

## ESP NEEDS ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS: LEARNING-CENTRED APPROACH

**Fatma DEMİRAY AKBULUT**

Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu,  
demiray\_f@ibu.edu.tr

Makale Gönderme Tarihi: 24.02.2016 Makale Kabul Tarihi: 09.11.2016

### Abstract

*The current study has been designed to survey needs analysis of Turkish GE students of School of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Arts and Sciences and Engineering. To analyse, a series of qualitative (interview with students) and quantitative (questionnaires) instruments has been used. The method of questionnaires and interview is used for undergraduate, intermediate level of preparatory class students (N=75). Both questionnaires and interview were adapted and after the validity and reliability analysis was verified they were brought to final shape to be conducted. For the purpose of finding out needs required for effective professional skills of participants and analysing the existing instructor content and their pedagogical knowledge, descriptive statistics have been provided in findings and results. The results of the study showed that the majority of the participants expressed that preparatory class is necessary for them but except from writing, grammar and vocabulary teaching, instructors should give more importance to listening, speaking and reading skills. Besides, they stated that materials in the classroom should be more authentic, real-like and interesting. Accordingly, students' objective and subjective are satisfied more or less effectively, on the other hand, content needs -especially curriculum design and departmental instructors' opinions- are valuable to reveal for them.*

**Key Words:** ESP, Learning-Centred Approach, Needs Analysis.

## ÜNİVERSİTE HAZIRLIK SINIFI ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÖZEL AMAÇLI İNGİLİZCE İHTİYAÇLARI ANALİZİ: ÖĞRENME ODAKLI YAKLAŞIM

### Özet

*Bu çalışma, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler, Fen-Edebiyat ve Mühendislik fakültesi öğrencilerinin Genel İngilizce ihtiyaçlarının analizini araştırmak amacıyla oluşturulmuştur. Analiz etmek amacıyla, nitel (öğrencilerle görüşme) ve nicel (sormacalar) veri toplama araçlarından yararlanılmıştır. Sormaca ve görüşme teknikleri, üniversite hazırlık sınıfında eğitim almakta olan orta düzeyde İngilizce bilgisine hakim öğrencilerle gerçekleştirilmiştir (N=75). Her iki sormaca ve görüşme soruları farklı kaynaklardan uyarlanmış, geçerlik ve güvenilirliği test edildikten sonra uygulanabilecek son halini almıştır. Katılımcıların etkili profesyonel becerilerini içeren ihtiyaçlarını bulmak ve eğitim vermekte olan öğretim elemanlarının içerik ve pedagojik yeterliliklerini analiz etmek amacıyla bulgular ve sonuçlar bölümünde betimsel istatistiklere yer verilmiştir. Sonuçlara göre, katılımcıların büyük bir çoğunluğu hazırlık sınıfının önemli olduğunu vurgulamış ancak İngilizce eğitimi vermekte olan öğretim elemanlarının yazma, dilbilgisi ve sözcük öğretimi becerilerinin yanında dinleme, konuşma ve okuma becerilerine de gereken önemi vermeleri gerektiğini vurgulamışlardır. Ayrıca, sınıf içerisinde kullanılan materyallerin daha özgün, gerçekçi ve ilginç olması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Bu doğrultuda, öğrencilerin nesnel ve öznel ihtiyaçları etkili bir biçimde karşılanırken, katılımcılar müfredat programının hazırlanması ve bu noktada bölüm öğretim elemanlarının fikirlerinin alınması gibi içeriksel ihtiyaçlarının da etkili bir şekilde karşılanması gerektiğini düşünmektedirler.*

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Özel Amaçlı İngilizce, Öğrenme Odaklı Yaklaşım, İhtiyaç Analizi.

## **1. Introduction**

In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) attracted researchers' attention in language learning process as a result of the fact that General English (GE) courses relatively did not meet learner or employer needs. Since then, this term has appeared in the classroom environment and has been realized as a compulsory target to analyse learning needs of adult learners (Carver, 1983; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Strevens', 1988). In the methodology of ESP, language teaching should be defined in a specific target and improved in an academic and professional reasons (Fernandez and Gunashekar, 2009; Brunton, 2009). Throughout the years, English (as a lingua franca) has created a great importance on the society (Cummins, 1979) in terms of having specific academic and professional competence to be more directly employment-related. English speakers, especially non-native speakers use the language for a variety of purposes; for doing business, for cross-cultural communication, for career opportunity etc... (Teodorescu, 2010). As Harding (2007) and later Teodorescu (2010) state that teaching of English is directly related to the vocational and professional needs of the individuals and as English gathers momentum as the main language of career opportunity, the pressure grows for teaching to be more directly employment and career related. Because of the developing trend of globalization, English for Academic Purposes or Specific Purposes has turned to be a key benchmark for national competitiveness. In this competition, Turkey has given the needed importance to English proficiency especially to ESP recent years. Beforehand, ESP was limited to translating numerous texts, teaching special vocabulary without giving importance to communicative competences, intercultural communication and needs analysis of the students. However, today, English Language Teaching (ELT) has held a particular appeal and has become an important subject in some faculties such as Faculty of Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Economic and Administrative Sciences, Education, Engineering and some departments inside these faculties (Akin, 2011; Bilokcuoglu,2012; Dincay,2011). As Widdowson (1998) states, English is peculiar to the range of principles and procedures and also specific and associated with a kind of institutional activity. From these perspectives, in this research, adult learners' needs have been specified and ESP perspective has been emphasized to construct an effective ESP curriculum. As noted above, ESP in English Language Teaching process, communicative competences, professional and vocational needs of learners and needs analysis in learning-teaching a foreign language environment should be underlined before preparing an ESP curriculum. In this study, the relationship between ESP and ELT will be investigated for Turkish participants by emphasizing the focus on needs analysis in the classroom. In this study, three sets of research questions were addressed as follows:

1. What are the expectations of students from their GE class?
2. In what ways learners' interests and approach to preparatory school can be improved?

