

# **LANGUAGE WANTS OF ENGLISH MAJORS IN A NON-NATIVE CONTEXT**

**Judit Kormos, Edit Hegybíró Kontra and Anita Csölle**

**Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest**

## **ABSTRACT**

The main aim of our research was to investigate the language wants of English majors in Hungary. First a questionnaire was administered to 279 students at all the six universities of Hungary where there are students majoring in English language and literature combined with TESOL. The participants were mainly students in the last two years of their university studies and their number represented approximately 10% of the target population. The same questionnaire was also completed by 80 students who graduated from one of the universities in Hungary in the past 5 years. The design of the questionnaire was informed by the Common European Framework of Reference prepared by the Education Committee of the European Union (Council of Europe, 2001). The questionnaire was piloted and validated with think-aloud interviews and test-retest reliability analysis. The results suggest that students use English mainly for academic purposes during their university studies. The most important functions for English majors in their future occupation seem to be expressing their opinion, reading texts on the Internet, conversing with non-native speakers, writing e-mail messages, giving explanations and instructions, and translating oral and written English in a variety of occupations. No major differences between students in different years of study and at different universities in the country were found. The methods applied and the findings concerning the needs of English majors in Hungary might also be relevant for other countries with a similar educational system.

## **KEY-WORDS**

Needs-analysis, higher education, questionnaire design, validation, language functions, EFL, EAP, ESP

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank Csépes Ildikó, Edwards Melinda, Fenyvesi Anna, Holló Dorottya, Nikolov Marianne and Ötvösné Vadnai Mariann for their help in administering the questionnaires, and to Albert Ágnes, Papp Csaba, Tóth Ágnes, and Piniel Katalin for their help in the analysis of data. This study was supported by a research grant from Felsőoktatási Kutatási és Fejlesztési Pályázatok (Higher Education Research and Development Fund) No. 0073/2000.

## INTRODUCTION

The diversity of needs of English language learners has long been acknowledged (see Tarone & Yule, 1989), and a wide variety of materials has been written for specific job areas such as business, science, technology or English for academic purposes (e.g.: Donovan, 1978; Glendinning & McEwan, 1993; Irigoien & Tsai, 1995; Trzeciak & Mackay, 1994; Wallace, 1980; Watson-Delestree & Hill, 1998). English majors in non-native contexts, however, represent a group unlike any of the others. They already have a good command of the language at the beginning of their studies, and their goals are not tied to any one profession. More often than not, in the first years of their studies, they are given courses in EAP so that they can successfully complete their studies, irrespective of the fact that following graduation very few of them are likely to stay in “academia”. Majoring in English in a non-native context is usually a prerequisite for becoming a teacher of the language, and it is also a passport to becoming an ‘authority’ in it. As a consequence, the language needs of English majors in non-native contexts are often given little thought under the tacit assumption that they have to know everything anyway. These students may not be taught English for business, but they might end up having to teach it, and they may not have dealt with English for science, but they may land in a job where they edit or translate science articles.

Mackay (1965) pointed out that since it is impossible to teach the whole of a language, all methods must select the part of it that they intend to teach. When designing courses or exams for English major students it is necessary that the English department have reliable information on the language use of these students during and after their studies so that what is taught and what is tested matches their needs as closely as possible.

It was the realisation of this necessity that led to the design of a needs analysis survey as part of a large-scale test-design project at the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. The investigation focused on the global level (Tarone & Yule, 1989), namely on “the situations in which learners will need to use the language and language related activities which typically occur in those situations”

(p. 37). The results of the investigation are being used in the re-structuring of the curriculum and the exit proficiency test, which closes the language studies of English major students. Although the actual needs of English majors might vary from country to country, the applied process of questionnaire design, validation and data analysis can serve as a model or example for other institutions in and outside the region.

### *Issues and methods in needs analysis*

In learner-centered approaches, learner needs have been of prime importance, and the study of these needs – known as needs analysis or needs assessment - has become an important part of curriculum design. The early study of needs analysis is associated with the work of Munby (1978), who developed one of the earliest models of needs analysis for language syllabus design. During the past decades the use of needs analysis has been extended to other fields of applied linguistics, therefore the definition of needs and needs analysis varies from scholar to scholar.

One of the most general definitions of needs is given by Berwick (1989), who claims that a need is expressed "as a gap or measurable discrepancy between a current state of affairs and a desired future state" (p. 52). An even more simple definition is given by Brindley (1989), according to which needs analysis shows "the gap between what is and what should be" (p. 65). Obviously, given such broad definitions, it is necessary to specify in each case of needs analysis research *what* is meant by the "current state of affairs", and *whose* gaps and desires are to be investigated. These different interpretations of needs have led to a great deal of disagreement between researchers and have given birth to several approaches to the interpretation and analysis of needs.

One of these approaches is the 'narrow' (product-oriented, objective) interpretation (Brindley, 1989), where the learners' needs are seen as the language they will have to produce in a particular communicative situation, in other words, needs mean target language behaviour in a target language situation. This orientation is applied, for instance, by Bachman and Palmer (1996),

who argue that "needs analysis, or needs assessment, involves the systematic gathering of specific information about the language needs of learners and the analysis of this information for purposes of language syllabus design" (p. 102). According to what Brindley refers to as 'broad' (process-oriented, subjective) interpretation, needs are individual learner needs in the learning situation, which entail a number of affective, cognitive and even social factors. We have to note that the use of 'objective' and 'subjective' needs analysis is not consistent in the literature. Some researchers, such as Nunan (1988a, 1988b), use them to describe objective/factual and subjective/perceived information about learners.

Based on those two approaches, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) distinguish between two types of needs: target needs and learning needs. Target needs comprise necessities (what the learner has to know in order to function effectively in the target situation), lacks (the gap between target and existing proficiency of the learner), and wants (the learners' view on their needs). Learning needs, on the other hand, is a cover term for all the factors connected to the process of learning like attitude, motivation, awareness, personality, learning styles and strategies, social background etc. (for a detailed discussion of types of needs see e.g., Berwick, 1989; Brindley, 1989; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; West, 1994).

There are various ways in which needs can be assessed, which obviously vary according to the purpose of the analysis. The most commonly used tools are questionnaires, interviews, observation schedules, and consultations, which may be designed for various audiences (learners, teachers, administrative staff, etc.) depending on the purpose of the assessment (for a classification of inductive and deductive methods see Berwick, 1989; for a critical analysis of methodologies see Swales, 1989). As several researchers argue, it is desirable to use a combination of these methods.

Concerning the content of any form of needs analysis, opinions differ to a great extent. It seems that each research project requires a different set of focal points. The oldest model was given in Munby (1978), who identified nine points to inquire about, and several researchers have

elaborated on this model or developed a new one (see e.g. Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Nunan 1988a, 1988b), but there are as many types of needs analysis tools (questionnaires, etc.) as projects.

