

Journal of English Language
Teaching and Learning
No. 13, 2014

**Observation and Feedback of Content Specialists versus General
English Teachers: Suggestions to Make Optimal English for Specific
Purposes Courses**

Sajad Davoudi-Mobarakeh

M.A. graduate, University of Isfahan

Abbas Eslami-Rasekh

Associate Professor, University of Isfahan

Hossein Barati

Assistant Professor, University of Isfahan

Abstract

There is a growing interest among the higher education principals and policy makers to improve teacher evaluation methods and more important than that to use the evaluation data. A number of research studies implied the ineffective instruction of ESP courses in Iran (Atai, 2002; Eslami, 2005; Hayati, 2008; Ahmadi, 2008; Sherkatolabbasi & Mahdavi, 2012; Boniadi, Ghojazadeh & Rahmatvand, 2013). The basic objective of research in field of ESP/EGP instruction and evaluation is to facilitate informed decisions for the betterment of English classes. The literature suggested that most of the teachers and students were dissatisfied with the students' progress in specific English courses. Data was collected from the teachers by various ways including observation checklist and feedback form. To carry out the study, 12 ESP and EGP teachers were observed using Marshall's rubrics (2011) and observation logs' analysis. Then, 18 teachers offered feedback on different aspects of their own courses. The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively using ANOVA statistical measurement. The findings firstly indicate that EGP teachers were more standard teachers in comparison to ESP teachers. Secondly, the feedback forms show discrepancy between the views of EGP teachers and ESP teachers in some areas including the material effectiveness and students' interest. To reach a standard point in EGP/ESP instruction, more evaluation is to be applied by the faculty members, university principals and the teachers themselves. Politically correct attitudes towards teachers should not lead to ineffective English courses. Some practical implications are suggested to upgrade the current practice in ESP classes.

Keywords: Teacher evaluation, Participant observation, ESP teacher, EGP teacher

تاریخ وصول: ۱۳۹۲/۱۱/۵ تأیید نهایی: ۱۳۹۳/۶/۸

E-mail:sajad.davoudi@gmail.com

E-mail:abbaseslamirasekh@yahoo.com

E-mail:h.barati@gmail.com

Introduction

It can be mentioned that evaluation does not appear to be a new issue in the modern world in which everyone is fully held accountable for the job that s/he practices. Lewis and Benson (1998) once advised teachers “YOU CANNOT FLEE from the evaluation of teaching and you should not try to do so. We suggest you embrace the process and learn from it.” Dudley-Evans (1997, cited in Anthony, 1998) listed the absolute and variable characteristics of ESP. The absolute characteristics are necessarily present in an ESP course while the variable characteristics are options of ESP.

Firstly, the absolute features include:

- I. It is designed to meet the learner’s specific needs.
- II. It uses the relevant activities and methodology of the subject matter.
- III. It focuses on areas of language like vocabulary, structure, register, genre, discourse and study skills in order to do the activities.

Secondly, variable features include:

- a. ESP may use a methodology different from EGP.
- b. It may be developed for a special discipline.
- c. It is possibly used in professional situation, secondary school level, tertiary institution, or adult schools.
- d. General knowledge of language is prerequisite to ESP courses.
- e. ESP courses are appropriate for intermediate and advanced learners.

The major thing that distinguishes ESP from EGP is awareness of the need. It is the first step that precedes the conduction of all modern ESP courses. There are also other steps such as curriculum design, materials development, teaching methodology, and finally evaluation (Flowerdew, 2013). Hence, Hutchinson and Waters (1993) believe that there is no difference between ESP and EGP in theory but in practice there are plenty of differences. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to conduct these courses without a systematic needs analysis. However, some may believe that they do not require a needs analysis before the course because they are aware of the real life needs of their students (Hill et al., 2010). If we want to supply effective teachers who appropriately meet students’ objectives, the educators and instructors need to acknowledge language necessities of the learners (Liu et al., 2011).

Detection of effective teacher

Evaluation is a comparable study which compares the criteria of an effective teacher with that of an exact practitioner. Effective teachers probably educate successful students. After considering all the relevant factors in student's success such as qualified teachers, socioeconomic factors, gender and class size, some scholars claimed that the main catalyst for student success is an effective teacher (Sanders, 1999; Wenglinsky, 2000). According to Alderson, McGinley, Mackay, Murphy, and Swan, evaluation has been neglected in ESP (Robinson, 1991, p. 65). Among the reasons they enumerate to support their claims are as follows: Time consuming nature of evaluation, one-off nature of ESP courses, and shortness of courses.

Generally, evaluation is used/done to discover weaknesses and strengths of the program of instruction. The findings of evaluation are usually most useful to the teacher who wishes to draw a conclusion about the quality of the entire program. More people can take advantage of the findings of evaluation in addition to the teacher: the faculty, and other course planners. Therefore, the need to evaluate the teachers' effectiveness goes to several reasons including (1) gathering information to provide new EGP/ESP teachers with guidance related to identified shortcomings and strengths (2) determine whether a new EGP/ESP teacher is meeting performance expectations in the classroom (3) determine the type of assistance a deficient teacher may need (4) gather information on a teacher ability to work collaboratively with colleagues to evaluate needs and determine appropriate instruction for students and etc.

