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ABSTRACT

With the advent of language training providers, running courses within workplaces has emerged as a surrogate for the conventional modus operandi of offering courses within the educational institutes. In quest of this issue, the study under scrutiny attempts to delve into the motives behind the training held by IN-tuition within SAMHA company (SAMSUNG Home Appliance, Sétif). In doing so, a focus group interview and two questionnaires (one for SAMHA student employees and one for IN-tuition trainers) have been deployed as data collection instruments in order to substantiate the upshots. As a matter of fact, this exploratory case study hinged on a wide-ranging theoretical framework related to business English and needs analysis to pinpoint the necessities, wants and lacks of SAMHA student employees. Thus, to put a new spin on the investigation, the standpoints of the trainers and trainees as to the training were taken into consideration and compared in a bid to gauge the fruitfulness of the training. Actually, the main upshots emanated from the questionnaires displayed divergent and convergent insights. On the one hand, a preference from the part of trainees to enhance an amalgam of general and business English besides the written and spoken communication skills, but with more emphasis on writing and speaking. On the other, despite the coverage of all these within the training, what impeded the teaching circumstances was the wide ability range within the same group and the heterogeneity of the elements within it. Ultimately, to amend the teaching/learning situation, the study afforded some guidelines that pertain to the design of a task-based syllabus for vocational purposes.
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1. Background of the Study

Notwithstanding the fact of being non-representative of the high ratio of first language speakers, English de facto, as a lingua franca, holds much sway over the entire world (Harmer, 2001: 1). Apropos its status quo in Algeria, it became deep-seated within the business affairs with foreigners. Sétif, as a case in point, is endowed with an illustrious industrial estate that undergoes actually vigorous economic and commercial activities, and currently a surge of investments. This industrial zone boasts a gigantic manufacturing company which is a subsidiary of Cevital group, SAMHA (SAMSUNG Home Appliance). The latter is deemed as the sole distributor of the outstanding South Korean brand “SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS”. It manufactures electrical household appliances, i.e. televisions, refrigerators, washing machines, and air conditioners. Moreover, it hires approximately 1800 individuals within its distinct departments, i.e. warehousemen, purchasers, engineers and managers, etc. On the other hand, along with the fact that the employees of SAMHA were to undergo 18 weeks’ training under the aegis of IN-tuition (a groundbreaking training organism and an official partner of Linguaphone and Direct English), the immense significance of using English in managing SAMHA dealings, the study under scrutiny endeavors to cast the light on the teaching/learning process in general and the learners’ requirements in particular. As a matter of fact, spelling out the nature of the learners’ needs has to be meticulous through what is referred to as needs analysis. The latter is reckoned as the first procedure to be espoused so as to ascertain the ultimate feasible outcomes of English learning. Brindley (1984, cited in Richards, 2001) reported that by 1980s, in many parts of the world, a ‘need-based philosophy’ emerged in language teaching, particularly in relation to ESP and vocationally oriented program design.
2. Statement of the Problem

The choice of embarking upon this project sprang from the initiative of the training within the company, and the magnitude of English in running its dealings. After conducting a focus group interview with SAMHA student employees and IN-tuition teachers, the problem became apparent. The gist of the findings entails a willingness to enhance the communicative abilities of the employees who use English in performing their tasks. In fact, under the auspices of IN-tuition, an interview was held with 132 employees. Thus, those on the interview panel selected 4 teachers to do the training, and yielded the following directives:

- The training sessions spread out over 18 weeks (72 hours), 2 sessions per week and 2 hours per session. The outset of the training is fixed on the 21st of October.
- The employees who undergo the training are split up into 10 groups (4 groups of the elementary level, 6 groups of the intermediate level). Besides, each group consists of 12 or 14 employees belonging to different departments (purchasing, supply chain, appro-planning, maintenance, quality control, logistics, etc).
- All the groups take courses in general business English.
- At the end of the training, a test will be set.

Making allowance for these references, an inference can be drawn about how to resolve the crux of the matter. The latter indeed is in need of designing a syllabus that fulfils the requirements of this variety of employees. Nevertheless, the presence of the employees from supply chain and purchasing, maintenance and quality control within the same group is controversial. In other words, notwithstanding the fact of taking heed of needs analysis (see appendix A), the question arises is that ‘do the needs of purchasers and supply chain members overlap with the ones of quality control and maintenance engineers?’
3. Purpose of the Study

The purport of this study is threefold: first, exploring the standpoints of SAMHA student employees insofar as their language needs (wants, lacks and necessities) and the training are concerned; second, exploring the standpoints of IN-tuition teachers as to the training held. Eventually, drawing an analogy between the two stances so as to highlight and posit feasible guidelines for the design of a task-based syllabus for vocational purposes.

4. Research Questions and Assumptions

By taking the purpose of the study into account, the researcher tries to investigate the ensuing research questions:

1. What are the leading reasons that display SAMHA trainees’ need to use English?
2. What are the core hindrances confronting them in using English?
3. Since they are to undergo a training:
   3.1 Is the interview held (as a placement test) sufficient to pinpoint the employees’ levels?
   3.2 Is the time allotted for the training sufficient to upgrade their levels?
   3.3 Is there an apt syllabus that may assist in attaining adequate upshots, a fortiori, may cater for their requirements?

Accordingly, the following assumptions are set out:

1. SAMHA trainees’ need to use English is ordinarily for business sake depending on the position they hold, i.e. dealing and negotiating with their suppliers, dispatching emails, effecting bank transactions, visiting trade fairs, etc.
2. The decision to do training reflects an unsatisfactory performance in assuming the tasks that necessitate the use of English. The latter is due to their lacks in language.
3.1 Doing uniquely a verbal test or interview to determine the employees’ levels is deficient. In default of a written test, it is intricate to ascertain the actual level.

3.2 Undergoing 18 weeks’ training is insufficient to cover intensive courses in general or business English.

3.3 Probably, a task-based syllabus can meet their needs as Willis (1996:1) propounds:

“The task-based syllabus stimulates real communication situations in the target language”. In addition, such teaching/learning “offers a rich but comprehensive exposure to language in use, through listening and reading, and provides opportunities for both spontaneous and planned speaking and writing”.

This squares with the tenet that claims that learning a foreign language generally entails the exposure of learners to the four skills.

5. Methodology and Procedure of the Study

5.1 Research Methods

The study under scrutiny is an exploratory case study which comprehends a blend of quantitative and qualitative instruments, i.e. a focus group interview and 2 questionnaires.

- Qualitative: a focus group interview was conducted in a bid to draw up the 2 questionnaires.
- Quantitative: two questionnaires were addressed (one to the 26 trainees and one to the 4 trainers) so as to get insights about the training in general and the trainees’ needs in particular (see appendices B & C respectively)
5.2 Research Sample

Insofar as research sample is concerned, it encompasses SAMHA employees and IN-tuition trainers:

- 26 employees who belong to distinct departments (purchasing, supply chain, approp- planning, maintenance and quality control).
- 4 high-school teachers of English.

6. Ethical Issues

In a bid to carry out our investigation in compliance with the bylaws of SAMHA, we have secured a letter of permission from the manager of human resources department after according him a certificate from the vice dean in charge of post-graduation and external relations (see appendices D & E respectively). Insofar as data collection is concerned, we abode by the employees' agenda and the timing of the training held either for conducting the focus group interview or for distributing and retrieving the questionnaires. So as to corroborate the data we gathered through the questionnaires, data were kept as they were without any attempt of alteration. As a matter of fact, we pledged to preserve the anonymity of the research participants (SAMHA trainees and IN-tuition trainers). Nonetheless, the latter were informed that prints of patterns (SWIFT, contracts, etc) afforded are to be appended to the dissertation.

7. Structure of the Dissertation

An imperative aspect that should not be glossed over is the dissertation structure. The dissertation encompasses five chapters. The first chapter revolves around a theoretical framework related to ‘English for Specific Purposes’ and ‘Business English’, and the second one to ‘Needs Analysis’ and ‘Syllabus Design’. Chapter three covers a thorough
portrayal of the research design and methodology. Chapter four expounds data analysis and interpretations of the findings. On the basis of the upshots, recommendations for the design of a task-based syllabus for vocational purposes, limitations and future perspectives of the study are put forward in chapter five.
Introduction

The pervasive deployment of the English language as an international intermediary of communication is in perpetual expansion. This fact is mirrored in miscellaneous realms and in diverse settings where English is held as an operational means. In a bid to attain specific objectives, countries all over the world, including Algeria, introduced English courses at all the echelons of the educational organism mainly at the tertiary level through ESP. The latter, so far, is becoming a growing trend in the framework of English language teaching and learning. Accordingly, this chapter endeavors to define ESP with a brief glimpse of its chronicle, its characteristics and headway, and identify its main pillars. By the same token, it also highlights the grounds of BE, and goes further on elucidating the line of demarcation between GE and BE.

1.1 English as an International Language

There is a wide-ranging array of provinces that displays the worldwide use of English (Graddol, 1997: 8). The latter as a matter of fact serves as:

- The working language of international organizations and conferences.
- The language of scientific publication.
- The language of international banking, economic affairs and trade.
- The language of advertising for global brands.
- The language of audio-visual cultural products.
- The language of international tourism.
- The language of tertiary education.
- The language of international safety (e.g. ‘airspeak’, ‘seaspeak’).
- The language of international law.
- A ‘relay language’ in interpretation and translation.
- The language of technology transfer.
- The language of internet communication.

1.2 English Standing in Algeria

By analogy with Arabic and French, is English hegemony so far hanging back or sprouting rivalry in Algeria?

Two language aspects indeed serve as the pedigree of Algeria: Arabic whether as a prime language of government or as a local language, and Tamazight as a Berber language. Within the educational sector, French is initiated as the first foreign language, whereas English as the second foreign language, i.e. as the former is inducted at the primary school level (precisely grade 3), the latter at the middle school level (precisely grade 1) but both endure up to the tertiary level. Within the commercial sector, French is described as a focal language of Business while English is still circumscribed. Along with Sonatrach merely certain multinational companies as Halliburton, Schlumberger and others which use English. Making allowance for the figure below, the percentage ascribed to the English use within the occupational sector by analogy with the educational one is approximately double. Moreover, it is critical to assert that language requirement for occupational purpose tends to outstrip the educational one as to English while it is antithetical as to French and Arabic.
In fact, it is noteworthy to assert the facts behind the English impacts:

- The flow of multinational companies: Siemens, Knauf, Unilever and others; the gas and oil companies such as BP and Total S. A, etc.
- The emergence of language training providers: the Centre of Intensive Training for Language (CIEL), the Linguaphone Group and its partner IN-tuition, the US Embassy and the British Council, etc.

All in all, the call for English education is attributable to three factors: government (50%), individual (40%), and company (10%). The overall percentages score is based on trade interviews (Ramaswami et.al, 2012: 56-87).

1.3 ESP Delineation

Actually, ESP is deemed as one of the core realms of applied linguistics in general, and of TEFL in particular that appeared on the scene in the early 1960s. Though, before expounding its genesis, the tenets and pillars that underlie it, it is indispensable to bring its definition to the fore.
Zhang (2013: 72) purports: “ESP is a goal-oriented and well targeted instruction system, which stresses the combination of English language learning and specific purposes of professional learning.”

Therefore, Mackay & Mountford (1978) assert: “ESP is generally used to refer to the teaching of English for a clearly utilitarian purpose.”

Hutchinson & Waters (1987) maintain that “ESP is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner’s reason for learning.”

On the other hand, ESP definition has been envisaged via absolute and variable characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Characteristics</th>
<th>Variable Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed to meet specified needs of the learner;</td>
<td>May be restricted as to the learning skills to be learned (for example reading only);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related in content (that is in its themes and topics) to particular disciplines, occupations and activities;</td>
<td>May not be taught according to any pre-ordained methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered on language appropriate to those activities in syntax, lexis, discourse, semantics and so on, and analysis of the discourse;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In contrast with ‘General English’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- ESP may be related to or designed for specific disciplines;
- ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of general English;
- ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be for learners at secondary school level;
- ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students;
- Most ESP courses assume some basic knowledge of the language system, but it can be used with beginners.

Table 1.1: ESP Characteristics
Insofar as Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 18) are concerned, they purport that:

- ESP is not a matter of teaching ‘specialized varieties’ of English.
- ESP is not just a matter of Science words and grammar for Scientists, Hotel words and grammar for Hotel staff and so on.
- ESP is not different in kind from any other form of language teaching, in that it should be based in the first instance on principles of effective and efficient learning.

1.4 ESP and GE

ESP research and pedagogy developed initially against conceptualizations of a general English language competence, a single language system target that could be described by some grammar (not yet determined) linked to a lexicon and articulated through a phonological and orthographic system, a competence that generally appeared to be mode-free (Paltridge & Starfield, 2013: 519).

1.5 ESP Genesis

LSP dawn dated back to the Roman and Greek Empires (Dudley-Evans & St John (1998:1). As Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 6) propound: “ESP was not a planned and coherent movement, but rather a phenomenon that grew out of a number of converging trends.” The latter indeed ranged between economic and educational ones:

- The demands of a brave new world, i.e. when the Second World War drew to a close, the world knew an era of an outstandingly tremendous growth in the economic, technical and scientific spheres. Consequently, it made a world unified and taken over by technology and commerce, yielded a requirement for an international language. Thus, due to the influx of Western experts and assets/funds into the oil-rich countries stemmed from the Oil Crises of the early 1970s, English hence emerged as the language that held much sway over the entire world.
The outstanding watershed in linguistics (the linguistics revolution), i.e. deflecting the focus from depicting the facets of language usage to determining the aspects in which language is indeed used in real communication, bringing about the need to unfold English courses destined for specific groups of learners.

The recent developments in educational psychology, i.e. laying a substantial emphasis on the learners and their needs owing to the fact that English courses no longer cater for learners’ needs and their preoccupations; and since the latter may have an overwhelming influence on their motivation and the efficiency of their learning likewise.

1.6 ESP Development

ESP as a realm, from its threshold in the 1960s till the turn of the millennium, has passed through five stages. Actually, three phases came into sight under the banner of language-centered approaches, and the two further ones under a skill-centered approach and a learning-centered approach respectively.

1.6.1 Register Analysis

Being transpired throughout the 1960s and early 1970s, register analysis heralded the inception of ESP (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987:9). It was primarily built on lexicostatistics which asserts “Although the grammar of scientific and technical writing does not differ from that of General English, certain grammatical and lexical forms are used much more frequently” (Swales, 1988, cited in Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 21). In the main, it focused utterly on language at the word and sentence level. Thus, it delved deeper into the linguistic properties of certain fields as medicine, engineering and journalism with reference to patterns of vocabulary occurrence, verb forms, noun phrases, and tense usage (Richards, 2001:30-31). Afterward, teaching materials drew on these
properties as their syllabus. As a case in point, the syllabus that was premised on structural precepts, centered around a frequency count of a three-million word corpus of scientific texts. It was in fact under the heading of ‘A Course in Basic Scientific English’ by Ewer and Latorre (1969). The latter along with others as Streves, Halliday, McIntosh and Swales are reckoned as precursors of this trend (Jordan, 1997: 228-9).

It was singled out for criticism as being labeled as descriptive rather than explanatory (Bhatia, 1993, cited in Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001:14). Thus, regardless the fact that materials were outstandingly viewed as pursuing an identical prototype (Dudley-Evans & St John 1998: 22), register analysis quests reemerged and forged ahead during the 1980s due to the advent of computer-based corpora and concordancing programs (ibid: 31).

1.6.2 Rhetorical / Discourse Analysis

After the demise of register analysis to come up with apt upshots, the premise of the upcoming tendency was to find out specifics about the arrangement of extended stretches of speech or text (Jordan, 1997: 229). Discourse or rhetorical analysis came about the 1970s, laid stress on the level beyond the sentence, gave primacy to language use over usage (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 23). In fact, Widdowson, Trimble, Selinker, Lackstrom and Todd-Trimble are held as vanguards of this trend (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987:10). Trimble’s book “English for Science and technology: A Discourse approach (1985)” is regarded as the epitome of this approach. It encompasses the “Rhetorical Process Chart”, which submits that a text must be organized at four rhetorical levels:

Level A (the objectives of the total discourse); level B (the general rhetorical functions that develop the level A objectives); level C (the specific rhetorical functions that develop the general ones); level D (the rhetorical techniques that provide relationships between the level c functions). (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 22).
Focused on Trimble’s chart (level C and D respectively), and originated from distinct teaching materials, Allen and Widdowson’s Focus Series (1973-78), Bates and Dudley-Evans’ Nucleus Series (1976-85) have been intriguing paradigms of this sphere (ibid: 23).

1.6.3 Target Situation Analysis

Under the appellation of target situation analysis, the third trend shaped up as the ‘coming of age’ of ESP. In fact, it was even bound up with the analysis of the surface linguistic features as the two bygone stages. Nevertheless, the analysis of learners’ needs which came to the foreground was a newfound modus operandi (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987: 12-13). Therefore, the most eminent framework for Needs Analysis is the so-called model “Communication Needs Processor” conceived by Munby (1978) in “Communicative Syllabus Design” (Jordan, 1997: 23). The outcome of the CNP is a scrupulous profile of the learners’ needs which stems from parameters. The latter are twofold: a priori parameters (purposive domain, setting, interaction, and instrumentality) and a posteriori ones (dialect, target level, communicative event, and communicative key). Thus, prior being transmuted into a ‘communicative competence specification’, the needs profile is arranged according to: a meaning processor, a language skills selector, and a linguistic encoder (Munby, 1978: 31-32). Despite the reproach allotted to the Munby’s model as the one of Schutz and Derwing (1981, cited in Paltridge & Starfield, 2013: 328): “its detailed specification of communicative events for a given participant contained no specification of the actual language forms realizing specific needs”, the approach of the learner need thereafter turned out to be the nucleus of course design.
1.6.4 Skills and Strategies

Making a foray into looking below the surface system of language per se, allowing for the thinking processes that underpin language use, unlike the three preceding stages, the skills and strategy approach enrolled in ESP annals. In fact, Hutchinson & Waters (1987:13) expound its pivotal grounds as:

“The principal idea behind the skills-centred approach is that underlying all language use there are common reasoning and interpreting processes, which, regardless of the surface forms, enable us to extract meaning from discourse.”

