THE ESP TEACHER AS A RESEARCHER – FROM NEEDS ANALYSIS TO MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

While quite a lot of publications concern the nature of training general language teachers, much less attention has been devoted to educating LSP practitioners. Increasing teachers’ awareness of the nature of specialised languages methodology and of the possible tools to be exploited during the teaching process is essential for educating better professionals. The paper shows the adoption of a research-based approach with the aim of building individual teaching style. Student teachers in a graduate teacher training programme at a middle-sized public university in Poland conducted field research within a selected domain, diagnosed the context, conducted needs analyses, evaluated coursebooks, developed digital materials and provided peer-feedback.
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1. Introduction

Teacher development in English Language Teaching has a rich body of theoretical research (e.g. Abdal-Haqq, 1995; Abdelraheem, 2004, Anderson et al., 1998; Balsanti, 2006; Bennett & Lockyer, 2004; Bennett & Marsh, 2002, Brill & Galloway, 2007, Chapelle and Hegelheimer, 2004; Hampel & Stickler, 2005; Krajka, 2012, to quote just a few), practical applications as well as national policy regulations, which make the process of educating language teachers at universities fairly predictable and straightforward. For instance, the teacher development standards set by the Polish Ministry’s of National Education specify exact subjects, hours, length and scope of all the courses, leaving little room for creativity to curriculum developers. On the other hand, LSP teacher education is a much more neglected area, with less emphasis placed on how to prepare teachers of specialised languages for the challenges of the job market. This apparent gap creates opportunities for innovations in designing university curricula.

The aim of the study will be to investigate the relevance of a research-based approach to LSP teacher education. A case study of ESP teacher development programme will be presented, in which trainees carry out actual field work by undertaking needs analysis, coursebook evaluation and digital materials development for selected workplace contexts. The results of interviews with trainees will shed light on the applicability of the adopted approach, showing how integration of three separate strands (ICT, ESP and materials development) enables student teachers (STs) to gain essential didactic skills necessary in the workplace.

2. Background to the study

2.1. Materials development and the ESP teacher

Often trained in the same language philology departments, Languages for Specific Purposes teachers share some characteristics with general English teachers as they perform similar functions in the classroom. As pinpointed by Harmer (2001), GE teachers need to perform a multitude of roles, flexibly switching from one to the other depending on the pedagogical purposes, personal characteristics of students, stage of the lesson and many others. The roles encompass, among many others: controller, organiser, assessor, prompter, participant, resource, tutor, observer and needs analyst (Harmer, 2001). A similar list produced in a fundamental work for LSP methodology (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998: 13-16) specifies the roles of teachers: course designers, materials providers, collaborators, researchers and evaluators. When confronting the two lists, it is evident that there is quite a considerable overlap between the two instructional contexts.

However, an ESP curriculum is fundamentally different from a standard GE classroom as an instructional context – the former is by principle skewed towards selected skills and areas, neglecting others, often adopting an atypical hierarchy of language skills, implementing the criteria of needs and content attractiveness more often than others (Komorowska, 2005). Thus, ESP instruction differs from General English in that it might omit structures basic for GE and start with more advanced concepts. Both GE teachers and LSP practitioners are generally
skilled at those roles that refer to delivering instruction. However, conducting classroom research with its indispensable phases of observation, intervention, evaluation and reflection find less attention in teacher training programmes.

