

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM**  
**AND COMMUNICATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE**

**INVESTIGATING WRITING NEEDS OF UNDERGRADUATE**  
**ECONOMICS STUDENTS: SAMARA UNIVERSITY IN FOCUS**

**BY: TAREKEGN TESEMA**

**JUNE 2013**

**INVESTIGATING WRITING NEEDS OF UNDERGRADUATE  
ECONOMICS STUDENTS: SAMARA UNIVERSITY IN FOCUS**

**By: Tarekegn Tesema**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and  
Literature**

**(Graduate Program)**

**Addis Ababa University**

**In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts  
(MA) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)**

**June 2013**

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication**

**Department of Foreign languages and Literatures**

**Investigating of Writing Needs of Undergraduate Economics Students:  
Samara University in Focus**

**By: Tarekegn Tesema**

**Approved by examining boards**

**Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_**

**Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ date \_\_\_\_\_**

**Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_**

## **Acknowledgements**

First, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Father God who has given me all the strength and grace to bear all the challenges of various types and to become successful in my education.

Apart from the effort a researcher makes, the success of any study depends largely on encouragement, comment and guidance an advisor offers. Therefore, my special gratitude goes to Dr. Anteneh Tsegaye, my advisor, for his critical comments and constructive suggestions he rendered me throughout my research works.

I would also like to acknowledge with much appreciation Samara University English instructors, students and instructors in economics department and business faculty dean, and economics graduates working in commercial bank and Bureau of finance and economic developments of Samara, the bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head. I really thank them for their cooperation in giving me necessary information I need for my study.

In addition, I would like to express my appreciation to W/ro Taddelech Demissie for her cooperation in printing the paper patiently and carefully.

Finally, I want to extend my appreciation to my friends Kebere Malla and Getachew Kassa, Samara University instructors, for their contribution in giving me invaluable comments in my thesis work. Likewise, I want to express my gratitude to all my friends who came to help me in offering me necessary suggestions in doing my paper. Thank you all.

## Content of Tables

Contents	page
List of Tables.....	v
List of Acronyms .....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Objective of the Study .....	4
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5. Scope of the Study.....	5
1.6. Limitations of the study .....	5
2.1. English for Specific Purpose.....	6
2.1.1. Definition of ESP .....	6
2.1.2. Emergence of ESP .....	9
2.1.3. ESP versus EGP .....	12
2.1.4. Classification of ESP .....	13
2.1.5. Language learning theory and ESP.....	16
2.2. Needs .....	17
2.3. Needs analysis.....	19
2.3.1. The Purpose of need analysis .....	20
2.3.2. The users of need analysis.....	20
2.3.3. Target population in needs analysis.....	21
2.3.4. Approaches to needs analysis.....	21
2.4. Course material evaluation .....	29

2.5. Previous research conducted on needs analysis .....	31
Chapter Three: Research Methodology .....	34
3.1. Research Design.....	34
3.2. Sampling.....	34
3.3. Data collection Instruments .....	36
3.3.1. Questionnaire .....	36
3.3.1.1. Questionnaire for Students.....	36
3.3.1.2. Questionnaire for Instructors.....	37
3.3.1.3. Questionnaire for Graduates.....	37
3.3.2. Interview .....	37
3.3.3. Course Material evaluation .....	38
3.4. Data Collection Procedures .....	38
3.5. Methods of Data Analysis.....	39
Chapter Four: Results of the Study.....	40
4.1. Quantitative data analysis.....	40
4.1.1. Present situation analysis .....	40
4.1.2. Target situation analysis .....	53
4.2. The qualitative data analysis.....	63
4.2.1.1. English instructors and business faculty dean interview data analysis .....	63
4.2.2.2. The interview data analysis of Bank manager and Bureau of Finance and Economic Development Head.....	65
4.2.2. Course material evaluation .....	67
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations .....	70
5.1. Summary.....	70
5.1.1. The students' English writing needs.....	70

5.1.2. The students' writing difficulties.....	71
5.1.3. The students' attitude towards taking the current writing course.....	72
5.1.4. Preferred type of English writing course .....	72
5.1.5. Relevance of the current writing course .....	72
5.1.6. Gap between students writing needs and their writing competence .....	73
5.2. Conclusions.....	73
5.2. Recommendations .....	74
Reference .....	75
Appendices .....	81
Appendix A: Questionnaire for students .....	81
Appendix C: Questionnaire for instructors.....	90
Appendix D: Questionnaire for graduates .....	95
Appendix E: Interview for English instructors.....	96
Appendix F: Interview for business faculty dean.....	97
Appendix G: Interview for bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head .....	98
Appendix H: Course material evaluation .....	99

## List of Tables

Tables	page
Table 1: Background information about the students.....	41
Table 2: The students' writing abilities in terms of other language skills .....	41
Table 3: English writing difficulties the students face in their academic studies.....	43
Table 4: The students' English writing difficulties in their future career .....	47
Table 5: The students' attitude towards taking the current writing course .....	49
Table 6: Preferred type of English writing course.....	51
Table 7: The students' English writing needs in their academic studies.....	53
Table 8: The students' English writing needs in their future career .....	56

## **List of Acronyms**

ESP= English for specific purpose

EST= English for science and technology

EGP= English for general purpose

EAP= English for academic purpose

ESAP= English for specific academic purpose

EGAP= English for general academic purpose

EOP= English for occupational purpose

ESOP= English for specific occupational purpose

EGOP= English for general occupation purpose

EBP= English for business purpose

EMP= English for medical purpose

ELP= English for legal purpose

NA= Needs analysis

TSA= Target situation analysis

PSA= Present situation analysis

TEFL= Teaching English as foreign language

ESL= English as second language

## **Abstract**

### ***Investigating Writing Needs of Undergraduate Economics Students with reference to Samara University***

***Tarekegn Tesema***

***Addis Ababa, May 2013***

*The main objective of this research is investigating English writing needs of economics students with reference to Samara University. In this study, an attempt was made to evaluate whether the current writing course the students are taking meets their academic and occupational needs. To this effect, data were collected through 5-point likert scale questionnaire from students, subject area instructors and economics graduates and through interview from English instructors, business faculty dean, bank manager and bureau of finance and economic development head. Besides, data were gathered through evaluation of course materials English instructors are using in offering writing course to the students.*

*In the analysis, writing activities the learners expected to perform in their academic studies and in their occupation were identified and prioritized. Then, it was found that the writing activities are important in learners' academic and occupational settings. On the other hand, it was identified that the students have positive attitude towards taking the current English writing course and prefer specific writing course that is relevant to business particularly to economics. However, the findings revealed that the students face almost high or some difficulties in performing the writing activities. As a result, it was pointed out that there is clear gap between the students' writing needs and their writing competence. What is more, it was discovered that the gap appeared between the students' writing needs and their writing competence is due to the students lack the expected writing abilities to carry out the writing activities. This is because the current writing course the students are being offered does not equip them with specific writing abilities. Thus, it was found that the writing course, Basic Writing Skills Course, is not adequately meeting their academic and occupational needs.*

*Based on the findings, it was recommended that syllabus designers should prepare specific writing course for economics students considering their academic and occupational needs, which were identified in this study. In addition, Samara University curriculum revisers and English instructors should evaluate the current writing course and make an adjustment in which the students will be provided with specific writing course.*

## **Chapter One: Introduction**

### **1.1. Background of the Study**

The ability to communicate in writing is very important skill for students' academic success and for their future career. In supporting this, Tomlinson (2003) states that English used in academic skills such as writing essay, writing assignment and project work are vital to students' success in a college or University. Concerning the ability to write particularly in business, Maican (2010) suggests that business communication is very crucial particularly in the fast growing world of business nowadays. Within the field of business communication, business writing holds a paramount role because it is a key part of daily activities in most business and records texts formally for future reference. In addition, Admas and keene (2000) strengthen that with the overture of free economic policy in Ethiopia, the business sector is making a significant use of English for communication. These have enhanced academic demand for English writing as students strive to perform successfully in their discipline and professional contexts.

However, whether all students in all fields of studies take the same writing course while they need English writing for different purposes is the big question to be raised. It is believed that students from different field of specialization need different writing course as they need the writing course for different purposes. Thus, offering them specific English writing courses that help them in their real life situation is very important. If they do not take specific English writing courses which help them for their practical purpose, it is obvious that they encounter writing difficulty in their academic studies and in their future career. Lau (2003) confirms that if students lack fundamental skills, especially in writing, they face difficulty to cope with their normal course workload. Likewise, John, Gross, Nord and Johnson (1986) cited in MCEWen (2003) note that a continuing problem facing business graduates is their limited written communication ability because of their unawareness of the kind of writing done in the workplace. And a poor writing skill weakens the effectiveness of a given message and creates a poor image of a company or institution and the writer-they both come across as ignorant. Consequently, the writing course students take has to center

on their current and future needs so that they are able to perform effectively writing activities in their studies and in their future occupation.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Traditionally, English language was taught for many years being focused on language form and rules whereby accuracy was much expected from learners. Since this mode of teaching language did not help students use the language for real purpose, attention has been shifted from teaching language forms and rules to communicative language teaching in which real life situations are created for students so that they use the language for communicative purpose. The emergence of communicative approach, according to Widdowson (1978), gave birth to English for specific purpose in which English language needed for certain group of learners is quite different from other group of learners as the context in which the language used is different. The scholar pointed out that the language we speak and write varies considerably, and in the number of different ways, from one context to another. If language varies from one situation of use to another, therefore, it should be possible to determine the features of the learners' courses. Variation of English language based on context in which the language is used shows learners in different field of studies need different English language for different purposes. Concerning this, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) says "Tell me what you need English for and I will tell you the English that you need". This indicates that the kind of English language course a particular group of students need depends on the purpose for which the language is required. In addition, Richards (2001) supports that students in different field of study have different language needs and what they are taught should be restricted to what they need.

In the same manner, the writing course necessary for particular group of students should be different from the others; for instance, English writing course given to business students has to be different from that of medical learners if we want the English course meet the students' specific needs. Giving students specific English writing course that depends on their specific need will prepare them to perform effectively the tasks prescribed by their field of study or work situation. Considering their specific needs and interest in designing the course also encourages them to take part actively in the learning process.

However, in higher institutions in our country, most students including business learners are given common writing course (basic writing skills course) that is used to develop general writing skill. This means the students are not being equipped with specific English writing abilities that help them to perform specific writing activities in their study areas and workplaces. If so, students may face difficulty in writing in their target situations.

Therefore, conducting research on analysis of business students' writing needs is mandatory so that the writing course will be designed in a way it meets the learners' specific needs. With this regard, certain local researches have been conducted, for instance, Abebe Tilahun (2010) conducted research on the writing needs of business management students in relation to sophomore English course offered at Dilla University in focus. Additionally, Abebe Alemu (2011) conducted research on the writing needs of business students (public financial management, and tax and custom administration) at Ethiopian Civil Service College. Both researchers have come to common finding, that is, the existing English writing course doesn't meet the writing needs of the learners' in their academic studies and in their occupational setting.

There are also other researches which have been conducted at tertiary level. These are: developing criteria for designing an appropriate English course for accounting students at Nekemte Africa Beza college by Beyene Wako (2007); assessment of the relevance of business English course at commercial college of Addis Ababa to the needs of employing organization by Solomon Mogas (2010); analyzing English course needs of nursing students on selected governmental nursing school by Epherem Tesema (2004); An Analysis of the English Language Needs of Students of Theology: with Reference to Some Selected Evangelical Colleges, by Tilahun Bekele (2003); determining English course needs of agriculture students at mekele University by Fesseha Abadi (2004); Determining the English Language Needs of Law Students at Mekelle University by Molla (2006); investigating of English language needs of medical students at selected private college in Addis Ababa by Kebera Malla (2012); analyzing English language needs of fine art students at Mekele teachers college by Habtamu Desta (2003); communicative language needs of commerce students at saint mary's college by Fitsum Abate (2005). All findings of the above

researches reveal that there is a clear gap between current English course and the learners' English language needs.

However, the researcher has not come across study conducted on writing needs of economics students so far in Ethiopian context. The writing types and the context in which these writing types are used in economics are different from other business fields. In advocating this, Simpson (2011) explains that every discipline has its own repertoire of typical writing types, which are unlikely to be used by members of other disciplinary or professional communities. This is because each discipline has its own typical ways of constructing, interpreting and using the writing types. In consequence, the researcher initiated to investigate the writing needs of the students. The researcher has given focus to writing because it is widely used in business in general and in economics in particular. And at the same time, the researcher has experienced that students face difficulty in writing. In supporting this, white (1981) cited in Nunan (1988) states that learning to write fluently and expressively is the most problematic of the macro-skills for all language users whether the language is first, second or foreign language. One of the reasons students face writing problem specifically in their studies and in their occupation may be because they are not equipped with specific writing abilities that helps them to write effectively in the target situation. Analyzing the writing needs of the learners therefore helps to design appropriate writing course that meet their specific needs so that the learners perform effectively writing activities they are given in their studies and in their occupation.

### **1.3. Objective of the Study**

The main purpose of the study is to investigate the writing needs of undergraduate economics students of Samara University in focus. More specifically, the study is to:

- ✦ examine whether the existing English writing course addresses the learners' academic and future writing needs.
- ✦ identify the attitudes of the learners towards taking the current English writing course.

- ✦ identify the specific writing activities the learners perform in their academic and occupational settings.
- ✦ find out writing difficulties the students face in performing writing activities in their academic and occupational setting.
- ✦ discover the gap between the learners' current English writing competence and their writing needs.
- ✦ suggest possible solutions that fill the gap between the learners' current writing competence and their writing needs

#### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

Firstly, since there is no specific syllabus designed particularly for economics students, it will be hoped that syllabus designers and curriculum developers will use the study to design appropriate English writing course that help the learners in their academic studies and in their future career. Secondly, it will help researchers for further study on the area in detail. Thirdly, it will assist instructors to be aware of English for specific purposes and the students' writing needs and then help them accordingly.

#### **1.5. Scope of the Study**

This study was confined to investigating writing needs of economics students of Samara University because dealing with all departments of the University will take tremendous amount of time and resources. It dealt with the writing needs of the learners both in academic and occupational settings.

#### **1.6. Limitations of the study**

Firstly, in identifying the students' writing difficulties, information that is more reliable is obtained if students' samples of writing are analyzed, but it is difficult to find samples of writing for all writing activities identified in the study. Secondly, it would be more appropriate if other economics graduates from different organizations were included as sources of data. However, there are no other organizations to host economics graduates in Samara. Thus, the study was limited to graduates working in bank and in Bureau of finance and economic development.

## **Chapter Two: Review of related literature**

In the process of conducting research, reviewing related literature is the very significant part that serves as a base and guideline for a study by providing conceptual theory and research works related to an intended study. The purpose of reviewing related literature is thus to put theoretical framework that helps as a guide for a study and to discuss the previous investigations' findings in order to show gap between the past researches and the present one. Accordingly, under this chapter theoretical aspect of ESP including English for business purpose (EBP), English language learning theory and ESP, needs and needs analysis, approaches to needs analysis, theoretical issues on course material evaluation and previous studies on needs analysis will have been discussed in broader sense.

### **2.1. English for Specific Purpose**

ESP was essentially a material and teaching-led movement. It has been influenced by the development and changes in applied linguistics and English language teaching (ELT) and in turn, it has brought influence on ELT. It was, for example, very influential in showing how communicative language curriculum could be turned into either a functional-notional syllabus or a task-based syllabus. Here, the reason behind English for specific purposes emergence was to make language course more relevant to learners' needs to help them communicate effectively in a target situation (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998).

#### **2.1.1. Definition of ESP**

Giving acceptable and universal definition of ESP had been a great problem because what is specific and appropriate in one part of the world may not work in other parts. Even today, there is a big on-going debate as to how to specify what exactly ESP constitutes (Robison, 1991; Strevens, 1977; Belcher, 2006; Dudley-Evan & St. John, 1998; and Anthony, 1997 cited in Brunton, 2009). Thus, it is difficulty to produce a worldwide applicable definition of ESP.

However, different scholars have given definition of their own. For example, Hutchison and Waters (1987) define ESP is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to

content and method are based on learner's reason for learning. ESP course design is therefore based on the question "why do the learners need to learn a foreign language?" This indicates that identifying language needs of the learner is the foundation in ESP course design.

To Munby (1978), ESP courses are courses in which the syllabus and materials are determined by the prior analysis of the learners' communicative needs rather than by predetermined goals set by an institution or experts. This implies that learners are the center in ESP course design.

Robison (1991) on her part defined ESP in term of criteria and characteristics in order to understand it instead of giving direct definition. The first criteria for ESP is that it is goal oriented, which means students study English because they need English for study or occupational purpose not because of they are interested in English language. The second one is that an ESP course is based on need analysis, which intends to specify what exactly students have to do using English. In the same token, there are two characteristics of ESP, which the scholar used to define it. Firstly, there is specific period when the course objectives should be specified and put into practice. Secondly, students on ESP course are likely to be adults who are in tertiary education, experienced members of the workforce or already studied EGP (English for general purposes) for some years rather than children.

Streven (1988) also defines ESP in terms of absolute characteristics and variable characteristics. The absolute characteristics comprises of language teaching that it is designed to meet specified needs of the learner; related in content to particular disciplines or occupation; centered on the language appropriate to those disciplines or occupations; and designed in contrast with General English. On the other hand, the variable characteristics of ESP may be restricted to the language skills to be learned (for example reading only); and may not be taught according to any pre-ordained methodology.

All of the definitions given have their own weakness though they have validity. According to Hutchison and Waters' definition, it is not clear where ESP courses end and EGP courses begin because many non-specialist ESP instructors use ESP approach in that their syllabi are

based on analysis of learners' needs and their own specialist persons' knowledge of English for real communication. In addition, Streven's definition that refers to content in the second absolute characteristic may confirm many teachers' impression that ESP is always and necessarily related to subject content. Moreover, the Robison's mention of 'homogenous class' as a characteristics of ESP may lead to the same conclusion (Antony, 1997).

Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) on the other hand offer a modified definition of ESP in term of absolute and variable characteristics by revising other scholars' definitions (especially of Streven, 1977). It is believed that this division of ESP into absolute and variable characteristics is very helpful in resolving arguments about what is and is not ESP. These definitions are given below.

#### 1. Absolute characteristics

- ✦ ESP is designed to meet specific needs of the learner;
- ✦ ESP makes use of the underlying methodology and the activities of the discipline it serves;
- ✦ ESP is centred on the language (grammar, lexis, register), skills, discourse and genres appropriate to these activities.