There’s none so ascendant as a doyen in this tendency. Nonetheless, besides the input of Grellet, Nuttall, Alderson and Urquhart which is indisputably creditable, a range of blueprints have been conceived, and bring reading strategies into sharp focus as the National ESP Project in Brazil and the University of Malaya ESP Project. Thus, along with the fact that the emphasis on specific subject registers is redundant within this trend, abundant courses take their cue from the cognitive stance of learning, and foster the learners’ awareness about their reading strategies which assist in fathoming texts (ibid: 14-44).

This movement has had a great deal of influence on BE materials and great number of books from the 1980s focused on skills work, such as the Longman series of skills in ‘Negotiating’ and ‘Telephoning’ (Brieger, 1997).

1.6.5 A Learning-Centered Approach

Over the span of several years, ESP quests via describing language use (whichever of surface forms or underlying processes) were mainly burdened with defects. The ultimate trend deflects the focus away from language use to language learning (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987:14). In fact, there is even a disparity that sets the learning-centered approach
apart from the learner-centered one. Whereas the latter refers to ‘learning which is totally
determined by the learner’, the former implies ‘learning which is a process of negotiation
between individuals and society’. In other words, the creed that underlies this learning-
centeredness takes in not merely learners, though teaching, syllabus, methods and materials
likewise (Jordan, 1997:25). Furthermore, details of the learning-centered approach are
broadly spelled out as:

It entails “Considering the process of learning and student motivation very fully and
working out exactly what is needed to enable students to reach the end target.” (Dudley-
Evans & St John, 1998: 26).

Making allowance for learners’ competence and performance, it is not the
competence per se which overwhelmingly assumes importance but otherwise how does
his/her competence acquisition ensue (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987: 73).

All in all, such a brand of approaches unequivocally stands for “An approach with
the avowed aim of maximising the potential of the learning situation.” (ibid: 77).

1.7 ESP Today

Along with the aforementioned approaches, Dudley-Evans & St John (1998) discuss
the growth of genre analysis and its overriding significance in the analysis of ESP
situations. Nonetheless, they assert that it cannot be held as a prevailing trend such as
register analysis, needs analysis and the learning-centered approach. On the other hand,
they also maintain the appearance of corpora and how this has validated new register
analysis work. Furthermore, another far-reaching change is pointed out:

One major change has been the emergence of Business English as a major
strand of ESP teaching. Early ESP work was dominated by English for
Science and Technology. However, in the 1990s, the largest area of growth
is Business English (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 31).
However, regardless of these substantial changes, it can be stated that practitioners are taking heed of all the foregoing facets of ESP so as to address the learners’ needs. This present period is referred to as the eclectic period. All in all, the diagram below exposes all the leading approaches on a time-line, highlighting the fact that all the preceding approaches are available to the practitioner today.

![Figure 1.2: A Time-line of Approaches to ESP](image)

**1.8 Genre Analysis**

Within ESP compass, genre has been primarily reckoned as “a tool for analyzing and teaching the spoken and written language required of nonnative speakers in academic and professional settings” (Hyon, 1996: 695). Besides, Swales (1990, cited in Bruce, 2008: 29) spells out the defining traits of genre as:

- A genre is a class of communicative events.
- The principal criterial feature that turns a collection of communicative events into a genre is some shared set of communicative purposes.
Exemplars or instances of genres vary prototypically.

The rationale behind a genre establishes constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their content, positioning and form.

A discourse community's nomenclature for genres is an important source of insight. As a matter of fact, Swales (1990) was concerned with genre analysis of the academic article. He sets out his Creating a Research Space (CARS) model of analysis of the pattern of article introduction. The model encapsulates three main moves which in turn take in several steps:

**Move 1: Establishing a territory**

- **Step 1** Claiming centrality
  and/or
- **Step 2** Making topic generalizations
- **Step 3** Reviewing items of previous research

**Move 2: Establishing a niche**

- **Step 1A** Counter-claiming
  or
- **Step 1B** Indicating a gap
  or
- **Step 1C** Question-raising
  or
- **Step 1D** Continuing a tradition

**Move 3: Occupying the niche**

- **Step 1A** Outlining purposes
  or
• **Step 1B** Announcing present research

• **Step 2** Announcing principal findings

• **Step 3** Indicating research article structure

1.9 ESP Types

ESP maturity through time knew multiple slants apropos its subdivision. As to Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 16), ESP is divided into three broad headings: EST (English for Science and Technology), EBE (English for Business and Economics) and ESS (English for Social Sciences). Each of these spheres of study falls into two branches: EAP (English for Academic Purposes) and EOP (English for Occupational Purposes). An example of EOP for the EBE branch is “English for Secretaries” whereas an example of EAP for the EBE branch is “English for Economics”.

1.10 English for Academic and/or Occupational Purposes

As a matter of fact, a question mark hangs over the trait that discerns English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) from English for Academic Purposes (EAP). On the one hand, the disparity resides in the quality of the courses offered, i.e. in EOP, courses train individuals to perform on the job, using English to communicate whereas in EAP common core elements (study skills) that underpin the courses, comprising writing academic texts, listening to formal academic discourses and making presentations, etc. Nevertheless, as to Hutchinson & Waters (1987:16), the disparity is blurred since:

“People can work and study simultaneously; it is also likely that in many cases the language learnt for immediate use in a study environment will be used later when the student takes up, or returns to, a job.”
1.11 ESP Teacher

Within the overall remit of ELT pedagogy, should the traits of the ESP teacher fit with the ones of the GE teacher?

On the one hand, Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 157) maintain that ‘practitioner’ instead of ‘teacher’ remains a term that pertains to ESP ambit. Thus, besides the regular undertakings of the GE teacher (as a classroom teacher), further aspects as needs analysis, syllabus design, materials writing or adaptation, and evaluation are among his/her operation.

The ESP practitioner occupies a pivotal role within the ELT framework:

- Teacher or language consultant.
- Course designer and material provider.
- Researcher – not just gathering material, but also understanding the nature of the material of the ESP specialism.
- Collaborator – working with subject teachers and subject teaching.
- Evaluator – constantly evaluating the materials and the course design, as well as setting assessment tests and achievement tests (Harding, 2007: 7).

Hutchinson & Waters (1993, cited in Ali et al., 2013, 13-14) emphasize the problems which face the ESP teacher. They are de facto threefold:

- Bearing in mind the state of transition from a GE teacher to ESP practitioner.
- Being au fait with the learners’ sphere of interest.
- Keeping abreast of ESP advance hence arranging authentic materials and hinging on a sound methodology are of immense significance.
1.12 ESP Learner

On the other hand, the attributes learners possess were addressed in terms of ripeness and awareness within ESP. Robinson (1993, cited in Ali et al., 2013, 14) insists on the fact that “ESP has a close association with adult learners or at least learners at the post-secondary level.” In the same strain, Dudley-Evans & St John (1998: 5) maintain:

“ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be for learners at secondary school level.”

Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 53) state that “what distinguishes ESP from GE is not the existence of a need as such but rather an awareness of the need.” In the same strain, Rogers (2007: 20) purports “Adults are sharply aware that they want to use the learning they are acquiring and may want to do so immediately.”

1.13 ESP and Language Skills

What language skills does the ESP query landscape encompass? ESP pedagogies have tended to focus on identifying – often through needs analyses – sets of transferable generic language and literacy skills that are seen to be applicable in the majority of academic and workplace settings (Paltridge & Starfield, 2013: 31).

1.13.1 ESP and Receptive Skills

1.13.1.1 ESP and Listening

On the one hand, Paltridge & Starfield (2013: 57-58) assert:

“ESP listening as a construct has many similarities to ESL listening. It involves the same cognitive processes that draw from a number of similar knowledge sources to process spoken input, and requires the use of the same core (or “macro”) skills that enable effective attention to information in accord with the purpose for listening. Where the two types of listening differ is in
the additional skills and specific types of knowledge required for EAP and EOP purposes.”

On the other hand, along with the fact of viewing listening and speaking as interrelated, listening falls under three headings: active listening, one-way listening, and interactive listening (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 105).

1.13.1.2 ESP and Reading

Within ESP reading pedagogy, an alteration as to the extraction of information from the text was put forward by Johns and Davies (1983). The latter delved into TAVI (Text As a Vehicle of Information) instead of TALO (Text As a Linguistic Object) and held that the apt extraction is more substantial than language details. Therefore, language process is brought to the fore before coalescing the core information and the bygone knowledge. On the other hand, reading as an ingredient within an ESP course calls for a balance between language and skills. The latter entail:

- Selecting what is relevant for the current purpose;
- Using all the features of the text such as heading, layout, typeface;
- Skimming for content and meaning;
- Scanning for specifics;
- Identifying organizational patterns;
- Understanding relations within a sentence and between sentences;
- Using cohesive and discourse markers;
- Predicting, inferring and guessing;
- Identifying main ideas, supporting ideas and examples;
- Processing and evaluating the information during reading;
- Transferring or using the information while or after reading.

(Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 96-98)
1.13.2 ESP and Productive Skills

1.13.2.1 ESP and Writing

Approaches to writing range between product, process, and social constructivist approach. Under the product approach, writing portrays the end-product as a model text that undergoes a change. After being analyzed and handled, a parallel text will be drawn up. Under the process approach, however, writing depicts problem-solving that submits to two stages. The thinking stage takes in planning and the process stage encompasses drafting and revising. In a bid to fuse the virtues of the aforementioned approaches (the process and product approaches), the social constructivist approach associated with genre analysis and sociological studies of academic and professional discourse came into use. A synthesis of approaches in fact tends to:

- Develop rhetorical awareness by looking at model texts;
- Practice specific genre features, especially moves and writer stance;
- Carry out writing tasks showing awareness of the needs of individual readers and the discourse community and the purpose of the writings;
- Evaluate the writing (through peer review or reformulation).

(ibid: 114-118)

1.13.2.2 ESP and Speaking

Along with being conjoined with listening, ESP speaking therefore touches upon speech corpora and EAP speaking. As Paltridge & Starfield (2013: 36) purport, the latter first and foremost encompasses:

- The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE).
- The British Academic Spoken English corpus (BASE).
- The English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings corpus (ELFA).
EOP speaking on the other hand comprises:

- Business as Business calls (Bowles 2006).
- Medicine as medical professionals (Hoekje 2006).
- Aviation as the high stakes aviation context (Aiguo 2007).

As a common point, spoken monologue can be a feature of EAP and EOP (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 112).

1.13.3 ESP and Vocabulary

Within ESP, vocabulary assumes several labels: specialized, technical, sub-technical and semi-technical (Paltridge & Starfield, 2013: 115). As Harding (2007: 53) maintains: “Vocabulary is an important part of the ESP course. Partly this is because specific technical words are used to describe particular features of the specialism”. As a case in point, the components of a car engine for motor mechanics have to be known so as to function in the specialism. In addition, vocabulary in ESP incorporates a number of sub-skills:

- Deducing meaning from context,
- Word-building,
- Understanding appropriate register and genre (including formal vs. informal, receptive vs. productive use).

1.13.4 ESP and Grammar

Is grammar freestanding from the scope of ESP? It is fairly common that ESP teaching is not slanted toward grammar. Yet, it is of the essence to dispel the fallacy about this fact. Since the grammatical intricacy that twists language inputs and outputs and the accuracy in using the language actually compel the learners’ attention, teachers hence have to spell them out (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 74-5). Thus, via the identification of the
grammatical structures (verb forms, tense usage, etc.) of scientific and technical writing, register analysis corroborates the fact that grammar was even embedded in the initial approaches to ESP. Above and beyond, the newfound impact in looking over scientific and technical English uncovers that the passive tense occurrences tend to be an often-recurrent act by analogy with general English as Barber (1962) propounds (Basturkmen, 2006: 35).

1.13.5 ESP and Materials Development

Being a balancing of factors comprising learning needs, language content and subject-matter content, materials development de facto tends to probe a range of concerns:

- What is the target topic/what will be the carrier content?
- Is this topic relevant for my students/the discipline?
- What do I, as an ESP practitioner, know about carrier content?
- What are my students supposed to know about the carrier content?
- To what extent do materials reflect the language/conventions of the discipline?
- What are the learning goals?
- What is the target language form/function/skill?
- What materials are available, suitable and accessible?
- What teaching equipment is required and available?
- How much time should be spent on the design, development and implementation of activities?
- Will materials be classroom-oriented or provide additional work?

(Ruiz-Garrido et al., 2010: 143)
1.13.6 Authentic Materials

Does the language in the course book come from the real world, or has it been specially generated or substantially adapted for language teaching purposes? Frendo (2005: 51) asserts:

“Within the world of English teaching, authentic materials are texts which have not been produced specifically for classroom use. In the context of Business English, they are normally real commercial documents, or newspaper articles, or recordings of meetings and conversations made in a workplace.”

In the same strain, Ellis & Johnson (1994: 157) label it as any kind of material taken from the real world and not specifically created for the purpose of language teaching. It can be text, visuals, or audio material; it can be realia such as tickets, menus, maps, and timetables; or it can be objects such as products, equipment, components, or models.

1.14 Business English

This realm of study ranges over a wide variety of standpoints. As to Whitehead & Whitehead (1993: 9), Business English is the language of communication in international business and “it is ordinary English, related particularly to business use”.

Within the broad framework of ESP, the salient facets of needs analysis, syllabus, course design, and materials selection and development are held in common with Business English. The latter, as with other brands of ESP, entails “the definition of a specific language corpus and emphasis on particular kinds of communication in a specific context.”

When it is at variance with further brands of ESP, Business English is nevertheless reckoned as an amalgam of general content pertaining to an aptitude for a fruitful communication, even if in business venues, and specific one belonging to a definite job area or industry (Ellis & Johnson, 1994: 3).
Furthermore, teaching Business English intends to imply teaching English which stands on the brand of instruction geared as Donna (2000: 2) expounds:

“To adults working in businesses of one kind or another, or preparing to work in the field of business. The businesses could be large multinationals (Procter & Gamble), small private companies or even state-run concerns involved with providing products or services”.

Dudley-Evans and St John (1996, cited in Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998:31) assert that BE, in the 1990s, came out as the focal facet of ESP teaching. Thus, owing to the high international enrollment in taking Masters courses in Business, Finance, Accounting and Banking, academic BE is reaching a substantial threshold.

1.15 The Scope of Business English

Moreno (2010: 44) illustrates in a simple way how Business English is organized. On the one hand, Business English feeds on English for Economics (Academic language) which offers the necessary theoretical support and explanatory apparatus. On the other, it develops into the two domains: Commercial English and Financial English (Professional languages) which put into practice the theories devised by the science of Economics.

![Figure 1.3: Business English Components](image-url)
1.16 Business English and General English

It is of paramount importance to set apart the line of demarcation between BE and GE. Ellis & Johnson (1994: 10-13) propound that despite the overlap between them, there are discernible disparities. As the table expounds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs analysis</th>
<th>Business English (BE)</th>
<th>General English (GE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To assess the needs of the company, the job, and individuals, and to define the language level required by the job. In-company training departments must make decisions about the type of the training required: group v. individual, on-site v. language school, person-to-person tuition v. distance learning, etc.</td>
<td>To assess the language needs of the learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of level</th>
<th>Business English (BE)</th>
<th>General English (GE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using formal tests or interviews.</td>
<td>Placement tests or interviews to allocate learners to courses or to form groups of a similar language level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabus</th>
<th>Business English (BE)</th>
<th>General English (GE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set courses will have fixed objectives and syllabus. Special courses will require a special syllabus. One-to-one courses may develop syllabus and content on an ongoing basis.</td>
<td>Often determined by choice of course book and (if applicable) an end-of-course examination. The syllabus is wide-ranging and may encompass the board vocabulary and variety of styles found in literature and other general reading and in the world of entertainment and the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course objectives</td>
<td>Defined precisely in relation to the needs analysis findings. May be worded in terms of the tasks/skills required in the job (job-experienced learners) or course of study (pre-experienced learners), or in terms of required language improvement (e.g. command of structures or pronunciation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination courses (e.g. Cambridge First Certificate) will have fixed pre-determined objectives. Individuals may have their own objectives: interest in the culture; desire to travel or live abroad; a feeling that language skills will be useful or will lead to better job prospects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Print, audio, and video materials can be brought off the shell for BE – but they may not meet the specific needs of an individual or group. It may be necessary to develop materials for a specific course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In most parts of the world, there is now a wide choice of off-the-shelf materials for GE teaching at all levels. Materials development by the teacher is not usually required or expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Many learning tasks and activities will be the same as on a GE course, especially for teaching structures, vocabulary, and social English. Role-plays are common to both although the situations and language will differ. BE also borrows ideas from management training–e.g. problem-solving, decision-making, and team-building tasks. Job-experienced learners will be given many opportunities to present and discuss aspects of their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be a broader range of techniques in use in the GE classroom. Many activities are designed to make learning more ‘fun’, and variety for its own sake is important to maintain interest and motivation in the absence of specific needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>In company language training, there are usually time constraints because of the need for training to be cost-effective. In colleges and universities, time for language study is also likely to be limited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the state education system, general language study will usually be open-ended. Even examinations can be repeated if necessary. An exception would be someone preparing for holiday or residence abroad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.2: Business and General English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner expectation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Business English</th>
<th>Evaluation of progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is noteworthy that under sundry labels the Business English learner was set forth. As a case in point, Ellis &amp; Johnson (1994: 15-17) pinpoint three underlying brands:</td>
<td>Learners are likely to be more goal-oriented and to expect success. Business people normally have high expectations of efficiency, quality, and professionalism.</td>
<td>Formal examinations include a written paper in which marks are awarded for grammatical accuracy as well as range of vocabulary and appropriacy. Oral examinations also take into account fluency, pronunciation and general communicative ability. Informal assessment (e.g. of class performance) is likely to focus mainly on grammatical accuracy, appropriacy of vocabulary, expression and pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-experience learners: Students at business schools – who have not yet started their careers.</td>
<td>In colleges and universities there may be set (written and oral) examinations. In company language training there is usually no examination, but the training organization may use an off-the-shelf BE test. In informal assessment, the emphasis is usually on evaluating the process of communication – i.e. did the speaker/writer express the idea precisely enough and appropriately enough for the target situation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-experience learners: Junior company members and learners who are moving jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-experienced learners: Employees who need BE for a wide range of motives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frendo (2005: 1-2), on the other hand, affords broader sorts which are compartmentalized in line with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.17 Characteristics of Business English

#### 1.17.1 The Business English Learner

It is noteworthy that under sundry labels the Business English learner was set forth. As a case in point, Ellis & Johnson (1994: 15-17) pinpoint three underlying brands:

- Pre-experience learners: Students at business schools – who have not yet started their careers.
- Low-experience learners: Junior company members and learners who are moving jobs.
- Job-experienced learners: Employees who need BE for a wide range of motives.

