


What is up with English: A Needs Analysis for Music Students

Esra HARMANDAOĞLU BAZ¹ , Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Common Courses Department, esraharmandaoglu@gmail.com

Recommended citation: Harmandaoglu Baz, E. (2023). What is up with English: A needs analysis for music students. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 7(1), 65-79.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1374630>

Abstract: The use of English throughout the world as an international language and English as a lingua franca (ELF) make it necessary to learn English at a level competent enough to build effective and appropriate communication. In this respect, this research aims to investigate the needs of Turkish music students in English courses at a state university in Türkiye. The study was designed as a descriptive study, and the participants were chosen by using convenience sampling. The needs analysis questionnaire was administered to the students, and focus group interviews were conducted with the students and the instructor. The qualitative data from the questionnaire and interview were analyzed by using a constant-comparative method derived from grounded theory with coding procedures. The quantitative data in the questionnaires were presented with the frequencies. The findings indicate that the learners seem eager to learn English and need English for communication and academic purposes. Nevertheless, they may not have the necessary qualifications and strategies as a language learner. Some pedagogical suggestions will be presented for language instructors and policymakers.

Keywords: Needs analysis, EFL learners, Music students, Language learning, ELF

INTRODUCTION

The rising importance of English as a foreign language all around the world seems very obvious. Harmer (2007, p. 13) clarifies that at the conclusion of the twentieth century “English was already well on its way to becoming a genuine *lingua franca*, that is a language used widely for communication between people who do not share the same first (or even second) language”. The education field has its share of this trend and it will not come as a surprise for both learners and educators to have a desire for proficiency in English language. The situation is the same in our country and the Turkish educators and learners need to communicate appropriately and effectively on an international level in order to keep up with today’s world. In the classrooms, there are many students with a variety of expectations for learning English. It should not be neglected that these students have different backgrounds related to learning English in addition to learning styles and motivation. Therefore, it is essential to look into the needs of the learners in order to provide a rich learning environment for them.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a lingua franca (ELF)

Second language acquisition (SLA) process has undergone many changes since the 1980s. Previously, the focus was put on accuracy and language usage to a great extent. However, with the development of communicative language teaching, a moment of perspective shift towards language,

¹ ORCID: [0000-0003-0694-0928](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0694-0928)

Submitted: 11.10.2023

Accepted: 15.11.2023



activities, teacher and learner roles was experienced. Unlike grammatical competence which emphasizes “the knowledge we have of a language that accounts for our ability to produce sentences in a language”, communicative competence is composed of such language knowledge (Richards, 2006, p. 3):

- Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions
- Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication)
- Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g., narratives, reports, interviews, conversations)
- Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies)

With respect to different aspects of language knowledge, communicative language teaching (CLT) focuses on the use of language for communication and interaction in alliance with communicative competence. Dörnyei (2009, p. 276) highlights with a regard to CLT that “the central theme of the approach is to underscore the importance of meaningful communication and usable communicative skills in L2 instruction”. Therefore, we as educators need to “explore pedagogical means for “real-life” communication in the classroom” (Brown, 2001, p. 42). Common European Framework of References (CEFR) sheds light on an important need for students to turn their learning into real-life practice to become fluent and proficient language users (CoE, 2001). But how? Harris (1969, p. 9) indicates “language includes four skills, or complexes of skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It is perhaps in this order that we originally learned our native language, and it is in that order that foreign languages are now frequently taught”. According to Dörnyei (2009, p. 20), “naturalistic SLA is embedded in authentic, real-life situations, whose language-specific characteristics have been described in the past by theories of acculturation and intergroup contact”.

On the other hand, the situation gets complicated when it comes to education in schools since many variables occur during language learning. Dörnyei (2009, p. 20) emphasizes that “the educational setting of instructed SLA has been described by means of a completely different set of factors such as teacher and student roles, classroom management, inter-student relations and interaction patterns, group norms, classroom goal structures, and group cohesiveness ...”. From another point of view, it may not be always feasible to have experience to use language outside the classroom due to English as a second language (ESL) and EFL issues. Regarding this, according to Kachru (1985), there are three concentric circles of World Englishes: the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanding circle. Kachru (2008, p. 522) reveals that the characterization of world Englishes is primarily based on the following factors:

- . the history of the types of spread and motivation for the location of the language
- . patterns of acquisition
- . societal depth of the language in terms of its users, and the range of functions that are assigned to the English medium at various levels in the language policies of a nation (e.g., in administration, education, and literacy)

He adds that “the three circles are not static, but dynamic and changing” (Kachru, 2008, p. 522). The inner circle involves mainly but not merely “the L1 speakers of varieties of English: Britain, United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand” (Kachru, 2008, p. 522). The outer circle comprises “the major Anglophone countries of Africa and Asia, including India, Nigeria, the Philippines, Singapore, and South Africa” (Kachru, 2008, p. 522). Lastly, the expanding circle contains “China, Taiwan, Korea, and Saudi Arabia” (Kachru, 2008, p. 522). Kachru (1985) comments that the inner, outer, and expanding circles represent English as the primary language, an official or widely-used second language, and a foreign language. In respect to this situation, Türkiye can be listed under the expanding circle because English is taught in Türkiye as an EFL. Nevertheless, the distinction between English “as a second language or foreign language may not be so easy to define



because many communities are multilingual and English is a language of communication” (Harmer, 2007, p. 19).