#### 2. Variable characteristics

- ✦ ESP may be related to or designed for specific disciplines;
- ✦ ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of general English;
- ✦ 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 used for learners at secondary school level;

- ✦ ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students.
- ✦ Most ESP courses assume basic knowledge of the language system, but it can be used with beginners.

In the above definition, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) try to point out the following important ideas. Firstly, they explain that ESP teaching does not necessarily have to be related to content but it should always reflect the underlying concepts and activities of the broad disciplines. Moreover, Dudley-Evans and St John claim that ESP should make use of a methodology that differs from that used in General Purpose English teaching. This means the methodology in ESP should refer to the nature of the interaction between the ESP teacher and the learners since the teacher sometimes becomes more like a language consultant enjoying equal status with the learners who have their own expertise in the subject matter.

Most essentially, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) believe that language should be included as a defining feature of ESP. While the specified needs arising from needs analysis relate to activities that students need to carry out in the real world (rather than language), a key assumption of ESP is that these activities generate and depend on registers, genres and associated language that students need to manipulate in order to carry out the activities.

### **2.1.2. Emergence of ESP**

Different scholars have put different reasons for emergence of English for specific purpose. To begin with, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) suggest that there were three reasons for the emergence of English for specific purpose. The first was the demand for a brave new world, and this comprises of two historical forces that played an important role to ESP occurrence. First, at the end of the Second World War, there was high expansion of scientific, technical and economic activity on international scale, for various reasons, most notably the economic power of the United States in the post-war world and the role of international language fell to English. As a result, people highly needed learning English language to be familiarized with the new technology and commerce. Second, the oil crisis of the early 1970s resulted in massive flowing of Western money and expertise into the oil producing countries. During

that moment, the limitations of money and time created a need for cost-effective course with clearly defined goals.

The other reason that had tremendous impact on the emergence of ESP was the occurrence of major change in the field of linguistics. Traditionally, the aim of linguistics had been to describe the rules of English usages. However, new language studies was shifted away attention from describing formal features of language usage to discovering the way in which language is actually used in real communication (Widdowson, (1978). One finding of the studies was that language we use varies from one situation of use to another. If language varies from one situation of use to another, it should be possible to determine the features of specific situation and then use these features as a base for learners' course design. English required by students in certain field of study could therefore be identified by analyzing the linguistic characteristics of their specialist area of study or work.

The third point that contributed for the growth of ESP was the new development in educational psychology that considers the learners and their attitude to learning (Rodgers, 1969 cited in Hutchison and Waters, 1987). As to Rodgers, rather than simply focus on the method of language delivery, more attention was given to the ways in which learners acquire language and the differences in the ways language is acquired. Learners were expected to employ different learning strategies, use different skills, enter with different learning experience, and are motivated by different needs and interests. This led to a focus on learners' need and designing specific courses to better meet individual needs. To this day, the catchword in ESL is learner-centered or learning-centered.

Munby (1978) also puts three main reasons for the rapid growth of ESP programs. One of the most significant reasons was the spread of higher and further education that resulted in increasing demand for English language by science students who needed to gain knowledge of science and technology. The second reason was an alteration in the status of English from medium to subject in some countries, which dropped standards of English for a better course demand. The third one was the attraction to specially made courses in English that will enable learners to do their job or pursue their studies rather than the irrelevant general English course.

Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) try to summarize that the study of language for specific purpose (ESP) has had a long history going back to the Roman and Greek Empires. Since the 1960s, ESP has become a vital and innovative activity within the teaching of English as a foreign or a second language movement. The original flowering of the ESP movement resulted from general developments in world economy in the 1950s and 1960s. This was the time when there came into being the growth of science and technology, the increased use of English as the international language of science, technology and business, the increased economic power of certain oil rich countries and the increased number of international students studying in the United Kingdom, United States of America and Australia.

The overall outcome of ESP development mention above was to put pressure on language teaching professionals to design specific English courses that meet the learners' needs. Strevens, (1988) claims that the rationale for the need of ESP may partly be due to the fact that ESP, as compared to English for General Purpose (EGP), is time and cost effective, relevant to the learners, successful in facilitating learning and related to content (that is in its themes and topics) to particular disciplines, occupations and activities. In advocating this idea, Nunan (1998) comments that adult learners learn best when the content is relevant to their experiences or present concerns and the learning process is relevant to their life experiences. And if English course, according to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), is based on the learners' need and interest, it would help improve their motivation and thereby make English learning better and faster.

Busturkmen (2010) also tries to put why ESP courses should be more effective than general ESL courses. First, since ESP courses cater to students' interests and needs, they are more likely to produce high levels of motivation, and students will be more interested in topics and texts related to their work or study areas. If students are more motivated, then learning is more likely to occur. Second, ESP courses are more efficient because they have more limited objectives than general ESL courses. Limited and highly specified objectives are more likely to be achievable.

In general, according to the above sources, English for specific purpose came to existence in attempt to equip learners with specific English language competence needed to perform

activities in a particular field of study or occupation. This is because it was believed that general English could not satisfy the specific needs of learners or employers since it has no limited and specific objective as in the case of ESP. What the learners do with the language was the main concern before offering them English course. This indicates that learners' language needs should be taken into account in the first place. Considering learners' needs motivates and then makes them value their leaning so that they actively participate in the teaching-learning process.

### **2.1.3. ESP versus EGP**

It may be difficult to make straightforward distinction between ESP and EGP. Barnard and Zemach (2003) cited in Busturkmen (2010) states that making a boundary between ESP and EGP is not always clear. Where do we place, for example, a course designed for a certain businessperson who is to assume a post abroad in the near future? If the learner's language proficiency level is poor, the course the learner need might be general communicative English skills that may help him/her for his/her daily communication. Most people would possibly agree that the course should be classified as ESP, simply because the aims are clearly defined, and the learner's needs are identified. However, ESP should not be regarded as a separate part in ELT, but simply an area (with unclear boundaries) whose courses are usually more focused in their aims and make use of a narrower range of topics.

However, Bustukmen (2010) argues that ESP courses are narrower in focus than general ELT courses because they center on analysis of learners' needs. This implies that ESP views learners in terms of their work or study demand for English and that ESP courses focus on work or study related needs, not personal needs or interests. That means every learner may have his/her own personal need or interest for learning English language writing while educational or work related needs require him or her to write different writing other than their personal need or interest. ESP is therefore focus on kind of language students are expected to use to carry out activities in their studies or at their workplaces, not individual needs or interests.

Moreover, what distinguishes ESP from general English is the awareness of the need not the existence of the need. If the learners, sponsors and teachers know why the learners need English, that awareness will influence what content is acceptable as reasonable in the language course and, on positive side, what potential can be exploited (Hutchison and Waters (1987). ESP differs from EGP in the sense that the words and sentences used and the subject matter discussed in ESP are all relevant to a particular field or discipline. There is no such particular situation targeted in general language learning, but rather emphasis of applications in general situations. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) support that ‘‘the main concern of ESP has always been, and remain, with needs analysis, text analysis, and preparing learners to communicate effectively in the tasks prescribed by their studies or work situation’’.

Furthermore, Munby (1978) points out that while ESP is usually specified by the prior analysis of learners' communicative needs, EGP is defined usually on the basis of predetermined goals set by an institution or experts. This means the emphasis given to learners needs in ESP usually exceeds that of EGP.

According to some of the above sources, putting a clear-cut distinction between ESP and EGP is not possible; however, the other sources uncovered very convincing points that differentiate ESP from EGP. Firstly, ESP differs from EGP in that it is concerned with why learners need English language. This indicates that ESP is largely concerned with the language use for practical purpose in specific study or workplace context, and so, it is narrower than EGP. Secondly, ESP course design centers on students' communicative needs, not on the predetermined goals already put by experts, which means students' needs are at the center of the language courses design process.

#### **2.1.4. Classification of ESP**

ESP is traditionally divided into two main categories: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) that help learners to pursue their academic studies and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) that help them to function in their workplaces (Hutchison and Waters 1987; Robison, 1991; and munby, 1978). The growth of English as the leading language for the

dissemination of academic knowledge has transformed the educational experiences of countless students by helping them gain necessary skills to understand their disciplines and to be successful in their learning. The response of the language teaching profession to these demands has been the development over many years of a new field in the teaching of English as a Second/ Foreign Language in universities and other academic settings (Hamp-Lyons and Hyland (2002).

To begin with, EAP is defined as teaching English communicative skills required for study purpose in educational setting (Jordan, 1997 and Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998). Hamp-Lyons and Hyland (2002) also states that English for Academic Purposes refers to language research and instruction that focuses on communicative needs and practices of particular groups in academic contexts. It means grounding instruction on understanding of the cognitive, social and linguistic demands for academic disciplines. This takes practitioners beyond preparing learners for study in English to developing new kinds of literacy: equipping students with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts.

When we come to the branches of EAP, Coffey (1984) states two major approaches have emerged in area English for academic purposes: common-core English course and subject-specific course. The former refers to English for general academic purpose (EGAP) that focuses on study skills. The latter, however, refers to English for specific academic purpose (ESAP) that emphasizes on examining the language features of individual discipline. Thus, it is teaching of the language that are related to demand for a particular discipline or department, which includes the language structure, vocabulary particular skill needed for the discipline and appropriate to academic convention.

English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) focuses on the language abilities that a particular job requires (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998). To Black and Hernandez (2009) EOP is teaching English that prepare learners for a particular job. This is providing students with opportunities to transfer and experience the application of skills and concepts learned in educational setting to real world situations. The purpose is thus to help students develop skills, attitudes and concepts that can be transferable to the real world of work. According to

Busturkmen (2010), EOP is also divided as English for General Occupational Purposes (EGOP) and English for Specific Occupational Purposes (ESOP). English for Specific Occupational purposes is further divided as English for Business Purpose (EBP), English for Medical Purpose (EMP), English for Legal Purpose (ELP) and so on.

In the area of ESP, English for Business Purpose emerged at the time when English use as international business language increased because of massive expansion of business throughout the world. At the beginning, ESP work was dominated by English for science and technology, however, in the 1990s, the largest area of growth became Business English. Within ESP, the largest published materials are also that of Business English. The growth of English for Business Purposes has coincided with the development of economy in many countries around the globe (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998).

In the fast growing business nowadays, Business English has also become very important in helping people develop business communication skills that make them communicate in business situations. In supporting this, Johnson and Morrow (1981) suggest that English for Business Purposes is a course that provides students with the practical language skills needed to communicate effectively in business situations. Kushal (2009) and Walker (2010) verify that in business world, nothing can be achieved without effectively communicating with employers, employees, clients, suppliers and customers. Within business communication, the ability to communicate in writing is the most important skill that business students should possess. This is because business learners do a lot of writing in their study and do more at their workplaces (Soles, 2010). For instance, Macian (2010) point out that writing activities business professionals are expected to write include commercial correspondence (the exchange of letters in business dealing with) enquiries, offers, orders, delivery, acknowledgements, payment, complaints, credit, applications and insurance. They also write other genres of texts which are produced to provide business information or records such as reports, proposals, memos, minutes, CVs, contracts, agreements, and recommendations.

### **2.1.5. Language learning theory and ESP**

English for specific purpose focuses on specific communicative needs and practices of social groups, and it is aimed at preparing students to study or work effectively in target environment. It has consistently been at the cutting-edge of both theory development and innovative practices in applied linguistics, making a significant contribution to our understanding of varied ways language is used in particular communities (Hyland, 2007). To Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998), the emergence of communicative language teaching was associated with the development of English language courses specifically targeted at preparing students to work in different professions. The development of these courses later led to the appearance of ESP in which focus has been given to language use in a specific situation. This shows that language-learning theory in ESP is to help learners develop their communicative competence in a particular situation.

In ESP, as to Hyland (2007), therefore, students are exposed to specific situations where they need to use English in order to perform certain activities. Therefore, situations that reflect the target environment are created using task or disciplinary based contents so that the learners use the language to carry out the activities, and in doing so, they develop their specific communicative skills that assist them to do activities in the target settings. In supporting this, Rodgers and Richards (2001) claim that ‘‘activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning’’. Basturkmen (2006) also suggests that ESP makes extensive use of task-based and content-based approaches. In task-based approach, for instance, students are provided with tasks that reflect the kind of work the ESP learners will do in the target discourse community (tasks that they will undertake in their workplaces or academic environment). These tasks help learners use language meaningfully and that through struggling to use the language to complete the tasks, they acquire the language.

In content-based approach to instruction to Basturkmen (2006), students are presented with disciplinary based texts, and target language is viewed as the vehicle through which subject matter content is learnt. Here, teaching activities are specific to the subject matter being taught and are geared to stimulate students to think and learn using the language. It also

involves the integration of language skills, for example, writing for example follows on from listening and reading, and students are often required to synthesize facts and ideas from multiple sources as preparation for writing. The success of this approach in ESP is reported by Parkinson (2000) cited in Basturkmen (2006), that is , the learners are able to build on their previous knowledge, are exposed to contextualized uses of language, and are able to prepare for the eventual uses to which the language would be put. The above sources indicates that language teaching in ESP is presented in specific contexts in which learners able to manipulate language that help them to study or work effectively in the target environment.

Other theory of language learning in ESP to Basturkmen (2006) is that learning arises from and through social interaction. Learning is seen as first social and then, second individual. For example, learners may face a task s/he is unable to complete with his/her present knowledge and skills. During this time, s/he works on the task in collaboration with a more knowledge or skillful individual. Through this collaboration, students acquire the concept needed to do the task. Later, the learner will able to work independently on similar tasks.

## **2.2. Needs**

Different scholars have tried to explain needs based on their own perspectives. Let us see some of the definitions. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) define needs by dividing them into two basic parts. These are target needs and learning needs. Target needs are knowledge and abilities students need to perform the required degree of competence in the target situation (needs that target situation demands). These scholars have viewed target needs in terms of necessities, lacks and wants. Necessities refer to what learner has to know in order to function effectively in the target situation. Lacks refer to the gabs between what learner knows already and what the target situation necessitates. Wants concerns with the learner's views and attitude towards taking a course. The second basic division of needs is learning needs that refer to what the learner needs to perform in order to learn. It focuses on how the target needs can be achieved. Thus, According to Hutchison and Waters, both target needs and learning needs are important grounds for course design.

Brindley (1989) cited in Robison (1991) defines needs as objective needs and subjective needs. Objective needs refer to needs that are derived from information about learners, their use of language in real-life situation, their current language proficiency and language difficulties they face in communication. Subjective needs, on the other hand, refers to needs derived from information about affective and cognitive factors like personality, confidence, attitudes, learners' wants and expectations with regard to the learning of English and their individual cognitive styles and learning strategies. And Robison points out that mostly, objective needs are perceived by the teachers and subjective needs are perceived by learners. However, many ESP students have a clear understanding of some of their objective needs though they may not notice, for example, the need to develop self-confidence, which the teacher can see it easily. This tells us that it is important to collect data from both teachers and students while assessing particular learners' needs.

Robison (1991) also tries to define needs in five different ways. Firstly, needs are the students' study or job requirements. Secondly, needs are what the user institution or the society at large consider as necessary to be learnt from the language course. Thirdly, needs are what learners have to do to acquire the language. Fourthly, needs are what the learners would like to learn from a language course. Lastly, needs are what learners do not know or cannot do in English.

According to Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) necessitates, what Busturkmen (2010) calls the destination of the students' journey, are regarded as objective needs since both refer to needs that target situation demands. And they use subjective needs instead of 'wants' in order to refer to attitude and perception learners have towards taking an English course. Hutchison and Waters (1987); Jordan (1997) on the other hand consider 'lacks' (what the students do not know or cannot do in English) as objective needs or present deficiency. Definition given by Robison (1991) in the first and second points can be considered as objective needs because they are needs that target situation demand from the learners and the rest definitions given in third and fourth points are learning needs. And Learning needs are subjective needs since every individual student has his/her own needs and interest in case of way of learning language. Therefore, based on the above definitions given by

different scholars, it is possible to categorize needs into two major groups as objective needs and subjective needs. This study is thus attempts to identify objective needs and subjective needs.

### **2.3. Needs analysis**

In foreign and second language teaching, one of several consequences is the increasing importance of careful studies of learner needs as a prerequisite for effective course design (Long, 2005). Long goes on saying no medical intervention would be prescribed before a thorough diagnosis of a patient, so no language-teaching program should be designed without a thorough needs analysis. Every language course should consider a course for specific purposes, varying only (and considerably, to be sure) in the precision with which learner needs can be specified in minute detail in the case of occupationally, academically, or vocationally-oriented programs for most adults. This implies that analyzing students' specific needs is the foundation for ESP course design.

Different scholars defined need analysis in different ways. Brown (1995) defines that needs analysis is “the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that influence the learning and teaching situation” (p. 36).

For Busturkmen (2010) and Dudley-Evans and St John, (1998), need analysis is the identification of skills, texts, linguistic forms, communicative practices a particular group of students need to function effectively in their discipline of study, professionals or workplace to determine and refine the content of ESP course. Busturkmen goes on saying needs analysis is also the identification of difficulties and standard situations through observation of participants functioning in a target situation combining with interviews and questionnaire. Chambers (1980) also describes that need analysis has to be concerned with the establishment of communicative needs and their realization, resulting from an analysis of the communication in the target situation.

### **2.3.1. The Purpose of need analysis**

To Richards (2001), the first step in conducting needs analysis is to decide exactly the purpose or purposes of the study. Thus, the scholar identifies different purposes of need analysis in language teaching. Firstly, needs analysis find out language skills learners need in order to perform a particular activity in workplaces or studies. Secondly, it identifies the learners' current language proficiency and problem they experience in real situations in order to find a gap between what the students are able to do and what they need to be able to do. This helps to determine which students from a group are most in need of training in particular language skill. Thirdly, it helps to determine if an existing course adequately addresses the needs of potential students. Fourthly, it helps to determine the attitude of the students towards learning English language.