3. What kind of needs should be taken into consideration for long-term needs of the students?

### **1.1. Theoretical Background**

#### **1.1.1. Development of ESP**

English for Specific Purposes is mainly concerned with researching and teaching English by individuals who need language and use it to perform academic tasks. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) present the early stages of ESP development describing the performance needed for communication in the target situation. As it is mentioned earlier, ESP has started to develop as a discipline and as an approach since the mid-1960s. The development of ESP was in fact influenced by a revolution in linguistics in terms of real communication. As a considerable debate, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) divided ESP development into two periods. They suggest that the first period of ESP started with the end of the Second World War for various reasons. For instance, economic power of the United States in the post-war worlds resulted in scientific, technical and economic activity in an international environment and the role of English as an international language gained an important role. On the other hand, Johns (2013) who classified ESP period as three important stages proposes that the first period started between 1962-1981 (the early years) as from text-based Counts to Rhetorical Devices and explains this period as the central focus of ESP research that English was used for science and technology in academic contexts. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) proposed this period as second important stage in which Oil Crisis of the early 1970s resulted in western money and language knowledge flew into the oil-rich countries. However, Johns (2013) defines that the second period was between 1981 and 1990 (the more recent past) as brooding the scope/introducing central concepts. During this period, needs assessment, linguistic devices and their rhetorical purposes and technology were emphasized. The last period for Johns (2013) was between the years 1990-2011 (the modern age) as new international journals, genre, and corpus studies taking centre stage were in the centre of this stage. Intercultural rhetoric, genre as a central concept, corpus studies, and prominent researchers were active in promoting research-informed ESP teaching and learning during these years.

Today, methodology of ESP has opened a way to learning centred and task based approaches and research on this area will become more centralized in the near future (Johnson and Johnson, 1975). Recent years, many theorists have studied and defined ESP underlying methodology and activities of the discipline. Traditionally, Dudley-Evans & St. John (1998) define ESP as the study of English language in specialized contexts and fields such as medicine, engineering, business and the like. Other researchers describe it as a particular case of the general category of special-purpose language teaching or as a research approach to teaching and learning, to meet specific needs of the learners, to use appropriate activities in terms of grammar, lexis, study skills and genre and to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner's reason for learning

(Stevens, 1988; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Gavioli, 1996; Harding, 2007). Perhaps, a simpler definition is that ESP is to learn and teach real language in a specialized and needed context such as vocational learning and training. As Harding (2007) states, there are a number of factors underlying this fact; such as globalization, international communication needs, the unnecessary factors to follow traditional GE approach starting from primary education and etc...No matter how competent the students have become, they will leave their primary education having already covered GE syllabus because they desire their studies to lead them to useful skills, in other words; they will not prefer the same old marry-go-round anymore (Harding, 2007). In the light of these definitions, since it is necessary to analyse and categorize the issues which are connected to ESP or EGP (English for General Purposes) needed information about this separation is given in the following part.

#### *1.1.2. ESP and General English (GE)*

In Turkey, ESP teaching -as an approach- does not have a long tradition and history except from recent movement during 1990s. After this period, as Basturkmen (1998) states, academic and vocational competency has been seen as an urgent facilitation for the future career opportunity. There has been a certain understanding that ESP teaching involves a different methodology from GE teaching and various purposes in using language. Based on the views mentioned above and in terms of our definitions in the previous section, there is a reasonable question as what the difference between ESP and General English is. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987:9) emphasize, it "is in theory nothing, in practice a great deal". Both ESP and GE show the existence of a need but rather an awareness of need shows their differences. In this aspect, whereas ESP course relates directly what the individuals need to do in their (future) jobs, GE is for no obvious reason and purpose. ESP, also can be characterized by its fields such as science, medicine, tourism, engineering etc..., however, GE "is a single language system that could be described by some grammar linked to lexicon" (Prior, 2013:519). In an another perspective, to show the distinct feature of ESP and GE, Farhady (1991) explains that ESP is deal with later stages of language instruction, while GE is deal with earlier learning procedures. To conclude the arguments about these differences, some opponents of ESP and GE separation explain the characteristics of an ESP course as follow:

ESP involves a certain degree of specialized language which:

- makes use of its own methodology and teaching process in it is goal-directed.
- sometimes focuses on a certain skill utterly required in the learner's profession.
- facilitates future professional career prospects and allows students to produce coherent and cohesive discourse of a given discipline.
- are based on content and method showing learner's reason for learning.
- is directed by specific and obvious reasons for learning.

- focuses on a smaller “number of varieties, text-types and situations” such as writing letters, reading newspapers and magazines, listening to authentic materials and TV channels, speaking in a real context and preparing task-based or situation-based activities (Donesch-Jezo, 2010; Gavioli, 1996:7; Harding, 2007; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Teodorescu, 2010).

In the explanation of differences between ESP and GE Gavioli (1996) states that both ESP and GE are concerned with a variety of features and language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, writing and vocabulary. Also Selinker et al. (1981) emphasize that ESP and GE practitioners should analyse the basic level of the learners, select appropriate materials and set needed tasks which will be parallel with course objectives to construct an effective language system.

#### *1.1.3. Learning-Centred Approach*

From ESP perspective, learning is not just presenting and acquiring language knowledge, items, skills, and strategies basically. As the teaching and learning environment is a dynamic and complicated process, it is important to realize that learning-centred approach in ESP methodology should be identified (Nunan,1988a; Mackay and Palmer, 1981). In this respect, a learning-centred approach presents all individuals that they must look beyond the competence that enables them to perform, because what they really want to solve is not the competence problem itself, but how they acquire that competence (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). If our concern in ESP is about the features of language competence, then, the starting point is the case of learning styles and factors. As a researcher in ESP, Reid (1987, cited in Aiguo,2007) states that successful language teaching-learning process is associated with co-operation of the individuals in the interaction. All in all, from learning-centred approach perspective, ESP is learning a language for a purpose to make sense of the flow of new information. In the other aspect, learning is an internal process which is crucially dependent upon the knowledge the learners already have and their ability and motivation to use it (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). In the light of ESP features, Celani (2008) collects the data to see the relationship between ESP and learning-centred approach as follow:

ESP features:

1. Regarding learners’ reasons for learning, the necessities of them and taking into consideration their abilities and capabilities for defined purposes.
2. Employing the language knowledge in their background and their skills to bring learning-teaching environment, i.e. what learners have, do, and can do in this learning process.
3. Supporting students to develop typical strategies for learning, changing useless study habits and breaking old kind of memorization. (Allwright, 1982; Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991, cited in Celani, 2008).

