., Dean, R. S., Blink, M. L., Anderson, J. L., & Gelder, B. C. (1997). Personality characteristics predicting Continuing Education student satisfaction with interactive telecourses. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 45*(3), 22-32.

Boucouvalas, M. (2005). Forging the family of humankind through international adult education. *Adult Learning, 16*(1/2), 17-19.

Bowden, H. W., Sanz, C., & Stafford, C. A. (2005). Individual differences: Age, sex, working memory, and prior knowledge. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition: Methods, theory, and practice* (pp. 105-140). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Brewer, D. J. (1999). *How do community college faculty view institutional mission? An analysis of national survey data*. Retrieved October 12, 2009, from http://crc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?uid=18

Briton, D. (1996). *The modern practice of adult education: A post-modern critique*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Brockett, R. G. (1994). Resistance to self-direction in adult learning: Myths and misunderstandings. In R. Hiemstra & R. G. Brockett (Eds.), *Overcoming resistance to self-direction in adult learning* (pp. 89-92). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1995). Adult learning: An overview. In A. Tuinjman (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of education.* Retrieved November 28, 2005, from http://www.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/facultypapers/StephenBrookfield_AdultLearning.cfm

Brookfield, S. (2006). *The skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brosch, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(2), 125-138.

Bucuvalas, A. (2002). Looking closely at second language learning: An interview with Shattuck Professor Catherine Snow. *HGSE (Harvard Graduate School of Education) News.* Retrieved October 12, 2009, from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/snow10012002.html

Burden, P. (2004). Do we practice what we teach? Influences of experiential knowledge of learning Japanese on classroom teaching of English. *The Language Teacher, 28*(10), 3-9.

Cadd, M. A. (1992). An examination of two methods of teaching culture and a comparison of their effects on ethnocentrism among college students of German. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*(11), 3844A. Abstract retrieved September 17, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Caffarella, R. (1994). *Planning programs for adult learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, C. (1996). Socializing with the teachers and prior language learning experience: A diary study. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Carlisle, C. M. (2003). An examination of adult learning style and course satisfaction with interactive instruction in multiple institutional teaching centers. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(11), 3815A. Abstract retrieved September 17, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Carlson, A. (2006a). Adults' experiences in learning a foreign language in a university classroom: A heuristic inquiry. (Doctoral dissertation, Union Institute and University, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66* (11). (UMI No. 3196613).

Carlson, A. (2006b, November). Adults' experience in learning a foreign language in a university classroom. In *Proceedings of the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education Conference*. Milwaukee, WI.

Carlson, N. N. (1980). An exploratory study of the characteristics of students who are gifted and talented in the area of foreign languages. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland-College Park, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 41*(01), 138A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005 from ProQuest database.

Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited. *IDEA Papers,* No. 32. Retrieved February 27, 2008, from http://www.idea.ksu.edu/resources/index.html

Cashin, W. E., & Downey, R. G. (1992). Using global student rating items for summative evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(4), 563-572.

Cassel, R. N. (1968). Facilitating student satisfaction in learning. *Peabody Journal of Education, 45*(4), 225-228.

Center for Community College Policy. (2003). *State files: Illinois, Missouri, Iowa.* Retrieved January 7, 2007, from http://www.communitycollegepolicy.org/html/top.asp?page=/html/state_files_main.asp

Chavez, M. (2006). Classroom-language use in teacher-led instruction and teachers' self-perceived roles. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 44*, 49-102.

Cheng, C. (2000). An exploratory study of the satisfaction of adult students with their learning environment. (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(01), 55A. Preview retrieved April 26, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Cheng, X. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System, 28*(3), 435-446.

Cheng, Y. C., & Tam, W. M. (1997). Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 5*(1), 22-31.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1987). *The collegiate function of community colleges: Fostering higher learning through curriculum and student transfer*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collins, J. (2004). Education techniques for lifelong learning: Principles of adult learning. *RadioGraphics, 24*(5), 1483-1489.

Collins, J. B., Jarvis-Selinger, S., & Pratt, D. D. (n.d.). *How do perspectives on teaching vary across disciplinary majors for students enrolled in teacher preparation?* Retrieved August 12, 2007 from http://www.teachingperspectives.com/PDF/howdoteachers.pdf

Conrad, D. G. (1998). Self-reported opinions and perceptions of first- and fourth-semester foreign language learners toward their language learning experience: A cross-sectional, cross-linguistic survey. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(10), 3864A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Conrad, D. G. (1999). The student view of effective practices in the college elementary and intermediate foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(4), 494-512.

Conti, G. J. (2004). Identifying your teaching style. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 75-92). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Conti, G. J., & Welborn, R. B. (1986). Teaching-learning styles and the adult learner. *Lifelong Learning, 9*(8), 20-24.

Cook, L. A. (2004). The relationship between expectation-experience growth discrepancies and satisfaction among students participating in international service-learning programs. (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(03), 847A. Abstract retrieved June 16, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Cooper, M. K., & Henschke, J. A. (2002). Andragogy: The foundation for its theory, research and practice linkage. In *Proceedings of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education Annual Conference*. Baltimore, MD. Retrieved March 5, 2008, from http://www.umsl.edu/~henschkej/henschke/more%20henschke_5_11_04/andragogy_the_foundations_for_its_theory_research_and_practice_linkage.pdf

Cooper, M. K., & Henschke, J. A. (2003). Thinking about andragogy: The international foundation for its research theory, and practice linkage in adult education and human resource development. In *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development International Research Conference*. Austin, TX. Retrieved March 3, 2008, from http://www.umsl.edu/~henschkej/henschke/new_linkages_for_ andragogy_and_HRD.pdf

Cooper, M. K., & Henschke, J. A. (2004). Additional thinking about andragogy: The international foundation for its research, theory and practice linkage in adult education and human resource development. In *Proceedings of the Commission on International Adult Education of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education Pre-conference* (pp. 109-124). Louisville, KY.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(1), 98-104.

Cramer, D., & Howitt, D. (2004). *The Sage dictionary of statistics: A practical resource for students in the social sciences*. London: Sage.

Crandall, J. (1993). Professionalism and professionalization of adult ESL literacy. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(3), 497-515.

Crandall, J., & Sheppard, K. (2004). *Adult ESL and the community college*. (CAAL Community College Series, Working Paper 7). New York: Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy. Retrieved October 2, 2009, from http:// ww.caalusa.org/eslreport.pdf

Creighton, S., & Hudson, L. (2001). Participation trends and patterns in adult education: 1991-1999. *Education Statistics Quarterly, 3*(4), 15-18. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 464126)

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297-334.

Crookes, G. (1997). What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach? *Modern Language Journal, 81*(1), 67-79.

Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P. (1992). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Cunningham, P. M. (1993). Let's get real: A critical look at the practice of adult education. *Journal of Adult Education, 22*(1), 3-15.

Daines, J., Daines, C., & Graham, B. (1993). *Adult learning, adult teaching* (3rd ed.). Nottingham, England: University of Nottingham, Department of Adult Education.

Davenport, J., & Davenport, J. A. (1985). A chronology and analysis of the andragogy debate. *Adult Education Quarterly, 35*(3), 152-159.

Davenport, J., III, & Davenport, J. H. (1985). Andragogical-pedagogical orientations of adult learners: Research results and practice recommendations. *Lifelong Learning, 9/10*, 6-8.

Davis, A. M. (2000). *Effects of gender, cognitive learning styles, and computer attitude on students' course satisfaction: A preliminary study II*. Grambling, LA: Grambling State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED442416)

Davis, B. G. (1993). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dawson, M. S. (1997). Instructional perspectives of nurse educators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*, 2955.

Dean, G. J. (2003). Designing instruction. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 93-118). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

DeBourgh, G. A. (1999). Technology is the tool, teaching is the task: Student satisfaction in distance learning. In *Proceedings of SITE 99: Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference.* San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432226)

den Brok, P., Levy, J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2005). The effect of teacher interpersonal behavior on students' subject-specific motivation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 40*(2), 20-33.

Donaghy, R. C. (2004). An afternoon with Allen Tough: The experience of a scholar who has studied self-directed learning. In *Proceedings of the Commission on International Adult Education of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education Pre-conference* (pp. 37-53). Louisville, KY.

Donohue, T. L., & Wong, E. H. (1997). Achievement motivation and college satisfaction in traditional and nontraditional students. *Education 118*(2), 237-243.

Dougherty, K. J. (2003). The uneven distribution of employee training by community colleges: Description and explanation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 586*(March), 62.

Draper, J. A. (1998). The metamorphoses of andragogy. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 12*(1), 3-26.

Drinkard, G. (2004). Instructional perspectives of nurse educators in distance education classrooms. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri--St. Louis, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*, 3927.

Du-Babcock, B. (1987). The effectiveness of the Suggestopedia approach in teaching English as a second language to adult learners. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(08), 2926A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Elbaum, B. E., Berg, C. A., & Dodd, D. H. (1993). Previous learning experience, strategy beliefs, and task definition in self-regulated foreign language learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18*, 318-336.

Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24*(2), 199-209.

Ellis, E. M. (2006). Language learning experience as a contributor to ESOL teacher cognition. *TESL-EJ, 10*(1), 1-20. Retrieved July 29, 2007, from http://tesl-ej.org/ej37/a3.html

Empathy. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. New York: Random House.

Endorf, M., & McNeff, M. (1991). The adult learner: Five types. *Adult Learning, 2*(7), 20-22, 25.

Ennis, C. D., Mueller, L., K., Hettrick, D. R., Chepyator-Thomson, J. R., Zhang, X. L., Rudd, W. S., et al. (1989). Educational climate in elective adult education: Shared decision making and communication patterns. *Adult Education Quarterly, 39*(2), 76-88.

Eoyang, E. (1989). Taking the "foreign" out of foreign language teaching. *ADFL Bulletin, 20*(2), 5-10. Retrieved November 26, 2005, from http://www.adfl.org/adfl/bulletin/v20n2/202005.htm

Errington, R. (2005). What's in a job? A self-learning opportunity for second language learners. *Reflective Practice 6*(2), 295-302.

Felder, R. M. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(1), 21-31.

Feldman, K. A. (1993). College students' views of male and female college teachers: Part II--Evidence from students' evaluation of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(2), 151-211.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Finaly-Neumann, E. (1994). Course work characteristics and students' satisfaction with instruction. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 21*(1), 14-22.

Finney, P. B. (2007, February 20). Not lost in translation. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 13, 2008, from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/20/business/worldbusiness/ 20language.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=Finney%20AND%20translation&st=cse&oref =slogin

Flowerdew, J. (1998). Language learning experience in L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 529-536.

Foote, E. (2001). *Community colleges: General information and resources.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/ccs/digests/dig9801.html

Fowler, E. M. (1991, June 11). Managers lack fluency in languages. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 13, 2008, from http://query.nytimes.com/gst/ fullpage.html?res=9D0CE7DE123CF932A25755C0A967958260

Fraser, B. J. (2001). Twenty thousand hours: Editor's introduction. *Learning Environments Research, 4*(1), 1-5.

Fraser, B. J., & Treagust, D. F. (1986). Validity and use of an instrument for assessing classroom psychosocial environment in higher education. *Higher Education, 15*, 37-57.

Freeman, D. (1996). Redefining the relationship between research and what teachers know. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 88-115). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2007). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2006*. New York: Modern Language Association. Retrieved May 17, 2008, from http://www.mla.org/2006_flenrollmentsurvey

Gadbow, N. F. (2002). Teaching all learners as if they are special. In J. M. Ross-Gordon (Ed.), *Contemporary viewpoints on teaching adults effectively* (pp. 51-61). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 93. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galbraith, M. W. (2004). The teacher of adults. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 3-21). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Garson, G. D. (2008a). Data imputation for missing values. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved December 1, 2008, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/missing.htm

Garson, G. D. (2008b). Data levels and measurement. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved January 9, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/datalevl.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009a). Generalized linear models and generalized estimating equations. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved October 30, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/gzlm_gee.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009b). Logistic regression. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved May 6, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/logistic.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009c). Multiple regression. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved May 6, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/regress.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009d). Normal curve tests of means and proportions. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved May 19, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/normal.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009e). Reliability analysis. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved May 19, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/reliab.htm

Garson, G. D. (2009f). Testing of assumptions. *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/assumpt.htm

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's

    alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. In *Proceedings of Midwest*

    Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community

    Education (pp. 82-88). Columbus, OH. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from

    https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem%20&%20Gliem

    .pdf?sequence=1

Gollattscheck, J. F. (1991). Will success destroy community services and continuing

    education or what do you do with the revolutionaries after you've won the

    revolution? *The Community Services CATALYST, 21*(3). (ERIC Document

    Reproduction Service No. EJ375320)

Gorham, J. (1985). Differences between teaching adults and pre-adults: A closer look.

