

**AN EVALUATION OF STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TO THE
GENERAL ENGLISH AND SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF
THEIR COURSE: A CASE STUDY OF HOTEL
EMPLOYEES IN CHIANG MAI,
THAILAND.**

Michael William Cameron Brunton

**TESOL Department
Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand.**

Email: mike_brunton@hotmail.com

Abstract: The aim of this research was to investigate hotel employees' attitudes toward two components in an 8-week course of English studies. One component was hotel English, the other general English. The course content was jointly negotiated with the participants. There were 10 participants from a five-star hotel with the majority working in the food and beverage department. Before the course started a small Needs Analysis was given to the participants and they were also interviewed. Each week both components were taught on differing days. After each class there were either questionnaires or class discussions on what the participants had studied that day. At the end of the course there was a final questionnaire on both components. The findings of this research paper are that the participants' attitudes toward both components did not differ significantly. The management of the hotel preferred to concentrate on just specific English due to the main constraints of time and money. Satisfaction with the ESP component was high however; it was found that the majority of participants wanted to learn general English. There was evidence from the research study that participants appreciated the broader range of topics studied in the general English component. This research paper supports the view that general English empowers students within the EOP domain and that courses should be designed with not just the stakeholders' more

narrow view of their employees' immediate perceived needs. It also supports the inclusion of needs analysis and student interviews in order to ensure that course design successfully meets a broad range of wants and needs. Finally this research paper suggests a new acronym for some ESP courses; GESP where a course is not truly specific and uses a generic textbook.

Introduction

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has a long history in the field of English teaching. Little research has been done however on just how effective an ESP course is in regards to comparing it with a general English course. Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) and Hutchinson and Waters (1987) wrote very detailed books which are viewed as seminal texts in the field. In these books however, there was no question of comparing results from a study of how students feel an ESP course caters not just to their immediate needs but their wants and desires for English in the future.

The question therefore to ask is whether a typical course with just a series of units based on hotel language from an ESP textbook meets students want and needs fully and if a general English course taught in conjunction with the ESP course is found to at least equal or perhaps even surpass the students attitudes toward their compulsory course of study. Also of interest is whether the students would like to see greater weighting toward one component of an equally taught course consisting of 50% ESP English and 50% general English.

Jasso-Aguilar (1998) researched hotel maids studying an ESP course. She used critically aware methodology, which included working alongside the hotel maids in her study. She discovered a mismatch between what the hotel wanted its maids to learn and what they needed to learn. She also questioned whether the language being learned met the long term goals of the hotel housekeepers. Since this study there have been no further studies carried out in hotels to examine students' attitudes toward the taught components of their courses.

From the early 1960's, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has grown to become one of the most prominent areas of EFL teaching today. It is driven often by stakeholders,

and sometimes by material writers. An examination of ESP textbooks today would find a huge variety of ESP textbooks designed for example not just for Business English, but now for Marketing, Banking and Advertising English. ESP has a history of almost 40 years and so you would expect the ESP community to have a clear idea about what ESP means.

The division of ESP into absolute and variable characteristics (See Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998) in particular, was initially very helpful in resolving arguments about what is and is not ESP. We can see that ESP is not necessarily concerned with a specific discipline, nor does it have to be aimed at a certain age group or ability range. However, in my opinion one of the main differences between ESP and general English is that the vast majority of ESP courses are studied by adults. ESP should be seen as an 'approach' to teaching, or what Dudley-Evans describes as an 'attitude of mind'. This is a similar conclusion to that made by Hutchinson et al. (1987, p.19) who state, '*ESP is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner's reason for learning.*'

If we agree with this definition we begin to see how broad ESP really is. In fact, one may ask 'What is the difference between the ESP and general English approach?' Hutchinson et al. (1987, p.53) answer this quite simply, "*in theory nothing, in practice a great deal*". When their book was written at that time, teachers of general English courses, while acknowledging that students had a specific purpose for studying English, would rarely conduct a needs analysis to find out what was necessary to actually achieve it.

Teachers nowadays though, are much more aware of the importance of needs analysis, and certainly today materials writers are more aware than they used to be about the goals of learners during material production. Perhaps this demonstrates the influence that the ESP approach has had on English teaching in general. Clearly the line between where general English courses stop and ESP courses start has become very vague. Anthony (1997, p.2) states that '*Rather ironically, while many General English teachers can be described as using an ESP approach, basing their syllabi on a learner needs analysis and their own specialist knowledge of using English for real communication, it*

is the majority of so-called ESP teachers that are using an approach furthest from that described above'.

What he means by this is that today many ESP teachers and courses are now based around a certain textbook without looking closely at learners' needs or wants. A proper review of materials from the textbook may be lacking and actually conducting work-based research into finding target language structures is seldom done. It almost could be said that it is the very success of ESP English that is now driving the failure of courses for students.

If this is the case, then perhaps just teaching a specific textbook designed for the hotel and catering trade while meeting the needs and expectations of hotel management will not meet the needs and expectations of the individual students. Clearly a hotel will want their employee to be able to function in their role, but may have no further desire for overall proficiency in English.

Although it can be argued rightly that in the case of hotel English textbooks much of the language could belong to a general English textbook, it is the narrow-beam focus that sets it apart from a general English textbook. In a hotel ESP textbook, every unit is based on a target situation that could happen in a particular setting or target situation.

This issue whether to focus on a 'common core' or to design a course with more specific aims is one that holds a central place in debate about ESP courses today.

This study examined a typical group of employees in a five-star hotel chain and examined their motivations and attitudes with perhaps giving directions for how employers and training managers can design English courses in cooperation with instructors to better suit employees' wants and needs. Giving employees' motivation to learn English, especially intrinsic motivation is of long term benefit to the employers, as self-directed learning is enhanced if learners want to learn for themselves.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Is teaching an ESP specific component designed for hotel workers received more positively than a general English component in regards to the students' attitudes?

SUB-PROBLEMS

What are the management feelings about the general English component?

Will students feel that the outcomes of the ESP component furthered their mastery of language needed for their present job and future careers?

Do students think that the ESP component or the general English component empowers them more?

Ultimately was there a significant difference between students' attitudes to both components or were students happy to study both ESP and general English at the same time?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A large amount of training for hotel employees is carried out annually throughout the world in English. Being the international language of travel, employees especially in hotel chains are expected to be able to communicate with guests in English. However there is frequently a mismatch between what employers, employees and guests expect with regards to English. Guests might wish and expect that all employees have a general ability in English and can communicate about a number of topics. Hotels might expect their employees to show expertise within their specific roles in the hotel but no further. The employees themselves might wish to gain not just English for their immediate role, but future possibilities in the hospitality sector, and also a level of competence in general communicative English which requires them to be able to talk about a number of different topics and to deal with different situations that might arise.

I set out to teach a course of general English and specific hotel English to a group of hotel workers at a five-star hotel in Chiang Mai, Thailand and assessed them using mainly qualitative means to find out just how big a difference there is with student attitudes between the two components.

Clearly this research study would benefit instructors when designing an ESP course. A key question in ESP courses is whether to have a broad-focus or narrow-focus approach (see literature review) when designing a syllabus. I hope that my research will also inform stakeholders and instructors choices for the future.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Component: the classes taught at the hotel consisted of two separate distinct components, the general English component using a standard EFL textbook and a specific English component using a textbook designed for Hotel and Tourism workers and students. Each class was taught using one component only.

Specific English component: all the units studied are from a textbook designed for hotel workers. Nearly all units had a focus on communicative English in target situations within a hotel setting. Units studied were decided upon by both participants and instructor.

General English component: all the sections taught were from a pre-intermediate level course book. The course book is of 'general' English design practicing all four English skills, reading and writing, speaking and listening. It contains a variety of topics. Similar to the hotel component, sections studied were decided upon by negotiation.

It should be mentioned that due to the nature of their job roles there was some cross-over between the books. For example the participants studied giving directions and having job interviews in the ESP component. In the general English component participants studied dining out in a restaurant and waiter/guest vocabulary.

Students' attitudes: This refers to their motivation to learn, the enjoyment they gain from the classes. The amount of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation they feel for each component when studying. How closely does each component match their particular wants and needs? Did they feel a class or a component met their expectations?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter I shall review the literature in the two main areas of my research questions and study; English for specific purposes (ESP) and attitudes and motivation. Motivation is closely linked to attitudes and a study of English for specific purposes gives an overview to the research and questions some of the key assumptions about ESP courses, namely whether an ESP course is distinct and different from a general English course. Also I have looked at previous studies to gather information on whether students want general English in conjunction with their ESP courses or whether instructors want to teach general English or at least have a broader focus during their ESP course.

The review of motivation strongly links attitudes with motivation, and research suggests that motivation or having a positive attitude towards studying the second language (L2) is vital to successful learning. Therefore it is important that attitudes be taken into account when designing any language course, whether for specific purposes or general English.

English for Specific Purposes

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or English for Special Purposes arose as a term in the 1960's as it became increasingly aware that general English courses frequently did not meet learner or employers wants. As far back as 1977 Strevens (1977) set out to encapsulate the term and what it meant. Bruton, Candlin and Leather (1976a) studied the discourse of doctor-patient communication and applied their findings in specialist course design (Bruton, Candlin & Leather, 1976b). This is one of the earliest examples of how analyzing the linguistic characteristics of the workplace could then lead to a specific purposes course. Robinson (1980) wrote a thorough review of theoretical positions and what ESP meant at that time. Coffey (1985) updated Strevens' work and saw ESP as a major part of communicative language teaching in general.

At first register analysis was used to design ESP courses. Register analysis was the focus on grammar and structural and non-structural vocabulary found in target situations within the ESP environment. The underlying idea behind register analysis was; that while the grammar of scientific and technical writing does not differ from that of general

English, certain grammatical and lexical forms are used much more frequently (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). A course in basic scientific English compiled by Ewer and Latorre (1969) is a typical example of an ESP syllabus based on register analysis.

However, using just register analysis failed to meet desired outcomes. Thus new courses were designed to meet these perceived failures. Target situation analysis became dominant in ESP course design as the stakeholders and employers demanded that courses better meet their needs. Technical English (Pickett & Laster, 1980) was an early example of a textbook using this approach.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) gave three reasons for the emergence of ESP, the demands of a brave new world, a revolution in linguistics and a new focus on the learner.

Today it is still a prominent part of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teaching (Anthony, 1997b). Johns and Dudley-Evans (2001, p.115) state that, '*the demand for English for specific purposes... continues to increase and expand throughout the world.*' The '*internationalism*' (Cook, 2001, p.164) of English seems to be increasing with few other global languages i.e. Spanish or Arabic, close to competing with it.

Under the umbrella term of ESP there are a myriad of sub-divisions. For example English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Business Purposes (EBP), English for Occupational Purposes (EOP), and English for Medical Purposes (EMP), and numerous others with new ones being added yearly to the list. In Japan Anthony (1997a, p.1) stated that as a result of Universities being given control over their own curriculums '*a rapid growth in English courses aimed at specific disciplines, e.g. English for Chemists arose.*' It could be said that ESP has increased over the decades as a result of market forces, globalization and a greater awareness amongst the academic and business community that learners' needs and wants should be met wherever possible. ESP courses were designed to meet the learning gap that general English textbooks could not provide.

As Belcher (2006, p.134) says ESP now encompasses an '*ever-diversifying and expanding range of purposes.*' This continued expansion of ESP into new areas has arisen due to the ever-increasing globalized world (Robertson, 1995). As our global village becomes smaller so the transfer of resources, capital, goods, and information increases. Flowerdew (1990) attributes its dynamism to market forces and theoretical renewal. Belcher (2004) also noted trends in the teaching of ESP in three distinct

directions: the sociodiscoursal, sociocultural (See Mitchell & Myles, 1998), and sociopolitical. Kavaliauskiene (2007, p.8) also writes on a new individualized approach to learners *'to gain each learner's trust and think of the ways of fostering their linguistic development.'*

From the outset, the term ESP was a source of contention with many arguments as to what exactly was ESP? Even today there is a large amount of on-going debate as to how to specify what exactly ESP constitutes (Belcher, 2006, Dudley-Evan & St. John, 1998, Anthony, 1997). I would add that as general English courses become increasingly specialized and learner centered with many courses using needs analysis, it is getting harder to describe what ESP is and what is 'general English'.

For example Strutt (2003, p.4) in his introduction, describes his textbook (English for International Tourism) as needing no specialized knowledge *'it is not technical or over-specialized in nature.'* If writers believe that their textbooks are not really specific or technical, then it becomes harder to describe using them as teaching ESP. The Language of Business English: Grammar & Functions (Brieger & Sweeney, 1994), what one might think of as an ESP textbook looks remarkably similar to any general English textbook using grammar as a means of structure. It is only that all examples are used within a 'business' context that separates it from a normal EFL textbook. Ellis and Johnson (1994, p.10) on listing several differences between business and general English then went on to say *'we acknowledge that there are many situations where the distinctions are not so clear.'* Donna (2004, p.2) also admits business English *'has much in common with general EFL'* but argues that the aims of a business English course are different, she focuses on students' and stakeholders' expectations and student's work as being different from general EFL classes. Although this sounds good, I disagree with her. In recent years all English courses are becoming focused on expectations of the learners' and output produced during the course, so once again it seems we lack a vital 'ESP' ingredient.

Wright (1992, p.1) described one of the differences succinctly; general English is concerned with everyday life these *'universal topics are socializing, shopping, traveling, eating out, telephoning friends.....So when one learns a language, one must be exposed to linguistic items relating to these universal topics. This is the task of a general English*

course. A specific English course may contain material pertaining to a general English course but (Wright, 1992, p.1) '*when we reach the stage at which any topic constitutes an individual's profession, it becomes crucial that he have mastery of the specialized language pertaining to it.*' A simple distinction to make between ESP and general English is that ESP builds upon what has been learnt and studied in earlier general English classes.

Dudley-Evans and St. John attempted (1998) to apply a series of characteristics some absolute and some variable to resolve arguments about what ESP is. This followed on from earlier work by Strevens (1988).

