

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING UIS STUDENTS'
PARTICIPATION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM AT UIS**

RESEARCH INTERNSHIP FINAL REPORT

SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ

LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS

**UNIVERSIDAD INDUSTRIAL DE SANTANDER
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS
ESCUELA DE IDIOMAS
LICENCIATURA EN INGLÉS
BUCARAMANGA
2007**

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING UIS STUDENTS'
PARTICIPATION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM AT UIS**

RESEARCH INTERNSHIP FINAL REPORT

SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ

LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS

**Research Internship Report
An Internship Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree Bachelor of Arts
in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

**Project Director:
Prof. Carmen Celina Uribe P.
M.A in Bilingual and Multicultural Education
GILAE 5215**

**UNIVERSIDAD INDUSTRIAL DE SANTANDER
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS
ESCUELA DE IDIOMAS
LICENCIATURA EN INGLÉS
BUCARAMANGA
2007**

CONTENT

	PAGE
GLOSSARY	6
SUMMARY	8
RESUMEN	9
1. RESEARCH GROUP PROFILE	10
2. OBJECTIVE OF THE INTERNSHIP	11
3. RESEARCH PROJECT	12
3.1 NAME OF THE PROJECT	12
3.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVES	12
3.3 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	12
3.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	12
3.4.1 SOCIAL CLASS	14
3.4.2 INCOME	16
3.4.3 STUDENTS' SOCIAL AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION	17
4. DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH TASKS & OUTCOMES/FINDINGS	20
4.1 UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW SHADOWING	20
4.2 INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING	21
4.3 UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWING	21
4.4 UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS TRANSCRIPTION	21
4.5 DOMAIN ANALYSIS	22
4.6 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS DESIGN	22
4.7 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS PILOTING	23
4.8 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING	23
4.9 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWING	23
4.10 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS TRANSCRIPTION	24
4.11 DOMAIN AND TAXONOMIC ANALYSIS	24

4.12 GROUPS DIFFERENTIATION	25
4.13 FOCUS GROUP SEMINAR	26
4.14 FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW DESIGN	26
4.15 FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW PILOTING	27
4.16 FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING	27
4.17 FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWING	28
4.18 PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS FOR THE QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN	28
4.19 DATA DOCUMENT RECORDING	29
4.20 GENERAL RESEARCH PROJECT LOGISTICS	29
4.21 READING COMPREHENSION COURSE IMPLEMENTATION	30
5. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS	31
5.1 SCHEDULING	31
5.2 PARTICIPANTS' RELUCTANCE	31
5.3 TAXONOMIC ANALYSIS	32
6. KNOWLEDGE GAINED	33
7. SELF-EVALUATION	35
7.1 SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ	35
7.2 LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS	36
8. APPENDIXES	41

GLOSSARY

Cultural Domain: A category of cultural meaning that includes other smaller categories. Cultural Domains are categories of meaning (Spradley).

EFL: This acronym stands for *English as a Foreign Language*. It refers to the English language teaching- learning process in a non-English speaking country.

GILAE: This acronym stands for *Applied Linguistics and Education Research Group*. It refers to a research group registered in CIVILAC, COLCIENCIAS which focuses on research aspects related to language learning, language teaching, second language acquisition and educational issues.

Income: The amount of money or its corresponding received during a period of time in exchange for employment, services or the sale of goods or property.

Research Internship: Optional research project aimed at obtaining a BA in the Teaching English as a Foreign Language Program offered at UIS, in which students are field workers who carry out several research tasks during a specific period of time.

Social Class: A social distinction of people made by their incomes, occupation, education and other factors in societies and cultures.

Successful Student: For the purpose of this research, successful students are those who have not only approved the minimally required English courses at UIS, but have moved on to take optional English courses.

Taxonomy: A set of categories organized on the basis of a single semantic relationship. It shows more of the relationships among the things inside the cultural domain.

UIS: Acronym that stands for “Universidad Industrial de Santander”. It was created in 1948 and its main campus is located in Bucaramanga, Colombia.

Unsuccessful Student: For the purpose of this research, unsuccessful students are those who have not approved the minimally required English courses at UIS.

SUMMARY

TITLE:

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING UIS STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM AT UIS*

AUTHORS:

SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ**
LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS

KEY WORDS:

Successful and unsuccessful students; socio-economic factor; retention; social class; income; academic and social integration, cultural domain, research internship.

DESCRIPTION:

This report accounts for the research internship carried out with GILAE "Applied Linguistics and Education Research Group" for seven months - from March to October 2007. The objective was to complete the qualitative stage of a study on the socio-economic factors affecting the students' participation in the English program offered by the "Universidad Industrial de Santander" (UIS). This factor is considered to be part of the successful and unsuccessful participants' characteristics which make up their profile design.

Field workers were in charge of the data collection process. For this purpose, qualitative techniques like unstructured, semi-structured and focus groups interviews were used. Data collection instruments were designed by researchers and field workers in periodical, general meetings in which the instruments were modified, data collected was shared and decisions were made about the research tasks. Besides, cultural domain and taxonomic analysis were applied to the data collected in order to find new relevant information that contributed to the identification of the particular characteristics of the successful and unsuccessful groups. The information revealed aspects related to the socio-economic factor that might affect the participants' willingness to continue or abandon the English course at UIS. It included the participants' social class, income and social and academic integration.

* Research Internship Final Report

** Faculty of Human Sciences. School of Languages. Project Director: Carmen Celina Uribe P.

RESUMEN

TÍTULO:

FACTORES SOCIO-ECONÓMICOS QUE INCIDEN EN LA PARTICIPACIÓN DE LOS ESTUDIANTES EN EL PROGRAMA DE INGLÉS OFRECIDO POR LA UIS*

AUTORES:

SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ**
LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS

PALABRAS CLAVES:

Estudiantes exitosos y no exitosos, factor socio-económico, retención estudiantil, clase social, ingresos, integración social y académica, análisis de dominio, pasantía de investigación.

DESCRIPCIÓN:

Este reporte informa sobre la pasantía de investigación llevada a cabo con GILAE “Grupo de Investigación en Lingüística Aplicada y Educación” durante siete meses - desde marzo a octubre del 2007. El objetivo de la misma fue el de cumplir con la fase cualitativa de un estudio sobre los factores socio-económicos que afectan la participación de los estudiantes en el programa de inglés ofrecido por la Universidad Industrial de Santander (UIS). Este factor hace parte de las características que contribuyen al diseño del perfil de los participantes exitosos y no exitosos.

Los trabajadores de campo estuvieron a cargo del proceso de recolección de datos. Para este propósito se hizo uso de técnicas cualitativas como entrevistas no estructuradas, semiestructuradas y grupos focales. Los investigadores, junto con los trabajadores de campo diseñaron y modificaron los instrumentos de recolección de datos durante reuniones periódicas, donde también se compartió la información recolectada y se tomaron decisiones respecto a las tareas de la investigación. Además, los datos recogidos se analizaron por medio de dominios culturales y análisis taxonómicos con el fin de encontrar información nueva y relevante que contribuyera a la identificación de las características específicas del grupo exitoso y no exitoso. Los datos revelaron aspectos del factor socio-económico de los participantes, el cual podría afectar su disposición de participar o abandonar el curso de inglés en la UIS. Estos aspectos incluyen la clase social, ingresos e integración social y académica de los participantes.

* Reporte Final de Pasantía de Investigación

** Facultad de Ciencias Humanas. Escuela de Idiomas. Directora de proyecto: Carmen Celina Uribe P.

1. RESEARCH GROUP PROFILE

GILAE, “Applied Linguistics and Education Research Group” is a research group registered in CIVILAC, COLCIENCIAS. The focus of this group is to do research on aspects related to language learning, language teaching, second language acquisition and educational issues. The following professionals lead these efforts:

- Yolima Beltrán V.: PhD in Education, Penn State University. Presently the Director of the School of Education at Universidad Industrial de Santander.
- Mariela Gómez F.: M.A in Applied Linguistics. Michigan State University. Presently Director of the UIS Language Institute.
- Carmen Celina Uribe P.: M.A in Bilingual and Multicultural Education. Northern Arizona University. Presently Professor at the School of Languages.
- Maribel Vega M.: M.A in English TESOL. Minnesota State University. Presently Professor at the School of Languages.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE INTERNSHIP

As students in the English Language Teaching Program at UIS, we find research as an important tool to develop work related to the identification and solution of problematic issues in the language learning process. We consider that throughout our work in GILAE's research project the following objectives were achieved:

- To apply the knowledge gained in our current program throughout the study of the theoretical foundations of the research process.
- To improve our teaching practices by using research as a way to study and understand the learner's needs and problems in and outside the classroom.
- To contribute with information related to the way socio-economic factors affect the students' participation in the English Program at UIS.