#### *1.1.4. Needs Analysis*

Needs Analysis is regarded as an important part of ESP in terms of enabling the learners to discover their own abilities and specifying these needs according to their aims, objectives and desires (Basturkmen, 1998; Chang, 2009; Maley, 1983). This term has been defined as a procedure in which compiling information exists on learners who are to learn a foreign language and on the usage of this language which they are expected to make use of it. In another definition, Basturkmen (1998) explains the concept of needs analysis as the “identification of difficulties and standard situations by observation of participants functioning in a target situation in conjunction with interviews and questionnaire” (p.1). As a result of emerging interest in ESP teaching and learning-centred approach, needs analysis is:

- An attempt to adopt a framework for ESP course conception.
- A procedure to collect information and needed data to be used in syllabus design.
- A process to develop a curriculum and needed materials for the needs-based course.
- An approach to prove inadequate GE syllabus in terms of learners’ future career opportunities.
- A concept to take all the needs of the learners into consideration such as objective needs (i.e. students’ background such as country, culture, education, family and profession) and subjective needs (i.e. personality, learners’ wants, lacks and expectations). (Brindley, 1989; Chostelidou, 2004; Nunan, 1988a; 2010; Richterich, 1983;).

At present, due to the fast development on learner needs-based approach in Turkey, ESP practitioners are interested in data analysis on subjective or objective needs or newcomer comprehension (Bilokcuoglu, 2012; Dincay, 2011). From this perspective, the first step is to analyse and investigate students’ needs as a fundamental organization of ESP program development. Accordingly, an attempt is made from Hutchinson and Waters (1987) saying; “tell me what you need English for and I will tell you the English that you need” (p.8). In the same approach, they divide the needs into two groups as “target needs (i.e. what the learner needs to do in the target situation) and learning needs (i.e. what the learner needs to do in order to learn)” (p.9). Target needs can be seen in the subcategories such as necessities- decided by the desires of the target situation-, lacks – background knowledge of the learners (what they know or they do not know), and wants – considering students’ interests lying behind English language for their purposes. Finally, learning need which interpreted in order to construct and integrated part of teaching-learning process is a particular state of knowledge. By the help of this student-centred research area –needs analysis- it is easy to identify the particular needs of the students, to meet needs of particular learners, to match skills in learning and using what has been acquired, to address the aims of ESP needs and to increase the ability of students in their future jobs and vocations (Belcher, 2009; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Supuran and Mela, 2010; Varnosfadrani, 2009).

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

This study which emphasizes GE courses and expectations of students in preparatory schools is analysed in terms of basic skills of undergraduate students in a state university in Turkey. They were originally 82 participants; however, 7 students were dropped from the study because of missing data. A number of 75 (male (n=34) female (n=41)) undergraduate students at university were from three different classes; however, they took the same English course programme. They were conducted the same questionnaires, needs analysis procedures and similar interviews in the present study. The students' age ranged from 17 to 24 and 23 (30,7%) of them were majoring in School of Economics, 21 of them (28%) in Engineering and 31 of them (41,3%) in Arts and Sciences department.

### 2.2. Instruments

#### 2.2.1. Questionnaires

In this study, qualitative and quantitative data instruments were used to gather more accurate and valid information about General English courses in preparatory classes. The first questionnaire used in this research was adapted from European Language Portfolio (2014) and the second questionnaire was adapted from Keşmer (2007). Validity and reliability of the questionnaires were calculated by the help of pilot study and specialists. Pilot study participants group consisted of 24 undergraduate preparatory class students and they were conducted the same instruments. After this study, correlation coefficient was calculated and after some changes in translation and items, the last version of the questionnaires was used in the study. In the first questionnaire, there were 35 items (see Appendix A.) which analyse the participants' second language proficiency on the basis of four skills (speaking, reading, writing and listening). It contained Likert-Scale items ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. In the second questionnaire, there were 45 items (see Appendix B.) which analyse participants' objective and subjective needs, wants (also we can say content needs) and interests. Similarly, this questionnaire contained the items ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree which was marked by the participants.

**Table 1.** Reliability Statistics

| Questionnaire 1  |            | Questionnaire 2  |            |
|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| ,940             | 35         | ,839             | 45         |

#### 2.2.2. Semi-structured Interview

In semi-structured interview, a written list of questions as a guide was used by the researcher to take more available information about the process (Mackey and Gass, 2005). This interview was around the stimulus of speaking lesson and speak-out parts in text-books in preparatory classes. This interview consisted of 6 questions

and was adapted from Hossein's (2013) ESP questionnaire (see Appendix C). These questions were conducted to elicit the idea of students about GE courses, background knowledge about ESP courses, their language problems, their wishes and needs for the following year when they will study on their own departments such as, psychology, sociology, international departments, math etc... Before majoring the interview questions in the study, a pilot study was done with 5 of the participants on the same degree with real participants. After making preliminary modifications of the interview questions, the latest version was used to gather qualitative data. According to Johnson (1992) to ensure the validity, accuracy and reliability of a qualitative data occur by applying triangulation so that it reduces researchers' bias. From this explanation, to control validity and reliability, methodological triangulation (conducting various kinds of research methods-questionnaires and interview-to investigate a specific phenomenon) was used in this study.

**2.3. Procedure**

After submitting the pilot study, the questionnaires were proposed to 75 preparatory class students. Before performing the questionnaires, the purpose of the study was explained to the students and the questions were answered. After that, for the next step, 32 participants were asked the interview questions. Each interview lasted about 5-7 minutes and was recorded by the help of tape-recorder.

**3. Results**

The findings of participants' responses to the questionnaires were analysed and the participants' language proficiency was classified as four basic skills. For the second part of the questionnaires, participants' needs (objective or subjective), interests and wants were classified and finally all results were interpreted.

**Table 2. Percentages of Students' Responses to English Skills Proficiency**

**A. Receptive Skills**

**1. Listening Skill**

| Items N. | SA   | A    | N    | D    | SD   |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1        | 4,0  | 30,7 | 36,0 | 18,7 | 10,7 |
| 2        | 34,7 | 54,7 | 10,7 | 0,0  | 0,0  |
| 3        | 13,3 | 41,3 | 30,7 | 10,7 | 4,0  |
| 4        | 9,3  | 50,7 | 25,3 | 10,7 | 4,0  |
| 5        | 6,7  | 26,7 | 44,0 | 16,0 | 6,7  |
| 6        | 9,3  | 62,7 | 13,3 | 12,0 | 2,7  |

**2. Reading Skill**

| Items N. | SA  | A    | N    | D    | SD  |
|----------|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 7        | 6,7 | 30,7 | 34,7 | 21,3 | 6,7 |
| 8        | 4,0 | 33,3 | 41,3 | 18,7 | 2,7 |
| 9        | 4,0 | 29,3 | 44,0 | 17,3 | 5,3 |