Definition of ESP (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998, p.4)

Absolute Characteristics

- 1) ESP is defined to meet specific needs of the learners.
- 2) ESP makes use of underlying methodology and activities of the discipline it serves.
- 3) ESP is centered on the language appropriate to these activities in terms of grammar, lexis, register, study skills, discourse and genre.

Variable Characteristics

- 1) ESP may be related to or designed for specific disciplines.
- 2) ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of General English (for example an EAP course which only teaches writing, or a business course which only teaches presentation).
- 3) ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be for learners at secondary school level.
- 4) ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students.
- 5) Most ESP courses assume some basic knowledge of the language systems.

This description helps to clarify to a certain degree what an ESP course constitutes. I would argue though that things have changed dramatically since his definition was written and today many ESP learners are of below intermediate level. Maleki (2006) demonstrated that low English language proficiency of Iranian EFL students hindered

their academic progress. He also states that strong language proficiency is needed for university level ESP courses. Also it would be expected of all general English courses to meet the specific needs of learners.

Perhaps one of the main distinguishing characteristics is that certain but by no means all ESP (especially EOP) courses are carried out for a group of workers from one area of work. There are a number of other characteristics of ESP that several authors have put forward. Belcher (2006, p.135), states that '*ESP assumes that the problems are unique to specific learners in specific contexts and thus must be carefully delineated and addressed with tailored to fit instruction.*' Mohan (1986, p.15) adds that ESP courses focus on preparing learners '*for chosen communicative environments.*'

Learner purpose is also stated by Graham and Beardsley (1986) and learning centeredness (Carter, 1983; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987) as integral parts of ESP. Thus it could be argued that ESP from the outset focused on learner centered teaching, a situation that was certainly not true of traditional general English courses. As stated above however, this situation has changed dramatically in recent years.

Lorenzo (2005, p.1) reminds us that ESP '*concentrates more on language in context than on teaching grammar and language structures.*' I would agree with him, but would argue that grammar still plays an important and necessary part in an ESP course. He also points out that as ESP is usually delivered to adult students, frequently in a work related setting (EOP), that motivation to learn is higher than in usual ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts. This area of motivation is also of interest in my research. Carter (1983) believed that self-direction is important in the sense that an ESP course is concerned with turning learners into users of the language. Thus ESP played an integral role in communicative language teaching.

Flowerdew (1990, p.327) points out that one reason ESP has problems in establishing itself in a clearly defined area within ELT (English Language Teaching) in general '*is that many of the ideas closely associated with ESP have been subsequently appropriated by the 'parent' discipline.*' He gives as an example functional/notional syllabuses which have been adopted into the mainstream of language teaching. He also includes the example of needs analysis which traditionally distinguished ESP courses from general English course design. Also one of the main distinguishing factors of ESP

from general English is the continued high focus on the learner. Not just at the outset of a course but increasingly during a course as well.

Another area of debate within ESP concerns the role of methodology. Widdowson (1983, p.87) has argued that *'methodology has generally been neglected in ESP.'* However, today there are so many various courses under the ESP umbrella that it is impossible to discuss this question, clearly different methodologies have to be used according to the course design and goals and outcomes of those courses. An instructor within the ESP umbrella might well have to change their style depending on the course taught. Wright though, (1992, p.5) believes *'Methodology is also of crucial importance. Since ESP courses aim to develop linguistic skills relating to particular spheres of activity, not only the nature of the linguistic items introduced, but the ways in which they are introduced and how they are practiced, are highly significant.'*

What is an undisputed fact is that any ESP course should be needs driven (Wright, 1992), and has an *'emphasis on practical outcomes.'* (Dudley-Evan & St. John, 1998, p.1). Therefore needs analysis is and always will be an important and fundamental part of ESP (Wright, 1992; Ellis & Johnson, 1994; Gatehouse, 2001; Graves, 2000; Scrivener, 2005).

It is *'the corner stone of ESP and leads to a very focused course.'* (Dudley-Evan & St. John, 1998, p.122) state grandly, indeed needs analysis might have once been the corner stone of ESP but is now increasingly common for many EFL situations. Holme (1996) offers a useful analogy of a general English book designed for a stereotypical European teenager. Clearly the book designers must have carried out a needs analysis (or something similar) when designing their book. Holme (1996, p.3) thus believes that *'ESP is simply a narrowing of this needs spectrum.'*

Kaur (2007, p.1) points out correctly though that it is not just general EFL courses that neglect needs analysis and describes the situation of Malaysia where *'many instances of ESP teaching and especially of course design are often ad-hoc and not entirely based on comprehensive needs analyses.'* Poon (2007) suggests a lack of time was a major factor in courses not being designed after a thorough needs analysis was carried out. Although time is a major factor in an exclusion of a needs or deficiency analysis (which

of their target situation needs they lack or need to study more), money is also a major factor.

Clearly an in-depth needs analysis with an examination of target situations even for a small group of learners would cost several hundred dollars, a sum that many stakeholders with tight training budgets might balk at.

Needs analysis evolved in the 1970's (See Munby, 1978) to include 'deficiency analysis', or assessment of the 'learning gap' (West, 1997, p.71) between target language use and current learner proficiencies. However, since the 1980's there has been debate if gathering expert and data driven objective information about learners is enough (Tudor, 1997). Nowadays there is increasing focus on looking at learners' subjective needs, *'their self-knowledge, awareness of target situations, life goals, and instructional expectations.* (Belcher, 2006, p.136). There is also an increasing focus on *'appropriate perspectives on language learning and language skills.'* (Far, 2008, p.2).

Clearly the subject of needs analysis is fundamental to all English instruction today, and the key question is whether the needs analysis is carried out in a thorough manner, with all participants involved, or whether it is carried out in a haphazard fashion. We also have to look closely at perceived needs and wants and realistic or obtainable or desired wants. Clearly there will always be a tension and friction between the teaching triangle of instructor/s, students and stakeholders.

Certainly though ESP was a driving force behind needs analysis as Richards (2001, p.36) says, *'The emergence of ESP with its emphasis on needs analysis as a starting point in language program design was an important factor in the development of current approaches to language curriculum development.'*

There is another aspect of ESP courses that is debated widely, that is how broad or narrow a focus should the course have (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998, Flowerdew, 1990). Should a course focus on subject area content exclusively and a set list of target situations or skills (narrow focus) or set out to cover a wider range of skills and target events (broad focus) perhaps even beyond the immediate perceived needs of the learners. I believe that the narrow focus approach can be disempowering to students and wherever possible instructors should expand their students' horizons. Carter (1983) identified one type of ESP as English as a Restricted language. An example cited by Gatehouse (2001)

is air traffic controllers, another example was hotel waiters. However, I do not agree with the second example, hotel waiters could be expected to use language not just in a restricted range.

Clearly for certain types of courses, the focus can start or end up being narrow. Kaur (2007) found that students were very happy with a narrow focus course as they felt no time was wasted during their course. However, Mackay and Mountford (1978) point out, and I agree with them, that knowing the restrictive language of their target situation would not enable them to function outside of that narrow context.

Students' and stakeholders' perceptions may be misguided and only focused on short-term goals. This then means that an adept instructor has to change those perceptions before or during a course. This then is a key issue not just in ESP but in all English courses, do students actually want a narrow focus, and if so, does it not limit their English progress? I deem this issue will become increasingly important.

Jasso-Aguilar (1999) examined how perceived stakeholder needs of hotel maids in a hotel in Waikiki failed to meet the expectations of the actual learners' themselves. Stapa & Jais (2005) examined the failure of Malaysian University courses in hotel management and tourism to meet the perceived wants and needs of the students with a lack of skills and genres covered in their courses. Therefore it is clear that needs analysis must include the students' input from the beginning of a course design. Stakeholders, institutions and employers will often perceive wants and needs differently from students.

Recently new debate has arisen as to the authenticity of materials within ESP. Although from the outset of ESP, the use of authentic materials was a fundamental concept. Authenticity was the main idea behind ESP exercise typology (Coffee, 1984). Bojovic (2006) believes that material should be authentic, up to date and relevant for the students' specializations. However, as Wang (2006, p.2) points out '*authentic materials are not automatically good materials or necessarily appropriate for learners and their specific roles.*' They can contain cultural and social knowledge which goes beyond learners' interpretation (Widdowson, 1990). Wang (2006) points out though, that authentic materials can lead to increased motivation as they have a real communicative purpose. I agree with this, authentic materials have a prominent role to play in any English classroom and especially if possible in an ESP course. Wright (1992, p.6) thinks

if the language level of the learners is low then authentic materials may have to be adapted; if their level is higher then *'the degree of authenticity becomes greater.'*

The fact that ESP should be materials driven was set out long ago by Dudley-Evan and St. John (1998). This has driven a need for instructors to evaluate their course books more closely to see just how suitable a match they are for their students.

Evaluating materials for ESP is a vital skill which as Anthony (1997a, p.3) states *'is perhaps the role that ESP practitioners have neglected most to date.'* Zhang (2007) set out a series of steps to evaluate materials used in class. Brunton (2009) evaluated a modern ESP course book designed for Hotel workers using these criteria. Ironically it is the very success of ESP that has given rise to this debate, and perhaps failure of recent ESP courses. Bookshelves are filled with a large amount of books designed for ESP students; this plethora of material thus reduces individual instructor's motivation to construct their own course content with a focus on the immediate learners' context and particular needs. Anthony (1997b, p.3) argues that *'materials writers think very carefully about the goals of learners at all stages of materials production.'* Clearly this will not happen when designing or using a generic assigned course book. Gatehouse (2001, p.10) believes that there is a value in all texts, but goes on to say that *'curricular materials will unavoidably be pieced together, some borrowed and others specially designed.'*

Anthony (1997b) had a very negative view of teaching from ESP course books believing that teachers were often slaves to the book or worse taught from textbooks which were unsuitable. Wright (1992, p.9) arguing against textbook courses says *'The scope of existing materials is often not appropriate to the needs of a particular group of trainees. Textbook courses are too broad or too narrow, too long or too short.'* However, he acknowledges that the reason for ESP courses often using textbooks is that teachers do not get paid to design their own specific materials for a specific class of students.

Toms (2004, p.3) strongly argued, especially against using a general English course book for learners with specific needs stating that the *'course book has an ancillary, if any role to play in the ESAP syllabus.'* Clearly though he is taking the narrow focus approach, which I do not agree with. Surely we would want students to be able to talk about themselves and their lives along with an ability to read and summarize academic texts? A further argument for the use of general English in conjunction with

specific English was put forward by Spack (1988) who found that academic students frequently had a problem with general English words. Finally Skehan (1998, p.260) argued that using course books goes against all notions of learning centeredness with regards to the individual stating '*the scope to adapt material to learner differences is severely constrained.*' I would argue though, that if a proper needs analysis has been carried out and students are given the chance to negotiate the curriculum with the instructor, then a good ESP instructor can indeed adapt written materials and make informed choices as to what material to include and what to leave out.

In an ideal world the instructor would have one to two hours of preparation time for every hour of teaching, this frequently does not happen, therefore textbooks are frequently a 'starting point' but not the end point when making decisions on what to teach in class.

Curriculum development is another important issue in ESP. Bloor (1998) discussed issues related to ESP design similar to the work of Dudley-Evans & St. John (1998) who set out a detailed summary of ESP course design. Richards (2001) wrote a detailed account of the history of ESP course design. Xenodohidis (2002, p.7) states that '*the goals should be realistic, otherwise the students would be de-motivated.*' Certainly having clear goals is necessary for a course. Chen (2006) stresses the importance of an identification of a 'common core' of English language needs as well as a diverse range of discourse and genres to meet 'specific' needs. However, as back as 1980 Chitravelu (1980) spoke about having a 'core' of language in an ESP course. Anthony (1997a, p. 3) thought that '*one of the main controversies in the field of ESP is how specific materials should be.*' In this context he was talking about team teaching with a general English teacher. He argued that a lack of specificity from course books leaves the instructor with no choice but to design materials that are appropriate for the students. I would argue that all course books need to be adapted to suit the learners.

Gatehouse (2001) successfully integrated general English language content and acquisition skills when developing the curriculum for language preparation for employment in the health sciences. This shows that it is possible for general English to be successfully included in an ESP course. In an ESP course for employees at the American

University of Beirut, as described by Shaaban (2005), the curriculum development and course content also focused on a common 'general' core for the learners.

It is agreed that when designing a curriculum for ESP students in the field of EOP (English for Occupational Purposes) that learning tasks and activities should have '*a high surrender value*', meaning that the students would be able to immediately use what they learned to perform their jobs more effectively (Edwards, 2000, p.292). Designing the course based around this belief increases the students' intrinsic motivation which should aid their learning (Gardner, 2000, Walqui, 2000). McCarten (2007, p.26) states '*making vocabulary personal helps to make it more memorable.*' So ESP courses can have an advantage over general English courses. Today English instructors are aware of the importance of making all tasks and activities personal, thus again the line between ESP and general English has become blurred. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) believed that all decisions as to content should be based on the learners' rationale for learning. When designing a curriculum or syllabus Johns and Evans (2001, p.117) suggest '*that the students' target English situations have identifiable elements.*' Thus once the elements have been identified the process of curriculum design can proceed. However, many ESP course today are delivered without a target situation analysis being carried out.

Dudley-Evans and St John (1998, p.171) state that materials need to be '*consistent and to have some recognizable pattern.*' This is to aid students' learning strategies (Oxford, 2000, Oxford & Crookall, 1989, Skehan, 1989). I believe that this is wise for lower level learners, but not really necessary for higher level students. Indeed intermediate and advanced students might become bored if materials are seen to be repetitive. Materials also have to have a very purpose-related orientation which Gatehouse (2001) believes is an essential component of any material designed for specific purposes. Having a clear purpose behind materials also promotes motivation (Dornyei, 2001a).

Gao (2007, p.6) sums up issues of ESP course design in her paper about an ESP course for business students in China, '*when designing an ESP course, the primary issue is the analysis of learners' specific needs. Other issues addressed include: determination of realistic goals and objectives; integration of grammatical functions and the abilities required for future workplace communication, and assessment and evaluation.*'

Today the debate is moving towards the area of negotiated syllabi, if learners' can state their wants and needs, then surely they can also help design their own courses? As Kaur (2007, p.9) says, '*When ESP learners take some responsibility for their own learning and are invited to negotiate some aspects of the course design.....they feel motivated to become more involved in their learning...*' I agree with Kaur's comments. However, Skehan (1998, p.262) discusses the process approach toward course design and warns against negotiated syllabi if the learners do not know how to be '*effective learners*.' I think this is ignoring the positive points that arise from giving students' choices. An instructor can also have the final say in a negotiated syllabus if student choices are detrimental to their own learning.