Another area of expertise that largely differentiates GE from ESP instructional contexts is the necessity to design courses taking learner needs as a starting point. The subdivisions of learner needs produced in the literature, encompass, among others, wants, lacks, necessities; target needs and learning needs (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), target situation analysis, discourse analysis, present situation analysis, learner factor analysis and learning environment analysis (Basturkmen, 2010). Even though ESP trainer handbooks pinpoint needs analysis as an essential step to LSP teaching (Basturkmen, 2006; Day & Krzanowski, 2011; Donna, 2000; Gajewska & Sowa, 2014; West, 1997), novice ESP practitioners find it often hard to properly design, implement needs analysis instruments and analyse data due to lack of preparation in the teacher training curriculum. Such practical problems are reported in the literature: a discrepancy between wants and lacks (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), inadequate language awareness, misunderstanding of metalanguage, inability to describe language needs (Chambers, 1980), taking a predefined conceptual framework as a starting point which could be in conflict with stakeholders’ expectations (West, 1997) or retrieving data of varying degree of usefulness (Gajewska & Sowa, 2014). The skills of diagnosing needs, creating instruments, analysing and sifting data, processing data qualitatively and quantitatively seem to have received relatively little interest in graduate or post-graduate LSP teacher training programmes, mainly due to lack of time or adoption of a fairly traditional, transmission-oriented, instructional approach.

Meta-methodological awareness enabling LSP teachers to evaluate existing materials, confront them with needs analysis data, author their own materials and critically evaluate their applicability is of immense importance, given how narrowly defined the specific purposes of LSPs often are, how the distinction into English for Academic Purposes and English for Occupational Purposes in particular disciplines may limit the supply of materials, or how quickly the world of certain professions might be changing. Thus, the four stages of materials evaluation in LSP enumerated by Hutchinson and Waters (1987), namely defining criteria for analysis, subjective analysis, objective analysis and matching the material to the teachers’ needs need to be expanded by confronting materials with the two major groups of criteria:

- learner fit: learner type, learner-diagnosed language objectives, their preferences for main topic areas to cover, attitudes towards and preferences for methodological approaches to be adopted, the role and attractiveness of the material (Ellis & Johnson, 2000);

- technical criteria: cost, availability, content and relevance, balance of skills, syllabus type, input, lexis, student preferences and needs, presentation, cultural appropriacy and sensitivity, accessibility and usability, teacher preferences and dates of publication (Donna, 2000).

While ESP textbooks are a necessary component of a practitioner’s toolkit, with studies showing their characteristics, methodological underpinnings or design patterns (for instance, Barnard & Zemach, 2014; Esteban, 2002; Javid, 2013; Jones, 1990), a staple part of LSP teachers’ practice is materials development (Bocanegra-Valle, 2010; Gatehouse, 2001; Islam & Mares, 2003; Johns and Price-Machado, 2001), which in the twenty-first century is bound to be digital.
To date, there has been some focus on the implementation of technology-mediated instruction in Languages for Specific Purposes. Studies dealt with, quite unsurprisingly, Data-Driven Learning (DDL) and corpus-based materials (e.g., Chang & Kuo, 2011; Tribble & Wingate, 2013) due to the great interest that Languages for Specific Purposes has received from corpus linguists as far as register analysis and genre analysis are concerned. The body of studies of features of specific products (e.g., research articles in selected disciplines) helped inform LSP course design and materials development. To give an example, in a study by Hüttner et al. (2009) specialized corpora were used as a source of information on genres and as a tool for LSP materials development. Similarly, for Sullivan and Girginer (2002) corpora and discourse analysis proved to be an important starting point for materials writing by student teachers. Corpus self-compilation has been reported as highly beneficial in increasing learner language awareness (Charles, 2014; Lee & Swales, 2006). Positive learner evaluations called for the use of multimedia in self-study (e.g., Brett, 2000) as well as in institutionalised online ESP learning (Fan & Xunfeng, 2002). In a recent paper Plastina (2017) shows how task-based output and observational data highlights the benefits of learners’ direct exposure to authentic language input and of their creation of a data-rich learning environment. Similarly, Kozlova and Rodriguez-Ines (2017) demonstrate the use of an ad-hoc corpus for materials development purposes, with corpus-based materials triggering the process of task design either in print or interactive mode. This indicates how either teacher- or student-made corpus studies might lead to greater awareness of the characteristics of specialized language in the area of medical English, business English or English for science and technology.