*ESP Needs Analysis of University Preparatory School Students: Learning-Centred Approach*

|    |      |      |      |      |     |
|----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 10 | 12,0 | 60,0 | 17,3 | 6,7  | 4,0 |
| 11 | 4,0  | 49,3 | 33,3 | 12,0 | 1,3 |
| 12 | 5,3  | 41,3 | 36,0 | 16,0 | 1,3 |
| 13 | 16,0 | 57,3 | 20,0 | 2,7  | 4,0 |
| 14 | 10,7 | 57,3 | 22,7 | 6,7  | 2,7 |

**B. Productive Skills**

**3. Speaking Skill**

| Items N. | SA   | A    | N    | D    | SD  |
|----------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 15       | 9,3  | 33,3 | 42,7 | 12,0 | 2,7 |
| 16       | 9,3  | 32,0 | 33,3 | 21,3 | 4,0 |
| 17       | 12,0 | 62,7 | 17,2 | 5,3  | 2,7 |
| 18       | 6,7  | 40,0 | 34,7 | 14,7 | 4,0 |
| 19       | 5,3  | 29,3 | 38,7 | 21,3 | 5,3 |
| 20       | 5,3  | 32,0 | 38,7 | 21,3 | 2,7 |
| 21       | 6,7  | 33,3 | 44,0 | 12,0 | 4,0 |
| 22       | 9,3  | 36,0 | 42,7 | 9,3  | 2,7 |
| 23       | 8,0  | 57,3 | 20,0 | 12,0 | 2,7 |
| 24       | 14,7 | 54,7 | 24,0 | 4,0  | 2,7 |
| 25       | 10,7 | 41,3 | 32,0 | 10,7 | 5,3 |
| 26       | 9,3  | 60,0 | 22,7 | 8,0  | 0,0 |
| 27       | 8,0  | 65,3 | 18,7 | 6,7  | 1,3 |

**4. Writing Skill**

| Items N. | SA   | A    | N    | D    | SD  |
|----------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 28       | 9,3  | 37,3 | 37,3 | 10,7 | 5,3 |
| 29       | 2,7  | 37,3 | 40,0 | 18,7 | 1,3 |
| 30       | 4,0  | 50,7 | 34,7 | 9,3  | 1,3 |
| 31       | 4,0  | 48,0 | 25,3 | 17,3 | 5,3 |
| 32       | 5,3  | 46,7 | 30,7 | 16,0 | 1,3 |
| 33       | 8,0  | 46,7 | 33,3 | 12,0 | 0,0 |
| 34       | 9,3  | 61,3 | 17,3 | 8,0  | 4,0 |
| 35       | 13,3 | 60,0 | 20,0 | 6,7  | 0,0 |

(SA: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, N: Neutral, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree)

First questionnaire investigated the proficiency level of preparatory school students according to Common European Framework schedule. As shown in Table 2, the majority of the students believed that 1-year preparatory school has met their needs on basic skills competences. Most of the respondents had an average level of proficiency in the target language. Apparently, without making any discrimination between productive or receptive skills, most of the participants agree that 1-year

English preparation education makes their degree higher than before. In the interview, when some of the participants were asked the real advantage of preparatory education, they expressed that they realize visible development in grammar, language skills -especially listening and writing-, study skills, sub-skills such as vocabulary knowledge and practice.

In the development of ESP programs and General English courses, students' English proficiency can lead to courses designed better and well-programmed. In fact, a well-conducted GE courses and preparatory education ensure that students can learn what they need and want. At this point, ESP and GE together can help students make progress in their target work and present them a wider vision in their studies. In teaching and learning environment, the features which underline the learners' skills and sub-skills will help the specialists focus on their needs in real life. After analysing the proficiency skills of the students, next questionnaire aims to understand their objective, subjective, content and process needs as shown in Table 3. This needs analysis will help researchers see the deficiencies of ESP or GE programs at schools, and the ways to accomplish these necessities in an appropriate way. Without this analysis, it is not possible to understand the concerns, interests and demands of learners. Thus, both specialists and educators should take into consideration these studies and the results of them.

**Table 3.** *Percentage of Students' Responses on Their Needs*

| <b>Sts' Objective Needs</b>                                   |           |          |          |          |           |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| <b>Items N.</b>   | <b>SA</b> | <b>A</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>SD</b> |
| 1. Prep.school is necessary.                                  | 62,7      | 25,3     | 2,7      | 2,7      | 6,7       |
| 4. Prep.school is unnecessary for my department.              | 56,0      | 32,0     | 4,0      | 5,3      | 2,7       |
| 9. Prep.education is important for my future career.          | 10,7      | 32,0     | 26,7     | 21,3     | 9,3       |
| 10. Prep.education motivated me for ESP.                      | 9,3       | 41,3     | 21,3     | 22,7     | 5,3       |
| 11. Prep.education motivated me for university.               | 4,0       | 42,7     | 28,0     | 17,3     | 8,0       |
| 16. After prep.school, I can go through sources in English.   | 2,7       | 17,3     | 26,7     | 30,7     | 22,7      |
| 17.I wasn't informed about the purpose of prep.school before. | 13,3      | 30,7     | 20,0     | 30,7     | 5,3       |
| <b>Sts' Subjective Needs</b>                                  |           |          |          |          |           |
| <b>Items N.</b>   | <b>SA</b> | <b>A</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>SD</b> |
| 6. I am satisfied with prep.school education                  | 1,3       | 36,0     | 21,3     | 28,0     | 13,3      |
| 7. I am an active student in prep.class.                      | 12,0      | 37,3     | 29,3     | 18,7     | 2,7       |

*ESP Needs Analysis of University Preparatory School Students: Learning-Centred Approach*

|   |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| 39. I had difficulties in reading text. | 24,0 | 36,0 | 12,0 | 13,3 | 14,7 |
| 40. Listening skills raised my level.   | 9,3  | 48,0 | 18,7 | 20,0 | 4,0  |
| 41. Speaking skills raised my level.    | 10,7 | 42,7 | 20,0 | 22,7 | 4,0  |
| 42. Reading skills raised my level.     | 10,7 | 48,0 | 30,7 | 9,3  | 1,3  |
| 43. Writing skills raised my level.     | 17,3 | 54,7 | 14,7 | 13,3 | 0,0  |