Williams and Burden (1997) set out a list of learning strategies and skills that teachers should develop in students' to enable autonomous and more independent learning to take place. Thus an instructor can work with the students not just on language skills but simultaneously with learning skills and strategies (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Dudley-Evans, 1997; Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Douglas, 2000).

It should not be forgotten though that even a successfully designed ESP course may have a mismatch between skills. As Ping and Gu (2004) found out on researching a technical communication course in China, in their summary they found that students technical reading and writing skills had increased but their ability in speaking had not. I would argue that time may have been a constraint in the course and the instructor most likely chose to focus on reading and writing.

Finally we should not forget the role of the instructor in an ESP course. Swales (1985, p.214) commented on a lack of '*specialized teacher-training*' within ESP. Some 25 years later the same situation still applies. Many instructors, who have taught ESP courses including myself, have received no special ESP teacher training. This lack of special training may impact on the effectiveness of instruction.

Another area of constant debate has been whether a true specialist in the field is better equipped to teach an ESP course. In a paper on teaching a medical science course Maleki (2008) found that student satisfaction was far higher with the TEFL teacher's class than the GP's (General Practitioner) class. This goes some way in showing that a greater awareness of teaching methodology is more important than a wide range of

knowledge in a specialist field. Zoumana (2007) however, conducted a study on pre-service ESP teacher training and thought that a basic knowledge in the technical field is required to make an ESP teacher operational. I would support Maleki's findings more, in my experience of teaching ESP courses a lack of specialist technical knowledge was rarely of issue. If an instructor does find they lack technical knowledge then they can elicit said information from students or stakeholders involved.

As Robinson (1991) asserts, an ESP teacher or instructor should be flexible, and in my own opinion any EFL teacher should welcome the opportunity to teach an ESP course as a chance to perhaps learn something new and increase their own knowledge span. In Qatar, the researcher was given a large technical science book to be used for instruction in the class. This then became a weekly lesson in the sciences for the instructor as well as the students. Maleki (2008) finishes his paper with a controversial statement that specialists wishing to teach English gain necessary teaching qualifications, I do not believe that this is necessary but attending a short four week teacher training course (i.e.: TEFL, TESL, CELTA) would be of great benefit.

Scrivener's (2005, p.324) comments on what an ESP course means for teachers might seem overly simplistic to ESP experts but I believe the advice is good. *'Go on teaching all the normal English you already teach in all the ways you know how to do already, but use lexis, examples, topics and contexts that are, as far as possible, relevant to the students and practice relevant specific skills.'*

In conclusion to illustrate the complex interaction of factors involved in ESP and ESP courses I have drawn a picture of the different factors and liken it to a juggling act (Figure 1).

The ESP Juggling Act




Figure 1. The ESP juggling Act.

As can be seen an ESP course involves juggling a lot of factors, therefore in my study I do not set out impose a panacea to the difficulties of ESP course design. Indeed many of the factors in Figure 1 are relevant to general English courses as well. Figure 1 is a summation of the factors discussed in the literature review. It is obvious that all courses by necessity have to include a number of factors and that those factors can exert positive or negative pressure on others.

Thus if time is of the essence, then a narrow focused approach may be necessary. If money is tight a generic textbook will be used. If stakeholders' and students' perceived wants are opposite to the instructor's then negotiation will have to take place as to the course content and syllabi. Is the textbook suitable or do authentic materials have to be introduced? Will the syllabi be negotiated fully or partly? Is empowerment an issue and more importantly does the instructor believe it to be important and if so how would this change course design? I will use these factors and the figure when discussing the results of my research.

In this review it can be seen that the distinction between ESP and general English is fuzzy and lacks clarity. As English teaching throughout the world becomes increasingly professional and highly organized and as learners' and stakeholders' needs are met, differences between the two EFL branches will decrease sometimes to the point of touching. Figure 1 shows the main factors involved with ESP courses but shows that the majority of these factors also have relevance for general English courses as well.

The main distinguishing point between many ESP and general EFL textbooks is that the ESP book will mainly stick to one area or context whereas general English books will set out their lessons within a variety of contexts or situations. One could almost argue that any so-called ESP course that proceeds using a generic textbook is similar to a general English course, and that it is only custom-made, designed and delivered courses using authentic materials delivered by an experienced practitioner or instructor that is true 'ESP'.

It has become clear in this review that ESP courses have fractured and sub-divided, today you have 'general' ESP courses, where a teacher is given a course book 'BANKING 101 – Intermediate Communication Skills' and told to teach a diverse group of banking employees. No needs analysis has been or will be carried out, no real target situation analysis has been done and there will be no real evaluation of the course at the end of the teaching cycle. Personally I have had experience of this type of ESP course.

At the other end of the spectrum you have highly professional ESP courses custom designed to a select group of employees. I would argue it is only this type of course that can truly call itself ESP. Perchance it is time to add a new acronym to the already bewildering list of terms in the literature and profession. GESP (General English for

Specific Purposes), perhaps ultimately it is up to the lowly instructor to decide on what end of the spectrum his or her course will be?

As we enter the next decade it can be seen from this discussion that ESP continues to evolve along several distinct paths. All these branches however, share something in common; an increasing focus on learners, not just their immediate wants and needs but future wants and needs as well. A move toward negotiated or process orientated syllabi with students' actively involved with their courses. A continued focus on individual learning, learner centeredness, and learner autonomy. A move away from ESP course books towards a more eclectic approach to materials, with an emphasis on careful selection of materials to meet learners' wants and needs. A continued high-emphasis on target situation analysis, deficiency analysis, and needs analysis, and following the course delivery a more objective approach to evaluation and assessment of the course (Graves, 2000).

Certain aspects of ESP continue to have debate, as to best teaching practice, for instance whether the course should be narrowly focused, just on immediate students needs. What could be termed a restrictive syllabi or a broader focus that also teaches skills and situations and hence vocabulary and grammar outside of the needs analysis. It is also open for debate whether students should be allowed to choose (if they have a choice) the narrow focus approach. On paper it might seem like a worthwhile approach but I would argue it does not empower learners' and rewards them for sticking to '*what they know best*'. Thus even in a negotiated syllabus, it is the teacher's choice to broaden the English skills and abilities of the students' beyond what they or involved stakeholders feel is necessary for them.

ESP is today more vibrant than ever with a bewildering number of terms created to fit the increasing range of occupations that have taken shelter under the ESP umbrella. It seems with increasing globalization and mobility of the world's workforce that the demand for specific courses will not decrease but only rise. As newer emergent economic powers arise e.g. India, Dubai, Qatar, Malaysia, and Eastern Europe this will fuel demand for worker's to have good command of English for their workplace. Perhaps stakeholders and learners also realize that English can be used for social purposes, as a means of

empowerment and self-expression and not restrict themselves too narrowly to just a few target situations.

Motivation and Attitudes

The motivation to learn or study an L2 (second language) has long been recognized as an important attribute for successful learning (Dornyei, 1998; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 2000).

The Cambridge Dictionary Online (2009) defines motivation as '*enthusiasm, need or reason for doing something.*' According to Dornyei (2001a, p.9) '*early theories of motivation were strongly influenced*' by the Austrian psychiatrist Freud. Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of human needs also influenced early research in motivation.

He proposed there were five classes of needs starting from the most basic, and as each need was met, the individual would then focus on obtaining the next need on the list. The list in order from most basic to the most advanced was; physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. What is remarkable is that even today we can place reasons and motivation for studying an L2 in all these positions. Personally, I find myself motivated to learn the Korean language better as a result of love and esteem.

According to Deci and Ryan (2000) motivation is a set of behaviors that will bring about desired outcomes or goals. Motivation or the student's attitude plays a key component to successful L2 acquisition. In my eight years' experience of classroom EFL teaching; motivated students frequently outperform less motivated students, regardless of potential aptitude or intelligence. Motivation however, is an extremely complicated area to research.

Harris (2007, p.1) points out that '*most people define motivation based on their own personal feelings.*' Personal feelings are very often hard to quantify. This then makes a lot of research in the area questionable. We have to assume that students know themselves well enough to define and quantify their own motivation. Furthermore, Dornyei (2000) thinks because there are so many meanings no one seems able to define it adequately.

Marchese (1997), believes motivation, like learning is complex because it requires the understanding of a whole person and whole brain activity, and therefore can not fit

into set categories. Indeed it is so complicated that it is necessary to breakdown motivating factors within the individual. In addition, it is also necessary to accept different theories of motivation as many have valid and relevant views. Ryan and Deci (2000) believe that motivation does not act as a single unit. There are different amounts and different kinds of motivation. I agree with their view, what motivates us if we accept Maslow's hierarchy of human needs is an ever increasing set of wants and needs, which if we believe in the famous rule of economics, can never be fully obtained.

I am sure we have all met the extremely successful second language learner who on appearance seems to be near fluent, yet they are frustrated with their own English abilities. This is a clear example of self-actualization, where the motivation to become even better at English comes from within the learner. Modern global society would accept them as near flawless English speakers, perhaps with abilities and vocabulary beyond that of certain native English speakers; therefore they are evidence of intrinsic motivation to learn (see below) at its most extreme form. As any language is '*so vast and complicated that it is literally impossible to master it completely*' (Wright, 1992, p.2).

What further complicates a discussion on motivation for the language learner is that motivation is never a constant. Dornyei and Otto (1999, p.1) say it is not a '*static state but rather a dynamically evolving and changing entity, associated with an ongoing process in time.*' It clearly can and does change over time.

It can also change or be affected due to a myriad of factors including learning history (Ushioda, 1998; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003), peers (Wentzel, 1998), social class (Hawkins, 1972), parents (Gardner, 1985), the location of the student (Hawkins, 1972), the student's culture (Jin and Cortazzi 1998; Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000; Kramersch, 2001; Olshtain et al, 1990), student autonomy (Garcia & Pintrich, 1996), the teacher (Breen & Mann, 1997; Noels et al. 1999; Dornyei, 2001), the materials (Nunan, 1997; Brown, 2001), tasks and activities (Cheah, 2003; Dornyei, 2003; Ellis, 2003; Harmer, 2006), physical setting of the classroom (Harmer, 2006), group interaction (Clement et al. 1994; Smith, 2001; Dornyei & Murphey, 2003), external rewards (Koestner & McClelland, 1990; Dornyei, 2001; Katsara, 2008), the social context (Krashen, 1977; Dornyei, 1996), age (Long, 2005), hobbies and social activities (Lam & Kramersch, 2002), the day, the month, the weather, and the list goes on.

Also at this point I want to state that motivation can also change due to our physical condition. The link between body and mind has long been accepted. Therefore if our bodies are tired or sick our level of mental energy and thus motivation will change. This is one area of research that has not been looked at closely, but clearly from long experience of teaching exhausted Korean High school students (and elementary) who have come from a ten hour day at school to a private institution to learn English for three more hours, it was their physical condition which underpinned the lack of motivation which was sometimes apparent in the classroom. Body rhythms or bio-cycles may also affect motivation, for example people who are active in the morning (morning larks) may have differing levels and times of motivation to those who are most active in the evening or nighttime (night owls). Thus people should try to study at the time when their own levels of energy are highest and avoid times when energy or mental activity is low.

De-motivated students can change their attitudes, for example in Lam & Kramersch (2002), Almon, a young Hong Kong immigrant to California was de-motivated to learn English at high school for a number of reasons, however his social interactions on the internet led him to change his attitudes and become motivated for communicative purposes and this resulted in a new motivation to learn and do better in his school studies. This supports theories of discourse (Hatch, 1983) that argue that interaction is vitally important for L2 learning.

Clearly then if motivation is capricious, if it never stands still, even for a moment researchers will always be left with an incomplete picture. As Dornyei (2001a, p.2) says '*motivation is one of the most elusive concepts in the whole domain of the social sciences.*' He also comments on the current state of motivational research (Dornyei, 2001a, p.2), '*contemporary motivational psychology is characterized by a confusing plethora of competing theories with little consensus and much disagreement among researchers.*' I would disagree with him, on this point, because if we look at L2 motivation theories, many contain in essence the same beliefs, and often it is the terminology that is different. For example Gardner & Lambert's (1972) view of instrumental motivation has parallels with Deci & Ryan's (1985) extrinsic view of motivation. Intrinsic motivation has similarities with integrative motivation.

Calvin (1991, p.1) links motivation directly with needs and attitudes and notes that while researchers try to identify main components of motivation, '*teachers are mainly concerned about their students' attitudes towards and interests in language learning.*' I agree with Calvin that an instructor's interest in motivation should lie directly with students' attitudes and should also be focused on knowing an individual's needs as well as the class needs and overall goals. For example a less successful learner may have had classroom instruction with limited communicative practice which affects motivation (Cook et al, 1979). Presenting quality activities can '*make an enormous difference in students' attitudes toward learning*' (Dornyei, 2003, p.14). Already we can see a strong link between attitudes and motivation.

Motivation therefore is strongly linked with needs analysis and learner centeredness (Liuoliene & Metiuniene, 2006), and current theories of motivation strongly support the view that it is equally as important to success in language learning as aptitude or intelligence. In a meta-analysis of 75 motivation studies, Masgoret and Gardner (2003, p.205) concluded that '*motivation is more highly related to second language achievement*' than other factors.

Harris (2007, p.1) believes 'motivation' to be an umbrella term and lists a series of '*components of motivation such as intrinsic, extrinsic, self-determination, attainment value, goal theories, affective factors, learner autonomy, valence, expectancy value, to name but a few.*' This list illustrates the confusing number of terms that exists in the field today. Brown (2001) also further suggests that language ego, self-confidence and self-esteem are all components of motivation factors.

Perhaps I should set down in a study of motivation, what researchers do seem all to agree upon. Motivation is concerned with the '*direction*' and '*magnitude*' of human behavior (Dornyei 2001a, p.7), which includes:

- 1) the *choice* of a particular action – why we do it.
- 2) the *persistence* with it – how long we will do it.