Frendo (2005: 1-2), on the other hand, affords broader sorts which are compartmentalized in line with:
Experience: Pre-experience learners who go through business English whether at university, secondary school or those who plan to pursue a business career. Job-experienced learners who are au fait with their undertakings and thus who are acutely aware of their BE needs. General business-experienced learners who are not bereft of work experience yet they need English for a particular end or to set off on another job.

Level in the organization’s hierarchy: Since the company’s echelons range from senior managers to junior staff, so each echelon undergoes distinct training. The latter can be one-to-one, intensive or extensive according to the standing they hold.

National culture: So as to cope with this, cross-cultural educational institutions sometimes constitute groups of culturally diverse learners. Otherwise, they may set them up separately since those whose communicative styles diverge may in effect affect the learning process.

Need: Taking heed of learners’ needs is imperative. Needs tend to be precise needs (as answering a company telephone hotline), general intent (as enhancing the English level) or tasks which are peculiar to secretaries, accountants or technicians.

Language level: Learners’ level of proficiency may be closely akin to others (elementary, intermediate or advanced). Owing to this fact, learners of each level form a group according to a set of norms as sitting for a test, etc.

### 1.17.2 The Business English Teacher

What are the tasks and insights of teachers within the business province? In fact, Frendo (2005: 5) casts light on the mark earmarked for BE. Within the latter, the tie between teachers and learners is synergetic, i.e. while the learners are absolutely cognizant of the nucleus of their job, the teachers are merely well-acquainted with the communicative aspect of language, though they are not destitute of certain attributes. Along with professionalism,
credibility and adaptability, familiarity with the business environment must be among their endowments. In this respect, their tasks take on three aspects:

- As trainers: Teachers are expected to alter the attitude and aptitude of learners to enable them to execute particular tasks.
- As coaches: Teachers are in charge to support the learners to pinpoint their plus points and flaws, and act accordingly.
- As consultants: Teachers are experts who maintain an outstanding status. Hence, they allot a training supplier, appoint the spot where the courses are run, sort out the communicative needs, etc.

In contrast, as Ellis & Johnson (1994: 26) highlight: “Whatever the background, it is important to stress that the business English trainer is primarily a language teacher. S/he does not need to be an expert in any particular business. It is the learners who have the specific content knowledge and who are able to bring that knowledge to the classroom.”

Moreover, Dudley-Evans & St John (1998: 60-61) hold those who run language training within a company as practitioners who are compelled to be aware of certain realms. The latter are de facto fivelfold:

- A knowledge of the communicative functioning of English in business contexts;
- An understanding of the business people’s expectations and learning strategies;
- An understanding of the psychology of personal and interpersonal interactions in cross-cultural settings;
- Some knowledge of management theories and practice;
- First-class training skills.

### 1.18 Business Communication Skills

Communication is the life blood of business, inasmuch as no business can develop in the absence of effective communication system (Bisen & Priya, 2009: 2).
As to Dudley-Evans & St Johns (1996: 26), business communication skills are those that are grounded on language. In other words, in contrast to business contexts, they do not lean on any specialised knowledge, since people ordinarily are meeting, discussing, corresponding, and these are very language-dependent activities. Nonetheless, the latter are hinged on verbal language. Along with verbal language, non-verbal language and awareness of the audience are among the other contributing components.

**Figure 1.4: The Features of the Work Environment**

1.18.1 **BE and Written Communication**

Within BE, writing and reading are engrained. They, all in all, encompass emails, letters, reports, contracts and manuals.

1.18.2 **BE and Spoken Communication**

Within BE, listening and speaking are also omnipresent. They generally encapsulate telephoning, socializing, negotiations, meetings and presentations (Osborne, 2005: 105).
1.19 The Business English Syllabus

Basturkmen (2010: 55) asserts that courses range from low to high specificity as shown in the figure below. Thus, they are organized at the behest of a particular workplace or academic spot.

![Figure 1.5: The Wide- and Narrow-angled Continuum](image)

Furthermore, Strelchonok (2012: 577) stresses that the rationale behind the BE course is:

- To develop students’ reading, speaking, listening, and writing skills in BE in order for the students to understand a range of work or business-related information and to respond appropriately when required.

- To develop students’ business communication skills: meeting, presentation, negotiation in order for the students to be able to interact in a range of work or business related communications.

- To acquaint students with specialist terminology in order for the students to understand and produce a range of language which will be clearly understood in professional environment.
To familiarize students with basic business concepts in order for the students to be able to communicate effectively in international working environment.

Conclusion

Within this chapter, ESP, the popular catchphrase of presently English language teaching programs, has been investigated from different perspectives. The latter encompass its genesis, development and types. By analogy with GE, there have been occasional forays into the role of ESP practitioner as one of the most distinctive features in the literature. In addition to fulfilling the usual role of a language teacher, ESP practitioner may be required to deal with administrative, personnel, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary, curricular, and pedagogical issues that may be unfamiliar to general English teacher. By the same token, BE has been also scrutinized. Subsequently, the ensuing chapter will delve deeper into this new assigned role which stands for analyzing the learners’ needs and designing a syllabus.
Introduction

Within the traditional English language teaching, teachers are outstandingly reckoned as the main stakeholder involved whereas learners are often overlooked. Consequently, courses have not yielded the anticipated upshots and have proved inadequate in addressing the learners’ needs. As a matter of fact, to ensure that courses remain aligned with the learners’ requirements, it is indispensable to take heed of learners’ prospective needs, deficiencies, and preferences. Along this chapter, we attempt to bestow the most eminent contributions related to the concepts of needs analysis and syllabus design.

2.1 Needs Analysis Delineation

Needs analysis (otherwise known as needs assessment) mainly stands for “Those activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students.” (Brown, 1995: 35). As to Graves (2000: 98), needs analysis is:

“An ongoing process of gathering information about students’ needs and preferences, interpreting the information, and then making course decisions based on the interpretation in order to meet the needs”.

On the other hands, Dudley-Evans & St John (1998: 125) reckon needs analysis as a concept that encapsulates the following aspects:

- Professional information about the learners: The tasks and activities students are/will be using English for (target situation analysis and objective needs).
- Personal information about the learners: Factors which may affect the way they learn such as previous learning experiences, cultural information, reasons for
attending the course and expectations of it, attitude to English (wants, means and subjective needs).

- English language information: What their current skills and language use are (PSA) which allows to assess their lacks.
- The learners’ lacks: The gap between the present situation analysis of the learners and their professional information.
- Language learning information: Effective ways of learning the skills and language in learners’ lacks (learning needs).
- Professional communication information about the learners’ professional information: Knowledge of how language and skills are used in the target situation (linguistic, discourse and genre analyses).
- What is wanted from the course.
- Information about the environment in which the course will be run (means analysis).

2.2 Needs Analysis Purposes

Richards (2001: 52) purports that NA in language teaching serves different purposes which enable:

- To find out what language skills a learner needs in order to perform a particular role, such as sales manager, tour guide, or university student.
- To help determine if an existing course adequately addresses the needs of potential students.
- To determine which students from a group are most in need of training in particular language skills.
- To identify a change of direction that people in a reference group feel is important.
- To identify a gap between what students are able to do and what they need to be able to do.
- To collect information about a particular problem learners are experiencing.

On the other hand, as Brieger (1997, cited in Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998: 58) submits:

“Needs analysis for Business English will set out to identify the range of general and specialist language knowledge required, together with general and professional communication skills.”

2.3 Needs Analysis Procedures

Graves (2000: 100) propounds that an assortment of decisions, actions, and reflections is entangled with the process of needs assessment. The latter is de facto viewed as a cycle as displayed in the figure below.

![Figure 2.1: The Needs Assessment Cycle](image-url)
In fact, the modus operandi of performing needs analysis can be either inductive (case studies, interviews, observation, etc.) or deductive (questionnaires, surveys, etc.). West (1994: 7-8) affords an array of ways:

- Pre-course placement/diagnostic tests which estimate the language level of the learners.
- Entry tests on arrival which can have a diagnostic value and identify learners’ language weaknesses and lacks.
- Observation of classes which are of value mainly for deficiency analysis.
- Surveys based on questionnaires which have been established as the most common method and help researchers draw a profile of learners’ needs/lacks/wants/learning styles/strategies etc. and at the same time make them aware of these needs/lacks, etc.
- Structured interview which consists of pre-planned questions. Answers can either be recorded or written down.
- Learner diaries which can be used as supplementary to end-of-course questionnaires offering retrospective, qualitative information.
- Case studies which provide in-depth information about the needs and difficulties of individual learners or groups.
- Final evaluation/feedback usually in the form of questionnaires which provides information on the evaluation of the course and helps in designing/improving the next course.

Furthermore, it is evident that depending on the method of data collection, NA can be:

- **Off-line**: When it is conducted in advance of the course, so that there is plenty of time for syllabus design and materials preparation.
- **On-line** or **first-day**: When it is carried out when learners start the course.
- **Ongoing needs re-analysis**: Which reformulates objectives periodically as awareness of the demands of the target situation increases and the needs become more focused (ibid: 5).

### 2.4 Needs Analysis Taxonomies

As to Hutchinson & Waters (1987), needs are split up into two taxonomies. 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). In addition, a tripartite subdivision of target needs was put forward:

- **Necessities**: What is necessary in the learners’ use of language?, and they fit into required knowledge.
- **Lacks**: What do the learners lack?, and they fit into present knowledge.
- **Wants**: What do the learners wish to learn?, and they fit into subjective needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE (i.e. as perceived by course designers)</th>
<th>NECESSITIES</th>
<th>LACHS</th>
<th>WANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To succeed in Business English Studies</td>
<td>The English needed for success in Business English Studies</td>
<td>(Presumably) areas of English needed for Business English Studies</td>
<td>To succeed in Business English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTIVE (i.e. as perceived by learners)</td>
<td>To reluctantly cope with a ‘second-best’ situation</td>
<td>Means of doing Business Studies</td>
<td>To undertake Business Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.1: Necessities, Lacks and Wants (Hutchinson & Waters 1987: 58)**

### 2.5 Approaches to Needs Analysis

Regardless the fact of being obscurely defined owing to the onward march of its progress, needs analysis nevertheless confined the stress on a set of approaches which extended its compass. These encompass: target-situation analysis, deficiency analysis,

2.5.1 Target Situation Analysis

In fact, Dudley-Evans & St John (1998, cited in Hyland, 2006: 74) spell out the TSA ambit as:

“Target situation analysis concerns the learners’ future roles and the linguistic skills and knowledge they need to perform competently in their disciplines. This relates to communication needs rather than learning needs and involves mainly objective and product-oriented data: identifying the contexts of language use, observing the language events in these contexts, and collecting and analysing target genres.”

In addition, TSA was viewed as the germinal phase of needs analysis which was inducted in the initial outputs of the Council of Europe (ELTDU, 1970; Stuart & Lee, 1972/1985; Trim et al., 1975). It may be conducted in a bid for:

- Establishing priorities in terms of various languages – English, German, etc.
- Establishing priorities in terms of skills in one language – speaking, reading, etc.
- Establishing priorities in terms of LSP situations, functions or tasks – speaking on the telephone, listening to lectures, etc. (Howard & Brown, 1997: 71).

In addition, the most notable framework for TSA is the so-called model “Communication Needs Processor” set up by Munby (1978) in “Communicative Syllabus Design”. The model encloses needs to be dissected when a language course, a target-level performance come to a close (Jordan, 1997: 23).

2.5.2 Deficiency Analysis

It therefore focuses on information about what the learners lacks. It came to light as a criticism to TSA. Learners’ present language proficiency has to gain much attention. Now needs turn to be termed lacks, deficiencies and subjective needs (Howard & Brown,
In the same vain, Basturkmen (2010: 18) define it as “Lacks or the gap between what the learner needs to know to operate in the target situation and the learner’s present language proficiency.”

Moreover, Jordan (1997: 26) maintains that deficiency analysis can mold the mainstay of the language syllabus since it should lay on information as to the gap between the present and target proficiency.

### 2.5.3 Strategy Analysis

Basturkmen (2010: 18) refers to the precept of this concept as “The preferred approaches and methods in teaching and learning.” In the same vein, Howard & Brown (1997: 71) assert that, in the main, strategy analysis aims to unveil learners’ preferences with respect to teaching methods, and learning styles or strategies.

Allwright (1982, cited in Jordan, 1997: 27), on the other hand, stresses that learners themselves who take stand on the insight of their needs, and in return addresses three aspects:

- **Needs**: The skills that belong to learners themselves;
- **Wants**: The learners’ needs that take precedence over any other ones;
- **Lacks**: They imply the disparity between the learner’s existent know-how and the desired one.

Needless to say, there are cultural diversities, academic cultural conventions, wide disparities in learning strategies and teaching methods. But insofar as the learner awareness of these aspects, learner autonomy when fostered the prospects of learning would be boosted.
2.5.4 Means Analysis

As Frendo (2005: 25) contends: “A means analysis is a description of the training environment: what is available in terms of equipment, facilities, and time, and perhaps more importantly, what is not.” Basturkmen (2010: 18) also attends to the current trend and labels it as “An identification of the constraints and opportunities in the teaching situation”. This classification de facto comprehends information on the classroom culture, learner factors, teacher profiles and status of language teaching in the organization. In the same strain, Howard & Brown (1997: 71-72) claim that the analysis tends to contain four main facets:

- Classroom culture/ learner factors – what is or is not possible within particular educational culture or tradition.
- Staff profiles/ teacher profiles – what is or is not possible with the staff available, considering numbers, language level, LSP background, etc.
- Status of language teaching/ institutional profiles – what is or is not possible in giving the status of LSP within the organization or institution, considering timetable and resource allocations, etc.
- Agents and management change – an assessment of what innovations are necessary or possible in order to establish an effective LSP programme.

2.5.5 Language Audit

As Jordan (1997: 28) purports: “They (language audits) are large-scale exercises in defining language needs carried out for companies, regions or countries.” Moreover, Long (2005: 40-41) posits: “Whereas a NA usually provides detailed information about the needs of individuals, and occasionally of much larger social groups, a language audit takes
institutions or organizations as the unit of analysis and is usually conducted through a quantified general survey”.

All in all, needs analysis, over a span of two decades, has undergone a variety of alterations which helped in molding its ground.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/period</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Scope of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 1970s</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>EOP - Target situation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later 1970s</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>EAP - Target situation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>ESP &amp; GLT</td>
<td>- Target situation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deficiency analysis (Present situation analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1990s</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>- Means analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Language audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning-centered approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Evolution of Needs Analysis (Howard & Brown, 1997: 70)

2.5.6 Rights Analysis

Apparently, regardless of the manifold facets of needs which assume learner needs and target needs, the latter is nonetheless presumed to be neutral and pre-existing. Consequently, learning and instruction are demoted and are to cope with external demands likewise. Otherwise, through rights analysis, learners’ awareness of their rights is fostered and the outright scope of learning is widened (Benesch, 2001, cited in Paltridge & Starfield, 2013: 483).
Hyland (2006: 79) stresses: “Rights analysis involves evaluating the findings of needs analysis, recognizing the challenges that students face and interrogating the results to create more democratic and participatory involvement by students in decision making.”

2.6 Needs Analysis Issues

Needs analysis was prone to censure owing to the fact that it is a means of fitting outsiders into the communicative practices of linguistically privileged in-groups. It purports to be a neutral enterprise but in fact is often used by institutions to get others to conform to established communicative practices (Benesche, 2001, cited in Basturkmen, 2006: 20).

2.7 Syllabus and Curriculum

Is there a disparity between course, syllabus and curriculum? In effect, the significations ascribed to these concepts occasionally intersect or diverge, and even tends to be misused or misunderstood. Hence, it is indispensable to glance at their nuances of meaning to ascertain the precepts of each trend.

From an etymological standpoint, syllabus purports ‘a label’ or ‘table of contents’ and curriculum ‘race course’ or ‘racing chariot’.

2.7.1 Definition of Curriculum

Curriculum and syllabus are poles apart yet the latter pertains to the former. Richards & Rodgers (1986, cited in Davies, 2007: 89) maintain: “Curriculum may of course encompass syllabus.” Graves (1996) portrays the ‘curriculum’ as a broad statement of the philosophy, purposes, design, and implementation of the entire language teaching program. First and foremost, syllabus is reckoned as subservient/subsidiary to curriculum from the British stance. Otherwise, while syllabus stands for the content or subject matter of an individual subject, curriculum attends to the totality of content to be taught and aims
to be realized within one school or educational system. Contrariwise, from the American stance, syllabus and curriculum are swappable or likewise “curriculum tends to be synonymous with syllabus in the British sense.” (White, 1988: 4). On the other hand, Stenhouse (1975: 4) defines the curriculum as “an attempt to communicate the essential properties and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice”.

2.7.2 Definition of Syllabus

Allen (1984, cited in Nunan, 1988:6) sustains the same guideline when he states “Syllabus refers to that subpart of curriculum which is concerned with a specification of what units will be taught”. McKay (1978, 11) purports that “A syllabus provides a focus for what should be studied, along with a rationale for how that content should be selected and ordered.”

Bastukmen (2006: 21), on the other hand, affords a perspective on syllabus through a set of attributes:

1- Consists of a comprehensive list of
   - content items (words, structures, topics)
   - process items (tasks, methods)
2- Is ordered (easier, more essential items first)
3- Has explicit objectives (usually expressed in the introduction)
4- Is a public document
5- May indicate a time schedule
6- May indicate preferred methodology or approach
7- May recommend materials

**Figure 2.2: Characteristics of a Syllabus**
2.7.3 Definition of Course

Hutchinson & Waters (1987: 65) define it as “An integrated series of teaching-learning experiences, whose ultimate aim is to lead the learners to a particular state of knowledge.”

