An Investigation into Iranian University Students' Views about Who Should Teach ESP Courses: A Specialist-in the Field Instructor, or an EFL Teacher?[*]

Seyed Hesamuddin Aliasin
PhD in TEFL, University of Zanjan
Parisa Pouyan
MA in TEFL, University of Zanjan

Abstract

This study was an attempt to explore the Iranian university students' views about the rather controversial question of who should teach ESP courses among EFL teachers and the specialists-in-the-field in Iran. For this purpose, 120 undergraduate students majoring in accounting, business management and industrial management were selected from among university students. The members of each major were divided into two groups of A and B, the former being taught their ESP course by an EFL teacher, the latter by a specialist-in-the-field instructor. Although different items of the research instrument (questionnaire) addressed diverse aspects of teaching method such as teacher knowledge, functions and techniques, the study was based on the following major research question: Which ESP instructor teaches more satisfactorily and effectively from students' point of view: the EFL teacher, or the specialist- in- the- field instructor? A survey questionnaire consisting of 35 items related to the ESP teachers' knowledge, functions and techniques used in the classroom was designed to collect the required data for the study. The data gathered was then subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Comparison of the total mean scores of the two groups for each major revealed that the students' rate of satisfaction with the EFL teacher was significantly higher than that with the specialist-in-the-field instructor. The study also offers some pedagogical recommendations for ESP practitioners.

1. Introduction

As one of the variables of the ESP course, teachers play a significant role in the success of the ESP programs. To show the scope of ESP teachers' work, Swales (1985) prefers the term *ESP practitioner* instead of the word *teacher*. In addition to normal functions of a classroom teacher, the ESP teacher has to deal with needs analysis, syllabus design, materials writing or adaptation and evaluation. Thus the multiplicity of the tasks ascribed to the ESP teacher clearly indicates that he/she is to be considered as a practitioner rather than a pure teacher. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) designate the following roles for an ESP practitioner: teacher, course designer, material provider, collaborator, researcher and evaluator.

The primary issue in ESP teaching is the struggle to master the target language as well as the subject matter. ESP teachers have been criticized for lacking in the specialist knowledge necessary to understand the target material. Hutchinson and Waters (1987), however, believe that the ESP teacher does not need to learn specialist subject knowledge. Accordingly, it suffices if he/she has a positive attitude towards the ESP content, some knowledge of the fundamental principles of the subject area and an awareness of how much learners probably already know.

According to Anthony (2007), ESP teachers are quite similar to students in their desire to know more about the language of the target field as well as about their weakness in understanding the target material. They should abandon their roles as all-knowing experts of the subject matter to play the role of 'teacher as student' so that they can create a more productive atmosphere that ultimately results in more dynamic, student-centered classroom activities and greater learning. Not only can they learn from students, but also they can contribute to increased student understanding by explaining the methods and strategies they use during class preparation.

The focal point in this study is the teacher factor; the question of who should teach the ESP courses has been a source of argument between EFL teachers and specialists-in-the-field in Iran. Specialists in the field claim that since EFL teachers do not posses enough knowledge about the subject area, they are not able to exchange ideas and are not qualified to teach the course. On the other hand, EFL teachers believe ESP teaching is part of their job because the aim of teaching the course is to teach English, not the subject matter. ESP teachers are primarily language teachers and should be experts in the language and language

teaching, and are not required to have full command of specialized subject knowledge (Rajabi, Kiany, & Maftoon, 2011; Sadeghi, 2005).

The present study was conducted to find out whose teaching satisfies the students more: EFL teachers or specialists in the field? This is a descriptive study conducted in the form of a survey to compare two groups of students' points of view and satisfaction with ESP teachers and their teaching methods.

2. Literature Review

2.1. ESP Revisited

There are ample definitions of ESP in the literature; some scholars have tried to define ESP in terms of what it is not rather than what it really is. Most definitions agree on three key topics: the nature of the language to be taught, the learners, and the settings in which the other two occur (Romo, 2006). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) give a broad description of ESP as "an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner's reason for learning" (p. 19).

Robinson (1991) mentions two key criteria and a number of characteristics in her definition of ESP. She stresses the importance of needs analysis in defining ESP. The two key criteria are that ESP is normally goal-directed and based on the analysis of the students' needs to specify exactly what students will use English for. She thinks that the objectives of ESP courses are to be achieved in limited time period, and that the learners consisting of adults are in homogeneous classes in terms of the work or specialist studies involved.

2.1.1. Parameters of ESP Courses

Needs, materials, method, learners, teachers, and context are the main parameters of ESP courses (See Farhady, 2006). More elaboration on these parameters is briefly presented below.