Moving on to consider motivation, it has been found to affect the rate and success of language learning and is considered the main incentive to start language learning and maintain the language learning process (Dörnyei, 1998). According to Dörnyei (1998, p. 131), “motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor”. As was pointed out above, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011, p. 4) indicate that motivation is a complex term to define, nonetheless, “the only thing about motivation most researchers would agree on is that it, by definition, concerns the *direction* and *magnitude* of human behavior”. In addition, they add that “motivation is responsible for *why* people decide to do something, *how long* they are willing to sustain the activity, and *how hard* they are going to pursue it” (2011, p. 4). What is more, it should be noted that some differences in people’s inclinations may occur in terms of attributing their success outcomes to ability and/ or effort (Weiner, 1972). Considering the fact that the attribution process emerges to be a prominent stimulant of learning and performance in the classes, there should be attempts to create appropriate (achievement-enhancing) attributions for students (Weiner, 1972). Furthermore, it is highly important to create a pleasant and supportive class environment because language learning is quite a challenging process and might cause anxiety among learners (Dörnyei, 2001).

Needs Analysis of Music Students in English Courses

In such a multivariable and delicate process as language learning, conducting a needs analysis becomes necessary for teachers and learners. According to Nunan (1988, p. 75), needs analysis is composed of “a family of procedures for gathering information about learners and about communication tasks for use in syllabus design”. West (1997, p. 68) brings our attention to the fact that the concept of ‘analysis of needs’ emerged while Michael West was “trying to establish *why* learners should learn English (answer: in order to read) and *how* they should learn English (answer: through reading)”. According to West (1997), a good needs analysis procedure should involve such requirements as transparency (thoroughness, accuracy, involvement, and transparency), being repeatable during the course (regular revision of the analysis to take account of evolving needs), being learner-centered (learners’ stated preferences in terms of both language and learning styles), taking account of both target situation needs and learners’ present deficiencies (present language proficiency and target needs), establishing a syllabus by indicating learning/teaching priorities (an indication of syllabus content giving an estimate of learning/teaching priorities), being related to the target situation/real world rather than linguistic categories, and being credible to learners and sponsors (transparency and common language).

Up to now, there have been some investigations into the needs of music students in English courses. Dai, Wu, and Dai (2015) investigate the relationship among motivation, learning styles, and English proficiency by collecting data from three hundred and eight students studying English as EFL at Xinghai Conservatory of Music in China. The results indicate that music students do not differ statistically in motivation to learn English, unlike learning styles and English proficiency. The researchers advise to reform College English courses in Chinese conservatories with regard to grouping methods and course content, which is, a shift towards English for specific purposes from general purposes.

Dewi (2017) designs a qualitative study to investigate students’ needs and develop ESP learning materials for students of music department and found out that general English material is less specific for music students. Hence, the researcher develops an ESP learning material as a supplementary material so that music students can experience a more effective language learning process by taking into account task based language instruction approach.

Hapsari (2015) conducts a needs analysis for music students and decides to carry out a project-based approach which is to write English song lyrics. The researcher chooses this project due to being



more learner-centered and promoting active learning. Hapsari (2015, p. 140) adds that proficiency in English for music students is highly important because music students “need English as their active support to communicate with overseas partners and to get the International links as musicians”. The study uses a qualitative method, and the data are collected from thirty students via observation, questionnaires, video recording, and student writing. Music students think that English is important for them because it is an international language used worldwide. Additionally, they state that they can transmit and distribute their activities with others and create more opportunities for improving their abilities and expertise thanks to English since it is one of the most prominent communication methods. Furthermore, they think that it is a need for musicians to have English proficiency so that they can enhance and reinforce their knowledge and understanding related to music. They also express that they need English in order to be able to get knowledgeable about music literatures, and its development. As a result, the project can be found beneficial in improving music students’ free writing and brainstorming; supporting students to be actively involved in language use; becoming active learners; practicing such language skills and areas as reading, writing, listening, speaking, grammar, vocabulary; promoting cooperative learning.

Wakeland (2013) demonstrates the development of English for specific academic purposes with a needs analysis comprised of consultations with subject specialists from the Department of Music, research into writing about music, a collaborative teaching project and analysis of seventeen music students’ writing. Wakeland (2013) mentions the difficulty of designing this course due to the fact that there is a scarcity of research for English language needs of music students. As a result of the needs analysis, there are such key observations from the needs analysis as (Wakeland, 2013, pp. 55-56):

“a lack of transfer of academic writing concepts taught in a first-year general academic writing course” and “the highly technical and abstract nature of writing about music and the careful balancing of technicality and figurative language in a good piece of writing about music”.

After examining the results of this needs analysis, the researcher develops a course of which center is “the English registers and genres used in the field of music and the language that students will need as music majors” by contributing to students’ communication efficiently about music via various written and spoken formats (Wakeland, 2013, p. 56).

