JANET L. EYRING
California State University, Fullerton

Results of the 1997 CATESOL College/University Survey

■ **This article provides a reasonably accurate picture of the opinions, needs, and interests of CATESOL college/university level members based upon the results of a 1997 survey. As a whole, members work as part-time and full-time professors or instructors in one of the California college systems. Even though they perceive themselves as well trained to deal with L2 issues and have a great deal of contact with ESL students, members are dissatisfied with the lack of articulation with the other programs that deal with L2 learners on their campuses. As a whole, members actively participate in professional conferences, keep up-to-date in their reading of CATESOL publications, and are hopeful about the role of technology in the future. While able to identify a wide range of positive decisions, activities and programs on their campuses within the past five years, most respondents expressed the need for greater professional respect in their work settings as well as more support in providing curricular options and staffing.**

This article will summarize the results of a survey of the college/university (c/u) membership conducted during spring 1997. The purpose of the survey was to gain a general idea of the level's opinions, needs, and interests in various areas including: publications, conferences, workload and salary, technology and language teaching, innovative programs, and future goals. With this information, the level will be better able to address the needs of its members and make plans for future projects, presentations, and publications that would relate to and possibly improve members' professional experiences. Although the focus is on c/u members,

the results have implications for the intensive English program (IEP) and community college (cc) levels as well.

Method

In constructing the survey, the level chair (Jan Eyring) and assistant level chair (Janet Lane) brainstormed various areas for investigation. While they knew that there were more than 700 members at the level, they did not know exactly what percentage were teaching at which institution, what setting they worked in, what their major roles were, what their perceived status was, and whether they were full-time or part-time or not working at all. Further, they wanted to assess members' opinions of the CATESOL publications and of the CATESOL regional and state conferences as well as to know about how materials were selected in the various campus programs and whether these materials were satisfactory or could be improved. Because the membership consisted of administrators, professors, teachers, and others who could often play a role in serving as advocates for second language (L2) learners, several questions related to the actual time members spent with these students, their familiarity with and opinion of matriculation procedures on their campuses, their own preparedness to serve c/u students, their familiarity with standards designed for this student population, and their willingness or their institution's willingness to engage in conversations about the needs of these students on their campuses. The authors also wished to determine how satisfied members were with their positions and salaries. They also sought information about the membership's experience with and opinion of the use of technology in teaching ESL on their campuses. Finally, they desired specific information about significant second-language-related activities that had occurred on c/u campuses in the past five years as well as specific suggestions about improvements the membership would like to see implemented on their various campuses.

Once the areas for investigation were identified, a four-page survey was designed (see Appendix A) which included 31 forced-choice items and 8 open-ended items. Three of the forced-choice items related to the percentage of time spent at various work locations, in various campus settings, and in various professional roles. Another item requested the names and telephone numbers of various experts who could be called upon to provide more in-depth information about various c/u issues in the future. Finally one item asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of the survey in allowing them to express their present Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) concerns. Open-ended items required respondents to provide suggestions about some ESL-related area—for example, suggestions for improving the *CATESOL News* and *The*

CATESOL Journal or the regional and state conferences. They also elicited respondents' comments on the needs of matriculated L2 students, the new Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates' (ICAS) Second Language Proficiency Descriptors (ESL Intersegmental Project, 1996), and the use of technology in ESL instruction. One item allowed several lines for the membership to write in other comments and concerns that may not have been addressed by the survey.

A pilot version of the survey was checked by a consultant in the Social Science Research Center at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) for format as well as content concerns. It was then distributed to 10 respondents in Northern and Southern California for feedback and suggestions. Once revised, the survey was edited, copied, and mailed to the entire U.S.-based CATESOL membership based on the currently available mailing list maintained by the organization. This included 653 members from California, 17 members from Nevada, and 15 members from outside of California and Nevada but from the United States. Ten additional California members requested a copy of the survey at the 1997 CATESOL State conference level rap session in Fresno. Altogether, 695 surveys were disseminated to the membership.

Of the 695 surveys mailed, 17 surveys were returned with an incorrect address or a note indicating that the member could not or would not fill out the form. After the deadline of May 12, 1997, e-mail reminder notices were sent to 162 members who had not yet returned their surveys and for which e-mail addresses were available. Of the 678 surveys mailed to correct addresses, 272 surveys were returned, constituting a return rate of 40%. The information in these surveys was coded into computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) software. This system produced a data file and supported the analysis of the open-ended items on the questionnaire. Using consultants from the CSUF Social Science Research Center and funding from the CSUF School of Humanities, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at CSUF, and CATESOL, the survey was input and analyzed. The return rate of 40% is fairly high and does permit a moderately reasonable assessment of a cross section of the membership. However, in all surveys of this sort, it should be noted that a systematic bias remains due to the nonresponse of some members.