### **2.3.2. The users of need analysis**

A need analysis may be conducted for the following different users as to Richards (2001). The first users of needs analysis are curriculum developers who may use the information to evaluate the adequacy of existing syllabus, curriculum, and material. Teachers and students who use the curriculum for teaching-learning process are also the users of needs analysis. The other users of needs analysis are staffs of tertiary institution who are interested in knowing what the expected level will be of students and what problem they face. Likewise, writers who prepare new textbooks are the users of needs analysis. The scholar goes on to say that with small-scale needs analysis such as that carried out by a single teacher on his or her class, the audience might consist of the teacher, other teachers, and the program coordinators. In cases of large-scale needs analysis, there will be multiple audiences for the results of needs analysis. Determining the likely audiences is therefore an important first step in planning a needs analysis in order to ensure that the information the audiences need is obtained from result of the study and that the needs analysis will have an impact it is designed to have.

### **2.3.3. Target population in needs analysis**

The very nature of need analysis starts with a focus on who is the target population and what are the needs of the population, not on what the program does. Here, target population refers to the people about whom information will be collected. In language program, target population will be learners, but other can be involved based on whether they can provide information useful in meeting the purpose of the needs analysis (Richards, 2001). Learners are indeed able to provide useful and valid information about their present and future needs. Nevertheless, better and more readily information may be available from language teachers who have prior experience with learners in the program, graduates of the program or field concerned, who have employed in the occupation for which the perspective learners are preparing, subject-area specialists, employers, and documents such as course materials and job descriptions (Long, 2005).

According to Robison (1991), target population, who are the source of information for needs analysis, are potential students, specialist academic department, the language teaching institution (teachers and administrators), past students who graduated in the field concerned and others who are or will be concerned with students' specific job or study situation. To Richterich and Chancerel (1987) quoted in Hutchison and Waters (1987), the target population used as sources of information are learners themselves, the language teaching establishment, and the host institution (the learners places of work).

In needs analysis conducted on writing problems encountered by foreign students enrolled in American Universities, information was obtained from samples of students writing, test data on students' performance, reports by teachers on typical problems students face, opinion of experts, information from students through interview and questionnaires, analysis of textbooks used in teaching writing and related literature (Richards, 2001).

### **2.3.4. Approaches to needs analysis**

The focus of ESP on purpose for which students need a language prompted the development of approaches to needs analysis. These approaches are helpful to analyze language that particular learners' needs. Among various approaches, the most common ones are target

situation analysis, present situation analysis, learning centered approach, strategy analysis, means analysis and language audits (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998; Jordan, 1997). In the words of Jordan (1997), in certain exhaustive needs analysis, each approach makes a paramount contribution. However, needs analysts should first decide which approaches they follow before embarking on the actual task since dealing with all approaches seems impossible. Thus, this study primarily focuses on target situation analysis (TSA) and present situation analysis (PSA).

#### **2.3.4.1. Target situation analysis**

Chambers (1980) defines target situation analysis as it is the process of identifying the target situation in which the learners will use the language they are learning and then carrying out a rigorous analysis of the linguistic features of that situation before designing ESP course. Robison, 1991 ; Hutchison and waters, 1987) also define TSA as “ the type of needs that is determined by the demands of a target situation by analyzing what learner or expert communicator has to know in order to function effectively in a given situation’’. Robison goes on saying it is analysis that focuses on the students’ needs at the end of a language course. Target situation analysis, according to Munby (1978), involves determining the types of situation in which learners will be using English, the task or activities they perform in the target language and their existing language skills or abilities with regard to what situation demands. Thus, the target needs and target level performance are established by investigating the target situation, and needs analysis is central to ESP, indeed the necessary starting point in material or course design.

Berwick (1989) cited in Richards (2001) holds similar view that target situation analysis concerns with the nature and effect of target language communications in particular situation (in content area classrooms or in workplaces). Target tasks the learners will have to carry out in English in their educational or occupational setting are identified. Once the target tasks have identified their linguistic characteristics and demands for the tasks are determined as a basis for language course design. The underlying reason for target needs analysis is therefore identifying elements of students' target English situations and using them as the basis of ESP instruction, proving students with the specific language they need to succeed in

their courses and future careers (Johns, 1991 cited in Benesch, 1996 ; busturkmen, 2010). This means tasks or activities the target situation demands are identified and then the kind of language used to carry out the tasks in that particular situation is defined so that the learners will be equipped with necessary language skills in order to function effectively in that given situation.

Thus, target situation analysis (TSA) related to communication needs rather than learning needs; and it involves mainly objective data: identifying the contexts of language use, observing the language events in these contexts, and collecting and analyzing target genres (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998). Thus, target situation analysis involves register analysis, discourse analysis and genre analysis.

Register is the name given to a variety of language according to its use in different situation (Widdowson, 1978). This means the concept of register analysis is based on the belief that English in one field of study constitutes a special register that is different from other field of study (Richards 2001). Thus, register analysis studies the language of fields such as economics, accounting, management, journalism, computer, and the like for their distinctive patterns of occurrence of vocabulary, verb patterns, forms, noun phrases and tense usage. Accordingly, register analysis is defined as analysis in which the grammatical and lexical features of a particular field are analyzed and organized with the aim of making the contents of the course more relevant to learners' needs (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998; and Tomlinson, 2003). Hence, Swales (1988) states that its primary goal is to identify the grammatical and lexical features occurring more frequently in specific English course than in general English.

ESP/EST courses in the 1960 have depended on the prior analysis of the register or of the language form and vocabularies that were more frequent in the discipline. Such analysis focused on language use at word and sentence level. However, in order to identify the linguistic structure of longer samples of text or speech, different and new (discourse or rhetoric) approach to language analysis came to existence (Richards 2001; Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998).

Discourse analysis refers to the evaluation of language use by members of speech community beyond a sentence or an utterance. In other words, it is concerned with describing language and its form at text or speech level that is perceived to be longer than sentence. To Richards (2001: 31) ‘‘conversation, paragraphs, letters, and the like can be examples of the language at which discourse analysis studies language’’. Discourse analysis is different from register analysis in that it goes beyond looking at grammar and words at sentence level. It attempts to study both language form and language functions (Harmer, 2001; Brown, 2007). Thus, to Brown and Yule (1983) discourse analysis is the analysis of language in use rather than a mere description of linguistic forms without considering the purpose and function of they are meant to serve.

Since the central concern of ESP is to enable learners communicate effectively in specific study or work related setting, description of specialist discourse that deals with the communication and the language use in the specialist field is the core building block of ESP course design (John and Dudley-Evans, 1991). The main advantage of discourse analysis is therefore to reduce difficulties learners face in using the target language for communication by helping them identify the typical patterns of use because the more students are able to identify typical patterns of use, the better their abilities to write, speak, read and listen become improved (Harmer, 2001). West (1998:5-6) claims:

*One might distinguish two kinds of abilities that an English course at this level should aim at to developing. The first is ability to recognize how sentence are used in the performance of facts of communication and the ability to understand the rhetorical functioning of language in use. The second is the ability to recognize and manipulate the formal devices used to combine sentences to create continuous passage of prose. We might say that the first has to do with rhetorical coherence of discourse and the second with the grammatical cohesion of text.*

Bruce (2008) also states that in discourse analysis, linguistic features like grammar, vocabulary and their functions used in a particular discipline are identified. Thus, teaching students in a particular field of study the linguistic knowledge with pragmatic knowledge and conventionalized forms of communication help the learners write extended prose that is

both accurate and appropriate. This helps learners develop discourse competence, which has always been included as an essential component of communicative competence.

Target situation analysis also involves genre analysis. Genre is a term for grouping texts together, representing how writers typically use language to respond to recurring situations. Genres are characterized by their communicative purposes and their patterns of structures, styles, contents and intended audience (Swales 1990 cited in Dudley Evans and St John (1998). West (1998) states that genre analysis and discourse analysis are similar in that they both deal with text instead of sentence or utterance. Their difference is discourse analysis involves the study of cohesive links between sentences or the structure of texts, but genre analysis emphasizes on the regularities of one form of language structure that distinguishes one text from another. To Robison (1991) there are many genre types in different discipline. These are business letters, expositions, academic articles and brochures of various types. Specially, in academic context there are often four types of genre: narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative.

The advantage of genre analysis is to help course developer in designing appropriate course for a particular discipline. In course design, first, key genres used in specific discourse community are identified and then language description as well as context in which the language is used in that discourse community is provided. In this case, learners able to understand what they read/listen and produce their own written and spoken language in a better way. Students who are trained about the moves of various genres are better communicators than those who are not (Harmer, 2001; Busturkmen, 2006). Shortly, swales (1990) states that genre analysis in ESP is used to identify the genres used in the target situation and to offer description of language to the second or foreign language learners.

#### **2.3.4.2. Present situation analysis**

Present situation analysis concerns where the learners are and refers to information about learners' current proficiencies and ambitions. These are: what they do and do not know and can and cannot do in relation to the target situation demands (their strength and weakness); what they want at the beginning of a course; their skills and perceptions; their previous

experience; their familiarity with specialist subject; and what they know of its demands and genres. Essentially, it refers to needs that enable students to learn and pursue their language goals as the course progress and to know the end needs (Robison, 1991; Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998; Busturkmen, 2010). As to Robison, 1991 and Hutchison and Waters, 1998) the source information can be why the learners are taking the course, the students' current language ability, their resources (financial and technical), their view towards language teaching and learning, the host institution's (place of work) attitude toward learning English and using it.

In explaining the relation between target situation analysis and present situation analysis, (West, 1997) states that in analyzing students' English language needs, information is sought to identify the gap between what students know and can do at present time and what they need ideally to be able to do in the target situation. The information yielded is used to design a language course bridging the gap between the two points. Robison (1991:9-10) also puts the following.

*First, the precise language skills needed to carry out specific jobs are determined, thereby establishing a target profile of language skills as part of a job description and facilitating in selection of personnel for new positions. In order to draw up this profile the analyst must find out what tasks or activities people perform in their job... Next, a profile of a present ability needs to be established, showing the extent to which present ability match up to their job requirement. ... Finally, the assessor must determine how much language training is needed (in terms of time and facilities required) to bridge the gap between the learners' present ability profile and the target profile.*

The above idea indicates that the first step in needs analysis is to identify particular tasks or activities learners perform in target situation (at their workplaces or in their study) and then find out language skills needed in order to carry out these tasks or activities. Next, the students' present language proficiency is analyzed in order to see whether their present language ability helps them perform the tasks or activities that they are expected to do in the target situation. This helps to find out the gap between the learners' current language ability and the ability that the target situation demands. Lastly, language training needed is

determined in order to bridge the gap so that the learners able to perform jobs that the target situation requires.

Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) summarize that language needs analysis incorporates learners' background, their current language proficiency, their reason for taking the course, their teaching and learning preferences, the situations they need to communicate in, and the genres most often employed in them. This shows that need analysis embraces both consideration of the present situation starting where the students are and looking at what they can do now, and of the target situation, their future roles and the linguistics skills and knowledge they need to perform those roles. Therefore, to Johns (1991) the rationale for needs analysis is to identify elements of students' target English situations and use them as the basis of ESP instruction, provide students with the specific language they need to succeed in their courses and future careers. As a result, this study considers both present situation analysis and target situation analysis.

To recapitulate the above sources about needs analysis in general, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) cited in Busturkmen (2010) claim that the current concept of needs analysis assessment in ESP requires determining the following points. The first points that have to be determined are professional and personal information about the learners. Professional information about the learners refers to tasks and activities they are or will be using English for in target situation (target situation analysis and objective needs). This is the identification of tasks and activities students are expected to carry out in the target situation so that language and skill necessary to carry out those tasks and activities are determined. And personal information about learners refers to factors that may affect the way they learn language such as previous learning experience, cultural information, reason for attending a course and expectation of it, attitude towards learning English (wants, means and subjective needs).

In addition, English language information about learners has to be determined. This is finding out the learners' current language proficiency (present situation analysis). In analyzing of the learners' present language proficiency in accordance to the ability that target situation demands, a gap may appears between the students' present language ability

and the ability that target situation demands and this gap is referred as learners' lacks or deficiency. Brindley (1989) cited in Robinson (1991) calls this as 'what the students do not know or cannot do in English'. Therefore, needs analysis also seeks to identify the learners' language deficiency, which helps to find ways in which learners' language ability can be improved.

In order to bridge the gap between the learners' current ability and the ability needed by target situation, it is vital to find out the language and skills the learners need and how they are used through analyzing linguistics, discourse and genre used in that target situation (identifying how to communicate in English in the target situation). This is concerned with what learners need to do to acquire the language, and Hutchison and Waters (1998) states it as how students learn to do what they do with the language. In addition, what learners need from a course is another necessary point to be determined in needs analysis. A language course should provide learners with tasks that reflect the real world ones so that the language and skills they manipulate to carry out the tasks in classroom are transferred to their real life situations. Thus, whether the language course meets the learners' language needs is determined in needs analysis.

There are some points that should be understood concerning needs analysis. In ESP learners' needs are described in terms of performance, that is, in terms of what learners will be able to do with the language at the end of a course of study. Hence, the goal of ESP is to prepare the learners to carry out a specific task or set of tasks. Since students of ESP are usually studying to perform specific tasks (Robinson 1991), the measure of the success of students learning English for a particular purpose is whether they can perform convincingly particular tasks in English (through speaking or writing). This indicates that particular tasks students carry out using English in target situation and difficulties they face in doing the tasks should be identified.

However, ESP course is often not long enough to cover all the learners' needs; therefore, we need information that will help us select and prioritize both at the needs analysis stage and when we meet the learners or the sources of information (Dudley- Evans and St John 1998). In the work of Richards (2001), it is indicated that in carrying out needs analysis, a large

number of potential needs may be identified, but these needs will have to be prioritized because not all of them may be practical to address in a language program.

In addition, we have to make a distinction between language needs and course needs of learners (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998; Jordan, 1997). Language needs of learners are concerned with the reason for learning English language, and it attempts to answer the question ‘what do learners need English for?’). But, course needs of learners tries to answer the question ‘what do learners need from the course? In other words, this refers to what kind language course students’ should be provided with so that their language needs can be met. Since the aforementioned points are important in needs analysis for evaluation and design a language program, they were considered in this study.

#### **2.4. Course material evaluation**

In ESP classroom, course materials like textbooks play a crucial role in meeting the learners’ needs, increasing their motivations, facilitating their learning and recalling the information. The main purpose of ESP is to prepare learners to study or work effectively in their target environment. In order to put this into practice as to Hutchison and Waters (1987), there has to be course material to provide contents that guide teachers and learners through various activities to maximize learning. Therefore, evaluation of course materials is an important in needs analysis to see if the materials are prepared in the way they meet learners’ language needs. To begin with the definition, Hutchison and Waters view evaluation of course materials as an interactive process involving a subjective and objective analysis of the materials and the extent to which they match with students needs in a given context. To Tomlinson material evaluation is a matter of judging the fitness of the material for a particular purpose. It would involve assessing how effective and useful the material is in actual use by a specific group students or how effective the material has been in promoting learning.

As LittleJohn (1998) cited in Tomlinson (2003), course material analysis should take place after the analysis of target situation of use in order to determine the appropriateness of the material to the target situation of use. Thus, Tomlinson believes that learning material has to

help learners connect the learning experience in the classroom to their own life outside the course. Nunan (1989) also claim that tasks (writing tasks for instance) students perform in their educational setting help the learners develop skills they need to carry out real-world communicative tasks beyond the classroom. Moreover, Busturkmen (2010) claims that in developing a course that will focus on written communication for particular learners, materials and contents in the course will need to be based on the writing situations students are expected to face currently and in the future. Generally, evaluation of course material is to examine how well a given material matches the needs of a language program and how effectively and efficiently it can realize the objectives of the program.

In course material analysis, to Tomlinson (1998), we need to examine the implication that use of the material may have for classroom work and thus come to whether or not the methodology and content of the material is appropriate for a particular language-teaching context. Thus, we consider the areas such as aims of the material, how the tasks, language and content in the material are selected and sequenced and the nature and focus of the content in the material. Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2000) add that tasks used in the material should be analyzed because tasks are viewed as a way of bringing the real world into classroom to give students opportunity for language learning. Thus, the tasks need to be prepared in the form of problem-solving activities for classroom work constituting approximation of the target tasks and gradually leading learners towards the target tasks.

In connection to this, Cunningsworth (1995) proposes some criteria that are used as a checklist to evaluate a course book. Firstly, the learning activities should mirror the learners' present and future realistic situation through task based and skill based activities. This indicates that activities should be prepared in particular context in which learners make use of English language to perform that particular activities. The language they use to carry out these activities helps them do jobs in their studies or at their workplaces. If students for instance will write report, summary and the like in the target situation, the course book should help learners to write report or summary in that particular situation. Thus, it equips students with specific English language ability that helps them carry out effectively specific activities in English at their work places or in their academic studies.

Secondly, evaluating whether the material consider the relation between teacher and students, and encourages collaborative approach. The sense of collaboration in ESP as indicated by Robinson (1991), Dudley-Evans and St. John (1996) and Strevens (1988) is that learners and teachers have to work collaboratively: the students are believed to have more knowledge in their subject areas while the teacher is an expert in the language. Thus, in an ESP context, the students are believed to be co-workers, input providers (content area), in general, collaborative trainees.

Thirdly, evaluating whether the material contains special language related to the subject area. Every discipline has its own special linguistic structure, vocabulary and the like. Hence, a course book prepared for a particular discipline has to contain special language that is related to that specific discipline. Fifthly, checking whether the learning activities in the course have objectives, and the objectives are specific in terms of content and performance. This helps learners to know what they are expected to achieve at the end of the activities.

Lastly, evaluating whether the material is sufficiently flexible to meet the constraint found in ESP work, for example having modular structure of non-sequential units. This indicates that the units in materials should not be sequenced in the way certain unit is prerequisite for the others so that learners cannot learn the other units without attending the prerequisite one.

## **2.5. Previous research conducted on needs analysis**

The purpose of discussing related previous studies is to see the available researches outputs and compare them with the present study in order to indicate the gap between the past researches and the present one. There are some studies carried out on business fields at tertiary level in Ethiopia. These are discussed as follows.

First, Abebe (2011) assessed the writing needs of business students at Ethiopian Civil Service College. The researcher employed questionnaire and semi-structured interview to collect data from third year business students, subject area instructors, English instructors and former graduates from the institution in concerned field. Course materials analysis was also used as source of information for the study. In the analysis, writing activities the learners were expected to do in their academic and occupational setting were identified and

difficulties they encounter in carrying out the activities were also prioritized. Then, the output of the study shows that the existing writing course did not meet the learners' needs. Thus, it was recommended that appropriate writing course that meets the learners' needs has to be designed.