3. RESEARCH PROJECT

3.1 NAME OF THE PROJECT:

Factors Affecting Students' Participation in the English Program at UIS.

3.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To determine the factors that affect UIS students' enrolment and retention in the English program.

3.3 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

- To identify the socio-economic factors affecting the students' participation in the English Program at UIS.
- To establish the effect socio-economic factors have on the students' enrolment and retention in the English Program.

3.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

Current trends in foreign language have demonstrated that learning is a process affected by diverse aspects related to socio-educational, socio-economic, and motivational factors, among others. These three factors and the quality of EFL programs constitute the main basis of this research work. The present study aims at determining the aspects that affect UIS students' enrolment and retention in the UIS English program. Each of the abovementioned factors is analyzed separately taking into consideration different studies related to the area of inquiry. The present work explores in-depth the socioeconomic issues that may hinder EFL students' active participation in their process of learning the target language. First, a broad review of studies on motivational and socio-educational factors and their relevance to this study are considered in this paper, as well as the connection

between the quality of EFL programs and students' desire to participate in them.

Learning English as a second/foreign language is becoming a necessary tool in the educational and professional field, as well as an increasing motivation for people's personal interests. The work conducted by Gardner and Lambert in the area of motivation was taken into account for the purpose of the present study on UIS students' enrolled in the English program. Their research emphasized integrative and instrumental aspects. The former, deals with the desire to use language to gain social and economical importance within society; and the later involves the wish to be part of the L2 culture (qtd. In Obeidat 3). This fact provides a solid basis for understanding L2 learning motivation. Furthermore, Garner in his socio-educational model attempts to interrelate four features of second language acquisition: the social and cultural environment, individual learner differences, the setting or context in which learning takes place and linguistic outcomes. Gardner's model, unlike other research carried out in the area, looks specifically at second language acquisition in a structured classroom setting rather than in a natural environment and his work focuses on the foreign language classroom (qtd in Norris-Holt). This focus fits into the context where the English learning and teaching process of students involved in the present project takes place.

In addition to the above factor affecting the language learning process, Seligman suggests another motivational aspect that affects such a process. He states that learners may think that all of their actions leading to language learning are doomed to failure. This tendency is due to motivational, cognitive and affective factors and might produce apathy, low self-esteem and lack of class participation. This phenomenon is called by Seligman Learned Helplessness (qtd. in Díaz and Barriga) and provides the study with

supporting theory that contributes to the understanding of the students' lack of participation in the UIS English program.

In the same way the language learning process is affected by the quality of the program learners are enrolled in. The English as a Second Language: Implementing Effective Adult Education Program manual claims that an effective English program should consider staff recruitment and training; scheduling; advertisement and financial resources as important aspects when designing and maintaining the services offered to the community (20). These aspects would guarantee the students' attendance, maintenance and completion of the program they are taking. Furthermore, a report of the Association for the Study of Higher Education points out that the quality of a program is based on its excellent resources, facilities, equipment and graduation rates (Conrad and Wilson). The preceding works are useful to this research since they attempt to characterize the good English program and contribute to the improvement of the program at UIS.

Having considered motivational and socio-educational factors and on the quality of ESL/EFL programs, studies on the socioeconomic factor are next described and analyzed bearing in mind their relevance to the present study. This factor addresses issues such as learners' social class, income, and social and academic integration affecting students' retention and attrition.

3.4.1 SOCIAL CLASS:

According to Ellis, one of the main factors affecting L2 learning is the socio-economic aspect which he calls "social class". He states that there is a close relation between social class and language learning achievement. Results from different studies show that learners from lower socio-economic backgrounds are less successful at learning a second language than those

from a higher social class. This distinction is mainly related to the formal language learning environment; while there is no difference when dealing with BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills). He proposes that this difference in performance is due not necessarily to the social class per se, but to the experiences the individual is likely to have in it (Ellis 2006).

Furthermore, depending on the learners' social class, they would have different experiences linked to their particular needs. Maslow proposes the Hierarchy of Needs Theory which states that a human being must satisfy his / her basic needs in order to meet successfully his / her higher needs. If a student does not fulfill his / her basic needs such as food, health, sense of belonging, interpersonal relationship, etc., he/ she will develop anxiety and physiological and emotional blocking that will diminish his / her achievement in the leaning process (qtd. in Benson). A research in Pakistan pointed out that upper -class students who have met their basic needs and have further exposure to resources like English books, schools, satellite TV, internet and the possibility to travel to English speaking countries, are more likely to have a greater English proficiency. Meanwhile, lower class students only count on their school subject producing a lack of exposure to the L2 and therefore, lower English competence (Schofield; Mamuna 3).

Aside from the above evidence, Aida Walqui points out some different issues that have an effect on second language learning. They include the socio-economic background and the relation among the students' culture, needs, goals, interpersonal relationships and family support (Walqui). If a learner counts on a suitable environment in which all of his/her needs are met, he/she will set higher goals that may require the use of a foreign language. The opposite may occur when the learner can not meet the fulfillment of his/her needs.

The previous works on the aspects related to social class and their effect on language learning contribute to the purpose of this study, since they reflect similar contexts in which this research is set. This is due to the fact that UIS is a public university with students from different backgrounds. Therefore, some of them may have a high status that allows them to cover their needs and to have further contact with technological tools that make their learning process more effective. Whereas, other group might not be able to fulfill their basic needs and, as a result their engagement, participation and performance in the EFL learning process can be hindered.

3.4.2 INCOME:

Another socioeconomic issue considered to have an effect on the language learning process is the income. According to the manual English as a Second Language: Implementing Effective Adult Education Program some learners may be responsible for the sustenance of their family or children as well as their own expenses such as transportation, food, tuition, etc. Thus, they are obliged to obtain their incomes from part or full time jobs which diminish their energy, attendance and the time spans they devote to study English (17). A similar situation occurs when learners do not count on the necessary funds to afford their higher education and avoid getting into debts they can not pay. This fear becomes more noticeable with disadvantage students who lack economic resources and self confidence limiting the possibility to engage and remain in a language learning program within higher education (Furlong and Forsyth 1).

The opposite happens when students are supported by the family members in their language learning process. A research in Columbia University shows that learners who have high-income families and whose parents graduated from college are more likely to get a degree (qtd. in Calcagno 2). Indeed,

according to the Report to the NSW Department of Education and Training it is the parents' socioeconomic status, and not the learners', the one that determines the degree of language learning achievement. This is due to the fact that students do not have to worry about finding a job or obtaining the money for their personal expenses and can devote their time and efforts exclusively to their studies.

The previous studies regarding the effect of learners' income on language learning provide a point of reference in the understanding on the socio-economic factors affecting UIS students' enrolment and permanence in the English program. They attempt to build a profile with the characteristics of the language students regarding their financial resources for transportation, course book and the tuition, paid when the free course offered is failed or when they want to continue with the course after the English requirement is fulfilled. They also describe the way learners overcome the problems they face concerning the preceding aspects.

3.4.3 STUDENTS' SOCIAL AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION:

Besides the previous socioeconomic issues, it is important to look into the interpersonal relationships as aspects that affect the students' decision to drop out or remain in a language learning program. Tinto claims that social and academic integration play an important role since students who do not achieve some level of academic or social integration are likely to withdraw (qtd in Kerka). The former is the result of sharing academic values and experiences; while the later is the outcome of developing friendships with different students and faculty members (qtd in Bean). Both situations are considered by Tinto to be the cause of learners' retention and attrition which he describes as psychological interactions between the students' expectations, commitment and motivation brought with them and the

experiences they have while enrolled in an academic program (qtd in Terenzini and others 4).