Results

Almost 80% (79.9%) of the respondents indicated that the survey was good or excellent in allowing them to express their concerns. The results below are grouped under the following categories: affiliation, status and salaries of members; value of professional conferences and publications;

familiarity with curriculum, materials, and assessment; contact with L2 students; meeting L2 learner needs; significant decisions, activities, or programs; and future goals. Within each section, frequency, cross tabs, and chi-square calculations were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 1997 program.

Affiliation, Status, and Salaries of Members

In order to obtain a composite picture of the membership, descriptive statistics were run on members' institutions, settings, and roles at their various campuses. As shown in Table 1, 226 out of 272 (or 83.1% of the membership) are employed at one location 60% of the time (or more than half time). This leaves 46 out of 272 (or 17%) who split their responsibilities between two or more institutions or organizations. The majority of the respondents (37.6%) are working in the California State University (CSU) system, which is more than twice the number of respondents working at the other institutions, including the University of California (UC) (17.7%), private colleges (14.2%), community colleges (15%), and other locations (15.5%). Although not shown in this table, 8.5% of the respondents admitted working 100% of the time at a community college, which might indicate an erroneous level choice at the time of joining the organization. Some indicated they do not work in a college system at all but work at home, church, universities outside of California (Arizona and Nevada), junior high and high schools, companies or businesses, private intensive English programs (IEPs), adult education/vocational education programs, consultation services, extension programs, or are retired.

Table 1
Members with Major Commitments to One Institution

Institution	Total number of persons	Percentage
California State University	85	37.6%
University of California	40	17.7%
Other (e.g., universities outside of California, private companies, public schools, private IEPs, extension programs, etc.)	35	15.5%
Community College	34	15.0%
Private College/University	32	14.2%
TOTAL	226	100%

The work settings of respondents are shown in Table 2. Of the respondents, 230 out of 272 (or 84.5%) work in one particular work setting at least 60% of the time. Of these respondents, about half (48.3%) work in college departments, 37.4% work in IEP settings, and 11.3% work in other settings such as at home, at elementary or secondary schools, at the workplace, at adult schools, in extended education, for a publisher, at a testing office, or doing teacher training workshops. About 1.7% work at academic skills centers and 1.3% work in writing tutoring centers with more than a part-time commitment.

Table 2
Members with Major Commitment to One Setting

Setting	Total number of persons	Percentage
College Department	111	48.3%
Intensive English Program	86	37.4%
Other (e.g., home, adult schools, publisher, testing office, etc.)	26	11.3%
Academic Skills Center	4	1.7%
Writing Tutoring Center	3	1.3%
TOTAL	230	100%

As far as professional roles, 211 out of 272 indicated that they had the same role 60% of the time (See Table 3). The majority (or 51.2%) indicated that they taught ESL, 23.2% indicated that they were professors in a university TESOL, applied linguistics, linguistics, English, education, or communications department, 12.8% were program administrators, 2.4% were graduate students, and 10% indicated a wide range of other roles such as publisher's representative, textbook author, cross-cultural, language, and academic development (CLAD) teacher trainer, editor, grant administrator, contract programs coordinator, assessor, business communications professor, junior high/high school teacher, program designer, tutorial center coordinator, elder and child care worker, computer lab supervisor, dean, or project director for researchers.

Table 3
Members with One Major Role

Role	Total number of persons	Percentage
ESL Instructor	108	51.1%
Professor	49	23.2%
Program Administrator	27	12.8%
Other (e.g., publisher's representative, textbook author, teacher trainer (CLAD), computer lab supervisor, etc.	21	10.0%
Graduate Student	5	2.4%
Tutor	1	.5%
TOTAL	211	100%

In order to derive a clearer picture of where the majority of the membership works, a cross tabs program was run between the following variables: institution by setting, institution by role, and setting by role. The largest number of respondents were accounted for in the institution by setting run (215 out of 272, or 79%). With an item response cut off point of 15 people per cell, by far the largest settings by institution clusters are: IEP employees at the CSU, college department employees at the CSU, and college department employees at the community college. Other clusterings include: IEP members at the UC and college department members at the UC. The actual number of persons in these places appears in Table 4.

Table 4
Institutions/Settings Where the Majority of Members Work

Institution/Setting	Total number of persons	Percentage
California State University/Intensive English Program	40	18.6%
California State University/College Department	36	16.7%
Community College/College Department	27	12.6%

University of California/Intensive English Program	19	8.8%
Private College/Intensive English Program	16	7.4%
University of California/College Department	15	7.0%
Other Combination of Institution/Setting	62	28.9%
TOTAL	215	100%

Regarding the various campuses, 64% indicated that they perceived their status somewhat lower or much lower than other professionals on campus. About 26.2% perceived their status about the same. Only 9.6% perceived their status as somewhat higher or much higher than others on campus at the same job classification or grade. In order to determine whether affiliations within the level might affect these responses, a chi-square analysis was run dividing the c/u respondents into three groups: those who indicated a 100% time commitment to the IEP (and would most likely choose the new IEP level as an affiliation in the future), those who indicated a 100% time commitment to the community college (and perhaps were misplaced at the c/u level), and all others (most of whom fit more closely the definition of a "c/u member." Table 5 shows these results. The directionality is the same for all three groups; that is, the largest percentage perceive themselves as lower than other professionals on campus, with a midrange percentage perceiving themselves as about the same on campus, and with the smallest percentage perceiving themselves as higher status than others at an equivalent job classification or grade. The chi-square analysis indicated significant differences among all three groups: Community college teachers perceive their status as higher than c/u or intensive English programs. IEPs perceive their status as lower overall.