    Adult Education Quarterly, 35(4), 194-209.

Graham, S. (1994). Foreign language learning processes in post-compulsory education.

    (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bath, England, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts*

    International, 57(01), 0013C. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from

    ProQuest database.

Grayson, J. P. (2004). The relationship between grades and academic program

    satisfaction over four years of study. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education,*

    34(2), 1-34.

Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis?

    Multivariate Behavioral Research, 26(3), 499-510.

Griffith, M. (1998). *Pueblo Community College part-time instructor handbook*. Pueblo,

    CO: Pueblo Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.

    ED422051)

Grognet, A. G. (1989, Winter). Elderly refugees and language learning. *Aging*. Retrieved August 29, 2005, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1000/is_n359/ai_7356434/print

Grubb, W. N., Badway, N., & Bell, D. (2002). *Community colleges and the equity agenda: The potential of non-credit education.* New York: Columbia University, Community College Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED466245)

Guarino, C. M., Ko, C. Y., Baker, L. C., Klein, D. J., Quiter, E. S., & Escarce, J. J. (2006). Impact of Instructional Practice on Student Satisfaction with Attendings' Teaching in the Inpatient Component of Internal Medicine Clerkships. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 21*(1), 7-12.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gundermann, C. (2000). The place and placement of foreign nationals in English, foreign languages, and comparative literature. *PMLA, 115*(5), 1195-1199.

Guolla, M. (1999). Assessing the teaching quality to student satisfaction relationship: Applied customer satisfaction research in the classroom. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 7*(3), 87-97.

Guy, T. C. (1999). Culture as context for adult education: The need for culturally relevant adult education. In T. C. Guy (Ed.), *Providing culturally relevant adult education: A challenge for the twenty-first century* (pp. 5-18). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hagedorn, L. S., & Laden, B. V. (2002). Exploring the climate for women as community college faculty. In C. L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 69-78). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hajduk, M. A. (2000). Differences between full and part-time faculties' student-centered instructional format as identified by PALS and APALS when teaching adults in academic credit courses in a community college. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(03), 849A. Abstract retrieved April 4, 2007, from ProQuest database.

Haley, M. H. (2000). Shaping the future of twenty-first-century schools: Fulfilling the need for minority teachers in foreign language classrooms. In D. W. Birckbichler & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Reflecting on the past to shape the future* (pp. 99-124). The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences: Keys to success in West Germany, France, and the United States*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.

Hashemi, M. R. (1992). *Feasibility of functional approach to EFL teaching in Iran*. Paper presented at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED354783)

Hazell, C. D. (1994). Continuing Education in Canada: The Metro College's continuing education survey. *The Community Services CATALYST 24*(2). Retrieved January 18, 2008, from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/CATALYST/V24N2/hazell.html

Hearn, J. C. (1985). Determinants of college students' overall evaluations of their academic programs. *Research in Higher Education, 23*(4), 413-437.

Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 597-613). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Helmich, D. I. (2000). Individual student characteristics and satisfaction within the college environment. (Doctoral dissertation, Johnson and Wales University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(09), 3218A. Abstract retrieved January 28, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Helms, R. M. (2005). Inhabiting the borders: The experiences of foreign language faculty in American colleges and universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(04), 1294. Abstract retrieved January 5, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Henschke, J. A. (1987). Training teachers of adults. In C. Klevins (Ed.), *Materials and methods in Adult and Continuing Education* (pp. 414-422). Los Angeles, CA: Klevins Publications in Adult and Continuing Education.

Henschke, J. A. (1989). Identifying appropriate adult educator practices: Beliefs, feelings and behaviors. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Midwest Research-To-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*. St. Louis: University of Missouri-St. Louis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED330781)

Henschke, J. A. (1994). Development and use of the Instructional Perspectives Inventory in graduate adult education. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Commission on International Adult Education of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education: Challenge and change.* Nashville, TN.

Hess, T. M. (2005). Memory and aging in context. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(3), 383-406.

Hiemstra, R. (Ed.). (1985). *Self-directed adult learning: Some implications for facilitators* (Syracuse University, Adult Education Program, Occasional Paper No. 3). Retrieved June 10, 2007, from http://www-distance.syr.edu/policy3.html

Hiemstra, R. (1991a). Aspects of effective learning environments. In R. Hiemstra (Ed.), *Creating Environments for Adult and Continuing Education* (pp. 5-12). New York: Jossey-Bass.

Hiemstra, R. (1991b). *Self-direction in adult learning: Perspectives on theory, research, and practice*. London: Routledge.

Hiemstra, R. (1994). Helping learners take responsibility for self-directed activities. In R. Hiemstra & R. G. Brockett (Eds.), *Overcoming resistance to self-direction in adult learning* (pp. 81-87). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hiemstra, R. (1999). *Translating personal values and philosophy into practice.* Retrieved May 30, 2008, from http://www-distance.syr.edu/philchap.html.

Hiemstra, R., & Brockett, R. G. (1994). Resistance to self-direction in learning can be overcome. In R. Hiemstra & R. G. Brockett (Eds.), *Overcoming resistance to self-direction in adult learning* (pp. 89-92). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hiemstra, R., & Sisco, B. (1990). *Individualizing instruction: Making learning personal, empowering, and successful*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from http://www-distance.syr.edu/iiindex.html

Hines, C. V., Cruickshank, D. R., & Kennedy, J. J. (1985). Teacher clarity and its relationship to student achievement and satisfaction. *American Educational Research Journal, 22*(1), 87-99.

Hope Southcott, L. (2004). A qualitative study of five ESL teachers using constructivism to support second language learning. (Master's thesis, Lakehead University, Canada, 2003). *Masters Abstracts International, 42*(03), 0744. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal, 72*(3), 283-294.

Houle, C. O. (1961). *The inquiring mind*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Houle, C. O. (1996). *The design of education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, C. L. (2001). *Facilitating responsibility for learning in adult community college students.* (ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, No. EDO-JC-01-03). Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/ccs/digests/dig0103. html

Hsieh, P. (2005). How college students explain their grades in a foreign language course: The interrelationship of attributions, self-efficacy, language learning beliefs, and achievement. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(10), 3691A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Huang, I. (2005). Student satisfaction with Web-based course delivery as a function of

  Personality, temperament, attitude and participation. (Doctoral dissertation,

  University of Idaho, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(01), 151A.

  Abstract retrieved April 26, 2009, from ProQuest database.

IDEA Center, Inc. (1998). *IDEA (Individual development and educational assessment)*

  survey form--Student reactions to instruction and courses. Retrieved February 20,

  2008, from http://iweb.tntech.edu/ideaevaluations/IDEAsurveylongformw.pdf

Illinois Association for College Admission Counseling. (2007). *State university foreign*

  language requirements for admission and graduation. Retrieved May 14, 2008,

  from http://www.iacac.org/resources/state_universities_foreign_language_

  requirements_2007.pdf

Illinois Community College Board. (2007). *Data and characteristics of the Illinois*

  community college system. Retrieved May 5, 2008, from http://www.iccb.org/

  pdf/reports/databook2007.pdf

Illinois State Board of Education. (n.d.). *Illinois learning standards: Foreign languages*.

  Retrieved June 6, 2008, from http://www.isbe.state.il.us/ils/foreign_languages/

  standards.html

Insensitive. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English*

  language. New York: Random House.

Instructor. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English*

  language. New York: Random House.

Instructor/course evaluation. (n.d.). Retrieved April 11, 2008, from St. Mary's

  University, Centre for Academic and Instructional Development Web site:

  http://www.smu.ca/academic/senate/downloads/seeq-evaluation.pdf

Ioup, G. (2005). Age in second language development. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 419-435). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Iowa Department of Education. (2006). *Condition of Iowa community colleges 2005*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED492957)

Jarvis, P. (1983). *Adult and Continuing Education: Theory and practice*. London: Croom Helm.

Jaschik, S. (2007, February 21). Languages without language faculty. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved May 17, 2008, from http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2007/02/21/language

Jernigan, C. G. (2001). The role of beliefs, attributions, and perceived goal attainment in students' motivation. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Pedagogy of language learning in higher education: An introduction* (pp. 23-45). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Johnson, S. (2006). The neuroscience of the mentor-learner relationship. In S. Johnson & K. Taylor (Eds.), *The Neuroscience of Adult Learning* (pp. 63-69). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 110. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Joiner, E. G. (1981). *The older foreign language learner: A challenge for colleges and universities*. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 34. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED208672)

Joint Board Task Force on Noncredit and Adult Education. (1998). *Noncredit and adult education: Challenges, opportunities, changes*. Sacramento: California State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED443975)

Jong, D. (2004). Assessing information technology-facilitated learning in adult and

    higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 2003).

    Dissertation Abstracts International, 64(08), 2853A. Abstract retrieved

    November 17, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Jorgensen, C. A. (1998). Changes in perceptions of self in second languages learners.

    (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1997). *Dissertation*

    Abstracts International, 59(02), 0373A. Abstract retrieved April 15, 2007, from

    ProQuest database.

Jurkowitsch, S., Vignali, C., & Kaufmann, H.-R. (2006). A student satisfaction model for

    Austrian higher education providers considering aspects of marketing

    communications. *Journal of Innovative Marketing, 2*(3), 9-23.

Justice, E. M., & Dornan, T. M. (2001). Metacognitive differences between traditional-

    age and nontraditional-age college students. *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*(3),

    236-249.

Kabuga, C. (1990). Andragogy in developing countries. In M. S. Knowles, *The adult*

    learner: A neglected species (4th ed., pp. 233-239). Houston, TX: Gulf

    Publishing.

Karanja, E. (2008). Treatment of missing data in information systems research. In J. E.

    Kendall (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-ninth Annual meeting of the Decision*

    Sciences Institute (pp.3701-3706)*.* Baltimore, Maryland. Retrieved June 15, 2009,

    from http://www.decisionsciences.org/Proceedings/DSI2008/docs/370-7982.pdf

Kidd, J. R. (1967). *How adults learn*. New York: Association Press.

Kim, K., Hagedorn, M. C., Williamson, J., & Chapman, C. (2004). *Participation in adult education and lifelong learning: 2000-2001* (NCES 2004-05). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kim, K., Hagedorn, M. C., Williamson, J., & Chapman, C. (2005). Participation in adult education and lifelong learning: 2000-2001. *Education Statistics Quarterly, 6*(4). Retrieved May 19, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_6/6_4/#5

Kline, P. (1993). *The handbook of psychological testing*. London: Routledge.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. New York: Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1972). The manager as educator. *Continuing Education and Training, 2*(2), 97-105.

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education, Prentice Hall Regents.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education, Prentice Hall Regents.

Knowles, M. S. (1989a). Adult learning: Theory and practice. In L. Nadler & Z. Nadler (Eds.), *The handbook of human resource development* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Knowles, M. S. (1989b). *The making of an adult educator: An autobiographical journey*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S. (1990). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Knowles, M. S. (1994). *A history of the adult education movement in the United States*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Knowles, M. S. (1995). *Designs for adult learning: Practical resources, exercises, and course outlines from the father of adult learning*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

Knowles, M. S. (1996). Adult learning. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), *The ASTD training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development* (4th ed., pp. 253-265). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F. I., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (5th ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Knox, W. E., Lindsay, P., & Kolb, M. N. (1992). Higher education, college characteristics, and student experiences. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(3), 303-328.

Koch, A. S., & Terrell, T. D. (1991). Affective reactions of foreign language students to Natural Approach activities and teaching techniques. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 109-126). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kozeracki, C. A. (2002). Faculty attitudes about students. In C. L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 47-56). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krajnc, A. (1989). Andragogy. In C. J. Titmus (Ed.), *Lifelong education for adults: An international handbook* (pp. 19-21). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Kramsch, C. J. (1995). Embracing conflict versus achieving consensus in foreign language education. *ADFL Bulletin, 26*(3), 6-12.

Kulich, J. (1984). Approaches to theory building and research in adult education in east Europe. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 3*(2), 127-136.

Lambert, R. D. (2001). Updating the foreign language agenda. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(3), 347-362.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*(1), 159-174.