Although the roots of needs analysis derive from learner-centeredness and ESP (English for Specific Purposes) curriculum design, it has been widely applied in other fields of applied linguistics research. Besides using needs analysis to determine course content (curriculum, syllabus) in ESP, EAP (see e.g. Benesch, 1996; Fulcher, 1999) and also GE (General English; see e.g. Seedhouse, 1995), needs analysis can also be a helpful tool in the planning of course duration, course intensity, teaching methodology, staff matters, the grouping of learners and any language policy/planning situation (for a discussion of the place of needs analysis in language planning and curriculum development see Johnson, 1989).

Strongly related to the matter of curriculum/syllabus design, needs analysis has gained considerable attention in the field of language testing as well. This was pointed out by Carroll (1980), who claimed that one of the three elements of test design is analysing the participants' communicative needs, and later by Fulcher (1999) who argues that test specifications for an EAP test should "flow as naturally from needs analysis as the EAP course itself" (p. 221). The direct link between the content of a course and its assessment is obvious, thus Fulcher (1999) connects the issue of needs analysis to the matter of content validity. However, it is not only content that is concerned here, but also test format, or task type. As Bachman and Palmer (1996) argue, regardless of whether test-developers are familiar with the target language use domain, they need to refine their 'best guesses' with a systematic approach to identifying the tasks.

## **METHOD**

### *Research questions*

In our study we were primarily interested in target needs, and within them the learners' views of their needs, that is, their language wants. There were several reasons for choosing this component of needs as a focus of our investigation. Firstly, as teachers of English majors with at least ten years of experience, we had implicit views of what students need to know in order to function effectively in academic settings. There is also a large body of literature that describes the academic skills university students need to acquire (e.g. Jordan, 1997). Nevertheless, we knew very little about the purposes English majors use the target language for outside the university, and we had even less information concerning the type of situations in which students might need the language after graduation. Another reason for focusing on students' wants was that because they can take up a wide variety of jobs, an extensive survey of employers' needs would have been very complicated to carry out. In addition, a study that investigated what expectations employers have as regards the English language skills of their employees in general had already been conducted, and we could rely on its results to a certain extent (Bárány, Major, Martsa, Nagy, Nemes, Szabó & Vándor, 1999).

Our initial research questions were the following:

1. What are the present and future language wants of English majors in Hungary?
2. Are there any differences between students in different years of their study and in different Hungarian universities as regards their language wants?

In order to verify whether the expectations of students regarding their future language wants are realistic, in the follow-up phase of the research, we added a third research question:

3. What are the language wants of former English majors in their present private and professional life?

Our hypotheses were that English majors use English mainly for academic purposes during their university studies and that after graduation they will make use of their language skills in the field of business and in teaching English as a foreign language. Even though the main research tool used in the investigation was a questionnaire, before and while designing it, we combined several research methods such as interviews and guided compositions.

### *Settings and procedures*

The main instrument used to assess the language learning needs of English majors in Hungary was a questionnaire. The major advantage of questionnaires is that data can be collected from a large number of respondents in a cost-effective way within a short period of time. Provided that the respondents are chosen appropriately, the results obtained with the help of the questionnaires can be generalised to the target population. A pre-condition for this is that the questionnaire used must be both valid and reliable. We applied several methods in constructing the questionnaire in order to ensure its reliability and validity, most of which were elaborated by Alderson and Banerjee (1996).

For source of items, we did not only rely on existing questionnaires (e.g. Weir, 1983; Nunan, 1988a; Nunan & Lamb, 1996; Richterich, 1980) and the theoretical framework provided by the study of the Education Committee of the European Union (Council of Europe, 2001), but collected preliminary qualitative data from future respondents. 153 second and third year English majors at Eötvös Loránd University Budapest were asked to write an essay with the title "What do I use English for". In this essay students described the situations in which they use the target language at present and in which they foresee they will need English after graduation. The compositions were analysed with qualitative methods and categories of language use were set up. These categories together with those found in the literature were incorporated in the questionnaire.

Once we compiled the first version of the questionnaire, we submitted it to tests of validity and reliability. In order to ensure that the respondents interpret the questions in the same way as



intended by us and that they fully understand the questions (response validity), we used the technique of verbal reporting (Alderson & Banerjee, 1996). Nine English majors from the target population at Eötvös Loránd University were asked to think aloud while filling in the questionnaire. The think-aloud sessions were recorded, and certain items were modified on the basis of the analysis of the protocols.

For checking the reliability of the questionnaire, we used test-retest reliability and internal consistency analysis (Alderson & Banerjee, 1996). With the help of the former method, it can be revealed whether the answers given by the participants remain stable when filling in the questionnaire for the second time. 30 English majors in the second and third year of their studies at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest filled in the questionnaire twice with a two-week interval. Due to the relatively low number of respondents, the accepted level of correlation between answers given at the first and second time was set for  $r > 0.7$ . Items that did not reach this level of correlation were either eliminated or reworded. The decision on the elimination of answers was also facilitated by the internal consistency analysis. Since the questionnaire did not investigate one specific and clearly defined concept, but several thematic issues, we divided the questions into four groups: questions concerning

- 1) academic language use,
- 2) using English for teaching,
- 3) using English for other professional purposes,
- 4) public language use.

Questions concerning the private domain were not submitted to internal consistency analysis, as the scope of the questions was very varied. The internal consistency analysis supported the test-retest reliability analysis, as the items that were found problematic in the test-retest procedure were the ones that were not consistent with the rest of the items in the group. After deleting these questions, the Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients in the four groups of questions were all above 0.8 (questions concerning using English for teaching:  $\alpha = 0.97$ ; questions concerning using English

for other professional purposes:  $\alpha = 0.88$ ; questions concerning public language use:  $\alpha = 0.85$ ; questions concerning academic language use:  $\alpha = 0.81$ ).

## **Questionnaire**

The final version of the questionnaire for under-graduate students comprised two main sections. In Part 1 we asked participants five biographical questions concerning their age, the number of completed semesters, other majors, part-time jobs and plans for future career. Part 2 consisted of two main parts: 48 questions inquired about the frequency of situations of English language use at present and another 48 about the expected frequency of situations of English language use after graduation. Students had to indicate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale, on which value 1 represented 'never' and value 5 'very frequently, on a daily basis'. Each point of the scale was defined so that students could select their answers more precisely (see Appendix for the questionnaire). In the case of questions concerning future situations of language use, participants were also offered a "don't know" choice. The 96 questions can be divided into five main domains of language use: the private, public, academic and professional domain, as well as situations of language use while teaching English to foreign language learners. Within these domains the questions asked about types of texts listened to and read, as well as types of output produced in speech, writing and mediation (see Appendix for the questionnaire).