ESP versus EGP teachers

ESP and EGP are two main areas in which English is taught and where English teachers are active. However, the question of what to teach for the course makes ESP different from EFL; needs and wants of the students decide what methodology is suitable for the course. John and Dudley Evans (1991, p.305) maintain that, "ESP requires methodologies that are specialized or unique"; the uniqueness is determined by the study or job requirements.

The difference which makes ESP different from EGP from every point of view is concerned with the analysis of the needs of the students. What is needed is an essential component of the course which decides the entire design of the course. Theoretically speaking, ESP is a kind of discipline which consists of three realms of knowledge: language, pedagogy, and content which include the students' areas of interest. Considering the bulk of studies on ESP, not many studies have dealt with the pedagogical issues among which is whose territory of activity it is.

A lot of writers (Jordan, 1989; Hutchinson & Waters, 1993; Robinson, 1991; Hyland, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2013) agree that ESP teachers should have the qualities of EFL teachers as well as the knowledge of ESP. In order to avoid the misinterpretations of what ESP means, Hutchinson and Waters (1993) define ESP instruction with three key arguments:

- The purpose of an ESP course is not the instruction of a specific variety and form of English. There are some contextual features which are learned in the target context by language use.
- The learning of technical words and specific grammar is not solely called ESP. Grammar and vocabulary which are surface structures do not lead to communication.
- ESP like other kinds of language teaching is dependent on learning principles. So the processes of learning for both ELT and ESP are similar. Therefore, teaching of ESP does not need any special methodology.

As observed in a descriptive study by Ahmadi (2008) from Shaheed Beheshti Medical University, the students of ESP classes believed that in teaching ESP courses, LD (Language Department) teachers are more qualified than discipline-specialist teachers.

The importance of teacher evaluation in ESP

As there are three components to every ESP course, there is never a predictable candidate for teaching it. So, the question is what we should do to provide good teaching administration for the ESP courses. Can we choose teachers from EFL departments? Or should

the teacher come from the content department? The answer to this controversial issue is not simple. Relative measures have to be discovered and used to solve the inefficacy of ESP administration. In order to discover the areas of weakness and strength observation and evaluation become necessary.

In order to answer the questions, the realm of ESP needs to be evaluated as any other instructional process which we hope to improve. Accordingly, Alderson says:

‘evaluation is a crucial and integral part of the instructional process....As material developers, ESP teachers or researchers we should be concerned with asking ourselves whether our courses are producing the effects we intend and if not, how we can improve or replace them for better effect’ (Alderson and Beretta, 1991, p.154).

Categories of evaluation

Two major roles for evaluation are formative and summative evaluation. The main distinction made between them is that whilst the purpose of formative evaluation is to improve and make changes, the aim of summative evaluations is to make decisions in employment and similar decisions for policy makers and principals. (Peterson & Kauchak, 1982)

The use of these methods of evaluation depends mostly on the purpose of the faculties and policy makers. If they want to hire, promote, demote or discharge teachers, summative evaluation would be appropriate. On the other hand, if they want develop professional teachers, modify teachers’ performance by providing feedback, introduce new practices and modify the old ones, they need to apply formative evaluation (Petreson, 2000). Accordingly, Hyland (2006) believes that formative and summative assessment are different because formative processes are related to the instruction and teacher feedback but summative processes are linked with overall learning of the learners at the end of the semester.

Evaluation Rubrics

Kim Marshall (2009) in his invaluable book “Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation” reports his earlier frequent evaluations of teachers as ineffective and “nonsense”. He then criticizes his own evaluations by listing following doubts:

- He could not give clear and sufficient feedback to teachers on each evaluation criteria. Or he did not tell them how they can overcome their weaknesses.
- The binary rating scale including *Unsatisfactory/satisfactory* was insufficient to make judgments on proficiency level of teachers.
- His evaluations are commonly not deep enough to hit the target.
- Teachers did not usually change based on his notes on evaluation forms.
- The overused evaluation processes were time consuming.

After these arguments he suggests a “promising solution” that is using evaluation rubrics. According to Marshall (2009), checklist and ratings by numbers do not lead to improvement and they are not effective and powerful. Most of the checklists consist of two to five levels. Each level is accompanied with a label like (unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished). Some of these rating are unhelpful because they are binary (unsatisfactory-satisfactory) so they cannot judge mediocre teachers. Also most of teachers are rated satisfactory (Marshall, 2009).

Another problem of some common ratings (Denver, 2005; Rockford, 2007; Akron, 2007) is grade inflation. These kinds of ratings do not describe the performance of teachers of each level. Kim Marshall came with a comprehensive synthesis which he further revised in 2011. These rubrics lack the abovementioned problems. The new rubric is presented as follows:

- A. Planning and preparation for learning
- B. Classroom management
- C. Delivery of instruction
- D. Monitoring, assessment and follow-up
- E. Family and community outreach
- F. Professional responsibilities

His suggested evaluation rubric is employed in this article.