2.1.2. Needs

A key feature of ESP course design is that the syllabus is based on an analysis of the needs of the students. The fact is that all courses are based on a perceived need of some sort; the difference between ESP and General English is that the needs of General English learner are not specifiable, and it is the awareness of the need that distinguishes General English from ESP rather than the existence of a need (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). Basturkmen (2006) notes that a syllabus based on the learners' needs is likely to be motivating for them because they see the obvious relevance of what they are learning.

2.1.3. Materials
Once the goals have been identified by prior analysis and the syllabus of ESP has been established based on the language needs of the learners, the teaching materials should be developed or selected. The key concept in developing or selecting teaching materials for ESP is authenticity. They need to be specific to the goals and needs of particular learners. The tasks and materials which are presented in learning situations should be authentic (Robinson, 1991).

2.1.4. Methodology
Farhady (2006) states that ESP follows the trends of methodology in the language instruction field because it is an offspring of General Purpose English. He mentions two reasons why ESP has not developed its own methodology. The first reason is that due to the failure of various methods of teaching, beginning in the 1970s, materials acquired a predominant role in language teaching in general and ESP in particular. So, what to teach became more important than how to teach. He cites Ewer (1983) as saying that "…methods in fact are far less important than appropriateness of linguistic content" (p. 22). The second reason offered is that ESP practitioners have been consuming the developing principles of EGP; communicative approaches to language teaching; the closely linked strands of functional syllabus, communicative and learning-centered approaches, authenticity, relevancy, and appropriacy in language and materials are all relevant to ESP.

2.1.5. ESP Learners
Robinson (1980) stated that ESP curricula needs to be developed based not on requirements imposed by language institutions or work supervisors but on real needs of real learners in the diverse realms of sciences and humanities. Robinson referred to ESP learners as goal-oriented people who do not wish to learn English because they are interested in it, or because they find cultural or any other pleasure in it, but because they need it as an instrument that will help them reach their study and work goals, and consequently will help them advance both financially and professionally in terms of academic achievement. Age and motivation are two important aspects of ESP learners.

2.1.6. ESP Teachers
ESP teachers have a lot in common with teachers of General English. Both of them need to know about recent linguistic development and teaching theories, new ideas regarding teachers' role and the learners' role in education, to use new technologies offered to improve their methodology. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) note that the work of the General English teacher and the ESP teacher differ in two ways: the first

difference lies in the fact that ESP teachers have to deal with needs analysis, syllabus design, material writing or adaptation and evaluation in addition to the normal functions of a classroom teacher. The second difference concerns the lack of training of a great majority of ESP teachers for teaching the courses. They believe that ESP teachers "need to orient themselves to a new environment for which they have generally been ill-prepared" (p.157).

Bojvoic (2006) states that what differentiates General English teachers from ESP teachers is that ESP teachers need to understand the requirements of other professions and show willingness to adapt to these requirements. They are expected to help students, who know their subject better than them, develop the essential skills in understanding, using, and/or presenting authentic information in their profession. Farhady (2006) in an attempt to clarify factors influencing ESP instruction in Iranian academic settings refers to the important role of teacher variable. He believes that teachers should be equipped with the trends and developments of ESP. In other words, there should be a sense of uniformity among the ESP teachers' attitudes, beliefs, methods, techniques, and classroom activities.

2.1.7. Context of Instruction

The word context covers many factors such as the dynamics of instruction, the learner and teacher characteristics, the educational objectives, the teacher-student and student-student relationships, the quality of the textbooks and materials, the attitude of teachers and students toward the class. Learners perceptions of the course and its objectives, their favorite types of activities, their preferences, likes and dislikes would influence the quality of instruction and eventually the context in which the objectives are achieved (Farhady, 2006).

2.2. Roles of the ESP Practitioner

Since ESP teaching is extremely varied, most scholars admit that the ESP teacher's work involves much more than teaching. Dudley-Evans and Jo St John (1998) prefer the term "ESP practitioner", as their definition seems to be more detailed and complete. They see an ESP practitioner as having five key roles:

  1. ESP practitioner as teacher: Unlike the teacher of General English, the ESP teacher is not a primary knower. The students may in many cases know more about the content than the teacher. The teachers' main role is to generate real, authentic communication in the classroom in the grounds of students' knowledge, and they need to have a reasonable understanding of the subject of the materials. ESP teachers should show willingness to listen to learners, and interest in the disciplines or

professional activities the students are involved in, they need to be flexible and take some risk in their teaching.

2. ESP practitioner as course designer and materials provider: Using supplementary material beside textbooks is usually needed, and sometimes published materials are not suitable for identified needs, and ESP practitioners have to provide materials for the course. Their task is to select material, adapt if they are not suitable, or write their own material. They also need to evaluate the teaching material used on the course whether that material is published or self-produced. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) believe that only a small proportion of good teachers are also good designers of course, materials, are good providers of materials, and argue that a good provider of materials will be able to:

1. select appropriately from what is available;
2. be creative with what is available;
3. modify activities to suit learners' needs; and
4. supplement by providing extra activities.