Table 5
Perceived Status of ESL/TESL Professionals on Campuses

		Higher	About the Same	Lower
Within community colleges	Count	3	7	9
	Percent	15.8%	36.8%	47.3%
Within Intensive English Programs	Count	2	9	43
	Percent	3.7%	16.7%	79.6%

| All other | Count | 17 | 44 | 95 |
| college/university | Percent | 10.9% | 28.2% | 60.9% |

$\chi 2$ = 20.096, *df* = 8, *p* < .01, two tailed.

When asked about current level of paid employment, a large percentage of respondents (18.5%) stated that they receive no compensation for their TESL or L2-related activities. Members working full-time comprise 52.7%, while 6.2% indicate three-fourths time, 13.6% indicate half-time, and 9.1% indicate quarter-time. Forty-six point three percent are somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their salaries while 53.8% are somewhat or very satisfied with their salaries.

Value of Publications and Professional Conferences

When comparing percentages for respondents who read the *CATESOL News* and *The CATESOL Journal*, 94.9% versus 78.9% indicate they read the journal sometimes or regularly. These results show that the newsletter is read more frequently than the journal. As far as satisfaction with the publications, the respondents seem satisfied or very satisfied with both—91.3% with the newsletter and 88.1% with the journal.

Specific suggestions for improvement of the *CATESOL News* were provided by the membership. They requested more articles on curriculum, more articles on literature, business English, specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), combining methods for native and nonnative speakers, more on methodology (lesson plans, teaching approaches, teaching resources), and more on web teaching and program administration. Several comments related to providing more information about graduate student activities, TA (teaching assistant) training, regional news, and research. Some respondents mentioned including special sections with student narratives, teaching bloopers, and interviews as well as a column on grammar and linguistics. Others noted the lack of coverage about resources for teaching adult Hispanics at the college level and for working in extended education programs within the UC and CSU.

As for *The CATESOL Journal*, respondents requested more special issues on specific topics. They also requested more research, either in the form of research projects/theses summaries from institutions offering master's and doctoral degrees or California K-12 and discourse analysis research. Other information requested was on CLAD, English for specific purposes(ESP), methodology, and professional development.

As far as professional conference attendance, a large percentage of respondents (44.4%) have attended 2 to 5 regional conferences (or 5 or

more regional conferences (35.1%), for a total of 79.5% attending two or more regional conferences. Eighty-four point seven percent of the respondents indicated being satisfied or very satisfied with these local conferences. Fewer, yet still a large percentage (67.8%), have attended 2 or more state conferences. As with the regional conferences, satisfaction (as indicated by satisfied or very satisfied responses) runs at 86.2%.

Many respondents indicated that the regional conferences were very practical and informative and generally well organized. However, some comments suggested that proposals were not screened thoroughly enough and that there were too many novice teacher talks and ordinary how-to sessions. Respondents indicated the need to actively recruit more higher powered, talented speakers on college-related topics. Presentations given by well-known authorities dealing with more theory and research were especially encouraged. Frequently mentioned topics which seem to be underrepresented at the regionals were: IEP programs, administration, CLAD programs, elementary and secondary presentations, and joint sessions with the cc level.

Various suggestions for improved logistics at the conferences were also given: more compact meeting sites, larger rooms for popular sessions, adequate numbers of handouts (copy machine accessible if possible), and better lunchtime organization. As far as scheduling, some mentioned posting the schedule on the Internet or sending out the program ahead of time, limiting late afternoon presentations, and scheduling a regional conference once every two years instead of every year.

Some of the same suggestions given for the state conference were given for the regionals (to print the program ahead of time to have more university-level sessions or theme-based presentations, etc.); however, a few other comments pertained particularly to the state conference. As far as scheduling, several respondents suggested that the regional conferences be moved to spring and the state conferences be moved to the fall or in late January, so as to not compete with the international TESOL conference each year. They also suggested holding the conference only in large metropolitan areas. Others encouraged better job search opportunities and more information on grants, partnerships, and coordinating/administering special projects.

Familiarity with and Need for Curriculum, Materials, and Assessment

Respondents were asked to indicate their familiarity with and willingness to apply the intersegmental Second Language Proficiency Descriptors contained in *California Pathways* (ESL Intersegmental Project, 1996). Only 24.9% of the respondents were very familiar or somewhat familiar with

these descriptors. Seventy-five point one percent were not familiar. For those who were familiar with these descriptors, 71.7% indicated a willingness to apply the descriptors to their settings.