Marshall (2009) explains three main reasons to support his proposed four-point scale;

- I. The rubrics make a clear distinction between the teachers
- II. They encourage improvement and send a clear message to the observed teachers
- III. They also describe unsatisfactory performance that can reasonably result in dismissing the unqualified teachers.

His proposed labels rate from the best performance to the worst;

- 4- Expert
- 3- Proficient
- 2- Needs improvement
- 1- Does not meet standards

Problematic areas in ESP program

One serious problem for EGP and ESP in Iran lies in the fact that there is not an adequate supply of teachers. There are many teachers teaching or administering ESP who have not received any special training. The status quo in Iranian universities is much like what Robinson (1980, p. 75) reports of an ESP seminar in 1978 in Manila: "Most participants...were university teachers who had found themselves thrust, willy-nilly, into ESP and service-English programs in their institutions."

According to Hayati (2008), the problems of ESP programs in Iran pertain to three major factors: Teacher, Time schedule, and Textbook. Concerning the first factor, he believes that either the knowledgeable

teachers should be granted enough opportunities (about 100 hours) to learn more English or the present ESP teachers should be guided to learn more technical words at a higher level than the textbooks. With regard to this factor he attaches the problem of Iranian ESP/EAP teachers mostly to their knowledge of the subject. Moreover, he believes different techniques should be handled to provide a communicative setting.

In her article, Eslami (2010) conducted a systematic needs analysis from both students and teachers perspective. The purpose of her study was to discover the problematic areas in EAP program in different academic fields. The results of her survey showed discrepancy between perceptions of EAP learners in different academic fields. The findings of her study support the fact that the students greatly need to enhance their general proficiency in English. Eslami (2010) opined that “It is possible that teachers’ perception of students’ low English language proficiency and low motivation leads to the teachers’ lower use of student-centered activities” (p. 7).

Despite the importance of English in higher levels of education, academics in Iran usually do not pay attention to the quality and efficacy of English language courses. In fact, the EGP and ESP courses in universities of Iran are not quite fruitful due to several shortcomings ranging from outdated methods of teaching to inappropriate textbooks and lack of pedagogically expert teachers and practitioners instructing the EGP and ESP courses. (Atai, 2002; Hayati, 2008; Eslami, 2010)

Mike Guest (Hill et al., 2010) criticizes most faculty members in Japan on the ground that they are not familiar with discourse of English. According to him, Japanese faculty members think that they are teachers of terminology. So their role should cover beyond what they what they think of.

Another researcher in the field, Eric Skier (Hill et al., 2010) suggests team teaching to improve one-dimensional teachers’ courses. As he observed, even bilingual ESP teachers were unwilling to teach language skills. So what makes an ideal ESP class is one with an English teacher helping a content specialist. But the problem is that no curriculum officially supports such approach of teaching.

Based on the evaluative nature of the study and the issues under

analysis in the research, the following questions will be addressed:

1-How much do the EGP/ESP teachers' performances meet standards?

2-What are the visions of EGP vs. ESP teachers of an optimal EGP/ESP course?

Method

So the purpose of evaluation with regards to ESP is to measure the efficacy and effectiveness of teaching programs. Accordingly, there seems to be a need to evaluate which groups of teachers are successful and perform more sufficiently. Because of the qualitative nature of the study, survey was the most appropriate way to collect the data. The data was collected during the spring semester of 2013.

Participants

The University of Isfahan was considered as the boundary of the research. The study is divided into two phases. In the first phase, from about 22 ESP teachers discovered in University of Isfahan, 4 permitted the researcher observe their classes through the whole term. Also, from 15 EGP teachers active in the faculty of foreign languages, 7 admitted to be observed. The majority of EGP teachers cooperated kindly with the study. In addition, in the second phase of the study, the teacher feedback forms adapted in this study were either delivered or emailed to 34 ESP and EGP teachers of the university. However, just 6 ESP and 12 EGP teachers responded at last.

Instrumentations

The first instrument utilized in the current study is a checklist observation. As presented in Appendix I, the checklist was a modified version of Kim Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubrics revised in 2011. In the instruction section of the checklist, it is asserted that "the rubrics are designed to give teachers an end of the year assessment of where they stand in all performance areas and detailed guidance on how to improve. So it does not intend to judge the overall performance of the teachers.

The main checklist involves 6 sections. Two sections of which were removed after the implementation of pilot study. The modified

checklist consists of four sections. Each section itself has ten subsections which wisely consider all aspects of the standards in question. The first section of the checklist is entitled Planning and Preparation for Learning. The second part deals with teacher's ability to manage the classroom. Subsequently, the third section has to do with delivery of instruction. In the end, the checklist measures such properties the teachers should have as monitoring, assessment, and follow-up. The main sections and subsections of the observation checklist are illustrated below.