If a learner fails to achieve his/her educational and occupational goals, he/she may not succeed to remain incorporated in the intellectual and social life of the institution causing attrition. Therefore, to guarantee students' retention Tinto suggests five conditions to implement in any academic program. First, it is the institution responsibility to set goals that learners feel they can attain and to let them know that they expect the best results from them. Second, students should be properly informed about the programs offered by the institution; as well as their future career goals. Third, it is important to provide the learner with academic, personal and social support like summer programs and students clubs. Fourth, the institution should give the students the opportunity to have contact with the faculty staff and other students so that they can create bonds to make them more confident. Finally, the setting in which learning takes place has to involve students in a way that they feel that their process is worth staying (Tinto 2, 3).

As afore mentioned, learners' social and academic integration have an impact on their learning process. They are a major cause of success or frustration in learners, and consequently, influence their decision to remain or not in a language learning program. Therefore, the work conducted by Tinto contributes, a great deal, to examine the UIS English program for its improvement in this regard.

Research has demonstrated that students' language learning process is likely to be influenced by different factors. Motivational, socio-educational and socio-economic factors affect, to some degree, EFL learners' attitudes, towards the target language. Learners' perception of the value of acquiring a

foreign language, the social and emotional aspects, and the learning situation itself are fundamental to attain their goals successfully. Studies have also demonstrated that the socio-economic issues such as social class, income and social and academic integration are associated with foreign language learning success. They play a determinant role in students' engagement in language learning programs, in their permanence in them, and in the achievement of a good performance as well.

4. DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH TASKS & OUTCOMES / FINDINGS

For the purpose of this study a qualitative approach was taken. First, interviews in the form of unstructured and semi-structured were conducted. Data collection was analyzed based on the cultural domain and taxonomic analyses proposed by Spradley. The former, is a way to organize information in categories according to their cultural meaning and including smaller categories. The later, is a set of categories that portray more of the relationships among the things inside the cultural domain (Spradley 88-112). Second, focus groups were arranged. In these groups participants are encouraged to express their opinions to collect more information find new fields and create new hypotheses (Schensul). It is important that these methods help us understand a particular socio-cultural phenomenon so that a specific language learning problem can be solved (Racelis 9).

The following tasks illustrate the procedure carried out in the first face of this study.

4.1 TASK 1: UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW SHADOWING:

DESCRIPTION:

For this task, one of the main researchers was shadowed while she performed an interview on one of the research participants. As the interview was taking place field notes were taken by field workers (interns).

OUTCOMES:

Two interviews were shadowed. Probing and elicitation techniques were seen as they were used in a real research situation.

4.2 TASK 2: INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING:

DESCRIPTION:

Four unstructured interviews were assigned to the field workers. One student from the successful group and another from the unsuccessful one were scheduled to each fieldworker. Interviewees were informed of the objectives of the research project before their acceptance.

OUTCOMES:

Four interviews were set taking into account students' time availability.

4.3 TASK 3: UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWING:

DESCRIPTION:

In this stage, participants were provided with a letter of consent for signature. This letter stated the purpose of their participation in this study. Field workers were assigned the role of interviewer or observer. The interviewer started with a single question from which the others were derived. The observer was in charge of taking notes on the behavior and specific details of the conversation.

OUTCOMES:

Four subjects were interviewed and conversations were allowed to be recorded. The protocol used during the first interview shadowing was followed.

4.4 TASK4: UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS TRANSCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

The conversations recorded during the previous stage were transcribed. A format and conventions were created to refer to the interviewer, the

interviewee, the time, the date and the group which the participant belonged to.

OUTCOMES:

Four interviews were transcribed making use of the format.

4.5 TASK 5: DOMAIN ANALYSIS:

DESCRIPTION:

Making use of the theory proposed by Spradley, tapescripts were analyzed to look for cultural domains or categories of common patterns.

OUTCOMES:

Nineteen cultural domains were found and organized in a chart (See Appendix 1).

FINDINGS:

The domain analysis showed that most of the categories are related to the participants' motivation and their reasons to enroll in the English Program or not. Besides, they refer to the teacher's methodology and the UIS Language Institute resources as influential factors when it comes to studying English. Regarding the economic factor, subjects did not address in-depth.

4.6 TASK 6: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS DESIGN:

DESCRIPTION:

Similarities among the domains were analyzed based on their findings. Then, questions related to each factor (socio-educational, socio-economic, motivational, and UIS program) were designed.

OUTCOMES:

A questionnaire of thirteen questions was designed. Two or three questions were included per factor.

4.7 TASK 7: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS PILOTING:

DESCRIPTION:

Each group of field workers was in charge of piloting the semi-structured interview questionnaire. The conversation was recorded and field notes on the possible problematic questions were taken.

OUTCOMES:

An interview was held with a student of the English Program at UIS. The problematic questions found through the piloting phase were discussed in a general meeting, and a final draft of the semi-structured interview questionnaire was drawn (See Appendix 2).

4.8 TASK 8: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING:

DESCRIPTION:

The group of field workers were given a list of participants from the successful and unsuccessful groups. Fourteen participants were scheduled, seven from the successful and seven from the unsuccessful group.

OUTCOMES:

Seven interviews were arranged per field worker. The participants, who did not take part in the unstructured interviews stage, were informed about the research objectives before their acceptance.

4.9 TASK 9: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWING:

DESCRIPTION:

Each field worker was assigned the role of interviewer or observer. Participants who did not take part in the unstructured interview stage were

given the letter of consent for them to read and sign if they agreed on the terms of the research. Besides, field notes were taken by the observers.

OUTCOMES:

Fourteen participants were interviewed and conversations were allowed to be recorded. The semi-structured interview questionnaire was applied and probing techniques were used when necessary.

4.10 TASK 10: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

TRANSCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

The conversations recorded during the previous stage were transcribed. Each field worker typed the interviews assigned.

OUTCOMES:

Fourteen interviews were transcribed.

4.11 TASK 11: DOMAIN AND TAXONOMIC ANALYSIS:

DESCRIPTION:

Based on the questions of the semi-structured interview thirteen cultural domains were drawn. Then, each field worker was assigned one domain for the taxonomic analysis.

OUTCOMES:

Questions number six and seven, related to non-academic factors affecting the students' participation in and the suggestions made to the UIS English program, were assigned to the field workers. Two taxonomies were generated.

FINDINGS:

In taxonomy number six, related to the extra-academic factors affecting the students' participation in the English program, it was found that students refer to emotional factors as being an obstacle for learning English. Besides, the economic factor is also a problem when it comes to buying the course book or paying the course, if they failed or didn't take it when they had to. Regarding taxonomy number seven, related to the suggestions made to the English Program at UIS, students mainly refer the methodology, organization, structure, services, resources and professors. They suggest that copied material should be allowed and that the course should be less expensive.

4.12 TASK 12: GROUPS DIFFERENTIATION:

DESCRIPTION:

Taking into account that the first taxonomy, related to the semi-structured interview questionnaire, did not show specific data for each group, it was necessary to analyze successful and unsuccessful groups separately.

OUTCOMES:

Taxonomies from questions number six and seven, outcomes of task 11, were divided up in regards to each factor. Four taxonomies (See Appendix 3) were generated and a document describing differences, similarities and the preliminary findings was designed (See Appendix 4).

FINDINGS:

In taxonomy number six unsuccessful students claim to have problems to continue with the course, buying the book and coming to classes due to economic problems; whereas successful students only refer to problems to buy the new book. Furthermore, unsuccessful students show a general apathy towards English; while successful students state that they know they need it for their future professional lives. Concerning taxonomy number

seven, successful participants are more interested in improving the teachers' methodology and the resources they use in class. Meanwhile the unsuccessful ones are more interested in the program organization and structure (scheduling, tuition and staff recruitment, etc) which has affected their study program graduation. They argue that those aspects affected their engagement and permanence in the UIS English program and emphasize that a good teacher-student relation may well help them to succeed in their EFL learning process.

4.13 TASK 13: FOCUS GROUP SEMINAR:

DESCRIPTION:

Information, based on reading articles, about focus group organization and interviews conduction was shared by each field worker.