Leach, C. (1979). *Introduction to statistics: A nonparametric approach for the social sciences*. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Learning. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. New York: Random House.

Learning. (2005). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved April 11, 2008, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/learning

Leeper, J. D. (2000). *Choosing the correct statistical test*. Retrieved July 31, 2009, from University of Alabama Web site: http://bama.ua.edu/~jleeper/627/choosestat.html

Leslie, D. W., & Gappa, J. M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. In C. L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 59-68). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levy, B. R., & Schlesinger, M. J. (2005). When self-interest and age stereotypes collide: Elders opposing increased funds for programs benefiting themselves. *Journal of Aging and Social Policy, 17*(2), 25-39.

Lewis, W. (1997). *Whole language and adult education*. ERIC Clearinghouse on

    Reading, English, and Communication Digest, No. 125. Retrieved August 29,

    2005, from Indiana University School of Education Web site: http://

    reading.indiana.edu/ieo/digests/d125.html

Li, Y., McCoy, E., Mack, S. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2005). Contributors to student

    satisfaction with special program (Fresh Start) residence halls. *Journal of College*

    Student Development, 46(2), 176-192.

Liljander, V., & Strandvik, T. (1997). Emotions in service satisfaction. *International*

    Journal of Service Industry Management, 8(2), 148-168.

Lin, T. (1998). Investigating the perceived relationship between Chinese adult students'

    early school language learning experiences and current American ESL teaching

    methods. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1998). *Dissertation*

    Abstracts International, 59(03), 0700A. Abstract retrieved June 3, 2007, from

    ProQuest database.

Lingenfelter, J. E., & Lingenfelter, S. G. (2003). *Teaching cross-culturally: An*

    incarnational model for learning and teaching. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker

    Academic.

Littlewood, W. (2000). Do Asian students really want to listen and obey? *ELT Journal,*

    54(1), 31-36.

Littlewood, W. (2001). Students' attitudes to classroom English learning: A cross-cultural

    study. *Language Teaching Research, 5*(1), 3-28.

Liu, N.-F., & Littlewood, W. (1997). Why do many students appear reluctant to

    participate in classroom learning discourse? *System, 25*(3), 371-384.

Logue, C. T., Lounsbury, J. W., Gupta, A., & Leong, F. T. L. (2007). Vocational interest themes and personality traits in relation to college major satisfaction of business students. *Journal of Career Development, 33*(3), 269-295.

Long, H. B. (2002). *Teaching for learning*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Long, H. B. (2004). Understanding adult learners. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 23-38). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Longmore, M. (1997). Language awareness: An efficient strategy in acquiring a second language? (Master's thesis, University of Calgary, Canada, 1996). *Masters Abstracts International, 35*(06), 1579. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Loughrin-Sacco, S. J. (1991). On apples and oranges: The effects of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary French classes. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990's for college foreign language programs* (pp. 89-112). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, R. A., Gibson, L. W., & Leong, F. T. L. (2005). An investigation of broad and narrow personality traits in relation to general and domain-specific life satisfaction of college students. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(6), 707-729.

Mahoney, V. L. M. (1991). Adverse baggage in the learning environment. In R. Hiemstra (Ed.), *Creating environments for effective adult learning* (pp. 51-60). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mano, H., & Oliver, R. L. (1993). Assessing the dimensionality and structure of the consumption experience: Evaluation, feeling, and satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(3), 451-466.

Manteuffel, M. S. (1982). The satisfied learner: A review of the literature. *Performance and Instruction, 21*(4), 15-18.

Marinova-Todd, S. H., Marshall, D. B., & Snow, C. E. (2000). Three misconceptions about age and L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 9-34.

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(5), 707-754.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1992). The use of student evaluations of university teaching in different settings: The applicability paradigm. *Australian Journal of Education, 36*(3), 279-300. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ461408)

McCollough, M. A., & Gremler, D. D. (1999). Student satisfaction guarantees: An empirical investigation of student and faculty attitudes. *Marketing Education Review, 9*(2), 53-64.

McCombs, B. L. (2001). What do we know about learners and learning? The learner-centered framework: Bring the educational system into balance. *Educational Horizons, 79*(4), 182-193.

McCombs, B. L. (2004). The learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for balancing academic achievement and social-emotional learning outcomes. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 23-39). New York: Teachers College Press.

McCurdy, J., & Trombley, W. (1994). *Broken promises: The impact of budget cuts and fee increases on the California community colleges.* Retrieved January 5, 2007, from California Higher Education Policy Center Web site: http://www.capolicycenter.org/broken/brokenc.html

McDonough, J. (2002). The teacher as language learner: Worlds of difference? *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 404-411.

McManus, L. K. (2008). The instructional perspectives of community college mathematics faculty. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68*, 4587.

McPhee, S. (2004). *Hot programs at community colleges*. Annapolis Junction, MD: Community College Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED485745)

Menard, S. (2002). *Applied logistic regression analysis*. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). Something old, something new: Adult learning theory for the twenty-first century. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The new update on adult learning theory* (pp. 93-96). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 89. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miglietti, C. L., & Strange, C. C. (1998). Learning styles, classroom environment preferences, teaching styles, and remedial course outcomes for underprepared adults at a two-year college. *Community College Review, 26*(1), 1-19.

Milam, J. (2005). The role of noncredit courses in serving nontraditional learners. In B.

    Pusser (Ed.), *Arenas of entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit*

    institutions meet (pp. 55-68). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 129. San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ760471)

Mills, N. A. (2004). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to

    motivation, achievement, and proficiency. (Doctoral dissertation, Emory

    University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(02), 440A. Abstract

    retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Morris, M. C. (1998). An examination of the beliefs and practices of four university

    teaching assistants of French toward target language usage in their classroom

    discourse. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1997). *Dissertation*

    Abstracts International, 58(12), 4589A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005,

    from ProQuest database.

Morstain, B. R. (1977). An analysis of students' satisfaction with their academic program.

    Journal of Higher Education, 48(1), 1-16.

The most unpopular school subject. (2005, September 17). *What's New from AOL News*.

    Retrieved August 25, 2007 from http://webcenters.netscape.compuserve.com/

    whatsnew/package.jsp?name=fte/hatemath/hatemath&floc=wn-dx

Mwaura, J. N. (2008). Non-traditional age black African international students'

    experiences: Phenomenological heuristic inquiry. In S. L. Lundry & E. P. Isaac

    (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Forty-ninth Annual Adult Education Research*

    Conference (pp. 276-281). St. Louis: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Financial accounting for local and state*

    school systems. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/

    h2r2/ch_6_6.asp#3

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Digest of Education Statistics: 2005*.

    Retrieved Nov. 24, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *The condition of education 2006*.

    Retrieved January 8, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/

    pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006071

Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2006). *Five-year trend study: National student satisfaction report*.

    Iowa City, IA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.

    ED490055)

North Seattle Community College instructor handbook 2007-2008. (2007). Retrieved July

    4, 2008, from North Seattle Community College, Teaching and Learning Center

    Web site: http://webshare.northseattle.edu/tlc/PDF/fachandbook07-08.pdf

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York:

    McGraw-Hill.

Oliver, R. L. (1993). Cognitive, affective, and attribute bases of the satisfaction response.

    Journal of Consumer Research, 20(3), 418-430.

Oliver, R. L., & DeSarbo, W. S. (1988). Response determinants in satisfaction

    judgments. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*(4), 495-507.

Omaggio, A. C. (1986). *Teaching language in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*.

    Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

One World Language Solutions. (n.d.). Retrieved Oct. 5, 2008, from http://

    ww.oneworldlanguage.com/index.html

Outcalt, C. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and*

    challenges. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco:

    Jossey-Bass.

Ozmen, K. S. (2004). Make them be aware, not beware of learning: The Cognitive Therapy Technique (CTT) in adult EFL classes. *Asian EFL Journal, 6*(1). Retrieved August 28, 2009, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/04_kso.php

Palinchak, R. (1973). *The evolution of the community college*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Palmer, J. C. (2002). Disciplinary variations in the work of full-time faculty members. In C. L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 9-20). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmunen, K. F. (1995). From dependency to self-directed learning: Implementing an elementary French program for adults in the Weekend College. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(3), 348-359.

Parker, C., & Mathews, B. P. (2001). Customer satisfaction: Contrasting academic and consumers' interpretations. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 19*(1), 38-44.

Parkinson, D., Greene, W., Kim, Y., & Marioni, J. (2003). Emerging themes of student satisfaction in a traditional course and a blended distance course. *TechTrends, 47*(4), 22-28.

Parnell, D. (1991). Will belly dancing be our nemesis? *The Community Services CATALYST, 21*(3). Retrieved January 6, 2007, from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/CATALYST/V21N3/parnell.html

Patterson, P., Romm, T., & Hill, C. (1998). Consumer satisfaction as a process: A qualitative retrospective longitudinal study of overseas students in Australia. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 16*(1), 135-157.

Peacock, M. (n.d.). The links between learner beliefs, teacher beliefs, and EFL proficiency. *Perspectives: Working Papers, 10*(1), 125-159. Retrieved January 7, 2008, from http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/10/1000134.pdf

Peng, C.-Y., Lee, K. L., & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An introduction to logistic regression analysis and reporting. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(1), 3-13.

Perry, B. D. (2006). Fear and learning: Trauma-related factors in the adult education process. In S. Johnson & K. Taylor (Eds.), *The Neuroscience of Adult Learning* (pp. 21-27). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 110. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Peterson, R. A., & Wilson, W. R. (1992). Measuring customer satisfaction: Fact and artifact. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 20*(1), 61-71.

Phillippe, K. A., & Valiga, M. J. (2000). *Faces of the future: A portrait of America's community college students.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 439760)

Podeschi, R. L. (1987). Andragogy: Proofs or premises? *Lifelong Learning, 11*(3), 14-16, 20.

Pratt, D. D. (1988). Andragogy as a relational construct. *Adult Education Quarterly, 38*(3), 160-181.

Pratt, D. D. (1993). Andragogy after twenty-five years. In S. Merriam (Ed.), *Adult learning theory: An update* (pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pratt, D. D., & Collins, J. B. (2001a). *History and development of the TPI*. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from Teaching Perspectives Inventory Web site: http://www.teachingperspectives.com/html/tpi_history.htm

Pratt, D. D., & Collins, J. B. (2001b). *Who else has taken the TPI?* Retrieved September
	10, 2009, from Teaching Perspectives Inventory Web site: http://
	www.teachingperspectives.com/html/tpi_who.htm

Pratt, D. D., Collins, J. B., & Jarvis-Selinger, S. (2001). *Development and use of the
	Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI).* Retrieved August 12, 2007, from
	Teaching Perspectives Inventory Web site: http://www.teachingperspectives.com/
	PDF/development1.pdf

Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interview
	with highly anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language
	anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101-108).
	Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Propst, M. A. G. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction with graduate nursing
	education and psychological types in graduate nursing students. (Doctoral
	dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts
	International, 52*(12), 4189A. Abstract retrieved May 1, 2008, from ProQuest
	database.

Rachal, J. R. (2002). Andragogy's detectives: A critique of the present and a proposal for
	the future. *Adult Education Quarterly, 52*(3), 210-227.

Ralph, E. G. (2001). Motivating instruction in university Continuing Education: A fresh
	look at the key principles. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education,
	27*(1), 61-76.

Ransdell, D. (1993). Creative writing is Greek to me: The continuing education of a
	language teacher. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 40-45.

Raykov, T. (1997). Scale reliability, Cronbach's coefficient alpha, and violations of essential tau-equivalence with fixed congeneric components. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 32*(4), 329-353.

Reischmann, J. (2004). *Andragogy. History, meaning, context, function*. Retrieved July 12, 2007, from http://www.andragogy.net

Richards, J. C. (n.d.). *Program factors in effective foreign and second language teaching*. Retrieved April 12, 2008 from http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/program-factors-effective-teaching.pdf

Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the process of change. *PAC Journal, 1*(1), 41-64.

Richland Community College. (2002). *Continuing Education student satisfaction survey*. Retrieved April 11, 2008, from http:// www.richlandcollege.edu/ce/survey.php

Richter, V. (2004). *Age factors in foreign language learning: Research project*. Retrieved Sept. 9, 2009, from Brown University, Swearer Center for Public Service Web site: http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Swearer_Center/Literacy_Resources/richter.html

Ringvald, V. (1999). The characteristics of learners enrolled in advanced level courses in Hebrew, Chinese, and Japanese at Brandeis University. (Doctoral dissertation, Lesley University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(06), 1907A. Abstract retrieved September 19, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Roberts, C. M. (2004). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. London: Arnold.

Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Rosetta Stone, Ltd. (2009). *Solutions for organizations*. (2009). Retrieved May 5, 2008, from http://www.rosettastone.com/organizations

Rossiter, M. J. (2002). The effects of strategy training on L2 learners. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(06), 2135A. Abstract retrieved September 17, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Rovai, A. P. (2002). Sense of community, perceived cognitive learning, and persistence in asynchronous learning networks. *Internet and Higher Education, 5*, 319-332.

Rovai, A. P., & Gallien, L. B., Jr. (2005). Learning and sense of community: A comparative analysis of African American and Caucasian online graduate students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 74*(1), 53-62.

Rowbotham, M. A. (2007). Teacher perspectives and the psychosocial climate of the classroom in a traditional BSN program. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68(06).*

Rust, R. T., & Oliver, R. L. (1994). Service quality: Insights and managerial implications from the frontier. In R. T. Rust & R. L. Oliver (Eds.), *Service quality: New directions in theory and practice* (pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryu, K. (2008). The teachings of Confucius: A humanistic adult education perspective. In S. L. Lundry & E. P. Isaac (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Forty-ninth Annual Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 330-335). St. Louis: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(2), 239-251.

Santhanam, E., Ballantyne, C., Mulligan, D., de la Harpe, B., & Ellis, R. (2000, February 2-4). Student questionnaires and teaching evaluations: Cutting the cloth to fit the purpose. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Teaching Learning Forum*. Perth, Australia. Retrieved February 23, 2008, from Curtin Institute of Technology Web site: http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2000/santhanam2.html

Satisfaction. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. New York: Random House.

Satisfy. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. New York: Random House.

Sauer, M. L. (2003). Relationship of selected student characteristics to students ratings of importance and levels of satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(05), 1497A. Abstract retrieved April 26, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Saunders, J. A., Morrow-Howell, N., Spitznagel, E., Dore, P., Proctor, E. K., & Pescarino, R. (2006). Imputing missing data: A comparison of methods for social work researchers. *Social Work Research, 30*(1), 19-31.

Saunders, J. C., & Huynh, H. (1980). Considerations for sample size in reliability studies for mastery tests. In *Proceedings of the Eastern Educational Research Association*. Norfolk, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 190608)

Savićević, D. (1999a). *Adult education: From practice to theory building*. Studies in Pedagogy, Andragogy, and Gerontagogy, Vol. 37. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Savićević, D. (1999b). Understanding andragogy in Europe and America: Comparing and contrasting. In J. Reischmann, Z. Jelenc, & M. Bron (Eds.), *Comparative adult education 1998: The contribution of ISCAE to an emerging field of study* (pp. 232-254). Bamberg, Germany: International Society for Comparative Adult Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED430118)

Schleppegrell, M. (1987). *The older language learner*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED287313)

Schleppegrell, M. (2001). Challenges in language teacher training. In G. Braüer (Ed.), *Pedagogy of language learning in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 237-252). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Schoenfeldt, A. L. (1997). Achievement and satisfaction in adult Spanish language courses with compressed and standard formats. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(02), 370A. Abstract retrieved April 12, 2008, from ProQuest database.

Schuetz, P. (2002). Instructional practices of part-time and full-time faculty. In C. L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 39-46). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulz, R. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 343-364.

Scott, S. V. (1999). The academic as service provider: Is the customer 'always right'? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 21*(2), 193-202.

Seaman, D. F., & Fellenz, R. A. (1989). *Effective strategies for teaching adults*. New York: Merrill.

Selkirk College, Department of Strategic Planning and Institutional Research. (2008).

    Student satisfaction survey results. Retrieved Sept. 15, 2009, from http://

    selkirk.ca/media/departmentsandschools/administration/institutionalresearch/

    publicreports/studentsatisfactionsurvey/SSSreport_for_web08.pdf

Seward, S. S. (1998). An identification of the instructional perspectives of Kansas parents

    as teachers educators. (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1997).

    Dissertation Abstracts international, 58(11), 4159A. (UMI No. 9817154)

Shank, M. D., Walker, M., & Hayes, T. (1995). Understanding professional service

    expectations: Do we know what our students expect in a quality education?

    Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 13(1), 71-89.

Shannon, F. (2006, August 20). Letter: EFL pedagogy in Taiwan. *Taipei Times*.

    Retrieved August 14, 2007, from www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/

    archives/2006/08/20/2003323973

Sharma, P. L. (2006). *The future of the learning world*. New Delhi, India: Sarup.

Sheskin, D. J. (1997). *Handbook of parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures*.

    Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Shrout, P. E. (1998). Measurement reliability and agreement in psychiatry. *Statistical*

    Methods in Medical Research, 7(3), 301-317.

Snedeker, K., Glynn, P., & Wang, C. (2002). *Ordered/ordinal logistic regression with*

    SAS and Strata. Retrieved July 31, 2009, from University of Washington,

    Sociology Department Web site: http://staff.washington.edu/glynn/olr.pdf

Snyder, M. D. (2002). Drake University eliminates foreign language department and

    language instruction. *International Journal of Humanities and Peace, 18*(1), 94.

    Retrieved October 16, 2009, from *Academic OneFile* database.

Stanton, C. (2005). A construct validity assessment of the Instructional Perspectives Inventory. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(05), 1597.

Starke, D. (2007). *Professional development module: Getting started--Resources for the new college instructor*. Retrieved July 14, 2008, from Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence, Teaching and Learning Resources Web site: http://www.texascollaborative.org/gettingstarted.htm

State University of New York-Albany, Central Staff Office of Institutional Research. (1995). *Non-credit instructional activities, July 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 with trend information from 1983*. Albany: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 389245)

Sternberg, R. J. (2002). Cultural explorations of human intelligence around the world. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, S. A. Hayes, & D. N. Sattler (Eds.), *Online readings in psychology and culture.* Retrieved September 23, 2005, from Western Washington University, Center for Cross-Cultural Research Web site: http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~culture/Sternberg.htm

Stewart, R. (2004, April 16). Continuing Education courses cut. *Portsmouth Herald*. Retrieved January 6, 2008, from http://archive.seacoastonline.com/2004news/04162004/news/10879.htm

St. Louis Community College. (n.d.). *Continuing Education instructor handbook.* St. Louis, MO: Author.

Strachota, E. (2006). The use of survey research to measure student satisfaction in online courses. In E. P. Isaac (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2006 Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education: Impacting adult learners near and far* (pp. 199-204). St. Louis: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Stricker, A. (2006). Learning leadership: An investigation of principals' attitudes towards teachers in creating the conditions conducive to learning in school-based staff development. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(06), 2016.

Studies suggest age-related declines may be overestimated. (2003, May 23). *Science Daily*. Retrieved October 1, 2006, from http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/ 2003/05/030523080524.htm

Syracuse University, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. (n.d.). *What's the use of student ratings of teaching effectiveness?* Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://oira.syr.edu/oira/Assessment/StudentRate/Use.htm

Szymanski, D. M., & Henard, D. H. (2001). Customer satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, 29*(1), 16-35.

Tannen, D. (1986). *That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. New York: Ballantine.

Tercanlioglu, L. (n.d.). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning and how they relate to gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 5-3*(1), 145-162.

Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence. (2007). Retrieved July 14, 2008, from http://www.texascollaborative.org/resource-level2intro.htm

Thomas, E. E. (1995). An identification of the instructional perspective of parent educators. (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56(03), 799A. (UMI No. 9522638)

Thomas, E. H., & Galambos, N. (2004). What satisfies students? Mining student-opinion data with regression and decision tree analysis. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 251-269.

Thomas, J. (1984). A study to determine the role of prior linguistic experience in second and third language learning. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & I University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44*(10), 3053A. Abstract retrieved September 20, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Tough, A. (1979). *The adult's learning projects: A fresh approach to theory and practice in adult learning* (2nd ed.). Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Tough, A. (1999). *Reflections on the study of adult learning.* Retrieved August 8, 2007 from New Approaches to Lifelong Learning Web site: http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/depts/sese/csew/nall/res/toughtalk.htm

Trust. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. (1996). New York: Random House.

Trylong, V. L. (1988). Aptitude, attitudes, and anxiety: A study of their relationships to achievement in the foreign language classroom. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*(10), 2564A. Abstract retrieved September 16, 2005, from ProQuest database.

Tse, D. K., Nicosia, F. M., & Wilton, P. C. (1990). Consumer satisfaction as a process. *Psychology and Marketing, 7*(3), 177-193.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J., & Supko, R. A. (2000). Nontraditional students: New ways to meet the needs of a growing population. In D. W. Birckbichler & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Reflecting on the past to shape the future* (pp. 163-186). The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Twyford, C. W. (1987/1988). Age-related factors in second language acquisition. *New Focus, NCBE Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education*, No. 2. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED296581)

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. (n.d.). *Adult education facts at a glance.* Retrieved Nov. 26, 2007, from http://www.ed.gov/print/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/aefacts.html

Ullman, M. T. (2005). A cognitive neuroscience perspective on second language acquisition: The declarative/procedural model. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition: Methods, theory, and practice* (pp. 141-178). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Understanding student satisfaction. (2003). *BC College & Institute Student Outcomes, 3*(1). Retrieved May 18, 2007 from Selkirk College Web site: http://admin.selkirk.bc.ca/research/documents/issue_satisfaction%5B1%5D.pdf

Unique. (1996). In *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. (1996). New York: Random House.

University of California-Los Angeles, Academic Technology Services. (n.d.). Annotated SPSS output: Multinomial logistic regression. *Introduction to SAS*. Retrieved July 29, 2009 from www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/SPSS/output/mlogit.htm

University of Missouri-St. Louis. (n.d.). *Graduate program profile: Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree in Education*. Retrieved October 2, 2009, from http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/graduate/pdf/PhD_Educ_profile.pdf

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Cooperative Extension. (2003). *A toolkit for volunteer leaders: Educational design*. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://ianrsearch2.unl.edu/4h/volunteers/toolkit/principl.htm

University of Virginia School of Continuing and Professional Studies. (2009). *Certificate in adult ESL: Teaching ESL to adults*. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.scps.virginia.edu/certificates/esl.php

Van Noy, M., Jacobs, J., Korey, S., Bailey, T., & Hughes, K. L. (2008, March). The landscape of noncredit workforce education: State policies and community college practices (CCRC Brief, No. 38). New York: Columbia University, Community College Research Center.

van Teijlingen, E. R., & Hundley, V. (2001). The importance of pilot studies. *Social Research Update, 35*(Winter). Retrieved October 25, 2009 from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU35.pdf

Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(4), 457-467.

Viechnicki, K. J., Bohlin, R. M., & Milheim, W. D. (1990). Instructional motivation of adult learners: An analysis of student perceptions in Continuing Education. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 38*(3), 10-14.

Vision and hearing loss often occur together in older age. (2006, October 11). *ScienceDaily*. Retrieved November 26, 2007, from http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/10/061010022657.htm

von Hippel, P. T. (2004). Biases in SPSS 12.0 Missing Value Analysis. *The American Statistician, 58*(2), 160-164.

Voorhees, R. A., & Milam, J. H. (2005). *The hidden college: Noncredit education in the United States.* Retrieved August 3, 2009 from http://www.highered.org/docs/ hiddenCollege.pdf

Wan, G. (2001). The learning experiences of Chinese students in American universities: A cross-cultural perspective. *College Student Journal, 35*(1), 28-44.

Warford, L. J. (2002). Funding lifelong learning: A national priority. *Community College Journal, 72*(3), 15-23.

Warren, C. (1989). Andragogy and N. F. S. Grundtvig: A critical link. *Adult Education Quarterly, 39*(4), 211-223.

Watson, V. L. (1998). Relationship between student perceptions of classroom climate and satisfaction in institutions of higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(05), 1489A. Abstract retrieved April 26, 2009, from ProQuest database.

Wegge, N. (1991). The effect of an in-service training program on the educational orientation of part-time adult Continuing Education instructors. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*(03), 784A.

Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Welles, E. (2004). Foreign language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2002. *ADFL Bulletin, 35*(2-3), 7-26.