3) the *effort* expended on it – how hard we are going to try and do it.

(Dornyei 2001a, p.8)

Another prominent motivational theory in L2 learning is the Self-Determination Theory proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985). They described motivation as either intrinsic or extrinsic; they also added that people will be more self-determined if they experience autonomy, competence and relatedness. Ryan and Deci describe intrinsic motivation as '*doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable*' and extrinsic motivation as '*doing something because it leads to a separable outcome*' (2000, p.55). The main point of separation is that intrinsic motivation comes from within the person; they want to study English or an L2 for themselves, for example to watch English movies, or speak English abroad when traveling. Extrinsic motivation comes from the outside environment and can include the need to pass exams, or to please parents and teachers. However, I should say that often motivation is on a point in a line between these two extremes. Where a motivation is placed on this line is dependent on how '*internalized*' the form of motivation is and '*...how much the regulation has been transferred from outside to inside the individual*' (Dornyei, 2001a, p.47).

Most researchers also seem to agree that intrinsic motivation is considered better than extrinsic motivation (Walqui, 2000), especially for long term motivation and behavioral changes which are important for language acquisition. Douglas Brown (1981, 1990, and 2001) is one of the main proponents of emphasizing the importance of intrinsic motivation in the L2 classroom and he offers a number of strategies on how to achieve this. If the learner wants or expects to communicate in English they will develop greater proficiency (Csizer & Dornyei, 2005). This is a key factor in the success of ESP courses.

According to Dornyei and Otto's (1999) process model of learning motivation, the motivation process can be divided into three phases: preactional, actional and postactional. A person or learner may go from one stage to another depending on their level of motivation (Dornyei 2001a). Today this cyclical nature of motivation is agreed upon by researchers. We all experience differing levels of motivation for example at work, in relationships, and in our own personal fitness, thus learners will experience the same with their language studies. It is thus up to the teacher to provide stimuli which

continue to create a positive cycle of motivation and avoid de-motivating factors which can negatively affect L2 acquisition.

A teacher can promote positive factors by addressing students' needs (Liuoliene & Metiuniene, 2006), reducing anxiety (Horwitz, 1986; Oxford & Shearin, 1996; Saito, Horwitz & Garza, 1999) which affects motivation, enabling cooperative learning (Crandall, 1999, Chen, 2005) and promoting learner autonomy (Knowles, 1995; Nunan, 1998; Dornyei, 2001a).

Autonomy was found to be *'more closely related to motivational factors than to performance and...seem(s) to foster intrinsic goal orientation, task value, and self-efficacy, all of which are critical components of 'continuing motivation''* (Garcia & Pintrich, 1996, p.477).

Although some research has shown that Asian students do not respond well to learner autonomy ((Pennycook, 1997; Sinclair, 1997), I would argue it is then the instructor's responsibility to change those attitudes which may well have been a result of traditional style teaching (teacher speaks and students' listen) imposed on students from middle and high school education.

Creating learner autonomy within the individual relies heavily on individual self-motivation. Bandura's (1977) notion of self-efficacy, a person's belief in their own capabilities, has been expanded greatly (Cotterall, 1999a, 1999b; Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003) to include learning strategies for self-motivation, such as *'allowing students to create finished products that they can perform or display...and...taking stock from time to time of their general progress'* (Dornyei, 2001, p.136). Learning strategies and styles are important factors of motivation. Indeed I have vowed never to ignore the importance of making students aware of their own learning strategies and how awareness of them can lead them to become better L2 learners.

As my research is focused on student attitudes I should mention that social psychology believes *'that attitudes exert a directive influence on behavior since someone's attitude towards a target influences the overall pattern of the person's responses to the target.'* (Dornyei, 2001a, p.29). Clearly then a student's attitudes towards a course of study directly relates to the amount of motivation they will experience (Yang & Lau, 2003). Rubin & Thompson (1982, p.6) state that *'positive*

attitudes usually help learners to maintain their interest long enough to achieve language mastery.' This statement is perhaps overly optimistic, and proficiency would better replace mastery.

Today classroom instructors' accept that students have their own individual learning styles and they will vary in their attitudes toward learning in general (Deci & Flaste, 1995; Dornyei, 2005; Skehan, 1989). Attitude affects levels of motivation and can make long term differences in a student's academic career.

For example, compulsory readings and memorization of terms versus classroom involvement and social interaction can influence a learner's attitude. Students' motivation may change depending on what English skill is being studied (Grabe & Stoller, 2001). Indeed I would argue that attitude is a component of motivation and language learning equally as important for example as aptitude. Therefore I disagree with Skehan's (1989) belief that aptitude is the foremost factor for success in L2 acquisition. Noels et al (2000) support my view. Krashen (1981) in addition believed that attitudinal and motivational factors are more important than aptitude.

Behaviorists' define motivation as the anticipation of rewards, and obtaining rewards further serves to reinforce the behavior (Brown, 2001). In Skinner's (1974) text he proposed the theory that human beings, like other animals, will try hard to complete a task with the anticipation of getting rewards. When the subjects are rewarded, the particular behavior will then be reinforced, thus causing the behavior to persist. Behavioral theory has solid grounding however; today cognitive theories of motivation have overtaken this earlier and more basic theory (Dornyei, 2001a).

Keller (1983, p.389) defined motivation as the '*choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect*'. In his Motivational Design Model (Keller, 1983, p.395), he proposed that the four categories of motivational conditions are what instructional designers should take into account to make English instruction interesting, meaningful and challenging; in other words, the English instructor has to pay attention to:

- 1) Interest (Attention): is the learners' curiosity aroused?
- 2) Relevance: is the desired goal of the learner perceived to be related to the instruction.

3) Expectancy (confidence): the learners' perceived likelihood of success.

4) Satisfaction (outcome): do extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation meet the learners' anticipations?

I judge that Keller's model has real practical implications for English instruction.

No review of literature on second language learning motivation is complete without reference to the Canadian psychologist, Gardner. He contributed hugely to and has and continues to inspire a large number of studies related to this field. Gardner worked mainly in the field of Canadian education.

A dichotomous model featuring instrumental and integrative orientation was proposed by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972). Integrative orientation is identified with an individual's desire for cultural and/or linguistic integration. Dornyei and Clement (2000) cited in Dornyei (2001a) found integrativeness to be the most powerful general component determining the general level of effort students intended to invest in the learning process. Instrumental orientation refers to learning the language for an instrumental purpose, such as getting a better job, earning more money or passing an examination. Clearly I believe, there are parallels between integrative and intrinsic motivation and instrumental and extrinsic motivation.

According to Gardner (1982, 1985), motivation is the combination of effort and desire needed to achieve the goal of learning a language and favorable attitudes toward learning it. He also pointed out that motivation to learn a second or foreign language is as important as language aptitude in order to acquire that language successfully. In his study he put forward 3 components of motivation: motivational intensity, desire to learn the language, and attitudes towards learning the language.

In his model he also included attitudes towards the learning situation as a factor of motivation. He argued that the truly motivated individual displays all 3 components. Orientation is another concept which he proposed, which is somewhat different from motivation. In Gardner and Tremblay (1994), orientation is a class of reasons for studying a language, while motivation is the directed and continually reinforcing effort one makes to learn the language. Motivation could be seen as goal directed and orientation as a construct explaining why a learner has the goal.

The well-known instrument used to measure the language learning motivation, the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), was developed by Gardner and Lambert in 1959. In 1975, Gardner and Smythe redeveloped the test, which has become a popular instrument used in studying second language motivation. Also Gardner and MacIntyre's (1993) socio-educational model of second language acquisition is a useful tool for educators to look at factors of L2 acquisition when considering students.

However, since 1990, second and foreign language researchers have begun to challenge Gardner's theory and have tried to develop other theories of language learning and motivation (Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1994; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). In response to this criticism an extended L2 motivation construct was developed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995).

Oxford and Shearin (1994) following on from the work of others analyzed a total of 12 motivational theories or models, including those from socio-psychology, cognitive development, and socio-cultural psychology, and identified six factors that impact motivation in language learning:

- 1) attitudes (i.e., sentiments toward the learning community and the target language)
- 2) beliefs about self (i.e., expectancies about ones attitudes to succeed, self-efficacy, and anxiety)
- 3) goals (perceived clarity and relevance of learning goals as reasons for learning)
- 4) involvement (i.e., extent to which the learner actively and consciously participates in the language learning process)
- 5) environmental support (i.e., extent of teacher and peer support, and the integration of cultural and outside-of-class support into learning experience)
- 6) personal attributes (i.e., aptitude, age, sex, and previous language learning experience).

I think that their work also has real practical implications for the instructor. As their work contains much of the research from other studies, in essence it is a list of factors which play an important role in classroom motivation. It has become clear that although there are a number of competing theories and conflicting research into motivation and language learning all these theories share some or all of the factors above. Therefore if language instructors are aware of these factors, they can adapt or change materials, methodology, tasks, activities, learner beliefs, and learner strategies to achieve greater motivation amongst their students. It is clear that students' attitudes are closely linked with motivation, and that motivation plays a prominent part in successful L2 acquisition. I hope my research into students' attitudes in an ESP course will inform stakeholders and instructors as to whether to include general English in their courses, taking into account student motivation and their attitudes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This introduces the methodology of this investigation into student attitudes towards an English course at a five-star hotel in Chiang Mai, Thailand. The investigation involved 10 Thai hotel employees and an instructor. The approach to this investigation was qualitative. One form of qualitative study is the case study. Merriam (1988, p.27) describes a case study as an '*intense, holistic description and analysis of single instance, phenomenon, or social unit.*' This study is intensive as it studies students' attitudes over a period of time, from pre-course to end of course with additional questionnaires collected in between. The instructor also noted down participants' comments and behavior during the course of study to further add to the data supplied by the participants. The participants also had one on one interviews with the instructor. Finally the training manager of the hotel was also interviewed to complete the teaching triangle within normal ESP courses of Students-Instructor-Stakeholder. Below is an explanation and description of the methodology, beginning with participants. The data collection instruments and data analysis are also described.

Participants

In this case study, a group of employees from a five-star hotel in Chiang Mai, Thailand were taught. The participants were given a personal set of questions to fill in to obtain data and background information for the instructor. The number of participants in the study was ten. The group consisted of nearly equal amounts of males and females. There were six males and four females on the course. Their age range was between 24-28 years of age. This sample is I believe fairly typical of participants in many ESP courses, namely younger employees who need English training for their work or occupations.

Instruments

To ensure validity and reliability of results there were several methods of gathering data. This triangulation of data and means of acquisition gave the researcher a large amount of information.

1) Before the course started the participants were given a small Perceived Needs Analysis to complete.

This Needs Analysis (NA) was designed to find out participants' attitudes toward the course, and the two components ESP and general English. It also asked them questions on their perceived wants. They were asked to rate 13 statements using a Likert scale. The results were examined and compared with the final questionnaire given at the end of the course and the final class discussion.

2) Every two weeks there was a class questionnaire on the course.

This short questionnaire was used to gauge participants' attitudes towards the class they had studied, as each class focused entirely on one component; that is one class was taught using either the general English material or the hotel English material, the results were used to compare the two components. There were 15 statements assessed by the participants using a Likert scale. It was decided to give out these class questionnaires every two weeks to avoid participant fatigue in answering the questions.

3) After each class there were open-ended questions to answer in the form of an open class discussion. These questions were asked by the instructor with participants answered recorded in the teacher's diary. To alleviate participant fatigue from questionnaires it was decided to hold an informal conversation with participants about the classes and course using the open ended questions as a springboard for discussion.

4) During and after the class, the instructor kept a teaching diary with notes and observations. These notes were based on fact, the participants recorded comments and also the instructor's perceptions on what he saw and heard.

Participants' comments were noted down here especially regarding their attitudes as to the syllabus and classes. Also participants' performance of tasks and activities were noted. During informal discussions the teacher took notes on what the participants said

5) At the end of the teaching schedule in week eight, there was an extended class for completion of the final questionnaire.

6) The training manager of the hotel was interviewed and recorded and the results written up, this was to examine the stake holder's feelings toward the teaching of general English.

Data Collection Procedures

Data was gathered after each of the 16: 1 ? hour classes. After each class there was an open ended discussion of the class about what was taught and practiced in class. There was a period of 15 minutes devoted to the open-ended discussion questions and completion of class questionnaires. The teacher noted down participants' comments in the teacher's diary. Every second week the participants also filled out the class questionnaire. Participants were also encouraged to talk about or give their feelings on the class, especially with regard to affective feelings, motivation and enjoyment. As the data collected was mainly in the form of participants' speech and the teacher's note taking data was assessed by qualitative means.

The first classes started at the beginning of May, 2009 and concluded at the end of June, 2009. There were 16 taught sessions, consisting of 12 hours English for Specific Purposes and 12 hours of English for General Purposes. The final class on the 26th of June also included an analysis and feedback of the whole course. Participants carried out an extended final questionnaire at this class relating to the previous 8 weeks of classes.

The course was taught using two textbooks. A general English component taught using material from a general English Pre-intermediate textbook 'Straightforward'. An English for Specific Purposes component taught using units from a Pre-intermediate Hotel and Catering textbook 'Highly Recommended'. Additional warm-up and other materials were supplied by the instructor. The course content was negotiated, with the participants deciding what units from each book they would like to study during the eight weeks. The final choice of units studied was decided by the instructor based upon the student's input. Eight units were covered from the ESP book and eight sections from the general English book in the time available for study.

Classes took place in the training room of a five-star hotel. The training room was adequately equipped with a whiteboard and was large enough to teach communicative classes. That is, there was room for all types of activities, pair work, group work and mingling. The classroom layout was horseshoe style which has been shown to be effective in communicative and modern language teaching (Harmer, 2006; Scrivener, 2005).

RESEARCH RESULTS

In this section the data collected from the instruments is discussed. First of all there is a discussion of the results of the perceived needs analysis. Then there is a discussion of the final class questionnaire. Then there are conclusions to the study and implications for future ESP courses. There are also suggestions for further research. Lastly there are my final comments of the research.