As far as materials, the majority (52.8%) indicated that materials are chosen by individual teachers (rather than by committee, administrators, or in some other fashion). Eighty-three point eight percent were satisfied or very satisfied with materials published in their area; 16.2% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Respondents had a great number of suggestions for needed ESL publications. The eight most frequently mentioned categories included writing (25 responses), technology (23 responses), listening/speaking/pronunciation (22 responses), content-based education (18 responses), teacher education (12 responses), grammar and editing (12 responses), assessment (9 responses), reading (6 responses), and program administration (5 responses).

As far as writing is concerned, members wanted to see more writing texts at all levels but especially at the beginning/low-intermediate and advanced levels. Some requested that more theme-based units, creative writing, portfolio writing, and grammar review components be incorporated into texts. Technology-related requests called for more software for all of the skills. Respondents also wanted to see more video production and distance learning materials produced as well as more materials on computer labs and the internet.

As for listening, speaking, and pronunciation materials, it appears that more materials are needed at all levels, but especially at the high beginning/low intermediate and advanced levels. Respondents focused especially on more content-related materials appropriate for college-level students and materials that include audio and video components. Content-based materials seem to be in short supply, and members requested more college level English for Academic Purposes (EAP) materials and ESP materials in science and business. Teacher education materials were also requested, especially those that emphasized methods for undergraduate courses or novice teachers who needed to learn about classroom research, L2 acquisition, and skills-based teaching using a more simplified approach.

Grammar and editing textbooks that are handy and communicative also seem to be in demand. Respondents noted the lack of practical testing materials, especially K-12 assessment instruments, reading tests, and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) project evaluation materials. Authentic reading materials that include critical thinking and interactive activities, as well as longer reading selections also seem to be in short supply. Finally, some respondents mentioned the need for more program administration materials.

When asked about technology and language teaching, 87.8% were positive or very positive about the use of technology in teaching while 12.2% were less than positive or not at all positive. In the area of computer labs and distance learning, enthusiasm was not matched by experience. While 43.5% had had some or a great deal of experience in a computer lab on campus, 56.5% had had little or no experience. A majority (77.9%) had had little or no experience with distance learning programs; 22.1% had had some or a great deal of experience as a learner, instructor, or an administrator in this type of program.

Elaborating on their responses, respondents appeared suspicious (i.e., they said that less expensive means are underused, benefits are exaggerated, technology cannot replace human teachers, technology is outdated rapidly, poor materials are on the market) and hopeful (i.e., they said that technology was a way to meet increasing demand, there was lots of room for development, this was essential training for students in the modern world, this was a great motivator for students, this could supplement teachers' efforts). Some noted that technology is best used in limited ways (e.g., for writing and pronunciation, to build community, for distance learning). Others noted that they felt underprepared because of few computers at their sites and insufficient training.

A majority of respondents (77%) indicated great or moderate familiarity with the means by which L2 matriculated students are served at the university from placement into classes to passing the writing requirements of a program, but 22.9% indicated no familiarity with this process. As far as whether these procedures assigned students to correct levels, 47.8% indicated that they assigned students very well or somewhat well; however, 19.1% felt that they were somewhat or very poor. When a chi-square test was conducted to distinguish those affiliated 100% with the community colleges, those affiliated 100% with intensive English programs, and all other c/u members, significant differences were obtained (see Table 6). If these results are any indicator, those working for the community college are most familiar with the procedures and also the most satisfied with them. Other c/u members perceived the procedures as working very or somewhat well most of the time, although 10.4% were not even familiar with the procedures and 18.5% felt that they performed somewhat or very poorly. Finally, IEP respondents showed the least familiarity with placement procedures and expressed the least satisfaction with the effectiveness of the procedures.

Table 6.
Perception that Placement Procedures
Assigned Students to Correct Levels

		Not familiar with procedures	Performed very or somewhat well	Performed somewhat or very poorly
Within community colleges	Count	0	14	4
	Percent	0%	77.8%	22.2%
Within Intensive English Programs	Count	9	20	7
	Percent	25%	55.6%	19.4%
All other college/university	Count	14	96	25
	Percent	10.4%	71.1%	18.5%

$\chi 2$ = 16.395, *df* = 8, *p* < .037, two tailed.

Contact with L2 Students

A rather large percentage of respondents (28%) indicated that they have contact with from 0 to only 10 L2 students per week—somewhat surprising for individuals involved in the instruction and administration of L2 students. A small number (8.3%) have contact with 81 students or more (possibly indicating that they teach four or more classes to ESL students) while 63.7% indicate contact with 11 to 80 ESL students per week. Actual time with L2 students corresponds to the previous statistic—31.8% indicated that they spend only 0 to 5 hours per week. Eighteen point six percent indicated that they spend 6 to 10 hours with students, 31.8% spend 11 to 20 hours, 13.3 % spend 21 to 30 hours, and 4.5% spend 31 or more hours per week.

