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TWO OPPOSING PERSPECTIVES: GE vs ESP
An outdated debate?
ESP = an extension of a basic/common core of general language;

- Common core (Corder 1993) defined as "a general pool of language of high frequency items that predominates all uses of languages" (Basturkmen 2006:16);

- Direct implication: necessity to master the common core before introducing ESP (Greenbaum, Leech & Svartik 1972, Coxhead & Nation 2001);

- “When learners have mastered control of the 2,000 words of general usefulness in English, it is wise to direct vocabulary learning to more specialized areas depending on the aims of the learners” (Coxhead & Nation 2001:252-253)
This view **implicitly adhered to** by the authors of the **CEFR**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations. |

| **C1** | 
Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices. |

| **B2** | 
Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options. |

| **B1** | 
Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. |
GE vs. ESP: PERSPECTIVE #2

- No common core of language **preexisting to varieties**: basic language is what is common to all varieties of English, and these **varieties overlap** (Bloor & Bloor 1986);
- No “general purpose” language, all language is specific purpose, no “English for no purpose” (Douglas 2010: 9);
- Languages always **learnt in a specific context**:
  - “All language learning is acquired from one variety or another, even if it's 'classroom English' variety. The language learner is as likely to acquire 'the language' from one variety as from another, but the use of language, being geared to situation and participants, is learned in appropriate contexts.” (Bloor & Bloor 1986: 28)
- The assumption of the necessary acquisition of a 'common core' of the language before introducing ESP = **not supported by research** (Hyland 2002: 388);
- **No clear correlation** between specialisation and complexity of the language: specialised discourse made accessible to the general public often **more syntactically complex** than the original discourse (Mangiante 2017).
Dichotomy between GE and ESP = outdated!

(Douglas 2010: 10)
Different grains of specificity within ESP

(Sarré 2018)
GE vs. ESP: NEEDS ANALYSIS AS THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTIC OF ESP?

- Needs Analysis = the “cornerstone of ESP” (Dudley-Evans & St John 1998)
  - “What distinguishes ESP from General English is not the existence of a need as such but rather an awareness of the need” (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987: 53)

- Defining Needs Analysis
  - “The use of systematic means to define the specific sets of skills, texts, linguistic forms, and communicative practices that a particular group of learners must acquire is central to ESP, informing its curricula and materials and underlining its pragmatic engagement with occupational, academic, and professional realities” (Hyland 2007)
GE vs. ESP: NEEDS ANALYSIS AS THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTIC OF ESP?

- **Different types of needs**: target needs/communication needs, learning needs/situation needs, felt needs (insiders), perceived needs (outsiders)

- **Different components of NA**:
  - TSA (Target Situation Analysis) / Target language use situation analysis
  - LSA (Learning Situation Analysis)
  - PSA (Present Situation Analysis)

- NA: diagnosing needs, creating instruments, analysing and sifting data, processing data qualitatively and quantitatively → **not common in language teacher education programmes** (Krajka 2018: 4) → LSP teachers = slaves to published textbooks available (Anthony 1998)
RESEARCH IN LSP TEACHER EDUCATION

Literature Review
LSP TEACHER EDUCATION

- Lack of specific training offered
  - In France (Braud et al. 2015, Brudermann et al. 2016)
  - In the UK (Howard 1997, Richards 1997)
  - In the US (Master 1997)

- Same conclusion drawn 20 years later (Basturkmen 2017)

- Lack of specific training → lack of published research in LSP teacher education (Basturkmen 2014, Ding & Campion 2016), very few empirical studies (three studies in Basturkmen 2017)
"The community that ESP professionals know least about is their own."

(Belcher 2013 : 544)

Some information about LSP teaching to be gathered in the general literature on LSP - implicitly addresses the topic (Basturkmen 2014)
Few links have been made in the ESP literature between ESP teacher learning and the wider literature on language teacher education (LTE).