Students' Perceived Needs Analysis Results

As was discussed in the instrument section, before the actual period of instruction started a small perceived Needs Analysis (NA) questionnaire was handed out to the participants (Appendix B). They were required to answer 13 items using a Likert scale. The format of each item was presented in typical fashion using five ordered response levels. Namely:

- 1) Strongly agree
- 2) Agree
- 3) No opinion
- 4) Disagree
- 5) Disagree strongly

The rationale behind giving out the NA to the participants was that indisputably NA is vital in the modern communicative classroom. An NA helps the instructor before the course starts by giving information about the students' perceived wants and needs. The instructor of course can choose to take these into account or ignore them. Much has been written about the importance of NA especially in ESP (see literature review).

My study was motivated by evidence that a proper NA of ESP students was frequently not carried out by stakeholders and instructors (Wright, 1992; Jasso-Aguilar, 1999; Kaur, 2007). I have also been employed to teach 'ESP' courses where there was no evidence of an NA having been carried out. This lack of preparation can lead to disagreement amongst the teaching triangle of students, stakeholders and instructor as to

how effective a course was. It can also result in a lot of time, money, and energy being wasted for little purpose (Wright, 1992), which is in the interest of no one.

I will now outline the results of the student's perceived NA. It should be noted that the training manager of the hotel translated all items into Thai, to avoid problems of miscommunication. The training manager's level of English is high, so I am confident she translated the statements well. Participants were also told all individual answers were confidential and would not be disclosed to anyone. It was further stressed that participants answer as honestly as possible to avoid acquiescence bias.

Item 1: I need to learn more hotel vocabulary.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | I need to learn more hotel vocabulary. | 6 | 4 | | | |

The participants responded favorably to this statement with six strongly agreeing and four agreeing, therefore it is fair to say that the participants' attitudes towards hotel English is positive and they do feel that they can benefit from further instruction in this area. It also shows that the participants value their jobs and careers enough to learn more vocabulary even if they have mastered functional language needed for their day-to-day jobs.

Item 2: I need to practice hotel role plays to become better at conversation.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|---|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 2 | I need to practice hotel role plays to become better at conversation. | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | |

This item showed more variation than item 1, showing that indeed some participants felt they did not really need hotel role plays (2 had no opinion and 1 disagreed) and perhaps felt that typical hotel role plays were of limited usefulness in

normal social conversation. This then shows that participants realize that hotel role plays are for a limited target situation and especially if not designed specifically for their job roles are not so useful. For example the negative answers were likely to have been given by the Audio/Visual staff.

Item 3: I want to learn general English for myself.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|---|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 3 | I want to learn general English for myself. | 3 | 6 | | 1 | |

This item had similar results to item 1, in that three strongly agreed and six agreed. It does appear at this stage that the participants' perceive they need hotel English more than general English. One participant even disagreed that they wanted general English. However, the results were still positive for the belief that participants view general English as a positive factor for their lives. It also supports the premise that it is wise to include general English in a course.

Item 4: I need general English to improve my spoken grammar.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 4 | I need general English to improve my spoken grammar. | 5 | 4 | 1 | | |

Again it appears that participants' value the teaching of general English with regards to their linguistic competence. Clearly ESP courses do not focus usually on grammar, a point made in the literature review. Therefore, it is further evidence to support including general English within an ESP course. Of course it could also be seen as evidence that the participants felt that their spoken grammar needed improving and not necessarily by just general English. Clearly there is practice of correct grammatical structures within ESP as well.

Items 5 and 6: The materials I need to study are general English. The materials I need to study are hotel English.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 5 | The materials I need to study are general English. | 3 | 6 | 1 | | |
| 6 | The materials I need to study are Hotel English. | 3 | 5 | 2 | | |

The response to these items clearly held no bias towards hotel or general English. It should be mentioned at this point that the participants may also be displaying acquiescence bias which is a common distortion when using Likert scales. However, the results still show the perceived need for general English is at least as strong as the need for hotel English. This may or may not surprise stakeholders. The training management at the hotel had a distinct bias towards hotel English; viewing the teaching of general English in the course as superfluous to their perceived needs (see later).

Item 7: I want the class to focus 50% on hotel English and 50% on general English.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 7 | I want the class to focus 50% on Hotel English and 50% on general English. | 6 | 4 | | | |

All the participants' showed a positive response to this item, again supporting the use of the general English component alongside the specific English hotel component. This supports the results from items 3-6.

Items 8 and 9: Learning general English will help me more in my life. Learning hotel English will help me more in my life.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 8 | Learning general English will help me more in my life. | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| 9 | Learning Hotel English will help me more in my life. | 3 | 5 | 2 | | |

This item was included to see if participants' thought that general English was of more use in their lives and is similar to item 3. The results are not as positive as item 3, perhaps because the participants' view their current jobs as integral part of their lives and hence perceive a contradiction between supporting one component more than another. It can be perceived that there is a slight acknowledgment in favor of general English versus hotel English. Also some participants' might view 'life' as synonymous with work. Although I believe there is a distinction.

Item 10: I want to learn about topics in English outside of the hotel situation.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|---|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 10 | I want to learn about topics in English outside of the Hotel situation. | 3 | 4 | 3 | | |

If a target situation analysis (TSA) has been correctly carried out by textbook designers then a hotel textbook would concentrate mainly on target situations within the framework of the hotel. Therefore the participants will not encounter topics outside of the hotel in an ESP hotel textbook. So I included this item to see if the participants' were interested in studying topics not related to hotels. The results were favorable although it

can be seen that three participants had no opinion. Clearly the general English component will introduce topics outside of the hotel situation.

Item 11: I want this class to enable me to speak about myself in English.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|---|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 11 | I want this course to enable me to speak about myself in English. | 6 | 4 | | | |

This item was included as it strongly supports the use of general English and issues of empowerment; namely are participants' able to talk about themselves. Clearly the results back the use of general English. One of the main differences between ESP and general English is that general English often uses the self as a springboard for discussion and communicative purposes in the classroom. So I view these 10 positive results as evidence strongly in favor of including the general English component.

Item 12: This class will match the hotels wants.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 12 | This course will match the hotels wants. | 4 | 3 | 3 | | |

It was interesting to see that three respondents had no opinion on this item. I included the statement because I wanted to see if participants' realized that teaching a course with a general English component may not be what the hotel management wanted or perceived to be necessary. Therefore there is some evidence that participants' realize this.

Item 13: I will like the hotel English classes more than the general English.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 13 | I will like the Hotel English classes more than general English. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |

I was relieved to see that the response to this item was not at all positive and this reduces the evidence for acquiescence bias which I mentioned earlier. Indeed the results show a fairly even distribution with no clear opinion as to whether hotel classes will be liked more than the general English classes.

I believe that the results of the students' perceived needs analysis fully support integrating a general English component within an ESP course. The participants' showed no clear bias toward hotel English despite their employment in the hospitality sector. Furthermore they expressed a desire to study about topics outside of the hotel situation and to be able to speak about themselves as individuals; clearly this would not happen during a normal hotel focused ESP course.

The participants also realized that general English materials often focus on teaching grammar, more directly than in ESP materials and that grammar instruction will improve their speaking competence in English.

As a simple NA, I felt that it performed adequately. Clearly, the general positive responses and for example the results of items 5 and 6 seem to contradict themselves. However, this may be because the participants' view hotel English as important for their present lives and jobs, and view general English as important for personal growth, communicating with guests day to day and being able to express themselves better.

Results of the Final Class Questionnaire

Following is a review of the results from the final class questionnaire. I expected these results to bare a striking similarity with the class questionnaires, as the questionnaires are very similar, indeed if the results had been much different I would have been surprised. Hotel classes are in bold parentheses.

| No | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | No opinion | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|----|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | These classes were fun and enjoyable (motivating). | (4) 4 | (4) 4 | (1) 1 | | |

Item one results were exactly the same for both general and hotel English. One reason for this may have been that the style of instruction and teaching methodology was the same for both components.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|------------|---|--|
| 2 | These classes helped my English speaking skills. | (5) 3 | (3) 5 | (1) | 1 | |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|------------|---|--|

Item two again showed a slight advantage for hotel English, as I have said previously, the general English classes practiced all four skills with the hotel English classes focusing usually on just two (listening and speaking).

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| 3 | I can now speak to hotel guests more easily in English. | (5) 2 | (3) 5 | (1) 1 | 1 | |
| 4 | I can speak to anyone more easily in English. | (4) 4 | (4) 3 | (1) 2 | | |
| 5 | The materials helped me to speak more English. | (5) 4 | (3) 4 | (1) | 1 | |

Items three, four, and five again showed the participants' thought the hotel English classes helped their English speaking skills more. This was true to the extent that they practiced speaking activities more in the hotel classes.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| 6 | The materials were too easy. | (3) | (3) | (2) | (1) | |
| 6 | The materials were too hard. | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |

Item six was worded differently for the components. For general English the researcher asked if the materials were too hard. Three participants thought so. As I have said this might be due to the longer readings and more complex vocabulary items. Most of the participants' thought the hotel English classes were easy. The results indicate that the hotel English classes were perceived to be easier.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 7 | The grammar used in the lessons was familiar and easy. | (5) 5 | (2) 2 | (1) 1 | (1) 1 | |
|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|

However, in item seven the results were the same with the participants thinking the grammar was easy with only two participants not having a positive response.

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|-------|-------|-----|--|
| 8 | I would like to study more hotel/general English | (4) 4 | (3) 4 | (2) 1 | | |
| 9 | I now want to study hotel/general English more at home. | (4) 3 | (3) 4 | (2) 2 | | |
| 10 | These classes gave me a wider choice of topics to discuss. | (2) 5 | (4) 2 | (2) 2 | (1) | |
| 11 | The classes were good for my job. | (5) 3 | (3) 3 | (1) 2 | 1 | |

Items eight and nine again showed no clear distinction between hotel and general English. The participants again thought the general English component gave them a wider range of topics to discuss in item 10. Also once more the hotel classes were viewed as good for their jobs.

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| 12 | Hotel English is better than General English for me. | (2) | (2) | (5) | | |
| 12 | General English classes were better than Hotel English | 4 | 3 | 2 | | |

Item 12 was of note in that seven participants' thought the general English classes were better than the hotel English classes. Only four said the same for the hotel classes, so again a slight advantage for the general English classes. There is also the possibility that one of the Audio/Visual employees rated general English classes negatively because of his English level (they were harder to study because of numerous new language items).

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 13 | These classes matched my wants and needs. | (3) 5 | (4) 2 | (1) 1 | (1) 1 | |
|----|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|

Finally item 13 showed no advantage with seven positive responses for both hotel and general English components.

Again these results were in line with the previous questionnaires and support the view that the participants perceived no real difference between classes individually or as a whole. It seems that the participants' perceived general English to be more interesting but harder than hotel English with hotel English being perceived as better for their speaking skills.

The Interview with the Training Manager

The training manager of the hotel was interviewed in week eight once the results of the classes were known. One of the sub-problems of this research paper was to find out management attitudes toward the instruction of general English. The interview took place in the manager's office and was recorded. The two videos making up the complete interview can be viewed on YouTube at:

- 1) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SqgxmqqBBf-M>
- 2) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ggq-OlX2qw>

The first question was; do you want employees to have a 100% focused course on hotel English? The manager's answer was a straightforward 'yes'. The follow up question asked why is that and her reply was because 80% of customers are from North America and Europe. Therefore they need employees who can speak English.

I asked question three; 'What about the low level employees, do you think they can learn hotel English without general English?' The reply '*yes because normally the guests*

may ask 'Where is the toilet?' 'May I have the bill please?' Not many words related to them, so it is faster to train them with a focus on the English for hotel. I suggested that this functional language was easier than starting them with general English and the manager agreed.

The next question was; "do you take employees' wants and needs into account when planning English courses?" There seemed to be some difficulty with this question as it had to be repeated. The manager answered that they do 'training needs' with the hotel employees. They have an evaluation twice a year about the courses that associates (low level employees in the hotel) need, and from those results they plan for the next year. I questioned the manager closely if the employees' wants were taken into account and the answer was negative, only employees' needs. This difference is very important as it has been shown that employees want to learn more general English and I am certain that employees' needs are those perceived by the hotel and not stated by the employees personally.

I asked the manager if the hotel would be willing to have courses of general English alongside courses of hotel English. The reply was that money was a major issue as they have 'a limited budget yearly....if we pay for general English...we start to grow a tree then we need to wait many years...to take apple. Then we normally focus on functional language.'

Question seven was whether an employee whose English level was low would benefit from general English. The reply was that some general English would be included in the hotel course but it would be very basic.

I was very interested to hear the manager's answer for question eight. I told her the results of my interviews with employees and that many of them wanted general English. Was the manager aware of this? Her reply stated that it was not a surprise, 'but in the terms of hotel hospitality we need one who can work....so that's why we focus on functional English, because we see the benefit from the thing that we invest.'

I was interested to see if the hotel had much feedback from guests staying at the hotel on the employee's English. The reply was that since the hotel had opened only two or three guests had commented on the employees' English. Not surprisingly these were in the form of complaints when employees failed to answer the guests' questions.

I asked the manager if the hotel had more money for its training budget, would the management be happy teaching them general English as well as hotel English. The reply was *'sure...we also plan if we have more money we would like to have English teacher work with us in hotel...like a permanent English teacher.'* The manager went on to say that hiring a full time native English speaker was beyond the hotel's budget at this time as the costs are too high.

The next question asked was whether the hotel's needs for hotel English are more important than employees' wants for general English. The manager replied that *'we can do win win situation in the hotel English we can teach them some general English which is related to work...to their area....we also teach some grammar from the textbook.'*

The next question related to materials and textbooks, I wanted to find out the manager's attitudes towards these as there are often integral parts of a course. The manager said that they designed the course as they have standard wording as part of their standard operating procedures (SOP). They gave the SOP words to the instructor and *'he can do his homework and come up with the solutions for us. Then we can choose what we want, and for some wording, some sentences in the textbook is not aligned to the hotel hospitality then we can develop and revise it.'*

The manager said that they have standard wording to use as part of their brand, she gave as an example *'like when we pick up the telephone, we don't say 'hello'...we should say 'good afternoon, this is Ting how may I be of service?'* The manager then showed me large volumes of SOP's including standard wording which employees should use. I suggested that it would be hard to use normal textbooks in the hotel due to these SOP's and the manager agreed.