3. The ESP practitioner as researcher: ESP teachers should function as a researcher to fulfill the students' needs. The teachers carrying needs analysis, designing a course or writing materials need to be able to incorporate the findings of the research. They need to be able to carry out research to understand the discourse of the texts that students use.

4. The ESP practitioner as collaborator: ESP teachers should cooperate with subject specialists. It may be simple cooperation in which ESP teacher gains information about subject matter or the tasks the students have to carry out in a work or a specific collaboration when there is some integration between specialist studies or activities and the language, for example, if the teacher wants to prepare the learners for subject lectures. Subject-specific work is often best approached through collaboration with subject specialists (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). The fullest collaboration is where a subject expert and a language teacher team-teach classes. When team-teaching is not possible, the ESP Practitioner must collaborate more closely with the learners, who are more familiar with the specialized content of materials than the teacher.

5. The ESP practitioner as evaluator: ESP teachers get involved in various types of evaluation, including testing for student assessment and the evaluation of courses and teaching materials. They need to be able to devise achievement tests to assess how much learners have gained from the course. Evaluating course design and teaching materials should be an on-going activity, which is done during the course and at the end of the

course (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). Thus, constant evaluation is an important factor contributing to a successful ESP course.

2.3. Who Should Teach ESP?

Based on Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) definition of ESP as an approach to language teaching which aims to meet the needs of particular learners, one can understand that ESP teachers need to be able to design appropriate courses for various groups of learners. So ESP teacher should have the same capabilities required by GE teachers as well as the ability to design the course.

Sadeghi (2005) mentions three major requirements for the ESP teacher: "English language knowledge, thorough command of course design, and an expert knowledge of the related field of science" (p. 24). He believes both the general language teachers and the subject teachers can teach ESP classes, in the case that he/she has the three requirements but he stresses the importance of a good command of the language knowledge and some general knowledge on the subject. He continues to say that "it seems the job is easier for a general language teacher, because all he/she needs is to have some sessions as it will be suggested to acquire the relevant general knowledge on the subject" (p. 28). He suggests a few consulting sessions on the part of the general language teacher, to make clear the points which he or she may lack knowledge about or feel as being unclear.

Rajabi, Kiany, and Maftoon (2011) found that the ESP in-service teacher training program influenced the students' classroom achievements. Regarding the outcomes of students' achievement test in experimental and control groups, the group with trained ESP instructor outperformed the other groups. Also the outcome showed better operation of the class with a trained non-ELT instructor versus the one instructed by an untrained non- English major ESP teacher. This proves the fact that English major ESP instructors can fulfill course goals much better than specialists in the field provided that they possess a certain level of background knowledge in their students' academic subjects of ESP teaching in order to meet this challenge Factors such as the potential superiority of ELT teachers over non-ELT instructors in terms of appropriate competence, language proficiency, linguistic performance, teaching styles, strategic competence, and language awareness are mostly influential in English majors' success in ESP classes.

Hassaskhah (2006) explains the drawbacks of the present paradigm in which ESP works in Iran, and stresses the need for rethinking and reappraisal. She argues that procedures followed in ESP classes do not fulfill the students' needs, and mentions some problems

with ESP classes: The language produced in class is language for display, and not intended to have any real communicative content. Study skills have no role in such classrooms. The teaching is exam-oriented; the emphasis is on learners' preparation for tests instead of focusing on the long-term English learning for life-long needs. According to Hassaskhah (2006), there is dissatisfaction with the dominant paradigm, which is informed by established practice, and it is challenged by theory, and new values that emphasize the centrality of the learner, the social nature of language, and its availability for personal use. Accordingly, "the challenge is to propose a methodological framework which is able to integrate theory into practice, formal and communicative activities, but there is no general agreement to the way forward" (p. 14). A change in the existing paradigm depends on a remarkable change in a number of factors including ESP teachers' beliefs, curriculum, educational policies, syllabi and textbooks.

Research on the question of who should teach an ESP course is emaciated; most researches deal with materials design, development, and teaching of EAP/ESP courses. Maleki (2006) conducted a research to find out who is better qualified for the job: the EFL teacher or the specialist in the field? Analysis of the results of the achievement test obtained from two classes, one of which taught by EFL teacher, and the other by the specialist-in-the-field, showed that the EFL teachers' class scored higher.

Ahmadi (2007) conducted a survey to investigate the ESP students' views on the question: Who is more qualified ESP teacher? The results showed that, on the whole, students preferred EFL teachers to the teachers of discipline-specific departments.

This study has aimed to explore the question of who is more qualified to teach ESP courses, EFL teachers or the specialists-in-the field, from the learners' point of view.