All in all, in accordance with the following slants we can set apart the line of demarcation between the terms (Singh, 2005: 29-30).

- The Whole and the Part:
  - (a) Syllabus is a part of curriculum.
  - (b) Curriculum is a complete teaching process.

- The kind of knowledge imparted:
  - (a) Syllabus is a theoretical aspect.
  - (b) Curriculum is a wider aspect.

- Who prepares it:
  - (a) Educationists prepare syllabus.
  - (b) Teachers prepare curriculum.

- Emphasis on which aspect:
  - (a) Syllabus is related to cognitive aspect.
  - (b) Curriculum is related to balances and harmonious development of the child.

- Various activities performed:
  - (a) Syllabus is related to content.
  - (b) Curriculum is related to cognitive, conative and affective level.

Furthermore, we can draw a conclusion that syllabus design is a part of course development, and a course is part of a curriculum (Graves, 1996: 3).
2.8 Approaches to Syllabus Design

Syllabus design’s unfolding can be labeled as a progression of suppositions about language learning, hence syllabi can be sorted in accordance with diverse norms. Breen as case in point used two main paradigms or frames of reference to classify syllabi. One of these being ‘propositional’, and the other termed ‘process’ (Breen, 1987: 81). Thus, White (1988: 44) draws a distinction between “Type A” and “Type B” syllabi as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A: What is to be learnt?</th>
<th>Type B: How is it to be learnt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interventionist</td>
<td>Non-interventionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External to the learner</td>
<td>Internal to the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other directed</td>
<td>Inner directed or self fulfilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined by authority</td>
<td>Negotiated between learners and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as decision-maker</td>
<td>Learner and teacher as joint decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content = what the subject is to the expert</td>
<td>Content = what the learner brings and wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content = a gift to the learner from the teacher or knower</td>
<td>Objectives described afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives defined in advance</td>
<td>Assessment in relationship to learners’ criteria of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by achievement or by mastery</td>
<td>Doing things for or with the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things to the learner</td>
<td>Doing things for or with the learner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Language Syllabus Design (White, 1988: 44)

To parallel Breen's attention to paradigms, Long & Crookes (1993) submit a dissimilarity between two superordinate categories: analytic and synthetic syllabi (as shown in figure below).
2.8.1 The Propositional Paradigm (Synthetic)

2.8.1.1 The Grammatical Syllabus

Stemming from the classical languages’ analysis and description, the grammatical (otherwise known as structural or formal) syllabus indubitably emerged to be the most vital and reliable syllabus type in language teaching. First and foremost, it is grounded in descriptive linguistics, the contrastive theories of the 1950s and 1960s, and thus the outputs of “traditional, descriptive” grammarians in the 1970s and 1980s, revolved around surface structure dissimilarities between languages.

Richards & Rodgers (2001: 42) state: “A structural syllabus is a list of the basic structures and sentence patterns of English, arranged according to their order of presentation.”
2.8.1.1 Merits

Krahnke (1987) mentions the positive characteristics of Structural syllabus as:

- Structure or grammar is the most general component of communicative competence. Every utterance, if it is reasonably well-formed, involves a given structure, which can be used for a variety of functions, situations, and meanings.
- Its content is relatively easy to describe. Noun, verb, imperative, plural, and gerund are terms that are generally shared within the language profession, and there is general agreement about what they mean.

2.8.1.1.2 Demerits

The key deficiencies of such sort of syllabi as Richards (2001: 153) claims:

- They represent only a partial dimension of language proficiency.
- They do not reflect the acquisition sequences seen in naturalistic second language acquisition.
- They focus on the sentence rather than on longer units of discourse.
- They focus on form rather than meaning.
- They do not address communicative skills.

2.8.1.2 The Functional Syllabus

The functional (otherwise known as notional, or notional-functional) syllabus emanates as a surrogate for the formal syllabus. In fact, it amalgamates two entities: A notional or conceptual facet that incorporates concepts as (time, space, movement, cause and effect) and a functional facet that illuminates an intentional or purposive use of language (White, 1988: 75).
2.8.1.2.1 Merits

- It takes the communicative facts of language into account from the beginning without losing sight of grammatical and situational factors. (Wilkins, 1976: 19)
- Aside from incorporating grammar and lexis, it also pins down topics, notions, and concepts which are required meanwhile communicating (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: 21).

2.8.1.2.2 Demerits

It was singled out for criticism since:

- The selection and grading of items become much more complex.
- It suffers in particular from a lack of any kind of systematic conceptual framework. (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987: 32)
- Textbooks that claim to have a functional base may be “sorely inadequate and even misleading in their representation of language as interaction.” (Berns, 1985, cited in Brown, 2000: 253)

2.8.1.3 The Situational Syllabus

White (1988: 63) claims that “In a situationally based syllabus a series of situations will form the main organizing principle.” In the same vein, Brown (1995: 8-9) asserts that while language reflects miscellaneous contexts, so the situational syllabus bestows a sharper focus upon:

- Organizing regular situations as at the airport, at the hotel, at a party, etc.
- Selecting probable situations that learners may come across.
- Sequencing situations that stand for a chain of events whether chronologically or the most likely to occur.
2.8.1.3.1 Merits

The potential advantage of situational syllabi is to appoint student’s knowledge of the world as a buttress to learning, and thus to accord realistic, and consequently prompting materials (Alexander, 1976 cited in Mahdi et al., 2012: 67).

2.8.1.3.2 Demerits

Richards (2001: 156-7) asserts:

- Little is known about the language used in different situations, so selection of teaching items is typically based on intuition.
- Language used in specific situations may not transfer to other situations.
- Grammar is dealt with incidently, so a situational syllabus may result in gaps in a student’s grammatical knowledge.
- Situational syllabi often lead to a phase-book approach.

2.8.1.4 The Topical Syllabus

In organizing ESL/EFL textbooks, topical syllabi are viewed to be a prevalent and apt method.

2.8.1.4.1 Merits

As the situational syllabi, they are endowed with a motivational potential, mainly if selection is based on needs identification, performed in terms of topics or on the findings of research, on frequency of topics in the conversations of people of the same age as the learner.
2.8.1.4.2 Demerits

Owing to the intricacy of drawing a divergence between situation and topic boundaries or forecasting what they contain, their use as units of analysis proved to be awkward (Long & Crooks, 1993).

2.8.1.5 The Lexical Syllabus

According to Skelton & Willis (2004), it consists of ‘grammar, expressions of notions and functions but the organizing principle is lexical’.

2.8.1.5.1 Merits

The lexical syllabus not only subsumes a stuctural syllabus, it also indicates how the ‘structures’ which make up that syllabus should be exemplified. It does this by emphasizing the importance of natural language (Willis, 1990: vi).

2.8.1.5.2 Demerits

Lewis (2002, cited in Mahdi et al., 2012: 78) posits its Achilles’ heel as:

- The inflected forms which are used in the form of a list of words do not conform somewhat to natural language use.
- The most recurrent words which stand for function words are not so expedient to convey the intended message.
- The grammar is whether inducted intuitively or decided by the words used. Hence, the multifarious aspects of grammar tend to be intricate to contend with.
- The array of distinct lexical items can not be covered entirely within a course. Instead of that, the bulk of lexicon can be procured from an arsenal of sources.
2.8.1.6 The Skill-based Syllabus

As Mohsenifar (2008) puts it, in a "skill-based syllabus", the content of the language teaching is a collection of specific abilities that may play a part in using language.

2.8.1.6.1 Merits

Richards (2001: 161) extols their virtues as:

- They focus on behavior or performance.
- They teach skills that can transfer to many other situations.
- They identify teachable and learnable units.
- They focus on performance in relation to specific tasks and therefore provide a practical framework for designing courses and teaching materials.

2.8.1.6.2 Demerits

According to Willis et al. (2005, cited in Mahdi et al., 2012: 74), a skills-based syllabus is not much more than a list of skills and micro-skills to be practiced. But can we really depend on a syllabus which is merely a list of skills? And, more importantly, in their experiment of implementing a skill-based syllabus they observed that teachers felt at sea because they felt they had little or no guidance in the choice of texts to use in order for students to practice these skills.

2.8.1.7 The Relational Syllabus

It is founded on the basis of “notional relations such as cause-effect, or discourse relations, such as question-reply, or clause structure” (White, 1988: 78). This syllabus failed to be popular because it includes only limited elements of the total linguistic system.
2.8.2 The Process Paradigm (Analytic)

2.8.2.1 The Task-based Syllabus

Ellis (2003: 9-10) affords the following underlying attributes of task-based syllabi:

- They involve a plan for learner activity;
- They have a primary focus on meaning;
- They engage with real-world authentic language use;
- They focus on any or all of the four language skills;
- They engage learners in cognitive skills in order to accomplish them;
- They have a defined communication-based learning outcome.

Thus, as to Nunan (1988: 45) tasks are twofold: real-world tasks and pedagogical tasks. The former refer to tasks to tackle beyond the classroom and the latter tend to occur within the classroom.

2.8.2.1.1 Merits

As a pretext for streamlining certain items, grasping them well, the recurrence of the grammatical and functional items within a distinct variety of contexts is entrenched in task-based syllabi (Nunan, 2004: 30).

2.8.2.1.2 Demerits

- They focus on fluency at the expense of accuracy (Nation & Macalister, 2010: 81).
- Krahnke (1987) also believes that the evaluation in task-based syllabuses can be difficult because the nature of tasks or tasks-based learning makes it difficult to measure learners’ knowledge by the utilization of traditional discrete-point achievement tests.
2.8.2.2 The Procedural Syllabus

Johnson (1982) labels it as “A syllabus of tasks which are graded conceptually and grouped by similarity.” It was singled out for criticism according to Prabhu (1987: 94) in view of the fact that it only envisages constant effort by learners to deploy their language recourses in the classroom, and does not attempt either to demarcate areas of real-life use for different stages of teaching or to bring about a thorough learning of use in some functions at each stage.

2.8.2.3 The Negotiated Syllabus

It is deemed as a social and problem-solving model for syllabus design, in which the learner occupies the pivotal role and where negotiation is the core concept. This model draws upon general philosophical and educational principles rather than on second language acquisition principles, and its origins can be found in the work of Breen (1984), Breen and Candlin (1987), and Breen and Littlejohn (2000).

2.8.2.3.1 Merits

Nation & Macalister (2010: 156) set forth its core assets as:

- Its responsiveness to the wants of the learners and their involvement in the process of learning.

- The learners’ involvement in shaping the syllabus has a strong effect on motivation, satisfaction and commitment to the course.

- The negotiation once is carried out in English may espouse the most involving meaning-focused activities in the program.

- The negotiation also develops learners’ awareness of the goals of language-learning activities and how these goals can be achieved.
2.8.2.3.2 Demerits

On the other hand, learners may be reluctant to negotiate or to let their classmates negotiate because they feel it should be the teacher’s expertise guiding the course:

- Learners may also not know enough of the range of options they could choose from and thus may make unimaginative choices.
- Learners may find it difficult to reach agreement about what they should be doing.
- Teachers may feel that using a negotiated syllabus removes too much of their power and status (ibid: 155).

2.8.2.4 The Learner-centered Syllabus

White (1988: 95) put forward that “A learner-led syllabus takes directions determined by the learners, so that it is impossible to predict in advance exactly what route the syllabus will follow, since it is the pace and direction set by the learners that will dictate its shape”. The fact that learners do follow some kind of internal syllabus has been referred to a number of occasions, and it is this kind of learner-led syllabus which constitutes the basis of the program to be followed.

2.8.2.5 The Natural Syllabus

By forging a nexus between a rational-cognitive attitude and a communicative emphasis on language use, the Natural Approach has broken new ground (Dubin & Olshtain, 1986: 36). In fact, Yalden (1987: 64) propounds: “It is an approach based on second language acquisition theory, and the syllabus is assumed to be a natural one, resident in the learner.” Krashen & Terrell (1983: 58) further expound its basic tenets as:

- The goal of the Natural Approach is communication skills.
- Comprehension precedes production.
- Production emerges (i.e. learners are not forced to respond).
- Activities which promote subconscious acquisition rather than conscious learning are central.
- The effective filter is lowered (i.e. reducing learner anxiety).

2.8.2.5.1 Merits and Demerits

Albeit the endeavor to highlight utterly the necessities for learning and acquisition, the Natural Approach as to SLA theory exists as ‘a classroom method’, and somehow may prohibit ‘the communication of interesting and relevant topics’ (Krashen, 1982: 140).

2.8.3 Syllabus Design Criteria

The sundry types of language syllabus (whether synthetic or analytic) might be taken concurrently by the ELT teacher and the ESP practitioner as an underpinning in the planning of a year's work. According to Harmer (2001: 295-296): “Whatever type it is, every syllabus needs to be developed on the basis of certain criteria”. These criteria are presumed to inform decisions about selecting, ordering, including or not each item and ultimately where and when it might be subsumed.

He puts forth four criteria to be taken into account by the teacher. These criteria are as follows:

- Learnability, i.e. the teacher starts to teach easier things first and then increases the level of difficulty as the learners advance through the syllabus.
- Frequency, i.e. the teacher incorporates the most frequent items in the target language and then the ones that are rarely used by native speakers.
- Coverage, i.e. to teach the words and structures that have larger scope of use than others. For example, to introduce the ‘going to’ structure to express future first because it is used in more situations than the present continuous.
Usefulness, i.e. to introduce words that learners are called to use frequently to develop their linguistic ability either in the classroom environment or everyday life.

2.8.4 Syllabus Design and Methodology

The traditional distinction between ‘methodology’ and ‘syllabus design’ puts forward that the latter deals with the selection and grading of content (the what of teaching) and the former deals with the selection of learning tasks and activities (the how of teaching). Yet, with the advent of communicative language teaching, the distinction between them becomes hard to sustain (Nunan, 1988: 5).

2.8.5 The Role of the Teacher in Syllabus Design

In spite of the fact that syllabi can be designed at the discretion of some teachers on which their teaching programs are grounded, teachers are predominantly viewed to be consumers of other people’s syllabi as Bell (1983, cited in Nunan, 1988: 7) maintains, i.e. occupying the role of implementing the plans of applied linguists, government agencies, and so forth.

In fact, so as to determine if classroom teachers are the ones in charge of designing, implementing, and evaluating their own curriculum, a study of an educational system was set out. In doing so, the following question was posed: “In your experience, for which of these tasks do you see the classroom teacher as having primary responsibility?”

The assumed tasks are (The scale from 0 ‘no responsibility’ to 5 ‘total responsibility’ is used to rate each task):

- Identifying learners’ communicative needs
  0 1 2 3 4 5
- Selecting and grading syllabus content
  0 1 2 3 4 5
- Grouping learners into different classes
  or learning arrangements
  0 1 2 3 4 5
- Selecting /creating materials and learning
  Activities  0 1 2 3 4 5
- Monitoring and assessing learner progress  0 1 2 3 4 5
- Course evaluation  0 1 2 3 4 5

In reply to the question, one group of teachers maintained that barring the third task (grouping learners into different classes or learning arrangements), they are on standby to undertake all the above tasks. Some felt quite comfortable with an expanded professional role and others felt that people with specific expertise who are answerable for carrying out syllabus development, and believed that they were receiving requests to take on tasks for which they were not effectively trained (ibid: 8).

2.8.6 Syllabus Design Issues

In this respect, Harding (2007: 17) submits guidelines for ESP course design and molds valuable measures to be espoused by ESP practitioners. These encapsulate a number of probing queries:

- Is it an intensive course (concentrated into one period of time) or an extensive course (spread out over a long period of time)?
- Is it assessed or non-assessed?
- Is it meeting immediate needs (learners are working and studying in parallel) or delayed needs (learners are pre-experience and will be working on the specialism sometime in the future)?
- Is the group homogenous or heterogenous? (Are they all at the same level of English? Do they all have the same level of knowledge of, and involvement in, the specialism?)
- Is the course designed by the teacher or the institution or negotiated with the learner?
Conclusion

This chapter has provided a broad overview related to needs analysis and the assorted practices in syllabus design. Some key concepts in ESP syllabus design have been highlighted so as to draw the disparity between syllabus and curriculum design. It has shown that in ESP, learners’ needs are of focal significance. By pinning these needs down, analyzing them, the teacher can adopt and make use of the apposite teaching methodology and plan the apt syllabus in order to help the learners to hone their specific language skills. Nonetheless, tailoring a syllabus to meet specific needs is time-consuming owing to the fact that it entails a thorough analysis and a continual checking of needs and objectives.
Introduction

Needless to say, it is requisite to pursue the line of inquiry through a scaffold. The latter holds the methods and techniques to be espoused in assembling and analyzing a germane collection of data, keeping in view the research aim along with staff, time and money which are subject to reliability. So, it is fairly true to reckon research design as the glue that fastens all the research facets. Accordingly, this chapter is geared to the description of the research methods, the sample of informants, the pros and cons of the instruments deployed along with the methods of analysis of data collected.

3.1 Delineation of Research Design

It can be referred to as “An operating model or blueprint for a research project, which accounts for internal reasoning (causality) and external reasoning (generalizability)” (Griffie, 2012: 44). Otherwise, Given (2008: 931) defines it as “the logic that links the data to be collected to the initial questions that were asked”. Its attributes as Kothari (2004: 32) purports are:

- It is a plan that specifies the sources and types of information relevant to the research problem.
- It is a strategy specifying which approach will be used for gathering and analyzing the data.
- It also includes the time and cost budgets since most studies are done under these two constraints.

3.2 Research Design Components

As the figure below illustrates, research design encompasses a wide-ranging constituents that stand for its rationale (Balnaves & Caputi, 2001: 66).
3.3 Research Method

First and foremost, undertaking a research with methodological rigor is of paramount importance since it is grounded on the fact of picking out the proper method. The latter de facto may assume a legion of forms, stand for manifold precepts, and can be realized in diverse ways. In the present research, the investigator opted for a case study owing to the theoretical motives that are cited below.
On the one hand, Anderson (1993: 152) maintains: “A case study is concerned with how and why things happen, allowing the investigation of contextual realities and the differences between what was planned and what actually occurred.” In the same strain, Yin (2003 : 13-14) asserts:

- A case study is an empirical inquiry that
  - investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when
  - the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.