Simultaneously, since ESP methodology places great emphasis on needs analysis, coursebook evaluation and materials writing, enhancing the process with selected technology-mediated techniques to facilitate design of teaching aids and classroom resources is of paramount importance. As expressed by Chapelle and Hegelheimer (2004), the indispensable skills of technology use and teaching with technology need to be grasped by teachers in order to teach languages effectively in the new millennium. Authoring digital materials involves student teachers in creating materials for teaching ESP and enables them to respond to learner preferences diagnosed during the needs analysis process. As is pointed out by Kramsch et al. (2000), engaging students in the process of creating learning materials is beneficial for motivation and attitude toward learning and the subject matter. The same applies to student teachers, who are, on one hand, learners of English at the advanced level, and, on the other, practising teachers of languages for specific purposes. Nikolova (2002) emphasises the fact that being involved in the selection of content for the revision activities teaches student teachers the skills of reflecting and prioritising, which leads to improvement in the learning process on the metacognitive level. However, a point that is often debated is to what extent teachers need to be equipped with the technical skills, to what extent they are to become producers of computer-based materials, rather than only consumers (Amiri, 2000), and to what extent digital materials writing is actually supposed to involve the knowledge of programming in the design and development of computer-based
materials. It is advocated by some authors (e.g., Amiri, 2000) that more specialised graduate courses for language teachers should concentrate on various aspects of IT, including end-user programming, learning or instructional design. However, given user-friendly authoring paths of modern Learning Management Systems or other online applications, this discussion is much less valid at the present day, with the exception, perhaps, of more advanced authoring environments that will inevitably involve some amount of computer training (see, for instance, Chuang, 2017, on such an authored Flash-based system for teaching English grammar).

Taking into account the great interest in the field of e-learning and a plethora of research into designing and evaluating e-learning environments for language instruction (e.g., Aldrich, 2004; Bates, 2005; Gajek, 2004a; Murphy & Rodriguez-Manzanares, 2009; Nichols, 2003; O'Lawrence, 2007; Plebańska, 2011), it is no wonder that research into multimedia authoring in teacher training is flourishing (as summarised by, for instance, Maciaszczyk, 2015). At the same time, the popularity of Moodle as an e-learning environment for language instruction (as exemplified, for example, by Brandl, 2005; Chinnery, 2008; Paulsen, 2003; Rice, 2004; Zsolt & Bessenyei, 2008) calls for implementing digital authoring in LSP teacher development courses. A viable option for LSP teacher training becomes authoring of dedicated e-learning courses available via a Learning Management System such as Moodle or Blackboard. While authoring full courses might demand quite a lot of work and needs a platform to be maintained by the school, other options for digital materials authoring in LSP instruction encompass materials writing for mobile-enhanced platforms such as Memrise or Quizlet or online quiz creators such as LearningApps. An interesting option, which integrates digital authoring and word processing skills, will also be preparation of interactive workbooks in the form of e-books with active links to online materials and interactive quizzes.

2.3. Developing technology-mediated individual teaching style

In order to create a technology-assisted (online, blended, corpus-based, internet-based, mobile-enhanced etc.) ESP course which would bring desired effects in terms of students’ language progress, the teacher needs to display particular skills that go beyond the usual Information Literacy (Fitzpatrick, 2003; Fitzpatrick and Davies, 2003; Fitzpatrick, 2004), technical or digital literacy (Gajek, 2004b) or ‘Web literacy’ (Chapelle and Hegelheimer, 2004). This additional skillset encompasses the ability to know how to use the Internet as a resource for current authentic language materials in varied formats (text, audio, video, and image), find linguistic and other reference materials and develop interesting and relevant activities around the materials on these sites. According to Chapelle and Hegelheimer (2004), this means repurposing materials for student use, adapting or recontextualising online information if needed to suit particular learning environments or pedagogical designs. Hampel and Stickler (2005) present this progression from technical skills to technology-based individual teaching style in a series of seven steps presented in a pyramid. Technology authoring and personalised teaching are indicated by Hampel and Stickler (2005) as the two highest levels of the model:
1. Level 1 – Basic ICT competence
2. Level 2 – Specific technical competence for the software
3. Level 3 – Dealing with constraints and possibilities of the medium
4. Level 4 – Online socialization
5. Level 5 – Facilitating communicative competence
6. Level 6 – Creativity and choice
7. Level 7 – Own style