When a chi-square statistic was run distinguishing the three groups previously mentioned (those who were affiliated 100% with the community colleges, those who were affiliated 100% with the IEPs, and all other c/u members), significant differences were found in the area of contact with L2 learners per week. See Table 7.

Table 7
Teacher Contact with L2 Students Per Week

		Number of Students			
		0-10	11-40	41-80	81 or more
Within community colleges	Count	4	9	2	6
	Percent	19.0%	42.9%	9.5%	28.6%
Within Intensive English Programs	Count	10	32	16	5
	Percent	15.9%	50.8%	25.4%	7.9
All other college/university	Count	60	73	36	11
	Percent	33.3%	40.6%	20.0%	6.1%

$\chi2$ = 20.263, df = 6, *p < .002, two tailed.

About half or a little less than half of the members in all three groups have contact with 11 to 40 L2 students each week. Compared across levels, a larger percent of c/u members have contact with fewer students (0-10) per week, followed by community college members, and finally by IEP members. Of cc members, 28.6% see more than 81 students per week, more than three times the percentage of the other two groups (7.9% of IEP instructors and 6.1% of other c/u members).

Meeting L2 Learner Needs

When asked whether or not respondents felt that L2 matriculated college student needs were being met at their institutions, 24.0% indicated that these needs were met very well, 45.6% indicated that they were met somewhat well, 22.8% indicated that they were met poorly, and 6.7% indicated they were met very poorly.

As far as preparedness of respondents to meet the needs of advanced level students, 92.1% of the respondents judged themselves very or somewhat prepared to address these needs while 7.9% judged themselves as somewhat or very unprepared to address the language needs of L2 learners.

Communication through meetings and in one-to-one conversation about L2 needs on a campus constitutes one step in meeting the needs of L2 learners. Eighteen point two percent of respondents indicated that there are 4 or more meetings a year to bring together ESL professionals on a campus while 34.5% indicated that there were 1 to 3 meetings per year. However, 18.7% indicated that there were no meetings of this type per year.

24.2% indicated that they initiate conversations about L2 issues on campus frequently; 39.3% indicated that they initiate conversations sometimes. However, 36.5% indicate that they rarely or never initiate conversations about these issues on campus.

Significant Decisions, Activities, or Programs

Although some individuals bemoaned the fact that there had been few or no L2-related decisions, activities, or programs that had a positive impact on their campuses in the past 5 years, others were able to identify several areas of improvement. Examples from UC campuses included: the movement of TESOL from the English department to the linguistics department where they were much better served (Davis), the formation of an ESL writing program advisory board with members from various departments (Santa Barbara), the permanent full-time appointment of most daytime program faculty (Berkeley, Extension), and the development of an accelerated certificate program (for advanced students) in TESL (Irvine, Extension).

Examples from CSU campuses included: the addition of a TESL concentration in the MA program (Pomona), the formation of the Department of Linguistics and Language Development (San Jose), the development of English 101 classes for ESL students only (Fullerton), the creation of a TESOL master's program (Hayward), a lottery grant to develop an EAP curriculum and placement test for matriculated ESL students (Los Angeles), the establishment of off-campus classes to help working elementary and secondary teachers obtain the CLAD certificate (San Diego), the development of a learning assistance center that provides professional tutoring of ESL and other students (San Francisco), the development of an upper division ESL reading/writing course to satisfy the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Sacramento), and the development of CLAD and bilingual cross-cultural, language, and academic development (BCLAD) programs (Northridge).

Developments at private colleges included: infusion of ESL/bilingual/multicultural considerations into all K-12 teacher preparation programs (Lewis and Clark College), the opening of the Fletcher Jones Language Center that incorporates new technology (Pitzer College), conversation partner exchanges between intercultural studies and ESL students at English Language Services (ELS) Centers (Chapman University), and the opening of a state-of-the-art computer-assisted language learning lab (Monterey Institute). The University of Nevada at Las Vegas developed a TESL interactive televised instruction (ITV) series focusing on L2 theory, materials, methods, and assessment for 1,000 teachers.

Positive developments in IEPs included restructuring curriculum of day and night ESL programs (English Institute, Cañada College), creating an ESL component to the university banking and investment program (American Language Center, UCLA), introduction of an outstanding student award which boosts morale and competition (Language Academy, University of Southern California), moving from hiring teachers through Foundation accounts to hiring them through state means in order to offer them benefits and quasi-full-time status (American Language Institute, CSU Long Beach).

Future Goals

When asked what two things members would like to improve related to TESL/ESL activities on their campus(es) or at their job(s), the largest group by far (80 respondents) agreed that the most important goal was the need to obtain greater recognition by schools for the significant contributions of TESL-trained individuals within them. Individuals wanted to be treated with more respect, be consulted more regularly, and have better job opportunities (e.g., more benefits for part-timers, more full-time jobs, more positions, higher pay, job security, longer term contacts, opportunities for advancement, pay for coordination and extra duties, lighter teaching loads, etc. They also wanted more in-service (paid and unpaid) opportunities.