**Sts' Content Needs**

| Items N.  | SA   | A    | N    | D    | SD   |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2. 1 year education is waste of time.   | 4,0  | 4,0  | 8,0  | 38,7 | 45,3 |
| 3. 1 year education is enough.  | 1,3  | 10,7 | 25,3 | 38,7 | 24,0 |
| 5. Prep.school is interesting.  | 2,7  | 25,3 | 24,0 | 38,7 | 9,3  |
| 8. Prep.school has developed my English.  | 1,3  | 1,3  | 21,3 | 45,3 | 30,7 |
| 12. The topics have met my needs.   | 1,3  | 14,7 | 30,7 | 32,0 | 21,3 |
| 13. The topics were related my major.   | 0,0  | 1,3  | 4,0  | 26,7 | 68,0 |
| 18. During prep.school, listening skills are given more importance.                       | 2,7  | 20,0 | 30,7 | 40,0 | 6,7  |
| 19. During prep.school, speaking skills are given more importance.                        | 4,0  | 24,0 | 24,0 | 41,3 | 6,7  |
| 20. During prep.school, reading skills are given more importance.                         | 2,7  | 28,0 | 34,7 | 32,0 | 2,7  |
| 21. During prep.school, writing skills are given more importance.                         | 6,7  | 49,3 | 13,3 | 25,3 | 5,3  |
| 22. During prep.school, grammar teaching is given more importance.                        | 13,3 | 41,3 | 25,3 | 17,3 | 2,7  |
| 23. During prep.school, vocabulary teaching is given more importance.                     | 2,7  | 37,3 | 32,0 | 24,0 | 4,0  |
| 34. Vocabulary teaching is not given importance.  | 1,3  | 17,3 | 22,7 | 41,3 | 17,3 |
| 38. I was bored in lessons for long texts.  | 6,7  | 26,7 | 29,3 | 30,7 | 6,7  |
| 44. Sts' opinion should be taken into account in curriculum design.                       | 65,3 | 30,7 | 1,3  | 1,3  | 1,3  |
| 45. Departmental instructors' opinions should be taken into account in curriculum design. | 74,7 | 20,0 | 2,7  | 0,0  | 2,7  |

**Sts' Process Needs**

| Items N.  | SA  | A    | N   | D    | SD   |
|---|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| 14. During prep.school, I attended meetings in English. | 0,0 | 16,0 | 4,0 | 48,0 | 32,0 |

*Fatma DEMİRAY AKBULUT*

|   |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| 15. During prep.school, I attended speaking clubs.                            | 0,0  | 1,3  | 2,7  | 37,3 | 58,7 |
| 24. The materials to teach listening skills are efficient.                    | 6,7  | 38,7 | 16,0 | 30,7 | 8,0  |
| 25. The materials to teach speaking skills are efficient.                     | 5,3  | 33,3 | 24,0 | 28,0 | 9,3  |
| 26. The materials to teach reading skills are efficient.                      | 4,0  | 32,0 | 32,0 | 28,0 | 4,0  |
| 27. The materials to teach writing skills are efficient.                      | 5,3  | 46,7 | 18,7 | 24,0 | 5,3  |
| 28. The materials to teach grammar are efficient.                             | 10,7 | 45,3 | 17,3 | 21,3 | 5,3  |
| 29. The teacher of listening skill is efficient.                              | 9,3  | 34,7 | 28,0 | 21,3 | 6,7  |
| 30. The teacher of speaking skill is efficient.                               | 8,0  | 45,3 | 28,0 | 14,7 | 4,0  |
| 31. The teacher of reading skill is efficient.                                | 10,7 | 49,3 | 30,7 | 8,0  | 1,3  |
| 32. The teacher of writing skill is efficient.                                | 14,7 | 46,7 | 21,3 | 16,0 | 1,3  |
| 33. The teacher of grammar is efficient.                                      | 16,0 | 53,3 | 21,3 | 9,3  | 0,0  |
| 35. During prep. school, we used to publish newspapers, magazines in English. | 1,3  | 0,0  | 1,3  | 22,7 | 74,7 |
| 36. Technology is used in ELT.  | 12,0 | 46,7 | 20,0 | 12,0 | 9,3  |
| 37. I was satisfied with classroom organization.                              | 8,0  | 58,7 | 24,0 | 5,3  | 4,0  |

As noted above, the second questionnaire surveyed the current situation of the GE learners and their needs. In terms of participants' objective needs, they (88%) agree that preparatory class is necessary for them, however the amount of learners claimed that this class is unnecessary when it is mentioned in their own departments. The next two items found out that the motivation of most of them increased however, most of them still have difficulties in going through sources in English.

When analysed their subjective needs, the participants (49,3%) thought that they were active students in class. The largest part of the participants (41,3%) was dissatisfied with preparatory school education, the other part of the participants (37,3%) was satisfied with it. About their weaknesses in reading text, most of them (60%) said that they had some difficulties in reading texts in English. The next four questions in subjective needs of participants were about basic skills in English.

Regarding strengths and weaknesses of them, they admitted that listening (57,3%), speaking (53,4%), reading (58,7%) and writing (72%) skills raised their levels.

The section about content needs analysed students' point of view on topics, skills, approaches and curriculum. 84% of the students, the highest, admitted that 1-year education is not a waste of time and they thought that this education process is not enough and not interesting for them. 76% of them believe that this process has not improved their second language skill because they believe that the topics have not met their needs (53,3%) and were not related to their major (94,7%). In four basic skills, 56% of the participants said that writing skills are given more importance and then the other four basic and sub-skills are given importance, such as grammar teaching (54,3), vocabulary teaching (40%), reading (30,7%), speaking (28%), listening (22,7%), respectively. Nearly all of them (96%) demanded that they should be taken into account in curriculum design and also their departmental instructors' opinions should be taken into account in this design (94,7%).

The efficiency of preparatory class has proved us the process needs of the participants. The majority of the respondents disagree on attending meetings in English or speaking clubs. Interestingly, for the next section while nearly half of the participants disagree on the efficiency of materials used for listening, speaking, reading and grammar; the other half agree on the efficiency of them. Only for writing materials, 52% of them thought that the materials used for this skill was efficient. In terms of the instructors of four basic skills and also grammar, majority of the students are satisfied with their instructors and thought that they were efficient in teaching all. While coming to the end, the students (97,4%) disagree on publishing newspapers or magazines in second language, however 58,7% of them decline that technology is used in ELT classrooms effectively. Finally, 66,7% of the students admitted that they were satisfied with classroom organization.

In semi-structured interview, thematic analyses have been consulted and similar themes, key words and phrases have been coded. The highly frequent statements (more than four times) on the basis of ESP and GE courses are given in coded way below.