West Virginia Adult Education and Literacy Information Network. (2007). *Adult Basic Education handbook, Section 3: Meeting the needs of adult learners*. Dunbar,

WV: Regional Education Service Agency. Retrieved October 9, 2009, from

http://wvde.state.wv.us/abe/teacherhandbook.htm

Westbrook, R. A. (1980). Intrapersonal affective influences on consumer satisfaction

with products. *Journal of Consumer Research, 7*, 49-54.

White, E. M. (2008, April 4). A proposal: Get serious about the foreign-language

requirement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A39.

Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Grogaard, J. B. (2002). Student satisfaction: Towards

an empirical deconstruction of the concept. *Quality in Higher Education, 8*(2),

183-195.

Williams, A. C., Bower, E. J., & Newton, J. T. (2004). Research in primary dental care,

Part 6: Data analysis. *British Dental Journal, 197*(2), 67-73.

Wimmer, D. R. (1981). Some student learning strategies and attitudes in foreign language

study. (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1981). *Dissertation*

Abstracts International, 42(02), 584A. Abstract retrieved October 3, 2005, from

ProQuest database.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (1999). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A comprehensive guide*

for teaching all adults. (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wood, P. G. (1999). Who is using the national foreign language standards? *Foreign*

Language Annals, 32(4), 435-440.

Wyss, R. (2002, January). Bring learners up-to-date on CLT classroom approaches. *ELT*

Newsletter. Retrieved September 1, 2007, from http://www.eltnewsletter.com/

back/January2002/art842002.htm

Yonge, G. D. (1984). Andragogy and pedagogy: Two ways of accompaniment. *Adult*

Education Quarterly, 35(3), 160-167.

Young, D. J. (1991). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 57-63). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yu, Y.-T., & Dean, A. (2001). The contribution of emotional satisfaction to consumer loyalty. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 12*(3/4), 234-250.

Zemke, R., & Zemke, S. (1984, March 9). 30 things we know for sure about adult learning. *Innovation Abstracts, VI*(8). Retrieved October 9, 2009, from http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/FacDevCom/guidebk/teachtip/adults-3.htm

Zenhui, R. (1999). Modern vs. traditional. *English Teaching Forum Online*. Retrieved August 19, 2007, from http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol37/no3/p27.htm

Zenhui, R. (2001). Matching teaching styles with learning styles in east Asian contexts. *The Internet TESL Journal, VII*(7). Retrieved September 2, 2007, from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Zenhui-TeachingStyles.html

Zinn, L. M. (2004). Exploring your philosophical orientation. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 39-74). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Personal Communications Related to
Data on Continuing Education and Noncredit Programs

Communication from Kent Farnsworth, Ph. D., University of Missouri-St. Louis
    Mary Ann Lee Endowed Professor of Community College Leadership,
    Community College President in Residence,
    Division of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

```
From: Ms Linda Ryan [mailto:lirvan816@verizon.net]
Sent: Thu 1/4/2007 3:58 PM
To: Farnsworth, Kent
Subject: Request for help in locating statistics on non-credit Cont. Ed.
participation

Dear Dr. Farnsworth,
My advisor, John Henschke, suggested I contact you. I am a doctoral candidate
at UMSL working on the research proposal for my dissertation. The study I am
proposing focuses on adults taking non-credit foreign language courses through
Continuing Education programs. I am struggling to find statistics on this
particular group. Most of the Continuing Education statistics I've found lump
together data on learners taking non-credit continuing Education courses and
learners taking courses to acquire Continuing Education Units (to fulfill
work-related or certification/licensing requirements). Could you recommend any
source or sources which could provide information on the size and
characteristics of the population of adults taking non-credit Continuing
Education courses?
Thank you for considering my request.
Sincerely,
Linda Ryan
```

RE: Request for help in locating statistics on non-credit Cont. Ed. part ...
Subject: RE: Request for help in locating statistics on non-credit Cont. Ed. participation
From: "Farnsworth, Kent" <farnsworthk.@umsl.edu>
Date: Fri, 05 Jan 200705:54:52 -0600
To: "Ms Linda Ryan" <ljryan816@verizon.net>

```
Dear Linda:
I'm afraid your statistics will be very difficult to locate. To the best of my
knowledge, there is no central repository for data on continuing education - at
least in Missouri. Some states may keep track of non-credit coursework, but
that would be on a state by state basis. Otherwise, you would have to go
directly to institutional records, and they will be less than uniform! Some
colleges don't even keep a "transcript" of continuing education activity.
Sorry I can't be of more help. I'm in Burma, so can't check with anyone. You
might call one of the departments of continuing education at one of the
colleges and see what information they can provide. Good luck.
Kent F
```

Communication from Vanessa Smith Morest, Ph. D., Community College Research
Center

--On Tuesday, January 09, 2007 4:14 PM -0600 Ms Linda Ryan
<ljryanB16@verizon.net>
wrote:
Dear Dr. Morest,
I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.
The study I am proposing for my dissertation focuses on adults taking
non-credit foreign language courses through Continuing Education
programs. I am struggling to find statistics on this particular group.
Many of the Continuing Education statistics I've found lump together data
on learners taking non-credit Continuing Education courses and learners
taking courses to acquire Continuing Education Units (to fulfill
work-related or certification/licensing requirements). Other Continuing
Education statistics do not separate out data on foreign language courses
from data on humanities courses or they do not directly distinguish
between credit and non-credit humanities courses or foreign language
courses when reporting enrollment, demographics, etc.
Could you recommend any source or sources which could provide
information on the size and characteristics of the following populations:
adults taking non-credit classes through Cont. Ed. programs AND/OR adults
taking non-credit Foreign Language classes through Cont. Ed . programs?
Thank you for any light you might be able to shed on the problem of
finding information on these populations.
Sincerely,
Linda Ryan

Re: Data on non-credit Continuing Education courses?
Subject: Re: Data on non-credit Continuing Education courses?
From: Vanessa Smith Morest <vks6@columbia.edu>
Date: Tue, 09 Jan 2007 21 :39:32 -0500
To: Ms Linda Ryan <ljryan816@verizon.net>
Hi Linda,
Overall, data on non-credit students are poor to non-existent. Could you just
clarify
for me what you have in mind with the non-credit foreign language students. Are
you
talking about adults (some of whom may hold college degrees) taking classes
like
Spanish or French through continuing ed. at a community college? If this is the
sort
of thing you have in mind, I think you will find it extremely difficult to get
enrollment data. You would probably have to call individual colleges to get the
numbers. Many colleges do not collect good data on non-credit students at all,
and
even fewer would be able to disaggregate those numbers to the course level.
I'm sorry that I can't be more helpful! There is a "listserv" that
institutional
researchers use. You could float the question out there and see if any
researchers
respond back about their college. Let me know if you'd like that address.
All the best,
Vanessa

Communication from Laura L. Vedenhaupt, Research Associate for Academic Affairs, Missouri Department of Higher Education

From: Ms Linda Ryan [mailto:ljryan816@Verizoo.net]
Sent: Sunday, January 07, 2007 4:56 PM
To: Missouri Department of Higher Education
Subject: Data on non-credit Cant. Ed. courses?
I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The study I am proposing for my dissertation focuses on adults taking non-credit foreign language courses through Continuing Education programs. I am struggling to find statistics on this particular group. Many of the Continuing Education statistics I've found lump together data on learners taking non-credit Continuing Education courses and learners taking courses to acquire Continuing Education Units (to fulfill work-related or certification/licensing requirements). Other Continuing Education statistics do not separate out data on foreign language courses from data on humanities courses or they do not directly distinguish between credit and non-credit humanities courses or foreign language courses when reporting enrollment, demographics, etc. . .
Could you recommend any source or sources which could provide information on the size and characteristics of the following populations: adults taking noncredit classes through Cont. Ed. programs AND/OR adults taking noncredit Foreign Language classes through Cont. Ed . programs?
Thank you for any light you might be able to shed on this problem

FW: Data on non-credit Cont. Ed. courses?
Subject: FW: Data on non-credit Cont. Ed. courses?
From: "Vedenhaupt, Laura" <Laura.Vedenhaupt@dhe.mo.gov>
Date: Wed, 17 Jan200713:53:21 -0600
To: <ljryan816@verizon.net>
Linda,
Thank you for contacting the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE).
The data you are seeking is not something we request from our institutions. The only thing we would have directly would be data on course offerings (and possibly enrollments) in non-credit vocational and technical education through a yearly survey we conduct of the Regional Technical Education Councils. We would not have anything directly on course-taking in non-credit foreign language, and I don't believe there is any data in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS - http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.
If it would be helpful, I can provide you with a list of Chief Academic Officers at Missouri's public and independent two- and four-year institutions. You may wish to contact them directly or perhaps with a survey, and they may be able to better assist you in your research.
I hope this information is helpful.
Laura L Vedenhaupt
Research Associate for Academic Affairs
Missouri Department of Higher Education
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO65109
Phone: (573) 522-1309
Fax: (573) 526-5431
www.dhe.mo.gov

Communications from Jamie Isaac, IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System)

From: Ms Linda Ryan [mailto:ljryan816@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 20072:33 PM
To: IPEDS Email
Subject: Data on non-credit Cont. Ed. courses?
Does IPEDS contain data related to either one of these populations: adults taking noncredit classes through Cont. Ed. programs AND/OR adults taking noncredit Foreign Language classes through Cont. Ed . programs? Could you recommend any source or sources which could provide information either population?
I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The study I am proposing for my dissertation focuses on adults taking non-credit foreign language courses through Continuing Education programs. I am struggling to find statistics on this particular group. Many of the Continuing Education statistics I've found lump together data on learners taking non-credit Continuing Education courses and learners taking courses to fulfill work-related or certification/licensing requirements--CEUs, PDUs. Others do not directly distinguish between credit and non-credit humanities courses or foreign language courses when reporting enrollment, demographics, etc.
Thank you for any light you might be able to shed on this problem.
Sincerely,
Linda Ryan

RE: Data on non-credit Cont. Ed. courses?
Subject: RE: Data on non-credit Cont. Ed. courses?
From: "IPEDS EmaiI" <ipe<isbeEp@rti.org>
Date: Tue, 23 Jan 2007 10:17:14 -0500
To: "Ms Linda Ryan" <ljryan816@verizon.net>, "IPEDS EmaiI" <ipedshelp@rti.org>
Thanks for your email. I'm sorry, but <u>IPEDS does not collect data on those populations</u>. <u>I do not know of any specific studies</u>, but if you haven't already done so, you might want to look at some of the sample surveys published by NCES, at: http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/.
Best of luck.
Jamie Isaac
IPEDS Help Desk
Toll Free 1-877- 225- 2568
ipedshelp@rti.org

Appendix B

STUDENT RESEARCH PACKET:
Instructions: Student
Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
Participant Information Form-Student (PIF-S)
Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory—Adapted for Students (MIPI-S)
Gift Card Information & Coupon

INSTRUCTIONS: STUDENT

Included in this packet you will find one copy of the following:
*   *Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities*
*   *Participant Information Form-Student* (*PIF-S*)
*   *Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory—Adapted for Students* (*MIPI-S*)
*   *Gift Card Information & Coupon* sheet and *Gift Card Drawing-Student* envelope
*   Self-addressed, stamped return envelope for the *MIPI-S*, *PIF-S*, and *Gift Card Drawing--Student* envelope.

Step 1: Please read the *Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities*. If you choose to participate in this study, complete Steps 2 through 5. If at any point in the process you have a question or concern, please feel free to contact the Investigator, Linda Ryan, by phone at (217) 243-6289 or by e-mail at ljryan816@verizon.net.

Step 2: Complete the *Participant Information Form-Student* (*PIF-S*).

Step 3: Complete the *Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory—Adapted for Students* (*MIPI-S*).

Step 4: Read the Information section on the *Gift Card Information & Coupon* sheet. If you choose to participate in the gift card drawing, complete the Gift Card Coupon. Cut the coupon off, place it in the *Gift Card Drawing--Student* envelope, and seal the envelope.

Step 5: Seal the *PIF-S*, the *MIPI-S*, and the *Gift Card Drawing—Student* envelope (if you are participating in the drawing) in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided and put this envelope in the mail.

Thank you for making an important contribution to understanding the adult learner's experience in foreign language courses!

Linda Ryan

College of Education

One University Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4400
Telephone: 314-516-5944
Fax: 314-516-5942
E-mail: coe@umsl.edu

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
Adult Learning Satisfaction and Instructional Perspective
in the Foreign Language Classroom

Participant _____   HSC Approval Number _____070726R_____

Principal Investigator __Linda Jo Ryan_____   PI's Phone Number __(217) 243-6289____

_____

1.   You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Linda Jo Ryan, a doctoral candidate in Adult Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Your participation in this study will help educators better understand *the adult learner's experience in foreign language courses.* Specifically, the study will examine the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective (the teacher's beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to teaching and learning) in foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program.