When asked if she had any other comments to make about the English classes and students the manager said that *'my associates work ten and half hours a day....then once they need to study something new, they need fun....I always tell my English teacher that if you need to provide English class for associate so make it fun.'*

I asked the manager if the student's attitudes towards their English studies were good. She replied *'yes...they like studying English.'* I also asked her if they were motivated to continue learning, her reply *'yes...they always ask me when can we start the English class but their working schedule doesn't match the time that they go.'*

The interview with the training manager brought up several issues relevant to ESP, and I shall discuss these fully in the next chapter. It seems that the management acknowledges the usefulness of general English classes but is constrained by both time and money. Also the stakeholder perceives general English to be secondary as the hotel wants employees to have a command of functional English directly related to their jobs. I also received the impression that the employees' wants for general English would not be met without a large influx of money into the training budget.

Discussion of Research Findings

This research study undertook to find out if hotel employees received the ESP component of their English course more positively than the general English component. Evidence has been shown that employees and students benefit from general English instruction in conjunction with their specific course of study (Graham & Beardsley, 1986; Spack, 1998). It has also been found that employees desire general English for their own perceived communicative wants and needs (Jasso-Aguilar, 1999). It would appear from Jasso-Aguilar's study that hotel maids felt disempowered with their ESP course as it had a very narrow focus, only teaching functional/target situation language.

Also of interest was the difference in attitudes between the two taught components; the hotel English classes and general English classes. Were the participants more motivated to study the ESP component because of their job roles? As motivation is so important for successful language learning; then having knowledge of student attitudes is of benefit to instructors when designing a language course.

Lastly the role of the stakeholder has to be taken into account. Within the ESP spectrum, stakeholders play a pivotal role. It is they who supply the most important thing capital. Without employers' money most ESP courses can not function. However, there is a small market for privately funded individual or group ESP instruction. The stakeholders also frequently supply another important commodity needed for a course time. Therefore the interview with the training manager of the hotel provided a useful comparison with the perceived views of the participants in this research study.

It is worthwhile to point out at this stage that the syllabus for the participants' course was partly negotiated and that the addition of two Audio/Visual employees meant that the researcher chose not to focus entirely on food and beverage units from the hotel textbook, this also meant that the course could not be said to be truly 'specific' because of their inclusion in the course however, I do not believe the results would have been very different if 10 food and beverage employees had undertaken the course.

It should also be mentioned that the researcher chose not to differ his teaching methodology during the course, and his approach was communicative in nature. I did not seek to vary teaching styles and indeed I wonder just how differently a true ESP

'specialist' instructs. Also as was discussed in the literature review, it should be pointed out that hotel English is not really specific in nature (Strutt, 2003) and contains much of the functional language and vocabulary found in a general ESP course. Thus there was an overlap between the two components.

It has been shown with the results of the participant interviews that a large majority of the participants (8/10) wanted to study mainly general English. This supports the evidence found by Jasso-Aguilar (1999), that hotel employees value the increased chances of individual expression that general English supplies; against the more narrow scope of a specific English course of study which focuses on target situations found within a hotel setting.

The results of the perceived needs analysis also supported this desire for general English but also gave evidence that the participants realized that ESP instruction was also good for them and they would benefit equally from it. All ten participants agreed that they wanted the class to focus 50% on hotel English and 50% on general English.

Clearly then the answer to the main research question is no, the hotel component is not received or perceived more positively than the general English component. In fact I would argue that the results show no real bias towards the either component. If we look at the results from the class questionnaires, it can be seen that hotel English scored higher in terms of speaking ability by a slight margin. It also of course scored higher when the Likert items were directly connected to their job roles.

With regards to self study or interest in the topic, general English scored higher. As self study and interest is closely linked to positive attitude and motivation it can be concluded that general English did enjoy a small positive advantage with regards to the participants' attitudes.

The final class questionnaire results were extremely similar and I believe this shows again that there was not a large difference between the two components. Lorenzo (2005) pointed out that motivation to learn was frequently higher within the ESP umbrella as students frequently are learning English for a specific and immediate purpose, therefore I was not surprised that hotel English scored equally as well as the general English component even if the students were more interested in general English.

From my classroom observations I perceived there was no real difference in attitudes during class and as I said previously it was actually the general English classes that sometimes lacked ‘atmosphere’ due to the lengthy readings and necessity of teaching many new language items to the participants. However, the participants seemed willing to do the readings as best they could and they did seem to appreciate learning new lexical items, there was a clear difference in the amount of new vocabulary introduced in the general English classes and perhaps the participants struggled but welcomed the addition of new vocabulary which they could work and communicate with.

In the after class discussions the participants again showed no overall bias toward hotel or general English with each unit and section being treated separately. Some hotel units were clearly more ‘fun’ and accessible than some of the general English sections. This goes some way in answering the last sub-problem of this research; were students happy to study both ESP and general English at the same time?

The results support this statement, the participants were happy to study both components at the same time. The introduction of general English to the syllabus meant that the material covered week by week was very diverse and followed no set pattern. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998, p.171) posited the view that materials need to be ‘*consistent and to have some recognizable pattern.*’ I disagree with this. It is the very ‘sameness’ of many textbooks that lead to students’ boredom and apathy as each class follows a set procedure of warm up speaking, a reading, a writing exercise, a listening exercise, speaking pair work, and a final class/group discussion. In this course by using two different textbooks the participants never fell into a dull routine and the participants were challenged to adapt to each lesson afresh.

A sub-problem of this research study was; “will students feel that the outcomes of the ESP component furthered their mastery of language needed for their present job and future careers?” As was discussed above the evidence is very positive that yes; the participants appreciated the ESP component. Twenty-four responses scored positively for this. Also twenty-five positive responses were scored for whether the ESP component matched the hotel’s wants. The participants clearly understood that much of what was studied in the hotel classes was of a practical and communicative nature. The language they practiced could be used immediately with hotel guests. They further perceived that

they needed to study the hotel classes (20 positive responses), evidence that the material was not too easy or a repeat of classes studied earlier in their hotel training classes.

Thus far the evidence supports the integration of general English within an EOP course, although evidence has been found (Kaur, 2007) that some groups of students wish only to study specific English, a course with a very narrow focus. Although I can understand some students' negative attitudes toward a broader course (it requires more time and self study), the benefits of having general English within or alongside a specific course outweigh any negative factors.

Many students can benefit from the increased focus on grammar that general English material provides. General English also supplies a wide variety of lexical items which increases students' vocabulary and thus overall communicative competence. Also as I have discussed, general English empowers students. As was seen in the literature review, general English concentrates on universal topics. Students should be able to communicate using these topics (family, jobs, housing, hobbies, going out, health, and entertainment) if they want to communicate broadly and effectively in English.

It can be seen that although general English does not always concentrate on spoken communication, the participants in this study enjoyed the topics covered in class and undertook to learn a wealth of new vocabulary. The reading sections were hard for many of the participants but again I believe the participants appreciated the reading practice as there were no lengthy reading passages in the ESP textbook. Indeed it is the difference between general English and ESP English which makes combining the two so desirable. If employees' learn only ESP English, perhaps vital skills will be neglected as Ping and Gu (2004) found.

Clearly the researcher has a positive attitude toward general English but what of the stakeholder? A sub-problem of this research study was to find out the feelings of the management toward the English component. Clearly without management acquiescence general English can not be included within an ESP course. So it was with great interest that I interviewed the training manager of the hotel and asked her a series of questions.

From the results it can be seen that the manager acknowledged the employees' wants to study general English but in the normal sphere of operations could not meet that want. The main constraint was a lack of money. The hotel's training budget could not

allow for general English to be taught as the manager viewed general English as a longer term outcome whereas ESP English with its emphasis on functional language as an obtainable short term outcome or goal.

However, when asked if employees' wants were taken into account she stated that they were not. This was a similar situation to the hotel workers in Hawaii in Jasso-Aguilar's (1999) study; also in this situation there was no attempt to carry out a needs analysis with the employees' input. I find this lack of input surprising as surely taking into account employees' wants before a course of study increases the chance of motivation and increases the feeling of participation which again means students will study better. In addition when employees have no say or stake in their training it leads to feelings of disempowerment which negatively affects motivation. The manager stated that they do '*training needs*' with the employees in order to find out what they need to study but I believe taking into account 'wants' is vitally important as well.

It is worthwhile to point out at this stage that wants and needs are often interchangeable and are not 'set in stone' also students' and stakeholders' may perceive wants and needs differently, this is before the instructor becomes involved. Clearly the issue of wants and needs is a classic example of the 'juggling' that an instructor must carry out when designing and delivering an ESP course.

Stated as another major issue was the constraint of time as employees worked 10 ? hour days and in split shifts the only time slot available for English instruction was a two-hour period in the afternoons. This result did not surprise me and as can be seen from Figure 1. I put those two factors together for very good reason. It is my belief that frequently these two factors affect the outcomes of ESP courses more than many other factors. Although it should be stated that an excess of time and money does not necessarily mean an ESP course will be successful.

The training manager also stated that there was normally some general English included for low level employees, so she did realize that general English has benefit within an ESP functional course. It also appeared that the hotel demanded that employees' use standard wording thus any course or syllabus design has to take this into account for a course to go ahead. This further restricts the teaching of general English as

all materials would have to be carefully checked in order that they did not teach language expressions that were not part of the hotel's extensive SOP.

Implications and Recommendations for Classroom Use

In Figure 1. I set out a list of factors involved with an ESP course. I shall now discuss the findings of this research with reference to these factors. I do not set out to list the most important factors first with view to this research study or the teaching of ESP courses. All factors are important and will differ according to the classroom context, situation or setting. Therefore I will work my way around Figure 1. from wants and needs ending up with empowerment.

Firstly it appears that frequently today a proper needs analysis is still not carried out for many courses. The reasons for this are varied, in the context of the hotel; it seemed that the management simply did not realize that they should take into account the employees wants and needs. It can be seen from the results of the needs analysis that a simple questionnaire is also not sufficient to gain a truly valid picture. It was only from the unstructured interviews with the participants later, that the desire for general English became apparent.

Therefore before a course starts it is vital that a questionnaire and at least a pre-course discussion take place for an instructor to gain a good picture of wants and needs. However, while all this is fundamental for a successful course from the point of view of the students, it seems in this situation that the wants and needs of the hotel were different.

As they have a tight monetary budget, delivering general English classes alongside specific English classes is simply not possible. From the interview with the training manager I consider that it is possible to negotiate with the management to include a certain amount of useful relevant general English. This type of instruction would have to prove to the management that students are learning to communicate better 'face to face' which is an overall aim of their specific English classes.

Doing a proper target situation analysis (TSA) is extremely time consuming and expensive. This is one of the main reasons why this is not carried out in many ESP courses. I only undertook to observe some of the food and beverage employees serving at the breakfast sitting. As one of the participants said usually they do not speak or use a lot

of English at work. For example at the omelet station, the attendant would ask '*What would you like Sir/Madam?*' Guests would reply '*Can I have/I want/ give/make me an omelet with tomatoes/onion/pepper and salami*', at the same time pointing to the various dishes. This type of transactional language is clearly very simple and easily learned for the employee. It is when a guest asks a question outside of this context that general English skills would be useful. The hotel realizes though that this does not happen very often and it is this fact that limits the attractiveness of including general English in their courses.

The employees who need a large amount of 'general' vocabulary are the front office staff who deal with customers and guests daily and probably the bar staff as it is here that more communication of a varied nature would take place with guests due to the social setting.

I also have to point out that the participants in my course were from a variety of positions within the hotel, bartenders, waitresses, room-service, mini-bar attendant and audio/visual technicians so it would have been impossible to do a TSA. I still think though that if an instructor does have a group of employees who all have the same or similar job function then attempting even a limited TSA might give useful results, for example as an opportunity to observe future students' English levels, to see if work needs to be done on a specific skill or if language/lexical items are misunderstood or happen frequently.

From the results of this study and from the classroom instruction it once again is obvious that no true 'specific English' can be carried out to a diverse group of employees. As said above, it is the bartending staff that would have the most immediate benefit from more general instruction. The inclusion of the audio/visual employees meant I could not focus specifically on food/drink situations as this would have been unfair to them. The hotel does usually split up employees into three different groups: food and beverage, housekeeping and kitchen staff which is good. Clearly for monetary reasons it is harder for the hotel to become more specific than this. It is therefore up to the individual instructor to try and cater for specific employees needs, perhaps by assigning specific homework for students (a narrow focus) and keeping classroom instruction more general

within the framework of the setting whether that be business, technical, medical or hotel and tourism.

The whole issue of a having broad or narrow focus will never be easily resolved within ESP courses. It became apparent that the employees in this study wanted a more broad approach with the inclusion of general English whilst the hotel wanted a narrow focus approach with only hotel English. As said above it was impossible to have a narrow focus with the diverse nature of the participants. An instructor will have to juggle the participants' job roles within a course to try and deliver an effective course that is successful for the majority. In a normal setting, I would have concentrated more on food/drink situations which would have been beneficial for the food and beverage employees and less so for the audio/visual employees.

The role of the stakeholder within the course has become very obvious to me following the interview with the training manager. As the stakeholder holds the purse strings, it is the instructors' duty to follow their wishes ultimately. Stakeholders however, are not expert in the field of English instruction and it is up to the instructor to negotiate the course with them and the potential pool of students. Stakeholders might have a clear idea of what they want but do not realize that a teaching situation is never straightforward or simple. For example; it might be more effective to split a class into two groups and teach each group separately for 30 minutes because of students' English levels or different job roles and this would lead to a more successful outcome than attempting to teach the whole group together for one hour.

The instructor as a professional should ensure that the teaching situation is as ideal as possible and layout clear reasons for his/her actions. If faced with difficulty from stakeholders, simply pointing out that the course will ultimately fail to deliver what they wanted (and therefore would be a monetary waste) should suffice to bring about negotiation between the instructor, students, and stakeholder.