The questionnaire was slightly modified when used with former students, but only to the extent necessary to make it appropriate for the target population. It had a similar structure: Part 1 contained biographical questions about age, job and other majors. Part 2 contained the same items as the questionnaire for the undergraduate students, but here we inquired only about present situations of language use and the 'don't know' option was not offered.

## Participants

The participants of the research were students majoring in English in the first phase, and former English majors in the second phase. We call our participants 'English majors', but the term should not be misleading. The education system in Hungary is very different from the American or British system. In Hungary university students receive an 8-10 semester long training, at the end of which they get a degree that is declared by Hungarian law (the 1993 Higher Education Act) as equivalent to an M.A. Students can choose to only major in English or to be double majors, pairing English up with another subject such as history, sociology, psychology, mathematics, or another foreign language. English major students study English linguistics, literature, history, culture, applied linguistics and language pedagogy, as well as participate in language development classes. They can choose to obtain a degree with a teaching qualification or without it. The students' level of English language proficiency is around or above upper-intermediate level when they enter the university, and they are required to reach a near-native level of competence by the time they finish their studies. Most students start university at the age of 19-22 and graduate at 24-28. Based on information from the enrolment list of Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, we can estimate that approximately 75% of English majors in Hungary are female and 25% male.

In the first phase of the research the questionnaire was filled in by 279 undergraduate students at six universities of Hungary (see Table 1 for the distribution of participants according to universities). Altogether 300 questionnaires were mailed to instructors at the universities, and they administered the questionnaires to their students in their classes. According to the figures published in the annual Higher Education Enrolment Catalogue in 2001, there are about 2,500-3,000 English majors in Hungary, thus the surveyed undergraduate students constitute roughly 10% of the target population.

Two of the universities were located in the capital of Hungary, Budapest and four of them in big cities in the provinces. Out of the six universities five were state-owned and one was owned by

the Catholic Church. Our initial aim was to survey English language majors who are in the third, fourth and fifth years of their study because we assumed that they would have more specific plans concerning their future than students in the first year. Nevertheless, colleagues at other universities made some first and second year students fill in the questionnaire, and therefore we also took data gained from them into consideration (see Table 2 for the distribution of participants according to years of study).

-----  
Insert Tables 1 and 2 around here  
-----

In the second phase of the study 80 former English majors who had obtained a degree at Eötvös Loránd University between 1996 and 2001 completed the questionnaire. (We chose the year 1996 because those who graduated in 1996 had started their studies in or around 1991, that is after the major political and socio-economic changes in the country and the region.) First we used snow-ball sampling, that is, we contacted a few of our past students with whom we had personal contact, and asked them for addresses of further possible participants. All together 65 graduates were contacted in this way either by email or by mail, of which 50 students returned the questionnaires filled in. Next we selected 70 students from the list of students who graduated not later than five years ago. This list was provided by the university administration, but contained addresses that were used by students at the time of their graduation. This might explain why only 30 questionnaire were sent back to us. The response rate in the survey of graduate students was 59%.

The respondents' age ranged from 24 to 34. Approximately 120 students graduate annually from Eötvös Loránd University with a degree in "English language and literature" (Source: Department statistics of refereed MA theses). Thus the surveyed population represents approximately 13% of English majors who graduated from this university in the past five years. The

job opportunities for English majors might be different in the four major cities of Hungary where the other universities are located, but unfortunately due to data protection laws, it was impossible for us to have access to addresses of students who graduated at other universities. Nevertheless the language learning wants of students in similar jobs can be assumed to be similar across the country.

## **Analysis**

The filled in questionnaires were computer-coded and analysed with the help of the program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). For each item descriptive statistics were produced, and for comparative analysis one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The significance level in this study was set for  $p < .05$ .

## **Results and discussion**

### *Plans concerning future career and students' part-time jobs*

Our first questions were concerned with the jobs the participants intend to fill after graduating from university and the part-time jobs they have besides studying. As Table 3 shows, out of the 279 participants, 142, that is, 50.9% of the respondents, have no idea about the jobs they would like to take after graduation. More than half of those participants who have plans concerning their future career ( $n = 78$ , 28% of the total sample) intend to become teachers, 9% ( $n = 25$ ) of the respondents wish to become translators or interpreters, and 3.2% ( $n = 9$ ) would like to work in business. An equal percentage of students would like to take a job in tourism and catering ( $n = 9$ ), and 2.2% of the participants would like to work in the printed and electronic media ( $n = 6$ ). Only 1.1% of the surveyed population intends to do research or obtain a PhD. Other jobs mentioned by the students include psychologist, sociologist, photographer and educational manager.

-----  
Insert Table 3 around here  
-----

Most students do not have a part-time job (n = 186, 66.7%) besides being a university student. 23.7% of the respondents (n = 66) work as teachers, 1.8% as translators (n = 5), and 0.7% of the respondents (n = 2) work in business and as office assistants respectively. Other part-time jobs mentioned by the students include aerobics instructor, baby-sitter, tour-guide, copy-editor, teaching assistant and photo-editor.

We also analysed whether students have more specific plans concerning their future career as they advance in their studies. It was interesting to observe that as the participants progressed in their university studies, they became only slightly more certain about their future jobs. 66% of the students who completed seven or more semesters did not know what job they would like to take. 57.6% of those who finished eight or more semesters did not have any plans concerning their career, and only 48.2% of the respondents in the last year of their studies (nine or more completed semesters) knew what job they would like to take.

The distribution of the jobs taken by the 80 English majors after graduation is in accordance with the undergraduate students' plans (see Table 4). 31.3% of the participants work as teachers, but teaching is also a part-time job for all the post-graduate students, for certain translators and for some participants working in business. 25% of the graduates found employment in business, and 11.3% do translations for a living. 6.3% of the participants work as educational managers and 3.8% as journalists. 2.5% of the participants are employed in the field of information technology and 1.3% as full-time researchers.

-----  
Insert Table 4 around here  
-----

These results suggest that English language majors in Hungary use their university studies as a springboard. Only a quarter of the students wish to become teachers and work currently as teachers besides studying, and the rest of the students who have specific plans intend to work either as translators or in business. The distribution of the jobs selected by former English majors also shows that approximately a third of those with an English degree make a living only by teaching. The rest of the surveyed participants are employed either as translators or in the field of business, or take a variety of jobs such as journalist, educational manager etc. What makes the job of curriculum and test-designers very difficult is that more than half of the students do not know at all, not even close to the end of their studies, what job they intend to fill. This would suggest that a basic aim of the training English language majors receive in our country should be to develop their general English language competence so that they will be able to use the language competently in a wide variety of jobs and situations.