2.   You must be <u>18 years of age or older</u> in order to participate in this study.

3.   Your participation will include
- completing the research instruments (a survey and information form),
- completing a Gift Card Drawing Coupon if you choose to participate in the gift card drawing for participants in this study, and
- returning the completed documents to the Investigator in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

<u>No class time</u> should be used for completing the research instruments.

Completing the survey and information form should take between <u>10 and 15 minutes</u>.

4.   **Return of the research instruments will constitute your consent to participate in this study.** Please keep this form for your records.

5.   Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. You will not be penalized in any way if you choose not to participate. You may choose not to answer any questions you do not want to answer on the research instruments.

6.   All participants who *complete and return* the research instruments will be eligible to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card. One $50 gift card will be drawn for the group of instructors participating in the study. Two $50 gift cards will be drawn for the group of students participating in the study. In order to enter your name in the drawing, complete the Gift Card Drawing Coupon (included in the research packet), seal it in the small envelope labeled "Gift Card Drawing" (attached to the Gift Card Information & Coupon sheet), and include it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope when you return the completed research instruments.

7.   Participants in this study will remain anonymous. The research instruments and the sealed Gift Card Drawing envelopes will be separated by a person not connected with the research study as soon as they are received. This person will retain custody of all Gift Card Drawing envelopes. The Investigator will have access only to the returned research instruments which will be destroyed after the study is completed. After all data collection has been completed, the person in custody of the Gift Card Drawing envelopes will draw one envelope from the group of instructors' Gift Card Drawing envelopes and two envelopes from the group of students' Gift Card Drawing envelopes. The person conducting the drawing will open the winning envelopes, contact the winners to verify their mailing addresses, and mail the gift cards to them. The Investigator will have no access to the opened Gift Card Drawing envelopes or the identities of the winners. All Gift Card Drawing envelopes and coupons will be destroyed once the gift cards are sent out.

8.   There are no known risks associated with this research.

9.   If you have questions, please contact the Investigator, Linda Jo Ryan at (217) 243-6289 or by e-mail: ljryan816@verizon.net. The Dissertation Committee Chairperson for this study is Dr. John A. Henschke, Associate Professor of Education – Adult Education in the College of Education. You may contact Dr. Henschke at (314) 516-5946 or by e-mail: henschkej@missouri.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Chairperson of the Institutional Review Board at UMSL at (314) 516-5897.

Thank you for considering participation in this effort to better understand adult foreign language learning.

Adult Learning Satisfaction/Instructional Perspective Study:
Participant Information Form-Student (PIF-S)

The following questionnaire is designed to collect information on the characteristics of language students participating in this study. Please provide the information requested below.

Satisfaction with Learning (in this course).
1.   Circle the number which best indicates your level of satisfaction with
        your personal language learning in this course

        No satisfaction   Highest possible satisfaction
                    0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Participant Information.

2.   Gender: _____male   _____female

3.   Age: _____18-19   _____50-59
                _____20-29   _____60-69
                _____30-39   _____70-79
                _____40-49   _____80+

4.   Race or ethnicity:_____

5.   I attended elementary and secondary school in: *(check ALL that apply)*
                _____USA
                _____Canada
                _____Mexico
                _____Central America (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____South America (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Europe (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Asia (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Pacific Islands (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Africa (specific country/countries: _____)

6.   I attended a post-secondary institution in: *(check ALL that apply)*
                _____USA
                _____Canada
                _____Mexico
                _____Central America (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____South America (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Europe (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Asia (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Pacific Islands (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Africa (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____ Not applicable

Participant Information Form—Student (PIF-S), page 2

7.   The highest diploma/degree I have earned:
                 _____High School Diploma (or equivalent)
                 _____Associate's Degree (or equivalent)
                 _____Bachelor's Degree (or equivalent)
                 _____Master's Degree (or equivalent)
                 _____Specialist certificate
                 _____Doctorate
                 _____ Not applicable

8.   The country in which I earned my highest diploma/degree: _____

9.   The language I consider my native language/mother tongue: _____

10.   Languages that I speak: _____

11.   The language I am studying <u>in this course</u>: _____

12.   Number of years spent studying the language I am studying <u>in this course</u>: _____

13.   My primary goal for this course: _____

14.   To what extent do you feel you achieved this goal? *(Circle the appropriate number.)*

        Goal NOT achieved.   **Goal achieved 100%.**
                        0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

15.   Other goals for this course:
        _____

16.   To what extent do you feel you achieved these goals?
        (Circle the appropriate number.)

        Goals NOT achieved.   **Goals achieved 100%.**
                        0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

17.   Other languages that I am currently studying or have previously studied:
        _____

18.   How would you rate your general experience with language study, past and
        present? (*Circle the appropriate number.*)

Totally UNSATISFACTORY   **Totally SATISFACTORY**
                0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

*Thank you for participating in this study. Please put the completed <u>Modified Instructional
Perspectives Inventory--Adapted for Students</u> (MIPI-S) and <u>Participant Information Form-
Student</u> (PIF-S) in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided and drop it in the mail.*

Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory--Adapted for Students (MIPI-S)
© John A. Henschke, Adapted by Linda Jo Ryan

Listed below are 45 statements reflecting beliefs, feelings and behaviors beginning or seasoned teachers of adults may or may not possess at a given moment. Please <u>indicate how frequently each statement typically applies to your instructor</u>. Circle the letter that best describes the instructor.

How frequently does your instructor…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
1. use a variety of teaching techniques?	A	B	C	D	E
2. use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to discuss information from lectures)?	A	B	C	D	E
3. appear to believe that his/her primary goal is to provide learners with as much information as possible?	A	B	C	D	E
4. appear to be fully prepared to teach?	A	B	C	D	E
5. have difficulty understanding learner point-of-views?	A	B	C	D	E
6. appear to expect and accept learner frustration as they grapple with problems?	A	B	C	D	E
7. purposefully communicate to learners that each learner is uniquely important?	A	B	C	D	E
8. express confidence that learners will develop the skills they need?	A	B	C	D	E
9. show he/she values searching for or creating new teaching techniques?	A	B	C	D	E
10. teach through simulations of real-life settings or situations?	A	B	C	D	E
11. appear to teach exactly what and how he/she has planned?	A	B	C	D	E
12. notice and acknowledge positive changes in learners?	A	B	C	D	E
13. have difficulty getting his/her point across to learners?	A	B	C	D	E
14. appear to believe that learners vary in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge?	A	B	C	D	E

How frequently does your instructor…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
15. really listen to what learners have to say?	A	B	C	D	E
16. appear to trust learners to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like?	A	B	C	D	E
17. encourage learners to solicit assistance from other learners?	A	B	C	D	E
18. appear to feel impatient with learners' progress?	A	B	C	D	E
19. balance his/her efforts between learner content acquisition and motivation?	A	B	C	D	E
20. make her/his presentations clear enough to forestall all learner questions?	A	B	C	D	E
21. conduct group discussions?	A	B	C	D	E
22. establish instructional objectives?	A	B	C	D	E
23. use a variety of instructional media? (Internet, distance, interactive video, videos, etc.)	A	B	C	D	E
24. use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?	A	B	C	D	E
25. appear to believe that his/her teaching skills are as refined as they can be?	A	B	C	D	E
26. express appreciation to learners who actively participate?	A	B	C	D	E
27. appear to experience frustration with learner apathy?	A	B	C	D	E
28. appear to prize the learner's ability to learn what is needed?	A	B	C	D	E
29. appear to feel that learners need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?	A	B	C	D	E
30. enable learners to evaluate their own progress in learning?	A	B	C	D	E
31. hear what learners indicate their learning needs are?	A	B	C	D	E

MIPI-S, page 2

Ryan, Linda, 2009, UMSL, p. 499

MIPI-S, page 3

How frequently does your instructor…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
32. have difficulty with the amount of time learners need to grasp various concepts?	A	B	C	D	E
33. promote positive self-esteem in learners?	A	B	C	D	E
34. require learners to follow the precise learning experiences which he/she provides to them?	A	B	C	D	E
35. conduct role plays?	A	B	C	D	E
36. appear to act bored with the many questions learners ask?	A	B	C	D	E
37. individualize the pace of learning for each learner?	A	B	C	D	E
38. help learners explore their own abilities?	A	B	C	D	E
39. engage learners in clarifying their own aspirations?	A	B	C	D	E
40. ask the learners how they would approach a learning task?	A	B	C	D	E
41. appear to feel irritation at learner inattentiveness in the learning setting?	A	B	C	D	E
42. integrate teaching techniques with subject matter content?	A	B	C	D	E
43. develop supportive relationships with learners?	A	B	C	D	E
44. appear to experience unconditional positive regard for learners?	A	B	C	D	E
45. respect the dignity and integrity of the learners?	A	B	C	D	E

Thank you for participating in this research.
After completing the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory—Adapted for Students and the Participant Information Form-Student, please put them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided and drop them in the mail.

GIFT CARD INFORMATION & COUPON: STUDENT

As an incentive to participate in this study, <u>all participants who **complete and return the research instruments** will be eligible</u> to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card.
One $50 gift card will be drawn for the group of instructors participating in the study.
Two $50 gift cards will be drawn for the group of students participating in the study.

If you wish to enter your name in the drawing,
1) complete the Gift Card Coupon below,
2) seal it in the small envelope labeled "Gift Card Drawing--Student" (attached), and
3) include the Gift Card Drawing--Student envelope <u>with the completed research instruments</u> in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by the Investigator.

<u>If you win</u> a gift card, <u>you will be contacted by the person in charge of the drawing (not the Investigator) to verify the mailing address before the gift card is sent to you</u>.
Please indicate the means by which you can to be contacted in the event that you win the gift card drawing.

Keep the top part of this page for your records.

If you have any questions or concerns about this drawing, please contact the Investigator:

Linda Jo Ryan, (217) 243-6289 or ljryan816@verizon.net.

Complete and return the Coupon below:

GIFT CARD DRAWING COUPON: STUDENT

YES, ENTER MY NAME IN THE DRAWING FOR A WAL-MART GIFT CARD.

Name _____

Address: _____

If I win, I understand that the person in charge of the drawing (not the Investigator) will contact me to verify my mailing address.

(Choose one:)

____ Contact me by phone. My telephone number is_____

____Contact me by e-mail. My e-mail address is_____

Appendix C

INSTRUCTOR RESEARCH PACKET:
Instructions: Instructor
Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
Participant Information Form-Instructor (PIF-I)
Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI)
Gift Card Information & Coupon

INSTRUCTIONS: INSTRUCTOR

Included in this packet you will find one copy of each of the following:
- *Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities*
- *Participant Information Form-Instructor* (*PIF-I*)
- *Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory* (*MIPI*)
- *Gift Card Information & Coupon* sheet and *Gift Card Drawing-Instructor* envelope
- Self-addressed, stamped return envelope for the *PIF-I, MIPI*, and *Gift Card Drawing-Instructor* envelope.

Step 1: Please read the *Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities*. If you choose to participate in this study, complete Steps 2 through 5. If at any point in the process you have a question or concern, please feel free to contact the Investigator, Linda Ryan, by phone at (217) 243-6289 or by e-mail at ljryan816@verizon.net.

Step 2: Complete the *Participant Information Form-Instructor* (*PIF-I*).

Step 3: Complete the *Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory* (*MIPI*).

Step 4: Read the Information section on the *Gift Card Information & Coupon* sheet. If you choose to participate in the gift card drawing, complete the Gift Card Coupon. Cut the coupon off, place it in the *Gift Card Drawing--Instructor* envelope, and seal the envelope.

Step 5: Seal the *PIF-I*, the *MIPI*, and the *Gift Card Drawing-Instructor* envelope (if you are participating in the drawing) in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided and put this envelope in the mail.

Thank you for making an important contribution to understanding the adult learner's experience in foreign language courses!

Linda Ryan

College of Education

One University Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4400
Telephone: 314-516-5944
Fax: 314-516-5942
E-mail: coe@umsl.edu

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
Adult Learning Satisfaction and Instructional Perspective
in the Foreign Language Classroom

Participant _____   HSC Approval Number ____070726R_____

Principal Investigator __Linda Jo Ryan_____   PI's Phone Number __(217) 243-6289____

_____

1.   You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Linda Jo Ryan, a doctoral candidate in Adult Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Your participation in this study will help educators better understand *the adult learner's experience in foreign language courses.* Specifically, the study will examine the relationship between adult satisfaction with learning and instructional perspective (the teacher's beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to teaching and learning) in foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program.