Second, Beyene (2007) studied on developing criteria for designing an appropriate English course for accounting students at Nekemte African Beza College. The researcher collected data from second year regular and extension accounting learners, subject area instructors, English instructors and accounting clerks using questionnaire, structured interview and observation. The result of the findings indicated that the students and accounting clerks were facing difficulties in productive skills than receptive skills in their academic study and at their workplaces respectively. Since it was found that the existing English course was irrelevant to the students' subject area study and future occupation in its content, activities and objectives, the researcher set criteria for designing an appropriate English course for the learners.

Third, Solomon (2001) investigated the relevance of business English course at Addis Ababa commercial college to the needs of employing organization. The researcher collected data from graduates of the institution who are working at Commercial Bank of Ethiopia in various capacities such as Foreign Exchange Office, Branch Managers, Selection heads and Supervisors through questionnaire and semi-structured interview. Document study was also another data collection instrument used. After analysis of the data, the findings show that the language proficiency of the graduates did not adequately meet the job requirement, which indicates that Business English Course the student were taking did not prepare them to communicate effectively in the target situations. Thus, it was concluded that appropriate Business English Course that fits the learners' needs should be designed.

Fourth, Abebe (2010) studied the writing needs of business management students in relation to sophomore English course offered at Dilla University. The researcher collected data from business management students, instructors and graduates using questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The findings of the studies reveals that there was clear gap between English writing course that the students were taking and their writing needs. Therefore, it

was concluded that since the English writing course did not address the learners' writing needs in their study and occupational environment, appropriate writing course has to be designed.

Fifth, Fitsum (2005) made investigation on communicative language needs of commerce students at Saint Mary's College using questionnaire, structured interview and document analysis to gather information from extension students of accounting, market management and secretarial science and office management and instructors who were offering major courses to the learners. When the data collected was analyzed, the result shows that the learners had serious problem in using English in their academic study. This was because the language activities in the course did not prepare the learners to communicate effectively in the language. Thus, it was concluded that the English course students were being offered should be revised.

To summarize, all the researches have common findings, that is, English language needs of different groups of learners (in both academic and occupational setting) were not addressed by the English course offered to them. This implies that all human, material, time and financial resources are wasted on English courses that do not help learners to develop specific language skills they need in their academic and occupational setting. Therefore, the findings tell us that the learners have to be provided with specific English courses that help them develop specific language skills they need in their academic and occupational environment. However, all the investigations conducted on business so far were concerned with accounting, business management, secretarial science and marketing students. The researcher has not come across study conducted on language needs of economics students. And majority of the past studies focused on the four language skills. Therefore, the present study is different from the past in that it investigates English language writing needs of economics students.

## **Chapter Three: Research Methodology**

### **3.1. Research Design**

During assessing English writing needs of economics students at Samara University, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. For the quantitative data questionnaire and for the qualitative one interview and course material analysis were used. Quantitative data were used as main data for the study because sufficient information was expected to be found through questionnaire. Qualitative data were used to back up data gained from the quantitative one. Concerning this, Patton (1990) cited in Densten and Gray (1998) suggests that where significant responses obtained through quantitative methods, it is often helpful to support the responses through in-depth study using qualitative methods to give substance to the areas of focus.

### **3.2. Sampling**

In this study, sampling was used since dealing with all members of data source needs tremendous amount of time and resource. Accordingly, from 31 universities in Ethiopia, the researcher intentionally selected Samara University using purposive sampling technique for the study. The researcher selected this University because no research has been conducted on English language needs of students at the institution so far. This helps instructors aware of ESP and the learners' language needs so that they support the learners accordingly. Most significantly, it was believed that there would be cooperation from the university during data collection as the researcher knows the staffs in particular and the University community in general. Moreover, the existing Commercial bank and Bureau of finance and economic development of Afar Region found at Samara were taken using purposive sampling.

Concerning sources of data, Robison (1991) suggests that the sources of information in needs analysis are potential learners, specialist academic department, the language-teaching institution ( teachers and administrators), individuals who are or will be concerned with students' specific job or study situation and past students who graduated in certain field under investigation. Based on this, subjects of the study were economic students of Samara

University, Subject area instructors, faculty dean of business, English instructors, economics graduates, bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head.

Concerning students, there are three groups namely first year, second year and third year students. The researcher left out first year students believing that important information would not be obtained from them since they had not successfully taken basic writing skills course at the time of data collection. Second and third year students who were selected for the study might not have the same understanding about the need of English writing skills for their academic studies and their future occupation. Therefore, in order to identify the students, stratified random sampling was used giving each year group a chance to be included in the sample so that each group has its own representative. Then, using simple random sampling method, the target students were identified for each group. Accordingly, out of the total 152 students, 76 students were selected for the study, which is 50% of the entire population. This was done by selecting randomly 50% from each group of the students using lottery method. That means, 48 students out of 96 second year and 28 students out of 56 third year were selected.

Regarding instructors, the existing 13 subject area instructors were selected to gather data through questionnaire, and 5 English instructors who were offering basic English writing course to economics students were selected using purposive sampling technique for an interview. The business faculty dean was also included in the study to gather data through interview. This is because the instructors and the faculty dean know the learners' writing difficulty, their writing proficiency and their writing needs in order to give information about the students. Pertaining to economics graduates, the existing 7 employees, 4 working in Samara commercial bank and 3 working in head office of Bureau of finance and economic development found at regional level were taken to gather data through questionnaire. What is more, the Commercial bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head were selected in order to collect data through interview.

### **3.3. Data collection Instruments**

For the investigation of English writing needs of the students, different data gathering tools were used. Using different methods to address different areas of the study and at the same time triangulating approaches to data collection (collecting information from several sources) is believed to be vital for researchers to obtain a more reliable and comprehensive data (Richards, 2001). Accordingly, Molle and Prior (2008) cited in Basturkmen (2010) identify that questionnaire, interview and observation are the main sources used in need analysis. To Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), instruments used in needs analysis include questionnaire, detailed interview, observation, analysis of course texts, discussion and assessment.

Based on the above scholars' idea, the researcher used the following data gathering tools.

#### **3.3.1. Questionnaire**

The researcher used questionnaire as the main data gathering instrument. This was because Richards (2001) suggests that questionnaires are one of the most common instruments used with large numbers of subjects and used to elicit information about many different kinds of issues like language use, communication difficulties, preferred learning style, classroom activities, attitudes and beliefs. Thus, it is likely that questionnaires were used to seek information for present situation analysis and target situation analysis. The researcher employed questionnaire as main data tools since major and large data were obtained through it.

The questionnaires include close-ended questions that were constructed in likert scales. The questionnaires were used to collect data from students, subject area instructors and economics graduates. They were prepared in a 5-point likert scale adapted from Abebe (2010) and Beyene (2007).

##### **3.3.1.1. Questionnaire for students**

The Questionnaire was administered to the selected 76 students. The questionnaire contains the students' current general writing proficiency, how often they perform certain writing

activities in their academic study and future career, writing difficulties they encounter in their academic study and future career, their attitude towards taking English writing course and their preference type of writing course.

### **3.3.1.2. Questionnaire for instructors**

These questionnaires were administered to the identified 13 economics instructors, which were filled out and returned in two days time. This was because the researcher believed that necessary information would not be obtained as instructors might be busy and bored to fill it in short period. The questionnaires include the students' general writing abilities, writing difficulty the students face in their academic study, how often they perform writing activities in their academic study and in their future career.

### **3.3.1.3. Questionnaire for economics Graduates**

These questionnaires were administered to 7 graduates and returned in two days time as they might be busy to fill the questionnaire in short period. The questionnaires include how often they perform certain writing activities in their studies and in their career, writing difficulty they face in their studies and in their occupation, their attitude towards taking English writing course and their preference type of writing course.

### **3.3.2. Interview**

Richards (2001) suggests that interview allows us to make more in-depth exploration of issues as compared to questionnaire though it is only feasible for small groups. Denscombe (2007) states that semi-structured interview allow a certain degree of flexibility in exploring a wide range of issues that may arise during interview. It helps interviewer reflect to information given and seek clarification when required. It also partly allows the respondent to talk freely. This indicates semi-structure interview help the interviewer to guide the respondents in the way focused data can be obtained by giving them partial freedom to express their opinion. And this interview was adapted from Habtamu (2008) and Abebe (2010).

Accordingly, semi-structured interview was used to gather data from English instructors who were offering basic writing course to economics students, business faculty dean, bank manager and bureau of finance and economics development head. The interview was used to identify writing activities students carry out in their studies and occupational settings, whether the writing activities in current writing course is related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of studies, the learners' view towards taking the current writing course and English writing difficulty the students face in their academic studies and in their career. In addition, it was used to find whether the current writing course is appropriate for their academic studies and for their future career, and if not, what English writing course should be designed for the learners.

### **3.3.3. Course Material evaluation**

In order to consolidate data obtained through questionnaire and interview, course materials were evaluated. To do so, reference books and handout English instructors commonly use in offering English writing course were identified. Then, data were collected based on course material evaluation checklist adapted from Cunningsworth, 1995. Here, the researcher attempted to identify whether the writing activities in the materials help the students develop their specific English writing competence to carry out writing activities in their academic studies and in their future occupation.

### **3.4. Data Collection Procedures**

First, the researcher gave clear explanation about the objective of the study for the selected students in the class. Then, they filled the questionnaire under the supervision of the researcher. Next, the instructors and economics graduates were given questionnaire to fill it out in two days time. This was because they might be busy and bored to fill out the questionnaire in a short period. Therefore, the researcher believed that giving them enough time would help them take time and fill the questionnaire attentively. After that, interview was conducted with English instructors, business faculty dean, bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head. Lastly, data about the course material were gathered using course material evaluation checklist. The researcher used questionnaire first

because it was the main data gathering tool while the others tools were used for triangulation, and this helped the researcher to validate the data and thereby increase the credibility of the data interpretation.

### **3.5. Methods of Data Analysis**

Data obtained from different sources were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods separately. In the analysis of quantitative data, descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, analysis of variance and 95% confidence interval for mean) were used. Mean gives the average value of all responses given to an item of questionnaire. The 95% confidence interval (CI) for mean is used to indicate the probability that the confidence interval captures the true mean value. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to test significant difference among responses given by groups of respondents. If there is significant difference, that means, P-value is less than 0.05, the values became bold. Here, both ANOVA test and 95% CI for mean help to compare and contrast the responses of the groups and to show level of each group agreement on an issue.

The qualitative data collected through semi-structured interview and course material analysis were analyzed and presented in paragraphs. Then, the overall findings obtained were cross-checked to come to the conclusions.

## **Chapter Four: Results of the Study**

In this chapter, analysis of data gathered from students, instructors, faculty dean, graduates, bank managers, bureau of finance and economic development head and course materials through questionnaires, interview and course materials evaluation are presented and discussed.

### **4.1. Quantitative data analysis**

In this section, analysis of data obtained through questionnaires was presented. Since the questionnaires contain questions that were aimed at gathering information about present situation and target situation of economics learners, the analysis can be categorized as present situation analysis and target situation analysis.

#### **4.1.1. Present situation analysis**

Questions in present situation analysis are divided into four parts. These are background information about the learners, their general writing abilities, their writing difficulties, their attitude towards taking the current English writing course and their preference type of writing course. Concerning students' general writing abilities, questions were provided to students and subject area instructors, and questions about the students' specific writing difficulties were provided to students, instructors and graduates. In the case of the students' writing difficulties, students, instructors and graduates were required to rate how much students face difficulty in performing writing activities they are expected to do in their academic studies and future career. Questions about attitude towards taking the current writing course and preferred type of writing course were provided to students and graduates. Then, similar data obtained from different sources were analyzed and discussed together.

##### **4.1.1.1. Background information about learners**

Under this section, the learners were required to give information regarding their education level (whether they are first, second or third year students) and their writing abilities before they joined university. These helps us to infer whether the leaners had an exposure to English writing course to make judgment in responding to questions in the questionnaires

and to find out writing abilities they had brought to English writing class, which might contribute for the learning of writing course they have taken. And summary of the responses is presented in the following table.

Table 1: Background information about the students

Year								Learners' writing ability before entering university											
First		Second		Third		Total		V. good		Good		Average		Poor		V. poor		Total	
F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
-	-	48	63.2	28	36.8	76	100	4	5.3	11	14.5	35	46.1	24	31.6	2	2.6	76	100

As indicated in the above table, the respondents were only second and third year learners. The second year learners account 63.2% while the third learners account 36.8% of the total respondents. This indicates that the learners have an exposure to the current English writing course to respond to questions in the questionnaires since at this level they have successfully taken the writing course. Pertaining the learners' academic level in writing before joining university, majority of them (46.1%) were average followed by 31.6% of them were poor, 14.5% of them were good, 5.3% and 2.6% of them were very good and very poor respectively. This suggests that most of the students had average writing abilities when they entered university, which might have an impact on their English writing learning given in the university.

#### 4.1.1.2. Students' general writing abilities

Table 2: The students' writing abilities in terms of other language skills

Language skills	Respondents	N	Mean	Standard deviation	P-value	95% CI of the mean difference
Speaking	Students	76	3.11	0.894	<b>0.00</b>	0.58-1.35
	Instructors	13	2.15	0.554		
Listening	Students	76	4.05	0.965	<b>0.00</b>	0.79-1.93
	Instructors	13	2.69	0.947		
Reading	Students	76	4.42	0.868	<b>0.00</b>	0.60-1.62
	Instructors	13	3.31	0.751		
Writing	Students	76	2.92	0.891	<b>0.00</b>	0.42-1.27
	Instructors	13	2.07	0.641		

Grammar	Students	76	3.01	0.959	<b>0.006</b>	0.23-1.34
	Instructors	13	2.23	0.725		
Vocabulary	Students	76	2.99	0.959	<b>0.008</b>	0.20-1.31
	Instructors	13	2.23	0.725		

Keys\* significant difference at 0.05, P=probability value, CI= Confident interval

As it can be seen from the above table, students rated their speaking, writing, grammar and vocabulary skills as average and nearly average where they represented mean values 3.11, 2.92 3.01, and 2.99 respectively. They also rated their listening skill (mean value is 4.05) and reading skill (mean value 4.42) as good. However, the instructors rated the students' speaking skill 2.15, writing skill 2.07, grammar 2.23 and vocabulary 2.23, which shows the students are poor in the skills. And they rated the students' listening and reading skills as average or nearly average where the mean values are 2.69 and 3.31 respectively.

In conclusion, the instructors' responses points out that the students are poor in productive skills (speaking and writing) including micro-skills (grammar and vocabulary) as compared to receptive skills (listening and reading). And according to students' responses, they are average in productive skills including micro-skills as compared to receptive skills. From the productive skills, as to the responses of both students and instructors, the highest mean values were given to writing skill, which indicates that writing skill is the most difficulty language skill students ever face. On the other hand, though the students and the instructors responded differently, the instructors' responses are more credible since they are in a better position to judge students' language abilities as good or poor. Therefore, it can be said the students are poor in their general writing abilities. Analysis of data obtained from English instructors through interview supports that the students' writing abilities are poor.

#### **4.1.1.3. Students' writing difficulties in their academic studies and in their future career**

Busturkmen (2010) claims that identification of language difficulties students face in the target situation is an important part in needs analysis because Chamber (1980) suggests that needs analysis is concerned with the establishment of communicative needs and their realization. Identification of students' language difficulties (writing difficulties in particular focus) helps us to identify the students' current writing competence.

To this end, in this section of the questionnaire, students, instructors and graduates were required to rate to what extent the students face writing difficulty in performing writing activities in their educational and occupational environment. Under these questions are lists of writing activities students are expected to do in their academic studies and future career. They are presented 5-point likert scale whereby 5 stands for ‘‘very high difficulty’’, 4 stands for ‘‘high difficulty’’, 3 stands for ‘‘some difficulty’’, 2 stands for ‘‘little difficulty’’ and 1 stands for ‘‘no difficulty’’. Then, the analysis of the data was summarized in the following tables.

Table 3: English writing difficulties in their academic studies

Writing activities	Resp.	N	Mean	95% CI for mean	P-value
Summary	Sts	76	3.04	2.77-3.30	0.143
	Insts	13	3.46	3.12-4.26	
	Grads	7	3.00	2.46-3.53	
	All	96	3.13	2.89-3.35	
Taking note from lecture	Sts	76	3.03	2.84-3.24	0.306
	Insts	13	3.38	2.92-3.85	
	Grads	7	2.86	2.51-3.21	
	All	96	3.07	2.90-3.24	
Making note from books	Sts	76	2.39	2.14-2.65	0.602
	Insts	13	2.46	2.15-2.78	
	grads	7	2.00	1.24-2.75	
	All	96	2.38	2.16-2.58	
Argumentative essay on economic issues	Sts	76	3.69	3.49-3.89	<b>0.001</b>
	Insts	13	4.46	4.15-4.78	
	grads	7	4.14	3.50-4.78	
	All	96	3.83	3.66-4.00	
Proposals	Sts	76	3.74	3.52-3.95	0.256
	Insts	13	4.15	3.74-4.57	
	Grads	7	3.57	2.84-4.29	

	All	96	3.78	3.59-3.96	
Senior essay	Sts	76	3.93	3.74-4.13	<b>0.042</b>
	Insts	13	4.54	4.22-4.85	
	Grads	7	4.14	3.50-4.78	
	All	96	4.03	3.87-4.19	
Term paper	Sts	76	3.13	2.92-3.35	<b>0.026</b>
	Insts	13	3.77	3.41-4.13	
	Grads	7	3.71	3.02-4.41	
	All	96	3.26	3.07-3.44	
Reports on practical work	Sts	76	3.12	2.81-3.40	<b>0.013</b>
	Insts	13	4.15	3.67-4.63	
	Grads	7	3.75	3.02-4.41	
	All	96	3.29	3.03-3.55	

keys\* = significant difference at 0.05, P= probability value, CI= Confidential interval, Sts= students, Insts=instructors, Grads= graduates

As it clearly shown in the table, the mean score given by instructors in rating how much economics students encounter difficulty to write senior essay was 4.54, which indicates that the students face nearly very high difficulty in writing senior essay in their studies as the score is close to 5. Besides, graduates and students attached high mean scores to the issue. The graduates mean value is 4.14 and the students' mean value is 3.93, which is very near to 4. This shows us the students face high difficulty in writing senior essay in their educational setting. In addition, the ANOVA test proves that there is significant difference between the responses given by the three groups of respondents.