This course had no clear outcomes or goals; this hampered my ability to deliver effective instruction. This research was aimed at finding out employees' feelings toward general English versus specific English. It is clear though that a successful course has to have very specific outcomes or goals. This enables the instructor to follow a 'path' toward the desired destination. As was said previously it was actually very hard to have

specific outcomes due to the participants different job roles. So once again it seems that it is the class make-up that is very important. The more specific a group of employees the better, as an instructor can design a course with set goals far more easily. Of course an overall goal might simply be 'to increase communicative effectiveness' or 'to be able to fill out patients' records and forms.' Within ESP courses it is therefore vital that before a course starts, the instructor and stakeholders must have agreement on course outcomes or goals before instruction takes place.

Methodology as was seen from the literature review is something that cannot be decided upon before the course starts. From my experience an instructor has to adapt to the class and change his/her methodology to best suit the class needs and wants. I do not believe though that the methodology should be very different from what a professional ELT teacher employs in general English classes, and the majority of teaching techniques can be successfully used in a specific English class. I therefore agree with Scrivener (2005) that methodology should not be something that instructors' worry unduly about.

I do believe that teaching an ESP course can be more challenging than teaching a general English course; therefore I would stipulate that instructors have sufficient experience of teaching before undertaking an ESP course. If they do not have experience or training then the effectiveness of the instruction might be lacking and course goals or outcomes not met. Also an experienced teacher/instructor is better able to view the class and various factors as a 'whole' and be able to successfully negotiate with the students and stakeholders before the course starts. Furthermore an experienced instructor will be able to design more effective materials or source authentic materials which are important in an ESP course. As mentioned previously the researcher taught a technical English course in his first year of teaching, if I could re-teach the course now with my added years of experience and training the course instruction and methodology would be better.

Time and money as seen from this research study still play a very prominent role. Unfortunately the twin constraints of these two factors frequently lead to ineffectual instruction and poorly designed classes. It can be seen that before a successful course starts, a lot of work has to be done to lay solid foundations. Far too often English classes are 'built on sand' a lot of content which appears to be impressive but blows away into the ether shortly after.

An effective instructor must be able to juggle these two constraints to the best of his/her ability. Clearly the constraint of time imposes a set amount of what a course can deliver. It is also not desirable to expect students to study extensively outside of class. Frequently ESP students are employees who put in a full day at work before their studies. In this research study the participants worked 10.5 hour shifts. It is clear this leaves little time for outside study.

The less time the students have to study means unfortunately that the course by necessity has to be more narrowly focused. Classroom instruction has to be very focused with a clear objective for every class. This instructor observed that the participants were motivated to study but were tired or missed classes due to their work.

Money although often lacking in an ESP course does not stop a simple NA being carried out. The NA which I handed out to the participants only took up the first 15 minutes of class one. Student interviews can be carried out after class with whoever is available. If money precludes a good textbook from being used then the internet is an excellent, free and abundant source of materials both authentic and semi-authentic designed by other teachers. As I said above though throwing a lot of money and classroom time at a group of students does not ensure success and a course should not be viewed as 'impossible' to teach or deliver if these factors are very limited. It is amazing how much ground one can cover in 20 hours of class time.

Usually this researcher does not carry out extensive assessment and evaluation of the class during the course. This was a useful exercise therefore to micro-examine classes and see the participants' attitudes to them. In fact it was so useful I will continue to use the class questionnaire sheets with future classes to gain a quick insight into students' perceived feelings on an individual class. A lot of useful information was gained from continual assessment of the classes, for example that general English classes were more interesting because of the topic but of less use to their speaking skills because of extensive readings. Or that ultimately there was no real difference in the participants' feelings toward the two components. I believe this was because general English and hotel English are similar.

This research study used a certain amount of the participants input in deciding the choice of units and sections studied. It was not fully negotiated. As can be seen from

above, it is impossible to have a fully negotiated course without the stake holder's input. I think though that negotiating course content with classes is important. Negotiation affects empowerment and increases participation. Students' actively involved in their classes are more likely to be motivated as participation and involvement fall more on the intrinsic side of the intrinsic-extrinsic line of motivation. This can only be good for the students and instructor.

This research study was investigating the participants attitudes toward two components, as said above there were no specific outcomes or goals before the course started. This made course design much harder. Some materials were resourced from the internet, the inclusion of sourced materials are vital to a more interesting class, for example 'a picture is worth a thousand words', and in the context of ESP I agree with other researchers and writers that a move toward sourcing authentic materials is seen as desirable. However, in the literature review I discussed this aspect of ESP. In this research study the textbooks used were adequate, although the general English textbook had perhaps too much reading and too much advanced vocabulary for the English level of the participants in this course. It is interesting to speculate that the participants would have been more positive with the general English component if an easier, more communicative English textbook would have been used.

Empowerment was an issue this researcher was interested in from the outset of this study. I have been very involved with this issue, since my studies in the Agricultural sector 12 years previously. If we look at the history of humankind, we can see that empowerment is a central driving force. It also has many related or closely associated words such as freedom, self-determination, rights, liberty, and equality. I believe and still do so after this research study that students benefit from general English instruction. As English is the number one undisputed international language of the world, having English skills provides several benefits. Clearly ESP employees and students need English for a specific purpose, but they should also need English for a more general purpose that of social communication. Much has been said for example of the global social community arising via the internet. Facebook, Myspace, Twitter, and YouTube, all these global forums use English as their main source of language. A recent CNN report stated that 2/3's of world internet users browse social networking sites regularly. I have personal

experience of this with my own Facebook friend list containing hundreds of non-native English speakers. The recent political problems in Iran also show that young Iranians are actively involved in these global forums, surely this is only the beginning of a truly global movement of free speech and spoken communication between all the diverse peoples of the world. It is hypothesized we all came from one small area in Africa before splitting and settling all over the world. Presumably we all spoke one language at the start (even if a series of guttural grunts), it would be nice to envisage a day when we all can speak one language again. Even if the abilities of people are not native-like it does not require a huge vocabulary to communicate and get your meaning across.

I believe from my research study that the participants appreciated the global nature of English and that is one reason why they desired to study general English so much. I do not believe that my question ‘did the general English component empower them more?’ was adequately answered because as I have said much of the general English and hotel English classes were interchangeable. It also is clear from the interview with the training manager (who had a good command of English) that employers still are not willing to take into account employees broader/wider English wants and needs into account. This is unfortunate and I would press instructors to point out when discussing a course with stakeholders, the social advantages of teaching general English alongside specific English courses. It was also pointed out that some ESP students benefit from the grammar and language practice in general English and this point should also be made to stakeholders.

Recommendation for Future Study

In this section I put forward ideas for future research in this area. As said previously this area has not been researched sufficiently within the ESP spectrum and additional data and information would be of practical value for all ESP instructors.

The decision of whether to include an amount of general English in a course is ultimately up to the instructor. It has been shown that especially for lower level learners, having a base of general English can be beneficial to their specific studies. It has also been shown that frequently workers appreciate the inclusion of general English in their

studies. Students' wants and needs are important for a course, if students are dissatisfied with the materials they are studying then this will lower motivation and negatively affect attitudes towards a course.

In this course hotel employees were examined, as mentioned previously there are few real differences between hotel and general English, therefore it would be very desirable to study a group of workers from a field far removed from normal English, this could be nurses, engineers, technicians and gauge their attitudes toward jointly learning both English for their occupations and general English.

Although the stakeholder will often want a 100% focus on specific English it is up to the instructor to point out the positive effects that teaching general English can bring. More research has to be done in this area to examine if students not just in the hotel and tourism sector perceive they want general English for purposes of broader communication and to empower them more. So far there has been a dearth of studies on joint ESP and general English courses.

Also of interest are the views of the stakeholders', little examination of their attitudes has been put forward in the research area of ESP and specifically EOP. It can be seen though that for stakeholders' to change their own attitudes toward inclusion of general English in their English courses, then real evidence would have to be put forward showing their employees have a strong desire for both English for work and English for social purposes. One way of doing this is including questions of general English in their NA before a course starts.

Conclusions

ESP is a very tentative term. It is widely used but I feel is losing its meaning as general English continues to develop. It was mentioned earlier in the literature review that GESP (general English for specific purposes) has arisen and reared its ugly head in many situations perhaps because of a lack of time and money to truly design a proper specific English course. Any course that does not really take into account wants and needs of both students and stakeholders I would argue; falls in this category.

This research study then was placed in a shady twilight zone between specific English and GESP. A needs analysis was carried out with a partly negotiated syllabus being delivered. The participants responded favorably to both the general and hotel English components. Ultimately there was no difference in results between the two components. It was only from the participant interviews and classroom discussions that general English was seen to be viewed more positively by the participants.

The stakeholder acknowledged these results but argued that a lack of money firstly and time meant that the main focus of classes within the hotel had to be on 'specific English.' This result is not really surprising. However, there was acknowledgment that there was a place for the instruction of general English especially for lower level employees.

The motivation to learn English is clear from the results of the study, the participants' attitudes toward learning English are positive and they desired further English instruction in both hotel and general English. They appreciated the ESP English as much of it had immediate communicative relevance for their jobs. They also enjoyed the general English classes because of the various topics covered and the opportunity to learn new lexical items. Also the general English classes practiced reading skills more than the hotel English classes.

Empowerment of the employees is increased by the study of both components, but I believe general English does empower them more as it increases the breadth and depth of their communicative repertoire. As was discussed in the literature review; general English focuses on universal themes and topics. A student needs knowledge of these in order to communicate socially.

I believe the results of this study support integrating (where possible) general English in a course of specific English. This study also highlights the importance of preparatory work before a course starts. Much is to be said for introducing negotiation into the syllabus. Negotiation is vital between the instructor and stakeholder and it is beneficial to include the students as well to increase their positive attitudes and motivation.

An instructor must juggle many factors to deliver a successful course. The importance of having set outcomes and goals is stressed; also classroom evaluation is a useful tool to gauge the success of individual lessons.

In the course of this study the researcher created a new acronym GESP as it became clear that many so called ESP courses are anything but.

Ultimately the relationship between ESP and life is shown with the twin constraints of time and money hampering courses. It is then up to the instructor to work within these confines to produce a successful course that meets both students and stakeholders wants and needs.

In the course of this study and during the intensive examination of ESP in the literature review it became clear that it is time for a new definition of EOP (English for Occupational Purposes). I therefore set out a list of my own findings as to what an EOP course is. It should be noted that my emphasis here is on the course itself and not the wider umbrella term.

A 'normal' EOP course should consist of:

- 1) A thorough needs analysis before the course, ideally with a deficiency or target situation analysis included.
- 2) A 'very' specific group of students with the same wants and needs.
- 3) Continuous assessment and evaluation of the course.
- 4) Careful examination of materials and tasks to best suit learners' needs and course goals.
- 5) Inclusion of stakeholders at the start of the course design process.
- 6) A clear set of goals and outcomes.
- 7) Following the course a final evaluation of the learners' attitudes and an evaluation of the course as a whole.
- 8) An experienced English instructor with at least some communicative language teaching credentials (TEFL, TESOL, CELTA, and DELTA).

Final Comments

This research study found that employees in a five-star hotel in Thailand wanted to learn general English more than hotel English. Reasons for this could include the more

narrow focus of specific English materials and sufficient mastery of English for their present job roles which makes learning general English more interesting for them. The actual attitudes toward both components of the course did not vary much. One reason being the instructor was the same and methodology was therefore the same as well. Also the materials used in both components came from lower intermediate textbooks. What was apparent also from this study was the similarity of 'hotel' English and general English a further reason that the participants could see no real difference between their components.

The evidence though from the NA and interviews and questionnaires does support including a component of general English alongside a specific course of study. Including general English can lead to increased interest and motivation to study. The inclusion of general English materials also decreases the risk of a course becoming 'routine'. Also general English will drive students' acquisition of new vocabulary items and practice of grammar which increases their overall English abilities.

Although stakeholders might perceive general English as superfluous to their own perceived wants and needs, it is worthwhile for instructors to change these attitudes. General English can be more empowering for students' especially if their specific course of study is in a very restricted range or area.

The participants in this study were shown to be content with both components and it is now necessary to investigate other joint general English and EOP courses to see if results are similar. This researcher believes that including general English alongside specific English is beneficial for several reasons, increased interest and motivation, acquisition of vocabulary and empowerment. I hope this study can lead to increased interest and research in joint general English and specific courses.

References

- Anthony, L. (1997a). *Defining English for specific purposes and the role of the ESP practitioner*. Retrieved November 18, 2008 from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/abstracts/Aizukiyo97.pdf>
- Anthony, L. (1997b). ESP: What does it mean? Why is it different? *On Cue*. Retrieved November 15, 2008 from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/abstracts/ESParticle.html>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Belcher, D. (2004). Trends in teaching English for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 165-186. Cambridge University Press.
- Belcher, D. (2006). English for specific purposes: Teaching to perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study and everyday life. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 133-156.
- Bloomer, A., Griffiths, P., & Merrison, A. J. (2005). *Introducing language in use*. Routledge, NY.
- Bloor, M. (1998). English for Specific Purposes: The Preservation of the Species (some notes on a recently evolved species and on the contribution of John Swales to its preservation and protection). *English for Specific Purposes*, 17, 47-66.
- Bojovic, M. (2006). Teaching foreign languages for specific purposes: Teacher development. *The proceedings of the 31st Annual Association of Teacher Education in Europe*. (pp. 487-493). Retrieved November 18, 2008 from

<http://www.pef.uni-lj.si/atee/978-961-6637-06-0/487-493.pdf>

Breen, M. P. & Mann, S. J. (1997). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.132-149). London: Longman.

Brieger, N & Sweeney, S. (1994). *The language of business English: Grammar & functions*. Prentice Hall, UK.

Brown, H.D. (1981). Affective factors in second language learning. In Alatis, J.E., Altman, H. B., and Alatis, P. M. (Eds.), *The second language classroom: Directions for the eighties* (pp. 111-129). Oxford University Press: New York.

Brown, H.D. (1990). M and Ms for language classrooms? Another look at motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round-table on language and linguistics* (pp. 383-393). Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. N.J., Prentice Hall Regents.