2.   You must be 18 years of age or older in order to participate in this study.

3.   Your participation will include
  ● completing the research instruments (a survey and information form),
  ● completing a Gift Card Drawing Coupon if you choose to participate in the gift card drawing for participants in this study, and
  ● returning the completed documents to the Investigator in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

No class time should be used for completing the research instruments.

Completing the survey and information form should take between 10 and 15 minutes.

4.   **Return of the research instruments will constitute your consent to participate in this study.** Please keep this form for your records.

5.   Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. You will not be penalized in any way if you choose not to participate. You may choose not to answer any questions you do not want to answer on the research instruments.

6.   All participants who *complete and return* the research instruments will be eligible to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card. One $50 gift card will be drawn for the group of instructors participating in the study. Two $50 gift cards will be drawn for the group of students participating in the study. In order to enter your name in the drawing, complete the Gift Card Drawing Coupon (included in the research packet), seal it in the small envelope labeled "Gift Card Drawing" (attached to the Gift Card Information & Coupon sheet), and include it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope when you return the completed research instruments.

7.   Participants in this study will remain anonymous. The research instruments and the sealed Gift Card Drawing envelopes will be separated by a person not connected with the research study as soon as they are received. This person will retain custody of all Gift Card Drawing envelopes. The Investigator will have access only to the returned research instruments which will be destroyed after the study is completed. After all data collection has been completed, the person in custody of the Gift Card Drawing envelopes will draw one envelope from the group of instructors' Gift Card Drawing envelopes and two envelopes from the group of students' Gift Card Drawing envelopes. The person conducting the drawing will open the winning envelopes, contact the winners to verify their mailing addresses, and mail the gift cards to them. The Investigator will have no access to the opened Gift Card Drawing envelopes or the identities of the winners. All Gift Card Drawing envelopes and coupons will be destroyed once the gift cards are sent out.

8.   There are no known risks associated with this research.

9.   If you have questions, please contact the Investigator, Linda Jo Ryan at (217) 243-6289 or by e-mail: ljryan816@verizon.net. The Dissertation Committee Chairperson for this study is Dr. John A. Henschke, Associate Professor of Education – Adult Education in the College of Education. You may contact Dr. Henschke at (314) 516-5946 or by e-mail: henschkej@missouri.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Chairperson of the Institutional Review Board at UMSL at (314) 516-5897.

Thank you for considering participation in this effort to better understand adult foreign language learning.

Adult Learning Satisfaction/Instructional Perspective Study:
Participant Information Form–-Instructor (PIF-I)

The following questionnaire is designed to collect information on the characteristics of language instructors participating in this study. Please provide the information requested below.

1.   Gender: _____male   _____female

2.   Age: _____18-19   _____50-59
               _____20-29   _____60-69
               _____30-39   _____70-79
               _____40-49   _____80+

3.   Race or ethnicity: _____.

4.   I attended elementary and secondary school in: *(check ALL that apply)*
                _____USA
                _____Canada
                _____Mexico
                _____Central America (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____South America (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Europe (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Asia (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Pacific Islands (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Africa (specific country/countries: _____)

5.   I attended a post-secondary institution in: *(check ALL that apply)*
                _____USA
                _____Canada
                _____Mexico
                _____Central America (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____South America (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Europe (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Asia (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____Pacific Islands (specific country/countries:_____)
                _____Africa (specific country/countries: _____)
                _____ Not applicable

6.   The *highest* diploma/degree I have earned:
                _____High School Diploma (or equivalent)
                _____Associate's Degree (or equivalent)
                _____Bachelor's Degree (or equivalent)
                _____Master's Degree (or equivalent)
                _____Specialist certificate
                _____Doctorate
                _____Not Applicable

Participant Information Form-Instructor (PIF-I), page 2

7.   The country in which I earned my *highest* diploma/degree: _____

8.   The language I consider my native language/mother tongue: _____

9.   Languages that I speak: _____

10.   The language that I am currently teaching in this class: _____

11.   *Other* languages that I am currently teaching or have previously taught:
        _____

12.   The country/countries in which I have taught: _____

13.   Number of years of teaching experience: _____

14.   Number of years teaching <u>foreign language(s):</u> _____

15.   Number of years teaching <u>foreign language(s)</u> to <u>adult</u> students (age 18+): _____

16.   My primary goal for this course:
        _____

17.   To what extent do you feel you achieved this goal? *(circle appropriate number)*

  Goal NOT achieved.   I fulfilled this goal 100%.
              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

18.   Other goals for this course:
        _____

19.   To what extent do you feel you achieved these goals? *(circle appropriate number)*

  Goals NOT achieved.   I fulfilled these goals 100%.
              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

20.   Have you been exposed to information on adult learning? _____ Yes   _____ No

21.   If yes, indicate the source(s) of that information:
        _____

Thank you for participating in this study.
Please put the completed <u>Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory</u> (MIPI) and <u>Participant</u>
<u>Information Form-Instructor</u> (PIF-I) in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided and drop
it in the mail.

Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI)
© John A. Henschke

Listed below are 45 statements reflecting beliefs, feelings and behaviors beginning or seasoned teachers of adults may or may not possess at a given moment. Please indicate how frequently each statement <u>typically applies to you</u>. Circle the letter that best describes you.

How frequently do you…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
1. use a variety of teaching techniques?	A	B	C	D	E
2. use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to discuss information from lectures)?	A	B	C	D	E
3. believe that your primary goal is to provide learners with as much information as possible?	A	B	C	D	E
4. feel fully prepared to teach?	A	B	C	D	E
5. have difficulty understanding learner point-of-views?	A	B	C	D	E
6. expect and accept learner frustration as they grapple with problems?	A	B	C	D	E
7. purposefully communicate to learners that each is uniquely important?	A	B	C	D	E
8. express confidence that learners will develop the skills they need?	A	B	C	D	E
9. search for or create new teaching techniques?	A	B	C	D	E
10. teach through simulations of real-life?	A	B	C	D	E
11. teach exactly what and how you have planned?	A	B	C	D	E
12. notice and acknowledge to learners positive changes in them?	A	B	C	D	E
13. have difficulty getting your point across to learners?	A	B	C	D	E
14. believe that learners vary in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge?	A	B	C	D	E

MIPI, page 2

How frequently do you…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
15. really listen to what learners have to say?	A	B	C	D	E
16. trust learners to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like?	A	B	C	D	E
17. encourage learners to solicit assistance from other learners?	A	B	C	D	E
18. feel impatient with learners' progress?	A	B	C	D	E
19. balance your efforts between learner content acquisition and motivation?	A	B	C	D	E
20. try to make your presentations clear enough to forestall all learner questions?	A	B	C	D	E
21. conduct group discussions?	A	B	C	D	E
22. establish instructional objectives?	A	B	C	D	E
23. use a variety of instructional media? (Internet, distance, interactive video, videos, etc.)	A	B	C	D	E
24. use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?	A	B	C	D	E
25. believe that your teaching skills are as refined as they can be?	A	B	C	D	E
26. express appreciation to learners who actively participate?	A	B	C	D	E
27. experience frustration with learner apathy?	A	B	C	D	E
28. prize the learner's ability to learn what is needed?	A	B	C	D	E
29. feel learners need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?	A	B	C	D	E
30. enable learners to evaluate their own progress in learning?	A	B	C	D	E

MIPI, page 3

How frequently do you…	Almost Never	Not Often	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
31. hear what learners indicate their learning needs are?	A	B	C	D	E
32. have difficulty with the amount of time learners need to grasp various concepts?	A	B	C	D	E
33. promote positive self-esteem in learners?	A	B	C	D	E
34. require learners to follow the precise learning experiences which you provide them?	A	B	C	D	E
35. conduct role plays?	A	B	C	D	E
36. get bored with the many questions learners ask?	A	B	C	D	E
37. individualize the pace of learning for each learner?	A	B	C	D	E
38. help learners explore their own abilities?	A	B	C	D	E
39. engage learners in clarifying their own aspirations?	A	B	C	D	E
40. ask the learners how they would approach a learning task?	A	B	C	D	E
41. feel irritation at learner inattentiveness in the learning setting?	A	B	C	D	E
42. integrate teaching techniques with subject matter content?	A	B	C	D	E
43. develop supportive relationships with your learners?	A	B	C	D	E
44. experience unconditional positive regard for learners?	A	B	C	D	E
45. respect the dignity and integrity of the learners?	A	B	C	D	E

Thank you for participating in this research.
After completing the <u>Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory</u> and the <u>Participant Information Form-Instructor</u>, please put them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided and drop them in the mail.

GIFT CARD INFORMATION & COUPON: INSTRUCTOR

As an incentive to participate in this study, <u>all participants who **complete and return the research instruments** will be eligible</u> to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card.
One $50 gift card will be drawn for the group of instructors participating in the study.
Two $50 gift cards will be drawn for the group of students participating in the study.

If you wish to enter your name in the drawing,
1) complete the Gift Card Coupon below,
2) seal it in the small envelope labeled "Gift Card Drawing--Instructor" (attached), and
3) include the Gift Card Drawing--Instructor envelope <u>with the completed research instruments</u> in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by the Investigator.

<u>If you win</u> a gift card, <u>you will be contacted by the person in charge of the drawing (not the Investigator) to verify the mailing address before the gift card is sent to you</u>.
Please indicate the means by which you can to be contacted in the event that you win the gift card drawing.

Keep the top part of this page for your records.

If you have any questions or concerns about this drawing, please contact the Investigator:

Linda Jo Ryan, (217) 243-6289 or ljryan816@verizon.net.

Complete and return the Coupon below:

GIFT CARD DRAWING COUPON: INSTRUCTOR

YES, ENTER MY NAME IN THE DRAWING FOR A WAL-MART GIFT CARD.

Name _____

Address: _____

If I win, I understand that the person in charge of the drawing (not the Investigator) will contact me to verify my mailing address.

(Choose one:)

___ Contact me by phone. My telephone number is_____

 ___Contact me by e-mail. My e-mail address is_____

Appendix D
Scoring the MIPI and the MIPI-S

Scoring process for both instruments: A = 1, B = 2, C = 3, D = 4, and E = 5 <u>except</u> on reverse scored items.

Scoring for items in Factors 5 and 7 is reversed: A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, and E = 1. Reverse scored items are 5, 13, 18, 27, 32, 36, 41 (Factor 5) and 3, 11, 20, 25, 34 (Factor 7).

(1)	(2)	(3)`	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
4 ____	7 ____	1 ____	6 ____	5 ____	2 ____	3 ____
12 ____	8 ____	9 ____	14 ____	13 ____	10 ____	11 ____
19 ____	16 ____	22 ____	15 ____	18 ____	21 ____	20 ____
26 ____	28 ____	23 ____	17 ____	27 ____	24 ____	25 ____
33 ____	29 ____	42 ____	37 ____	32 ____	35 ____	34 ____
	30 ____		38 ____	36 ____		
	31 ____		40 ____	41 ____		
	39 ____					
	43 ____					
	44 ____					
	45 ____					
TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

FACTORS	MEAN	TOTAL	POSSIBLE MINIMUM	POSSIBLE MAXIMUM
1. Teacher empathy with learners	_____	_____	5	25
2. Teacher trust of learners.	_____	_____	11	55
3. Planning and delivery of instruction.	_____	_____	5	25
4. Accommodating learner uniqueness.	_____	_____	7	35
5. Teacher insensitivity toward learners.	_____	_____	7	35
6. Experience based learning Techniques (Learner-centered learning process).	_____	_____	5	25
7. Teacher-centered learning process.	_____	_____	5	25

Appendix E
Use of Andragogical Principles
Category Levels for Scores on Instructional Perspectives Inventory
(Stanton, 2005, p. 280)

IPI Category Levels	Percentage	IPI Score
High above average	89% - 100%	225-199
Above average	88% - 82%	198-185
Average	81% - 66%	184-149
Below average	65% - 55%	148-124
Low below average	54%	< 123

Appendix F
Adaptations reflected in MIPI-S
(MIPI adapted by Linda Jo Ryan, 2007)

The purpose of the following adaptations was to change the items in the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory to reflect learners' perceptions of the instructional perspective of the teacher in the foreign language classroom. Revisions to the original items are <u>underlined.</u>

Listed below are 45 statements reflecting beliefs, feelings and behaviors beginning or seasoned teachers of adults may or may not possess at a given moment. Please indicate how frequently each statement typically applies to your instructor. Circle the number that best describes the instructor.