OUTCOMES:

Notes of the different aspects to consider when conducting focus group interviews were taken. At the end, a short summary was written by each field worker (See Appendix 4). A final document was drawn compiling all the summaries.

4.14 TASK 14: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW DESIGN:

DESCRIPTION:

Based on the findings of the semi-structured interviews, a set of questions for the focus group interviews was designed.

OUTCOMES:

Each field worker team was assigned one academic unit (faculty) at UIS for focus group interviews with four to six participants. This field worker team was responsible for the Faculty of Medicine. Questions regarding the

socioeconomic factor were designed with the assistance of the project director. The final draft of the focus group questionnaire was an eighteen-question instrument regarding the four different factors (socio-educational, socio-economic, motivational, and UIS program).

4.15 TASK 15: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS PILOTING:

DESCRIPTION:

Four participants from the unsuccessful group were contacted by one of the researchers and this field worker team volunteered to pilot the focus group. Materials such as video camera, mp3 voice recorder, inducements and a personal information sheet were arranged. One of the field workers was in charge of conducting the interviews and the other of taking care of the recording materials and inducements.

OUTCOMES:

Four subjects, from different faculties, attended the meeting. The interviews were recorded and subjects were given inducements as a reward for their cooperation. The video was watched and analyzed by the research group to modify the questionnaire.

4.16 TASK 16: FOCUS GROUPS INTERVIEWS SCHEDULING:

DESCRIPTION:

Field workers were given a list of participants, categorized by faculties, to be interviewed. Each group was in charge of scheduling the four or six interviews required from both the unsuccessful and successful focus group.

OUTCOMES:

Four participants, from both the successful and unsuccessful groups, were scheduled for interviews. They were scheduled after six in the evening taking into account the subjects' availability.

4.17 TASK 17: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWING:

DESCRIPTION:

The place, the recording material and the inducements were arranged for the focus groups with participants from the different faculties.

OUTCOMES:

Four participants were interviewed, two from the successful and two from the unsuccessful group. As there were not enough participants from the Faculty of Medicine, some interviews were held by asking single participants to cooperate with the research at once.

FINDINGS:

Results showed that data collection had become exhausted for subjects, since some of them had already been interviewed during the previous stages. Furthermore, new data were not being provided.

4.18 TASK 18: PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS FOR THE QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN:

DESCRIPTION:

For the quantitative data, an analysis of the findings about the qualitative phase was done. Additionally, the literature regarding the socioeconomic factor was reviewed to focus on question on this factor that could confirm students' answers in interviews, or reveal new findings.

OUTCOMES:

Six questions were designed for this factor.

4.19 TASK 19: DATA DOCUMENT RECORDING:

DESCRIPTION:

The documents related to the research were compiled and filed. Two groups were assigned to collect the information referring to the methodology of the research project. Tasks 11 to 14 were described and organized by this field work team.

OUTCOMES:

Research documents were organized and bound, and a detailed report of the methodology for the first phase of this research study was written (See Appendix 6).

4.20 TASK 20: GENERAL RESEARCH PROJECT LOGISTICS:

DESCRIPTION:

As field workers in GILAE research project it was necessary to punctually attend meetings, respect deadlines and share the information found in the different stages of the process.

OUTCOMES:

We attended the meetings arranged, handed in the information required at the proper time and carried out processes responsibly. In addition, the data collected was always available for the group.

4.21 TASK 21: READING COMPREHENSION COURSE

IMPLEMENTATION:

DESCRIPTION:

To encourage unsuccessful students to participate in the research, they were offered a reading comprehension course. The purpose of this course was to provide participants with reading comprehension strategies which allow them to improve the reading skill. Field workers were in charge of preparing classes, materials and applying two proficiency tests to participants. Thirteen students registered in this English course which consisted of seven two-hour lessons

OUTCOMES:

A total of seven lessons were taught as planned. The number of participants was not constant and decreased from thirteen to seven subjects at the end of the course. Materials were prepared for each lesson taking into account the topics given by the researchers.

5. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

5.1 SCHEDULING:

DESCRIPTION:

One of the main problems during the internship was related to participants' availability for the interviews. Some had to attend classes of their field of study or had to work, and their schedule interfered with the interview time. This time interference became more difficult to handle as we moved on to the focus groups stage, since participants had to be interviewed the same day at the same time.

SOLUTION:

The field workers' timetable was adapted to the participants' availability. Sometimes interviews had to be conducted early in the morning, at lunch time, or in the evening.

5.2 PARTICIPANTS' RELUCTANCE:

DESCRIPTION:

Another problem was the participants' reluctance to cooperate with the interviews. Some of them arranged a meeting at a particular time and did not attend it, in spite of having been summoned. Some others just refused to be interviewed, even though they had been informed of the importance of their participation in this study.

SOLUTION:

A free reading comprehension course was offered to unsuccessful students. It motivated them to cooperate with the interviews for the study, and facilitated the application of these interviews either at the beginning or at the end of the

lesson time. For the focus groups interviews both successful and unsuccessful students were given an inducement.

5.3 TAXONOMIC ANALYSIS:

DESCRIPTION:

The first taxonomic analyses provided plenty of data on the socio-educational, socio-economic, motivational, and UIS program factors. However, they were too general, difficult to analyze and did not show the specific factors affecting successful and unsuccessful students

SOLUTION:

A taxonomy for each group of students, successful and unsuccessful, was created. In this way, the specificities of these two groups of students could be clearly identified to establish their profile.

6. KNOWLEDGE GAINED

This internship research allowed us to widen out our academic, professional and personal experience in the education and research field. It has also reinforced the need to align teaching to research in an effort to find useful tools and suitable approaches to improve the teaching/learning process of English taking into account our context.

Through the internship we gained valuable knowledge and essential elements on conducting a research project. We were given opportunities to learn how to generate questions, conduct interviews, define cultural domains, and organize the data collected by means of taxonomic analyses; fundamental aspects that will certainly strengthen our profession and scope of practice.

Moreover, we were able to acquire good interpersonal relationship skills which facilitated to have a successful team work and guaranteed a nice working environment. In addition, we were aware of the importance of punctuality, responsibility and respectful on others' work to make possible a good development of the different stages in the research project. Another benefit from this internship deals with the strategies gained to conduct interviews properly making the participants feel comfortable and willing to cooperate. The interaction with the participants also allowed us to know about their expectations, and needs related to learning English, as well as the failure or success they have experienced as EFL students.

All of this process made us aware of the fact that learners of English as a foreign language are complex and affected by diverse factors. Therefore, our duty, as future teachers, is to uphold the study of those differences and to help them overcome the obstacles they may face in their learning process. In

that way, not only will students enjoy learning English, but also we will increase and generate, with the help of research, new knowledge that contributes to the future teaching profession.

7. SELF EVALUATION

7.1 SILVIA JULIANA ANGARITA VÁSQUEZ

I think that my participation in this internship was an opportunity to work and learn from experienced and qualified professors. I also believe that with a high quality of commitment and enthusiasm, I had the possibility to contribute in different ways to the enhancement of GILAE's research process.

First, I consider that I could successfully complete tasks like interviews and data analysis which represented a major part of my participation as a field worker in the present research project. Second, I feel that during the English reading comprehension course offered to unsuccessful students, I managed to fulfill the participants' expectations by addressing their specific linguistic needs, and providing assistance to overcome them. Thus, it was rewarding to hear about their good results in the English reading comprehension test that UIS students have to approve as a requirement to obtain their degree in their field of study. Third, I think that being part of a research group requires commitment, responsibility, punctuality and hard work. For me it was rewarding to work with Lina, my field work partner. We both work cooperatively and enthusiastically and in all the tasks under our responsibility, therefore, our work contributed to conclude successfully the first phase of the present research.

In the light of the above, I realized that one cannot do research without the proper motivation. For that reason, during the research process I always tried to imagine the research participants as my own students so that I was forced, in a good way, to accomplish the tasks the best I could. I knew that in this way I would be contributing to the effective development of this study.

7.2 LINA GISELLE RAMÍREZ SANTOS

I consider that my contribution to GILAE's project was rewarding and enriching. I could commit myself in the proper development of the first phase of this study by doing tasks with a positive outlook and attitudes. I carried out duties having in mind the impact they would have on the entire development of the research study, and so results were always satisfactory.