1. Students use their second language to develop their *professional skills* in communication, to *write* better and to find a suitable *job* after graduation. They also suppose that they will need to use it for going abroad and participate in *Erasmus Student Exchange Programmes* or studying at international universities.

2. The participants took part in the interview suggest that the classrooms should include authentic (*real-like*) materials. They think that some topics and *reading passages* in *textbooks* are not interesting for them. More specific themes take their attention and increase their motivation. If so, they protect that they would be better in *speaking sections* and *relaxed* while expressing themselves.

3. The students told that they had no background information about English for Specific Purposes. Some of them estimate that it is about learning English to use in *real life* and also their own *majors*.

4. After some brief explanation, most of the participants agree that ESP courses should be applied in preparatory classes. They think that although they have learned *English B2 level*, they will have difficulties in *getting used to their own departments*. Specifically, students studying on international relations department would like to know what is happening all around the world and understand *English TV channels or websites*. They think that, the basic reason of this is that materials used in the classroom are not sufficient for their *future career*.

5. The students would like to have a classroom in which *multimedia* facilitated with sound system and decorated with *posters, puzzles, vocabulary tips and authentic materials*. Some of the students propose that there should be some projects including active roles of the students in the classroom so that the classes would be more *enjoyable*, informative and creative.

6. The participants gave an explanation about benefits of ESP courses. According to the interpretation of the interview, they suggest that although they have learned all *grammar rules* and lots of vocabulary items they still are not be able to present a topic and *speak fluently*. The main reason of this, they have no opportunity to use the language in *real world*. To prevent this, they believe that they should be equipped with *necessary information* about their future jobs, *careers*, professions or departments.

#### **4. Conclusion and Discussion**

The results of the present study are in line with the needs of GE courses students on ESP. The efficiency and the importance of ESP mostly depend on the needs analysis on which the whole courses are restructured. The findings suggest that the curriculum of English preparatory classes was not efficiently constructed or directed to second language learners' future needs. As long as specific needs of the students are not defined in terms of their own majors, the learners will not be motivated in language learning environment. It should be underlined that, ESP ought not to be considered as an alternate sort of instructing the language. The outcomes demonstrated that four basic skills were appeared to be critical and ESP specialists ought to consider them. It can be derived from this study as opposed to individual and controlled exercises in the book, understudies need to utilize errands which engage their understudies' advantage, create bunch and match work and finish the learning process. This integrative instructional method permits second language learners to practice language frames with in sensible open settings. Basically, on the premise of the discoveries of this study, there is a solid sign that language learning can be best procured through informative exercises implanted in the reading material.

4. The findings of the current study indicate that school of economics, arts and sciences or engineering students need both linguistic competence and real life skills. Since the current syllabus of GE course satisfies the aims and goals in a segmental way, some radical changes should be done to improve the quality. Firstly, teaching and learning practices and curriculum should be reorganized in cooperation with departmental instructors to improve the outcome. Learners' needs assessment should be taken into account while preparing this curriculum in terms of analysing their language background, their future aims and previous language proficiency. Then, students should be motivated to attend speaking clubs, real-life activities, and preparing projects to accomplish the aim of authentic learning environment. The findings of this study offer an ESP curriculum around needs analysis in line with current trends in ELT in terms of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (see also Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés, 2015), English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Language and content together include an attempt to integrate EAP, ELF and ESP INTO THE General English courses at schools and universities. Regarding the first research questions in this study, the expectations of the students are new pedagogical model, new curriculum around their needs and an integrated English language teaching environment. The second research question in terms of the improvement ways of learners' interests can be solved after modification of ESP courses. Finally, emphasizing the last research question about needs analysis of the students, the results of the second questionnaire and answers of the participants to interview questions are fairly coherent. The focus of the students was on content and process. All in all, despite all difficulties and challenges on changing GE curriculum and integrating it into ESP courses, a modified GE programme according to students' needs and demands can be helpful to lead multidisciplinary English courses.

#### Appendix A. Questionnaire I

##### İNGİLİZCE YETERLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Sevgili öğrenciler,

Bu anketin amacı, siz öğrencilerin İngilizce dil yeterliklerini belirlemektir. Ölçek, dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma olmak üzere dört temel dil becerisini içeren 35 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Vereceğiniz samimi yanıtlar çalışmaya destek sağlayacaktır. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatma DEMİRAY AKBULUT

Cinsiyet: A) Kız B) Erkek

Fakülte/Bölüm : \_\_\_\_\_

Lütfen her maddeyi dikkatle okuyunuz ve sizin için uygun olan dereceyi belirtiniz.

| 5                      | 4           | 3          | 2            | 1                       |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Kesinlikle katılıyorum | Katılıyorum | Kararsızım | Katılmıyorum | Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |

1. Gürültülü ortamlarda bile, standart dilde bana söylenenleri ayrıntılarıyla anlayabilirim.
2. Eğer konu tanıdık ve sunumu açık ve anlaşılır biçimde olursa, kendi uzmanlık alanıma giren bir ders ya da konuşmayı takip edebilirim.
3. Standart dildeki radyo programlarının çoğunu anlayabilir, sunucunun ses tonundan verilmek istenen duyguları ayırt edebilirim.
4. Televizyonda yayınlanan standart dildeki belgeselleri, röportajları, tiyatro oyunlarını ve filmlerin çoğunu anlayabilirim.
5. Soyut ve somut içerikli karmaşık konuşmalardaki ana fikirleri ve uzmanlık alanıma giren teknik konulardaki tartışmaları anlayabilirim.
6. Konu içinde geçen ipuçlarını kullanarak anladığımı kontrol etmek ve ana fikri bulmak gibi anlamaya yönelik çeşitli dinleme yöntemlerini kullanabilirim.
7. İşim ya da ilgi alanıma giren haber, makale ve raporlara hızla göz atarak tümünün okunmaya değer değmeyeceğine karar verebilirim.
8. Yazarın özgün fikir ve görüşlerini aktardığı güncel bir konu hakkındaki rapor ve makaleleri anlayabilirim.
9. İlgili alanıma giren, akademik ya da uzmanlık alanımla ilgili metinleri ayrıntılarıyla anlayabilirim.
10. Mesleki ya da akademik alanım dışındaki makaleleri gerektiğinde sözlüğe bakmak kaydıyla anlayabilirim.
11. Sinema, tiyatro, kitap ve konser gibi kültürel konulardaki yorum ve eleştirileri okuyabilir, önemli noktaları özetleyebilirim.
12. Mesleki veya akademik ya da ilgi alanıma giren konulardaki mektupları okuyabilir ve en önemli noktalarını kavrayabilirim.
13. Kullanım kılavuzlarına (bilgisayar programları için hazırlanmış olan gibi) bakarak ilgili açıklamaları ve örnekleri bulup sorunu çözmeyi başarabilirim.
14. Bir öykü ya da tiyatro oyununda yer alan karakterlerin olaylar karşısındaki tutumlarını ve sonuçlarını hikâyenin gelişimi açısından anlayabilirim.
15. Sıram geldiğinde bir konuşmaya katılabilir, konuyu geliştirebilir ve sonuçlandırabilirim.
16. İlgili alanıma giren bilimsel konularda ayrıntılı bilgi alışverişinde bulunabilirim.
17. Olaylar ya da deneyimlerle ilgili duygu ve düşüncelerimi aktarabilirim.
18. Fikirlerimi uygun açıklamalarla, görüşlerle ve yorumlarla destekleyerek bir tartışmaya katılabilirim.
19. Bilinen konuların anlaşılmasını sağlayıp diğer konuşmacıları da konuya çekerek bir tartışmada yer alabilirim.
20. Konu ile ilgili açıklamalar, kanıtlar ve yorumlarla bir tartışmada düşüncelerimi destekleyerek, onlarla ilgili açıklama yapabilirim.
21. Bilginin doğruluğunu kontrol edip ilginç yanıtları irdeleyerek önceden hazırlanmış bir röportajı uygulayabilirim.
22. İlgili alanıma giren pek çok konuda ayrıntılı ve anlaşılır açıklamalar yapabilirim.
23. Fikir ve tartışmalar içeren belgeseller, röportajlar ve haberlerden alınan kısa bölümleri özetleyebilirim.
24. Film ya da tiyatro oyunlarının konularını ve olaylar zincirini anlayabilir ve özetleyebilirim.
25. Fikirlerimi mantıklı bir şekilde sıralayarak neden sonuç ilişkisine dayanan bir sav/tez oluşturabilirim.



26. Güncel bir konu hakkındaki çeşitli seçeneklerin olumlu ve olumsuz yönlerini vererek görüş bildirebilirim.
27. Sebep, sonuç ve olası durumlara ilgili tahminde bulunabilirim.
28. Uzmanlık alanımla ilgili çeşitli konularda ayrıntılı ve anlaşılabilir rapor, sunu, kompozisyon gibi metinler yazabilirim.
29. Toplumsal konulara ilişkin makalelerin özetini çıkarabilirim.
30. Çeşitli kaynaklardan ve medyadan aldığım bilgileri özetleyebilirim.
31. Belirli bir bakış açısına ilişkin olumlu veya olumsuz görüşlerimi sebeplerini de belirterek bir kompozisyon ya da "editöre mektup" biçiminde yazabilirim.
32. Önemli noktaları vurgulayarak ve destekleyici ayrıntılara da yer vererek bir fikri kompozisyon ya da rapor haline getirebilirim.
33. Ayrıntılı ve kolay okunabilir bir şekilde olaylar ve gerçek ya da gerçek dışı deneyimlere ilişkin metinler oluşturabilirim.
34. Bir film ya da kitap hakkında kısa bir eleştiri yazabilirim.
35. Kişisel bir mektupta farklı duygu ve tavırları ifade edebilir, günün olaylarını, olayların önemli noktalarını açıklayarak aktarabilirim.

#### Appendix B. Questionnaire II

Dear Students,

The aim of this questionnaire is to determine the attitude of students who had preparatory class education implemented at AIBU in 2012-2013 academic years towards the English preparatory program. The answers that you will give to the questions below will contribute to the study. Thank you for your cooperation.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatma DEMİRAY AKBULUT

Please read the items and indicate the most appropriate number near them.

| 5              | 4     | 3       | 2        | 1                 |
|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

1. I believe that English preparatory education is necessary.
2. I think one-year (two semesters) English preparatory education is a waste of time.
3. I think one-year (two semesters) English preparation period is enough for me to start the undergraduate programme.
4. I believe that English preparatory education is unnecessary in the Faculty of Arts and sciences, where the medium of instruction is Turkish.
5. Preparatory courses were interesting to me.
6. I am satisfied with the English preparatory education.
7. I can be said to be an active student in preparatory classes.
8. I believe that the English preparatory programme has developed my level of English required by the undergraduate programme.
9. I believe that the English preparatory education will enable me to get promotion in my carrier in future.
10. The English preparatory education motivated me to use English for Specific Purposes.
11. The English preparatory education has raised my motivation for the undergraduate programme.

12. The topics given in the English preparatory education can be said to have met my needs.
13. The topics, examples and texts in the English preparatory programme were related to my major.
14. During the English preparatory education, I attended meetings (conferences, seminars etc.) in English.
15. During the English preparatory education, I attended English speaking sessions with the departmental instructors.
16. After the English preparatory education, I can go through sources in English related to my major.
17. I was not informed beforehand about the purpose of the English preparatory education.
18. During the English preparatory education, listening skills were given more importance than other language skills.
19. During the English preparatory education, speaking skills were given more importance than other language skills.
20. During the English preparatory education, reading skills were given more importance than other language skills.
21. During the English preparatory education, writing skills were given more importance than other language skills.
22. During the English preparatory education, grammar teaching was given more importance than other language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing).
23. During the English preparatory education, vocabulary teaching was given more importance than other language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing).
24. The materials used in listening skills course were enough in number.
25. The materials used in speaking skills course were enough in number.
26. The materials used in reading skills course were enough in number.
27. The materials used in writing skills course were enough in number.
28. The materials used in grammar course were enough in number.
29. The language teacher of the listening skills course was efficient in teaching.
30. The language teacher of the speaking skills course was efficient in teaching.
31. The language teacher of the reading skills course was efficient in teaching.
32. The language teacher of the writing skills course was efficient in teaching.
33. The language teacher of the grammar course was efficient in teaching.
34. Vocabulary teaching was not given importance during the English preparatory education.
35. During the English preparatory education, we used to publish newspapers/magazines in English.
36. Technology was used in English language teaching.
37. I was satisfied with the classroom organization.
38. I was bored in lessons, since the texts were too long.
39. I had difficulties in comprehending reading texts because of lack of my English competence.
40. Listening skills course raised my level of competence in English.
41. Speaking skills course raised my level of competence in English.
42. Reading skills course raised my level of competence in English.
43. Writing skills course raised my level of competence in English.