The three levels at the bottom of the pyramid cover the basic competencies of managing hardware and software, without which the design of any digital environment is barely possible. “Online socialization” denotes the ability to build social communities necessary to overcome the feeling of isolation which often accompanies digital learning (Hampel & Stickler, 2005). The fifth level is dependent on the sense of community which would then facilitate distance communication and eliminate communication barriers (Hampel & Stickler, 2005). At level six, where creativity and choice are tapped into, the online tutor is supposed to choose high-quality materials which would suit the needs of his/her students out of a variety of available sources (Hampel & Stickler, 2005). It is only the last level that concerns the development of the tutor’s own teaching style in the online environment (Hampel & Stickler, 2005). Effective training in teaching LSP with technology, then, is not about trying to “jump” straight to the topmost levels, demanding that trainees show their individually-authored scenarios or activities straight away, but rather gradually help them develop their own understanding of what technology can be useful for in the LSP classroom. In other words, gradually moving student teachers up the pyramid is something that should be attempted by teacher trainers, making them aware of different dimensions of technology use (see Otero et al., 2005) and the most appropriate contexts for their activation.

3. Digital materials development in LSP teacher training - the study

3.1. Research aim and questions

The need to reflect upon the relevance of digital authoring in LSP materials development triggered a case study which aimed at investigating student teachers’ perceptions of the research-based approach in an LSP graduate training programme as well as to increase their professional awareness as digital materials authors, designers and evaluators. The secondary aims were to examine the opportunities and limitations of Moodle as an authoring environment for digital LSP teaching and come up with pedagogical guidelines for Moodle-based LSP course supplements. In particular, the research was targeted at the following questions:
1. How will STs perceive ESP training through field work?
2. Which of the stages of the action research process will be most troublesome?
3. What view of professional identity is shaped by action research?
4. What attitudes will STs have towards the integration of ESP curriculum design and multimedia authoring?

3.2. Participants and procedure

The study was conducted at a middle-sized Polish university, in a dual language programme (English with one of the following languages: German, French, Russian) aiming at training double-language interpreters, translators and teachers. The research spanned over the period of two years, with two interventions delivered during the spring semester to two groups of post-graduate student teachers (STs) training to teach foreign languages to adults in its different contexts.

1. The two iterations had the same general structure: STs were placed in 3-person groups, who chose their own specialist area to deal with throughout the whole semester. The groups followed the action research cycle with the following steps:

2. conceptualising the specialist areas;
3. designing needs analysis (NA) instruments;
4. gathering and interpreting NA data;
5. choosing digital environment and online tools for materials development;
6. authoring digital LSP materials;
7. presenting products to the whole class and giving peer-feedback on others’ course supplements.

The two instalments of the study differed in terms of the digital environment in which student teachers were supposed to author their specialist language supplements. In the 2015/2016 academic year all STs were required to use university Moodle as the hub for language resources and learning activities, however, they were also instructed in external tools such as LearningApps, Quizlet, Memrise, QuizFaber, ESLvideo, Kahoot, Socrative. As a result, all the LSP course supplements were authored within the university's Moodle, with a varying degree of utilisation of internal (Moodle-based) vs. external (Web-based) tools. On the other hand, for the second iteration of the course the instructional procedure was exactly the same; it also consisted in instructing STs how to find, evaluate, upload, author materials and activities within Moodle and other tools mentioned above, however, this time the participants were free to choose the mode of the final product: either Moodle-based e-learning supplement, Moodle-based supplement with resources prepared in external tools, e-book with traditional paper-based activities or e-book with active links to corresponding online resources and activities authored in external tools.
The data collection procedures included formal analysis and assessment of student products, peer-feedback given on student-made courses, end-of-course anonymous questionnaire and informal group interviews.