(Basturkmen 2017: 3)
Several potential problems:

- **Limited “generalisability” of theory-based training**: teaching contexts, learner types, specialised varieties of the language, etc. too varied (Chun 2000) → importance of **context-based and/or practice-based training**

- Initial teacher education: **impossibility to deal with all specialised varieties of a language** + impossibility **to predict the genres/discourse types** a teacher will have to teach throughout their career (Kaltenböck & Mehlmauer-Larcher 2002)

**LSP TEACHER NEEDS**

- **Paradox #1**: Needs analysis central to LSP teaching BUT **not applied to LSP teachers themselves** (Richards 1997: 115)

- **Paradox #2**: specific training needs of LSP teachers acknowledged in the 1980s (Strevens 1988) BUT **no fine needs analysis carried out**

- Different authors → **different types of needs**
  - discourse analysis, varieties of the language, methodology, curriculum design, material design (Howard 1997)
  - history and development of ESP, ESP strands, design and evaluation of teaching materials, curriculum design, evaluation and in-depth analysis of at least one specialised variety of the language (Master 2005)
  - pedagogy, language and discourse in context (specialisation, specific purposes), class management (Hall 2013)
LSP TEACHER NEEDS

- Deeper knowledge of the specialised domain, of needs analysis, of curriculum design, of material design, of evaluation (Venkatraman & Prema 2013)

- Knowledge of the genres specific to the specialised domain (Hüttner, Smit & Mehlmauer-Larcher 2009)

- BUT these = authors’ views, not based on empirical studies (observations, surveys, needs analysis)

- Teacher as researcher (Dudley-Evans & St John 1998, Basturkmen 2010, Hall 2013)
LSP teachers not only often conduct investigations themselves in preparation for course development but are also consumers of the research published in LSP specialist journals and thus may need understanding of the forms of research currently reported in the literature. (Basturkmen 2014: 29)
It is argued that teacher needs are an important basis for determining content for LSP teacher education programmes and that further research is needed to identify these needs.

(Basturkmen 2017: 17)
LSP TEACHER NEEDS ANALYSIS

Results of the CATAPULT Project
THE CATAPULT PROJECT

- Computer-Assisted Training And Platforms to Upskill LSP Teachers
- A 3-year strategic partnership, KA2 of the ERASMUS+ programme
- One main objective: to strengthen the quality of in-service training of language teachers for those involved in Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) teaching in tertiary, adult, and continuing education by developing training and tools to address a dual need
  - the specific approaches to LSP teaching (LSP didactics)
  - the integration of digital technologies in the teaching of LSPs.
A European consortium gathering 6 countries
The CATAPULT Project
Computer Assisted Training And Platforms to Upskill LSP Teachers

1. A Situational Survey
to study LSP teacher job market in higher and adult education and to identify skills gap

2. A Common Competence Framework
to serve as the basis for a specific LSP teacher training programme

3. A MOOC
to upskill language teachers involved in LSP teaching from a dual perspective: LSP didactics and digital technology integration

4. A Community of Practice Platform
to offer trained LSP teachers an online environment to advertise their expertise and find work (face-to-face sessions and online teaching)

5. An Accreditation Procedure
to guarantee the highest quality of the training offered (MOOC) and to offer certification to trained LSP teachers
### SITUATIONAL SURVEY: NEEDS ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job market analysis (recruitment of LSP teachers) - TSA</strong></td>
<td>What skills are the most sought after by recruiters of language teachers, especially LSP teachers?</td>
<td><strong>93 job announcements</strong> posted on job boards and professional networks (September-October 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey of LSP teachers - LSA</strong></td>
<td>What training have they received? What are their residual needs?</td>
<td><strong>560 replies</strong> to an electronic questionnaire offered in 7 languages, open-ended and closed questions (September - November 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Zourou & Torresin, 2019 : 6)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: TSA RESULTS - The most sought after skills for LSP teachers (n=43)

- Top priority: **previous experience** (sometimes in the domain)
- **Domain knowledge** ranks #2
- **IT skills** cover 3 of the 5 categories → critical importance?