According to the data given in the table, the second writing activity the students encounter difficulty in their academic studies is writing argumentative essay on economic issues. In rating this writing activity, both instructors and graduates respectively represented the mean values of 4.46 and 4.14. This indicates that the students face high difficulty in writing argumentative essay on economic issues in their academic studies. However, students

attached the mean value of 3.69, which implies that they face nearly high difficulty in writing argumentative essay. Moreover, the ANOVA test exhibits that there is significant difference between the responses given by the groups of the respondents.

On the other hand, the data in the table verify that the third high writing difficulty students encounter in their educational areas is proposal writing. Students, instructors and graduates the mean scores in order as 3.74, 4.15 and 3.57. The mean scores of the three groups of respondents are similar. Thus, the students face high or nearly high difficulty in writing proposal. The ANOVA test also confirms that there is no significant difference between the responses given by the groups.

As the data indicated in the table, writing report on practical work the fourth writing difficulty students face in their academic setting. Its mean values are 3.12, 4.15 and 3.75, by students, instructors and graduates respectively. Accordingly, the students face high or nearly high difficulty in writing report on practical work as to responses given by instructors and graduates. But the students' response reveals that they face some difficulty in performing the writing activity. In supporting this, the ANOVA test shows there is significant difference between the responses given by the groups.

Among the rest writing activities, as shown in the table, writing term paper is the fifth writing difficulty the students face in their academic environment. The three groups of respondents gave mean values as students (3.13), instructors (3.77) and graduates (3.71). According to mean values given by instructors and graduates, the students nearly face high difficulties in carrying out the writing activity. Nevertheless, the students' mean value reveals that they face some difficulty in performing the writing activity. What is more, the P value of ANOVA test portrays that there is significant difference between the responses offered by the three groups of respondents.

Writing summary is also another writing difficulty the students encounter in their academic studies as data illustrate in the table. Its mean scores are respectively 3.04, 3.46 and 3.00, by students, instructors and graduates. The responses of all groups of respondents are similar. From this, we can infer that the students encounter some difficulty in performing the writing

activity in their educational setting. Thus, this writing activity takes the sixth position among the given writing activities in which students encounter difficulty in their academic studies. As the P value of ANOVA test displays, there is no significant difference between the responses given by the three groups of respondents.

In addition, the data in the table confirm that taking note from lecture is the seventh writing difficulty students encounter in their educational environment. In rating how much the students face difficulty to take note from lectures, the three groups of respondents offered almost similar mean scores, that is, students (3.03), instructors (3.38) and graduates (2.86). Here, the students encounter some difficulty in taking note from lecture as it can be understood from the responses offered by students and instructors, and they nearly encounter some difficulty in taking the note as to the response offered by graduates since the mean score is very near to 3. The P value of ANOVA test advocates that there is no significance difference between the mean scores offered by the three groups of respondents.

Lastly, Students rarely face difficulty in making note from books since the responses given by students (2.39), instructors (2.46) and graduates (2.00) were similar. Furthermore, the P value of ANOVA test confirms that there is no significant difference among the responses given by the groups.

The aggregate mean scores given in the table for each writing activity also supports the findings discussed above. With this respect, the writing activities can be arranged in order starting from high difficulty writing activity to rare difficulty one. These are senior essay (4.03), argumentative essay on economic issues (3.83), proposal (3.78), report on practical work (3.29), term paper (3.26), summary (3.13), taking note from lecture (3.07) and making note from books (2.38).

In general, as the findings indicates, the significance difference appeared among the three groups of respondents was because of the instructors gave high mean values in rating how much the students face difficulty in performing the given writing activities in their academic studies. This might signify that instructors are in better position to decide to what extent the students face difficulty in carrying out the given writing activities than the students or

graduates think they face difficulties. Moreover, although the writing activities, as discussed in the previous section, are important in the students' academic studies, the above findings depicts that the students encounter high or some difficulty in performing almost all the writing activities. This implies that the students' current writing abilities in performing the writing activities in their academic studies are almost poor (low) or average. This is because high writing difficulty implies that the students are poor in writing competence and some writing difficulty indicates that the students are average. The interview conducted with business faculty dean also proves that the students' current writing abilities are poor.

Table 4: The students' English writing difficulties in their future career

Writing activities	Mean	Standard deviation
Business report	4.29	0.756
Argumentative text on economic issues	3.57	0.535
Agenda	2.25	0.488
Business letters	3.71	0.488
Memorandum (memos)	2.71	0.756
Minutes in meeting	4.14	0.690
Advertisement (of marketing or job)	3.00	0.817
project proposal	4.00	0.577
project research	4.42	0.534
Survey studies	3.86	0.899
Notice	2.57	0.535
Recommendation letters ( on feasibility of a given project)	3.86	0. 899
Business plan	3.57	0.976
Job application letter	2.43	0.976
Curriculum vitae	2.29	0.951
Motivation letter	3.42	0. 535
Policy document	3. 29	0.951

As illustrated in the above table, the students encounter high difficulty in writing business report, minutes in meetings, project proposal and project research. Their mean values are 4.29, 4.14, 4.00 and 4.42 respectively. With regard to writing argumentative text, business letter, recommendation letter, survey studies and business plan, the respondent offered similar mean values since they are near to 4. These are presented in order as 3.57, 3.71, 3.86,

3.86 and 3.57. This describes that the students face nearly high difficulty in performing the writing activities in their workplaces.

Concerning writing advertisement, motivation letter and policy document, the respondents attached similar mean values respectively as 3.00, 3.42 and 3.29. From this data, it can be understood that the students face some difficulty in writing the writing activities in their occupations.

In responding to the rest writing activities, the respondents offered mean scores for agenda (2.25), memorandum (2.71), notice (2.57), job application letter (2.43) and curriculum vitae (2.29). The mean scores given by the respondents in rating how much the students face writing difficulties to write memorandum and notice are almost similar because both mean values are close to 3. And the mean values given for agenda, job application letter and curriculum vitae are also similar as they near to 2. Thus, it can be generalized that the students face nearly some or rare difficulty in writing the given writing activities in their workplaces.

Briefly, from the above findings, it can be concluded that the students face high or some difficulty in performing almost all the writing activities in their professional areas. This tells us that the graduates' current writing competence in performing writing activities in their workplaces is low or average. In supporting this, commercial bank manager and bureau of finance and economic development head were asked to rate the graduates' current writing abilities. The finding indicates that the graduates' current writing abilities are average.

#### **4.1.1.4. Students' attitude towards English writing course**

Investigating students' attitude towards their learning is important because Patel and Vyas (2009) state that most of the time, students fail to achieve their goal of learning language due to lack motivation, and one of the most significant factors having influence on motivation is the students' attitude towards language learning.

To this effect, in this study, attempt was made to identify the students' attitude towards taking the current writing course. In order to realize this, students and graduates were

required to rate how much they agree to statements about the writing course the students are taking. There were six statements. Three statements reflect positive and the rest three statements negative attitude. The statements were presented in 5-point likert scale where 5 represented “strongly agree” 4 represented “agree” 3 represented “moderately agree” 2 represented “disagree” and 1 represented “strongly disagree.” Then, their responses are summarized in the table below.

Table 5: The students' attitude towards taking the current writing course

Statements	Resp.	N	Mean	Standard deviation	P-value	95% CI of the mean difference
Taking the current English writing course is important for academic studies and future occupation.	Sts	76	4.13	0.854	<b>0.029</b>	-1.37 – -0.07
	Grads	7	4.86	0.378		
Taking the current English writing course is waste of time.	sts	76	1.97	0.986	0.295	-0.21 – 1.29
	Grads	7	1.57	0.535		
Taking the current English writing course is interesting.	sts	76	4.25	0.974	0.663	-0.93 – 0.58
	Grads	7	4.43	0.787		
Taking the current writing course has nothing to do with academic studies and future career.	sts	76	1.71	0.512	<b>0.038</b>	0.02 – 0.83
	Grads	7	1.29	0.487		
The current English writing course helps me to develop my writing ability.	sts	76	4.12	0.993	0.425	-1.36 – 0.17
	Grads	7	4.43	0.786		
The current English writing course does not help me to develop my writing ability.	Sts	76	2.17	0.914	0.198	-0.24 – 1.16
	Grads	7	1.71	0.488		

Keys\* significance difference at 0.05, P=probability value, CI= confident interval

As indicated in the table above, in the first statement, the respondents were requested to rate how much they agree whether the current writing course is helpful for academic studies and future career. Concerning this, graduates offered very high mean value of 4.86, which is near to 5. Students on their part offered high mean value of 4.13. Thus, it can be said that graduates strongly agree and students agree to the statement. The P-value also indicates that there is significant difference between the responses given by the two groups of respondents. In addition, 95% CI of the mean difference supports this idea. Even though both respondents responded differently to the statement, they believe that the current writing course is important for the students' academic studies and future career.

In the second statement, the respondents were required to rate how much they agree whether taking the current writing course is waste of time. Pertaining this negative statement, the mean value of students is 1.97 and the mean value of graduates is 1.57. Thus, both students and graduates disagree to the statement because of their mean values are near to 2. In addition, P-value shows that there is no significant difference between the responses given by the groups. From this result, it can be inferred that the respondents do not believe that taking the current writing course is waste of time.

In rating how much the respondents agree whether taking the current writing course is interesting, both students and graduates show their agreement. Graduates gave mean value of 4.43, and the students gave mean value is 4.25. Since both mean values are near to 4, it can be said that both respondents agree to the idea. In supporting this, P-value signifies that there is no significant different between the responses given by the groups. This tells us that the students have interest in taking the current writing course.

The respondents were also asked whether the current writing course has nothing to do with academic studies and future career. Regarding this statement, both students and graduates show their disagreement. The students disagree as their mean score is 1.71, which is close to 2 and the graduates strongly disagree to the statement as their mean score is close to 1, that is, 1.29. The P-value also proves that there is significant difference between the responses given by the groups. This shows that the students do not accept the statement that says the current writing course has nothing to do with academic studies and future career.

Regarding if the current writing course helps the respondents develop their writing abilities, the students' mean score is 4.12 and graduates' mean score is 4.43. Here, the mean score of both students and graduates are close to 4. This implies that both of the groups agree to the statement. Moreover, P-value denotes that there is no significant difference between the responses. From this, we can understand that the students believe that the writing course help them develop their writing abilities.

On the contrary, the respondents were asked to rate how much they agree whether the current writing course does not help them develop their writing abilities. With this respect,

students gave mean score of 2.17 and graduates gave mean score of 1.71, which is close to 2. In this case, both respondents disagree to the statement. And the P-value shows that there is no significant difference between the responses. This means the students do not accept the idea that the current writing course does not help them develop their writing abilities.

To generalize, the findings indicate that both students and graduates show their agreement to all positive statements and show their disagreement to all negative statements. This tells us that the students have positive attitude towards taking the current writing course. Besides, English instructors were asked if the students have interest of taking the current writing course, and the findings indicate that the students have positive attitude towards taking the course. Students' positive attitude towards taking writing is important because Brown (2007) states that students who have positive attitude towards learning language are better in attaining language proficiency than those who have negative attitude. This is due to negative attitude leads to decreased motivation and this leads to low interaction in language learning, and students with low interaction are less likely to attain proficiency.

#### 4.1.1.5. Students' preference type of English writing course

In this section, students and graduates were asked to rate how much they agree to statements that attempted to identify students' wants regarding to the type English writing course. The statements were presented in 5-point likert scale so that the students rate their agreement. Here, 5 represented "strongly agree" 4 represented "agree" 3 represented "moderately agree" 2 represented "disagree" and 1 represented "strongly disagree." Hereunder in the table is the data presented in summarized way.

Table 6: Preferred type of English writing course

Statements	Resp.	N	Mean	Standard deviation	P-value	95% CI of the mean difference
I prefer specific English writing course for business purposes.	Sts	76	4.26	0.884	0.949	-0.72 – 0.67
	Grads	7	4.29	0.951		
I prefer general English writing course for general purposes.	Sts	76	2.42	0.997	0.985	-0.80 – 0.89
	Grads	7	2.43	0.789		
I prefer combination of specific and general English writing course.	Sts	76	4.43	0.825	0.482	-0.87 – 0.42
	Grads	7	4.57	0.787		

Keys\* significance difference at 0.05, P=probability value, CI= confident interval

As depicted in the above table, students and graduates were required to rate how much they agree whether they prefer specific English writing course for business purposes. In responding to this question, both students and graduates gave high mean scores, that is, 4.26 and 4.29 respectively. This implies that both students and graduates agree that they prefer specific English writing course for business purposes. The ANOVA test also reveals that there is no significance difference between the responses.

Concerning whether the respondents prefer general English writing course for general purposes, both students and graduates gave similar mean scores. The students' mean score is 2.42 and the graduates' mean score is 2.43. As the two mean scores are close to 2, it can be said that the respondents disagree to the idea. The ANOVA test also reveals that there is no significance difference between the responses.

In the last statement, the respondents were asked to rate to how much they agree whether they prefer the combination of specific an general English writing course. Here, the responses show that students agree and the graduates strongly agree to the statement. This is because the mean score of students is 4.43, which is close to 4, and the mean score of graduates is 4.57, which is near to 5. However, P-value indicates that there is no significant different between the responses given by the two groups of respondents. The 95% CI for mean difference also supports that there is no significant difference between the responses given to all statements.

In general, as the findings indicates, the highest mean score has been attached to the statement that the students prefer the combination of specific and general English writing course. From this, it can be noted that the students want specific writing course that is relevant to business particularly to economics. The respondents also attached high mean score to statement that they prefer specific English writing course for business purposes. This supports that the students want specific writing course. Moreover, English instructors, business faculty dean, bank manager and bureau of finance and economic development head were asked what kind of English writing course should be designed for economics students

in order to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their writing competence. The findings show that specific English writing course that addresses the learners' needs in their academic and future career has to be designed for them.

#### 4.1.2. Target situation analysis

Assessment language needs of learners, according to Long (2005), is prerequisite for effective course design. The scholar strengthens that as no medical intervention would be prescribed without a thorough diagnosis of a patient, no language program is designed without a thorough analysis of students' language needs.

In this section, therefore, questions were aimed at gathering information concerning English writing needs of the students. The questions were to identify how often the students carry out a given writing activities in their academic studies and future career. They were provided to students, subject area instructors and graduates. Here, the respondents were presented with writing activities that the students are expected to do in their academic and professional environments. The items in the questions were arranged in 5 likert scale where 5 represented "very often", 4 represented "often", 3 represented "sometimes", 2 represented "rarely" and 1 represented "never". Then, the respondents were required to rate as very often, often, sometimes, rarely and never.

##### 4.1.2.1. Students' writing needs in their academic studies and in their future career

Regarding students' English writing needs in their academic environment, students, instructors and graduates were asked how often the students carry out the given writing activities in their academic and occupational areas. In the following tables are summary of the responses.

Table 7: The students' English writing needs in their academic studies

Writing activities	Resp.	N	Mean	95% CI for mean	P-value
Summary	Sts	76	3.25	2.98-3.50	0.672
	Insts	13	3.00	2.22-3.78	
	Grads	7	3.43	2.70-4.16	

	All	96	3.23	3.00-3.45	
Taking note from lecture	Sts	76	4.17	3.99-4.35	0.671
	Insts	13	4.31	3.61-4.69	
	Grads	7	4.00	3.47-4.53	
	All	96	4.18	4.03-4.33	
Making note from books	Sts	76	4.00	3.81-4.19	0.871
	Insts	13	4.08	3.33-4.21	
	grads	7	4.14	3.50-4.78	
	All	96	4.02	3.86-4.18	
Argumentative essay on economic issues	Sts	76	3.16	2.86-3.46	0.875
	Insts	13	3.31	2.51-4.10	
	grads	7	3.00	2.08-3.92	
	All	96	3.17	2.93-3.43	
Proposals	Sts	76	3.12	2.97-3.24	0.462
	Insts	13	3.23	2.96-3.49	
	Grads	7	3.29	2.83-3.74	
	All	96	3.14	2.03-3.25	
Senior essay	Sts	76	3.08	2.96-3.19	0.785
	Insts	13	3.00	2.40-2.98	
	Grads	7	3.14	2.79-3.49	
	All	96	3.07	2.98-3.17	
Term paper	Sts	76	3.52	3.37-3.68	0.120
	Insts	13	3.46	3.15-3.78	
	Grads	7	3.00	2.46-3.53	
	All	96	3.47	3.34-3.61	
Reports on practical work	Sts	76	2.41	2.14-2.78	0.418
	Insts	13	2.15	1.56-2.75	
	Grads	7	2.86	2.22-3.49	
	All	96	2.40	2.18-2.64	

keys\* = significant difference at 0.05, P= probability value, CI= Confidential interval, Sts= students, Insts=instructors, Grads= graduates

As it is seen from the table, students, instructors and graduates represented mean values to summary writing as 3.25, 3.00 and 3.43 respectively. This implies that the students sometimes write summary in their academic studies.

Concerning note taking from lecture and note making from books, all the respondents' mean values are high. In the case of note taking from lecture, students, instructors and graduates gave mean values 4.17, 4.31 and 4.00 in order in rating how often the students carry out the writing activities in their academic studies. On the other hand, they gave mean values for note making from books respectively as 4.00, 4.08 and 4.14. This shows that the students often take note from lecture and make note from books.

In responding to how often the learners write argumentative essay on economic issues in their academic studies, the three groups of the respondents attached similar mean values as 3.16, 3.31 and 3.00 respectively. This points out that the learners sometimes write argumentative essay on economic issues in their studies.

From the data above, it can be observed that students, instructors and graduates respectively calculated the mean values for proposal writing in the learners' academic studies as 3.12, 3.23 and 3.29. Thus, according to the responses obtained from the respondents, the learners sometimes write proposals in their educational setting.

Next, the data in the table appears to reveal that students, instructors and graduates gave mean values of 3.08, 3.00 and 3.14, in order, in rating how often the learners write senior essay in their academic studies. This denotes that the students sometimes write senior essay. Moreover, from the data indicated in the table, students, instructors and graduates presented the mean values in order as 3.52, 3.46 and 3.00 to rate how often the learners write term papers in their academic studies. Therefore, according to students' response, the learners nearly often write term papers in their academic studies since their mean value is close to 4. Nevertheless, the instructors' and graduates' responses shows that the learners sometimes write term paper.

In rating how often the students write reports on practical work, students, instructors and graduates offered mean values of 2.41, 2.15 and 2.86 respectively. The responses of students and instructors show that the students rarely write report, and as to graduates responses the students nearly sometimes write report on practical works in their academic studies.