- The case study inquiry
  - copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result
  - relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result
  - benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis.

On the other, Wei & Moyer (2008: 101) expound the pros and cons of case studies as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple sources of data.</td>
<td>- Limitation in generalizability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Richness and depth of data.</td>
<td>- Susceptibility to bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intensive study and possibility of considering extreme cases.</td>
<td>- Unsuitability for statistical analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need for repeated access to subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need for skills in many techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Advantages and Disadvantages of Case study

In addition, the study is reckoned as single-site, inasmuch as the training was carried out on Samha premises.
3.4 Research Type

The current study is intended to be an exploratory investigation aimed at exploring the student employees’ use of English along with the teachers’ standpoints about the training held by IN-tuition. Moreover, within its compass, the description and explanation of both the target situation needs and the learning needs are omnipresent. According to Yin (2003: 5), case study hues are threefold: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory. An exploratory case study (whether based on a single or multiple cases) is aimed at defining the questions and hypotheses of a subsequent (not necessarily a case) study or at determining the feasibility of the desired research procedures. A descriptive case study presents a complete description of a phenomenon within its context. An explanatory case study presents data bearing on cause-effect relationships – explaining how events happened.

3.5 Research Techniques

It is worth noting that data is the sine qua non of research since it connects theory to practice. Griffie (2012: 128) defines data collection instruments as “The means (physical or nonphysical) of producing quantitative or qualitative data to be analyzed and interpreted”. In other words, physical stands for printed words (a questionnaire), nonphysical (an interview protocol).

3.5.1 Interview

Broadly speaking, as Litosseliti (2010: 157) puts forward: “Despite the obvious etymology of the term, most interviews are understood, not as reciprocal or two-way exchanges, but as a mechanism by which one party (i.e. the interviewer) extracts vital information from another (i.e. the interviewee)”. Among the sundry types of interviews (see the figure below), a focus group interview was conducted prior designing the questionnaires.
On the one hand, focus group interview is expedient for:

- Orienting to a particular field of focus;
- Developing themes, topic and schedules flexibly for subsequent interviews and/or questionnaires;
- Generating hypotheses that derive from the insights and data from the group.

(Cohen et al., 2007: 376)

Besides, apropos focus group members as to Morgan (2006, cited in Denscombe, 2007: 179):

“…[they] share their experiences and thoughts, while also comparing their own contributions to what others have said. This process of sharing and comparing is especially useful for hearing and understanding a range of responses on a research topic. The best focus groups thus not only provide data on what the participants think but also why they think the way they do”.

On the other hand, Anderson & Arsenault (2005: 177) afford its strengths and weaknesses as:
Focus Group Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses group synergy to maximize recall and highlight the diversity of perspectives.</td>
<td>Requires extensive question-planning and logistics planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides rich qualitative perspectives.</td>
<td>Depends on a skilled group facilitator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group process can uncover underlying attitudes.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to quantification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Advantages and Disadvantages of Focus group interview

3.5.2 Questionnaire

First and foremost, despite the profusion of research tools, questionnaires are no exception. As to Richterich & Chancerel (1980: 59): “Questionnaires are structured instruments for the collection of data which translate research hypothesis into questions.” Thus, they are at their most productive as it is purported by Denscombe (2007:154) “when used with large numbers of respondents in many locations; when what is required tends to be fairly straightforward information relatively brief and uncontroversial”. As the figure below elucidates, types of questionnaire are twofold: self-administered and interviewer-administered.
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Figure 3.3: Types of Questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2009: 363)

In many respects, the potential drawbacks of questionnaires go hand in glove with the potential benefits. As Basturkmen (2010: 32) maintains:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less time and energy consuming to administer</td>
<td>Self-selecting bias. Not everyone who receives the questionnaire returns it and those who do may have different attitudes that those who do not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often greater anonymity to respondents</td>
<td>Lack of opportunity to clarity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not allow for spontaneous responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents may consult with one another before answering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Advantages and Disadvantages of Questionnaires

3.5.2.1 Piloting the Questionnaires

Prior being administered, the questionnaire is liable to review which must be within the purview of the research partakers. Since the latter may evade questions due to the obscurity that may pervade them, hence a preliminary analysis is compulsory. This review is referred to as a pilot study or test as Sapsford & Jupp (2006: 103) expound:

“A pilot investigation is a small-scale trial before the main investigation, intended to assess the adequacy of the research design and of the instruments to be used for data collection.”

Thus, as to Saunders et al. (2009: 394), its ultimate end serves to:

- Expurgate the opacity from the questionnaire in order to obviate data bias.
- Appraise the validity of the investigative questions and the reliability of the compiled data.

Accordingly, we afforded our questionnaires a trial run relying on 32% of the sample population of the student employees and 50% of the one of the teacher trainers. Insofar as students are concerned, their comments touched upon two questions. Within question ‘4’ and ‘17’, the options ‘continuing education university’ and ‘personal view’ were added respectively. Besides, the wording of some questions was regarded as equivocal. As to the
teachers, they put forward the addition of question 23 (the setbacks that they encountered during the training).

3.5.2.2 Administering the Questionnaires

Both of the questionnaires were designed to pile up quantitative and qualitative data concurrently. They de facto encapsulate miscellaneous questions ranging between closed and open-ended. The subjects were asked to check or circle the best answer (for closed questions) and fill the boxes (for open-ended questions). On the one hand, the first questionnaire was addressed to 26 student employees. It is split up into 3 sections: demographic information (from question ‘1’ to ‘8’), information on their English use while undertaking their professional tasks (from question ‘9’ to ‘14’), and information on their English use while learning and in this case during the training held by IN-tuition (from question ‘15’ to ‘25’). On the other, the second questionnaire was addressed to 4 teacher trainers. By the same token, it falls under 2 sections: demographic information (from question ‘1’ to ‘6’), thorough details on the training provided (from question ‘7’ to ‘24’). Actually, 5 days after the administration of the questionnaires, we ended up with 29 respondents, i.e. 25 questionnaires from the part of trainees with only one as a blank questionnaire and all the questionnaires from the part of trainers.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedures

How does one analyze quantitative and qualitative data? Dörnyei (2007: 268) submits that: “The analysis of data should proceed independently for the QUAN and QUAL phases and mixing should occur only at the final interpretation stage”.

On the one hand, with reference to quantitative data, using statistical procedures (using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 10.0) is of paramount importance.
In fact, coding data so far acts as an indispensable process owing to the fact that questionnaire data may assume diverse types. The latter are chiefly fourfold:

- Nominal (or categorical) data that stands for labels instead of numbers.
- Ordinal data that stands for ranked numbers.
- Interval data that stands for ordinal data implying intervals between data points.
- Textual data which stands for open-ended responses (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010: 92).

Accordingly, the data obtained from questionnaires were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Answers for closed questions were tabulated and graphed, whereas for open-ended ones, the number of occurrences was counted.

### 3.7 Sampling Technique

In fact, after selecting the method of the subject under scrutiny, the investigator has to find out the sample that will represent the population. A sample is defined as being the group of participants or informants whom the researcher actually examines in his empirical investigation, and the population is that group of people whom the study is about (Dörnyei, 2007: 96). Yet, to avert the impact of bias and buttress the objectivity, sampling shouldn’t be an arbitrary process. In other words, deploying one of the types of sampling is indispensable (see the table below). Accordingly, research participants were chosen from a list which forms 10 groups (132 subjects). Furthermore, since a proportion of 20% of the population forms the research subjects as most of the researchers pinpointed, so 26 subjects are determined (2 groups). Insofar as teachers are concerned, all of them were selected. In a nutshell, the sample encompasses:

- Twenty six employees who belong to distinct departments (purchasing, supply chain, appro-planning, maintenance and quality control).
- Four language teachers chosen by IN-tuition (high-school teachers).
Type of Sampling | Characterized as
--- | ---
Nonprobability sampling | Subjects selected by the researcher
- Convenience | A group already formed and easy to use
- Purposeful | Knowledgeable and available persons
- Snowball | Selected respondents suggest other respondents
- Quota | Stratified sampling, but not randomly chosen

Probability sampling | Subjects selected by a random mechanism
- Simple random | Pull names out of a hat
- Systematic random | Computer generated numbers to select
- Stratified | The sample divided into groups called strata
- Cluster | Groups of strata

Table 3.4: Types of Sampling (Griffee, 2012: 58)

3.8 Concepts of Measurement

According to Emory (1980: 128) validity, reliability and practicality are deemed as the characteristics of a sound measurement. He upholds the contention that the tools should be an accurate counter or indicator of what we are interested in measuring. In addition, they should be easy and efficient to use.

Reliability is concerned with the consistency of measures (Bless et al., 2006: 150). Reliability is concerned with stability of scores. So, a reliable measure is one in which the scores remain the same over a few measurement points. A test-retest method was adopted as both of the research subjects (amongst those who helped in pilot testing) were given the questionnaires to fill in. After a span of seven days, the same questionnaires were handed out again, but this time round the questions were not in the same order as in the first questionnaires. By doing so, we attempted to reduce bias simply because such a span is not long and respondents would remember the answers.

Valid research is plausible, credible, trustworthy, and therefore defensible (Johnson & Christensen, 2000, cited in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003: 300). Types of validity are threefold:
content, construct and criterion-based validity. Construct and criterion-related validity are statistical and do not fit the approach of the present study. Hence, we are to measure the content validity which does not require quantification with numbers. Rather, the documentation of content-related evidence of validity begins with test development and is established by a detailed examination of the test content (McDonald, 2007: 21).

In fact, wording and items sampling within questionnaires must be taken into account. For this reason, the researcher requested the opinion of some colleagues who already built up a quite similar needs analysis questionnaires. We wanted to make sure that all the items mentioned in the questionnaire would elicit the desired information and thus address the research questions. Yet, content validity judgments are different from the judgments referred to in determining face validity (Waltz et al., 2010: 166).

Face validity is closely related to the notion of content validity and refers to the familiarity of our instrument and how easy it is to convince others that there is content validity to it (Mackey & Gass, 2005: 107). But, the difference is that face validity concerns the acceptability of a test to the test-taker, while content validity concerns the appropriateness of the content of the test as judged by professionals (Bartram, 1990, cited in Laver Fawcett, 2007: 182). That is, the judgments of face validity should reveal to what extent testees find the test elements or tasks familiar to them. For the present research, this was assured before pilot-testing and participants expressed their familiarity with all items in the questionnaires.

Practicality of research measurement tends to be economic, convenient, and interpretable (Emory, 1980: 134-135). The present research was designed to exhibit the elements of practicality in its procedures.


Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted to afford a painstaking account on our research procedures. In a bid to pinpoint the needs and motives behind using and learning English, a focus group interview was conducted, and two questionnaires were addressed to the partakers (trainees and trainers). Ultimately, the data obtained will be analyzed and interpreted in the ensuing chapter.
4.1.1 Students Questionnaire

1. Gender:

Table 4.1.1: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table expounds, males outnumber females by four to one. Actually, this paucity of females is only confined to the sample under scrutiny.

Figure 4.1.1: Gender

2-Age:

Table 4.1.2: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table displays, the highest percentage which stands for the 30-39 age bracket (56%) parallels two times the percentage of the student employees in the ‘40 and more’ age bracket (28%). Thus, although it is relatively low in percentage terms, 16% represents those in the 20-29 age range.
3-Did you study English before?

Insofar as English is concerned, all of the student employees did study it.

4-Where did you study English? (Location). And how long? (Duration)

Table 4.1.4: Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home (personal study)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the student employees embarked upon the study of English at primary school and even more so at overseas institutes (abroad). Actually, along with being exposed to English as a core subject at middle and high schools, and over a span of 2 and 3 years respectively, the student employees were all initiated into the English credit at college.
Table 4.1.4: Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, within their tertiary education, the initiation fluctuates in duration from specialization to another and endures ordinarily from 1 to 4 years. As displayed in the undermentioned bar chart, the highest proportion stands at 32% and represents a one-year span and a two-year one likewise, and the lowest counterpart otherwise reaches 12% regarding the three-year span. Apropos the four-year span, the proportion is twice as huge as the preceding one (24%).

Figure 4.1.4: Duration (University)

As to the chart below, the percentage of those who didn’t undertake a study at the CEU accounts for 68%. This sizeable proportion can be ascribed to the fact that the CEU
runs evening courses and the employees knock off work in the late afternoon. So, they are running out of time. Besides, 32% of those who studied at the CEU for a three-year period or less is described as minute by analogy with the foregoing ratio. The percentage of those who graduated from the CEU amounts to 20% and 12% constitutes the ratio of those who are still pursuing their studies or plausibly whose studies spanned certain months.

**Figure 4.1.4: Duration (CEU)**

In fact, a substantial proportion (60%) refers to the category of those who didn’t attend courses at private schools. In turn, a reasonable one (40%) denotes the overall ratio of those who enrolled in courses within private schools, for months (32%) and for years (8%). Undoubtedly, insofar as the span of months or years are concerned, it is the brand of the course (whether intensive or extensive course, a refresher course, etc) which determines it.
Making allowance for the chart below, an overwhelming proportion that equals 88% stands for those who didn’t study English by themselves. In turn, a tiny proportion that equals 12% represents those who did so. Yet, the study span ranges between years (8%) and months (4%).
5-What is your educational qualification?

Table 4.1.5: Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A degree in economic sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A degree in English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac+3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac+5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed above, all the student employees are educated to university level. Their tertiary grades range between holders of the bachelor’s degrees in economics (20%), in English (4%) and engineers in electromechanics, electrotechnology, and metallurgy (52%). In addition, university degree, Bac+3 and Bac+5 fall into these tertiary categories (24%). The latter imply that the respondents are either reticent on their educational credentials or they ignore the equivalent of their qualifications in English. Furthermore, 52% bears an ample testimony to the fact that SAMHA staffs are predominantly recruited from the engineering community, and even within the purchasing department. Feasibly, this is accredited to the nature of SAMHA production since it embraces a portfolio of electrical household appliances.

Figure 4.1.5: Educational Qualification
6-Current occupation

Table 4.1.6: Current Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of purchasing department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical data manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDS manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDS assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control engineer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of maintenance department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance engineer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart uncovers a panoply of occupations within the different departments which incorporates the managerial staff and their assistants. The percentage 4% equally stands for the managers of purchasing, supply chain, appro-planning, quality control and maintenance. Their assistants are as follows: purchasers (24%); supply chain members (16%), procurement members (12%); appro-planning assistant (4%); quality control engineers (8%); maintenance engineers (16%) respectively. Apparently, the assistants’ number outstrips the managers’ one and that seems decidedly ordinary. Besides, the training provided by IN-tuition is geared to managers and their assistants jointly.

Figure 4.1.6: Current Occupation
7-Department

Table 4.1.7: Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appro-planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram portrays the number of SAMHA personnel within distinct departments. Proportionally, it ranges in ascending order as follows: appro-planning (8%), quality control (12%), maintenance (20%), supply chain (32%), purchasing (28%). Whatever the proportion is, ample or tiny, it is only confined to the sample under scrutiny. Additionally, besides the aforementioned departments, SAMHA organogram comprises further departments as human resources, logistics, marketing, etc. The latter, as a matter of fact, lie outside the ambit of the study.

Figure 4.1.7: Department
8-How long have you been working in this company?

Table 4.1.8: Working Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart displays the professional experience of the employees under three spans: less than one year, 1 to 2 and 3 to 4 years respectively. The ratio of the first span to the third one is 1 to 5, and to the second one is roughly 1 to 2. Similarly, the ratio of the second span to the third one is approximately 1 to 2. Thus, since the maximum stint stands at 4 years, it is conceivably true to propound that SAMHA was set up recently.

Figure 4.1.8: Working Period

9-Do you use English in your current job?

Insofar as English is concerned, all of the student employees use it in their job.

10-If yes, is this mainly in-company, externally, or both.

11-With whom?
Table 4.1.11: Where and with whom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>With whom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-company</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Native speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td>Non-native speakers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated by the chart, the use of English within SAMHA accounts for 72%. This overwhelming proportion reveals that the prerequisite intermediary for running the company dealings is English. Its external use along with its internal one make up only 24% of the overall dealings. To some extent, 4% is de facto negligible by analogy with the foregoing proportions. So, it is of paramount importance to deem this linguistic mediator as a transactional language.

On the other hand, English use with natives and nonnatives (as an ethnic dichotomy) is commonly prevalent. With non-native speakers, an intrinsic use stands at 76%, whereas with both (natives and nonnatives), it is equivalent to 20%. As to native speakers, a low use rate that accounts for merely 4%. All in all, this implicates that SAMHA business affairs incorporate miscellaneous dealers from distinct countries.

Figure(s) 4.1.11: Where and with whom
12-How do you rate the importance of your English use?

Table 4.1.12: Importance of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table displays, 46% represents a preponderance of the employees who label their English use within a variety of contexts (a, c, d) as exceedingly significant barring the variety (b). In fact, the ratio of the latter is analogously tiny (8%), i.e. the ratio of (b) to (a) is 1 to 9, to (d) is 1 to 8, and to (c) is 1 to 5. So, English use overly serves as a prerequisite in handling SAMHA business transactions which in turn compel the employees to buttress their careers in order to fulfill their distinct tasks. On the contrary, its use within the training seems somehow dull. Feasibly, this is ascribed to a mismatch between the content of the subjects taught and the employees’ needs.

Figure 4.1.12: Importance of English

13-With regard to the tasks you perform at work

13a- How important the skills are
Table 4.1.13: Importance of Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart displays, the array of language skills is reckoned as indispensable since its overall average proportion attains 91%. The latter contains 35% as the largest average proportion of the skills that are tremendously important (very important). Thus, since the magnitude extent of these skills and the employees’ requirements in undertaking their tasks are interdependent, hence it is the task’s brand which spells out the apparatus or mechanism of performing it. Accordingly, the skills that serve as the mainstay for performing their duties are in ascending order as follows: pronunciation (12%), grammar and listening (equally 16%), speaking and vocabulary (equally 40%), reading (52%), and writing (68%).