Regarding interaction among the group members, it was an aspect that made my performance in this project easier. I always cooperated responsibly so that tasks were performed on time and following the group's suggestions. For me, it was basic to be able to share ideas and opinions on the way things had to be done. Specifically, my work with Silvia, my field work partner, turned into a space in which I could negotiate and improve tasks by doing my best. I put into practice values that could be considered of common sense, but that were the foundations for my performance in terms of responsibility, affection and respect of each others' opinions.

On the whole, my experience in GILAE's project has been one of the most rewarding ones. I consider I managed to do tasks successfully and to integrate with the group within a nice working atmosphere in which the research project could effectively take place. Now, the seeds of research have been spread on me and the desire to continue working on the generation of new knowledge, created out of interaction, keeps on growing.

WORKS CITED

Bean, John P. "College Student Retention" National Center for Educational Statistics. 2001. Answers.com. < <http://www.answers.com/topic/college-student-retention>>

Benson, Nancy, Sharon Crosier, and Linda Parker. "Maslow's Motivation Theory and its Application to Education". PSY 501. SUNY Cortland. <ParkerFacultyweb<http://facultyweb.cortland.edu/andersmd/MASLOW/HOME PAGE.HTML>>

Calcagno, Juan C. Community College Student Success: What Institutional Characteristics Make a Difference? New York: 2005. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED489096 <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/29/dc/74.pdf>

Conrad, Clifton F, and Wilson Richard F. Academic Program Reviews. Washington DC: 1996. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED284522

Díaz, Gerardo F., and Arceo, Barriga. Estrategias Docentes Para Un Aprendizaje Significativo "Una Interpretación Constructivista. México: Mac Graw Hill, 2004.

Ellis, Rod. The study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. 198-241

English as a 2nd Language: Implementing Effective Adult Education Program. Sacramento: California State Department of Education. P.O. Box 271

Furlong, Andy, and Alasdair Forsyth. "Socio-economic Disadvantage and Experience in Higher Education" Published for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation by the Policy Press May 2003 <www.jrf.org.uk>

Kerka, Sandra. Adult Learner Retention Revisited. 1995. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED389880. <<http://www.ericdigests.org/1996-3/adult.htm>>

Norris, Holt J. "Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition". The Internet TESL Journal VII. June 2001 <<http://iteslj.org/Articles/Norris-Motivation.html>>

Obeidat, Mohamed M. "Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning". Journal of Faculty of Education 22 (2005): 3 <<http://www.fedu.uaeu.ac.ae/Journal/PDF22/issue22-artical6.pdf>>

Racelis, Mary. "Doing Ethnography: Look, Listen and Learn" Power Point Presentation. Palma Hall.25-28 April 2006. <<http://web.kssp.upd.edu.ph/admin/2006/materials/racelis.ppt#256,1>>

Report to the NSW Department of Education and Training. Australia: NSW Department of Education and Training. 2005 <www.psp.nsw.edu.au>

Schensul, Jean J., et al.Enhance Ethnotgraphic Methods. London: Altamira P,1999.

Schofield, Peter, and Ghani Mamuna. "The Relationship of Socio-Economic Status and Length/Medium of English Instruction with Individual Differences and English Proficiency in Pakistan". Journal of Research 3

(2003): 1-25 < <http://bzu.edu.pk/jlanguagesvol-3%202003Dr%20Mamuna-1.pdf>>

Spradley, James. The Ethnographic Interview. United States of America: Wadsworth Publishing, April 1979, 88-12

Terenzini, Patrick T., and others. A Path Analytical Validation of Tinto's Theory of College Student Attrition. New York: 1983 ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED231276 < http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/31/df/52.pdf>

Tinto, Vincent. Taking Student Retention Seriously. 15 Nov. 2007. < http://soeweb.syr.edu/academics/grad/higher_education/vtinto.cfm>

Walqui, Aida. Contextual Factors in Second Language Acquisition. 2000 ERIC Digest Reproduction Service ED444381. < http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/67/3a.pdf>

REFERENCES

- Ames, Carole, and Rickard Ames. Research in Motivation in Education 3. San Diego: Academic Press, 1989
- Bernard, H Russel. Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. London: Altamira P, 1995.
- Ellis, Rod. 'Classroom Interaction and its Relation to Second Language Learning'. RELC Journal 11 (1980): 29-48.
- Giles, Howard & Justine Coupland. Language: Contexts and Consequences. USA: Open University Press. 1991
- Heyrman, Jan & Jo Goedhuys. "The Multiple Key Informant Survey: a method for the comparison of international qualitative data". EURACT. 2007
< <http://www.euract.org/doc012.html>>
- Oxford, Rebecca, and Jill, Shearin. "Language Learning Motivation: Expanding the Theoretical Framework". Modern Language Journal, 78. (1994)
- Schensul, Jean. Enhanced Ethnographic Methods: Audiovisual techniques, focused group interviews and elicitation techniques 3. United States of America: Altamira Press, 1999
- Spradley, James P. Participant Observation. Austin: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

8. APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1

1er ANÁLISIS DE DOMINIOS: ENREVISTAS NO ESTRUCTURADAS Estudiantes Remisos y Cupo 270

Fecha: Marzo 26 de 2007

Trabajadoras de campo: Lina Ramírez y Silvia Juliana Angarita

TÉRMINOS INCLUIDOS	RELACIÓN SEMANTICA	TERMINO INCLUYENTE
Horrible Malo Tedio Aburrido Productivo Chévere Poco llamativo No le veía futuro No le veía importancia Se me ha dificultado Básico No fue mucho aprendizaje Ha avanzado muchísimo	X es una forma de Y	Referirse a su experiencia de aprendizaje del inglés
	X es una tipo de Y	Factor que hace el

<p>Poca exigencia Escribir y escribir Sentarse a explicar Traducir Hacer correcciones</p>		<p>por el profesor</p>
<p>Se centraba en lo que sabían Desplazaba a los que no sabían Chévere Es como feo Interesante Clase magistral Muy buena Mediocre No tenia metodología Les falta preparación en el extranjero</p>	<p>X es una forma de Y</p>	<p>Referirse a la metodología de su profesor</p>
<p>Difícil Tienen mas metodología Costosos para los estudiantes Cubren todas las habilidades Les ha gustado mucho Se evalúa lo que no se ha visto</p>	<p>X es una forma de Y</p>	<p>Describir los cursos de inglés</p>

<p>Falta de tiempo</p> <p>Falta de dedicación</p> <p>No se siente el compromiso de parte del instituto</p> <p>Concentrarse en la carrera</p>		
<p>Uno paga los niveles</p> <p>No estoy segura si se paga el libro</p> <p>Hay que comprar el libro original</p> <p>Poseen muy buenas metodologías</p> <p>Faltan recursos y disponibilidad por la cantidad de estudiantes</p> <p>Grupos grandes</p>	<p>X es un tipo de Y</p>	<p>Información sobre le programa de inglés en la UIS</p>
<p>Soy un poco cerrada</p>	<p>X es una forma de Y</p>	<p>Referirse a su habilidad para aprender una lengua</p>
<p>Buscar palabras en el diccionario</p> <p>Leer textos y escribir</p> <p>Concluir frases por análisis</p> <p>Comenzar con las bases</p> <p>Aprender pronunciación de palabras</p>	<p>X es una forma de Y</p>	<p>Estudio personal</p>