Brunton, M. (2009). Evaluation of Highly Recommended: A textbook for the hotel and catering industry. *ESP World*. 1(22), Vol 8. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from http://www.espworld.info/Articles_22/esp%20essay%20for%20publication.htm

Bruton, C., Candlin, C. and Leather, J. (1976a). Doctor speech functions in casualty consultations: predictable structures of discourse in regulated settings. In: G. Nickel (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress on Applied Linguistics* (pp. 297-309) Freiburg: Rombach.

- Bruton, C., Candlin, C. and Leather, J. (1976b). Doctors in casualty: applying communicative competence to components of specialist course design. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 14(3), 245-272.
- Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2009). Retrieved May 16, 2009 from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=52065&dict=CALD>
- Carroll, D. W. (1999). *Psychology of language*. 3rd Edition. Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Carter, D. (1983). Some propositions about ESP. *The ESP Journal*, 2, 131-137.
- Cheah, Y. M. (2003). English language teaching in Singapore today. In W.K. Ho & R.Y. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today* (pp. 351-374). Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Chen, P. C. (2005). Effectively implementing a collaboration task- based syllabus (CTBA) in EFL large-sized business English classes. *ESP World*, 2(10), Vol 4, Retrieved May 21, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_10/CTBS_htm.
- Chen, Y. (2006). From the common core to specific. *Asian ESP Journal*. 1(3), Retrieved March 2, 2009 from http://www.asian-esp_journal.com/June_2006_yc.php
- Chittravelu, N. (1980). *English for special purposes project*. In ELT Documents 107, The British Council.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clement, R., Dornyei Z. and Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417-448.
- Coffey, B. (1984). State of the art: English for specific purposes. *Language Teaching*, 17 (1), 2-16.
- Coffey, B. (1985). ESP: English for specific purposes. In V. Kinsella, (Ed.), *Cambridge Language Surveys 3* (pp. 78-93) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. 3rd Ed. London, Arnold.
- Cook, V., Long, J., & McDonough, S. (1979). First and second language learning. In G. E. Perren (Ed.), *The Mother Tongue and Other Languages in Education* (pp. 89-112). CILTR.
- Cotterall, S. (1999a). Working with groups: Introduction. In S. Cotterall, & D. Crabbe, (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (pp. 43-49). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Cotterall, S. (1999b). Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them? *System*, 2(4), 493-513.
- Crandall, J. (1999). Cooperative language learning and affective factors. In J. Arnold, (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 226-245). Cambridge University Press.
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512.

- Csizer, K. & Dornyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort *Modern Language Journal*, 89(I), 19-36.
- Deci, E. & Flaste, R. (1995). *Why we do what we do*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (2000). The 'What' and 'Why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Donna, S. (2004). *Teach business English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: pathways to the New Century* (pp.71-80). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.
- Dornyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in Action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualization of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(4), 519 – 539.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dornyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(S1), 3-32.
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*: L. Erlbaum.
- Dornyei, Z. & Clement, R. (2000). *Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey*. Paper presented at the AAAL Convention, Vancouver, Canada.
- Dornyei, Z. & Otto, I. (1999). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Thames Valley University, London. Vol 4, 43-69. Retrieved May 21, 2009 from http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/39/0/Motivation_in_action.pdf
- Dornyei, Z. & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing language for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, N. (2000). Language for business: Effective needs assessment, syllabus design and materials preparation in a practical ESP case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19 (3), 291-296.
- Ehrman, M.E., Leaver, B.L., & Oxford, R.L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, 31(3), 313-330.

- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, M & Johnson, C. (1994). *Teaching business English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ewer, J. R. & Latorre, G. (1969). *A course in basic scientific English*. London, Longman.
- Far, M. (2008). On the relationship between ESP & EGP: A general perspective. *ESP World*. 1(17), Vol 7. Retrieved February 25, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_17/issue_17.htm
- Flowerdew, J. (1990). English for specific purposes: A selective review of the literature. *ELT Journal*, 44/4, 326-337.
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. 2005. *Second language listening*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Gao, J. (2007). Designing an ESP course for Chinese university students of business. *Asian ESP Journal*. 3(1). Retrieved March 5, 2009 from http://www.asian-esp-journal.com/April_2007_gj.php
- Garcia, T. & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). The effects of autonomy on motivation and performance in the college classroom. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 477-86.
- Gardner, R. C. (1982). Language attitudes and language learning. In E. B. Ryan, and H. Giles (Eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation* (pp. 132-147). London, Edward Arnold.

- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning*. London, Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation and second language learning acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 41, 1-24.
- Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272.
- Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26, 1-11.
- Gardner, R. C. & Smythe, P. C. (1975). Motivation and second language acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 218-230.
- Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 359-368.
- Gatehouse, K. (2001). Key issues in English for Specific purposes (ESP) curriculum development. *Internet TESL Journal*, Vol VII, No. 10. Retrieved November 17, 2008 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Gatehouse-ESP.html>
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. (2001). Reading for academic purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL teacher. In M, Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 187-203). 3rd Edition. Heinle & Heinle.

- Graham, J. G. & Beardsley, R. S. (1986). English for specific purposes: Content language, and communication in a pharmacy course model. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 227-245.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing Language Courses: A guide for teachers*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Harmer, J. (2006). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 6th Edition. London, Pearson Longman.
- Harris, D. (2007). Does “Motivation” even exist? *RAK Report: RAK Chapter Newsletter, September 2007*. Retrieved May 18, 2009 from <http://tailearn.googlepages.com/SeptemberpaperRAKReport.doc>
- Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hawkins, L. E. (1972). Extra-school factors that influence language learning. In D. Lang & C. James (Eds.). *Foreign Language Education: A reappraisal* (pp. 321- 340). National Textbook Company: Illinois.
- Hinenoya, H. & Gatbonton, E. (2000). Ethnocentrism, cultural traits, beliefs and English proficiency : A Japanese sample. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 225-240.
- Holme, R. (1996). *ESP ideas*. Longman, UK.
- Horwitz, E. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 25-32.
- Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jasso-Aguilar, R. (1999). Sources, methods, and triangulation in needs analysis: A critical perspective in a case study of Waikiki hotel maids. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 27-46.
- Jin, L. & Cortazzi, M. (1998). The culture the learner brings: a bridge or a barrier? In M. Bryam (Ed.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 98-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johns, A. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2001). English for specific purposes: International in scope, specific in purpose. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 297-314.
- Katsara, O. (2008). Aspects of Motivation within the context of an ESP course. *ESP World*, 3(19) Vol 7. Retrieved May 15, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_19/issue_19.htm
- Kaur, S. (2007). ESP course design: Matching learner needs to aims. *ESP World*. 1(14), Vol 6. Retrieved March 5th, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_14/DESIGNING%20ESP%20COURSES.htm
- Kavaliauskiene, G. (2007). Students reflections on learning English for specific purposes. *ESP World*. 2(15), Vol 6. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_15/issue_15.htm
- Keller, J. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models: An overview of their current status* (pp. 383-434). L. Erlbaum
- Knowles, M. S. (1995). *Self directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. Chicago: Association Press.

- Koestner, R. & McClelland, D.C. (1990). Perspectives on competence motivation. In L. A. Perrin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 527-548). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2001). *Language and culture*. 3rd Impression. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1977). The Monitor model of adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language* (pp. 152-161). New York: Regents.
- Krashen, S. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Learning*. London: Pergamon.
- Lam, W. S. & Kramsch, C. (2002). The ecology of an SLA community in a computer-mediated environment. In J. H. Leather & J. Van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of Language Acquisition* (pp. 141-158). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Liuoliene, A & Metiuniene, R. (2006). Second Language Learning Motivation. *Santalka*, Vol 14 (2), 93-98.
- Long, M. (2005). *Problems with supposed counter evidence to the critical period hypothesis*. In IRAL 43, 287-317.
- Lorenzo, F. (2005). Teaching English for specific purposes. *UsingEnglish.com*. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from <http://www.usingenglish.teaching-english-for-specific-purposes-esp.html>
- Mackay, R. & Mountford, A. (1978). *English for specific purposes*. London, Longman.

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 4 (25), Volume 8, 2009

- Maleki, A. (2006). A survey on the relationship between English language proficiency and the academic achievement of Iranian EFL students. *Korea TESOL*, 8 (1), 49-57.
- Maleki, A. (2008). ESP teaching: A matter of controversy. *ESP World* 1(17) Vol 7. Retrieved April 19,2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_17/PDF/ESP%20Teaching%20Iran.pdf
- Marchese, T. (1997). The new conversations about learning insights from neuroscience and anthropology. *Cognitive Science and Workplace Studies*. Retrieved May 21, 2009 from http://www.newhorizons.org/lifelong/higher_ed/marchese.htm
- Masgoret, A. M. & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning* 53(S), 167-210.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. 2nd Edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCarten, J. (2007). *Teaching vocabulary: Lessons from the corpus, lessons for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, Jose-Bass Publishers.
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories*. London, Arnold.
- Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley.

- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Noels, K. A., Clement, R. & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal* 83, 23-34.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57-85.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller. (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 192-203). Longman: London.
- Nunan, D. (1998). Encouraging learner independence. In Reid, M. (Ed.), *Understanding Learning Styles in the Second Language Classroom* (pp. 147-155). Prentice Hall, Regents.
- Olshtain, E., Shohamy, E., Kemp, J., & Chatow, R. (1990). Factors predicting success in EFL among culturally different learners. *Language Learning*, 40, 23-44.
- Oxford, R. (2000). The role of styles and strategies in second language learning. *ERIC Digest ED317087*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC. Retrieved March 5th, 2009 from <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9214/styles.htm>

- Oxford, R. & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on six situational language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 404-419.
- Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1996). Language learning motivation in a new key. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 121-160). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy. In P. Benson, & P. Voller, (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 35-53). London: Longman.
- Pickett, N. & Laster, A. (1980). *Technical English*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Ping, D. & Gu, W. (2004). Teaching trial and analysis of English for technical communication. *Asian EFL Journal*. 6(1). Retrieved March 5th, 2009 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/04_pd_wg.php
- Poon, W. (2007). *Needs analysis of business students and its implications for curriculum review and development*. Retrieved June 1, 2009 from <http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/10/1000018.pdf>
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 25, 54 – 67. Retrieved May 21, 2009 from

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 4 (25), Volume 8, 2009

http://www.unco.edu/cebs/psychology/kevinpugh/motivation_project/resources/ryan_deci00.pdf

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone., S. Lash., & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 24-44). London, Sage.

Robinson, P. (1980). *ESP: The current position*. Oxford, Pergamon.

Robinson, P. (1981). The contribution of discourse analysts to ESP and ESP practitioners to discourse analysis. *ELT Documents* 112, 53-57.

Rubin, J. & Thompson, I. (1982). *How to be a more successful language learner*. Heinle & Heinle.

Saito, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Garza, T. J. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 202-218.

Shabaan, K. (2005). An ESP Course for employees at the American University of Beirut. *ESP World*. 2(10), Vol 4. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_10/issue_10.htm

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching*. Macmillan, UK.

Sinclair, B. (1997). Learner autonomy: The cross-cultural question. *IATEFL* 139. Retrieved May 21, 2009 from <http://www.iatefl.org/archives/texts/139Sinclair.html>

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second language learning*. London, Edward Arnold.

- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About Behaviorism*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Smith, R. C. (2001). Group work for autonomy in Asia: insights from teacher research. In L. Dam (Ed.), *AILA Review 15*, 70-81.
- Smyth, D. (2002). Thai speakers. In M. Swain & B. Smith (Eds.) *Learner English* (pp. 343-356). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22 (1), 48-62.
- Stapa, S. & Jais, I. (2005). A survey of writing needs and expectations of hotel management and tourism students. *ESP World*. 1(9), Vol 4. Retrieved November 13th, 2008 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_9/issue_9.htm
- Stevens, P. (1977). Special purpose language learning: A perspective. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Abstracts*, 10, 145-163.
- Stevens, P. (1988). ESP after twenty years: A re-appraisal. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *ESP: State of the Art*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Strutt, P. (2003). *English for international tourism*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Swales, J. M. (1985). *Episodes in ESP*. Oxford, Pergamon Institute of English.
- Toms, C. (2004). General English coursebooks and their place in an ESAP programme. *Asian EFL Journal*. 6(1). Retrieved March 5th, 2009 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/04_ct.php

Tourism Authority of Thailand. (2008). *Tourism statistics in Thailand 1998- 2007*.

Retrieved May 28, 2009 from http://www2.tat.or.th/stat/web/static_index.php

Tremblay, P. F. & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 505-520.

Tudor, I. (1997). LSP or language education? In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher education for LSP* (pp. 90-102). Clevedon, England, Multilingual Matters.

Uchibori, A., Chujo, K., & Haesegawa, S. (2006). Towards better grammar instruction: Bridging the gap between high school textbooks and TOEIC. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(2). Retrieved May 28, 2009 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_06_au&kc&sh.php

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53, 168-176.

Walqui, A. (2000). Contextual Factors in Second Language Acquisition. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics, Document ED444381, Washington, DC.

Wang, X. (2006). The role of motivation in university learners' language acquisition in China. *Sino-US English Teaching*. Vol, 3 No, 9. ISSN1539- 8072.

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 202-209.

- West, R. (1997). Needs analysis: state of the art. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher education for LSP*. (pp. 68-79). Clevedon, England, Multilingual Matters.
- Widdowson, H. (1983). *Learning purpose and language use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, C. (1992). The benefits of ESP. *Cambridge Language Consultants*. Retrieved May 31, 2009 from <http://www.camlang.com/art001.htm>
- Xenodohidis, T. H. (2002). An ESP curriculum for Greek EFL students of computing: A new approach. *ESP World*, 2, Vol 1. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_2/issue_2.html
- Yang, A., and Lau, L. (2003). Student attitudes to the learning of English at the secondary and tertiary level. *System*, 31, 107-123.
- Zhang, Y. (2007). Literature review of material evaluation. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 4(6), 28-31. Retrieved December 8, 2008 from <http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/su200706/su20070605.pdf>
- Zoumana, K. (2007). Pre-service ESP teacher training in an African French-speaking country: The case of Cote D'Ivoire. *ESP World*, 1 (14). Retrieved May 13, 2009 from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_14/Preservice_ESP_teacherTraining.htm