Table 1

Teacher Evaluation Rubrics

A. Planning and Preparation for Learning	B. Classroom Management	C. Delivery of Instruction	D. Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-up
a. Knowledge	a. Expectations	a. Expectations	a. Criteria
b. Standards	b. Relationships	b. Mindset	b. Diagnosis
c. Units	c. Respect	c. Goals	c. On-the-Spot
d. Assessments	d. Social-emotional	d. Connections	d. Self-Assessment
e. Anticipation	e. Routines	e. Clarity	e. Recognition
f. Lessons	f. Responsibility	f. Repertoire	f. Interims
g. Engagement	g. Repertoire	g. Engagement	g. Tenacity
h. Materials	h. Efficiency	h. Differentiation	h. Support
i. Differentiation	i. Prevention	i. Nimbleness	i. Analysis
j. Environment	j. Incentives	j. Application	j. Reflection

Note. Taken from Marshall (2011)

The researcher acted as participant observer and documented the checklist observation form, but during the three sessions of observation in each class, he did not make any changes during the delivery of the course. The checklist consists of 4 rating levels with

following labels;

1- Highly effective: “It is reserved for truly outstanding teaching that meets very demanding criteria; there will be relatively few ratings at this level.”

2- Effective: “It describes solid, expected professional performance; teachers should feel good about scoring at this level.”

3- Improvement necessary: “indicates that performance has real deficiencies; no teacher should be content to remain at this level (although some novices might begin here)”

4- Does not meet standards: “It is clearly unacceptable should lead to dismissal if it is not improved immediately”(Marshall, 2011, p.1).

The final Teacher Feedback Form (presented in Appendix) applied in this study was partially adapted by referring to Macer’s Teacher Feedback Form (2006). In order to test the material to check the content validity a pilot study was conducted. The reliability coefficient of the feedback form was 0.81. The reliability results of the form show that it was reliable enough to be used as an instrument for the actual study. Below are the main sections of the teacher feedback form:

Part 1: Course Material: this part reflects the views of the ESP/EGP practitioners about the effectiveness of the material used in their own classroom.

Part 2: Classroom activities and tasks: the second part shows the views of ESP/EGP practitioners about their students’ interest in course tasks.

The two parts of the form comprised of 11 Likert type statements. Each of them had 7 response options including 1. *Strongly Disagree (SD)*, 2. *D (Disagree)*, 3. *PD (Partially Disagree)*, 4. *NA (Not Applicable)*, 5. *PA (Partially Agree)*, 6. *A (Agree)*, 7. *SA (Strongly Agree)*. The researcher explained the instructions of the feedback form to the teachers before submitting the form to them. The feedback of the teachers is compared against each other to supply answer to the second question.

Procedure

Within the scope of this study is the observation of EGP teachers’ performance versus that of ESP teachers. In addition, in order to find

optimal EGP/ ESP courses, EGP and ESP practitioners are requested to offer feedback. First, having used a classroom observation checklist to provide adequate and genuine data about classroom language teaching, the researchers carried out separate pilot studies for the observation checklist and feedback form. The instruments were checked by the pilot group including 2 EFL professors, 2 ESP teachers and 2 EGP teachers. Based on the results of the pilot study, the researchers revised some of the items and finalized the instruments for the purpose of the main study. The first draft of the observation checklist consisted of six criteria namely a. planning and preparation for learning, b. classroom management, c. delivery of instruction, d. monitoring, assessment and follow up, e. family and community outreach, and f. professional responsibilities. Since the observation of the teachers concerning the last two criteria seemed only feasible in a longitudinal study, they were removed in the pilot study.

Next, using the modified version of the checklist, the researcher observed 12 English language teachers' classes in University of Isfahan. The observations logs are presented to provide further evidence for teachers practice. Having collected the data through observation checklist, the researchers analyzed the data using descriptive statistical techniques and tried to answer the research question.

ESP and EGP teachers are then invited to reflect their feedback on a feedback form. The researcher explained the instructions of the feedback form to the teachers before submitting the form to them. The feedback of the teachers is compared against each other to supply answer to the second question.

Results and discussion

The two questions of the study are answered in two phases. In the first phase of the study, teachers' performances were compared using an observation checklist. In addition, observation logs are provided in Appendix 1 to give additional information about teachers' practices. There were four main rubrics (planning and preparation, classroom management, delivery of instruction, monitoring and follow up) in the observation checklist. Four rating levels measure the performance of each teacher. The best level is titled (Highly effective), the next is

(effective) and the two low levels are (Improvement necessary) and (Does not meet standards).

The value attached to each rubric ranged from 1 to 4, the highest possible score could be 100 (highly effective). In each row of table 6, the mean and standard deviation of the scores attached to EGP teachers can be compared with the scores related to ESP practitioners. Thus, the scores lower than 50 imply that the performance is not effective and therefore improvement is necessary

Table 2

Evaluation Form

Variables	EGP	ESP
	(Mean+/-SD)(Min, Max)	(Mean+/-SD)(Min, Max)
Planning and preparation	65.3 +/- 5.4(60,72)	48.1 +/- 3.1(45, 52)
Classroom management	68.2 +/- 3.4(65,72)	51.8 +/- 6.8(45, 60)
Delivery of instruction	63.9 +/- 5.5(55, 72)	48.7 +/- 5.9(42, 55)
Monitoring and follow up	54.6 +/- 5.4(50, 65)	41.2 +/- 8.7(32, 50)
TOTAL	63 +/- 2.2(60, 66)	47.5 +/- 4(42, 51)

Concerning the first rubric, the mean score of EGP teachers is 65.3 that is significantly higher than the score of ESP practitioners performance (sig=.000<.05). The findings imply that EGP teachers outperformed their ESP counterparts in planning the course and preparation of the lesson.