Figure 4.1.13: Importance of Skills
13b- How often you have difficulty with these skills

Table 4.1.13: Difficulty of Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>05%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart also unveils that difficulties within the aforementioned skills prevail with a total average proportion that equates 95%. The latter entails 46% as the largest average proportion of the ones that are occasionally encountered (sometimes). Accordingly, the intricacy rates of the skills are in ascending order as follows: reading (36%), grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation (equally 44%), listening and writing (equally 48%), speaking (56%). Actually, a mastery of these rudimentary skills is attributable to the aptitudes of employees, and the existence of intricacies is an evidence of their deficiencies in these skills.

Figure 4.1.13: Difficulty of skills
14-How frequently do you perform the following tasks in English at work?

Table 4.1.14: Target Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Tasks</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business letters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placing an order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Average</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business letters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received orders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books related to your job</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Average</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Average</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral instructions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Average</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral instructions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tasks Average</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>05%</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing:

As the chart reveals, the rate of the employees who hinge on writing for carrying out their tasks accounts for 53%. The latter encapsulates 26% as the highest average rate of the tasks to be usually fulfilled. They range in descending order as follows: emails (68%), placing an order (40%), business letters (28%), translation (24%), reports and proposals (equally 20%), contracts (16%), faxes and memos (equally 8%). In addition, a further regular task was put forward under the label ‘requests for quotation’.

![Figure 4.1.14: Target Tasks (Writing)](image)

Reading:

By the same token, the rate of those who rely on reading for carrying out their tasks amounts to 53%. The latter takes in 23% as the highest average rate of the tasks to be occasionally undertaken (sometimes). They range in descending order as follows: brochures (36%), emails and received orders (equally 32%), business letters, reports and books (equally 24%), contracts and proposals (equally 20%), memos (12%) and faxes (8%).

88
Speaking

On the one hand, the rate of the employees who depend on speaking for performing their tasks stands at 52%. The latter comprehends 23% as the highest average rate of the tasks to be occasionally accomplished (sometimes). They range in descending order as follows: phone calls (40%), negotiation (32%), briefing (28%), presentation (20%), conference (12%), and social meetings (4%).
Listening

On the other hand, the rate of the employees who pivot on listening for performing their tasks constitutes half the overall rate (50%). The latter involves 29% as the highest average rate of the tasks to be rarely performed. They range in descending order as follows: briefing (56%), presentation (40%), negotiation and oral instructions (equally 20%), and conference (08%).

Figure 4.1.14: Target Tasks (Listening)

![Bar chart showing the distribution of tasks based on frequency: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Usually.]

Other Tasks:

Ultimately, only a quarter of the target population (25%) stands for those who get on with the rest of tasks. In turn, these tasks are fulfilled rarely by 18% (as the largest average proportion). Thus, they range in descending order as follows: attending to foreign guests (32%), business trips to foreign countries (28%), visiting other companies (20%), job interviews (8%), and making reservations (4%).
15-Is your attendance to the training planned by IN-tuition

Table 4.1.15: Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to attendance, the ratio of (optional) to (obligatory) is 1 to 4. By inference, attendance is compulsory (80%) owing to a resolution announced by the human resources department or otherwise voluntary (20%) owing to a pre-eminent position that permits to decide (being department heads, managers, etc).
16-Level of proficiency in general English and in business English

Table 4.1.16: Proficiency level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>GE level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>BE level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bar chart below affords the distinct levels in GE and BE under three broad sorts (elementary, intermediate and advanced). In respect of the first sort, the percentage that stands at 20% (GE) soars to 56% (BE), and the percentage that reaches 76% (GE) shrinks to 44% (BE) as to the second sort. Vis-à-vis the third one, the proportion that is actually nil (BE) gets up to 4% merely (GE). In essence, assessment through testing or interviewing is the gauge whereby the genuine level is allocated. Yet, a personal view is somehow unpersuasive or rather indecisive.

Figure 4.1.16: Proficiency Level

17-To what do you attribute your level

Table 4.1.17: level Attribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement test</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal view</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fact, a legion of employees ascribed their level to the interview conducted by Intuition as depicted in the chart (56%). Contrariwise, a fair proportion equal to 44% represents those who assessed their level from a subjective stance notwithstanding the interview held. Probably, the latter was just a formality or rather a cursory survey and hence they can be shrewd in their personal assessments.

**Figure 4.1.17: Level Attribution**

![Level Attribution Chart]

**18-Do you find the subjects taught within the training course**

**Table 4.1.18: Subjects Taught**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within your level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below your level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above your level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant to your needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the bar chart displays, the employees who reckon the subjects taught as being within their level represent 36%. The residue (64%), in turn, constitutes the ones who view the existence of a disparity between their levels and the content of the subjects taught (below or above the level, and even irrelevant). So, there is something amiss with the interview (as a
proficiency test) held by IN-tuition. Apparently, it was either bereft of a needs assessment or the assessment was just a formality.

**Figure 4.1.18: Subjects Taught**

![Subjects Taught Chart](image)

**19-Do you find the time allocated to the training course**

**Table 4.1.19: Time Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sufficient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apropos the allotted span, it is reckoned as excessive by a substantial proportion that accounts for 52%. Plausibly, this is due to an undue pressure since the employees are working and studying concurrently. Furthermore, as sufficient and insufficient, the ratio of the former to the latter is 1 to 5 as the table above illustrates. Feasibly, this emanates from an ardent enthusiasm to learn more.
20-What is the timing that you recommend for an effective training?

In fact, no precise timing was offered. Nevertheless, responses diverge between a two-hour stretch and timing after the working hours.

21-What kind of English do you want to improve?

Table 4.1.21: Kind of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mixture of both</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above depicts disproportionate numbers as to English varieties. Actually, a sizeable ratio that stands at 52% represents a preference to ameliorate GE and BE jointly. With reference to GE, its ratio to BE is double. In essence, opting for such a variety relies on the employees’ needs.
22- Which area(s) of English do you want to improve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not needed</th>
<th>Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, in an abundant number, the employees express a need to hone the productive skills instead of the receptive ones. The latter are singled out indeed but to a lesser extent by analogy with the former. In descending order, the proportions 68%, 60%, 24% and 16% stand for reading, listening, writing and speaking (as redundant skills) respectively. On the other hand, 84%, 76%, 40% and 32% refer to speaking, writing, listening and reading (as preferred skills) respectively. Accordingly, the average proportion of the latter amounts to 58% and the one of the former stands at 42%.
23-How much it is useful to carry out the classroom activities in the following ways?

Table 4.1.23: Forms of Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Options</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Of some use</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in pairs</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher oriented</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart indicates, although the rates (of some use, useful and very effective) are closely approximate in outward appearance to 27/28%, the options tend to alter from one rate to another. While the average percentage of the rate ‘of some use’ incorporates the options ‘teacher oriented’ (36% as the highest) and ‘whole class’ (16% as the lowest), the one of ‘very effective’ embraces the options ‘whole class’ (0% as the lowest) and ‘in groups’ (48% as the highest). Besides, the average percentage of the rate ‘useful’ encompasses the options ‘in groups’ and ‘whole class’ (20% as the lowest), ‘individually and in pairs’ (36% as the highest). Contrariwise, with an average percentage that accounts for 18%, the rate ‘useless’
comprises the options ‘individually and in pairs’ (0% as the lowest), and ‘whole class’ (64% as the highest).

In this current instance, it is palpable that when they are involved in activities, the employees overwhelmingly favor to perform independently or in tandem (in pairs and in groups), but they obviate the option to operate all together otherwise (whole class). To a certain extent, they entrust the teacher with the task of guidance (teacher oriented).

**Figure 4.1.23: Forms of Interaction**

![Forms of Interaction](image)

24-How much it is useful to use the following materials in explaining the course?

**Table 4.1.24: Materials Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Of some use</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1 04%</td>
<td>5 20%</td>
<td>12 48%</td>
<td>7 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>6 24%</td>
<td>9 36%</td>
<td>8 32%</td>
<td>2 08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific documents</td>
<td>1 04%</td>
<td>3 12%</td>
<td>13 52%</td>
<td>8 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>8 32%</td>
<td>6 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio tapes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>6 24%</td>
<td>7 28%</td>
<td>12 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tapes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5 20%</td>
<td>11 44%</td>
<td>9 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>05%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the chart illustrates, the average ratios of the source materials are thoroughly divergent. Thus, by analogy with certain materials, the rates de facto tend to alternate between the extremes of high and low ratio. In other words, the rate ‘useless’ that stands at 5% comprises the highest ratio of journals (24%) and the lowest counterpart of audio and video tapes along with dictionaries (0%). The latter (dictionaries) nonetheless represents the highest ratio of the rate ‘of some use’ (44%) which in turn comprehends the lowest counterpart of specific documents (12%). In the same strain, the latter (specific documents) acts as the highest ratio of the rate ‘useful’ (52%) which in turn contains the lowest counterpart of audio tapes (28%). Conversely, the latter (audio tapes) serves as the highest ratio of the rate ‘very effective’ (48%) which in turn holds the lowest counterpart of journals (8%). All in all, when it comes to elucidate a course, the employees enormously prefer documents that pertain to their professional undertakings (52%). Subsequently, books (48%), video tapes (44%), dictionaries and journals (equally 32%), and audio tapes (28%).

**Figure 4.1.24: Materials Used**
25- Can you supply us with prints of patterns which you use in performing your task?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I can’t</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A request for affording facsimile patterns was met with a refusal that equals 84% proportionately. Probably, this is due to the bylaws of the human resources department which prevent the employees to divulge SAMHA concerns. In other words, on account of the fact that documents’ content is replete with confidential information in respect of SAMHA dealings, i.e. suppliers’ whereabouts, amounts as to income and expenditure, etc. Contrariwise, 16% represents those who granted consent and furnished certain patterns as SWIFT, contracts (see appendices F, G & H respectively).
### 4.1.2 Questionnaire Findings

**The Needs Profile of SAMHA Student Employees**

- **Gender**: males (80%) and females (20%).

- **Age**: 20-29 years (16%), 30-39 years (56%), 40 and more (28%).

- **English study**:
  - **Middle school**: 100%
  - **High school**: 100%
  - **University**: 100%
  - **Continuing Education University**: 32%
  - **Private school**: 40%
  - **Personal study**: 12%

- **Educational qualifications**: Engineering (52%), a degree in economics (20%), a degree in English (4%), a tertiary degree (24%).

- **Current occupations**: managerial staff (20%) and their assistants (80%).

- **Departments**: supply chain (32%), purchasing (28%), maintenance (20%), quality control (12%), and appro-planning (8%).

- **Experiences**: less one year (12%), 1-2 years (28%), 3-4 years (60%).

- **English use**:
  - In-company (72%), externally (4%), both (24%).
  - With non-native speakers (76%), native speakers (4%), both (20%).

- **English use (very important)**: For performing tasks in work situations (72%), for career development (64%), for business communication (40%), and performing tasks in the training provided by IN-tuition (8%).

- **Skills importance (very important)**: writing (68%) reading (52%), speaking and vocabulary (equally 40%), grammar and listening (equally 16%), and pronunciation (12%).

- **Skills difficulty (sometimes)**: speaking (56%), listening and writing (equally 48%), grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation (equally 44%), reading (36%).
Target tasks:
- **Writing (usually):** emails (68%), placing an order (40%), business letters (28%), translation (24%), reports and proposals (equally 20%), contracts (16%), faxes and memos (equally 8%).
- **Reading (sometimes):** brochures (36%), emails and received orders (equally 32%), business letters, reports and books (equally 24%), contracts and proposal (equally 20%), memos (12%) and faxes (8%).
- **Speaking (sometimes):** phone calls (40%), negotiation (32%), briefing (28%), presentation (20%), conference (12%), and social meetings (4%).
- **Listening (rarely):** briefing (56%), presentation (40%), negotiation and oral instructions (equally 20%), and conference (08%).
- **Other tasks (rarely):** attending to foreign guests (32%), business trips to foreign countries (28%), visiting other companies (20%), job interviews (8%), and making reservations (4%).

Level: intermediate (according to the interview held by IN-tuition).

Time allocation: after the working hours.

Kind of English: GE (32%), BE (16%), a mixture of both (52%).

Areas of English: speaking (84%), writing (76%), listening (40%), and reading (32%).

Learning styles:
- **Forms of interaction (useful):** working individually and working in pairs (equally 36%), teacher oriented (28%), working in groups and whole class (equally 20%).
- **Materials (useful):** documents that pertain to the employees’ undertakings (52%), books (48%), video tapes (44%), dictionaries and journals (equally 32%), and audio tapes (28%).
4.2.1 Teachers Questionnaire

1-Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart shows, the number of males exceeds the one of females. In effect, for providing the training within SAMHA, the trainers sit for a test (Prospective Teachers Awareness Test) as a precondition that was laid down by IN-tuition (Algiers center). Conceivably, males represent the bulk of trainers by analogy with females in view of the fact that the site of the center is out of Sétif.

Figure 4.2.1: Gender

2-Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table displays, age groups are twofold: one under the age of fifty and the other over the age of fifty. Actually, the latter accounts for 50% of those who turned fifty (52 and 53 years old) and the former likewise (50%) stands for those who are in their early forties (42 and 45 years old).

Figure 4.2.2: Age

![Age distribution chart](chart.png)

3-Qualification

4-Occupation

As a matter of fact, besides being holders of the bachelor’s degree in English, they are all high-school teachers.

5-Experience in teaching

Table 4.2.5: Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GE Experience</th>
<th>BE Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-20 +20 -10 +10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50% 50% 75% 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As to the table above, 50% stands correspondingly for those whose teaching career apropos GE spanned beyond 20 years (27 and 26 years) and less than 20 years (18 and 15 years). In turn, as to BE, a significant rate that equates 75% represents those who have an experience of less than 10 years (four-year, two-year, and one-year stints), and a minute one that accounts for 25% stands for the one who has an experience of more than 10 years (eleven-year stint).

**Figure(s) 4.2.5: Teaching Experience**

![Graph showing teaching experience for GE and BE](image)

6-**Have you ever undergone a training to teach business English?**

As a matter of fact, none of the teachers have received such a sort of training.

All in all, making allowance for the teachers’ profiles, they evidently cover the same academic credentials and profession along with long stints. Plausibly, these denote that those recruited by IN-tuition are in the main veteran trainers of English.

7-**The brand of the training**

8-**The span of the training**

In fact, along with being extensive, the training spread over 72 hours, 2 hours per day and 2 days per week as all the teachers maintained.
9-What is the number of the student employees in the groups you instruct?

As a matter of fact, within the groups, the number of the student employees ranges between 12 and 14 as all the teachers stated.

10-What is the level of the student employees you instruct?

Actually, the student employees’ levels are twofold: elementary and intermediate. The ones at the elementary level make up 4 groups and the ones at the intermediate level form 6 groups.

11-How their level was determined?

Abiding by the decision of the human resources department (precisely the training manager), merely an interview was conducted with the employees as the teachers held. Indubitably, in default of a placement test, it is intricate to gauge the actual level of the employees.

12-Is the student employees’ attendance to the training optional or compulsory?

With reference to attendance, all the teachers maintained that it is mandatory in view of the fact that each session the student employees set their signatures to an attendance sheet (see appendix I).

13-What is your view about the following possible use of English by your students?

Table 4.2.13: English Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed above, the trainees’ diverse uses of English tend to be tremendously significant according to the trainers. They account for 75% as a largest average percentage,
and range in descending order as follows: for performing tasks in the training course (100%), for career development and for performing tasks in work situations (equally 75%), for business communication (50%).

#### Figure 4.2.13: English Use

14-What sort of English does the training course touch upon?

Actually, the training approached an amalgam of general and business English by consensus.

15-Which skills need to be covered in the course and which ones take priority over the others?

**Skills coverage:**

Basically, within the elementary and intermediate courses, skills receive a full coverage but the primacy of one over another is patent indeed.

**Table 4.2.15: Priority (Elementary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insofar as skills’ primacy is concerned, reading and writing are reckoned as important by the two trainers. Whereas grammar, listening, pronunciation and speaking are labeled as important by one, they are labeled as very important by the other. Moreover, while vocabulary is held as very important by one, it is held as quite important (of some importance) by the other.

**Figure 4.2.15: Priority (Elementary)**

![Diagram showing priority levels for different skills](image)

**Table 4.2.15: Priority (Intermediate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insofar as skills’ primacy is concerned, whereas grammar and vocabulary are deemed as important, speaking and writing are deemed as very important for both of the trainers. Thus, while listening, pronunciation and reading are categorized as important by one, they are categorized as very important by the other.
By inference, although the skills within each course book are convergent (at the elementary and intermediate level), the trainers’ methods of approaching them are divergent.

16-How teaching materials were selected for this training?

Table 4.2.16: Teaching Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On the basis of needs analysis</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials are selected completely by you</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials are selected by you and other teachers</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials are prescribed by IN-tuition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated by the chart, the highest proportion that constitutes 75% stands for a preponderance of the teachers who ascribed their selections to the option ‘materials prescribed by IN-tuition’. Contrariwise, the lowest counterpart represents the teacher who opted for the option ‘on the basis of needs analysis’. Feasibly, IN-tuition didn’t consult with the teachers when selecting the materials, even though it took heed of the employees’ needs (see appendix A).
17- What is the sort of these materials?

Actually, the source materials as all the teachers asserted are BE books (teacher’s book, course book and workbook). Nevertheless, the ones geared to the intermediate level are under the name of ‘Market Leader’ and the others geared to the elementary level are under the name of ‘Direct English’. Accordingly, materials were tailored to cater for the specific needs of each level.

18- How frequently do you employ the following teaching techniques?

Table 4.2.18: Teaching Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to audios</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching videos</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation drills</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form completion</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3 75%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof-reading</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>3 75%</td>
<td>1 25%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word games</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3 75%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions/conversations</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role plays</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving activities</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>/</th>
<th>/</th>
<th>/</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar exercises</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking exercises</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form completion</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart illustrates, the overall deployment rate of the techniques that pertain to listening amounts to 100%. The latter encapsulates 56% as the highest average rate of the ones that are usually implemented. They range in descending order as follows: listening to audios (100%), pronunciation drills (75%), watching videos (50%), and form completion (0%).