Mentioned less frequently were two areas which seemed to be of about equal concern: more ESL support in staffing/curriculum (52 responses) and increased articulation between segments (51 responses). Respondents wanted to see a larger quantity of and more varied credit-bearing ESL sections as well as smaller classes (especially for writing). They also wanted to see better advisement of these students. EAP as well as writing-across-the-curriculum curricula were recommended to better orient students to university culture and expectations. Others also encouraged increased tutoring and TA training help.

As far as increased articulation, respondents wanted to consolidate language resources and people on college campuses in order to better coordinate amongst ESL experts and increase communication between levels and segments (e.g., intensive language programs and regular university programs, English departments and learning resource centers, ESL faculty and non-ESL faculty, faculty and administrators, university foreign student advisors and IEP students, and foreign students and American students). A strong need was noted to better inform non-ESL faculty about the common cultural and language challenges of nonnative speakers (including long-term bilinguals, foreign students, and new immigrants). Others noted the importance of serving the needs of students moving between levels

(community college to university [transfer students], high school to university, intensive language program to university, etc).

About half as many respondents (20) identified the need to have better access to technology through more and better computer and language labs. Others noted the need for training in distance learning and in materials and techniques for using technology in ESL instruction. Still others (15) identified the important goals of improving placement and assessment procedures and having better admissions screening of students. They also identified the need to better track students as they complete their schooling.

Other areas of general concern related to the improvement of facilities and better TESL and CLAD/BCLAD teacher training programs and opportunities.

Discussion

The preceding results suggest several interesting findings. First, if the criteria for measuring commitment to an institution is raised to 100%, 23.5% of the total number of respondents work in IEP settings 100% of the time. This is a staggering number, especially when combined with the 7.7% of cc respondents who claimed 100% commitment at the cc level above. Both of these groups could deplete the number of the c/u-level members by about one third (31%) in the future, either because they will move to the newly established IEP level or change their level affiliation because they had mistakenly checked the wrong level at the time of joining.

If the level is depleted, it will be important to address the needs and interests of those remaining and to recruit individuals previously unaccounted for or weakly acknowledged. Tables 1 to 4 paint a picture of a membership largely consisting of instructors and professors affiliated with the CSU system (most likely because the stated mission of this system is to train teachers) but also with UC and private c/u programs. A varied group that has lower visibility but nevertheless should be served and recruited by CATESOL consists of regular c/u level members who might also be working concurrently in the public schools, adults schools or community colleges and extended education as well as CLAD teacher trainers, publishers, writers, administrators, testers, and retirees working outside traditional school boundaries.

Second, more attention needs to be paid to the perceived status of ESL/TESL professionals on campuses. Table 5 clearly shows that only about 11% of respondents view themselves as having higher status than other professionals on their campuses at the same job classification or grade. About 29% view themselves as having about equal status, but about 61% view themselves as having lower status than other profession-

als. More needs to be known about the root of these feelings of inferiority. The survey showed that 92.1% of the respondents viewed themselves as very or somewhat prepared to address L2 learner needs. Therefore, lack of preparation must not be a reason for the negative feelings. Other reasons need to be suggested.

The survey showed that few interdepartmental meetings take place on campuses, limited articulation occurs across segments, and little discussion is initiated about L2 concerns amongst faculty, even though members feel that this is an important need. This lack of assertiveness could also play a part in an ESL/TESL professional's sense of weak status. Respondents revealed that they are poorly informed about the means by which L2 matriculated students are served at the university from placement into classes to passing the writing requirements of a program. This lack of information, either because respondents do not pursue explanations or are excluded from them by other faculty or employees at their institution may contribute to their sense that they lack status. Blame could also lie with other campus units, which may view ESL/TESL professionals housed in departments of English, education, and linguistics as threats to the funding of longer established programs that mainly serve majority students. Even worse, lower salaries and/or fewer benefits for equal work could also be a factor.

Third, the c/u membership generally expresses satisfaction with CATESOL conferences and publications, but future level chairs should continue to work to include varied topics that will satisfy the varied membership at this level. Methodological and politically related articles should form a backbone of the *CATESOL News. The CATESOL Journal* should continue its policy of publishing issues on special topics and include more K-12 research and topics relevant to teacher trainers preparing instructors for the public schools.

Fourth, the survey outlined several gaps in knowledge of the general c/u membership that should be remedied in the near future. With more than three fourths of the membership not being familiar with the *California Pathways* (ESL Intersegmental Project, 1996) Second Language Proficiency Descriptors, more effort at disseminating information about the descriptors and training in how to apply them must take place—either through CATESOL publications, conferences, or training workshops. More than half of the membership has had no or not much experience with computer labs or distance learning programs. This too should be an important training priority in the years to come.

Conclusion

The 1997 College/University Level CATESOL Survey provided a good opportunity for the level to analyze the needs, interests, and accomplishments of its constituents. Much of the information obtained through the survey will be used to guide decisions and directions for the level in the future. Conference presentations and publications will focus on issues of current interest. Greater attention will be paid to the important role that ESL/TESL professionals must play on c/u campuses that have increasing nonnative English speaking enrollments. The c/u level must also keep up with technological developments in order to maintain a perspective on the effective use of such technologies with nonnative English speaking learners.