The analysis to find which group of teachers has a better performance on classroom management shows that EGP teachers scored 68.2 on this rubric while the mean score of ESP practitioners is lower (51.8 out of 100). That is EGP teachers managed their classes better than content specialist (sig. = .000<.05).

As the above table represents, the performance of EGP teachers on delivery of instruction scored 63.9 while ESP teachers scored 48.7 in

this rubric. So EGP teachers had comparatively better performance while delivering the instruction than ESP teachers (sig. = .002<.05).

On the last rubric also EGP teachers scored higher with the mean of 54.6 than ESP teachers with mean score of 41.2 (sig. = .012<.05). Since P-value is less than the level of significance ($p < .05$) in all T-tests, all the differences turned out to be noticeably significant.

In the second phase of the study, the second question is addressed. The teacher feedback forms consisting of 11 items were conducted with 7 questions on material of the course, 4 questions on the students' interest in classroom activities. The descriptive statistics of 11 seven point Likert-scale questions concerning the material effectiveness and student's interest in course tasks are separately shown in table below.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Teachers Feedback

Variables	EGP		ESP	
	(Mean+/-SD)	(Min, Max)	(Mean+/-SD)	(Min, Max)
Material effectiveness	59.1+/- 15.4	(26.1, 80.9)	72.2 +/- 10.1	(54.7, 85.7)
Student interest in tasks	57.6 +/- 20.5	(25, 83.3)	79.1 +/- 13.1	(62.5, 95.8)

The feedback of EGP teachers was significantly different from ESP teachers regarding the material effectiveness (sig. = .04). It means that lower percentage of EGP teachers (59.1 < 72.2) think that the materials they use are effective. Accordingly, ESP teachers are more optimistic about the material they use in their own classes. So the majority of ESP practitioners (72) percent trust in the effectiveness of the course material. Although about 59 percent of the EGP teachers believe in the effectiveness of the textbooks they are offered to use, almost 41 percent of them do not think that the course books they teach could be of high value to the students.

In addition, the views of ESP teachers concerning their students' interest in classroom activities varies significantly from those of EGP teachers (sig. = .03). So EGP teachers have a less positive view towards their own students' interest in class activity (57.6 < 79.1).

Conclusion and implication

Several observations justify the lower evaluation score obtained by ESP practitioners in comparison to their EGP counterparts:

1. Most of ESP teachers were just vocally active while it was not the case with the majority of EGP teachers who made a lot of pedagogical movements in the classroom.

2. Despite EGP teacher, ESP teachers did not encourage students to participate in class or to be active.

3. Despite ESP teachers, EGP teachers tried to make autonomous learners by involving them in the process of teaching and learning. They often asked students to share their ideas and give presentations and summaries.

4. Despite ESP teachers, EGP teachers activated learners' prior knowledge by linking the previous topics to the new ones. They provoked students' background knowledge by frequent warm ups and use of various materials.

5. The observed ESP classes were teacher oriented. The teacher in such classes spends most of the time. On the contrary, EGP classes are not much teacher oriented. Class discussions take most of the time.

The observations in this study are in agreement with earlier observations by Atai (2002) which noticed the following problems in ESP classes;

- Teacher centeredness
- The teachers' disregard of diversity in different disciplines
- Negligence of class participation
- Absence of collaboration between EGP and ESP teachers
- Dominant use of L1
- Lack of consistency in pedagogical activities and preferences
- The dominance of sentence by sentence translation

The findings of the study are in line with Rajabi et al. (2011) in which they concluded that grammar is neglected in most ESP courses. ESP teachers do not try to explain functional element of sentences and paragraphs like discourse markers and sentence organization. It can be argued that the results verify the findings of a previous study by Dehghan Harati (2012) which mentioned that ESP practitioners had fewer problems dealing with special content and technical vocabulary

but as far as EFL instruction and the linguistic knowledge (e.g., genre, discourse, and general vocabulary) concern they become less effective.

Likewise, the data in this study corresponds with the result of previous research (Dehghan, 2012) which mentioned that ESP teachers were not successful to meet all language needs of the learners. Most of them just focus on the content. They rarely teach grammar, parts of speech and linguistic features.

In both ESP classes observed, communication was just limited to short questions and answers. However, EGP students were often invited to participate in class discussions. While teaching of grammar was regularly observed in EGP classes, general and technical grammar was taken for granted in ESP classes. So the classes observed needed improvement to be called ESP since even the teaching of specific vocabulary and grammar is not solely called ESP (Robinson, 1991).