Wolfe (2006) mentions the difficulties for international students coming to Australia to study music from the perspective of proficiency in English language. The students must pass audition either live or via recording to get access to a music program. Following this, the students have to get English language proficiency made a requirement by the university, which comprises General English, English for Academic Purposes courses.

Taking all these into consideration, it can be easily recognized that English has become the lingua franca for travel, tourism, international communication, academic discourse, conferences, journal articles (Harmer, 2007). Nonetheless, it is not clear whether the learners’ and the faculty members’ opinions are taken into consideration during language learning and teaching process, which should be seen crucial since there may be individual differences and different objective for language learning among students. There is a paucity of research investigating the needs of music students in English language (Wakeland, 2013). In regard to this, the aim of this study is to find out the needs of Turkish music students in English courses. The research question is as below:

- What are the needs of Turkish music students in English courses at a state university in Türkiye?



METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study aims to determine Turkish music students' needs in English courses. The study was designed as a cross-sectional survey because the purpose of the study is “to collect information from a sample that has been drawn from a predetermined population” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011, p. 394). The pre-determined population is the instructor and freshman students of a state university in Türkiye.

Context and Participants

The present study was conducted at a state university in Türkiye in 2019. It is mandatory to take Foreign Language I and II during the first year of the bachelor education according to Council of Higher Education (CoHE) in its Higher Education Law published in 1991. In Foreign Language I course, the students are expected to gain knowledge towards such skills of language as talking about general events, repeated actions and what people do regularly and are doing right now (to introduce themselves, to give the directions of a place, to ask and answer personal questions, etc.) in addition to reading (to read timetables, shopping labels, etc.), writing (to write a short message, to design a poster, to fill a form, etc.), and listening (to give directions, to introduce a person/a place, etc.). In the second term, the students are to take Foreign Language Course II. During this course, the students should practice speaking (to ask and answer questions at the restaurants, to order food, to make predictions, to express abilities and necessities, to make requests, etc.), writing (to write a short message, to describe a location in a written form, to write e-mail/invitation letter, etc.), reading (Internet weather forecasts, recipe, poster information), and listening (weather forecast, recipe, etc.) about past and future events.

The study participants are composed of one instructor and five freshman students studying at a state university in Türkiye using convenience sampling. “A convenience sample is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for study” (Fraenkel et al. 2011, p. 99). The participants were chosen based on the willingness principles. The researcher gave detailed information about the scope of the study and asked the participants to sign a consent form prior to the study. The participants were assured that they can withdraw from the study any time they want and their names will be kept anonymous. The researcher adhered to the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Statements for Higher Education Institutions, and none of the actions listed under the section titled "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" were carried out during the research.

Data Collection Tools

Data were collected via a questionnaire and interview questions. The questionnaire was adapted from Nunan (1988). The questionnaire is composed of questions requiring objective and subjective data towards the learner along with questions of tasks. Objective and subjective data are utilized in order to recognize the learner, also called learner analysis. Objective data is about “factual information which does not require the attitudes and views of the learners to be taken into account” while subjective data involves “the perceptions, goals, and priorities of the learners” (Nunan, 1988, p. 18). Task analysis on the other hand is carried out to “specify and categorize the language skills required to carry out real-world communicative tasks” (Nunan, 1988, p. 18). Interview questions were designed by taking into consideration the points in Nunan (1988) in order to obtain more in depth data from the participants. The interview is composed of two parts: needs analysis towards the learner and the task. Both the interview and the questionnaire were presented to the experts and expert opinions were taken. After this process, the researcher collected data from the participants.



Data Analysis

The qualitative data collected in the questionnaires and interviews were analyzed by using content analysis. Fraenkel et al. (2011, p. 436) clarify content analysis as “extremely useful as a means of analysing interview and observational data”. The procedure followed in analyzing the data was to use coding procedures. Some pre-determined themes were used to categorize the learners’ needs based on Nunan’s (1988) schema for needs analysis as towards the learner and the task. For the learner, (1) learner profile and (2) learner goals were used. For the task, (1) views toward (SLA), (2) learning environment, (3) teaching program, and (4) measurement and evaluation were applied. For the quantitative data in the questionnaires, the answers were categorized based on their frequency.

In the analysis of the interviews, some pre-determined themes were utilized in order to categorize music students’ needs in their English courses. These themes were (1) learner profile, (2) learner goals, (3) SLA, (4) learning environment, (5) out of class activities, (6) teaching program, and (7) measurement and evaluation.

According to Fraenkel et al. (2011) credibility is often used in qualitative studies to explain both instrument validity and reliability and internal validity. Two different data collection instruments were applied in order to triangulate the data. The researcher asked one of the participants to review the accuracy of the research report in order to enhance the validity and reliability of the data.

FINDINGS

Findings from the Questionnaire

The questionnaire starts with the personal information towards the learner (department, age, gender, native language, proficiency in English, year of experience and institution in learning English). It is clear from the answers that three students are studying in the Music Theory department and two in the Musicology department. Their age ranges from eighteen to twenty-two: two is eighteen, one is nineteen, one is twenty-one, and one is twenty-two. While three of the learners are male, two are female. Everybody’s native language is Turkish. They see their proficiency in English as A1 (two of them), A2 (two of them), and B1 (one of them). The learner with B1 clarifies that it is the learner’s second university and the participant had preparatory class at the first university. They have experienced learning English for quite a long time. One of them tells that it has been ten years while the other two explains that it has been twelve years. Two of the participants clarify that they have been learning English since secondary school. Lastly, they all agree that they have been learning English in the school.

