

Review of: "EFL Teachers' beliefs and Challenges About ESP Teaching"

Julio César Tovar-Gálvez¹

¹ Universidad a Distancia de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction

1. It is not convenient to use acronyms without explaining them beforehand.
2. The first part of the introduction does not situate the problem. The claims in this first paragraph are very general and not developed and supported.
3. As the claims are very general, it is not clear what context justifies the questions' formulation. This limitation could be overcome if the author explains more about the specific problem to address and cites current literature that demonstrates the existence of this problem.
4. The subsection "Teacher Thinking" helps to understand key concepts. However, the cited literature needs to be updated. In the same way, the subtitle "Teacher Knowledge" helps readers to understand the construct the author wants to study. Nonetheless, the references need to be updated.

Similarly, the subtitle "Overview of English for Specific Purpose (ESP)" describes key concepts. The new thing here is that the author cites some studies from the last 10 years.

The subtitle "Situations for Teaching ESP" describes some issues of ESP, such as the limitations of short courses, students' needs (without describing them), students' motivation, and teachers' experience. However, the key question arises: are those the issues that the author wants to solve or contribute to?

5. This section does not provide information about the issue in the specific context.

In conclusion, the introduction is missing the definition of the specific problem to address, in the specific context, and supported by actual literature.

Regarding the methodology, the author needs to explain in detail the sampling – why is it a purposive sample? – and about the pilot of the instrument.

Results and Discussion

This section needs improvement to reach credibility. The main issues are the weak discussion in relation to other studies, outdated literature (the most recent is from 2016), and many statements without explanation of their origin and empirical

support. For instance:

1. It is very superficial to say “(...) *teachers provide empirical evidence to support previous studies that ESP teaching is a complex and challenging task (Javid, 2015; Nonthisong, 2015; Ruangkam & Chuenchaichon, 2016)*” or “(...) *the current results provide evidence to support previous findings showing that ESP teaching is demanding and challenging (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Javid, 2015; Jones, 1990).*” The author would contribute to the field's development by explaining the mentioned evidence, complexity, and convergence with the previous studies and the possible changes through the decades.

2. The next statements miss detail on how many teachers provided this information and to which question:

“The current findings showed that ESP teachers placed more emphasis on teaching grammar and vocabulary than preparing students for chosen communicative environments”. Specifically, did the teachers state that they place greater emphasis on teaching grammar and vocabulary? Or does this deduction come from a possible description that the teachers made of their classes? Or was this a direct observation of the researcher? Or is this interpreted from interviewing the students?

“This study illustrates that ESP requires efficiently planned activities and tasks and the selection of matching pedagogical methodologies”. Specifically, what are the data that illustrate those requirements? Did the author ask teachers about pedagogical planning and methodologies?

3. Additionally, the author states on many occasions “Tunisian University teachers” as if it was a representative sample of Tunisian University teachers, which it is not, according to the methodology section.

The second part of the section is more adequate, since this part displays “statement + evidence + interpretation”.

Finally, this section is missing some relevant discussions. An example is the possible discussion between the information in the methodology about the interviewed “*Half of the teacher participants had received ESP training, while the remaining half had not. Nine out of twenty are MA holders and the rest had doctorate degrees*” and the statement in the results “*Indeed, the current findings strongly suggest a demand for thorough, all-inclusive training for the ESP teachers’ professionalisms and teaching careers*”.

Conclusions

Some of the statements seem not to emerge from the results and discussions. Some examples are:

1. “*First, the results revealed a moderate understanding of ESP among Thai university professors*”. The instrument, results, and discussion do not provide a scale to indicate that teachers have a “moderate” understanding. It is not clear what moderate means. Additionally, why Thai University professors?

2. “(...) *it also calls for the involvement of a researcher, a course planner and material provider, a course assessor, a content instructor or expert, and a number of other crucial components.*” The instrument, results, and discussion do not

provide evidence that professors need a researcher, material providers, a course assessor, or a content instructor. Indeed, I am not sure if universities have the budget to pay four or more supporting experts for each ESP professor they contract.

Note: I apologize for my use of the English language, but this is not my mother tongue.