3. Method
3.1. Participants
The participants of the study consisted of 120 Iranian students studying in three different majors including Accounting, Business Management and Industrial Management at the University of Zanjan and the Islamic Azad University of Zanjan. They were all undergraduate junior or senior students, who were taking their ESP courses during the academic year of 2011-2012. The students of the mentioned majors are required to pass one 3-credit general English course as a prerequisite to their 4-credit, or 2-credit ESP courses depending on their majors. The general English

courses are normally taught by TEFL teachers and include all the four skills with specific attention to reading. It takes one semester with three hours a week to complete. After its completion, the students have to choose ESP courses with three hours a week in each semester which are usually taught by the specialists in the field. The participants were two groups; each group consisted of three classes studying in the three majors mentioned above. The ESP teachers of one group were specialists in the field and the teachers of the other group were EFL teachers.

3.2. Instruments

In this research a questionnaire was used to investigate the students' views about their ESP teachers and their teaching procedure. The questionnaire was based on a four-point Likert Scale consisting of thirty six items. Each option was given a numerical value from one to four. On the first part, the students were asked to write their major and their ESP teacher's field of study. The items in the questionnaire dealt with the teachers' knowledge and capabilities, function, and techniques he/she used in classroom to teach the ESP courses. These questions were adopted from Swandee's (1995) questionnaire regarding successful teachers characteristics.

3.2.1. Reliability and Validity of the Research Instrument

The questionnaire used included criteria which examined successful ESP teachers. It was examined by a number of experts for the evaluation of efficient teaching of ESP courses. Some items were modified and some were deleted according to their advice until the researcher came up with the final draft; Cronbach's alpha for the reliability of the questionnaire was calculated at 0.77, which is regarded as an acceptable index.

3.3. Data Collection

A questionnaire-based survey was used to obtain information from the participants in order to find out how satisfactorily they think their ESP teachers teach the courses. Six classes of students from three different majors: Accounting, Business Management, and Industrial Management were selected. The ESP courses of one group were taught by EFL teachers and the other group's by specialists in the field. The questionnaire was translated into Farsi so that every student could understand the items clearly. In order to elicit the students' genuine attitudes toward their ESP teacher's teaching method, the researchers assured them that their answers were to be used in a research project and their identities would be kept confidential. The copies of the questionnaire were distributed among the respondents at the end of the academic year 2011-2012, and the data was collected in two weeks.

3.4. Data Analysis Method

In analyzing the survey data, the rating took the form of Likert Scales. Rating Scales were numerically coded as 1 (for weak/never/not at all), 2 (for average/sometimes/little), 3 (for good/often/to some extent), and 4 (for very good/always/a lot), depending on the content and nature of each item on the questionnaire. Then the data were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistical analysis via the SPSS package.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. T-test Results for Students' Satisfaction with ESP Teachers' Knowledge and Ability

In order to explore the students' rate of satisfaction in the two groups on the basis of the teachers' knowledge and abilities, we conducted several independent-samples t-tests. The first part of the questions on the questionnaire dealt with the teachers' knowledge and abilities. Students' degree of satisfaction with the EFL teacher in all items in this part (i.e., 1. speaking English fluently, 2. vocabulary knowledge, 3. grammar knowledge, 4. knowledge of the subject matter, 5. knowledge of language and linguistics, 6. skill in providing appropriate material for the course, 7. skill in providing syllabus for the course) were found to be above the average mean (2.5). And in the second group, the students' level of satisfaction in items 2, 4, 6 proved above the average mean.

The comparison of students' satisfaction in each item through t-test showed that mean differences on items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were significant (See p-values below); Thus, students' satisfaction level in group A was higher than that in group B on items 1, 2, 3, and 5. In group A, high percentage of students assessed their teachers' knowledge as good or very good: (1) %43, (2) %46, (3) %46, and (5) %56. In group B high percentage of students assessed the teachers' knowledge as average: (1) %41, (2) %38, (3) %50, and (5) %48. But in item 4 the students were more satisfied with the specialist-in-the-field. Most of the students thought the teachers' knowledge of subject matter was average: %60, but in group B most of the students thought their teachers' knowledge was good: %63. Table 1 below represents these results.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Independent-Samples T-Test Results for Students' Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers' Knowledge and Abilities

Question	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Question 1	A	60	3.2500	.77295	6.187	.000
	B	60	2.3500	.81978		
Question 2	A	60	3.2333	.69786	3.505	.001
	B	60	2.7167	.90370		
Question 3	A	60	3.3667	.68807	7.564	.000
	B	60	2.3667	.75838		
Question 4	A	60	2.6333	.80183	-3.384	.001
	B	60	3.1000	.70591		
Question 5	A	60	3.1667	.71702	7.087	.000
	B	60	2.1333	.87269		
Question 6	A	60	2.8667	.72408	-.247	.805
	B	60	2.9000	.75240		
Question 7	A	60	2.6667	.72875	1.552	.123
	B	60	2.4333	.90884		

Note. A refers to the class whose ESP teachers were EFL teachers, and B refers to the classes whose teachers were specialists in the field. (Table 1 continued).