<p>Escuchar y aprender canciones</p> <p>Hablarlo</p> <p>Tratar de traducir</p> <p>Responder cuestionarios</p>		
<p>Enfocada al vocabulario</p> <p>Textos grandes / largo</p> <p>Muy estructurales</p> <p>No es difícil para el que estudia, con bases</p> <p>Impresionante</p> <p>Corto</p> <p>Sencillo</p> <p>Breve</p> <p>In entendible</p>	<p>X es una característica de Y</p>	<p>El examen</p>
<p>Tenaz</p> <p>Chévere</p> <p>Suave y armónico</p> <p>Normal</p>	<p>X es una forma de Y</p>	<p>Ver su lengua nativa</p>
<p>Pésima</p> <p>Palabras marcadas</p> <p>Dificultad para redactar</p> <p>Facilidad para hablar</p> <p>Lenta para leer</p> <p>Leer y escribir bien mejor que</p>	<p>X es una característica de Y</p>	<p>Su habilidad en su lengua nativa</p>

en inglés		
<p>Mirar primero el encabezado</p> <p>Leer las primeras frases varias veces</p> <p>Ver que preguntan primero</p> <p>Repasar el texto</p> <p>Tratar como de medio leer lo que más o menos se entiende</p> <p>Tin marin de don pingüe</p>	X es una forma de Y	Abordar el examen
<p>Falta de decisión</p> <p>Poco vocabulario</p> <p>Falta de enseñanza de estructura gramatical</p> <p>Falta de preparación</p> <p>Falta de bases</p> <p>Fotocopia rayada que no gustaba</p> <p>Mal manejo del tiempo</p>	X es un tipo de Y	Problema que ellos identifican al presentar el examen
<p>Tener ya dos niveles de ingles, lo básico</p> <p>Mas corto</p> <p>Buena presentación</p>	X es un tipo de Y	Característica del examen que le ayudo a pasarlo
	X es un tipo de Y	Recomendación

<p>Evaluar lo que realmente se aprende</p> <p>Que no se base en un libro</p> <p>Implementar un metodología mas personalizada</p> <p>Abrir tutorías</p> <p>Abrir grupos pequeño para los estudiantes con problemas</p> <p>Que el cd lo de la universidad</p> <p>Un mejor manejo de información sobre los cursos</p> <p>Mejor atención</p>		<p>hecha al instituto</p>
--	--	---------------------------

APPENDIX 2

CUESTIONARIO PARA ENTREVISTAS SEMIESTRUCTURADAS

GRUPO REMISO Y CUPO 270

1. ¿Qué opina del aprendizaje del inglés?
2. Compare la enseñanza del inglés a nivel de su colegio con la enseñanza de las inglés en propuesta UIS
3. ¿Qué opina de la cultura angloparlante?
4. ¿Qué factores académicos interfirieron en el momento de ingresar en el programa propuesta UIS? ¿Cómo los superó? (cupu 270) *(Hay que hacer probing para que la persona sepa de que estamos hablando. Mariela autorizó)*
5. ¿Qué otros factores aparte de los académicos en el momento de ingresar en el programa propuesta UIS? ¿Cómo los superó? (cupu 270) *(Hay que hacer probing para que la persona sepa de que estamos hablando. Mariela autorizó)*
6. ¿Qué cambios sugeriría para el programa propuesta UIS?
7. ¿Ha hecho parte del Instituto de Lenguas alguna vez? *(En caso positivo)* ¿Cómo fue esa experiencia? *(En caso negativo)* ¿Por qué?
8. ¿Qué ha escuchado de las experiencias de otros en el instituto de lenguas?
9. ¿Qué utilidad tiene el inglés para su vida?
10. ¿Qué concepto tiene de usted mismo como aprendiz de inglés?
11. ¿Utiliza usted estrategias para aprender una lengua? ¿Cuales?
12. ¿Cómo cree usted que debería ser una clase ideal de inglés?
13. ¿Qué factores considera que le han facilitado el aprendizaje del inglés? (cupu 270)

APPENDIX 3

<p>6. FACTORES NO ACADÉMICOS QUE INTERFIEREN AL MOMENTO DE INGRESAR AL PROGRAMA DE PROPUESTA UIS (GRUPO REMISOS)</p>	FACTOR ECONÓMICO	<p>Falta de dinero para el curso (5) Costo adicional aparte del semestre (5)</p> <p>Cursos costosos (7)</p> <p>Falta de dinero para el cambio de libro (5)</p> <p>Falta de darle importancia (5)</p> <p>Falta de interés (8)</p>	QUE SE TRADUCE EN:	<p>Pereza (3)</p> <p>Descuido o Negligencia (19)</p> <p>Cansancio (1)</p>	
	PERCEPCIONES PERSONALES SOBRE EL INGLÉS	<p>Falta de motivación para estudiar inglés (10)</p> <p>No tener mucho conocimiento del inglés (8)</p> <p>Falta de gusto por el inglés (3)</p> <p>Falta de utilidad (3)</p>	DEBIDO A QUE:	<p>Los problemas colombianos no son en inglés</p>	
	ACTIVIDADES EXTRA - ACADÉMICAS	<p>Actividades deportivas (1)</p> <p>Ser cabeza de hogar (1)</p> <p>Trabajo (6)</p>	QUE CONLLEVAN:	<p>Falta de tiempo (15)</p>	
	FACTORES SOCIALES	<p>Shock de primiparo (3)</p> <p>Vivir lejos (1)</p>			
	FACTORES RELACIONADOS CON EL INSTITUTO DE LENGUAS	<p>Falta de información (3)</p> <p>Proceso de matrícula complicado y demorado (1)</p> <p>Falta de calidad (1)</p> <p>Falta de compromiso (2)</p> <p>Enfermedad (1)</p> <p>Cansancio</p>			
	FACTORES FÍSICOS				

6. FACTORES NO ACADÉMICOS QUE INTERFIEREN AL MOMENTO DE INGRESAR AL PROGRAMA DE PROPUESTA UIS (GRUPO CUPO 270)	FACTOR ECONÓMICO	Falta de dinero para el curso (2)			
		Costo adicional aparte del semestre (3)			
		Cursos costosos (7)			
	PERCEPCIONES PERSONALES SOBRE EL INGLÉS	Falta de dinero para el cambio de libro (2)			
		Falta de dinero para el libro (1)			
		Falta de darle importancia (2)			Pereza (2)
		Falta de interés (1)			Descuido o Negligencia (2)
		Falta de motivación para estudiar inglés (1)			Cansancio (3)
	ACTIVIDADES EXTRA - ACADÉMICAS	No tener mucho conocimiento del inglés (1)			
		Trabajo (3)			Falta de tiempo (9)
		Viaje (1)			Costo adicional (1)
	FACTORES SOCIALES	Ser de otra ciudad (1)			Costo adicional aparte de las cosas necesarias (1)
		Falta de información (2)			
	FACTORES RELACIONADOS CON EL INSTITUTO DE LENGUAS	Falta de compromiso (1)			
FACTORES FÍSICOS	Enfermedad (1)				
	Cansancio				