Author

Jan Eyring is the coordinator of the Master's in TESOL Program at California State University, Fullerton. For the past 20 years she has trained students and teachers in adult school, intensive English program, community college, and university settings.

References

ESL Intersegmental Project. (1996*). California pathways: The second language student in public high schools, colleges, and universities.* Sacramento: Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates in conjunction with the California Community College Chancellor's Office.

Appendix

1997 COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY LEVEL CATESOL SURVEY

Directions: Circle items and fill in the following blanks according to your *present* ESL/TESL/L2 related position(s). (L2 indicates second language.) In cases where you would like to qualify your answer, please comment next to the item or at the end of the survey.

1. What percentage of your time is spent doing (T)ESL or L2- related work at which location? Indicate the percentage of time to the right of each location option below. Use "other" to indicate a location we have not listed. Please make sure that totals add up to 100%.

(T)ESL or L2-related location	% of Time
a. California State University	_____%
b. University of California	_____%
c. Private College or University in California	_____%
d. Community College	_____%
e. Other_____	_____%
	TOTAL 100%

2. Now, we'd like to know in which settings within your institution you do your (T)ESL or L2-related work. Indicate to the right of each setting option below the percentage of time spent at each setting in an average work week. Use "other" to indicate settings we have not listed. Please make sure that totals add up to 100%.

(T)ESL or L2-related location	% of Time
a. Intensive English Program (IEP)	_____%
b. Writing Tutoring Center	_____%
c. Academic Skills Center	_____%
d. Foreign Student Center	_____%
e. College/University Department	_____%
f. Other_____	_____%
	TOTAL 100%

3. Indicate your major role(s) related to (T)ESL or L2-related activities and the percentage of time spent in performing each role. Please make sure that totals add up to 100%.

Roles	% of Time
a. TESL, Applied Linguistics, Linguistics, English, Education, or Communications Professor	_____%
b. Program Administrator	_____%
c. Graduate Student	_____%
d. ESL Instructor	_____%
e. Advisor	_____%
f. Tutor	_____%
g. Other_____	_____%
	TOTAL 100%

4. How often do you read the CATESOL newsletter?

    a. regularly
    b. sometimes
    c. rarely
    d. never

5. Rate your overall satisfaction with the content of the CATESOL newsletter as it relates to your work activities:

    a. I do not read the CATESOL newsletter.
    b. very satisfied
    c. satisfied
    d. dissatisfied
    e. very dissatisfied

6. If you have suggestions for improving the CATESOL newsletter, please list them below.

_____
_____
_____

7. How often do you read the *CATESOL Journal*?

    a. regularly
    b. sometimes
    c. rarely
    d. never

8. Rate your overall satisfaction with the content of the *CATESOL Journal* as it relates to your work activities:

    a. I do not read the *CATESOL Journal*.
    b. very satisfied
    c. satisfied
    d. dissatisfied
    e. very dissatisfied

9. If you have suggestions for improving the *CATESOL Journal*, please list them below.

    _____
    _____
    _____

10. How many times have you attended a CATESOL *regional* conference (e.g., Los Angeles Regional, Northern Regional, San Diego Regional, Northern Nevada Regional, etc.)?

    a. never
    b. once
    c. two to five times
    d. five or more times

11. Rate your overall satisfaction with the content of the CATESOL regional conference(s) as related to your work activities:

    a. I have never attended a regional conference.
    b. very satisfied
    c. satisfied
    d. dissatisfied
    e. very dissatisfied

12. If you have suggestions for improving the CATESOL regional conferences, please list them below.

    _____
    _____
    _____

13. How many times have you attended a CATESOL *state* conference?

    a. never
    b. once
    c. two to five times
    d. five or more times

14. Rate your overall satisfaction with the content of the CATESOL state conference(s) as related to your work activities:

    a. I have never attended a state conference.
    b. very satisfied
    c. satisfied
    d. somewhat dissatisfied
    e. dissatisfied

15. If you have suggestions for improving the CATESOL state conference(s), please list them below:

    _____
    _____
    _____

16. How many different L2 students do you have telephone or in-person contact with during an average work week?

    a. 0-10 different L2 students per week
    b. 11-40 different L2 students per week
    c. 41-80 different L2 students per week
    d. 81 or more different L2 students per week

17. How many hours do you spend with L2 students either on the telephone or in-person during an average work week?

a. 0-5 hours
b. 6-10 hours
c. 11-20 hours
d. 21-30 hours
e. 31 or more hours

18. Most universities have a means by which L2 matriculated students are placed into English classes, are provided necessary language/writing assistance throughout a program, and are able to fulfill requirements to graduate from a program. What is your overall familiarity with this process at your institution(s)? (Remember: This question refers to *regular* matriculated students versus intensive language program, adjunct, or other students on a campus.)