*The present language wants of students*

The major part of the questionnaire comprised items concerning various situations in which students currently use English. In Table 5 mean values close to 5 indicate that students use English in a given situation on a daily basis, while mean values around 4 represent a frequency of once or twice a week. Mean values around 3 express a monthly frequency, and values around 2 mean that participants use English in the given situation once or twice a year. Mean values around 1 indicate that the respondents never need English in that particular situation. As Table 5 suggests, the most

frequent situations in which the respondents use English are related to their university studies. English language majors listen to lectures and take notes while doing so almost on a daily basis. They listen to the other students' presentations, express their opinion verbally, use dictionaries and read professional books once or twice a week. They read professional journals, and texts on the Internet and take notes while reading less frequently, only once or twice a month. The participants hold presentations in English and write essays also with a monthly frequency. What surprised us as teachers of English majors was that the participants only read fiction in English with a monthly frequency. This finding does not match the requirements in the curriculum of the English studies courses where students are supposed to read fiction in English on a weekly basis. The results of the survey seem to suggest that students either do not read the compulsory readings regularly or that they read them in Hungarian instead of English.

-----  
Insert Table 5 around here  
-----

Students do not seem to use English outside the university very often. In their private lives the respondents watch English language films and news and read newspapers in English once or twice a month. As can be seen in Table 5, the participants have more chance to converse with non-native speakers of English ( $X = 3.12$ ) than with native speakers ( $X = 2.61$ ). English language majors occasionally watch entertainment programmes on television ( $X = 2.65$ ) and read instruction manuals ( $X = 2.77$ ) in English. They sometimes interpret ( $X = 2.62$ ) and translate for family members, friends or acquaintances ( $X = 2.33$ ). The respondents hardly ever chat on the Internet or write traditional letters in English. Nevertheless they sometimes use English when writing e-mail messages ( $X = 2.58$ ).

As also suggested by the figures concerning the participants' part-time jobs, the participants use English for teaching purposes on average with a monthly frequency. If we examine the most frequently selected answers, however, it turns out that participants can be divided into two distinct



groups: those who use English for teaching purposes with weekly frequency and those who never use it. As can be seen in Table 5, English language majors hardly ever use English in business or for official purposes before graduation. They hardly ever translate texts or interpret in business or public situations.

As the results presented above indicate, current language learning needs of English language majors in Hungary are mainly related to study skills. Our participants rarely use English outside the sphere of the university, and if they do, they mainly read newspapers or magazines or watch various television programmes in English. This means that in their private lives students use the receptive skills more frequently than the productive skills, and that at present mediation skills are seldom needed by the participants.

#### *Differences according to length of study*

We also investigated whether English language majors in Hungary have varying language wants in different years of their study by means of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and a number of differences between the various groups of participants were found. Students in the second year of their studies play with computer games the language of which is English significantly more frequently than those in the fifth year of their studies ( $F = 3.50, p = 0.008$ ), which indicates the increasing role of electronic games in younger students' lives. Participants in the fifth year were found to take notes while listening to lectures significantly less frequently than third and fourth year students ( $F = 4.87, p = 0.001$ ). This is due to the fact that owing to the curricular requirements, fifth year students in Hungary have to attend very few lectures in the last year of their studies. Respondents in the fifth year also express their opinion less frequently in English than fourth year students ( $F = 3.07, p = 0.001$ ), but they ask questions ( $F = 4.50, p = 0.002$ ) and give instructions as teachers ( $F = 3.77, p = 0.005$ ) significantly more frequently than students in the third year. These differences are also caused by the structure of the curricula applied in training English language

majors in Hungary. Generally students in the fifth year of their studies take part in school-based practical teacher-training, in the course of which they observe and also teach a number of lessons. In this year they usually take very few courses, and besides doing their teaching practice, they write their thesis. Therefore students in the last year of their studies use language functions related to teaching more frequently and certain study skills less frequently than students in the third and fourth year.

#### *Differences according to universities*

We also analysed whether the language learning needs of the participants differed according to the universities the students attend by means of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Very few significant differences were found at the  $p < 0.05$  level. The ANOVA procedure and the post-hoc Scheffe test showed that participants from the University of Debrecen read texts on the Internet significantly more frequently than students at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest and students at the University of Pécs ( $F = 3.59$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ). This difference is probably due to the differing ease of access to electronic resources at the universities. Students at the University of Debrecen also read fiction in English significantly more frequently than students at the University of Szeged ( $F = 3.31$ ,  $p = 0.006$ ), which difference might be caused by different requirements in the curricula at the two universities. Another difference concerned the frequency with which students watch documentaries on television. Students at the University of Debrecen were found to watch documentaries significantly more frequently than students at Eötvös Loránd University ( $F = 3.53$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ). No significant differences were found between the participating six universities in any other respect.

From these results, we can conclude that the language learning needs of English language majors at different universities in Hungary are fairly homogenous. This in turn calls for national co-operation in designing effective curricula and valid and reliable language exit tests in the language.

### *The future language wants of students*

In the first phase of the research students were also asked about the situations in which they intend to use English in the future. Since in a follow up-stage of our research we administered the same questionnaire to 80 former students, we were able to compare the expectations of current students to the actual frequency with which former English majors with a degree use English. The comparison of the data gained from the two populations shows that undergraduate students over-estimated the frequency with which they are going to use the language in 34 questionnaire items out of the 48 items. In the case of these 34 items, the independent samples t-test showed statistical differences at the  $p < 0.05$  level. These differences, however, were not always meaningful, since only in 15 questions was the difference higher than 0.7 on a scale with an interval of 1.0. In one of the items under-graduate students under-estimated the frequency of language use. These results suggest that under-graduate students cannot judge appropriately how frequently they will need English in specific situations. Nevertheless, the most frequent and least frequent situations undergraduate participants thought they would use English in are the same as indicated by participants who already finished their studies.

As can be seen in Table 6, the four most frequent situations in which former students use English are the reading of texts on the Internet ( $X = 4.23$ ), the use of monolingual dictionaries ( $X = 4.02$ ), and expressing opinion ( $X = 3.97$ ) and job-related conversations ( $X = 3.73$ ). In the academic domain the respondents read professional books ( $X = 3.67$ ) once a week and journals once a month ( $X = 2.91$ ). Study skills such as taking notes, giving and listening to presentations are rarely needed after graduation. In the private domain former students watch news ( $X = 3.56$ ) and films in English ( $X = 3.31$ ) approximately twice a month, and read newspapers ( $X = 3.51$ ), fiction ( $X = 3.37$ ) and instruction manuals ( $X = 2.96$ ) in English with a monthly frequency. English majors with a degree converse with non-native speakers ( $X = 3.46$ ) and write e-mail messages ( $X = 3.61$ ) in English weekly, and these two types of communication can take place both in the private and in the business

sphere. On average the participants read and write business documents and letters once or twice a month, and use English for teaching purposes with a weekly frequency. English is hardly ever needed in the public sphere; it is only public documents that are read by the participants once or twice a month ( $X = 3.23$ ).