4. Results and findings

4.1. Student teachers’ perceptions of training through field research

The way that student teachers perceive LSP instruction was the starting point for the analysis of their development as researchers. In response to questions in a questionnaire, the participants found different metaphors for their ideal LSP classroom: “a comfortable sofa”, “concentrated audience”, “a chat room”, “a jungle”, “a discussion room”, “a meeting with friends”, “a place of mutual cooperation”, “a comfort zone”, or even “home”. The metaphors generally indicate strong commitment to lowering the affective filter of students, building their confidence and trust in the teacher and in their own learning strengths and limitations, fostering teacher-learner-stakeholder understanding, and finally, making communication and collaboration inherent features of their individual teaching style.

The way professional competence was to be built up through undertaking field research was another area examined in the study. The participants generally found the following easy or relatively easy to master and execute: creating needs analysis instruments, conducting needs analysis, finding informants. On the other hand, much more troublesome areas of the action research process proved to be the following:

• adaptation of materials, selection of contents, prioritising materials, applying authenticity;
• coming up with aims and objectives, constructing the syllabus;
• finding authentic materials with both general and specialised vocabulary, prioritising skills to skew the syllabus;
• fitting topics with time.

The reasons for these perceived problems were mainly the time-consuming nature of these operations, a greater intellectual and linguistic demand necessitating specialist knowledge of the domain, and non-existing/outdated/inadequate coursebooks. The general conviction was that it is hard to meet prospective learners’ expectations. These post-intervention assumptions are demonstrated in the selection of quotes from interviews below:

“I think I can conduct needs analysis, but when it comes to syllabus construction I feel I would do it better with someone else rather than individually.”

“I found it difficult to adjust their [target learners] needs to the form of the course.”

“I received practical information on how to analyse learners’ needs and pieces of advice on how to use them in order to prepare a suitable course.”

“I am able to create a broad curriculum and select useful content as well as provide
relevant materials. I realise that I am at the beginning of the development of my teaching competence in ESP but I am content with what I acquired till now.”

“I can understand my strengths and weaknesses now much better, as I see what it takes to be a teacher in a different context”

At the same time, the field research enabled STs to gain a better understanding of their own competence lacks as ESP teachers. More effort needs to be put into the development of skills of creating exercises and developing materials, building a personal approach with confidence and patience. The effect on individual teaching style can be perceived in better distinction between GE and ESP (“I realised that English language methodology does not confine itself to simple school classes”), the importance of needs analysis as a starting point for course design and materials writing (“I learned that while teaching English we have to take into consideration what needs of our learner(s) are and how we can either teach general English or English for specific purposes”, “Yes, I found out how important the needs analysis is to create a good course. I learnt how to conduct such an analysis and construct a course”) and the specificity of adults as language learners (“Yes, now I am more aware of how complex subject the English language methodology is and that is not all about school and teaching children”).

4.2. Analysis of digital LSP course supplements

The analysis of digital course supplements, Moodle-based in the first year and e-books in the second one, showed that student teachers improved their skills of finding and evaluating materials and digitising them as Moodle activities. The interviews showed that STs felt they would still need much more practice with Moodle authoring, though they were less apprehensive about Moodle as the teaching environment than at the beginning.

At the same time, Moodle did not turn out to be the natural choice as the authoring environment in the second year of the study once the participants were given the freedom to structure their course supplements as desired. Rather than use a robust yet difficult to master e-learning platform, creating a mix of paper-based tasks with links to resources authored in LearningApps, Memrise or HotPotatoes proved to be easier and preferred by the participants. When asked about the reasons for this choice during interviews, STs reported trying different tools, including cutting-edge ones, during the authoring process but reverted back to “safe” technologies such as HotPotatoes or LearningApps.