The following part is about their preferences in learning English via reading, writing, listening, and speaking and the reasons for their favorite choices. All four participants prefer reading, writing, listening, and speaking practice in learning English. When it comes to choosing their favorites, one of them clarifies that “*all of them. Because they are all useful*”. Three participants prefer listening and speaking “*because this is the most useful and easiest way to communicate with other people using this language*” and “*because I think that is more practical and useful*”. One learner prefers writing “*because I think that writing makes my learning more long-lasting*”.

Commenting on whether the learners like studying grammar, learning new words, and practicing sounds and pronunciation and again their favorite ones with the reasons in the second part, three participants like studying grammar and learning new words as their favorite “*because this is the easiest way to describe an object or event that I want*” and “*because I believe that it increases curiosity*”. One participant chooses learning new words and practicing sounds and pronunciation as a favorite activity “*because I believe that they teach me by having me love English*”. Another learner likes all of them equally “*because I think that they are all necessary for learning a language*”.



Another question is whether they like learning English through cassettes, games, talking to English speakers, studying English books, and watching TV and to talk about which is the most important for them. Two of them circle cassettes and games. Three of them prefer speaking to English speakers and watching TV. One of them chooses studying English books. For the most important ones, three of them agree upon talking to English speakers because *“I think it is easier and faster”* and *“I think that this is the most useful and fun way to learn English”*. One of the participants chooses watching TV because *“it is more memorable”* and one of them thinks that studying English books and watching TV are the favorites because *“we can turn learning into a pleasure”*.

Following this, the participants' opinions towards four skills in English language learning are gathered. For reading skill, they are asked whether they can use a dictionary. Two of them answer as a little while one of them answers as neither a little nor very well but something like average. The researcher wants them to answer what the participants can read in English like simple stories, newspapers, forms (bank, post office, and consumer electronics show), advertisements (shopping, housing, employment), bus timetables, maps/directories, and school notes. Additionally, they are asked which ones are the most important to learn at the moment. One of them answers newspaper while another says it is articles, which is not on the list. One clarifies all are important. Another chooses newspaper as the most important because *“I think that the newspaper has both daily and academic language and concepts”*. One participant mentions the materials used during the course which is not on the list, either.

For writing skills, the participants are asked whether they ever write letters, notes to teachers and fill in forms and which one is the most important to learn now. One of them answers that it is writing notes to teachers while another says filling in forms. Again, one of them says that it is articles which are not on the list. Another's answer is letters and filling in forms. One of the participants prefers none as the most important.

In the next part, the participants are asked with whom they speak English such as shop assistants, neighbors and friends, bus drivers, medical people, teachers, employers, and others along with the reasons indicating which one is the most important for the participants at the moment. Furthermore, the participants talk about the percentage with a regard to how much English they understand. Three participants comment that they talk to neighbors and friends. Four of them talk to teachers in English and two of them indicate their choice as others. Three of them clarify that they understand a little while two of them understand a lot during their English speaking. Two of the participants prefer teachers to talk English because *“we may not have the chance to learn in a principled way from other people”* and *“this will be much easier if the teachers are open to chat and affectionate. True and false answers can be detected and it becomes a fast process”*. One of the participants' choice is *“to make a dialogue with people speaking a foreign language or to learn grammar from a book”*. Another participant highlights that *“I would like to learn from someone whose native language is English. I think that it is going to be more superficial and understandable”* and another comments that *“maybe, I can do a presentation abroad”*. Commenting on whether they watch TV, four say *“yes”* and one of them adds *“with subtitles”*. When it comes to listening to radio, two say *“yes”* whereas one says *“no”*. In their accounts of the percentage with a regard to how much they understand, three participants' answer is *“a little”*, one participant gives a percentage of 65, 75%. Another emphasizes that it may *“a little”* or *“a lot”* because *“it depends on the simplicity of the dialogue”*.

In the following part, the question is about how they learn best, namely, alone, pairs, small group, class, and outside the class with a range of answers varying never, a little, good and best. For learning alone, two answers are never and best for each of them while one answer is a little. When it comes to pairs, four answers are good and one answer is best. For small group preference, one answer is a little and good for each of them and two answers are best. With a regard to learning as a class, one answer is never, three answers are a little. Lastly, for outside the class preference, one answer is a little and best for each of them and two answers are good.



In the final part of the questionnaire, the participants are asked about the most important things for them to learn in the short term and long term. They do not want to write by one by here and prefer talking about this topic in the interview. Following is about the time they spend for studying English with an answer range from per day to per week. One answers per day while another spends three days in a week. Three participants clarify that they spend per week. The final part pertains to where they would like to study: independent learning centers and homes. Three participants for each would like to study English at independent learning centers and homes.