The results suggest that after graduation, English majors use production skills in English more frequently than during their university studies. They use the language for expressing their opinion, in job-related conversations and in conversations with non-native speakers with a weekly frequency. The role of the Internet also increases to a considerable extent after graduation. Participants with an English degree use English most frequently for reading texts on the Internet, whereas before graduation this was the tenth most frequent situation of language use. Among the receptive skills, mainly reading is used, but participants sometimes watch news and films in English, where their listening skills are also needed.

-----  
Insert Table 6 around here  
-----

#### *Differences according to jobs*

Since the 80 former students work in very different kinds of jobs, their different language wants were also investigated by means of one-way analysis of variance in this study. Table 7 shows the mean values for the various situations of language use in six different jobs: teacher, translator, job in the business sphere and in the field of information technology, educational manager and journalist. In this analysis participants who had part-time jobs as teachers were excluded and only the graduates with one particular job were included. Teachers were found to ask questions ( $F = 104.4$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), give instructions ( $F = 104.4$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and explanations ( $F = 124.7$ ,  $p <$

0.0001), correct homework ( $F = 37.34, p < 0.001$ ) and translations ( $F = 23.47, p < 0.001$ ), listen to student presentations ( $F = 9.53, p < 0.001$ ) and write tasks ( $F = 79.85, p < 0.0001$ ) and tests ( $F = 37.38, p < 0.001$ ) significantly more frequently than the rest of the participants. Teachers and educational managers also express their opinion verbally in English more frequently than translators and those working in the field of information technology ( $F = 5.79, p = 0.001$ ), but teachers read texts on the Internet significantly less frequently than the other participants ( $F = 3.23, p = 0.01$ ).

Translators translate business documents ( $F = 4.94, p = 0.001$ ), business letters ( $F = 4.21, p = 0.003$ ), books and articles ( $F = 7.57, p < 0.001$ ), significantly more frequently than graduates in other jobs. Translators and graduates in the field of information technology also read instruction manuals in English more frequently than participants in other jobs ( $F = 4.83, p = 0.001$ ). Businessmen and translators read ( $F = 7.70, p < 0.001$ ), and write business documents ( $F = 10.53, p < 0.001$ ), significantly more frequently than teachers, while business letters are read ( $F = 10.68, p < 0.001$ ), and written ( $F = 9.45, p < 0.001$ ), more frequently by those working in business and as educational managers than by teachers. In addition, educational managers write official letters significantly more frequently than teachers ( $F = 3.41, p = 0.01$ ).

-----  
Insert Table 7 around here  
-----

The results show that the language wants of teachers are distinctly different from the wants of participants in other professions. They mainly use English for teaching purposes, and they hardly ever need the language in the business and public sphere. Translators differ from other respondents in their need of translation skills. It is interesting to observe that in other respects translators, educational managers, businessmen and journalists have very similar language wants. They frequently use English in the business sphere for reading and writing various types of business letters and documents, and speak English in job-related conversations. This finding indicates that

the teaching of business English also needs to constitute an important part of the curriculum for English majors.

## **Conclusion**

The analysis of English majors' needs described in this paper has two major conclusions. It has become evident to the researchers that the assumptions and insights of instructors regarding student needs were by and large correct. Yet, it can also be concluded that with the help of valid and reliable research it is possible to get a much more complete, complex and refined picture of those needs. The information gained can be used both in the shaping of the curriculum and also in the re-designing of the exit proficiency test by test designers refining their 'best guesses' (Bachman and Palmer, 1996).

The research results confirmed that the present practice of primarily including EAP in the curriculum is appropriate since students tend to use English mainly for study purposes. On the other hand, it was new information for the faculty that students read relatively little in English. The conclusion drawn from that can either be that students do not read the set literature in English because the requirements are not enforced effectively enough, or, alternatively, because they find it easier to read the articles and books in Hungarian. This has implications for the design of the exit test, namely that the development of reading skills specifically as regards the comprehension of academic texts has to be tested systematically.

Another skill that has to be taught is note taking while listening. This is obviously needed when the students listen to lectures and is useful for those who wish to pursue postgraduate studies at foreign universities. In the area of speaking, the importance of oral expression of ideas and argumentation has been confirmed. The results showed that English majors use English in conversation with non-natives more than with native speakers of the language. For the curriculum

designer this means that it is necessary to timetable classes with native speakers to provide exposure to native language use. On the other hand, an increased awareness of certain learning strategies, such as seeking opportunities for using the language with native speakers, should be achieved.

The results suggest that English language majors in Hungary use their university studies as a springboard. Only a quarter of the students wish to become teachers and work currently as teachers besides studying, and the rest of the students who have specific plans intend to work either as translators or in business. The distribution of the jobs selected by former English majors also shows that approximately a third of those with an English degree make a living only by teaching. The rest of the surveyed participants are employed either as translators or in the field of business, or take a variety of jobs such as journalist, educational manager etc. Not surprising is the fact that many of our graduates run two different jobs, a full time job in business or translating and a part time teaching job. The discrepancy between present and future needs is clear. While at present the students need primarily EAP, in the future they do not foresee much use of those skills. At the same time, they expect to use a few skills more frequently after than before graduation. On the basis of the research results, elective courses in mediation skills, business English, and classroom English must also be included in the curriculum.

With the respondents representing roughly 10% of the target population our findings allow for some generalization. By making the above results public, similar changes in both curriculum-design and proficiency testing can be initiated at other English Departments in the country. Beyond that, cooperation is being sought between the English Departments for the purpose of implementing a common exit test for English majors nationwide. For those who teach under somewhat different circumstances and must therefore carry out their own needs analysis, the applied procedure can serve as an example to model their research on.

## REFERENCES

- Alderson, C. J., & Banerjee, J. (1996). *How might impact study instruments be validated?*  
Unpublished manuscript commissioned by UCLES.
- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bárány, F., Major, É., Martsa, S., Nagy, I., Nemes, A., Szabó., T., & Vándor, J. (1999).  
Stakeholders' attitudes. In. H. Fekete, É. Major, & M. Nikolov (Eds.), *English language education in Hungary: A baseline study* (pp. 137-204). Budapest: The British Council.
- Benesch, S. (1996). Needs analysis and curriculum development in EAP: An example of a critical approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 723-738.
- Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: from theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, B. (1981). Specifications for an English Language Testing Service. In J. C. Alderson & A. Hughes (Eds). *Issues in language testing* (pp. 66-110). The British Council: ELT Documents 111.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for teaching, learning and assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donovan, P. (1978). *Basic English for science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fulcher, G. (1999). Assessment in English for Academic Purposes: Putting content validity in its place. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 221-236.