On the other hand, as observed, EGP teachers tried to facilitate learning by different techniques. One of them is by providing the learners with relevant prior knowledge. This is in line with studies of Rumelhart (1980) and Benoussan (1998) which claim that activating suitable background knowledge helps learning.

In the observed EGP classes, translation was limited to few words; on the other hand, translation was prevalent in ESP classes. The first part of the finding is different from the findings of the study by Rajabi, et al. but the second part concerning the use of translation in ESP classes, the findings verify each other. The overall findings are consistent with Gallagher (2000) which indicated that evaluation outcome can provide reliable and valid information about teaching effectiveness so teachers should use the evaluation information to increase their effectiveness.

The comparative analysis of the responses to the feedback forms showed that a significantly higher percentage of ESP teachers believed that the materials they use are highly effective. In comparison to EGP teachers, a higher percentage of ESP teachers think that their students are interested in their courses. It illustrates a common finding that content specialists have a positive view about ESP courses (Rajabi et al., 2011; Sherkatolabbasi & Mahdavi, 2012).

The results are in line with the findings of Eslami (2005) that

implied administration of ESP courses should overcome fundamental limitations to become effective. He highlighted several solutions like the development of cross-discipline departments, co-operation in syllabus design and weekly lesson planning.

Practically speaking, the results may be helpful for English teachers and faculty members teaching ESP. It is suggested that EGP/ESP teachers should become aware of their areas of strengths and deficiencies. One of the ways that help them know themselves better is by being observed and evaluated by an impartial evaluator. Altogether, no one can ignore the relationship between the fruitful influences of teachers' evaluation on teaching EGP/ESP courses. Some relating to EGP/ESP courses should not be taken for granted.

Specifically, the implications may be relevant to policy makers. It was noted that the needs of the learners should be taken into account before material development and course design. But, many observations implied that the priorities of students are not satisfied in many cases. Thus, necessary measures should be adopted to guarantee the motivation and interest of the learners in the courses. The results called for participation of English teachers of all faculties to complement each other in designing and teaching optimal courses. Finally, this kind of study is greatly relevant for PhD candidates and untenured teachers who want to gain insights into their teaching or are going to become EGP or ESP teachers.

References

- Ahmadi, M. (2008). Who should teach ESP? Retrieved from <http://www.tesol-france.org/Documents/Colloque08/Ahmadi.pdf>
- Alderson, J.C, & A. Brett. (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. Glasgow: Cambridge university press.
- Anthony, L. (1998). Defining English for specific purposes and the role of the ESP practitioner. *Center for Language Research 1997 Annual Review*, pp. 115-120.
- Atai, M. R. (2002). *EAP teacher education: Searching for an effective model integrating content and language teachers' scheme*. Islamic Azad University, Qazvin branch, Qazvin, Iran.
- Benoussan, M. (1998). Schema effects in EFL reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 21, 213-227.
- Boniadi, A., Ghojzadeh, M., & Rahmatvand, N. (2013). Problems of English for Specific Purpose course for medical students in Iran. *Khazar Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 16 (1), 48.
- DehghanHarati, R. (2012). Personal observation of three ESP classes. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 318-333.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M.J. (1991). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eslami, R. A. (2005). A no man's land area of activity: Investigating ESP courses administered in Iranian Universities. *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference*. The center for Research and Development in Humanities of SAMT, Tehran, Iran.
- Eslami, Z. R. (2010). Teachers' voice vs. students' voice: A needs analysis approach of English for academic purposes (EAP) in Iran. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 3-12
- Flowerdew, L. (2013). Needs Analysis and Curriculum Development in ESP. In Paltridge, B. and Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (1 ed. Vol. 1): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gallagher, T. J. (2000). Embracing Student Evaluations of Teaching: A Case Study. *Teaching Sociology*, 28, 140-147.
- Hayati, M. (2008). Teaching English for special purposes in Iran: Problems and suggestions. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education*, 7(2), 149-164

- Hill, G., Guest, M., & Skier, E. M. (2010). Panel discussion redux: What are the roles of teachers in ESP/EAP courses? *OnCUE Journal*, 4(2), 154-166.
- Hutchison, T., & Waters, A. (1993). *English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Jordan, R. R. (1989). English for academic purposes (EAP). *Language Teaching*, 22 (3), 150–64.
- Lewis, J. M. & Benson, D. E. (1998). "Section Eight. Course Evaluations." pp. 99-114 in *Tips for Teaching Introductory Sociology*, edited by Jerry M. Lewis. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Liu, J., Chang Y., Yang, F., & Sun Y. (2011). Is what I need what I want? Reconceptualizing college students' needs in English courses for general and specific/academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 271-280.
- Macer, D. (2006). *A cross-cultural introduction to bioethics*. Christchurch, N.Z.: EubiosEhticsInstitute.p. 11.
- Marshall, K. (2009). *Rethinking teacher supervision and evaluation: how to work smart, build collaboration, and close the achievement gap*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, K. (2011). Teacher evaluation rubrics. Retrieved November 1, 2011, Retrieved from from <http://www.marshallmemo.com>
- Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Peterson, K. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445087)
- Peterson, P., & Kauchak, D. (1982). *Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises*. Salt Lake City: Center for Educational Practice, University of Utah.
- Rajabi, P., Kiany, G. R., & Maftoon, P. (2011) *Iranian English Major vs. Subject-matter ESP Teachers' Beliefs and Instructional Practices in ESP Classes: A Comparative Study*. In: 1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (FLTAL'11), 5-7 May 2011, Sarajevo.