Totally, as indicated in P values of the ANOVA test, there is no significant difference among groups of the respondents in giving mean values to show how often the students perform the given writing activities in their academic studies. This might be because of the respondents have nearly similar awareness about the writing activities the students do in their academic studies.

The aggregate mean values given by the three groups of respondents to indicate how often the learners write summary, notes from lecture, notes from books, argumentative essay on economic issues, proposals, senior essay, term papers and reports on practical works in their academic studies were: 3.23, 4.18, 4.02, 3.17, 3.14, 3.07, 3.47 and 2.40. Here, it seems that the respondents attached high value to note taking from lectures (4.18) and note making from books (4.02). This tells us that the students often take note from lectures and make note from books. In addition, as it can be seen from the aggregate mean values, all the respondents agreed that the students sometimes write summary, proposals argumentative essay on economic issues, term papers and senior essay, and rarely write report on practical work in their academic studies.

Generally, the analysis reveals that the students need to write the given writing activities in their academic studies though how often they perform the writing activities varies. In interview made with business faculty, writing activities the students perform in their academic studies were also identified. Therefore, all the writing activities are important in the students' academic studies.

Table 8: The students' English writing needs in their future career

Writing activities	Resp.	N	Mean	95% CI for mean	P-value
Business reports	Sts	76	3.88	3.67-4.09	<b>0.027</b>
	Insts	13	4.54	4.22-4.85	

	Grads	7	4.29	3.83-4.74	
	All	96	4.00	3.82-4.18	
Argumentative text	Sts	76	3.41	3.14-3.67	0.64
	Insts	13	3.38	2.99-3.78	
	Grads	7	3.00	2.08-3.92	
	All	96	3.37	3.15-3.59	
Agenda	Sts	76	3.47	3.19-3.76	0.781
	Insts	13	3.23	2.79-3.67	
	grads	7	3.43	2.93-3.92	
	All	96	3.44	3.21-3.67	
Business letters	Sts	76	3.71	3.49-3.92	0.086
	Insts	13	4.23	3.87-4.59	
	grads	7	4.14	3.79-4.49	
	All	96	3.81	3.63-3.99	
Memorandum (memos)	Sts	76	3.32	3.05-3.58	0.10
	Insts	13	3.46	2.78-4.14	
	Grads	7	3.57	2.84-4.29	
	All	96	3.35	3.13-3.58	
Minutes in meeting	Sts	76	3.04	2.87-3.21	0.792
	Insts	13	3.07	2.78-3.38	
	Grads	7	2.86	2.26-3.16	
	All	96	3.03	2.89-3.18	
Advertisement	Sts	76	3.16	2.91-3.40	<b>0.036</b>
	Insts	13	3.31	2.85-3.76	
	Grads	7	2.14	1.50-2.78	
	All	96	3.10	2.89-3.32	
Project proposals	Sts	76	3.80	3.64-3.96	<b>0.003</b>
	Insts	13	4.46	4.06-4.86	
	Grads	7	4.29	3.59-4.98	
	All	96	3.93	3.78-4.07	
Project research	Sts	76	3.76	3.56-3.964	<b>0.002</b>
	Insts	13	4.23	3.67-4.79	
	Grads	7	4.57	3.59-4.98	
	All	96	3.92	3.74-4.09	
Survey studies	Sts	76	3.59	3.40-3.78	0.180
	Insts	13	4.00	3.65-4.35	
	Gras	7	3.71	3.26-4.17	
	All	96	3.65	3.51-3.81	
Notice	Sts	76	3.42	3.23-3.62	0.082
	Insts	13	3.15	2.67-3.64	
	Grads	7	2.71	2.26-3.17	
	All	96	3.32	3.15-3.49	
Recommendation letters	Sts	76	3.63	3.42-3.83	<b>0.035</b>
	Insts	13	4.31	3.79-4.82	
	Grads	7	4.00	3.24-4.76	

	All	96	3.75	3.56-3.94	
Business plan	Sts	76	3.79	3.57-4.00	<b>0.017</b>
	Insts	13	4.54	4.22-4.85	
	Grads	7	4.14	3.50-4.78	
	All	96	3.92	3.73-4.10	
Job application letters	Sts	76	3.11	2.95-3.29	0.976
	Insts	13	3.08	2.68-3.46	
	Grads	7	3.14	2.79-3.49	
	All	96	3.11	2.97-3.19	
Curriculum vitae	Sts	76	3.04	2.87-3.21	0.925
	Insts	13	3.08	2.69-3.46	
	Grads	7	2.86	2.22-3.49	
	All	96	3.03	2.89-3.18	
Motivation letter	Sts	76	2.80	2.59-3.01	0.772
	Insts	13	2.85	2.36-3.33	
	Grads	7	2.57	2.08-3.06	
	All	96	2.79	2.62-2.96	
Policy document	Sts	76	3.22	2.95-3.49	0.315
	Insts	13	3.77	3.02-4.52	
	grads	7	3.43	2.25-4.60	
	All	96	3.31	3.07-3.56	

keys\* = significant difference at 0.05, P= probability value, CI= Confidential interval, Sts= students, Insts=instructors, Grads= graduates

As depicted in the table above, both instructor gave the mean value of 4.54 and graduates gave mean values of 4.29 to business report. The mean value given by the instructors is close to 5 and the mean value given by graduates is close to 4. This indicates that the students nearly very often or often write business report in their future career. However, according to students' mean value (3.88), the students nearly often write business report in their future career as the mean value is close to 4. The ANOVA test also informs us that there is significant difference between responses given by the three groups of respondents.

When we see the responses given by students, instructors and graduates to indicate how often the students write argumentative text on economic issues in their occupation, all of the respondents attached similar mean values to the issue in order, that is, 3.41, 3.38 and 3.00.

This suggests that that the students sometimes write argumentative texts on economic issues in their occupations.

According to the responses of students, instructors and graduates given in the table, economics students sometimes write agenda in their future career as their mean values are 3.47, 3.23 and 3.43 respectively. In addition, the ANOVA test indicates that there is no significant difference between responses given by the three groups of respondents.

Regarding business letters students write in their future career, students' mean value is 3.71, instructors' mean value is 4.23 and graduates' mean value is 4.14. According to the mean values of instructors and graduates, the students often write business letter in their occupation. And since the mean values of students is close to 4, it can be concluded as the students nearly often write business letter in their occupation. Therefore, the responses given by the three groups of respondents are almost similar. The ANOVA test also proves that there is no significant difference between the groups in giving mean value to indicate how often the students write business letters in their occupation.

In case of memo writing, the three groups of respondents gave similar mean values, that is, students (3.32), instructors (3.46) and graduates (3.35). In supporting this, ANOVA test shows there is no significant difference between the mean values the groups attached to the issue. Thus, the students sometimes write memos in their future career. In similar manner, the data in table indicates that the three groups of respondents attached similar mean values to rate how often the students write minutes in meeting in their occupational setting. The mean value of students is (3.04), instructors (3.08) and graduates (2.86). Hence, according to the mean values of students and instructors, it can be concluded that the students sometimes write minutes in meeting in their occupation, and since the mean value of the graduates is near to 3, it can be said that the students nearly sometimes write minutes in their occupation. The ANOVA test also points out that there is no significant difference between the responses given.

The respondents were also asked to rate how often the students write advertisement in their occupation. Accordingly, both students (3.16) and instructors (3.31) responded that the

students sometimes write advertisement in their future career. However, graduates gave the mean value of 2.14, which shows that the students rarely write advertisement in their future career. The ANOVA test is also indicates that there is significant difference between the mean values given by the groups of the respondents.

As shown in the table, the mean values given by students, instructors and graduates to rate how often the students write project proposal in their future career were respectively 3.80, 4.46 and 4.29. This implies that the students often or nearly often write project proposal in their workplaces. In addition, the ANOVA test shows that there is significant difference between the mean values.

Concerning, how often the students write project research, the students' mean value is 3.76, which is near to 4. And the mean values of instructors and graduates are 4.23 and 4.59 respectively. According to the students' mean value, the students nearly often write project research in their professional environment and often write the writing activity as to the responses given by instructors. Since the mean value of graduate is close 5, it can be said that the students nearly very often write the writing activity. In addition, ANOVA test tells us that there is significant difference between the mean values of the three groups of respondents.

Regarding survey studies, the three groups of respondents gave similar mean values, that is, 3.59, 4.00 and 3.71 in order by students, instructors and graduates respectively. As the mean values are near to 4, it can be concluded that the students often write survey studies in their occupation. P-value of ANOVA test confirms that there is no significant difference between the responses given by the three groups of the respondents

When we see data shown in the table, the mean values given by the three groups of respondents to indicate how often the students write notice in their occupation were similar. The mean values are 3.42, 3.15 and 2.86 respectively. According to mean values of students and instructors, the students sometimes write notice in their occupation. As to the mean value of graduates, however, the students nearly sometimes write the writing activity since

the mean value is close to 3. P value of the ANOVA test also exhibits that there is no significant difference between the responses.

In responding to how often the students write recommendation letter in their workplaces, both mean values of students, instructors and graduates are 3.63, 4.31 and 4.00 respectively. As to instructors and graduates responses, the students often write recommendation letter whereas the students mean value indicates that they nearly often write the writing activity. However, the ANOVA test also exhibits that there is significant difference between the responses. In the case of writing business plan, the respondents attached mean values of 3.79, 4.54 and 4.14, in order, by students, instructors and graduates. Since the mean values of students and graduates are close to 4, it can be said that the students often or nearly often write business plan, and they nearly very often write business plan according to the mean value of instructors. Moreover, as indicated in P-value of ANOVA test, there is significant difference between the responses given by the three groups of the respondents.

When we compare the responses given by students, instructors and graduates concerning job application letter, the three groups agreed that the students sometimes write the writing activities in their profession. This is because the mean values of three groups attached to application letter were 3.04, 3.08 and 3.14 respectively. The respondents also gave mean values for curriculum vitae in order as 3.04, 3.08 and 2.86. This indicates that the students sometimes or nearly sometimes write curriculum vitae. The P value of the ANOVA test also proves that there is no significant difference between the responses given by the groups to indicate how often the students perform the writing activities in their professional areas.

When we see the responses given by students, instructors and graduates about how often the students write motivation letters in their workplaces, three of the groups' mean values were 2.80, 2.85 and 2.57 respectively. From the mean values, it can be concluded that the students nearly sometimes write motivation letter because the mean values are near to 3. Besides, P value of the ANOVA test shows that there is no significant difference between the responses.

Regarding how often the students write policy documents in their occupation, students' mean value is 3.22, instructors' mean value is 3.77 and the graduates' mean value is 3.43. The mean values of the students and the graduates are near to 3, which indicates that the students sometimes write policy documents in their occupation. Since the instructors' mean value is near to 4, it can be noted that the students nearly often write policy documents. Yet, the P value of the ANOVA test indicates that there is no significant difference between the responses given.

On the other hand, the aggregate mean values given to business report, project proposal, project research, business plan, business letter, recommendation letter and survey studies were 4.00, 3.93, 3.92, 3.92, 3.81, 3.75 and 3.65 respectively. This reveals that the students often or nearly often perform the writing activities in their professional areas. And the aggregate mean values the respondents gave for agenda (3.44), for memo (3.35) for notice (3.32), for policy (3.31), for argumentative text (3.20), for job application letter (3.11), for advertisement (3.10), for minutes (3.03), for curriculum vitae (3.03) and for motivation letter (2.79). This implies that the students sometimes or nearly sometimes perform the writing activities in their occupation. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students often or sometimes perform the writing activities in their occupation.

To generalize, as the P value of the ANOVA test shows, there is significant difference between responses given by the groups of respondents regarding some writing activities. These differences were in most cases because of students attached low values to the writing activities. This may inform us that students are less aware of writing activities they carry out in their professional environment than instructors and graduates. However, the findings show us that the students frequently or nearly frequently write business report, recommendation letter, business letter, project proposal, project research, survey studies and business plan in their occupational settings. In addition, they sometimes write argumentative text, agenda, memo, minutes, advertisement, notice, application letters, curriculum vitae and policy document in their occupational settings. In the interview made with bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head, major writing activities the students

perform in their occupation were identified. Therefore, according to the findings, it can be concluded that the students need all the writing activities in their professional areas.

## **4.2. The qualitative data analysis**

Under this section, the analysis and discussion of data obtained through interview and course material evaluation are presented in paragraphs.

### **4.2.1. Interview analysis**

Here, the results of interview made with English instructors, business faculty dean, Bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head are presented.

#### **4.2.1.1. English instructors and business faculty dean interview data analysis**

Interview was conducted with five English instructors who were offering Basic English writing course to economics students and business faculty dean. The questions in the interview were targeted at searching information about the learners and writing course they have taken. And the responses obtained have been summarized below.

First, the five English instructors were asked the contents of the current writing course, and all of them answered that the course contains sentence type, common sentence error and sentence error correction, paragraph writing, essay writing, job application letter writing and curriculum vitae writing. On the other hand, the faculty dean was also asked the writing activities the learners carry out in their major courses. Then, the respondent listed them as taking note from lecture, argumentative essay, making note from book, term paper, proposal, senior essay and report.

Second, the instructors and the faculty dean were requested if the writing activities in the current writing course are related to writing activities the students perform in their field of study. All of them responded that the writing activities in the current writing course are not related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study as the course is prepared to help learners develop their general writing abilities. Therefore, almost all of the activities in the course are not specifically the same as the writing activities they carry out in

their academic environment or in their occupational areas. The result of course materials evaluation also supports this finding.

Third, when the faculty dean was asked whether the learners face difficulty in carrying out writing activities in their studies and to what extent they face the difficulty, the respondent answered that the learners face high difficulty in carrying out the writing activities in their major courses. The respondent emphasized that the learners have a problem in using appropriate vocabulary and grammar in their writing. The quantitative analysis of data collected from economics students, subject area instructors and graduates also reveals (refer table 3) that the writing activities in which the learners encounter writing difficulty in their studies were prioritized. According to the result of the analysis, the students face high or some difficulty in carrying out the writing activities.

English instructors were also asked to rate the students' writing abilities. With this regard, all of the instructors agreed that the students' writing abilities are poor. On the other hand, the business faculty dean was asked to rate the learners' current writing abilities. Then, the respondent said that the learners' current writing abilities are poor. In quantitative analysis of data collected from students, subject area instructors and graduates, the result also reveals (refer to table 3) that the students' current writing abilities are poor or average since they face high or some difficulty in performing the writing activities.

In responding to the learners' interest towards taking the current writing course, four of English instructors agreed that the students have interest of taking the course though they face high level of difficulty in writing because they know that the course is important for them. The rest one of the instructors responded that the learners have no interest to take the writing course. The quantitative analysis of data gathered from students and graduates shows (refer table 6) that the students have positive attitude towards taking the writing course.

Moreover, the instructors and the faculty dean were required to answer if the current writing course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study. All of them agreed that although the course assists them to develop their general writing abilities, it does not help them develop specific writing abilities that support

them carry out specific writing activities in their academic environment since it was not prepared considering business situations.

Lastly, the respondents were required to comment what English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the learners' current writing abilities and their writing needs. All of the respondents commented that in designing the writing course for the learners, their target situations have to be taken into account if we want the students develop specific writing ability that helps them in the target situations. Thus, specific writing course that helps them to carry out specific writing activities in their studies and in their professional areas has to be designed for them.

#### **4.2.2.2. The interview data analysis of Bank manager and Bureau of Finance and Economic Development Head**

In this interview, commercial bank manager and bureau of finance and economic development head at regional level were asked to find information concerning writing activities the perspective graduates carry out and difficulties they face in carrying out the activities. This was to see whether the current writing course fits the graduates' professional needs. Then, their responses are summarized as follows.

In first question, the bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head were required to answer the major writing activities economics graduates perform in their occupation (in the bank or in the office). Then, the respondents said that the graduates perform writing activities like minutes, memos, business report, agenda, business letter, business plan, project proposal, project research, recommendation letter, policy document, notice and the like.

The respondents were also asked whether the writing activities in English writing course are related to writing activities the graduates perform in their profession. Then, both of the respondents answered that the writing activities in the writing course are not related to the writing activities the graduates perform in their workplaces. They added that the writing activities that graduates learnt at university are quite different from what they are doing at

their workplaces because the writing activities the graduates perform in their workplaces are specific; it is through experience that they gain skills to write the writing activities.

In responding to the writing difficulty the graduates encounter in carrying out writing activities in their occupational, the respondents said that the graduates, especially at the beginning of their career, come across high difficulty in carrying out the writing activities. The quantitative analysis of data gathered from graduates implies (see table 4) that writing difficulty the graduates face in carrying out writing activities in their occupation were prioritized. Thus, the result indicates that majority of the graduates face high or some difficulty in carrying out writing activities in their workplaces.

Besides, when the bank managers and Bureau of finance and economic development head were required to rate the graduates' current writing abilities, both respondents rated as average. In quantitative analysis of data collected from graduates, the result indicates (see discussion under table 4) that the graduates' present writing abilities are low or average.

Moreover, the respondents were asked whether the current writing course helps economics students to develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in their workplaces. All of them responded that the course does not help them develop specific writing ability.

Furthermore, the respondents were required to comment what kind of English writing course should be designed for economics students in order to fill the gap between their writing abilities and their writing needs. All of the respondents answered that the learners should be offered specific writing course that helps them develop specific writing ability. In designing writing course for the learners, their workplaces writing needs should be taken into consideration. Therefore, specific writing course that helps them develop specific writing abilities (which help them to carry out writing activities in their occupational environments) should be designed for them.

#### **4.2.2. Course material evaluation**

Course material evaluation was carried out to see whether the materials used to offer the course adequately meets economics learners writing needs. Accordingly, course materials (reference books and handout) commonly used by instructors to offer Basic Writing Course were selected and analyzed using an evaluation checklist adapted from Cunningsworth (1995), which contains six questions (see appendix G). And the result of the evaluation is presented below.

First, when an attempt was made to see whether the writing activities in materials have objectives and the objectives are specific in terms of content and performance, it was found that there are no specific objectives for the writing activities in the materials except general objectives that are found at the beginning of certain books. Thus, the students do not know what they are supposed to achieve at the end of a lesson.