- Glendinning, E., & McEwan J. (1993). *Oxford English for electronics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hock, I. English for teaching purposes. *novELTy*, 7 (2), 4-11.
- Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irigoin, J. & Tsai, B. (1995). *Business English recipes A creative approach to business English*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Johnson, R.K. (1989). A decision-making framework for the coherent language curriculum. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackay, W. (1965). *Language teaching analysis*. Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press.
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988a). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988b). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richterich, R. (1980). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Seedhouse, P. (1995). Needs analysis and the general English classroom. *ELT Journal*, 49, 59-65.
- Swales, J. (1989). Service English programme design and opportunity cost. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 79-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarone, E. & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trzeciak, J. & Mackay, S. E. (1994). *Study skills for academic writing*. Harlow: Longman.

Wallace, M. (1980). *Study skills in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson-Delestree, A. & Hill, J. (1998). *The working week. Spoken business English with a lexical approach*. Howe: Language Teaching Publications.

Weir, C. J. (1983). Identifying the language problems of overseas students in tertiary education. University of London. Unpublished PhD thesis.

West, R. (1994). State of the art article - Needs analysis in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 27, 1-19.

Dear Participants,

The following questionnaire constitutes part of a research project that investigates the English language use of university students of English. The research is conducted by a team working at ELTE, School of English and American Studies and is sponsored by the National Research and Development Fund.

**Part I. Please answer the following biographical questions first. The questionnaire is anonymous and all the data will be handled confidentially.**

Do you have a permanent part-time job besides being a university student? Yes:  No:  If yes, what? \_\_\_\_\_

What job/position do you expect to fill after graduating at university? \_\_\_\_\_ I do not know:

How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_ years

How many semesters/terms have you completed as an English major? \_\_\_\_\_ terms/semesters

Do you have another major? Yes:  No:  If yes, what? \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II. We are asking you to fill in the rest of the questionnaire by circling the appropriate answer.** In the first column of the questionnaire, you will find situations of language use. In the second column please circle the answer that that characterizes you the best at the present. In the third column please circle the answer that you think will realistically characterize your language use after graduation.

Example

<b>How frequently do you</b>	<b>Now</b>	<b>After graduation how frequently do you expect you will</b>
	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis X = I do not know.
eat at fast food places?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
buy presents?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X

For example, if you do a certain activity such as eating at fast food places once a month, you should circle 3. If you perform the activity only in certain period of the year such as buying presents in the example, please consider the annual average.

Thank you for your help.

Csölle Anita, Kontráné Hegybíró Edit and Kormos Judit ELTE, Department of English Applied Linguistics

For more information on the project please contact: [dolgos.l@mail.datanet.hu](mailto:dolgos.l@mail.datanet.hu)

How frequently do you	Now	After graduation how frequently do you expect you will
	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis X = I do not know.
1. use English in conversations with acquaintances/friends who are <b>native</b> speakers of English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
2. use English in conversations with acquaintances/friends who are <b>non-native</b> speakers of English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
3. read newspapers and/or magazines in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
4. read fiction in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
5. write personal e-mail messages in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
6. write traditional personal (non-electronic) letters in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
7. chat in English on the Internet?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
8. watch news programmes (e.g. CNN, BBC) on television in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
9. watch documentaries on television in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
10. watch English language films in the cinema, on television or video?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
11. watch entertainment programmes (e.g. quizzes, talk shows, Music Television) on television in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
12. listen to radio programmes in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
13. read texts in English on the Internet?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
14. read instruction manuals in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
15. use electronic/computer games the language of which is English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
16. translate for non-English speaking friends/acquaintances/ family members in writing?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
18. interpret orally for non-English speaking friends/acquaintances/ family members?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
19. use English in activities related to your hobby (e.g. collecting something, gardening, fitness)?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
20. listen to lectures in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
21. listen to student presentations in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
22. read professional books (e.g. text books, reference books) in English either in whole or in part, either in original or in photocopy?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X

How frequently do you	Now	After graduation how frequently do you expect you will
	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis	1 = never 2 = occasionally, once or a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis X = I do not know.
23. read professional journal (e.g. history, linguistics, law) articles in English either in original or in photocopy?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
24. use English monolingual dictionaries?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
25. take notes while listening to lectures/presentations in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
26. take notes while reading professional books/ journal articles in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
27. express your opinion orally in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
28. hold presentations in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
29. write essays/seminar papers in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
30. correct and mark translations as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
31. correct and mark homework as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
32. write tasks in English as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
33. write tests in English as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
34. ask students questions in English as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
35. give instructions in English as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
36. give explanations in English as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
37. use English in job-related conversations?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
38. interpret orally in job-related meetings?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
39. use English at conferences?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
40. interpret lectures/presentations/discussions at conferences?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
41. write business letters (e.g. company correspondence) in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
42. read business letters (e.g. company correspondence) in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X

How frequently do you	Now	After graduation how frequently do you expect you will
	1 = never 2 = occasionally, a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis	1 = never 2 = occasionally, a few times a year 3 = sometimes, once or twice a month 4 = frequently, once or twice a week 5 = very frequently, on a daily basis X = I do not know.
43. translate business letters (e.g. company correspondence)?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
44. read business documents other than letters (e.g. business reports, regulations, contracts) in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
45. write business documents other than letters (e.g. business reports, regulations, contracts) in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
46. translate business documents other than letters (e.g. business reports, regulations, contracts)?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
47. read public documents (announcements, description of scholarship opportunities, regulations, notes etc.) in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
48. write letters to authorities/organizations in English?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
49. translate books or articles?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X
50. use English for other purposes? Please specify:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 X

**Table 1 Distribution of participants according to universities**

University	Frequency	Percent
Eötvös Univ. Budapest	59	21.1
Univ. of Szeged	64	22.9
Univ. of Debrecen	59	21.1
Univ. of Pécs	44	15.8
Univ. of Veszprém	27	9.7
Pázmány Univ. Budapest	26	9.3
Total	279	100

**Table 2 Distribution of participants according to length of study**

Years of study	Frequency	Percent
1	4	1.4
2	26	9.3
3	61	21.9
4	125	44.8
5	55	19.7
Missing	8	2.9
Total	279	100



**Table 3 Frequency of jobs participants intend to take after graduation**

Job	Frequency	Percent
Don't know	142	50.9
Teacher	78	28.0
Translator/interpreter	25	9.0
Job in the business sphere	9	3.2
Job in tourism and catering	9	3.2
Job in the media	6	2.2
Researcher/PhD student	3	1.1
Job in information technology	2	0.7
Environment protector	1	0.4
Ethnographer	1	0.4
Photographer	1	0.4
Psychologist	1	0.4
Sociologist	1	0.4
Educational manager	1	0.4
Total	279	100

**Table 4 Jobs taken by graduated students**

Job or sphere of work	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	25	31.3
Business	20	25
Translator	9	11.3
Post-graduate student and teacher	6	7.5
Translator and teacher	5	6.3
Business and teacher	4	6.3
Educational manager	4	6.3
Journalist	3	3.8
Information technology	2	2.5
Researcher	1	1.3
Total	80	100