The materials created by students had some common points but also differed a lot. All had the “knowledge base” in the form of documents, text-, audio-, video-based resources, mostly as links to external online materials. However, close evaluation of course materials showed a need to focus on increasing coherence of materials, ensuring better transitions and progression, showing a sense of structure, improving quality of grammar input as well as integrating online and print components.

Some participants, labelling themselves “technopeasants”, claimed they were bad at IT or even resisted the idea of digital materials authoring as a requirement for the course. However, even they reported they tried hard and managed to overcome the challenge. Eventually, almost all the participants appreciated the idea of putting together in-built and
external resources within Moodle and online apps as a useful tool for organising materials and resources. As demonstrated by one student, “I found out more about usefulness and variety of internet platforms and apps”. Thanks to the collaborative nature of group projects, both digital enthusiasts and resisters could find their place and take responsibility for areas of interest.

All in all, the research-based approach on the one hand and digital authoring on the other had a positive effect on increasing student teachers’ awareness of autonomy and independence. As one participant said, “all teachers should be independent at least to some extent”, however, another added that “teachers should be free of coursebook control, only general guidelines of the Core Curriculum might bind them in course planning”. An interesting finding in this respect was that most participants found both the jobs of GE and ESP teachers equally demanding, however, for one, “the independence of an ESP teacher is more limited than that of a GE teacher – there are fewer options as regards activities to use and materials to choose”.

5. Final conclusions and recommendations

As proven by the study, there is a need for more systematic LSP teacher education in modern philology M.A. curricula, especially at the graduate level, when student teachers can be reasonably expected to have the general methodology basis, skills and abilities to conduct foreign language instruction to students at primary and secondary levels. Once such a basis is built during the undergraduate teacher training programme further work can be devoted to LSP teacher education. This could either take place in a dedicated course or be dispersed across other simultaneously taken courses. The second model demands close cooperation of lecturers of linguistics, research methodology or information technology with those responsible for the shape of LSP teacher education, however, it can lead to synergy of technical, methodological and linguistic training.

Teacher trainees need to be provided with actual fieldwork tasks to accomplish within a self-selected professional domain, which will encourage them to exercise greater autonomy and independence in analysing needs, planning courses, evaluating materials and authoring resources. The awareness of the essential role of teacher as researcher/needs analyst/materials evaluator, together with the practical application of these roles in an actual project, enables would-be LSP teachers to gain better skills and adapt to varied instructional contexts.

Since digital learning has become an essential part of every contemporary student's learning habit, LSP education cannot neglect developing digital materials and delivering technology-based instruction. As demonstrated by the current study, skilful integration of well-focused computer training, LSP methodology instruction and field research in a single teacher training programme (not necessarily in a single class) gives best results in terms of buildup of the student teachers’ skillset. When computer training is subordinated to the needs of core modules, and when the actual digital environment (e-learning, interactive online, e-book) is up to students’ choice, the instructional setup seems to be most favourable to encompass different categories of learners, ranging from Early Adopters and Enthusiasts to technopeasants, Laggards and Resisters (Anderson, Varnhagen, & Campbell, 1998; Geoghegan, 1994; Markee, 1997; Rogers, 1983).
The development of individual teaching style of would-be LSP practitioners means changing their understanding of previously grasped General English methodology, builds increased awareness of how different needs of learners can be encompassed in course planning and materials development, and, finally, allows them to realize the challenge and importance of needs analysis as a starting point for pedagogical reflection. Guiding future LSP teachers through the path of action research gives them better understanding of how GE and ESP contexts differ and equips them with greater confidence and skills to teach in a new age group, together with the expansion of personal language competence in new, more specialist, domains.
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Appendix 1. Needs analysis materials from “English for police officers” course supplement

NEEDS ANALYSIS – TARGET SITUATION

1. Why is the language needed?

The language is needed for work. The language will be used by the police officers working in the Podkarpackie Voivodship who will take part in the workers exchange programme between police officers from Y and Z.