**Figure 4.2.18: Teaching Techniques (Listening)**

With reference to reading, the overall deployment rate of the techniques that pertain to it constitutes 81%. The latter embraces 37% as the highest average rate of the ones that are occasionally implemented (sometimes). They range in descending order as follows: proof-reading (75%), reading comprehension (50%), word games (25%), and summarizing (0%).
On the other hand, the overall deployment rate of the techniques derived from speaking stands for 100%. The latter comprehends 50% as the highest average rate of the ones that are occasionally implemented (sometimes). They range in descending order as follows: presentation (75%), problem-solving activities and role plays (equally 50%), and conversations (25%).

In respect of writing, the overall deployment rate of the techniques derived from it accounts for 90%. The latter takes in 45% as the highest average rate of the ones that are
occasionally implemented (sometimes). They range in descending order as follows: grammar exercises and form completion (equally 75%), note-taking exercises (50%), and composition (25%).

**Figure 4.2.18: Teaching Techniques (Writing)**

In a nutshell, the techniques that are based on speaking and listening are more deployed by analogy with the ones that are based on writing and reading. This implies that courses require more emphasis on spoken communication skills than on written communication ones.

19-What is your view about the following classroom management methods?

**Table 4.2.19: Classroom Management Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Of some use</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in groups</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in pairs</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table expounds, the set of options is viewed as crucial since its overall average proportion amounts to 80%. The latter incorporates 35% as the largest average proportion of
the options that are exceedingly important (very effective). They are in descending order as follows: working in pairs (100%), working in groups, individually and teacher oriented (equally 25%), whole class (0%).

**Figure 4.2.19: Classroom Management Methods**

20- **Is there a form of assessment to gauge the trainees’ achievements on this course?**

In fact, at the end of each unit, trainees whether at the elementary or intermediate level are submitted to written tests which are in turn graded. Besides, there is an ongoing appraisal of motivation, class participation, pronunciation, team work, and homework assignments (see appendix J). Feasibly, the test score and the record of attendance specify those who pass or fail along with their attained levels.

21- **Do you consider working in tandem with professional trainers of Business English as**

**Table 4.2.21: Working in Tandem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As depicted in the chart, the overwhelming proportion (75%) stands for those who reckon working in partnership with experts in BE as vital. On the contrary, the smallest one (25%) represents the one who deems this collaboration as fairly significant. Plausibly, a sense of teamwork allows them to exchange ideas and experiences and in turn enhances their know-how.

**Figure 4.2.21: Working in Tandem**

---

**22-What are the setbacks that the trainees encountered during the training?**

By consensus, trainers stated that studying within the working hours acted as a great hindrance to trainees.

**23-What are the setbacks that you encountered during the training?**

By consensus, trainers asserted that along with the wide ability range in the same class, the evaluation of some trainees was awkward owing to their frequent absences. Furthermore, there was a constant interruption meanwhile the explanation of the lessons especially from the part of engineers, i.e. when their cell phones ring they leave and then return repeatedly.
24-What are the aspects that you recommend in a bid to amend the training circumstances?

Insofar as recommendations are concerned, the trainers maintained that sitting for a written test is compulsory to specify the trainees’ level, groups’ elements should be from the same department, and training shouldn’t be carried out on SAMHA premises.
### 4.2.2 Questionnaire Findings

#### Biodata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN-tuition teacher Trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> males (75%) and females (25%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> between 42 and 53 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational qualifications:</strong> bachelor’s degree in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current occupations:</strong> high-school teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experiences:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>GE:</strong> between 15 and 27 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>BE:</strong> between 1 and 11 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training to teach BE:</strong> never.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The training

| **Training brand:** extensive. |
| **Training span:** 72 hours (2 hours per day and 2 days per week) |
| **Students’ number:** between 12 and 14. |
| **Students’ level:** according to the interview held by IN-tuition: |
| - Elementary (4 groups) |
| - Intermediate (6 groups) |
| **Students’ attendance:** compulsory. |
| **English use (very important):** for performing tasks in the training course (100%), for career development and for performing tasks in work situations (equally 75%), for business communication (50%). |
| **Sort of English dealt with:** a mixture of GE and BE. |
| **Skills coverage:** the receptive and productive skills + (grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation). |
Skills priority:
- Level (elementary): reading and writing are reckoned as important by the two trainers. Whereas grammar, listening, pronunciation and speaking are labeled as important by one, they are labeled as very important by the other. Moreover, while vocabulary is held as very important by one, it is held as quite important (of some importance) by the other.

- Level (intermediate): whereas grammar and vocabulary are deemed as important, speaking and writing are deemed as very important for both of the trainers. Thus, while listening, pronunciation and reading are categorized as important by one, they are categorized as very important by the other.

Teaching materials: prescribed by IN-tuition but on the basis of needs analysis.

Sort of the teaching materials: BE books (teacher’s book, course book and workbook):
- Elementary: under the name of ‘Market Leader’.
- Intermediate: under the name of ‘Direct English’.

Teaching techniques:
- Listening (usually): listening to audios (100%), pronunciation drills (75%), watching videos (50%), and form completion (0%).
- Speaking (sometimes): presentation (75%), problem-solving activities and role plays (equally 50%), and conversations (25%).
- Writing (sometimes): grammar exercises and form completion (equally 75%), note-taking exercises (50%), and composition (25%).
- Reading (sometimes): proof-reading (75%), reading comprehension (50%), word games (25%), and summarizing (0%).

Classroom management methods: working in pairs (100%), working in groups, individually and teacher oriented (equally 25%), whole class (0%).

Form of assessment: trainees whether at the elementary or intermediate level are submitted to written tests which are in turn graded. Besides, there is an ongoing appraisal of motivation, class participation, pronunciation, team work, and homework assignments.

Collaboration with professional trainers of BE: important.

Setbacks encountered (trainees): studying within the working hours acted as a great hindrance to trainees.
**Setbacks encountered (trainers):**
- The wide ability range in the same class.
- The evaluation of some trainees was awkward owing to their frequent absences.
- The constant interruption meanwhile the explanation of the lessons especially from the part of engineers.

**Aspects suggested:**
- Sitting for a written test is compulsory to specify the trainees’ level.
- Groups’ elements should be from the same department.
- Training shouldn’t be carried out on SAMHA premises.
Introduction

As is evident from the foregoing chapter, the training held by IN-tuition was fraught with defects despite the fact of embracing needs analysis. In fact, the absence of a placement test and the existence of heterogenous elements within the same group were detrimental to the training. Yet, taking into consideration the fact that the exploratory results of this study can be a springboard for further investigations in the field of business English within professional settings, the researcher provides some guidelines and propositions as to the design of a task-based syllabus for vocational purposes.

5.1 Designing a Syllabus

Actually, it should be pinpointed that the elaboration of a particular syllabus for specific learners is not a straightforward task to fulfill. In fact, it requires thorough efforts from the part of the teacher, since the syllabus is designed on the basis of learnability, frequency, coverage, and usefulness (Harmer, 2001). Furthermore, it is noteworthy that such a task should be done in close collaboration with the subject-specialist teachers, the learners involved (SAMHA employees) and the administrative staff (SAMHA personnel). Nonetheless, for this research work, on the basis of the questionnaires’ outcomes, the investigator suggests a set of recommendations that pertains to the apposite syllabus that can be adopted.

5.2 Syllabus Genre

In essence, picking out the syllabus shouldn’t be in a haphazard way even though after harvesting data as to the learners’ needs. In fact, groups’ elements de facto occupy a decisive role, i.e. being homogenous or heterogenous. In accordance with the stripe of the tasks carried out within the different departments, we put forward a business English course for the employees who belong to the appro-planning, supply chain and purchasing departments and a
general English course for those who belong to the maintenance and quality control departments. Thus, in view of the fact that the employees’ levels range between elementary and intermediate despite the interview held by IN-tuition, it is indispensable to suggest a written test to determine their actual levels (see appendix K). Making allowance for the learners’ level, we can specify the level of the courses offered, i.e. elementary or intermediate.

5.3 Syllabus Type

It is presumed that a proficiency gap may engender obstructions in the course. Consequently, it is imperative to espouse a syllabus that serves the purpose. Among the plethora of syllabi within language teaching, a task-based syllabus is deemed as the most salutary in this context. The latter as Robinson (2011: 2) purports “Can foster form-function-meaning mapping and can do so in ways that motivate learners to learn”. Tasks are de facto endowed with the following traits:

- Tasks offer a context for negotiating and grasping the meaning attributed in task input, or deployed by a partner performing the same task.
- Tasks open up opportunities for uptake of (implicit or explicit) corrective feedback on a participants’ production, by a partner, or by a teacher.
- Tasks open up opportunities for integrating the premodified input, incorporating ‘positive evidence’ of forms that are of paramount importance in effective interaction.
- Tasks open up opportunities for detecting the gap between a participant’s input provided and for metalinguistic reflection on the form of output.
- So as to enhance the accuracy of production, task demands can confine attention to definite concepts which are requisite for expression in the second language (L2) and strive to grammaticize them.
- So as to boost the fluency of production, simple task demands can promote access to and automatization of the currently emerged interlanguage means in order to satisfy these demands.
- Furthermore, simple task demands can promote effort at reconceptualizing and rethinking about events, in ways that match the formal means for encoding conceptualization.
- Sequences of tasks can consolidate memories for previous efforts in order to deal with the problems that may come up in interaction.
- Following attempts to perform simpler versions, complex tasks can prompt learners to attempt more ambitious, complex language to resolve the demands they make on communicative success, thereby stretching interlanguage and promoting syntacticization.

On the one hand, Ellis (2003: 27) labels tasks as being a pivotal attribute of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The latter serves a dual purpose: interactional function (where language is deployed to make and maintain contact) and transactional function (where language is deployed obliquely to exchange information).

On the other, in Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT), tasks tend to be the focal constituent of analysis at distinct levels (Branden, 2006: 12). The latter are threefold:

- Target tasks: Spring from an analysis of why learners are learning language and what functional things they want to use it for.
- Pedagogical tasks: Stand for the target tasks that learners are asked to try and perform.
- Assessment tasks: Stand for the intermediate tasks that permit to assess the extent to which learners are able to perform these target tasks.
All in all, the ensuing diagram delineates the syllabus design process:

Figure 5: Syllabus Design Procedures (Willis & Willis, 2007: 197)

5.4 Syllabus Objectives

In line with the above arguments, the suggested syllabus purports to cater for SAMHA student employees’ needs. Actually, making allowance for the content of the syllabus, it must entail the exposure of language inputs and outputs with more focus on the productive skills. So, the syllabus has to be contently and communicatively based.
5.4.1 Written Communication

The syllabus must touch upon writing and reading. In doing so, the learners will be able to:

5.4.1.1 Writing

- Spell lexical items correctly and use punctuation appropriately.
- Employ grammar accurately in their business correspondence.
- Produce cohesive and well-structured emails, letters, reports, etc.

5.4.1.2 Reading

- Retrieve the most important information when flicking through brochures, emails, contracts, etc.
- Synthesize and evaluate information.

5.4.2 Spoken Communication

The syllabus must touch upon speaking and listening. In doing so, the learners will be able to:

5.4.2.1 Speaking

- Communicate and interact with their dealers while telephoning and negotiating.
- Give accurate instructions.
- Participate in social and business discussions.

5.4.2.2 Listening

- Give the gist of a message either verbally or in writing.
- Follow oral instructions.
- Respond to spoken English used in social and business situations.
5.5 Research Limitations

Within the narrow compass of this research, some limitations must be noted. In fact, it is deficient in several respects:

- The research didn’t investigate all the levels, or otherwise it hinged only on 2 groups from the intermediate level.
- Merely members from the appro-planning, purchasing, supply chain, maintenance and quality control departments who partook in the research. Members from the finance, logistics, marketing, and human resources departments lie outside the ambit of the study.
- Since the number of participants is relatively small, so results cannot be fully generalized.

Yet, all these are confined to the short period offered by the manager of the human resources department (only 2 days).

Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, the researcher has endeavored to present a set of suggestions that may aid in buttressing the teaching/learning situation. To switch the emphasis on the flaws of the training, the investigator has submitted recommendations as to the enhancement of the receptive and productive skills. All in all, the aim behind was to elaborate a kind of a syllabus that may satisfy the needs of SAMHA student employees.
GENERAL CONCLUSION

Owing to the surge of investments that Sétif witnessed during the last decade, English hegemony never ceased to sweep through the commercial institutions. Indubitably, the motive behind that is to foster the blooming of the economy. In turn, due to the crystallization of English as a transactional language, English learning is becoming more and more entrenched even within the companies premises. This de facto falls in with our case study. Thus, what kindled our concern was not the deployment of English within SAMHA, yet the training held by IN-tuition which purported to buttress and improve this deployment. To pursue the line of inquiry, an extensive exploration was carried out using a skeleton that consisted of a theoretical part and a practical one.

On the one hand, the theoretical part encompassed two chapters which expounded the literature review that pertains to our area of investigation. The first chapter fell into two sections: English for specific purposes (definition, genesis, development, types, skills and sub-skills, materials development and authentic materials) and business for specific purposes (definition, characteristics, scope, written and spoken communication, BE syllabus). The second chapter, by the same token, was split up into two sections: needs analysis (definition, purpose, taxonomies, approaches and issues) and syllabus design (syllabus, curriculum and course, approaches, merits and demerits, criteria and issues).

Insofar as the practical part is concerned, the research design was set up in the third chapter. The researcher provided a thorough description of the research method, sampling, instrumentation and procedure used in the study. Chapter four dealt with the analysis and interpretations of the data obtained from the questionnaires of the trainees and trainers likewise. Ultimately, on the basis of the upshots obtained, the researcher put forward in
chapter five some guidance about designing a syllabus which is vocationally oriented. The latter, in turn, may assist SAMHA employees to enhance their English language aptitudes so as to be active and efficient participants in the Algerian professional society.

All in all, it should be noted that the upshots obtained are as follows:

1. SAMHA student employees need:
   - An amalgam of general and business English.
   - Writing: Emails, faxes, business letters, memos, contracts, reports, proposals, placing an order, and translation.
   - Reading: The tasks listed under writing.
   - Speaking: Phone calls, business meetings (briefing, presentation, negotiation, and conference), social meetings (dining, party, etc).
   - Listening: At/to the tasks listed under speaking.

2. The difficulties encountered touch upon speaking, listening, writing, grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and reading respectively.

3. As to the training:
   3.1. The interview (as a placement test) held is insufficient to determine their levels. So, a written test is compulsory.
   3.2. The training shouldn’t be within the working hours and groups’ elements shouldn’t be from different departments.
   3.3. The most appropriate syllabus is the task-based syllabus since there is a wide ability range in the same class.
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Appendix A

**Fiche des besoins**

Nom et prénom de l'apprenant: ...........................................................................................................................................

Nom de la compagnie: ....................................................................................................................................................

1. Quel est le secteur d’activité de votre entreprise ?
......................................................................................................................................................................................

2. Quelle est votre fonction ?
......................................................................................................................................................................................

3. Avez-vous déjà suivi des cours dans la langue concernée par cette formation ?

☐ Anglais    ☐ Français    ☐ Arabe    ☐ Autres ..............................................................................................................

4. Si oui, où ? Quelle a été la durée ?
......................................................................................................................................................................................

5. Quelles sont les aptitudes linguistiques que vous aimeriez développer ?

☐ Expression écrite    ☐ Expression orale    ☐ Compréhension écrite

☐ Compréhension orale    ☐ Grammaire    ☐ Autres ..............................................................................................................

6. Quelles sont les compétences spécifiques que vous souhaiteriez développer ?

☐ Présentations    ☐ Conversations téléphoniques

☐ Négociations    ☐ Correspondances (lettres, e-mails, etc...)

☐ Meetings

☐ Autres .............................................................................................................................................................................

7. Quels sont les objectifs que vous souhaiteriez atteindre au terme de votre formation ?
......................................................................................................................................................................................
Appendix B

THE STUDENT EMPLOYEES QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear trainees,

I am in the process of conducting a Magister research at the level of the Doctoral School – EDOLAS (Sétif). Accordingly, this questionnaire is drawn up to identify your language needs and explore your standpoints as to the training held by IN-tuition. So, you are kindly requested to answer the following questions frankly and objectively by checking (✓) and/or filling the boxes. You may be assured that your responses will be used just for research purposes and will be kept confidential.

1. Gender
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Age
   20-29 [ ]
   30-39 [ ]
   40 and more [ ]

3. Did you study English before?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. Where did you study English? And how long?
   (a) Primary school [ ] [ ] Years/months
   (b) Middle school [ ] [ ]
   (c) Secondary school [ ] [ ]
   (d) University [ ] [ ]
   (e) CEU (Continuing Education University) [ ] [ ]
   (f) Private school [ ] [ ]
   (g) Home [ ] [ ]
   (h) Abroad [ ] [ ]

5. What is your educational qualification?

6. What is your current occupation?

7. Department

8. How long have you been working in this company? [ ]

9. Do you use English in your current job?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. If yes, is this mainly
    (a) In-company [ ]
    (b) Externally [ ]
    (c) Both [ ]
11. With whom?
   (a) Native speakers  
   (b) Non-native speakers  
   (c) Both  

12. How do you rate the importance of your English use?
   (a) For performing tasks in work situations  
   (b) For performing tasks in the training course  
   (c) For business communication  
   (d) For career development  
   Scale: 1 = Unimportant  2 = Of some importance  3 = Important  4 = Very important  

13. With regard to the tasks you perform at work, indicate for each of the following:
   - How important the skills are, and
   - How often you have difficulty with these skills (please circle):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of importance</th>
<th>The skills</th>
<th>Rate of difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Of some importance</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How frequently do you perform the following tasks in English at work? (please circle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Tasks</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Correspondence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Memos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reports (e.g., sales, audit, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposals (e.g., project, plan, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Placing an order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translation (e.g., documents, brochures, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify and rate):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Is your attendance to the training planned by IN-tuition
   (a) Optional [ ] (b) Obligatory [ ]

16. What is your level of proficiency in general English and in business English besides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. To what do you attribute your level?
   (a) Placement test [ ]
   (b) Interview [ ]
   (c) Personal view [ ]

18. Do you find the subjects taught within the training course
   (a) Within your level [ ]
   (b) Below your level [ ]
   (c) Above your level [ ]
19. Do you find the time allocated to the training course
   (a) Sufficient
   (b) Not sufficient
   (c) Too much

20. What is the timing that you recommend for an effective training?

21. What kind of English do you want to improve?
   (a) General English
   (b) Business English
   (c) A mixture of both

22. Which area(s) of English do you want to improve?
   (a) Listening
   (b) Reading
   (c) Writing
   (d) Speaking

23. How much it is useful to carry out the classroom activities in the following ways?
   (a) Whole class
   (b) Working in groups
   (c) Working in pairs
   (d) Individual working of the student
   (e) Teacher oriented/directed

   Scale: 1 = Useless  2 = Of some use  3 = Useful  4 = Very effective

24. How much it is useful to use the following materials in explaining the course?
   (a) Books
   (b) Journals
   (c) Documents related to your job
   (d) Dictionaries
   (e) Audio tapes
   (f) Video tapes

   Scale: 1 = Useless  2 = Of some use  3 = Useful  4 = Very effective

25. Can you supply us with prints of patterns which you use in performing your tasks (e.g., emails, contracts, business letters, etc.) for our research objectives?
   Yes, I can
   No, I can’t

   Thank you for your participation and cooperation
Appendix C

THE TEACHER TRAINERS QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear colleagues,

I am in the process of conducting a Magister research at the level of the Doctoral School – EDOLAS (Sétif). Accordingly, this questionnaire is drawn up to explore your standpoints about the training held by IN-tuition. So, you are kindly requested to answer the following questions by checking (✓) and/or filling the boxes. You may be assured that your responses will be used just for research purposes and will be kept confidential.