**Table 5 Frequency of situations students currently use English in (in decreasing order according to domains)**

	N	Mean	Mode	SD
PRIVATE DOMAIN				
1 Reading fiction	278	3.61	4.00	1.04
2 Watching news on TV	278	3.26	3.00	1.16
3 Reading newspapers	277	3.25	3.00	0.87
4 Reading texts on the Internet	277	3.24	4.00	1.19
5 Watching films	275	3.16	3.00	0.89
6 Conversation with non-native speakers	276	3.12	4.00	1.28
7 Watching documentaries on TV	275	2.93	3.00	1.14
8 Reading instruction manuals	275	2.77	3.00	1.01
9 Watching entertainment programs	279	2.65	1.00	1.32
10 Interpreting for family	278	2.62	2.00	0.97
11 Conversation with native speakers	279	2.61	2.00	1.04
12 Writing e-mails	276	2.58	1.00	1.31
13 Translating for family	277	2.33	1.00	1.35
14 Activities related to hobby	277	2.33	1.00	1.35
15 Using electronic games	277	2.02	1.00	1.24
16 Writing letters	279	1.91	2.00	0.89
17 Listening to radio programmes	278	1.59	1.00	0.92
18 Chatting on the Internet	273	1.47	1.00	0.92
ACADEMIC DOMAIN				
1 Listening to lectures	278	4.63	5.00	1.98
2 Taking notes while listening	276	4.59	5.00	0.72
3 Using dictionaries	279	4.16	5.00	0.88
4 Reading professional books	278	4.12	5.00	0.91
5 Listening to student presentations	273	4.03	4.00	0.85
6 Expressing opinion	274	4.02	4.00	0.90
7 Taking notes while reading	270	3.47	4.00	1.20
8 Reading professional journals	275	3.13	3.00	1.12
9 Holding presentation	277	2.98	3.00	0.77
10 Writing essays	276	2.93	3.00	0.73
TEACHING ENGLISH				
1 Asking questions as teacher	276	2.81	1.00	1.55
2 Giving instructions as teacher	275	2.78	1.00	1.55
3 Giving explanations as teacher	271	2.72	1.00	1.50

---

4	Writing tasks as teacher	274	2.59	1.00	1.43
5	Correcting homework as teacher	276	2.53	1.00	1.45
6	Correcting translation as teacher	274	2.37	1.00	1.33
7	Writing test as teacher	274	2.22	1.00	1.26

---

**Table 5 cont.**

	N	Mean	Mode	SD
OTHER PROFESSIONAL DOMAIN				
1	274	2.21	1.00	1.33
2	270	2.12	2.00	1.01
3	274	1.61	1.00	0.91
4	274	1.52	1.00	0.83
5	269	1.49	1.00	0.77
6	270	1.49	1.00	0.77
7	275	1.44	1.00	0.77
8	266	1.43	1.00	0.78
9	268	1.23	1.00	0.58
10	275	1.22	1.00	0.48
11	273	1.17	1.00	0.48
PUBLIC DOMAIN				
14	267	2.79	3.00	1.07
15	267	1.72	1.00	0.86

**Table 6 Frequency of situations of English language use among MA holders (in decreasing order according to domains)**

	N	Mean	Mode	SD
PRIVATE DOMAIN				
1 Reading texts on the Internet	80	4.23	5.00	0.95
2 Writing e-mails	80	3.61	4.00	1.13
3 Watching news on TV	79	3.56	4.00	1.08
4 Reading newspapers	80	3.51	3.00	0.79
5 Conversation with non-native speakers	80	3.46	5.00	1.23
6 Conversation with native speakers	80	3.37	3.00	1.16
7 Reading fiction	80	3.37	3.00	1.15
8 Watching films	79	3.31	3.00	0.77
9 Watching documentaries on TV	80	3.03	2.00	1.03
10 Reading instruction manuals	79	2.96	2.00	1.05
11 Activities related to hobby	77	2.94	2.00	1.38
12 Interpreting for family	80	2.85	2.00	0.96
13 Watching entertainment programs	80	2.82	2.00	1.26
14 Translating for family	80	2.63	2.00	0.97
15 Using electronic games	79	2.10	1.00	1.28
16 Writing letters	80	1.86	2.00	0.79
17 Chatting on the Internet	80	1.63	1.00	1.11
18 Listening to radio programmes	80	1.46	1.00	0.65
ACADEMIC DOMAIN				
1 Using dictionaries	80	4.02	5.00	1.01
2 Expressing opinion	80	3.97	5.00	1.09
3 Reading professional books	79	3.67	5.00	1.19
4 Reading professional journals	79	2.91	2.00	1.32
5 Listening to student presentations	78	2.55	1.00	1.55
6 Holding presentation	80	2.50	1.00	1.29
7 Taking notes while reading	80	2.47	2.00	1.19
8 Taking notes while listening	80	2.46	1.00	1.28
9 Listening to lectures	80	2.32	2.00	1.12
10 Writing essays	80	1.78	1.00	0.93
TEACHING ENGLISH				
1 Asking questions as teacher	80	3.08	5.00	1.81
2 Giving instructions as teacher	80	3.08	5.00	1.81
3 Giving explanations as teacher	80	3.06	1.00	1.83

---

4	Correcting homework as teacher	80	2.81	1.00	1.63
5	Writing tasks as teacher	80	2.80	1.00	1.63
6	Correcting translation as teacher	80	2.53	1.00	1.49
7	Writing tests as teacher	80	2.43	1.00	1.35

---

**Table 6 cont.**

	N	Mean	Mode	SD
OTHER PROFESSIONAL DOMAIN				
1	79	3.73	5.00	1.25
2	80	3.17	5.00	1.48
3	78	3.00	3.00	1.32
4	80	2.93	5.00	1.53
5	78	2.53	1.00	1.36
7	78	2.50	2.00	1.21
8	78	2.50	2.00	1.21
9	80	2.43	1.00	1.31
10	78	2.05	2.00	1.04
11	78	1.50	1.00	0.86
PUBLIC DOMAIN				
1	78	3.23	3.00	1.13
2	78	2.42	2.00	1.02