2. How will the language be used?

• medium: speaking
• channel: face-to-face
• types of text or discourse: formal and informal conversations, presentations, conferences, discussions

3. What will the content areas be?

• subjects: safety, law enforcement, working conditions, crime, anti-social behaviours, emergency etc.
• level: young police officers with the basic knowledge of English (policemen who passed their Matura exam in English) – they need secondary education in the areas of the English language for communication concerning work in the police
• target recipient: native speakers, police officers working in Z

4. Who will the learner use the language with?

• physical setting: police station, conference room, lecture hall
• human context: cooperating with the English police officers, meetings, conferences, discussions
• linguistic country: abroad

5. When will the language be used?

The language will be used subsequent to the course – during a one-month stay in Z. It will be used in larger chunks.
6. Why do the learners intend to participate in the course?

The course is obligatory for the police officers who will take part in the workers exchange. The learners know what their tasks in Z will be and they know the aim of the course. The learners’ attitude towards the course is rather positive. They have some background knowledge concerning the language. However, they are rather unprepared for using it in practice and in communication. They must develop their speaking skills and broaden their vocabulary. The course is sponsored by the Voivodship Headquarters of the Police in Rzeszów.

7. What resources are available to the course organisers?

There are two teachers who have some background knowledge connected with the police work. The teachers are not police officers. The teachers’ professional knowledge is limited – they gain information concerning the discipline on their own (sources: the Internet, interviews with police officers, course book analysis). There is one course book available on the market Campaign: English for Law Enforcement.

8. Who are the learners?

- Gender: men
- Age: 20-30 years
- Nationality: Polish
- Interests: physical activity, information technology, music, movies etc.
- Attitude to TL culture: unaware of and not accustomed to the TL culture
- Learning style preferences: learning by heart, reading, listening to audio recordings
A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING LEARNING NEEDS

1. Why are learners taking the course?

Police officers are taking the course within the workers exchange programme concerning Poland and Great Britain. The course is compulsory in order to take part in the exchange and results from the apparent need of communicating with English police officers. Participation in the exchange was optional for young police officers, but they have to pass the Matura Exam in English. After finishing the course they will get the symbolic amount of money and the certificate which can have an influence on their further promotion. Learners want to develop their speaking skills and broaden their vocabulary in order to effectively communicate with English police officers and be able to talk about their area of specialization in English. They want to improve their English; their attitude towards the course is rather positive.

2. How do the learners learn?

The learners have some background knowledge concerning the basics of English because all of them passed the Matura Exam in English. They want to improve their speaking skills and use English in natural and real conditions – so, in practice. They prefer learning by heart, reading and listening to audio recordings. In order to be prepared for real conversations they have to do a huge number of speaking activities, so they expect it from their teacher. Long grammar exercises, texts and recordings are likely to bore and alienate them. They also expect variety and work in no artificial conditions. Various and practical exercises will appeal to them.

3. What resources are available?

There are two English teachers who have some background knowledge connected with the police work because they gained some information about this discipline on their own. However, the teachers are not police officers. They have a Master's degree in English. The concept of ESP is familiar to them. They have positive attitude towards the subject content and are willing to teach police officers. They expect the cooperation with learners as they are aware of the fact that the amount of knowledge connected with the police work that they gained on their own may be sometimes insufficient. There is one course book available on the market Campaign: English for Law Enforcement and teachers will make use of them. Additionally, language will be used in formal and informal conversations, presentations, conferences and discussions.

4. Who are the learners?

The course participants are 20-30-year old men from Poland who passed the Matura Exam in English at B1 level, so they have some background knowledge concerning the English language. However, some of them have difficulties with speaking in English. They should have a broad knowledge concerning the work in police because they passed special tests.
and took part in courses and trainings which are obligatory before getting proper eligibility to work in police. They are interested in PE, IT, music and movies. They are not aware of and not accustomed to the English culture, but they have a friendly attitude towards the cultures of the English-speaking world and they are eager to get to know it. They want to learn English. They are accustomed to be taught in a classroom where the teacher is the main mentor and the course book is the medium and source of exercises during the lesson.