(Zourou & Torresin, 2019 : 21)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS
> EMPLOYMENT SECTORS

- HE → AE → difficulty to reach AE professionals

(adapted from Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 24)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS

QUALIFICATIONS

- 77%: Master's degree

(adapted from Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 24)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS > SPECIFIC LSP TRAINING RECEIVED

- 59% of LSP teachers: some kind of LSP training (CPD + initial TE + research)
- 41% ‘only’: no LSP training

BUT...

(adapted from Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 27)
88% of LSP Teachers go into LSP teaching without specific training
Over half (57%) design their own materials
Just over a quarter (27%) use ready-made materials

→ LSP teachers as material designers

(adapted from Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 28)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS
> IT INTEGRATION IN LSP TEACHING

- Just under a third (28%) offer online classes
- 13% use videoconferencing (Skype + Zoom)
- 8% use LMSs (Moodle)

(Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 29)
What specific difficulties do you encounter when teaching LSP?

- No reply: 203 (33%)
- Lack of time: 58 (9%)
- Lack of subject knowledge: 107 (17%)
- Lack of support from hierarchy/institutions: 50 (8%)
- Lack of pedagogical resources: 134 (21%)
- Lack of adequate training: 73 (12%)

(Zourou & Torresin, 2019: 30)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS
> RESIDUAL ‘FELT’ NEEDS

Are there any specific skills or knowledge you feel you need to be an efficient LSP teacher which you did not acquire during your studies/professional training? Which ones?

- N/A: 51%
- Knowledge on how to adapt materials to different disciplines: 15%
- Knowledge regarding methodology and pedagogy: 26%
- ICT skills: 8%

(Zourou & Torresin, 2019 : 33)
NEEDS ANALYSIS: LSA RESULTS
> FURTHER TRAINING NEEDED

What further qualifications do you think you need in your career as an LSP professional?

- No reply: 55% (339 respondents)
- Domain-specific training: 11% (65 respondents)
- ICT Training: 7% (43 respondents)
- Additional degree or certificate: 4% (25 respondents)
- Training on methodology and pedagogy: 11% (66 respondents)
- In-service training and lifelong opportunities for learning: 12% (75 respondents)

(Zourou & Torresin, 2019 : 35)
CONCLUSIONS
Towards a Common Competence Framework for LSP Teachers
With so many English language teachers world-wide now working in EAP and ESP, and increasing numbers of new teachers coming into the field and requiring some form of ESP teacher education, it is important that more information becomes available about the ESP teaching profession.

(Basturkmen 2017: 12)
CATAPULT’S CONTRIBUTION

- CATAPULT = contribution to the characterisation of the LSP teaching profession at the European level
  - bridges a gap in the literature
  - LSP teachers’ needs clearly expressed

- NA and situational survey = first step towards the design of training modules

- NA → design of a Common Competence Framework (CCF)
  - 5 areas of competence (general teaching, collaboration and intercultural mediation, research, course and material design, evaluation)
  - 17 competences in total + indicators
| 3. ANALYTICAL competences | 3.1. LSP discourse awareness | • knows that LSP is not reduced to lexis;  
• knows that languages for specific purposes have their own syntax, semantics (metaphor!), pragmatics, prosody / intonation, rhetorical strategies, etc. |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          | 3.2. Discourse analysis skills | • can establish context; can identify, collect and categorise spoken and written discourse samples;  
• can analyse the various levels or dimensions of discourse, such as sounds (intonation, etc.), gestures, syntax, the lexicon, style, rhetoric, meanings, speech acts, moves, strategies, turns, and other aspects of interaction and production. |
|                          | 3.3. Basic knowledge of corpus linguistics | • knows basic methodology of corpus compilation, annotation and analysis;  
• can use specific tools for corpus building, annotation and analysis. |
|                          | 3.4. Knowledge of classroom data collection techniques and tools | • can design a survey, especially for needs analysis and learner satisfaction surveys;  
• can use digital surveying tools;  
• can carry out classroom observation: knows how to prepare an observation sheet, how to tally observed behaviour, etc.;  
• can carry out interviews (one-to-one, focus groups, etc.);  
• can do action research to solve a problem in the classroom. |
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