44. I believe that students' opinions should be also taken into account in the curriculum development of the English preparatory education.
45. I believe that departmental instructors' opinions should be also taken into account in the curriculum development of the English preparatory education.

### Appendix C. Questionnaire III

#### INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. When and how do you want to use your second language?
  - a) To develop professional communication in writing and speaking
  - b) To develop skill in writing business correspondence
  - c) To develop job interview skill
  - d) To develop presentation skill
2. What types of materials do you think the course should include?
3. Do you have any background information about English for Specific Purposes?
4. Do you think that English for Specific Courses should be applied in preparatory classes? Why or Why not?
5. What type of classroom do you want?
  - a) Classroom with white-board and OHP
  - b) Multimedia facilitated with sound system
  - c) Internet and multimedia facilitated with sound system
  - d) Internet and multimedia facilitated with sound system and decorated with posters and maps with speaking and writing tips, phrases and idioms, puzzles, vocabulary learning tips, etc.
6. Do you think that ESP courses will be beneficial for your future career? If yes, how do you define this beneficial term?

#### References

- Aiguo, W. (2007). Teaching aviation English in the Chinese context: Developing ESP theory in a non-English speaking country. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26 (1), 121-128.
- Akın, G. (2011). Polis akademisi öğrencileri için andragojik ilkelere göre geliştirilmiş problem temelli mesleki İngilizce eğitimi programının etkililiği. *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(1), 115-136.
- Allwright, R.L. (1982). Perceiving and pursuing learners' needs. In M. Geddes & G. Sturtridge (Eds.). *Individualisation*, London: Modern English Publications, 24-31.
- Arnó-Macià, E. and Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 63-73.

Basturkmen, H. (1998). Refining procedures: A needs analysis project at Kuwait university. *English Teaching Forum*, 36(4), 2-9.

Belcher, D. (2009). What ESP is and can be: An introduction. In D. Belcher (Ed.), *English for Specific Purposes in Theory and Practice*. 1–20. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Bilokcuoglu, H. (2012). English for Specific Purposes 'A Paper on the Special Area of English of the Non-Specialist Esp English Instructor'. *Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesini, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 78-91.

Brindley, G. (1989). *Assessing Achievement in the Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Sydney: National Centre for English teaching.

Brunton, M. (2009). An account of ESP-with possible future directions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 3.(24), 1-15.

Carver, D. (1983). Some propositions about ESP. *The ESP Journal*, 2, 131-1377.

Celani, M.A.A. (2008). When Myth and Reality Meet: Reflections on ESP in Brazil. *ESP Journal*, Vol. 27, pp. 412-423.

Chostelidou, D. (2004). *A Needs Analysis Approach to ESP Syllabus Design: Business English in the Greek State Vocational Institute Sector*. MA Thesis, Hellenic Open University, HOU, Patras, Greece.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.

Dincay, T. (2011). Designing a learner-centered Esp Course for adults and incorporating the learners' aims into a situational-based syllabus. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 49, 235-247.

Donesch-Ježo, E. (2010). Teaching Academic Discourse Writing in ESP Courses for Medical Students and Professionals. *Sino-US English Teaching*, Vol. 8 (1),1-6.

Dudley-Evans, T. and St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

European Language Portfolio (2014). Retrieved June, 2015, from: <http://talimterbiye.mebnet.net/Kitaplar/2015YeniKitaplar/Orta-Lise/AvrupaDilPortfolyosu.pdf>

Farhady H.(1991). *Testing ESL proficiency in ESP context*. -the revised version of the paper printed in -Farhady, H., Varzegar, M. & Maftoon, P. (eds.) (1991). Issues in teaching foreign languages in Iran. Tehran, Iran. University for Teacher Education Iran University of Science and Technology.

Fernandez, R.and Gunashekar, P. (2009). A socio-psycholinguistic model for English for specific purposes writing skill formation diagnosis. *ACIMED* [online]. 2009, vol.20 (6), 141-160. ISSN 1024-9435.

Gavioli, L. (1996). Corpus di testi e concordanze: Un nuovo strumento nella didattica delle lingue straniere [Text corpora and concordances: A new tool for foreign language teaching]. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata*, 2, 121-146.

Harding, K. (2007). *English for specific purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hossain, J. (2013). ESP Needs Analysis for Engineering Students: A Learner Centered Approach. *Journal of PU*, Part: B, 2/2, 16-26.

Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A. (2013). The History of English for Specific Purposes Research. (in) Paltridge, Brian and Sue Starfield (eds.). 2013. *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Boston: Wiley-Blackwell. 592 pp.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1975). *Learning together and alone: Cooperation, competition and individualization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D.M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. Newyork: Longman.

Keşmer, E. (2007). *Needs assessment of the prep- class students in the faculty of engineering at Ondokuz Mayıs University*. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun.

Mackay, R., & Palmer, J. (Eds.). (1981). *Languages for Specific Purposes: Program design and evaluation*. London: Newbury House.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. London, England: Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1987). The teacher as curriculum developer: An investigation of curriculum processes within the Adult Migrant Education Program. *South Australia: National Curriculum Resource Centre*.

Nunan, D. (1988a). *Syllabus design*. London: Oxford University Press.

Prior, P. (2013). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the Academy*. England, London: Routledge.

Richterich, R. (1983). (Ed.), *Case studies in identifying language needs*. Pergamon/Council of Europe, Oxford.

Selinker, L., Tarone, E., & Hanzeli, V. (Eds.). (1981). *English for Academic and Technical Purposes: Studies in honor of Louis Trimble*. London: Newbury House.

Stevens, P. (1988). ESP after twenty years: A re-appraisal. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *ESP: State of the Art* (pp. 1-13). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Centre.

Supuran, A. & Mela, D. (2010). Textbook selection - An important factor in introducing ESP in vocational schools. A case study. *Analele Universității din Oradea, Fascicula: Ecotoxicologie, Zootehnie și Tehnologii de Industrie Alimentară*. 601-606.

*Fatma DEMİRAY AKBULUT*

Teodorescu, A. (2010). Teaching English for specific purposes. *Seria Filologie*, 62(2), 67-74.

Varnosfadrani, A. D. (2009). *Teaching English for specific purposes*. In Reinelt, R. (Ed.), *Into the Next Decade with (2nd) FL Teaching*. Rudolf Reinelt Research Laboratory EU Matsuyama, Japan. 181-201.

Widdowson, G.H. (1998). Communication and community: The pragmatics of ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17 (1) , 3–14.