4.2. T-tests Results for Students' Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers' Functions

The second part of the questionnaire included 14 items related to the teachers' function in the classroom. They included items 8 (making the students think), 9 (encouraging the students to correct each other's errors, 10 (assessing the students progress), 11 (encouraging the students to be monitor themselves), 12 (encouraging the students to participate in classroom activities), 13 (letting the students know about the objectives of the course), 14 (motivating the students to learn ESP), 15 (introducing supplementary materials for learning English), 16 (teaching according to the level of the students), 17 (considering the students interests and learning styles, 18 (providing answers to the students questions), 19 (interest in the subject matter, 20 (interest in teaching the course), and 21 (creativity in teaching).

In group A, the students' degree of satisfaction appeared above the average mean (2.50) in items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 20. But in items 16, 17, 19 and 21 it was found to be below the average mean. In the second group in items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 it fell below the average.

The results indicated a significant mean difference for items 15 and 19 between the two groups (see p-values below). In item 15, the mean score of group A is higher than that of group B. The majority of the students believed that their teacher introduced materials for English learning to some extent, %41, and in group B most of them thought they

did so a little: %55. This implies that the students' level of satisfaction in group A was higher than that in group B in this item. But In item 19, the mean score of group B was higher than that of group A. Most of the students in group A assessed their teachers' interest in the subject matter as average and little: %43, %21, but in group B they assessed it as a lot and average %33, and %36. Table 2 shows the results.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Independent-Samples T-Tests Results for Students' Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers' Functions

Question	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Question 8	A	60	2.8000	.83969	.648	.518
	B	60	2.7000	.84973		
Question 9	A	60	2.6500	.91735	.107	.915
	B	60	2.6333	.78041		
Question 10	A	60	2.9000	.83767	1.223	.224
	B	60	2.7167	.80447		
Question 11	A	60	2.5500	.79030	-.119	.906
	B	60	2.5667	.74485		
Question 12	A	60	2.8500	.87962	.950	.344
	B	60	2.7000	.84973		
Question 13	A	60	2.5833	.74314	.352	.726
	B	60	2.5333	.81233		
Question 14	A	60	2.6333	.95610	.098	.922
	B	60	2.6167	.90370		
Question 15	A	60	2.8167	.87317	5.181	.000
	B	60	2.0333	.78041		
Question 16	A	60	2.3167	.72467	.254	.080
	B	60	2.2833	.71525		
Question 17	A	60	2.1667	.78474	.215	.830
	B	60	2.1333	.91070		
Question 18	A	60	2.5333	.94406	-.976	.331
	B	60	2.5833	.92593		
Question 19	A	60	2.3500	.98849	-2.927	.004
	B	60	2.8500	.87962		
Question 20	A	60	2.6333	.88234	-.719	.474
	B	60	2.7500	.89490		
Question 21	A	60	2.3167	.81286	-1.109	.270
	B	60	2.4833	.83345		

4.3. T-tests Results for Students' Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers' Methods and Techniques
In this part the questionnaire included items related to the methods and techniques used in classroom by EFL and field specialist teachers; these were items 22 (activating the students background knowledge), 23 (teaching reading strategies), 24 (teaching study skills), 25 (making the students use monolingual dictionaries), 26 (giving appropriate assignments), 27 (teaching grammatical points), 28 (doing the reading comprehension exercises), 29 (having English presentations in classroom), 30 (doing listening activities), 31 (summarizing texts), 32

(conducting cooperative and collaborative activities in classroom), 33 (having discussions in English), 34 (teaching method), and 35 (testing techniques).

As indicated by Table 3 below, the students' level of satisfaction in items including 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 34, and 35 proved above the average. But in items 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 it stood below the average. And in the second group the students' satisfaction in items 26 and 28 appeared above the average. But in items including 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 32, 34, and 35 it was below the average.

The t-test results revealed a significant mean difference between the two groups of teachers on items 23, 27, 29, and 31. The students' degree of satisfaction regarding these items with the EFL teacher was higher that with the specialist-in-the-field. Most of the students in group A believed that their teacher taught reading strategies and grammatical points to some extent: (23) %46, (27) %47. But in group B, they believed that the teachers taught reading strategies and grammatical points a little: (23) %51, (27) %51. In items 29 and 31 in group A, the majority of the students stated that they sometimes have presentations and sometimes summarize texts: 29 (%56), 31 (%53). But in group B most of the students stated that they never did: 29 (%50), 31 (% 50) (See the next table).