How frequently <u>does the instructor</u>:

1 Use a variety of teaching techniques

2 Use buzz groups (learners placed in groups to discuss information from lectures)?

3 <u>Appear to</u> believe that his/her primary goal is to provide learners with as much information as possible?
> NB Learners can only report what they observe; they cannot assess the teacher's beliefs, attitudes, values, feelings, or perceptions except as those characteristics are observed in classroom behaviors. (See Note 1)

4 <u>Appear to be</u> fully prepared to teach?

5 Have difficulty understanding learner point-of-views?

6 <u>Appear to</u> expect and accept learner frustration as they grapple with problems?

7 Purposefully communicate to learners that each <u>learner</u> is uniquely important?

8 Express confidence that learners will develop the skills they need?

9 <u>Value searching for or creating</u> new teaching techniques?
> NB *Teaching techniques* is used in Item 42 of the original Henschke's IPI; the word *techniques* appears to have been omitted in the Stanton (2005) MIPI.

10 Teach through simulations of real-life <u>settings or situations</u>?
> NB Stricker (2006) adds <u>*settings*</u> to this item. Typical learning activities in a foreign language classroom might include role-play in a real-life setting (ordering from a menu in a café), role-play of real-life situations (returning a pair of shoes that are the wrong size), or both (discussing a problem with your food with the

waiter in a café). It therefore seems appropriate to add *situations* to this item for the learners completing this instrument.

11 <u>Appear to</u> teach exactly what and how <u>he/she</u> has planned?

12 Notice and acknowledge positive changes in <u>learners</u>?
NB Replace *them* with *learners* for clarity and continuity; Stricker's item reads: *notice and acknowledge to <u>me</u> positive changes in <u>me</u>. To learners* was omitted in the MIPI-S.

13 Have difficulty getting his/her point across to learners?

14 <u>Appear to</u> believe that learners vary in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge?

15 Really listen to what learners have to say?

16 <u>Appear to</u> trust learners to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like?

17 Encourage learners to solicit assistance from other learners?

18 <u>Appear to</u> feel impatient with <u>learners'</u> progress?
NB Previous items generally refer to the group of learners so *learners'* seems appropriate.

19 Balance <u>his/her</u> efforts between learner content acquisition and motivation?

20 <u>Make her/his</u> presentations clear enough to forestall all learner questions?
NB *His/her* from Stricker instrument to replace *your* in Henschke instrument. Replace *try to make* with *make* because student can't reliability judge how much teacher is trying, only what teacher actually does.

21 Conduct group discussions?

22 Establish instructional objectives?

23 Use a variety of instructional media? (Internet, distance, interactive video, videos, etc.)

24 Use listening teams (learners grouped together to listen for a specific purpose) during lectures?

25 <u>Appear to</u> believe that <u>his/her</u> teaching skills are as refined as they can be?

26 Express appreciation to learners who actively participate?

27 <u>Appear to</u> experience frustration with learner apathy?

28 <u>Appear to</u> prize the learner's ability to learn what is needed?

29 <u>Appear to</u> feel <u>that</u> learners' need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?
       NB Insert *that* for clarity.

30 Enable learners to evaluate their own progress in learning?

31 Hear what learners indicate their learning needs are?

32 Have difficulty with the amount of time learners need to grasp various concepts?

33 Promote positive self-esteem in learners?

34 Require learners to follow the precise learning experiences which <u>he/she</u> provides <u>to</u> them?
       NB Stricker instrument uses *he/she* and inserts *to*.

35 Conduct role plays?

36 <u>Appears to act</u> bored with the many questions learners ask?

37 Individualize the pace of learning for each learner?

38 Help learners explore their own abilities?

39 Engage learners in clarifying their own aspirations?

40 Ask the learners how they would approach a learning task?

41 <u>Appears to</u> feel irritation at learner inattentiveness in the learning setting?

42 Integrate teaching techniques with subject matter content?

43 Develop supportive relationships with learners?
       NB Delete *your* from original item.

44 <u>Appear to experience</u> unconditional positive regard for learners?
       NB Delete *your* from original item.

45 Respect the dignity and integrity of the learners?

NOTES

1. The most common adaptation of this instrument was to insert *appear to* in items that require students to assess the instructor's feelings, experience, perceptions. (See Items 3, 4, 6, 11, 14,…)

2. Some language was inserted to make more explicit the sentence syntax, e.g. Items 11, 29, 34.

3. Henschke's instrument is written in second person, using *you* and *your*.
Subject and possessive pronouns used in the Henschke instrument were changed from *you -- your* to *he/she -- his/her* to reflect the <u>third person subject</u> of the root sentence in the adapted version of the instrument: *How often does <u>your instructor</u>….*

4. The Stricker (2006) adaptation of Henschke's Modified IPI used some of the same language adaptations mentioned in Notes 2 and 3 above. (Indicated in note following each item where relevant.)

Appendix G
SAMPLE LETTER TO INSTRUCTORS, INCLUDING OVERVIEW OF STUDY

35 Sunset Drive
Jacksonville, Illinois 62650
October ___, 2007

[Name, address of Instructor]

Dear [Name of Instructor],

I am a former foreign language teacher and, currently, a doctoral candidate in Adult Education at the University of Missouri—St. Louis. I am writing to invite you to participate in a research study I am conducting on adult foreign language learners and their instructors.

The study being conducted examines the relationship between *adult satisfaction with learning* and *instructional perspective* (the teacher's beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to teaching and learning) in noncredit beginning foreign language courses offered through a Continuing Education program. Attached is a description of the study.

You and your students have important insights into this subject.
Would you consider participating?
Would you encourage your students to participate?

This study has the approval of the community college. The Manager of the Continuing Education program will distribute Instructor and Student Research packets to your class or classes this fall. I ask two things:
> --that you consider participating yourself and
> --that you make your students aware of the invitation to participate in this research and encourage them to take a Research packet if they are interested.

NO class time is to be used for completing the two instruments in the research packet. This should be done outside of class. It should take 10-15 minutes to complete the instruments. The instruments will be returned to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided in each research packet.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request and the study description. Your participation and the participation of your students is important to this study and will make a big contribution to better understanding the adult learner's experience in foreign language courses. If you have any questions or concerns, I would enjoy talking to you. I can be contacted by phone (217) 243-6289 or e-mail: ljryan816@verizon.net.

Sincerely,
Linda Jo Ryan

Overview
**Adult Learning Satisfaction and Instructional Perspective
in the Foreign Language Classroom**

Researcher: Linda Jo Ryan, Doctoral Candidate, University of Missouri-St. Louis

Purpose of Study:
To gain a better understanding of *effective learning environments for adults studying a foreign language* and the *adult learner's experience in foreign language courses*.

This study will examine the relationship between *adult satisfaction with learning* and *instructional perspective* in noncredit beginning foreign language classes offered through a Continuing Education program.

Need for Study:
1) Instructional perspective (the teacher's beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to teaching and learning) has not been examined in the context of foreign language learning.
2) Adult satisfaction with learning has not been examined in the context of noncredit foreign language courses (which are not English as a Second Language courses).
3) Little demographic information exists on the populations being examined:
    • *adult students* learning a foreign language (other than English as a Second Language) for personal interest, not related to degree completion or employment and
    • *instructors* of noncredit Continuing Education foreign language courses.
4) The study will contribute to better understanding the intersection of principles of andragogy and foreign language teaching and learning in the Continuing Education context

Subjects:
Adult students (age 18 and older) participating in noncredit beginning foreign language classes in all languages (except English as a Second Language or American Sign Language) offered through a Continuing Education program and the **instructors** teaching those classes.

Data Collection:
Surveys to be completed during the second half of the Fall, 2007 class schedule. Instructors and students willing to participate will complete the appropriate instruments <u>outside of class</u> and mail them to the researcher. All data will be collected and coded in a way which maintains participant anonymity.

Each participant will receive a research packet containing: instructions for participating in the study; an Informed Consent document; the two data collection instruments (an instructional perspectives inventory and a participant information form); a self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by the Researcher; and a Gift Card Information & Coupon. (see *Incentive* section).

All research instruments will be completed outside of class.
Estimated time for completion of instruments: **10-15 minutes**.

Incentive to participate offered by Researcher
All participants who <u>*complete and return*</u> the research instruments will be eligible to win a $50 Wal-Mart gift card. One $50 gift card will be drawn for the group of instructors participating in the study. Two $50 gift cards will be drawn for the group of students participating in the study. Each person choosing to enter the drawing will complete the Gift Card Coupon (included in the research packet), seal it in the small envelope labeled "Gift Card Drawing" (attached to the Gift Card Information & Coupon sheet) and mail it to the Researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided in the research packet. A person not connected with the research study will conduct the drawing after data collection is complete and be responsible for sending the gift cards to the winners. The Researcher will have no access to the Gift Card Drawing envelopes or the identities of the winners.

Appendix H

Letter of Permission for Use of MIPI and MIPI-S, John A. Henschke

College of Education

Division of Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies

One University Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4400
Telephone: 314-516-6944
Fax: 314-516-6942

7/24/07

Ms. Linda Ryan
35 Sunset Drive
Jacksonville, IL 62650

Dear Ms. Ryan:

I am pleased that you wish to use the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) and the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory – Adapted for Students (MIPI-S) in your doctoral dissertation research study regarding "Adult Learning Satisfaction and Instructional Perspectives in Foreign Language Learning." I hereby give you permission to use these copyrighted instruments. I would expect an appropriate citation for these tools in your dissertation or any publications that result from using them.

If there is any other way I may help you in this process, please let me know. My best wishes to you in your research.

Most Sincerely,

John A. Henschke, Ed. D.
Associate Professor – Adult Education

Linda Jo Ryan – page 30 of 31

21st

Creating the 21st Century College of Education

AN NCATE ACCREDITED INSTITUTION

an equal opportunity institution

Appendix I

Completion Certificate, Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Ryan, Linda, 2009, UMSL, p. 522

Human Participant Protections Education for Research T

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

*   **Linda Yamnitz**

has completed the **Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams** online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 10/20/2002.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
http://www.nih.gov

*   NOTE: Name change of researcher from *Linda Yamnitz* to **Linda Ryan**
All current University of Missouri—St. Louis student documents reflect name change due to marriage in December, 2003.

Appendix J

Certificate of Approval
Institutional Review Board

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Interdepartmental Correspondence

Name: Linda Ryan

Title: Adult Learning Satisfaction and Instructional Perspective in the Foreign
Language Classroom

The chairperson of the Human Subjects Committee for UM-St. Louis has reviewed the above mentioned protocol for research involving human subjects and determined that the project qualifies for exemption from full committee review under Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46.101b. The time period for this approval expires one year from the date listed below. You must notify the Human Subjects Committee in advance of any proposed major changes in your approved protocol, e.g., addition of research sites or research instruments.

You must file an annual report with the committee. This report must indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects to date from start of project, or since last annual report, whichever is more recent.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator must retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and they must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the UM-St. Louis human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

Protocol Number	Date	Signature - Chair
070726R	8-6-07	

Footnotes

[1] The equivalent null hypothesis for the Primary Research Question is: There is no significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as reported on the PIF-S, and the instructional perspective of the teacher in the noncredit foreign language classroom, as measured by the MIPI.

[2] The equivalent null hypothesis for Sub-question 1 is: There is no significant relationship between adult satisfaction with learning, as reported on the PIF-S, and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI-S.

[3] The equivalent null hypothesis for Sub-question 2 would be: There is no significant difference between the teacher-reported instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI, and students' perceptions of the teacher's instructional perspective, as measured by the MIPI-S, in the noncredit foreign language classroom.

[4] The equivalent null hypothesis for Sub-question 3 would be: There is no one student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, which explains students' perceptions of High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI-S.

[5] The equivalent null hypothesis for Sub-question 4 would be: There is no one student characteristic or combination of student characteristics, identified on the PIF-S, which explains high learning satisfaction (i.e., ratings of 7 or above on Item 1 of the PIF-S).

[6] The equivalent null hypothesis for Sub-question 5 would be: There is no one teacher characteristic or combination of teacher characteristics, identified on the

PIF-I, which explains High Above Average teacher ratings on the use of andragogical principles, as measured by the MIPI.