- Robinson, P. C. (1980). *ESP (English for Specific Purposes): the present position*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Robinson, P. C. (1991). *ESP Today: A practitioner's guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition, *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, Lawrence Associates.
- Sanders, W. (1999). Teachers! Teachers! Teachers! *Blueprint Magazine, Online edition*. Retrieved March 28, 2012, from <http://www.ndol.org/blueprint/fall/2012/solutions4.html>.
- Sherkatolabbasi, M., &Mahdavi, A. (2012).Evaluation of ESP Teachers in Different Contexts of Iranian Universities.*International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(2), 198-205.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: The Milken Family Foundation and Educational Testing Service.

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Summary of observation logs

EGP class no.1

This course is a three-credit course, and the class is held twice a week on Saturdays and Sundays. The material was not decided upon by the teacher. After a couple of minutes, the teacher, having passed the warm-up stage, begins her lesson. Then, the teacher asks some questions about the new words. While answering the questions a topic comes up and based on that topic, a discussion is raised by the teacher and the students. After reading five paragraphs, the teacher asks students to read from the book. After reading each paragraph, the teacher asks some questions and the students answer them. In cases that one student misses the right answer, the teacher seeks help from other peer students, or she herself, gives the correct answer. After the whole reading is attended to, the teacher asks the students to take out a piece of paper and write five to seven questions about the passage. The teacher then, redistributes the question in a random fashion. After the ten minutes have passed, the teacher asks the students to score themselves based on the number of correct answers they have provided. After all the students have reported their scores, the teacher writes down the scores on her grading sheet.

EGP class no. 2

The teacher tries to catch up from the previous lesson attended to in the last session. During the review process, the teacher does not explain any point; instead she totally relies on the students' responses provided to the questions asked by the teacher. The teacher explains some related new points about the topic of the previous session, and after a while (about 15 minutes), she introduces the new topic. Materials and learning activities were appropriate for the topic that they were working on. There was a sense of positive atmosphere in the classroom and the pace of presenting materials and the lesson was appropriate. There were some explanations of grammatical points, and occasionally the teacher would explain the meaning of new vocabulary items.

EGP class no. 3

The teacher walks in and after doing the greeting, he goes straight to the book. After finishing all the exercises of chapter four, the teacher goes on to teaching the new chapter after a 3-minute recess. He writes the topic of the next lesson on the board and gives a short speech on that. Then, he invites the students to share their ideas with the class. It was observed that not all of the students were as enthusiastic as some others.

EGP class no. 4

The teacher begins the lesson by reviewing the exercises of the previous lesson. After attending to all the exercises (with took about 30-40 minutes), the teacher delivers an introduction for the students about the new lesson. Introducing the topic of the new lesson, the teacher provokes students' background knowledge about the topic and asks a couple of students to share their information with the class. Two of the students that have prepared an article about Isaac Newton begin to read from their article. The teacher writes down every new word from the article on the board and explains the meaning to the students. The new vocabulary is explained by the teacher and sometimes the teacher asks students to provide the answers. The teacher explains the grammatical point of the lesson and writes some notes on the board. There were very few cases of mother tongue use by the students. Each student was involved in the class activities at some point. Each student is supposed to have a monolingual English-English dictionary. The teacher asks them to look up that word or to guess that from the context. The meaning to new words was presented mostly through synonyms and antonyms and sometimes through English definition.

EGP class no. 5

The teacher start the lesson by asking some questions about the chapter they are going to work on (they are required in advance to be prepared for the lesson). First, the teacher asks two students to give a very brief summary of the text. Afterwards, she asks students to provide some questions from the text. After this questioning and answering is done, they begin working on the vocabulary. Then, they start working on the paragraphs one by one. For each paragraph the

teacher asks students to give a concise summary. After this questioning and answering, the teacher asks randomly from the students to give the main idea of each paragraph. In presenting the new grammar, the book has adopted a somewhat inductive procedure, whereas, the teacher follows a deductive procedure in explaining the grammar. Little use of native language was made by the teacher; however, the students used Persian from time to time freely. The teacher used the boards only for explaining new grammatical patterns.

EGP class no. 6

Teacher started the class by reading a piece of text of a new lesson. She highly emphasized the grammatical features of sentences she explained in English and Farsi. She highly paid attention to different parts of speech. As it is clear, she was practicing a combination of ALM and GTM. The teacher was the main authority in the classroom: reading and explaining were all done by the teacher. Regarding teacher's pronunciation, it was OK and comprehensible. At times, teacher's sense of humor attracted the attention of the students.