Findings from the Interview

Learner profile

All five participants acknowledge that they have had English courses in their formal education for years ranging from secondary school to university: *“I have been having English courses since secondary school but never took it seriously. Maybe, the education system was wrong. Except that I know a few things, it is not well (Par1)”*; *“I started taking English courses in the fourth grade and it continued during high school. Also, I was at a different university beforehand and had a preparatory class there and was successful at finishing the program (Par3)”*; *“I have been taking English courses since secondary school. The courses were not generally taken seriously so they were mostly scarcely taught and studied. We did not take the course seriously because our high school was a fine arts school. Hence, I can say that it is bad (Par2)”*. It can be clearly seen from the remarks that except a student with an English preparatory class experience, their history with learning English and the ability to use English is not satisfying for the students. Additionally, the instructor clarifies that the learners are not very aware of language learning process and their level is not high: *“Their motivation was satisfying. They think that they need to learn English, they have this awareness. On the other hand, what they are not aware of is what needs to be done to learn. They do not have that much conscious to take steps for language learning process. They have the motivation nevertheless they do not know how to study and succeed. Their level is mostly elementary except one or two students with a preparatory class experience”*.

Learner goals

When the students are asked about their goals for language learning, they emphasize that they need English for academic purposes, communication, and international exchange programs like Erasmus mostly: *“It is very important academically because department of musicology is connected to abroad not Türkiye. And we have to be certainly in communication with people. We need to be able to write articles like essays (Par5)”*; *“I would like to analyze a sentence and understand what the teacher says. We do not know what is going to happen in the future maybe an opportunity for abroad. After all, this is what we do. Maybe, we will never go abroad but if we do, it can be necessary everywhere because ours is a social job (Par5)”*; *“I want to learn English for Erasmus the most. I can never find any book sources in Turkish. All of them are in English and I encounter them at various occasions. Actually, I think that I will need English when I go to any place (Par1)”*. The instructor explains clearly that though the students are very aware of ELF, there are some departmental differences in their perspective: *“Not only our students but also everyone knows that learning English is a global need. Some are aware of the fact that their needs related to education are based on the foreign sources at some point. We have students of music technologies and there are few books in Turkish about music technologies. They are the studies of particular teachers and mostly translations from English. As a result, the resources are abroad and to great extent in English. Students of music technologies are highly aware of that. We have two musicology students at present and they certainly know that they are going to need something like discourse analysis from foreign sources. Students of music theory are a bit behind this awareness because there are some core performers in this department and they give their full concentration on that instrument, which puts foreign language behind. The awareness occurs among technology students the most, musicology the second, and theory the third (Ins)”*. The instructor adds that the students are going to need English for international



exchange programs and academical life though they may not have that awareness right now: *“When we come to talk about graduate programs, the need urges more and more. For now, due to the fact that they are freshman, they do not hold the capability what kind of texts they are going to have to decipher and write. There is going to be that kind of necessity and we have a course for this, Vocational English. Besides this, they may have opportunities for Erasmus. Our university does not have international students right now. However, in the following years I think that students from different nationalities are going to come. I believe that this is going to be a tremendous source of motivation since somehow they are going to be friends and share things, which, I believe, is going to be motivating a lot. For Erasmus, they are also going to need English because there are some interviews conducted for the application and there are some authorities coming directly from Turkish National Agency”.*

Second Language Acquisition

The students are knowledgeable and aware enough about SLA concept and think that learning a language is not only about the language and is like a new world: *“I think that learning a language is a very nice and useful thing. According to me, learning a language is not just fixed to the language. When you master a language, we can learn everything about the society in connection with that language like culture, songs, history, stories, everything. The language is not a concept that can be oversimplified (Par3)”*; *“Actually, I see learning a language as a new world (Par1)”*; *“Language learning is like something towards more understanding and speaking (Par2)”*. The instructor thinks that SLA is not entirely covered in language classes for the time being: *“SLA is a concept coming from the childhood. It is not something we can bring up for the education system at the university right now. We are performing teaching based education here”.*

Learning environment

All the participants mention the importance of a class division based on the language levels: *“We must select our sections based on our levels (All)”*. The participants emphasize developing positive attitudes towards the course during learning process: *“Both the student and the learner are responsible for language learning. A teacher who endeared himself/herself very much to his/her students. For example, I used to hate my university but I was going to prep school because I liked my teacher. We had a really good communication because the teaching methods were not just ‘okay friends, we are now opening that book and you are going to make these exercises’. It was more social, namely, ‘game-based like a child’ and it was very beneficial (Par3)”*; *“While teaching, the teacher needs us to love English and the courses should flow. I have to take pleasure (Par4)”*. The participants desire to have productive and receptive skills focused course with a perspective towards different contents: *“I would like to have different contents from different cultures, music histories or famous artists (Par3)”*; *“I would rather learn by speaking and listening than phrases or structures (Par1)”*; *“My biggest fear is pronunciation so we should learn by speaking, listening, and seeing (Par2)”*. Learners neither prefer individual work nor crowded class activities: *“I would prefer pairs or small groups (Par3)”*; *“We should work with small groups (Par1&2)”*. The instructor emphasizes that there should be class divisions based on the language levels: *“Division based on students’ language levels and a class of fifteen students would be better”*. In addition to this, the instructor explains that they may not be so voluntary to attend the course: *“They are not very voluntary to attend the course. They underestimate foreign language and Turkish course when compared to main courses in their department. That is the truth. I mean some are indifferent to the course due to the fact that some have upper language levels compared to what we present. Some remain disconnected because their levels are lower than what we present. Those at the level we present make little of the course. I could not achieve to do interactive activities like speaking, listening to a dialogue, writing a dialogue or a paragraph, etc. they are not very participatory at that point”*.