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Independent-Samples T-Tests Results for Students' Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers' Methods and Techniques

Question	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Question 22	A	60	2.5500	.90993	.602	.548
	B	60	2.4500	.90993		
Question 23	A	60	2.7667	.83090	.589	.003
	B	60	2.2833	.90370		
Question 24	A	60	2.3667	.82270	1.705	.091
	B	60	2.1167	.78312		
Question 25	A	60	2.2500	.96770	1.554	.123
	B	60	1.9833	.91117		
Question 26	A	60	2.5500	.81025	.808	.420
	B	60	2.5167	.77002		
Question 27	A	60	2.8333	.90510	4.334	.000
	B	60	2.1500	.81978		
Question 28	A	60	2.8667	.91070	1.080	.282
	B	60	2.6833	.94764		
Question 29	A	60	1.8667	.65008	2.396	.018
	B	60	1.5833	.64550		
Question 30	A	60	1.0500	.21978	-.386	.700
	B	60	1.0667	.25155		
Question31	A	60	1.9000	.68147	2.613	.010
	B	60	1.5833	.64550		
Question 32	A	60	1.7667	.67313	.554	.581
	B	60	1.7000	.64572		
Question 33	A	60	1.9667	.75838	1.264	.209
	B	60	1.8000	.68396		
Question 34	A	60	2.7333	.82064	1.585	.116
	B	60	2.4800	.79191		
Question 35	A	60	2.7333	.84104	1.920	.057
	B	60	2.4333	.87074		

Apart from the mean scores of each item, the total mean scores of the two groups were computed and compared through t-test analysis. The descriptive statistics and t-test results for the two groups are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Students' Overall Satisfaction with the ESP Teachers

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	St. Error Mean
Satisfaction	60	92.5833	9.27415	1.19729
A	60	85.3500	6.5434	.84500
B				

Table 5

Independent-Samples T-Test for Students' Level of Satisfaction and the ESP Teachers

		Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F	3.228	
	Sig.	.075	
t-test for Equality of Means	t	4.936	4.936
	df	118	106.092
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	Mean Difference	7.23333	7.23333
	95% Confidence Interval lower of the Difference	4.33136	1.46544
	upper	10.13531	4.32798

The results indicate a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. The mean score of group A (M = 92.58) was higher than that of group B (M = 85.35). Thus, the null hypothesis stating that "there is no difference between the students' satisfaction with ESP teaching by EFL teachers and specialists in the field" is rejected and it can be concluded that the level of the students' satisfaction with the EFL teacher is higher than that with the specialist-in-the-field.

5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study seem to be in line with what is found in the related literature. Especially, the overall finding that ESP students feel more satisfied with the EFL teacher than with the Specialist-in-the–field teacher regarding the methodology of teaching is compatible with Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) notion that ESP teachers "need to orient themselves to a new environment for which they have generally been ill-prepared" (p.157). The findings here also reaffirm the significance of the roles ascribed to an ESP practitioner by Dudley-Evans and Jo St John (1998) as well as by Farhady (2006) as mentioned above. The findings of the study also subscribe to Ellis and Johnson's (1994) notion that good ESP teachers are experts in language and language teaching; and they have the ability to ask the right questions and make good use of the answers. The findings also confirm the view that the EFL teacher is in a better position to teach the ESP course than the specialist-in-the-field because the former subscribes more substantially to the traits of an ESP teacher as outlined by Savas (2009). He states that since ESP teaching

requires particular and sometimes special skills such as dealing with language input, handling skills work, answering questions on terminology, and listening to lectures and research presentations and seminar skills training, Functional Academic Literacy (FAL) is an inevitable skill for an ESP teacher. Acquisition of FAL involves acquiring the discourse of science, and he mentions the lack of FAL as the main barrier against student and teacher in comprehension of texts. As the EFL teacher of ESP has already sufficient control over the target language (English) itself, he can have acquired the FAL more effectively than the specialist-in-the-field instructor. Likewise, these findings indicate that the EFL teacher of an ESP course may be said to perform more effectively in the roles of the ESP practitioner (teacher, course designer, researcher, collaborator, evaluator) as designated by Dudley-Evans and Jo St John (1998) than the specialist-in-the-field instructor because the former enjoys the prerequisites for most of these roles more adequately than the latter. The results are also supportive of empirical research findings encountered in the literature (Ahmadi, 2007; Maleki, 2006; Rajabi, Kiany, & Maftoon, 2011; Sadeghi, 2005) though such research lacks abundance in the literature.

Students feel more satisfied with the EFL teacher regarding methods and techniques used in classroom including providing background information, teaching reading techniques, teaching grammatical points, giving appropriate assignments, and doing reading comprehension exercises. Those specialists-in-the-field interested in teaching ESP English should attain the necessary qualifications. Also, an optimal case for an ESP program would be the cooperation between the two groups of ESP teachers; the two parties can join in a collaborative task in order to teach the courses, but the major part of the instruction should be trusted to the EFL teacher.

ESP is a problematic and complex issue. It is hoped that more research studies will be conducted in order to contribute to understanding ESP issues properly and propose suggestions for the academics, ESP administrators, English language planners, and policy-makers.