The second question was pertaining to whether the writing activities mirror real life situation through task based and skill based activities. Even though there are tasks and activities in the materials, they are not tasks or activities students do in their educational and professional environment but they are tasks or activities that help learners develop their general writing skills. Interview conducted with English instructors also supports this idea in that the writing activities in the current writing course are identifying sentence type and sentence error, correcting sentence error, writing paragraph, writing essays and the like, which help them develop only their general writing skills. On the other hand, the quantitative analysis of data collected from students, subject area instructors and graduates indicates that the writing activities students carry out in the target situations are not related to writing activities learners do in the current writing course. In addition, concerning interview conducted with business faculty dean, bank managers and bureau of finance and economic development head was also support this idea. Therefore, the writing activities in materials do not reflect the students' real life situations.

Besides, when evaluating whether or not there is a body of core specialist language related to business situations used in the materials, it was found that almost all, there is no special

language ( in terms of topic or vocabulary) related to business situations in the materials except few writing activities given in handout used by instructors.

It was also evaluated if the materials equip economics learners with specific writing skills that assist them to do writing activities in their target situations. Since the writing activities in materials do not reflect the writing activities that the students carry out in their target environment, it is unlikely that the materials equip them with specific writing skills that help them perform writing activities in their target environments. Interview made with English instructors, Business Faculty Dean, Bank managers and Bureau of Finance and Economic Development Head supports this idea. Moreover, the quantitative analysis of data gathered from students, subject area instructors and economics graduates prioritized English writing needs of economics learners. Thus, the writing activities included in the materials are quite different from the learners' writing needs as indicated in the findings. This shows that since the materials were not prepared taking into account the learners' specific writing needs, they do not equip the students with specific writing skills that assist them to carry out writing activities in their target environments.

The other attempt made was to see whether the materials consider the relationship between teachers and students and if a collaborative approach is encouraged. In the materials, it was found that there is no indication of relationship between teachers and students and collaborative approach treatment. Since the course materials seem that they are not related to the learners' field of study, the essence of relationship between teacher and students where they collaboratively work together does not seem to exist.

Concerning the flexibility of the materials to fit the constraints often found in ESP work, for example, by having a modular structure of a non-sequential units and sections, it seems that the materials are not flexible since the units and sections do not have modular structure of non-sequential self-contained. If a student for instance misses certain section of a unit, s/he cannot easily learn the next section as the missed section is a prerequisite for the next one.

In general, the course materials do not seem to meet the learners' specific writing needs. This is because the contents in the materials are not tailored to the learners' field of study

and the methodological approach to language teaching treated in the materials does not fit what Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) states as ESP make use of underlying methodology that is different general English (the nature interaction between ESP teacher and learners). Consequently, the tasks and activities in the materials do not equip learners with specific writing abilities that help them perform writing activities in their academic studies and future career. However, Nunan (1989) stresses that tasks students perform in their educational setting should help the learners develop skills they need to carry out real-world communication tasks beyond the classroom.

## **Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **5.1. Summary**

It has been indicated that the main objective of this study is to investigate the writing needs of economics students with reference to Samara University. In order to achieve this objective, data were collected from different sources through questionnaire, interview and course materials evaluation. Then, the obtained data were analyzed, and English writing needs of the students and writing difficulties they face in their academic studies and in their occupation were identified and prioritized. In addition, writing course materials were evaluated to identify whether the current writing course adequately addresses the students' academic and professional needs. Accordingly, the major findings of the study are summarized as follows.

#### **5.1.1. The students' English writing needs**

In attempt made to identify English writing needs of economics students, the students, subject area instructors and graduates were presented with writing activities students are expected to carry out in their academic studies and in their future career. Then, they are required to rate how often the students carry out the given writing activities in their academic and occupational environments. Based on the aggregate mean values the respondents attached to each writing activities, the writing activities students perform in their academic studies were identified in order as taking note from lecture (4.18), making note from books(4.02), term paper (3.47), summary (3.23), argumentative essay on economic issues (3.17), proposal (3.14), senior essay (3.07), and reports on practical work (2.40).

In the case of writing needs the students perform in their occupation, the following writing activities were also identified and prioritized. The writing activities the students perform almost frequently in their occupation, in order, are writing business report (4.00), writing project proposal (3.93), writing project research (3.92) and writing business plan (3.92), writing business letter (3.81), writing recommendation letter (3.75) and writing survey studies (3.65). Writing activities the students sometimes perform are given in order of as

writing agenda (3.44), writing memorandum (3.35), writing notice (3.32), writing policy document (3.31), writing argumentative text on economic issues (3.37), writing job application letter (3.11), writing advertisement (3.10), writing curriculum vitae (3.03) and writing minutes (3.03) and writing motivation letter (2.79).

### **5.1.2. The students' writing difficulties**

An attempt was also made to identify writing difficulties the students encounter both in their academic studies and in their future career. Regarding writing difficulties students encounter in their educational setting, students, subject area instructors and graduates were presented with writing activities they are expected to carry out in their education. In the case of writing difficulties students face in their workplaces, graduates were presented with writing activities that they are expected to do in their workplaces. Then, they were asked to rate how much they face difficulty in carrying out the writing activities.

As indicated in the findings, therefore, the aggregate mean values given by students, instructors and graduates shows the students face high difficulty in writing senior essay and nearly high difficulty in writing argumentative essay and proposal since the mean values are 4.03, 3.83 and 3.78 respectively. In addition, they face some difficulty in writing reports, term paper, summary, taking note from lecture and face rare difficulty in making note from books. This is because the aggregate mean values are respectively 3.29, 3.26, 3.13, 3.07 and 2.38. Interview conducted with business faculty dean also indicates that the students face high difficulty in performing writing activities in their educational setting.

Concerning writing difficulty the students face in their occupational setting, the following writing activities were identified and prioritized based on their mean values. Thus, in writing project research (4.42), business report (4.29), minutes in meeting (4.14) and proposal (4.00), the students face high difficulty. The students face nearly high difficulty in writing recommendation letter (3.86), survey studies (3.86), business letter (3.71), business plan (3.57) and argumentative text (3.57). Moreover, the students face some or nearly some difficulty in writing motivation letter (3.42), policy document (3.29), advertisement (3.00), memorandum (2.71) and notice (2.57), and they face rare difficulty in carrying out

application letter (2.43), agenda (2.25) and curriculum vitae (2.29). Interview made with bank manager and Bureau of finance and economic development head also reveals that the graduates face high difficulty in carrying out the writing activities.

### **5.1.3. The students' attitude towards taking the current writing course**

In identifying the students' attitude towards taking the current writing course, both students and graduates were presented with three positive and three negative statements. The respondents attached high mean values to positive statements and low mean values to negative statements. This shows that the students have positive attitude towards taking the writing course because they believe that the writing course is important to develop their general writing abilities that directly or indirectly helps them in their academic studies and in their occupation. Interview made with English instructors also supports that the students have interest in taking the writing course.

### **5.1.4. Preferred type of English writing course**

In attempting to identify the preferred type of writing course, both students and graduates were provided with three types of English writing courses namely specific writing course, general writing course and combination of specific and general writing course. The respondents attached high mean values to specific English writing course and combination of specific and general English writing course and attached low mean values to general English writing course. Therefore, they prefer specific writing course in addition to general writing course.

### **5.1.5. Relevance of the current writing course**

An attempt was made to identify whether the current writing course adequately address the students' academic and occupational needs. In order to identify this, the writing activities the students are expected to do in their academic and in their occupational areas were identified. On the other hand, course materials English instructors commonly use in offering the writing course were also analyzed using evaluation checklist. The findings indicate that the writing activities identified in quantitative data analysis are not related the writing activities

in the writing course materials. The writing activities in the course materials are writing activities that help learners develop their general writing abilities whereas the writing activities identified in the quantitative data analysis are specific writing activities students perform in their academic studies and in their workplaces. The findings of analysis of data obtained from English instructors and business faculty dean through interview supports that the writing activities in the current writing course are not related to writing activities the students perform in their academic studies and future career.

#### **5.1.6. Gap between students writing needs and their writing competence**

In the analysis, writing activities the students are expected to carry out in their educational and occupational settings were identified. In the same token, writing difficulties the students face to carry out the writing activities were identified. In either academic and occupational areas, all the writing activities are important, but the students face almost high or some difficulty in performing the writing activities. This indicates that the students have low or average writing competence to carry out the writing activities, which is interpreted as lacks, what the students do not know or cannot do in English (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991; Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998). The students are expected to write the writing activities successfully, but they lack the expected writing competence to do so.

### **5.2. Conclusions**

Based on the data analysis and the summary of the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

The students need to carry out all the given writing activities in their academic studies and future occupation. However, they face high or some difficulty in performing almost all the writing activities, which implies that the students' current writing abilities are low or average. One of the main reasons for their difficulties is that they are not being equipped with specific writing abilities that help them to perform the specific writing activities. That means the students lack the expected writing abilities to carry out the writing activities even though they need to do so. Thus, there is a clear gap between the students' writing needs and their writing competence. This tells us that that the current writing course is not

addressing the students' academic and occupational needs, as it does not equip them with specific writing abilities that help them to do writing activities in their studies and in their occupation. Though the students lack specific writing abilities, they have positive attitude towards taking the current writing course, and they want specific writing course that is relevant to business particularly to economics.

## **5.2. Recommendations**

Based on summary of the findings and conclusions given above, the following recommendations were made.

1. In this study, writing activities the students perform in their academic studies and in their occupation were identified. Therefore, syllabus designers should prepare specific English writing course that meets the students' academic and occupational needs by considering these identified writing activities.
2. English curriculum revisers and English instructors of Samara University have to be aware the students' English writing needs and their writing difficulties. Then, they should evaluate the current writing course and make an adjustment in which the students will be provided with specific writing course that meets their academic and occupational needs.
3. In designing ESP course for the students, it is impossible to address all the students writing needs. Therefore, writing activities that are more important, but in which the students face high difficulty in writing should be given first priority to be included in the course.
4. The findings of this study may also serve as an indication for other Universities in relation with the need to prepare ESP writing course.

## Reference

- Abebe Alemu (2011). ‘Assessing the Writing Needs of Business Students at Ethiopian Civil Service College’ (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.
- Abebe Tilahun (2010). ‘Assessing the Writing Needs of Business Management Students in Relation to Sophomore English Course offered: Dilla University in Focus’ (Unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.
- Admas, K., and Keene, M. (2000). *Research and Writing across the Discipline* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Anthony, L. (1997). Preaching to Cannibals: A Look at Academic Writing in Engineering. *Proceedings of the Japan Conference on English for Specific Purposes*. Retrieved on November 20, 2012, from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/abstracts/Aizukiyo97.pdf>
- Basturkmen, H. (2006). *Ideas and options in English for Specific Purpose*. New Zealand: New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2010). *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purpose*. New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- 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.
- Benesch, S. (1996). Needs Analysis and Curriculum Development in EAP: An Example of a Critical Approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 4. pp. 723-738.
- Beyene Wako (2007). *Developing criteria for designing an appropriate English course for accounting students: with particular reference to Nekemte African Beza College*. (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.

- Black, W.E., and Hernandez-Gantes, V. M. (2009). *Teaching English language learners in career and technical education program*. UK: Routledge.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. San Francisco State University: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, G., and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: English in Academic and Research Setting*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bruce, I. (2008). *Academic writing and genre: A systematic Analysis*. Great Britain: Biddles, Norfolk.
- Brunton, M. (2009). An account of ESP – with possible future directions. *English for Specific Purposes Issue 3 (24)*, Volume 8. Retrieved on November 25, 2012, from [http:// www.esp-world.info](http://www.esp-world.info)
- Chambers, F. (1980) 'A Re-Evaluation of Needs Analysis', *English for Specific Purposes Journal*, 1, 25–33.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing Your Course Book*. Oxford: Heinemann Publishers Ltd.
- Coffey, B. (1985). *ESP: English for specific purposes*. In V. Kinsella, (Ed.), Cambridge Language Surveys 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guide for Small-Scales Social Research Project (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. England: Open University Press.
- Desten, I., and Gray, J.H. (1998). *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis Using Latent and Manifest Variables*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Dudley- Evans and St. John (1996). *Report on Business English: A Review of Research and Published Teaching Materials*. TOEIC Research Report No.2 Princeton, MJ: The Chauncey Group International

\_\_\_\_\_ (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ephrem Tesema (2004). ‘‘Analysis of English Course Needs of Nursing Students on Selected Governmental Nursing School: Menelik II and Assela Nursing School and The Respective Hospitals in Focus’’ (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.

Fesseha Abadi (2004). ‘‘Determining English Course Needs of Agriculture Students at Mekele University’’ (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.

Fitsum Abate (2005). ‘‘Investigation on communicative language needs of commerce students at Saint Mary’s College’’ (Unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.

Habtamu Desta (2008). ‘‘English Language Needs Analysis Of Fine Art Students At Mekelle College Of Teacher Education’’ (Unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.

Hamp-Lyons, L., and Hyland, K. (2002). EAP: issue and direction. *Journal of English for academic purpose*, 1, 1-12. Retrieved on December 9, 2013, from <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap>

Harmer, J.(2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. London: Longman.

Hutchinson, T., and Water, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purpose: A learning-centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Hyland, K. (2007). *English for specific Purpose: Some influences and Impacts*. London: UK.

- Johns, A. M. (1991). *English for Specific Purposes (ESP): Its History and Contributions*. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 67-77). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Johnson, K., and Morrow, K. (1981). *Communication in the Classroom: Applications and Methods for A communicative Approach*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for Academic Purpose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kebere Malla (2012). *Investigating the English Language Needs of Medical Students at Saint Paul Hospital Millennium Medical College (Unpublished MA Thesis)*. Addis Ababa: AAU.
- Kushal, S. J. (2009). *Business communication*. Delhi: Vaibhav Printers.
- Lau, L.K. (2003). *Institutional Factors affecting Students' Retention*. *Education*, 124(1), 12-136.
- Long, M. H. (2005). *Second Language Needs Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maican, M. A. (2010). *Enhancing Business Writing Skills in English for Economics Undergraduate: Bulletin of the Transylvania University of Brasov*, 3(52). Retrieved on November 17, 2012, from [http://but.unitbv.ro/BU2010/IV/BULETIN/PDF/LANGUAGEA/LINGUISTICS/17\\_Maican.pdf](http://but.unitbv.ro/BU2010/IV/BULETIN/PDF/LANGUAGEA/LINGUISTICS/17_Maican.pdf)
- MCEWen, B.C.(2003). *Improving Writing Skills of Business Majors*. Association for Business communication.
- Molla Kebede (2006). *Determining the English Language Needs of Law Students at Mekele University (Unpublished MA Thesis)*. Addis Ababa: AAU.

- Munby, J. (1987). *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner- Centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Olshtain, E., and Celce-Murcia, M. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Patel, Y.H., and Vyas, M. A. (2009). *Teaching English as a Second Language: A New Pedagogy For a New Century*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Richard, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodgers, S.T. Richards, J.C. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robison, P. (1991). *ESP Today: A Practitioners' Guide*. Britain: Prentice Hall
- Simpson, S. (2011). *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. USA:Routledge
- Soles, D. (2010). *The essentials of Academic Writing (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. USA: Cengage Learning, Inc.
- Solomon Mogues (2001). ‘*Investigating the relevance of business English course at Addis Ababa commercial college to the needs of employing organization*’ (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU .
- Stevens, P. (1977). *New orientation in the teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1988). *ESP after twenty years: a re-appraisal*. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *ESP: State of the Art*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Tilahun Bekele (2003). *Analysis of English Language Needs of Students of Theology: With Reference to Meserete Kristos College (unpublished MA thesis)*. Addis Ababa: AAU
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Setting*. New York: Cup.
- Walker, R. (2010). *Strategic Management Communication*. USA: Cengage Learning, Inc.
- West, R. (1998). *ESP-State of Art*. Retrieved on December 25, 2013 from <http://www.education.man.ac.uk/lang/lit/esp/west.htm>
- West, R. (1997). *Needs analysis: State of Art 1*, in Howard, R., and Brown, G. (eds.). *Teacher Education for LSP*. Great Britain: Multilingual Matters.
- Widdowson, H.O. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

Addis Ababa University

College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication

Department of Foreign language and Literature

#### Questionnaire for economics students

Dear economics students,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course you are taking meet your needs, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond all the questions attentively and genuinely for the success of the study. You are appreciated for your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire.

The researcher

Thank you!

#### I. Instruction: Please put a tick mark (✓) in the box of your choice for each item.

##### Your background information

1. Year: First  Second  Third
2. Your writing ability before entering University: very good  Good   
Average  poor  very poor

#### II. Instruction: Circle number of your choice for each item given in the table

**1. Information about your current English writing ability in terms of other language skills**

1.1. How do you rate your current ability in the following English language skills?

<b>Item</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Very poor</b>
Speaking	5	4	3	2	1
listening	5	4	3	2	1
Reading	5	4	3	2	1
Writing	5	4	3	2	1
Grammar	5	4	3	2	1
Vocabulary	5	4	3	2	1

**2. Information about your writing needs in your academic studies**

How often do you need to carry out the following writing activities in your academic studies?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very often</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
Summary of a text you have read	5	4	3	2	1
Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work)	5	4	3	2	1

### 3. Information about your writing needs in your future career.

How often do you think you carry out the following writing activities in your future career?

Writing activities	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Business report (report on worthiness of a business )	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative text on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Agenda	5	4	3	2	1
Business letters	5	4	3	2	1
Memorandum (memos)	5	4	3	2	1
Minutes in meeting	5	4	3	2	1
Advertisements ( on marketing / job vacancy)	5	4	3	2	1
Project proposal	5		3	2	1
Project research	5	4	3	2	1
Survey studies	5	4	3	2	1
Notice	5	4	3	2	1
Recommendation letters (on feasibility of a project)	5	4	3	2	1
Business Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Job application letter	5	4	3	2	1
Curriculum vitae	5	4	3	2	1
Motivation letter	5	4	3	2	1
Policy document	5	4	3	2	1

### 4. Writing difficulties you face in your academic studies

How much do you face difficulties in writing to carry out the following writing activities in your studies?

Writing activities	Very high difficulty	High difficulty	Some difficulty	Little difficulty	No difficulty
Summary of a text you have read	5	4	3	2	1

Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work )	5	4	3	2	1

## 5. Information about your attitude towards English writing course

### 5.1. Your attitude towards the current English writing course

How much do you agree to the following statements?