Out-of-class activities

Learners think that out of class activities are beneficial: *“I think that out of class activities may be effective (Par1&2)”*. Participants would like to have listening and speaking activities out of the class: *“You can give us listening activities out of the class, I mean online. We can write down what we hear and send it to you (Par2)”*; *“We would like to watch movie (Par1&2&4&5)”*; *“I think that language develops as long as you speak and make listening activities for sure. Reading and writing are fine but I think that speaking is at most importance. We must gather together and practice speaking because the people have the fear of talking. Even if they know, they can express what they would like to convey and have the language experience, they have fear in their hearts. According to me, we must first overcome this. We must absolutely perform speaking activities all the time (Par3)”*; *“We can participate in chat hours for practicing speaking (Par1&2&3)”*. The instructor thinks that there can be some progress in students if the teacher checks out of class activities: *“If you check out of class activities, there can be these kinds of activities for them. My expectations are not that high but I think that it can get better. It is common knowledge that every course has ECTS and it is a must that there be out of class activities for this course though it is not the same as the others”*.

Teaching program

The participants give credit to language for communication principle and would like to focus on daily life English and speaking followed by reading and writing: *“We have grammar in our courses now but it does not get our attention a lot. If we can have more topics about daily life, we like more and the more we like, the more we would like to learn grammar (Par1)”*; *“I need writing. I have difficulty in writing because it is very different from speaking. I would like to think about it the most (Par2)”*; *“I want both articles and speaking (Par5)”*; *“There have to be speaking activities in every course because the language improves as long as you speak and listen. Reading and writing are fine but speaking comes at first according to me (Par3)”*. The instructor thinks that the syllabus in parallel with the real life and music-related topics would get the attention of the learners: *“The course time is restraining me with a regard to choosing content for this course because it is very short time. There are situations in parallel with the life, simulations and models in those books I gave to you. I assume that it is logical. On the other hand, I feel that creating music related context may trigger their attention towards the course”*.

Measurement and evaluation

When the learners are asked whether they would like weekly homework like gathering portfolio, the learners seem voluntary to do homework weekly or twice a week but some mention their busy schedule: *“We would like these kinds of homework every week (Par3&5)”*; *“We have a lot of homework from other courses but we would like to do as long as we can. Even if it is not for every week, we would love to do it often(Par4)”*; *“I think that twice a week is much better (Par3)”*; *“You can give us homework every week in order to be active (Par1)”*; *“If there is homework on the same day with the course, we can both practice the topic and get more active and it will be good (Par2)”*. They prefer homework that gets their attention and allies with their learning goals: *“The homework must be interesting not an ordinary one like going to British culture museum and tell what they wear. The homework should be both informing and contributing to our language along with getting our attention (Par5)”*; *“We can write texts (Par1)”*; *“The homework certainly must be in accord with our goals. It would be logical for us to write an essay due to the fact that we want academic career, these kinds of things, namely, in alliance with everyone’s goals (Par5)”*. Some learners would like to have their homework marked and multidimensional exam: *“I think that the homework can be graded (Par1&2)”*; *“If you grade the homework, everyone will pay more attention. They do not tire you. The exam maybe a normal written exam, listening or talking to you about something, I mean, multidimensional (Par1)”*; *“There should be speaking, listening, and normal grammar but please do not give us a single grammar exam and tell us to solve them. I want it to be multidimensional (Par5)”*. The instructor is not in favor of giving classical homework and prefers using technology at this point:



“Giving classical homework to the students can limitedly contribute to students’ progress. When you ask them to write something and bring it, five from thirty students write it down. On the other hand, if there can be a follow up for this by using technology and by creating an online classroom, I assume that the laziness can be avoided. They can do it with their phones, tablets, and computers. There has to be such a shadow apart from the course. For me, two hours is nothing”. The instructor clarifies that the students study their course exam-focused and they are not focusing on the process: “They are studying exam-based. Even if they do not care a lot about midterm, they study really hard for the final exam. They are not focusing on the process but the product. The product for them is whether to pass or fail the exam. However, when asked, they talk like ‘we want very much, we need English very much’. This is a skill like playing violin. I would like to play violin a lot but I sleep and in the morning, I will be playing violin. They are similar. You have to give time”.