5. Where will the ESP course take place?

The course will be held at the Voivodship Headquarters of the Police in Rzeszów. The most appropriate place for learners will be one of the conference halls because of the spaciousness of the room. Its arrangement is very comfortable and is favourable to conducting speaking activities because there are no typical desks as in a classroom. The surrounding is pleasant for learners.

6. When will the ESP course take place?

The ESP course will last for 10 weeks and it will cover 10 most important thematic areas.
Appendix 2. “English for Police Officers” Entry test

Name: _________________________ Points: _____/30
Date: __________________________ Grade: _________

Answer the following questions by choosing a correct answer (A, B, C).

1. I attempted to __________ what transpired.
   A. get to know
   B. presuppose
   C. ascertain

2. I drove _____ car home because they had been drinking.
   A. thare
   B. their
   C. there

3. I responded to the caller’s __________ to make contact.
   A. residence
   B. number
   C. resident

4. I ________ to three suspects and they were going to come in for an interview.
   A. was talking
   B. talked
   C. have been talking

5. Upon closer examination, it was evident that someone ____________ a brick at the window.
   A. through
   B. threw
   C. throw
6. A violation of F.S.S. 784.03 (1a1) is a __________ of the first degree.
   A. delinquency
   B. crime
   C. misdemeanour
7. I arrested them ________ possession of drug paraphernalia.
   A. for
   B. of
   C. in
8. The speeder was __________ towards the bridge.
   A. traveling
   B. travelling
   C. travling
9. The defence attorney issued a __________ for me to testify in court.
   A. motion
   B. subpoena
   C. list
10. Based on my __________, physical evidence and witness statements, it was evident that he was the primary aggressor in the altercation.
    A. investigation
    B. presumption
    C. interrogation
11. On this date at approximately 1500 hours, I responded to a call for__________.
    A. service
    B. help
    C. support
12. I noticed the ___________ was cold to the touch and appeared to be deceased.
    A. victim
    B. witness
    C. suspect
13. The ___________ investigation revealed that the victim had been battered by the suspect.
   A. initial
   B. middle
   C. court

14. A property receipt ______________ for the found property yesterday.
   A. is completed
   B. was completed
   C. is being completed

15. ______________ the strange behaviour exhibited, the individual was taken into custody under the Baker Act.
   A. Despite of
   B. Due to
   C. Because of

16. After completing the traffic stop, arrangements were ___________ for the unlicensed driver to get a ride home.
   A. decided
   B. taken
   C. made

17. The Florida __________ for DWLSR is 322.34.
   A. statute
   B. statue
   C. statyou

18. __________it was a custodial interview, I had to advise him of his rights.
   A. For
   B. Since
   C. Due

19. All evidence was __________ placed into an evidence locker.
   A. subsequently
   B. continuously
   C. consciously
20. The victim had ___________ documentation showing a pattern of abuse.
   A. many
   B. much
   C. a few

21. The crime ________ is described as....
   A. place
   B. scene
   C. square

22. The vehicle abruptly came to a ____________.
   A. halt
   B. pause
   C. stop

23. Upon dispatch advising the altercation was now physical, I __________ my response last month.
   A. expadit
   B. was expading
   C. expedited

24. Because the suspect ___________ a bat to strike the victim, he was charged with aggravated battery.
   A. used
   B. had used
   C. was using

25. There ________ nobody living in the trailer park yesterday evening.
   A. was
   B. were
   C. is

26. _______________ of glass were everywhere!
   A. Sheets
   B. Element
   C. Pieces
27. I believed the suspect to be high _________ an unknown type of narcotic.
   A. with
   B. in
   C. on

28. There were _________ unknown number of witnesses.
   A. an
   B. a
   C. the

29. Due to the crime scene being _____________ by the fire department personnel, I could not process the area for latent prints.
   A. ordered
   B. investigated
   C. contaminated

30. I responded to the park after _____________ a report of suspicious activity.
   A. getting
   B. get
   C. being get
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