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Moderately agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
Taking the current English writing course is important for academic studies and future occupation.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current English writing course is waste of time.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current English writing course is interesting.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current writing has nothing to do with academic studies and future career.	5	4	3	2	1
The current English writing course helps me to develop my writing ability.	5	4	3	2	1
The current English writing course does not help me to develop my writing ability.	5	4	3	2	1

## 5.2. Your preferred type of English writing course

How much do you agree to the following statement?

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Moderately agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
I prefer specific English writing course for business purposes.	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer general English writing course for general purposes.	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer combination of specific and general English writing course.	5	4	3	2	1

## Appendix B

Addis Ababa University

College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication

Department of Foreign language and Literature

### Questionnaire for subject area instructors

Dear instructors,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course the learners are taking meet their need, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond all the questions attentively and genuinely for the success of the study. You are appreciated for your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire.

The researcher

Thank you!

**I. Instruction: Please put a tick mark (✓) in the box of your choice for each item.**

#### Your background information

1. Qualification: Bachelor degree  Masters degree  PhD

2. Year of service in the university: one year  two years  three years   
four years  five years

**II. Circle number of your choice for each item given in the table**

**1. Information about the students' current English writing ability in terms of other language skills**

How do you rate your students' ability in the following English language skills?

<b>Item</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>poor</b>	<b>Very poor</b>
Speaking	5	4	3	2	1
Listening	5	4	3	2	1
Reading	5	4	3	2	1
Writing	5	4	3	2	1
Grammar	5	4	3	2	1
Vocabulary	5	4	3	2	1

**2. Information about your students' writing needs in their academic study**

How often do your students need to carry out the following writing activities in their academic study?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very often</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
Summary of a text you have read	5	4	3	2	1
Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work)	5	4	3	2	1

### 3. Information about your students' writing needs in their future career.

How often do you think your students carry out the following writing activities in their future career?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very often</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>
Business report (report on worthiness of a business )	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative text on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Agenda	5	4	3	2	1
Business letters	5	4	3	2	1
Memorandum (memos)	5	4	3	2	1
Minutes in meeting	5	4	3	2	1
Advertisements ( marketing / job vacancy)	5	4	3	2	1
Project proposal	5	4	3	2	1
Project research	5	4	3	2	1
Survey studies	5	4	3	2	1
Notice	5	4	3	2	1
Recommendation letters (on feasibility of a given project)	5	4	3	2	1
Business Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Job application letter	5	4	3	2	1
Curriculum vitae	5	4	3	2	1
Motivation letter	5	4	3	2	1
Policy document	5	4	3	2	1

#### 4. Information about your students' writing difficulty

How much do your students face difficulties in writing to carry out the following writing activities in their study?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very high difficulty</b>	<b>High difficulty</b>	<b>Some difficulty</b>	<b>Little difficulty</b>	<b>No difficulty</b>
Summary of a text they have read	5	4	3	2	1
Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work)	5	4	3	2	1

## Appendix C

### Addis Ababa University

College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication

Department of Foreign language and Literature

#### Questionnaire for economics graduates

Dear graduates,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course the learners are taking meet their need, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond all the questions attentively and genuinely for the success of the study. You are appreciated for your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire.

The researcher

Thank you!

**I. Instruction: Please put a tick mark (✓) in the box of your choice for each item.**

#### Your background information

1. Qualification: Bachelor degree  Masters degree  PhD

2. Work experience: One year  Two years  Three years

four years  five years

3. Your writing ability before entering University: Very good  Good

average  poor  very poor

## II. Circle number of your choice for each item given in the table

### 1. Information about your writing needs in your previous studies

How often did you need to carry out the following writing activities in your studies?

Writing activities	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Summary of a text you have read	5	4	3	2	1
Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work)	5	4	3	2	1

### 2. Information about your writing needs in your career.

How often do you need to carry out the following writing activities in your career?

Writing activities	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Business report (report on worthiness of a business etc)	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative text on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Agenda	5	4	3	2	1
Business letters	5	4	3	2	1
Memorandum (memos)	5	4	3	2	1
Minutes in meeting	5	4	3	2	1
Advertisements ( marketing / job vacancy)	5	4	3	2	1
Project proposal	5	4	3	2	1

Project research	5	4	3	2	1
Survey studies	5	4	3	2	1
Notice	5	4	3	2	1
Recommendation letters (on feasibility of a given project)	5	4	3	2	1
Business Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Job application letter	5	4	3	2	1
Curriculum vitae	5	4	3	2	1
Motivation letter	5	4	3	2	1
Policy document	5	4	3	2	1

#### **4. Information about writing difficulty you face in your studies**

How much did you face difficulties in writing to carry out the following writing activities in your studies?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very high difficulty</b>	<b>High difficulty</b>	<b>Some difficulty</b>	<b>Little difficulty</b>	<b>No difficulty</b>
Summary of a text you have read	5	4	3	2	1
Taking note from lecture	5	4	3	2	1
Making note from book	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative essay on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Proposals	5	4	3	2	1
Senior essay	5	4	3	2	1
Term papers	5	4	3	2	1
Reports (on practical work )	5	4	3	2	1

### 5. Information about writing difficulty you face in your occupation.

To what extent do you face difficulties in writing to carry out the following writing activities in your career?

<b>Writing activities</b>	<b>Very high difficulty</b>	<b>High difficulty</b>	<b>Some difficulty</b>	<b>Little difficulty</b>	<b>No difficulty</b>
Business report (report on worthiness of a business )	5	4	3	2	1
Argumentative text on economic issues	5	4	3	2	1
Agenda	5	4	3	2	1
Business letters	5	4	3	2	1
Memorandum (memos)	5	4	3	2	1
Minutes in meeting	5	4	3	2	1
Advertisements ( marketing / job vacancy)	5	4	3	2	1
Project proposal	5	4	3	2	1
Project research	5	4	3	2	1
Survey studies	5	4	3	2	1
Notice	5	4	3	2	1
Recommendation letters (on feasibility of a given project)	5	4	3	2	1
Business Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Job application letter	5	4	3	2	1
Curriculum vitae	5	4	3	2	1
Motivation letter	5	4	3	2	1
Policy design	5	4	3	2	1

## 6. Information about your attitude towards English writing course

### 6.1. Your attitude towards the current English writing course

How much do you agree to the following statements?

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Moderately agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
Taking the current English writing course is important.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current English writing course is waste of time.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current English writing course is interesting.	5	4	3	2	1
Taking the current writing course is boring.	5	4	3	2	1
The current English writing course helps me to develop my writing ability.	5	4	3	2	1
The current English writing course does not help me to develop my writing ability.	5	4	3	2	1

### 6.2. Your preferred type of English writing course

To what extent do you agree to the following statements?

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>undecided</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
I prefer specific English writing course that is relevant to business.	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer general English writing course that helps me for general writing purpose.	5	4	3	2	1
I prefer combination of specific and general English writing course.	5	4	3	2	1

**Appendix D**  
**Addis Ababa University**  
**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication**  
**Department of Foreign language and Literature**

**Interview for English instructors**

Dear instructors,

This interview is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course the learners are taking meet their need, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, it would be very appreciable if you respond to the interview genuinely for the success of the study.

1. What are the contents of the current English writing course?
2. Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities that the learners perform in their field of study?
3. Do the students face writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?
4. How do you rate the students' writing abilities?
6. How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?
7. Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?
8. What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

**Appendix E**  
**Addis Ababa University**  
**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication**  
**Department of Foreign language and Literature**

**Interview for business faculty dean**

Dear the faculty dean,

This interview is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course the learners are taking meet their need, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, it would be very appreciable if you respond to the interview genuinely for the success of the study.

The researcher

1. What are the writing activities the students perform in their academic studies?
2. Do you think these writing activities are related to writing activities in the current English writing course?
3. Do the students encounter writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities in their major courses? To what extent?
4. How do you rate the students' current writing abilities?
5. Do you believe that the current writing course helps learners develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in educational setting?
6. What kind writing course should be designed for the learners to bridge the gap between the learners' writing needs and their current writing abilities?

**Appendix F**  
**Addis Ababa University**  
**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication**  
**Department of Foreign language and Literature**

**Interview for Bank manager and Bureau of finance and economics head**

Dear manager/ head,

This interview is designed to gather information to investigate the writing needs of economics students at Samara University. The information you are required to give in the inquiry is found to be very important in order to make judgment whether the current writing course the learners are taking meet their need, and if not, recommend possible solutions that help to design appropriate writing course. Thus, it would be very appreciable if you respond to the interview genuinely for the success of the study.

The researcher

1. What are major writing activities economics graduates perform in your bank or office?
2. Do you think the writing activities are related to writing activities in the current English writing course?
3. Do the graduates encounter writing difficulty in carrying out writing activities in your bank or office? To what extent?
4. How do you rate the graduates' current English writing ability in performing the writing activities?
5. Do you believe that the current writing course helps graduates develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in their occupational setting?
6. What kind writing course should be designed for economics learners to bridge the gap between the learners' writing needs and their current writing abilities?

## **Appendix G**

### **Addis Ababa University**

**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and communication**

**Department of Foreign language and Literature**

#### **Course material evaluation checklist (adapted from Cunningsworth, 1995)**

1. Are there objectives for writing activities given in the materials? Are the objectives specific in terms of content and performance so that they fit particular learners' language needs?
2. Do the writing activities mirror real life situations, for example, through task based and skill based activities?
3. Is there a body of 'core' specialist language related to business situations used in the materials?
4. Do the materials equip the learners with specific writing skills that will allow them carry out writing activities in their academic and occupational situations?
5. Do the materials consider the relationship between teachers and students? If so, is a collaborative approach encouraged?
6. Are the materials sufficiently flexible to meet the constraints often found in ESP work, for example, by having a modular structure of non-sequential units?

**Appendix H**  
**Interview transcription**

**Transcription of interview made with English instructors**

Teacher 1

Q<sub>1</sub> = what are the contents of the current English writing course?

Ans= The contents of the current writing course are sentence and sentence type, sentence error and correction, paragraph writing, essay writing, curriculum vitae and application letter writing.

Q<sub>2</sub> =Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study?

Ans=they are not specifically related to writing activities in learners perform in their field of study, but in few activities, it is related to students field of study. The writing activities in the course help learners develop their general writing abilities. So, it is not tailored to the students' field of study.

Q<sub>3</sub> =do the students face writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?

Ans= Yes, the leaners face high level of difficulty in writing the activities.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' writing abilities?

Ans= the students' writing abilities are poor.

Q<sub>5</sub> =How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?

Ans= they like taking the writing course because they know that the course is important though they are poor in writing the activities.

Q<sub>6</sub> = Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?

Ans= The course helps the learners but it does not help to develop the students' specific writing abilities as it is designed for general writing purpose.

Q<sub>7</sub> = What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= specific writing course particular business writing course should be designed for them.

#### Teacher 2

Q<sub>1</sub> = what are the contents of the current English writing course?

Ans= The contents are sentence type, sentence error and correction, writing paragraph, writing essay, writing curriculum vitae and job application letter.

Q<sub>2</sub> = Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study?

Ans= As the course was not designed based on the students' academic needs, the activities are not related to the activities the students perform in their field of study except in few activities.

Q<sub>3</sub> =Do the students face writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?

Ans= Yes, majority of them face high difficulty in writing, and only few students wrote fluently.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' writing abilities?

Ans= the students' writing abilities are poor.

Q<sub>5</sub> =How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?

Ans= since they know that the course is important for them, they are interested in taking the course.

Q<sub>6</sub> = Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?

Ans= I personally believe that the course helps the learners, but it does not specifically addresses their writing needs since it was designed for general writing purpose.

Q<sub>7</sub> = What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= The writing course that specifically addresses the students' writing needs should be designed for them.

### Teacher 3

Q<sub>1</sub> = what are the contents of the current English writing course?

Ans= The contents of the current writing course are sentence type and sentence error, sentence error correction, paragraph writing, essay writing, writing job related letter (curriculum vitae and application letter writing).

Q<sub>2</sub> = Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study?

Ans= the writing activities in the writing course are not related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study. They are not specifically the same as the writing activities the students perform in their academic studies.

Q<sub>3</sub> =Do the students face writing difficulties in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?

Ans= Yes, the students face very high difficulty in writing the writing activities.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' writing abilities?

Ans= The students have poor writing abilities.

Q<sub>5</sub> =How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?

Ans= The students have no interest towards taking the course.

Q<sub>6</sub> = Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?

Ans= even though the writing course helps learners develop their general writing abilities, it does not help them develop specific writing abilities to perform writing activities in their academic studies.

Q<sub>7</sub> = What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= The writing course that considers the students' writing needs should be designed for them.

#### Teacher 4

Q<sub>1</sub> = What are the contents of the current English writing course?

Ans= They are sentence type, common sentence error, sentence error correction, paragraph writing, essay writing, letter of application and curriculum vitae writing.

Q<sub>2</sub> = Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study?

Ans= The writing activities in the writing course are not related the writing activities the students perform in their field of study, but I sometimes try to relate the activities to the learners' field of study.

Q<sub>3</sub> =Do the students face writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?

Ans= Yes, majority of the students face high difficulty in carrying out the writing activities, but there are some students who face some difficulties.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' writing abilities?

Ans= The students' writing abilities are poor.

Q<sub>5</sub> =How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?

Ans= Majority of the students are interested in taking the writing course.

Q<sub>6</sub> = Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?

Ans= The writing course helps them develop their general writing abilities, but it does not help to develop specific writing abilities that helps them perform writing activities in their field of study.

Q<sub>7</sub> = What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= First, the students' academic needs has to be analyzed. Based on their needs, specific writing course has to be designed for them.

#### Teacher 5

Q<sub>1</sub> = what are the contents of the current English writing course?

Ans= The contents of writing course are sentence type and basic sentence fault, sentence error correction, paragraph writing, essay writing, curriculum vitae and application letter writing.

Q<sub>2</sub> = Are the writing activities in the writing course related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study?

Ans=They have no direct relevance to the writing activities in the students' field of study. They are rather writing activities that helps to develop general writing abilities.

Q<sub>3</sub> =Do the students face writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities? To what extent?

Ans= Yes, the students face high difficulty in writing the writing activities.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' writing abilities?

Ans= Majority of the students writing abilities are poor, but there are some students whose writing abilities are good.

Q<sub>5</sub> =How do you find the learners' interest towards taking the course?

Ans=The students have interest in taking the writing course.

Q<sub>6</sub> = Do you think the course helps learners develop specific writing ability to carry out writing activities in their academic study?

Ans= The course has a sort of input; however, it does not fully helps the students to develop their specific writing abilities.

Q<sub>7</sub> = What kind of English writing course should be designed to bridge the gap between the students' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= The writing course that is relevant to their field of study has to be designed for them.

### **Transcription of interview made with business faculty dean**

Q<sub>1</sub> =What are the writing activities the students perform in their academic studies?

Ans= the writing activities the students write in their studies are taking note from lecture, making note from books, argumentative essay on economic issues, term paper, proposal, senior essay and report

Q<sub>2</sub> = Do you think the writing activities in the current English writing course are related to writing activities the students perform in their field of study?

Ans= The writing activities in the current writing course are not related to writing activities the learners perform in their field of study.

Q<sub>3</sub> =Do the students encounter writing difficulty in carrying out the writing activities in their major courses? To what extent?

Ans= the students face high difficulty to carry out the writing activities. Particularly, the students have great problem in using appropriate vocabulary and grammar in their writing.

Q<sub>4</sub>= How do you rate the students' current writing abilities?

Ans= The learners current writing abilities are poor.

Q<sub>5</sub>= Do you believe that the current writing course helps learners develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in educational setting?

Ans= The course helps them develop their general writing abilities, but it does not help them develop specific writing abilities that helps them perform specific writing activities.

Q<sub>6</sub>= What kind writing course should be designed for the learners to bridge the gap between the learners' writing needs and their current writing abilities?

Ans= In order to design the writing course, what the students need to write in their studies and in their occupation should be considered if we want our students develop specific writing abilities. Thus, specific writing course that helps learners to carry out specific writing activities should be designed for them.

### **Transcription of interview made with bank manager**

Q<sub>1</sub> = What are major writing activities economics graduates perform in your bank?

Ans=the major writing activities the graduates perform are business letter, business plan, memos, agenda, minutes and business reports.

Q<sub>2</sub> =Do you think the writing activities in the current English writing course are related to writing activities the students perform in their profession.?

Ans= Specifically, the writing activities are not related to writing activities the graduates perform in their workplaces since the course is designed for general writing purpose.

Q<sub>3</sub> = Do the graduates encounter writing difficulty in carrying out writing activities in your bank? To what extent?

Ans= The graduates show high level of difficulty in writing the activities especially at beginning of their career.

Q<sub>4</sub> = How do you rate the graduates' current English writing abilities?

Ans= Since they are showing improvement, their current writing abilities are average.

Q<sub>5</sub> = Do you believe that the current writing course helps graduates develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in their occupational setting?

Ans= Indirectly, it helps the learners to carry out the writing activities, but it does not help them develop specific writing abilities of the students.

Q<sub>6</sub> = What kind writing course should be designed for economics learners to bridge the gap between the learners' writing needs and their current writing ability?

Ans= The course has to be designed based on the learners' specific writing needs.

### **Transcription of interview made with Bureau of finance and economic development head**

Q<sub>1</sub> = What are major writing activities economics graduates perform in your office?

Ans= Some major writing activities the graduates perform in our office are business letter, business report, project research, project proposal, policy document, recommendation letter and agenda

Q<sub>2</sub> = Do you think the writing activities in the current English writing course are related to writing activities the graduates perform in their profession?

Ans= They are not related to writing activities the graduates perform in their occupation. The writing activities the graduates perform in their occupation are quite different from the writing activities they learnt. The graduates gain the writing abilities through experience.

Q<sub>3</sub> = Do the graduates encounter writing difficulty in carrying out writing activities in your office? To what extent?

Ans= The graduates face high difficulty in carrying out the writing activities specifically at the beginning of their career.

Q<sub>4</sub> = How do you rate the graduates' current English writing abilities?

Ans=The graduates current writing abilities are average.

Q<sub>5</sub> = Do you believe that the current writing course helps graduates develop specific writing abilities that help them carry out writing activities in their occupational setting?

Ans= It helps to some extent, but specifically, it does not help them develop specific writing abilities to carry out writing activities in their occupation.

Q<sub>6</sub> = What kind writing course should be designed for economics learners to bridge the gap between the learners' writing needs and their current writing abilities?

Ans= The writing course that is tailored to the learners' profession has to be designed for them so that they perform the activities effectively.