7. TIPOS DE CAMBIOS PARA PROPUESTA UIS (GRUPO REMISOS)	METODOLOGIA	<p>Clases más personalizadas (1)</p> <p>Trabajar en lecturas y actividades cotidianas (1)</p> <p>Que en el primer nivel se hable Español (1)</p> <p>Tener en cuenta el ritmo de aprendizaje del estudiante (6)</p> <p>Tener en cuenta el nivel de inglés con que viene el estudiante (2)</p> <p>Más didáctico (2)</p> <p>Vocabulario técnico (2)</p> <p>Que se trabaje más en listening (1)</p> <p>Hacer actividades fuera del salón (1)</p> <p>Motivación a talleres de conversación (2)</p> <p>Que no se den los contenidos tan rápido (4)</p> <p>Que no fuera materia dentro de la carrera (1)</p> <p>Ampliar los horarios (8)</p> <p>Que fuera obligatorio en el pensum (1)</p> <p>Que abran cursos los sábados (3)</p> <p>Trabajar con las personas más quedadas (2)</p> <p>Que sea accesible a todo el mundo (1)</p> <p>Quitar los créditos (2)</p> <p>Que ofrecieran otros idiomas (1)</p>
	ORGANIZACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA	<p>Cambiar los horarios pesados (medio día y noche) (6)</p> <p>Abrir grupos de niveles (2)</p> <p>Que no fuera obligatorio (nota/cursos) (2)</p> <p>Hacer clasificación más consciente (1)</p> <p>Que sea mínimo por dos semestres a principios de la carrera (2)</p> <p>Que no cambien tanto a los profesores (1)</p>
	ESTRUCTURACION DEL PROGRAMA	<p>Grupos más pequeños (3)</p> <p>Que sea más económico (3)</p>
	SERVICIO	<p>Hacer más publicidad (3)</p> <p>Hacer una campaña de sensibilización de la importancia del Inglés (2)</p> <p>Hacer públicas las becas que se pueden ofrecer por saber Inglés (2)</p>
	RECURSOS	<p>Que no se exija libro original (1)</p> <p>Mejor acceso a medios audiovisuales y tecnológicos (1)</p> <p>Que los profesores no hablen tan rápido el Inglés (2)</p> <p>Que los profesores tengan más experiencia (1)</p>
	PROFESORES	<p>Planear (3)</p> <p>Deben motivar a los estudiantes (1)</p> <p>No deben presionar para que el estudiante participe si éste se siente cohibido (1)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">7. TIPOS DE CAMBIOS PARA PROPUESTA UIS (GRUPO CUPO 270)</p>	METODOLOGIA	Clases más personalizadas (2)	Que se evaluó lo que se esta aprendiendo realmente (1)	
		Tener en cuenta el nivel de inglés con que viene el estudiante (2)	Utilizar material a parte del libro (1)	
		Tener en cuenta el ritmo de aprendizaje del estudiante (2)	Que se explique la utilidad de la gramática (1)	
		Profundizar en temas difíciles (1)	Que hubiera interacción con extranjeros en cada nivel (1)	
		Más didáctico (1)	Hacer actividades fuera del salón (1)	
		Vocabulario técnico (1)		
		Que se trabaje más en listening (3)		
		Más énfasis en la gramática (2)		
		Motivación a talleres de conversación (3)		
		Que no se den los contenidos tan rápido (1)		
Ampliarlo a todos los semestres (1)				
Ampliar los horarios, mas flexibilidad (6)				
Que abran cursos los sábados (2)				
Clases en la facultad de salud (1)				
Cambiar los horarios pesados (medio día y noche) (1)				
Enseñar un inglés más práctico (1)				
Escoger mejor a los profesores (1)				
Hacer clasificación más consciente (2)				
Que se roten los profesores (1)				
Que no fuera obligatorio (nota/curso) (1)				
Clases diarias (2)				
Agilidad en la asignación de cupos (2)				
Grupos más pequeños (3)				
Que sea más económico (1)				
Hacer más publicidad (3)				
Que les den el mismo trato que a los que pagan (1)				
Que no se exija libro original (1)				
Mejor acceso a medios audiovisuales y tecnológicos (3)				
Personalizar los computadores, profesores y libros (2)				
Salones más cómodos (2)				
Que los profesores tengan más experiencia en el exterior (1)				
Que no mezclen los dos acentos (británico y americano) (2)				
No basarse solo en el libro (2)				
ORGANIZACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA	ESTRUCTURACION DEL PROGRAMA	SERVICIO	RECURSOS	PROFESORES

APPENDIX 4

HALLAZGOS INICIALES

Dominio Cultural: 6

X es un tipo de Factor no académico que interfiere al momento de ingresar al Programa Propuesta UIS

Trabajadora de campo: Lina Giselle Ramírez Santos

Factor: Motivación, Socioeconómico y de Evaluación.

	Diferencias	Similitudes
270	<p>-Factor Económico: Manifiestan falta de dinero para la compra del libro.</p> <p>-Actividades Extra-académicas: Planean viaje y el curso se hace un costo adicional</p> <p>-Factores Sociales: Son de otra ciudad y el curso se hace un costo adicional.</p>	<p>- Factor Económico: Manifiestan falta de dinero para el curso y los cambios de libro.</p> <p>Creen que los cursos son costosos.</p> <p>-Percepciones Personales sobre el Inglés: Reconocen su falta de interés y motivación hacia el inglés.</p>

<p>Remisos</p>	<p>-Percepciones Personales sobre el Inglés: Manifiestan falta de gusto por el inglés. Creen que no tiene utilidad. -Actividades Extra-académicas: Interferencia con actividades deportivas Ser cabeza de hogar Esto se traduce en falta de tiempo para el inglés. -Factores Sociales: Shock de primíparo. Vivir lejos. -Factores Relacionados con Iluis: Proceso de matrícula complicado. Falta de calidad.</p>	<p>Manifiestan no tener aptitud. Esto lleva a la pereza y negligencia. -Actividades Extra-académicas: Trabajan. -Factores Relacionados con Iluis: Falta de información. Falta de Compromiso. -Factores Físicos. Enfermedad Cansancio</p>
<p>Conclusión: Los factores más fuertes son el económico y de percepciones sobre el inglés. Los remisos manifiestan falta de interés por el inglés y no le ven utilidad inmediata (cosa que no sucede con cupos). Son mínimas las actividades que los cupos sobreponen al inglés; mientras que los remisos le dedican tiempo al hogar y los deportes y no al inglés. Además, si lo hacen el cansancio se convierte en un factor dificultante en el proceso de aprendizaje. Los cupos aluden a factores de tipo económico mientras que los remisos tratan de resaltar lo emocional y lo social como interferencias. Además, aluden a entes externos como el proceso de matrícula y la falta de calidad al hablar del instituto de Lenguas.</p>		

HALLAZGOS INICIALES

Dominio Cultural: 7

X es una sugerencia de cambio para el programa P-UIS

Trabajadora de campo: Silvia Juliana Angarita V.

Factores: TODOS

	Diferencias	Similitudes
270	<p>Metodología: Más comentarios con respecto al enfoque de la clase, actividades, interacción con hablantes nativos.</p> <p>Organización: calidad de profesores, y rotación de estos</p> <p>Servicio: Igual trato para el que no paga</p> <p>Recursos: Mas acceso computadores y salones mas cómodos</p> <p>Profesor: Rol: experiencia, planeador, un solo acento en el programa</p>	<p>Organización: Horarios Flexibilidad, ampliar</p> <p>Servicio: Factor económico: valor de cursos, mas baratos</p> <p>Publicidad: promoverlo mas</p> <p>Recursos: Mejor acceso a medios AV y tecnología, no obligación libro</p>

<p>Remisos</p>	<p>Metodología Ritmo = Tener en cuenta el Pace del estudiante Programa Organización: creditaje, obligatoriedad Servicio: Concienciación acerca de la importancia del inglés Profesores: Rol: motivador</p>	
<p>Conclusión: Para ambos grupos es importante mejorar o dar más flexibilidad en los horarios, reducir el costo de los cursos y hacerle más publicidad al programa. Los remisos se enfocan en sugerencia para mejorar la parte de organización y estructura del programa, mientras que los de cupo tienen más sugerencias hacia la metodología y rol del profesor ya que han tomado más cursos.</p>		

APPENDIX 5

ORGANIZACIÓN Y PREPARACIÓN DE LAS ENTREVISTAS DE GRUPOS FOCALES (Silvia)

- **Tiempo:** 1:30- 2:00 horas. El 30% del tiempo total se debe dedicar a una socialización informal. Se debe tratar de establecer un tiempo adecuado para cada respuesta con mirar a la participación de todos los sujetos. Si se van a tratar diferentes temas limitar un tiempo adecuado para discutir cada uno de ellos.
- **Sujetos:** Al escoger a los posibles participantes es importante tener en cuenta que el número de personas en cada grupo focal sea el mismo y que represente al total de la población. Para este propósito, se puede crear un perfil con las características de los sujetos ideales basado en datos que se hayan recogido con anterioridad. Al tener la lista de los sujetos más adecuados para la investigación se les debe contactar, vía telefónica, por carta o Internet, para hacerles la invitación; identificar las necesidades que tengan (transporte, cuidados maternos...); y decidir los incentivos que se les darán por su participación.
- **Organización de los grupos:** Es importante trabajar con dos grupos focales por cada variable del estudio; sin embargo el número total de grupos depende de las variables más importantes para la investigación.