DISCUSSION

This study sets out with the aim of finding out the needs of music students in English courses. It is very promising to see that music students in this study are highly aware of EFL and its importance (Brown, 2001; Dai et al., 2015; Dewi, 2017; Hapsari, 2015; Harmer, 2007, Wakeland, 2013, Wolfe, 2006). In addition, music students are going to have Vocational English course, which promotes many benefits as suggested in other studies (Dewi, 2017; Wakeland, 2013) for English for specific purposes course. The findings reveal that music students in this study value all skills, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar due to being very beneficial and useful in language learning (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2007; Harris, 1969; Richards, 2006). They favor using games, English songs, and speaking to English speakers, which presents many benefits in language learning (Cakir, 1999; Kara, 2009; Salcedo, 2010). The participants seem to keep in touch with the authentic materials of the language like newspaper, stories, music and it can be said that they value authenticity, real-life communication, and meaningful materials (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2007). Additionally, music students would like to have different contents for language learning (Hapsari, 2015; Wakeland, 2013). It can be understood from their comments that they would like to do meaningful activities with the language instead of focusing on just the forms and usage of the language. Harmer (2007) highlights the importance of creating a context for adolescents so that they can actively participate in the courses with their own thoughts and experiences instead of simple ask and answer questions and abstract learning activities. According to Long (1991), there is a distinction between focus on form and focus on formS. Focus on formS is about discrete language units. It takes the language items separately and the accumulation of those discrete units forms the language. On the other hand, focus on form is about the use of the language in a meaningful and contextualized way. It is not about not giving the language forms but giving them in a meaningful way so that the focus can be on the meaning. In this meaning-making process, it can be said that the learners would like to have interaction and collaboration with their friends. With a regard to this, Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) is that through focused negotiation of meaning and negative feedback obtained through negotiation may be facilitative of L2 development. Through interaction, the learner can notice what is missing in her/his language faculty (noticing the gap) and correct herself/himself. Through this way, learners are somehow pushed to produce output, which leads to Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985). People have both competence and performance. Output is a process from semantic to syntactic processing. Swain (1985) also labels this output comprehensible or pushed output in that learners are pushed in their production to make themselves understood: they either modify a previous utterance or try out forms that they had not used before. The learners can notice the gap with the help of negotiation of meaning and test their hypotheses. Additionally, social constructivism developed by Vygotsky (1962) sees language as a tool for meaning-making and this should be done through collaboration and interaction. Therefore, the language classes should encourage opportunities for interaction and collaboration among the students.

In the current study, the students do not seem to take English courses seriously and it can be said that they are not aware enough to take responsibility for their language learning process. Therefore, language teachers should take into consideration Harmer’s (2007, p. 33) expression that “perhaps our greatest responsibility, therefore, is to help students develop their language awareness,



that is their ability to spot grammatical patterns and behaviour for themselves". On the other hand, the students' motivation based on their statements is very encouraging, which is a prominent factor in language learning process (Dai et al. 2015; Dörnyei, 2009; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). They motivate themselves for learning English so that they can accomplish academic purposes, communicate with the globe, reach different sources, and take part in international exchange programs as in the studies of Hapsari (2015), Wakeland (2013), and Wolfe (2006). Surprisingly, it can be observed from the statements of the music students in this study that they would like to extend their study from in-class activities by showing interest for out of class activities unlike in class activities based on the expressions in the findings. It is highly important to see students volunteer to take responsibility for their own learning, which will promote their learner autonomy in language learning process. Holec (1981, p. 3) defines autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning". According to Benson (2013, p. 840), "autonomy is manifested in the form of autonomous language learning, which here refers to learning practices involving learners' control over aspects of their learning or, more broadly, learning that takes place outside the context of formal instruction". Therefore, opportunities for out of class activities should be provided for music students.

Though the students do not seem to be aware enough for language learning process, they value language learning and see it like a new world. This finding is really meaningful since "one powerful reason for encouraging language students to discover things for themselves is the complex nature of language itself" (Harmer, 2007, p. 57). Hence, it is highly important to offer opportunities to the learners to explore the language through the appropriate contexts created by the human in such a formal curricula (Dörnyei, 2009). Furthermore, it can be understood from the remarks that they would like to hold positive attitudes towards the course. This kind of affective status is also important for motivation because Dörnyei (2009, p. 182) sees motivation as "the affective characteristics of the learner, referring to the direction and magnitude of learning behaviour in terms of the learner's choice, intensity, and duration of learning". In accordance with this, affective filter hypothesis developed by Krashen (1982), is about the relationship between affective factors and SLA. The more anxious a learner feels during language learning process, the higher the filter is. Therefore, language teachers need to come up with ideas to lower the learners' affective filter while providing comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). Similarly, Rogers (1983) values human emotion and sees language class as a dynamic group interacting through threat-free and caring manners. Furthermore, music students would like to have pairs or small groups. According to Harmer (2007), pair work presents some advantages like promoting learner independence, sharing responsibility by providing them a friendly and relaxed environment. Similarly, group work is good for learners from such aspects as rising talking opportunities, broader cooperation and negotiation skills (Harmer, 2007).

As mentioned above, the students would like to have out of class activities and value portfolio. Brown (2001) explains that with the new developments in testing, formative assessment highlights to observe the process of learning in contrast to product. "Most informal assessment is what testing experts call formative evaluation: assessing students in the process of 'forming' their competencies and skills in order to help them continue that growth process" (Brown, 2001, p. 402). Portfolio is one of the alternative assessment ways in CLT (Brown, 2001). Though it was previously regarded as only for younger children's art and written work, learners of various ages and disciplines make use of the portfolios (Brown, 2001). Nevertheless, it is explained in the comments that the students may put behind progress and focus on passing the exam.