References

Ahmadi, M. (2007). Who should teach ESP? Retrieved on October 3, 2013 from https://www.tesol-rance.org/Documents/Colloque08/ *Ahmadi*.pdf.

Anthony, L. (2007). The Teacher as student in ESP course design. Keynote address presented at the 2007 International Symposium

on ESP and its Applications in Nursing and Medical English Education. Fooyin University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

Basturkmen H. (2006). *Ideas and options in English for Specific Purposes*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bojovic, M. (2006). Teaching foreign language for specific purposes: Teacher development. Application of teacher education in Europe. 31st Annual ATEE Conference.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, M., & Johnson, C. (1994). *Teaching business English*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Ewer, J. R. (1983). Teacher training for EST: Problems and methods. *The ESP Journal, 2, 9*-31.

Farhady, H. (2006). Reflections on and direction for ESP materials development in SAMT. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayyamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference: Vol.3* (pp.2-32). Tehran: SAMT.

Hassaskhah, J. (2006). From Theory to Practice: Where is the Missing Link? In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayyamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference: Vol.1* (pp.13-34). Tehran: SAMT.

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

Maleki, M. (2006). Medicine or medical? In G. R. Kiany, and M. Khayyamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference: Vol.1* (pp.169-178). Tehran: SAMT.

Rajabi, P., Kiany, G. R., & Maftoon, P. (2011). The impact of ESP in-service teacher training: Programs on Iranian ESP teachers' beliefs, classroom practices and students' achievements. *The Iranian EFL Journal, 7*(3), 202-226.

Robinson, P. (1980). *ESP* (*English for Specific Purposes*). New York: Pergamon.

Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today*: *A Practitioner's guide*. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

Romo A. J. (2006). *An English for specific purposes curriculum to prepare English learners to become nursing assistants* (Unpublished master's thesis). Department of Linguistics and English Language, Brigham Young University.

Sadeghi, A. (2006). ESP methodology: A Transition from the present state. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayyamdar (Eds.). *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference: Vol.1* (pp. *21*-33). Tehran: SAMT.

Savaş, B *(*2009). Role of functional academic literacy in ESP teaching: ESP teacher training in Turkey for sustainable development. *Journal of International Social Research, 2(9),* 395-406.

Swales, J. M. (1985). *Episodes in ESP: A source and reference book on the development of English for science and technology.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Swandee, A. (1995). Students' perceptions of university instructors' effective teaching characteristics. *SLLT Journal, 5*, 6-22.

Appendix A

The Questionnaire

Teacher's Knowledge and Abilities:

Note: 1= very good, 2= good, 3= average, 4= weak

1. How fluently does your teacher speak English?
    1 2 3 4

2. How do you evaluate your teacher' vocabulary knowledge?
    1 2 3 4

3. How do you evaluate your teacher's subject knowledge?
    1 2 3 4

4. How do you evaluate your teacher' knowledge of language and linguistics?
    1 2 3 4

5. How do you evaluate your teacher's grammar knowledge?
    1 2 3 4

6. How do you evaluate your English teacher' skill in providing the appropriate materials?
    1 2 3 4

7. How do you evaluate your teacher's skill in designing the syllabus for the course?
    1 2 3 4

Teacher's Function:

Note: 1= a lot, 2= to some extent, 3= little, 4= not at all

8. To what extent does your English teacher make the students think by asking questions?
    1 2 3 4

9. To what extent does your teacher encourage the students to correct each other's errors?
    1 2 3 4

10. To what extent is your teacher aware of students' progress?
    1 2 3 4

11. To what extent does your teacher make the students monitor their progress?
    1 2 3 4

12. To what extent does your teacher encourage the students to participate in classroom activities?
    1 2 3 4

13. To what extent does your teacher make the students know the aims of the course?
    1 2 3 4

14. To what extent does your teacher motivates the students to learn ESP?
    1 2 3 4

15. To what extent does your teacher provide the learners with supplementary references for improving English language?
    1 2 3 4

16. How do evaluate your teacher's ability in teaching according to the level of the students?
    1 2 3 4

17. To what extent does your teacher consider the students needs, learning styles, interests and problems?
    1 2 3 4

18. To what extent does your teacher provide appropriate answers for the students' questions?
    1 2 3 4

19. How much is your teacher interested in the subject matter?
    1 2 3 4

20. How much is your teacher interested in teaching the course?
    1 2 3 4

21. How much creative is your teacher in teaching?
    1 2 3 4

Method and Techniques:

22. To what extent does your teacher activate the students' background knowledge?
    1 2 3 4

23. To what extent does your teacher teach the students reading skill?
    1 2 3 4

24. To what extent does your teacher teach study skills?
    1 2 3 4

25. To what extent does your teacher make the students use monolingual dictionary?
    1 2 3 4

26. To what extent does your teacher give assignments according to what has been taught?
    1 2 3 4

27. To what extent does your teacher teach grammatical points?
    1 2 3 4

Note: 1= always, 2= often, 3= sometimes, 4= never

28. Do the students do reading comprehension exercises in class?
    1 2 3 4

29. Do the students have presentations in English?
    1 2 3 4

30. Do the students do listening activities?
    1 2 3 4

31. Do the students summarize texts provided?
    1 2 3 4

32. Are the students involved in cooperative and collaborative activities for learning English?
    1 2 3 4

33. Do the students have discussions in English in class?
    1 2 3 4

Note: 1= very good, 2= good, 3= average, 4= weak

34. How do you evaluate your teachers' teaching method?
    1 2 3 4

35. How do you evaluate your teachers' testing method?
    1 2 3 4

Appendix B

Distribution of Answers, in Percentage

Question No	Group	N	Very good %	Good %	Average %	Weak %
1	A	60	43.0	35.0	20.0	2
	B	60	6.7	36.7	41.7	15.0
2	A	60	38.3	46.7	15.0	0
	B	60	23.3	31.7	38.3	6.7
3	A	60	46.7	45.0	6.7	1.7
	B	60	6.7	33.3	50.0	10.0
4	A	60	1.7	43.3	50.0	5.0
	B	60	30.0	63.3	6.7	0
5	A	60	31.7	56.7	8.3	3.3
	B	60	8.3	20.0	48.3	23.3
6	A	60	16.7	56.7	22.3	4.3
	B	60	20.0	53.3	23.3	3.3
7	A	60	11.7	46.7	38.3	3.3
	B	60	13.3	31.7	40.0	15.0

Question No	Group	N	A lot	To some extent	Little	Not at all
8	A	6060	21.7	41.7	31.6	5.0
	B	60	20.0	35.0	40.0	5.0
9	A	60	18.3	40.0	30.0	11.7
	B	60	11.7	46.7	35.0	6.7
10	A	60	23.3	50.0	20.0	6.7
	B	60	11.7	58.3	20.0	10.0
11	A	60	10.0	43.3	38.3	8.3
	B	60	10.0	41.7	43.3	5.0
12	A	60	21.7	51.7	16.7	10.0
	B	60	15.0	50.0	25.0	10.0
13	A	60	8.3	48.3	36.7	6.7
	B	60	10.0	43.3	36.7	10.0
14	A	60	20.0	36.7	30.0	13.3
	B	60	18.3	35.0	36.7	10.0
15	A	60	23.3	41.7	28.3	6.7
	B	60	5.0	16.7	55.0	23.3
16	A	60	5.0	31.7	53.3	10.0
	B	60	3.3	33.3	51.7	11.7
17	A	60	6.7	20.0	56.7	16.6
	B	60	11.7	13.3	51.7	23.3
18	A	60	13.3	33.3	35.0	18.3
	B	60	16.7	38.3	31.7	13.3
19	A	60	11.3	43.7	21.7	23.3
	B	60	33.3	36.7	21.7	8.3
20	A	60	16.7	40.0	33.3	10.0
	B	60	21.7	40.0	30.0	8.3
21	A	60	6.7	33.3	45.0	15.0
	B	60	11.7	35.0	43.3	10.0
22	A	60	16.7	33.3	38.3	11.7
	B	60	15.0	28.3	43.3	13.3
23	A	60	18.3	46.7	28.3	6.7
	B	60	13.3	18.3	51.7	16.7
24	A	60	10.0	28.3	50.0	11.7
	B	60	6.7	16.7	58.3	18.3
25	A	60	15.0	16.7	46.7	21.7
	B	60	8.3	15.0	43.3	33.3
26	A	60	10.0	33.3	46.7	10.0
	B	60	8.3	25.0	56.7	10.0
27	A	60	22.3	47.7	20.0	10.0
	B	60	6.7	21.7	51.7	20.0

Question No	Group	N	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never
28	A	60	26.7	41.7	23.3	8.3
	B	60	20.0	41.7	25.0	13.3
29	A	60	0	15.0	56.7	28.3
	B	60	0	8.3	41.7	50.0
30	A	60	0	0	5.0	95.0
	B	60	0	0	6.7	93.3
31	A	60	0	18.3	53.3	28.3
	B	60	0	8.3	41.7	50.0
32	A	60	0	13.3	50.0	36.7
	B	60	0	10.0	50.0	40.0
33	A	60	0	26.7	43.3	30.0
	B	60	0	15.0	50.0	35.0

Question No	Group	N	Very Good	Good	Average	Weak
34	A					
	B	60	15.0	51.7	25.0	8.3
		60	11.7	33.3	48.3	6.7
35	A	60	16.7	48.3	26.7	8.3
	B	60	15.0	23.3	51.7	10.0