- **Lugar:** Al escoger el lugar para las entrevistas de grupos focales se debe tener en cuenta:
 - La comodidad: ¿Hay suficiente espacio y luz para todos los participantes? ¿Son cómodas las sillas? ¿Existe un sitio donde se puedan colocar alimentos y bebidas para los participantes?
 - La conveniencia para todos los participantes: ¿Qué percepciones tiene los participantes del lugar? ¿Es fácil de encontrar el lugar?
 - Los factores de interrupción que puedan existir
 - El nivel de ruido

IDENTIFICACIÓN Y ENTRENAMIENTO DE LOS FACILITADORES (Lina)

Un buen facilitador debe tener la capacidad de:

- Integrarse en el grupo de manera que inspire confianza en el grupo
- Conducir la participación: que no haya sujetos que no hablen, ni otros que lo hagan demasiado.
- Sintetizar los datos que recibe de manera que pueda usarlos mas adelante en la elaboración de preguntas sobre la marcha
- Grabar mentalmente las respuestas verbales o actitudes ya que pueden ser útiles como datos
- Manejar artefactos de grabación como videograbadora, casetes, etc.
- Poder manejar grandes cantidades de información sin agobiarse
- Crear un ambiente de confianza entre los participantes que los lleve a confiar uno en el otro
- Controlar el ambiente de la discusión para evitar conflictos y drama
- Evitar que e grupo de desvíe del tema, es decir, debe poder centrar la atención del grupo en el tema de la discusión.
- Recoger datos estadísticos, como edades, genero, estatus, etc., al tiempo de la entrevista
- Revisar los métodos de recolección de datos antes de la entrevista
- Evitar que sus opiniones personales salgan a flote durante la discusión

APPENDIX 6

Metodología

- 1. población y muestra:** la población de este estudio fue inicialmente constituida por 80 estudiantes activos de la Universidad Industrial de Santander de todos los programas académicos, excepto de licenciatura en inglés. Sin embargo, por diversos inconvenientes de horarios y disponibilidad de los estudiantes, solo se trabajó con una muestra de 78. ésta consiste de 2 grupos que los investigadores han decidido llamar: Remisos y Cupo 270. Al primer grupo pertenecen 43 estudiantes y al segundo 35. Se entiende por Remisos a aquellos estudiantes que no han aprobado el requisito de inglés exigido por la universidad para su graduación, y por Cupo 270 los que han cumplido este requisito exitosamente. Es importante mencionar que la selección de la población se dio por medio de un muestreo por conveniencia.

- 2. Procedimiento:** inicialmente, los investigadores principales se reunieron con el fin de efectuar la revisión preliminar de la literatura para soportar teóricamente el problema planteado en la investigación. Seguidamente, los investigadores determinaron los ejes y posibles categorías conceptuales de los mismos. El primer eje corresponde a Motivación, Actitudes y Percepciones. Las posibles categorías conceptuales son:

 - actitud hacia el inglés
 - actitudes hacia los anglo-parlantes, creencias sobre si mismo (posibilidades de éxito y fracaso, percepción de autoeficacia)

- claridad y relevancia de las razones que motivan el aprendizaje del inglés.
- compromiso con el aprendizaje activo del idioma.
- manejo de la ansiedad

El segundo eje corresponde a los factores educativos:

- respaldo de profesores, compañeros y entorno en el aprendizaje del inglés (factores contextuales: valores y prácticas de la comunidad educativa, PEI y currículo, clima del aula, influencias familiares y culturales)
- experiencias previas de aprendizaje de lenguas: bachillerato en colegio bilingüe, contacto con hablantes nativos, contactos con otras culturas, actividades extracurriculares relacionadas con otras culturas
- habilidades de estudio, planeación y monitoreo
- profesor: actuación pedagógica, manejo interpersonal, mensajes y retroalimentación con los alumnos, organización de la clase, comportamientos que modela, formas en que recompensa y sanciona a los alumnos.
- estilos de aprendizaje
- historial académico del estudiante: en el programa de inglés, gpa, tiempo de permanencia en la universidad, carrera.
- su percepción sobre su dominio de la lengua nativa: hablar, escribir, comprensión de lectura y del discurso.

El tercer eje abarca los factores sociodemográficos:

- edad
- género
- estrato social

- barreras en el aprendizaje del inglés

Finalmente, el cuarto eje comprende propuesta UIS:

- docentes, estudiantes, infraestructura, horarios, contenidos, evaluación del aprendizaje.

Después de establecidos los ejes principales de la investigación, los investigadores principales y los trabajadores de campo se reunieron para la distribución de éstos. Para cada uno de ellos se asignó un investigador principal con sus respectivos trabajadores de campo.

- La siguiente etapa comprende la recolección de datos la cual esta compuesta de dos fases. Una cualitativa y una cuantitativa. La primera consiste de entrevistas no estructuradas, semi-estructuradas, entrevistas a grupos focales y a informantes claves.

Las entrevistas no estructuradas se llevaron a cabo con un número de 10 estudiantes del grupo remiso y 10 del Cupo 270. Una de las investigadoras principales realizó cuatro de estas entrevistas como parte de una inducción para los trabajadores de campo. Los trabajadores de campo de cada grupo llevaron a cabo las otras 16 de forma equitativa. Las entrevistas no estructuradas partieron de la siguiente pregunta descriptiva: “¿Cómo ha sido su experiencia en el aprendizaje del inglés en general?”. De esta pregunta se fueron generando otras relacionadas con los ejes.

Luego de realizar las entrevistas no estructuradas, se hizo un primer procesamiento de los datos. Se analizaron las respuestas con el propósito de

sacar patrones comunes y dominios culturales. Cada grupo elaboró un documento de dominios culturales, 4 en total. (Ver anexo 1). Así mismo, cada grupo con su respectivo investigador principal compartió los resultados de los análisis de dominios culturales para así elaborar el cuestionario a ser aplicado en las entrevistas semi-estructuradas. Dicho documento consiste de 13 preguntas las cuales fueron planteadas teniendo en cuenta no sólo el análisis previo de los dominios sino también los 4 ejes principales de la investigación. (Ver anexo 2)

A continuación, se dio paso a la realización de las entrevistas semi-estructuradas basadas en el cuestionario previamente mencionado. Se efectuaron 58 en total de las cuales 33 pertenecen al grupo Remiso y 25 al Cupo 270. En esta segunda etapa hubo cierta dificultad para completar el número de entrevistas inicialmente establecido debido a la renuencia, por parte de los cupos, a colaborar en el proceso. (80).

Finalizando esta serie de entrevistas se procedió a realizar un Análisis Taxonómico a partir de los dominios elaborados en la primera etapa (Anexo 3). Dichos dominios se distribuyeron individual y equitativamente entre las investigadoras y las trabajadoras de campo. Luego, en reunión general, se decidió que era necesario dividir cada taxonomía entre los grupos Cupos y Remisos para identificar los factores que influyeron específicamente en cada grupo (Anexo 4). En éste proceso se cuantificó la frecuencia de aparición de ciertos comentarios de los participantes, con el objetivo de tener una idea más amplia de la perspectiva de cada grupo.

Más adelante, se realizó una reunión para compartir los resultados de los análisis taxonómicos y se decidió hacer énfasis en la similitudes y diferencias encontradas entre grupos Cupo y Remisos de cada dominio. Se discutieron

los resultados y se tomó la decisión de crear un formato unificado para organizar las diferencias y similitudes en los dos grupos, además de los hallazgos iniciales que se hicieron. Debe quedar claro que este proceso se hizo siempre a partir de dominios individuales (Anexo 5)

Luego, se realizó una reunión de cada grupo con su investigador principal respectivo para analizar todos los documentos de hallazgos iniciales y así formular las preguntas posibles para los Grupos Focales a partir del eje propio. La idea era que estas preguntas exploraran profundamente en cada uno de los ejes para identificar que había sido omitido y podría ser incluido en los grupos focales.

En la siguiente reunión general del grupo GILAE se compartió el trabajo de los grupos individuales y se analizó el procedimiento por el cual se llegó a tal producto. Entre éstos, llamó la atención el trabajo del grupo de Evaluación del Instituto que realizó un trabajo de sondeo de relaciones entre los dominios y los respectivos ejes. De esta manera sabríamos con más exactitud cuales factores son los que más influencia tienen en cada eje. En esta reunión se habló de la importancia de que cada grupo revisara el marco teórico de la investigación y empezara a trabajar en su eje correspondiente, para que así saber que cosas necesitan ser exploradas en más profundidad y que otras se han quedado por fuera y serían de importancia en la investigación.

Finalmente, se decidió hacer dos reuniones más antes de los grupos focales con el fin de compartir las preguntas de cada eje y la siguiente para la realización del taller de preparación de los trabajadores de campo para las entrevistas de grupos focales.