It can be understood from the comments of the music students that they wish the teacher to check the homework preferably with a grade and to prepare an exam not focusing on a single dimension. It is really promising to see that music students expect instructor feedback. Previous studies have explored the benefits of corrective feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chen, Nassaji, & Liu, 2016; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006, Schulz, 2001). It should be paid attention to give feedback to the learners' studies. From another perspective, participants may prefer the use of technology for their homework and may not favor the classic pen and pencil homework. Considering the fact that these students are digital natives and born into this technological world (Prensky, 2001),



this finding is not very surprising. Additionally, 21st century learning demands from the students such skills as collaboration, communication, creativity, and critical thinking skills. Integration of technology into the 21st century classrooms is very important (Darling-Hammond et al. 2005; Ward & Overall, 2013).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study aims to explore the needs of Turkish music students in English courses. The researcher used questionnaire and interviews to collect data from five music students and one instructor at a state university in Türkiye. The findings indicate that music students in this study seem motivated to learn English and find it crucial to learn English in today's world with the increasing demand for English as a global language. Nevertheless, they seem to have trouble figuring out how to study a language and do not take English courses seriously. Additionally, they would like to have varying English course contents and real-life, authentic, and meaningful activities in the course. Music students seem to favor the use of technology for their homework and demand feedback from the instructor. They suggest a class division based on language levels and practice all language skills and areas in the class. In light of these, there will be some recommendations for language instructors and policy makers:

- The students should be conscious that though valuing English learning is a big idea, turning English learning into action by actively participating and taking it seriously in the courses is another prominent issue.
- There should be class divisions based on students' English language levels.
- The course materials should cover all language skills and areas in varying contents designed as pairs or small groups.
- The teachers should create a stress-free learning environment so that the learners can feel positive towards language learning process.
- The students should be given aid to develop their awareness towards how to study a language.
- The course should meet the demands of 21st century education.
- Information and communication technology integration should be practiced in language classes.
- The material developers and instructors should integrate technological outcomes and activities into the language learning process.

As in every study, this research has some limitations. The number of the participants may be increased because it is small scale research and lacks generalizable data as the nature of the qualitative study. What is more, classroom observation and document analysis (student & teacher book) can be added to the study in order to delve into a broader perspective towards language learner needs.

REFERENCES

- Benson, P. (2013). Learner autonomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), 839-843.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Cakir, A. (1999). Musical activities for young learners of EFL. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 5(11). Retrieved July 14, 2019 from <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Cakir-MusicalActivities.html>.
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Council of Higher Education (CoHE). (1991). Higher education law. Retrieved August 28, 2019 from www.mevzuat.gov.tr > MevzuatMetin > 1.5.2547.doc.



- Dai, Y., Wu, Z., & Dai, L. (2015). The relationships among motivation, learning styles and English proficiency in EFL music students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(6), 75-83.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Banks, J., Zumwalt, K., Gomez, L., Sherin, M. G., Griesdorn, J., & Finn, L. (2005). Educational goals and purposes: Developing a curricular vision for teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford, (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 169-200). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewi, R. R. (2017). *Developing a task-based ESP learning materials for music department of SMM Yogyakarta (a research and development at the eleventh grade students of SMK N2 Kasihan Bantul in the academic year of 2016/2017)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2008). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. USA: Cambridge.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation*. Great Britain: Pearson.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine.
- Hapsari, P. D. (2015). The need analysis of music department students to learn English by using the project-based approach with song lyrics writing as supporting technique. *Promusika*, 3(2), 137-148.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. United Kingdom: Pearson Longman.
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. England: Pergamon.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer World Englishes circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Kachru, B. (2008). World Englishes. In M. Berns (Ed.), *Concise encyclopaedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 521-528). United Kingdom: Elsevier.
- Kara, M. (2009). Games in the teaching of foreign languages. Retrieved July 14, 2019 from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/be06/e74eb4810112789c27d2b8ba0f75cedd21a6.pdf>.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. UK: Pergamon.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. USA: Cambridge University.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the eighties*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Salcedo, C. S. (2010). The effects of songs in the foreign language classroom on text recall, delayed text recall and involuntary mental rehearsal. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 7(6), 19-30.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensive output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). Corrective feedback makes a difference: A metaanalysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.



- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: US-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-258.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Wakeland, L. (2013). Development of an English-for-specific-academic-purposes course for music students. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 45-59.
- Ward, G., & Overall, T. (2013, March). Technology Integration for Preservice Mathematics Teacher: A Time-Series Study. *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*. Retrieved November 18, 2019 from <https://goo.gl/pBS2Ug>.
- Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution theory, achievement motivation, and the educational process. *Review of Educational Research*, 42(2), 203-215.
- West, R. (1997). Needs analysis: State of the art. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher education for LSP* (pp. 68-79). Great Britain: WBC Book Manufacturers.
- Wolfe, J. (2006). A musician's English: The challenge awaiting international students in tertiary music programs in Australia. *TESOL in Context*, 16(1), 1-16.