ESP class no. 1

The teacher greets the students and asks them to open up their study materials. The material provided for the students by the teacher is an article copied from the net. The first paragraph is read by a female student as a volunteer and after she reads the whole paragraph, the teacher himself reads it once more. Then they cover every single new vocabulary and work on grammatical structures that are difficult for the students to understand. The pacing of the lesson was appropriate, but the material and the class lacked the required variety. Not every student was involved in the learning process, especially among the male students. No instance of teacher using the blackboard through the course of study was observed. As for the learners, all the questions were asked in Farsi.

ESP class no. 2

The teacher had assigned 7 sentences for the students in the previous session and had asked them to try to translate them. Then, the teacher asks some students as volunteers to present their translations to the class. 3 to 4 students read from their translation and the teacher writes one of them (the one considered to be the best) on the board.

Beneath the student's translation which is put on the board, the teacher writes his own translation. After all the sentences are translated, the teacher assigns 6 more sentences for their next session.

ESP class no. 3

The course was generally reading-based. Their textbook was a collection of the latest articles available on the subject matter. Most of the class instruction was in Persian, but the teacher used English from time to time. The procedure was totally based on reading comprehension: Students are supposed to read one of the articles at home in order to get the general idea of each paragraph. Then, they explain in Persian what they got from the text. The teacher asks some comprehension questions in English to check understanding and students answer in Persian. If they cannot understand a concept in the text, the teacher assigns it as their homework to do research about that. In general, what made this class an ESP one was the context in which students found them. The texts were all technical/specific and the aim was to enhance students' knowledge of concepts in the subject.

ESP class no. 4

The teacher had given the students some assignments. Students were given 4 sentences and they were asked to translate them. After listening to some students reading their translations and correcting them, the teacher himself provided them with the final translation and wrote it on the board. In case a student asked upon had a good rendering, the teacher would copy it on the board and modify it. The textbook was one published by SAMT publication. The students were supposed to read one of the lessons at home and translate it. A volunteer took the floor and started reading the lesson and translating each sentence. After her, the teacher translated those sentences which were not well done by the student. Throughout the class time no grammar point is taught, which is common in most ESP classes observed. After the lesson was over, the teacher read through the next lesson in order for the students to become familiar with the pronunciation. They were supposed to read it again at home and translate it for the next session. The teacher did not call the roll and participation in the class was not obligatory.

ESP class no. 5

The teacher started teaching by giving an introduction about the text students were supposed to face. He gave some background information about the text to raise students' awareness. It was a historical text related to *Savafy Dynasty*. He generally let one of students just read the text; then he himself read the text; he first translated unfamiliar words for the students. He used L1 to explain about different words and unknown characters mentioned in the text. The teacher in this class did his best to provide students with a fluent and well-organized translation. Regarding the role of students in the classroom, they had quite passive roles. They just read the sentences without paraphrasing or explaining or translating. L1 was the medium of instruction in the classroom. There was no room left for communication in L2. A combination of GTM and translation was the prominent teaching methodology in the classroom.

ESP class no. 6

The teacher started reading some written texts relevant to the topic: *open form in literature*. He asked some questions about lexical items unknown for the students. He then translated them. Students were all listening to the teacher. While he was reading the selected text, he translated unknown words for students and tried to elaborate on them; in some cases, he involved students in guessing the unknown words; if they could not guess correctly, he himself did it. Then the teacher distributed some pages including common expressions and proverbs in English. Like the previous classes, L1 was the medium of instruction. Guessing the intended meaning of expressions was the only strategy implemented by the teacher. The methodology implemented in the classroom was GTM; it was crucially based on translation.

Appendix 2: Teacher Feedback Form

Title of the Material: _____

Dept.of University	(Please write your email if you have any.)		Date ()d()m()y	Age	
				Gender	M / F
				<i>Instructions</i>	
Classroom language				· Write/check clearly.	
Name of the course			Class hours ()hrs/week	· Completed form should be returned to the email below.	
	Level	Size of the class	Male:		
		Total:	Female:		

· Should you have any suggestion about the feedback form, please email to Sajad Davoudi, <mailto:sajad.davoudi@gmail.com>

Part One: Course Material

*** Please indicate your agreement or disagreement using this seven point scale:
SA(Strongly agree), A (Agree), PA (Partially agree),NA (Not applicable), PD (Partially disagree), D (disagree), SD (Strongly disagree) ***

1	I am very interested in this subject matter/course.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
2	The allocated time is adequate for the course.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
3	The material and topics are helpful in provoking meaningful discussion in the class.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
4	The material is well organized and contains meaningful information.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
5	The questions in the material/book are helpful to guide meaningful thinking and further study/research on the topic.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
6	The examples and contents of the material are inadequate to address the issue in the course.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
7	I recommend my material/book to other related teachers.	S A P N P D S A A A D D

Part Two: Students Interest in Classroom tasks

*** Please indicate your agreement or disagreement using the seven point scale ***

8	The students are interested in the course.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
9	The students can make good use of examples and illustrations.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
10	All students have opportunities to answer and comment.	S A P N P D S A A A D D
11	The students are active in discussion.	S A P N P D S A A A D D