**Table 7 The frequency of present situations of language use in various professions**

	Teacher (N = 25) Mean SD	Translator (N = 9) Mean SD	Business (N = 20) Mean SD	Information technology (N = 2) Mean SD	Educational manager (N = 4) Mean SD	Journalist (N = 3) Mean SD
PRIVATE DOMAIN						
Conversation with natives	3.44 1.00	3.44 1.33	3.20 1.23	2.00 1.41	4.25 0.95	3.33 1.52
Conversation with non-natives	3.32 1.34	3.33 1.50	3.45 1.09	2.50 0.70	5.00 0.00	4.00 1.00
Reading newspapers	3.60 0.76	3.33 0.70	3.40 0.68	3.00 1.41	3.25 1.25	3.66 1.15
Reading fiction	3.60 1.15	3.11 1.05	3.30 0.92	3.00 2.82	2.75 1.50	4.00 1
Writing e-mails	3.08 1.15	3.66 1.22	3.60 0.82	4.00 1.41	4.00 1.15	4.33 1.15
Writing letters	2.04 0.78	1.55 0.72	1.75 0.71	1.00 0.00	2.00 0.00	2.00 0.00
Chatting on the Internet	1.32 0.98	2.44 1.23	1.45 0.88	3.00 2.82	2.50 0.57	2.66 2.08
Watching news on TV	3.37 1.17	3.88 1.05	3.75 0.91	2.50 0.70	3.25 0.50	4.33 1.15
Watching documentaries on TV	3.12 0.97	3.33 1.22	2.70 0.92	3.00 0.00	3.00 0.81	3.66 1.52
Watching films	3.32 0.74	3.33 0.70	3.45 0.88	2.50 0.70	3.00 0.81	4.00 1.00
Watching entertainment programs	2.64 1.22	3.33 1.32	3.00 1.37	3.00 0.00	2.75 1.25	3.66 1.52
Listening to radio programmes	1.32 0.69	1.77 0.83	1.40 0.59	1.50 0.70	1.50 1.00	2.00 0.00
Reading texts on the Internet	3.80 0.44	4.77 0.44	4.40 0.75	5.00 0.00	4.75 0.5	5.00 0.00
Reading instruction manuals	2.48 0.77	3.88 1.05	2.84 0.89	4.50 0.70	3.25 0.95	3.00 1.00

Using electronic games	1.88 1.26	3.00 1.73	2.15 1.06	3.50 2.12	1.50 0.57	2.66 1.52
Translating for family	2.24 0.66	3.33 1.11	2.65 1.08	3.00 0.00	3.00 0.00	2.33 0.57
Interpreting for family	2.56 0.82	3.11 1.26	2.95 0.82	3.50 0.70	3.25 1.25	2.66 0.57
Activities related to hobby	2.43 1.30	3.33 1.41	2.55 0.94	5.00 0.00	3.25 1.25	3.66 1.52

**Table 7 continued**

	Teacher (N = 25) Mean SD	Translator (N = 9) Mean SD	Business (N = 20) Mean SD	Information technology (N = 2) Mean SD	Educational manager (N = 4) Mean SD	Journalist (N = 3) Mean SD
<b>ACADEMIC DOMAIN</b>						
Listening to lectures	2.32 0.98	1.66 0.70	2.40 1.18	1.00 0.00	1.75 0.95	2.33 0.57
Listening to student presentations	3.45 1.41	1.44 0.72	1.45 0.99	1.00 0.00	1.50 1.00	1.00 0.00
Reading professional books	4.12 1.07	2.88 1.16	3.35 1.30	2.50 0.70	2.50 0.57	3.66 1.15
Reading professional journals	2.83 1.23	2.77 1.09	2.70 1.52	1.50 0.70	2.50 0.57	3.66 1.15
Using dictionaries	4.56 0.76	4.22 1.09	3.45 1.05	3.00 1.41	3.25 0.50	3.33 0.57
Taking notes while listening	2.44 1.19	2.11 1.05	2.40 1.31	1.00 0.00	1.75 0.95	2.00 1.00
Taking notes while reading	2.64 1.11	2.00 1.11	2.10 1.11	2.50 2.12	1.75 0.95	2.00 1.00
Expressing opinion	4.32 0.74	2.77 1.56	3.75 1.01	2.00 0.00	5.00 0.00	4.00 0.00
Holding presentation	2.72 1.56	1.66 0.86	2.40 1.04	1.00 0.00	1.75 0.94	2.00 0.00
Writing essays	1.76 0.92	1.44 0.52	1.80 1.15	1.50 0.70	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
<b>TEACHING ENGLISH</b>						
Correcting translation as teacher	3.80 1.11	1.66 1.00	1.25 0.55	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
Correcting homework as teacher	4.32 0.90	1.55 1.01	1.40 0.75	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
Writing tasks as teacher	4.44 0.58	1.55 1.01	1.25 0.44	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
Writing test as teacher	3.72 0.79	1.55 1.01	1.20 0.41	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00

Asking questions as teacher	4.88 0.33	1.55 1.01	1.35 0.67	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
Giving instructions as teacher	4.88 0.33	1.55 1.01	1.35 0.67	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00
Giving explanations as teacher	4.88 0.33	1.55 1.01	1.25 0.55	1.00 0.00	1.25 0.50	1.00 0.00

**Table 7 continued**

	Teacher (N = 25) Mean SD	Translator (N = 9) Mean SD	Business (N = 20) Mean SD	Information technology (N = 2) Mean SD	Educational manager (N = 4) Mean SD	Journalist (N = 3) Mean SD
<b>BUSINESS DOMAIN</b>						
Job related conversation	3.54 1.06	3.66 1.58	4.10 1.07	2.00 0.00	5.00 0.00	3.00 0.00
Interpreting in job-related conversation	1.76 0.87	3.33 1.80	2.90 1.16	2.00 0.00	2.25 0.95	2.00 0.00
Interpreting in meeting	1.73 0.54	2.77 1.39	2.00 1.07	1.00 0.00	2.75 1.70	2.66 0.57
Using English at conferences	1.33 0.56	2.37 1.06	1.35 0.74	1.00 0.00	1.50 1.00	1.33 0.57
Writing business letters	1.68 0.74	3.33 1.58	4.15 1.13	3.00 2.82	4.50 0.57	3.33 1.52
Reading business letters	2.00 1.08	3.33 1.58	4.30 1.03	4.00 1.41	4.50 0.57	4.00 1.00
Translating business letters	1.91 0.94	3.88 1.53	2.90 1.41	2.00 1.41	1.75 0.95	2.66 0.57
Writing business documents	1.52 0.79	3.33 1.65	3.75 1.01	1.50 0.70	3.25 0.50	2.33 1.52
Reading business documents	2.04 0.97	3.66 1.50	3.90 1.07	2.50 2.12	3.75 0.50	4.33 0.57
Translating business documents	1.95 0.87	3.88 1.36	2.85 1.22	1.50 0.70	2.25 0.95	2.66 0.57
Translating books and articles	2.04 1.22	4.11 1.05	1.60 0.88	2.00 1.41	1.75 0.50	3.33 1.52
<b>PUBLIC DOMAIN</b>						
Reading public documents	2.78 0.90	3.77 1.30	3.65 1.04	2.50 0.70	3.75 0.95	3.00 1.73
Writing official letters	1.91 0.73	3.00 1.22	2.50 1.05	2.00 1.41	3.75 1.25	2.33 0.57