a. very familiar
b. somewhat familiar
c. unfamiliar

19. (If you answered "a" or "b" on question 18), how well do you think these placement procedures assign students to correct levels? (Remember: This question refers to *regular* matriculated students versus intensive language program, adjunct, or other students on a campus.)

a. I am not familiar enough with these procedures to comment.
b. very well
c. somewhat well
d. somewhat poorly
e. very poorly

20. How well do you think the needs of L2 matriculated college students are met at your institution(s)?

a. I am not familiar enough with the needs of L2 matriculated college students to comment.
b. very well
c. somewhat well
d. somewhat poorly
e. very poorly

Comments:_____

21. How well prepared do *you* personally feel to address the language needs of advanced proficiency L2 learners on your campus(es)?

    a. very prepared
    b. somewhat prepared
    c. somewhat unprepared
    d. very unprepared

22. How familiar are you with the Second Language Proficiency Descriptors designed by the intersegmental California Pathways project?

        a. very familiar
        b. somewhat familiar
        c. unfamiliar

23. (If you answered "a" or "b" on question 22), how willing are you to apply the Second Language Proficiency Descriptors in your ESL/TESL/L2-related position(s)?

        a. I am not familiar enough with these descriptors to comment.
        b. very willing
        c. somewhat willing
        d. somewhat unwilling
        e. very unwilling

Comments:_____
_____
_____

24. In your opinion, what is the general status of ESL/TESL professionals on college/university campuses as compared to others hired at a similar level (e.g., same job classification and step or grade)? Would you say that the status of ESL/TESL professionals is…

        a. much higher than others at a similar step and grade
        b. somewhat higher
        c. about the same
        d. somewhat lower
        e. much lower

25. On average, how frequent are meetings at your institution(s) which bring together personnel from various areas (i.e., other departments, offices, centers, etc.) on campus who have expertise and/or interest in serving L2 learners?

      a. 9 or more times a year
      b. 4-8 times a year
      c. 1-3 times a year
      d. 0 times a year
      e. I don't know.

26. How frequently do you personally initiate conversations with people who are at your institution(s) but who are outside of your department/section about L2 issues?

      a. frequently
      b. sometimes
      c. rarely
      d. never

27. Indicate the percentage of time which you receive paid compensation for (T)ESL or L2 related activities:

      a. Full-time (100%)
      b. Three-quarters time (75%)
      c. Half-time (50%)
      d. Quarter-time (25%)
      e. I am not presently compensated for (T)ESL/L2 related activities.

28. How satisfied are you with your current salary based on your current duties?

      a. very satisfied
      b. somewhat satisfied
      c. somewhat dissatisfied
      d. very dissatisfied

29. What is your general attitude towards the use of technology in ESL instruction?

       a. very positive
       b. positive
       c. less than positive
       d. not at all positive

Comments:_____
  _____
  _____

30. How much experience have you personally had as an instructor or an administrator in a computer lab on your campus?

       a. a great deal
       b. some
       c. not much
       d. none

31. How much experience have you personally had as a learner, an instructor, or an administrator in any kind of a distance learning program ((T)ESL or non-(T)ESL related)?

       a. a great deal
       b. some
       c. not much
       d. none

32. If you teach, indicate how materials are *usually* chosen for use in your area(s) of expertise:

       a. Not applicable. I do not teach.
       b. by committee
       c. by administrators
       d. by individual teachers
       e. other_____

33. Rate your general satisfaction with published materials in your area of expertise:

    a. very satisfied
    b. satisfied
    c. dissatisfied
    d. very dissatisfied

34. What types of new materials would you like to see published to assist you in your area of expertise?

    a._____
    b._____
    c._____

35. List the 2 most significant L2-related decisions, activities, or programs that have had a positive impact on your campus(es) in the past 5 years. (Be specific. Name campus(es) if possible.)

    a. _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    b._____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

36. What are 2 things you would like to improve related to (T)ESL/ESL activities on your campus(es) or at your job(s)?

    a. _____
    _____
    _____
    b._____
    _____
    _____

37. We are seeking more in-depth information about several other areas. If you are knowledgeable about these areas and would be willing to be contacted by phone for an additional interview, please indicate below:

May we contact you by phone?

Area   **(yes/no)**

a. Identification of and service to ESL transfer students from community colleges. _____

b. Articulation between high schools, community colleges, and universities about L2 issues. _____

c. Ways of addressing CSU mandate for cutbacks in remediation programs. _____

d. Management of computer labs (hardware and/or software) which serve ESL students. _____

e. Management of effective learning centers which serve L2 students. _____

f. Management of effective distance learning programs on campus. _____

g. Other_____

_____ _____

Name _____

Phone Number (_____)

_____

Day and time to call _____

38. Other Comments or Concerns: _____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

39. Please rate this survey as far as allowing you to express your present (T)ESL/L2 concerns?

     a. excellent
     b. good
     c. fair
     d. poor

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. We appreciate your comments and feedback!