1. **Gender**
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. **Age**
   - [ ]

3. **Qualification**
   - [ ]

4. **Occupation**
   - [ ]

5. **Your experience in teaching**
   - (a) General English [ ]
   - (b) Business English [ ]

6. **Have you ever undergone a training to teach business English?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. **What is the brand of the training planned by IN-tuition?**
   - (a) Intensive [ ]
   - (b) Extensive [ ]

8. **What is the span of the training?**
   - [ ] hours
   - [ ] day(s) per week
   - [ ] hours per day

9. **What is the number of the student employees in the groups you instruct?**
   - [ ]

10. **What is the level of the student employees you instruct?**
    - (a) Elementary [ ]
    - (b) Intermediate [ ]
    - (c) Advanced [ ]

11. **How their level was determined?**
    - (a) Placement test [ ]
    - (b) Interview [ ]
    - (c) Both [ ]

    Explain the procedure?
    - [ ]

12. **Is the student employees’ attendance to the training**
    - (a) Optional [ ]
    - (b) Compulsory [ ]
13. What is your view about the following possible use of English by your students?
   (a) For performing tasks in work situations
   (b) For performing tasks in the training course
   (c) For business communication
   (d) For career development

   Scale: 
   1= Unimportant   2= Of some importance   3= Important   4= Very important

14. What sort of English does the training course touch upon?
   (a) General English
   (b) Business English
   (c) Both

15. Which skills need to be covered in the course and which ones take priority over the others? (For skills coverage tick the skills required and for skills priority use the scale below the table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 
1= Unimportant   2= Of some importance   3= Important   4= Very important

16. How teaching materials were selected for this training?
   (a) On the basis of needs analysis
   (b) Materials were selected completely by you
   (c) Materials were selected by you and other teachers (collaboration)
   (d) Materials were prescribed by IN-tuition

17. What is the sort of these materials? (Under the name of)
   (a) General English book(s)
   (b) Business English book(s)
   (c) Generalist authentic texts, e.g. journals, on-line materials
   (d) Specialist authentic texts, e.g. contracts, emails

18. How frequently do you employ the following teaching techniques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Reading comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proof-reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Word games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Grammar exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Note-taking exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Form completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 
1= Never   2= Rarely   3= Sometimes   4= Usually
19. What is your view about the following classroom management methods?
   (a) Whole class
   (b) Working in groups
   (c) Working in pairs
   (d) Individual working of the student
   (e) Teacher oriented/directed

   Scale: 1 = Useless  2 = Of some use  3 = Useful  4 = Very effective

20. Is there a form of assessment to gauge the trainees’ achievements on this course?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   If yes, explain how?

21. Do you consider working in tandem with professional trainers of Business English as
   (a) Important
   (b) Somehow important
   (c) Unimportant

22. What are the setbacks that the trainees encountered during the training?

23. What are the setbacks that you encountered during the training?

24. What are the aspects that you recommend in a bid to amend the training circumstances?

Thank you for your participation and cooperation
الموضوع: طلب استقبال طلبة مدرسة الدكتوراه

يشرحني أنا السيد نائب العميد المكلف بما بعد التدريس البحث العلمي والعلاقات الخارجية لجامعة سطيف، أن أطلب منكم السماح للطالب

تيم حمزة المسجل بمدرسة الدكتوراه، تخصص انجليزية الأعمال (Anglais des Affaires) 

بإجراء تربص في إطار إنجاز مشروع بحث علمي، وعليه فنرجو من سيادتكم تزويدهم بمستلزمات ما يتطلبه البحث

كما يتعهد الطالب باستخدام الوثائق والمعلومات في حدود ما يسمح به البحث العلمي والقانون.

نائب العميد المكلف بما بعد التدريس

البحث العلمي والعلاقات الخارجية
ATTÉSTATION DE PRESENCE

Monsieur TEBBANI Hamza

Cette attestation est délivrée à :

Je suis Monsieur SIKAOUI Toufik, directeur des ressources humaines de la société SPA SAMHA Home Appliance.

Certifie que Mme M'BENDI Hamza a effectué un stage de recherche au sein de notre société du 05/12/2012 au 06/12/2012.

Au cours de cette période, il (elle) a développé un questionnaire et collecté des informations qui lui ont permis de réaliser son projet de fin d'étude, « Magistère en Anglais des affaires ».

30 JUN 2013
| Block 1 | F01B.... |
| Block 2 | I700T.... |
| Block 3 | 108:IVAL193.... |
| Tag 27 | 1/1 |
| Tag 40A | REVCABLE or IRREVOCABLE |
| Tag 20 | 09990LCA ... |
| Tag 31C | Y / M / D |
| Tag 40E | UCPURR LATEST VERSION |
| Tag 31D | The date and the place. |
| Tag 50 | The Name and the Address of the Applicant " The importer" |
| Tag 59 | The Name and the Address of the Beneficiary " The Exporter" |
| Tag 32B | USD / EUR / TND ... etc + The amount in numbers. |
| Tag 39A | Percentage we are free to add or to cancel from The global amount. |
| Tag 41A | The Swift code of the Confirming bank or/and Notifying bank. |
| Tag 42P | DEF PAYMENT or AT SIGHT PAYMENT. |
| Tag 43P | ALLOWED or NOT ALLOWED |
| Tag 43T | ALLOWED or NOT ALLOWED |
| Tag 44E | PORT OF LOADING |
| Tag 44F | PORT OF DISCHARGE |
| Tag 44C | Y / M / D |
| Tag 45A | CFR / FOB / CPT / EXW .. etc. + The related Port. Name of GOODS AS PER PROFORMA INVOICE NR.... DD D/M/2013. |
| Tag 46A | Requested Docs. |

For example:
COMMERCIAL INVOICES INDICATING UNIT PRICE AND QUANTITY ORIGIN OF GOODS AND PAYMENT TERMS BY LETTER OF CREDIT
BILL OF LADING SHIPPED ON BOARD MADE OUT OR ENDOSES TO ORDER OF APPLICANT BANK, NOTIFY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 47A</th>
<th>Additional Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ For Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN CASE OF DISCREPANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOCUMENTS WE WILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEDUCT USD ...00 BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 71B</th>
<th>Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR EXAMPLE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL BANKING CHARGES OUTSIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALGERIA ARE FOR BENEFICIARY’S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCOUNT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 48</th>
<th>Period for Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 DAYS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 49</th>
<th>Confirmation Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONFIRM or NOT CONFIRM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 53A</th>
<th>Reimbursing Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE SWIFT CODE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REIMBURSING BANK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 78</th>
<th>Instructions to the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying/Accepting/Negotiating Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ON MATURITY WE AUTHORIZE YOU TO CLAIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REIMBURSEMENT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag 72</th>
<th>Sender to Receiver Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOCUMENTS TO BE SENT BY DHL TO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPLICANT BANK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Contract for Equipment Sales and Technology Licensing

Contract No. ____________________

This Contract (hereinafter referred to as the “Contract”) is made and entered into as of _______ (the date of signature) in _______ (the place of signature) through friendly negotiation by and between _____________, a company incorporated and existing under the laws of ____________ with its registered address at - ___________________________________, and with its principal place of business at ___________________________ (hereinafter referred to as the “Buyer”), and ______________________, a company incorporated and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China with its registered address at - ___________________________________, and with its principal place of business at ___________________________(hereinafter referred to as the “Seller”).

Whereas, the Buyer desires to engage the Seller to provide the Equipment, related design, Technical Documentation, Technical Service and Technical Training and to obtain from the Seller a license of Patent and/or Know-how in relation to the Erection, Test Run, Commissioning, Performance Test, operation and maintenance for the Equipment, as well as manufacture of the Contract Products.
Name of distributor (“Representative”) confirms that it is fully aware of and understands the provisions of the U.S Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 as amended and similar laws. Representative confirms that, in its performance of services or sale of goods as a distributor of The Supplier, and since the date of its last Certificate of Compliance, neither it nor any person or firm acting for it has offered or paid any money or offered or given anything of value to an international Government Official or any other person for the purpose of obtaining or retaining business. For the purpose of this Certificate of Compliance, the term “International Government Official” includes any of the following individuals:

I. Any officer or employee of any federal, regional or local government, government agency, or state-owned or state-controlled enterprise;
II. Any person acting in an official capacity for or on behalf of any such entities identified in clause (i); or
III. Any official of a political party, or candidate or nominee of any political party or for any position with any entity identified in clause (i) above, or any public international organization.

In connection with its performance of services or sale of goods for The Supplier, neither representative nor any of its officers, directors, partners, stockholders, employees or agents, nor any person or firm acting for it, has offered, paid, promised to pay, or authorized the payment of any money or any other thing of value to any International Government Official or to any other person while knowing that all or a portion of such money or thing of value would be offered or given directly to any International Government Official for any of the following prohibited purposes:

I. To influence an act or decision of such International Government Official in his, her or its official capacity;
II. To induce such International Government Official to do or omit to do any act in violation of the lawful duty; or
III. To induce such International Official to use his, her or its influence with a government or government agency.
### Fiche de présence des participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom de la compagnie</th>
<th>N° Groupe</th>
<th>Numéro de client</th>
<th>Date de naissance</th>
<th>Prénom</th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Signature obligatoire de chaque participant</th>
<th>Signature obligatoire de chaque participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Signature obligatoire de chaque participant
**Compte-rendu de fin de session (☐ Sur-site / ☐ Hors-site)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom de l’apprenant: ........................................</th>
<th>Nom du formateur: ...........................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niveau actuel de l’apprenant: ...........................</td>
<td>Programme: ......................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jours: Dim-Mar/Lun-Mer/Jeu-Sam/Ven</td>
<td>Horaires: ...........................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Date de début de session: ................../........./2012 | Nom de la compagnie: ...........................................
| Date de fin de session: ........../........../2012        |                                                        |

**Appréciation du formateur:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Faible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prononciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Travail en groupe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travaux d’applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Résultats :**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score du test:</th>
<th>.......... / 100</th>
<th>☐ Admis(e)</th>
<th>☐ Ajourné(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport des présences:</td>
<td>.......... / .......... séances</td>
<td>☐ Admis(e)</td>
<td>☐ Ajourné(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Résultat final de l’apprenant</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Admis(e)</td>
<td>☐ Ajourné(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ce présent compte-rendu donne accès aux programmes et niveaux suivants :

**Programmes:**

- GE
- GBE
- FG
- FA
- DE
- ESP
- Autres

**Niveaux : Session (S) / Module (M)**

- Débutant (A1) .................
- Pré-intermédiaire (B1) .............
- Intermédiaire avancé (C1) ...........
- Elémentaire (A2) .............
- Intermédiaire (B2) .............
- Avancé (C2) .................

**Visa de l’apprenant:**

........................................

**Visa du formateur :**

........................................
Appendix K

Placement Test

Consider how effective you are in business grammar and vocabulary by answering the questions below (Lowe & Pile, 2009: 5-6).

Grammar

Present tenses

1. My boss ______ work before 7 a.m. at least twice a week.
   a. starts  b. is starting  c. does start

2. At the moment, sales ______ very quickly.
   a. increase  b. are increasing  c. increased

Past tenses

3. Only six people ______ the training yesterday.
   a. attend  b. are attending  c. attended

4. What ______ at your appraisal last week?
   a. did you discuss  b. you discuss  c. do you discuss

Will and going to

5. Are you late? ______ you a lift to work if you like.
   a. I'll give  b. I give  c. I giving

6. It's already decided. We ______ the conference in May.
   a. are going to hold  b. held  c. hold

Modals

7. I'm not sure what to do about the meeting. I ______ just postpone it.
   a. can  b. shall  c. might

8. Stop here. You ______ go into the chemical research lab.
   a. don't need to  b. mustn't  c. couldn't

Conditionals

9. If I were you, I ______ for the job.
   a. would apply  b. apply  c. applied

10. If sales ______ further, the company will be in trouble.
    a. will fall  b. fall  c. are falling

-ing forms and infinitives

11. My colleague suggested ______ out for lunch.
    a. to go  b. go  c. going

12. Are you hoping ______ promotion?
    a. to get  b. getting  c. get

Comparatives and superlatives

13. James is much ______ at finance than Henry.
    a. good  b. better  c. well

14. The Oxford branch is ______ successful in the whole company.
    a. the more  b. more  c. the most

Relative clauses

15. My boss, ______ is the head of HR, is planning to retire early.
    a. who  b. which  c. that

16. The department ______ I work in is under tremendous pressure.
    a. what  b. that  c. who

Articles

17. Have you seen ______ report we were talking about earlier?
    a. the  b. a  c. —

18. I'm ______ designer and I work for Shiptons.
    a. an  b. a  c. the

Determiners

19. I'm sorry, but I don't have ______ money on me.
    a. some  b. any  c. many

20. Don't worry. We've still got ______ time left before the meeting.
    a. a little  b. little  c. few

Passives

21. Due to a lack of support, the exhibition ______.
    a. has been cancelled  b. has cancelled  c. cancelled

22. All staff reaching their target ______ a bonus.
    a. will give  b. will be given  c. give

Reported speech

23. My boss told me she ______ her job.
    a. would hate  b. hating  c. hated

24. Sylvie said she ______ to take early retirement.
    a. wanted  b. will want  c. want
Vocabulary

Companies and offices
1. KP Recruitment hasn’t been in business for very long. It is ______ company.
   a. an upcoming  b. a well-established  c. a multinational

2. The media are reporting the unexpected ______ between JG Construction plc and Designtech.
   a. merge  b. merger  c. merged

Finance
3. Sales have continued to go down over the last few months – they’ve ______ to 10,000 units per month.
   a. dropped  b. increased  c. evened out

4. We don’t make much money on those products, but we do on the E754 – it’s quite ______.
   a. profit  b. profitable  c. profitably

Human resources
5. Helmut is only 59, but he’s already planning what he’ll do during his ______.
   a. retirement  b. pension  c. application

6. JF Electronics looks after its staff – all ______ have good salaries and opportunities for training.
   a. employees  b. employers  c. employment

Logistics
7. The goods are being loaded onto the lorry, about to be ______.
   a. delivered  b. dispatched  c. ordered

8. Our usual ______ has let us down, so we are looking for a new one.
   a. supply  b. supplier  c. supplies

Meetings and conferences
9. Linda took notes in the meeting, so she is typing up the ______.
   a. minutes  b. handouts  c. agenda

10. Are you able to ______ the meeting tomorrow?
    a. attend  b. attendee  c. attend

People and places
11. The head of Production speaks to workers on the ______ every day.
    a. office  b. factory  c. shop floor

12. Helen currently ______ a team of 12 people.
    a. manages  b. managers  c. managed

Planning
13. We should not open any more offices. However, we need to ______ and produce a wider range of goods.
    a. downsize  b. diversify  c. expand

14. Next year’s results aren’t ______ – we had good results last year, but bad ones this year.
    a. predictable  b. predict  c. prediction
Abstract

With the advent of language training providers, running courses within workplaces has emerged as a surrogate for the conventional modus operandi of offering courses within the educational institutes. In quest of this issue, the study under scrutiny attempts to delve into the motives behind the training held by IN-tuition within SAMHA company. In doing so, a focus group interview and two questionnaires (one for SAMHA student employees and one for IN-tuition trainers) have been deployed as data collection instruments in order to substantiate the upshots. As a matter of fact, this exploratory case study hinged on a wide-ranging theoretical framework related to business English and needs analysis to pinpoint the necessities, wants and lacks of SAMHA student employees. Thus, to put a new spin on the investigation, the standpoints of the trainers and trainees as to the training were taken into consideration and compared in a bid to gauge the fruitfulness of the training. Actually, the main upshots emanated from the questionnaires displayed divergent and convergent insights. On the one hand, a preference from the part of trainees to enhance an amalgam of general and business English besides the written and spoken communication skills, but with more emphasis on writing and speaking. On the other, despite the coverage of all these within the training, what impeded the teaching circumstances was the wide ability range within the same group and the heterogeneity of the elements within it. Ultimately, to amend the teaching/learning situation, the study afforded some guidelines that pertain to the design of a task-based syllabus for vocational purposes.

Résumé

Avec l’apparition des centres de formation linguistique, l’enseignement des langues dans les milieux professionnels ne cesse de s’accroître et de rivaliser énormément les institutions pédagogiques. Ceci concorde et explique la formation appliquée par ‘IN-tuition’ dans la société ‘SAMHA’. Nous nous sommes basés dans notre travail de recherche sur deux outils de collecte de données : une interview et deux questionnaires. En outre, ce cas d’étude repose sur un plan théorique pertinent où l’Anglais des affaires et l’analyse des besoins. Ceux qui ont suivi cette formation désirent développer leur savoir-faire en Anglais général comme en Anglais des affaires, car cela a une importance décisive concernant les compétences communicatives (parler et écrire). Pour conclure, il est dans notre but de réformer cette situation par le biais d’un programme basé sur des tâches à accomplir.