

ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES (ESP): THE MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Dr. G. RAMAMURTHY

Associate Professor in English, Usha Rama College of Engineering and Technology, Telaprolu, Andhra Pradesh.

ABSTRACT

The field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) emerged roughly fifty years ago in response to rising pressures on schools and educators to cater to the individual needs of their students and to keep up with the rapidly evolving field of theoretical linguistics. Although it developed out of ELT, Applied Linguistics in the subject of TESOL is now recognised as its own distinct discipline. This paper will cover the origins, evolution, and status quo of ESP, and then anticipate the future directions of this vital field. Text-first and context-first approaches to discourse structure analysis are compared, as well as the theoretical, analytic, and methodological developments of ESP, the roles of genre analysis, target language use situation analysis, and context in ESP, and the 'just-in-case' EAP and 'just-in-time' EOP approaches are discussed. The paper predicts that ESP will adopt a wide-angled epistemological stance to survey the (a) discursive, (b) generic, (c) social, and (d) organisational structures of specialised texts and discourses, as well as those of texts and discourses simplified for the popularisation of science, in a systematic and contextualised manner. Practitioners of ESP are likewise cautioned against the perils of spreading knowledge of ESP's powerful genres.

Keywords: ESP; ELT; English for Science and Technology (EST); English for Business And Economics (EBE); English For Social Studies (ESS).

INTRODUCTION

The area of English Language Teaching (ELT) developed English for special purposes (ESP) roughly fifty years ago to aid international students in writing academically in English at schools where the language is used as a medium of instruction. A less significant goal was to aid academics in English medium-language journals in non-English nations. Post-war globalisation brought to an explosion in international trade, multinational corporations, digital technologies, etc., necessitating the emergence of a common language for academics, businesspeople, and traders. English as a Second Language (ESL) has made learning English feasible and inexpensive for non-ESL students since the 1960s and 1970s (with the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the Notional Approach to Language Learning).

Robinson suggests in her research on the history of ESP that the phenomenon arose due to (a) international demands, (b) the spread of written language, and (c) the individual learner. Johns and

Salmani Nodoushan have found that when compared to other methods of language learning, ESP receives much less attention from the learner as a psycho-socio. They do, however, believe that it is rational to put effort into students if doing so will better equip them for the responsibilities and promptness expected of them in their future careers. There is still ongoing research and development in the field of ESP, which is now a well-established subfield of applied linguistics. This essay will do four things:

1. Take a quick look back at the last several decades of ESP,
2. Separate out the 'just in time' and 'just in time' approaches to ESP education,
3. Discuss content and integrated language learning and topic-based learning, and
4. Identify the future paths of ESP.

DIFFERENT KINDS OF ESP

ESP has changed over the years and been looked at in many different ways. There are different kinds: this study is based on work by Hutchinson and Waters. Someone created the "Tree of ELT" in 1987. It quickly became one of the most well-known and useful ways to teach English. They broke ESP down into three types in it:

1. (EST) Stands for English for Science and Technology.
2. (EBE) Stands for English for Business and Economics.
3. (ESS) This is English for Social Studies.

Each type of knowledge is related to a different area of science, like business, economics, technology, or social problems in general. There are also sub-branches for each of these: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and Occupational English (EOP). The phrase "English for psychology" is an example of EOP for the ESS branch. "English for teaching" is an example of EAP for the ESS branch. That being said, Hutchinson and Water's classification of EAP and EOP is not clear, so more information is needed to tell them apart.

ESP vis-à-vis EGP

English for General Purposes (EGP) and English for Specified Purposes (ESP) seemed to be the most rational difference, though I've always been uncomfortable with this break. Just like Mackay and Mount Ford didn't think ERL was a specific language form, I always thought ESP was useful for a species. The difference between "driving" and "automobiles" might help you understand these two things better. People who know how to drive can handle cars. Any type of car can be driven by anyone who knows how to drive it with a few minor changes. Any English speaker can learn how to "use" them in certain circumstances by comparing them to other things. Instead of learning a different language, they need to be taught the right types of genres and/or discourses. They also need to change how they use language to meet their gender-specific needs in the target language situation (TLU), such as being familiar with rhetorical moves, meta discourse, register, and other parts of speech. ESP is a language that can only be used in certain fields, while EGP is

a language that depends on them. ESP and EGP are not technically different, but Hutchinson and Waters said they are very different in practise. They say that "ESP is a language teaching strategy that makes all choices about content and technique dependent on the reason the learner is learning".

Swales' wrong ideas about genre are part of the case that the EGP and the ESP are two different areas. As Swales worked on ideas and built on them, he began to think about what we now call genre analysis. "Purpose" and "gender" are both important ideas in genre analysis. However, Swales' genre analysis method never said that EGP and ESP were two separate languages, but rather two skills that were linked. In Swales, the word "gender" has to do with (a) aim and (b) prototype text.

There was a clear link between aim and genre in Swales's book from 1990, but he isn't so sure about it now. Swales established "communicative intent" as the main factor to identify a text as belonging to a certain genre in the 1990s. Later on, in the 21st century, he changed his mind and said that (a) texts aren't always genre-specific, (b) any genre can be used for more than one thing at the same time, and (c) these are reasons that are unique to each student or user. According to Swales and Rogers, just because different examples of the same genre use similar language and/or speech does not mean they are all trying to communicate the same thing. It was stated by Swales that the communication goal is not fixed and may change, shrink, or expand over time in order to complicate this image. Additionally, texts in the same category may be used for different communication goals in different countries. This means that cultural differences affect text and communication goals.

This change in point of view lead to a lot of new professional language used in the study of genres. Swales came up with a lot of terms, like "genre constellations," "genre hierarchies," "genre chains," "genre networks," and "subgenres." The debate over these terms is outside the scope of this piece. In the same way, Bhatia said that "gender colonies" are types of music that are used in different jobs, areas, and settings to communicate the same message. Johns also says that a single text of a certain genre is likely to serve more than one purpose for both the author and the audience. She also says that it is no longer possible to say that a text of a certain genre has a one-to-one relationship with a certain purpose. So, ESP and EGP can't be told apart based on language. They can only be told apart based on how they are used for communication and/or functionality, such as genre, text types, jobs, purposes, contexts, TLU situations, and so on.

One could say that all language use cases are "specific," though, since different language use scenarios need different linguistic codes. Furthermore, Hymes rightly pointed out that each skilled language user evaluates and chooses a code that works best for the current language situation (i.e., Speaking).

1. S stands for the setting, including time, place, physical conditions, and psychological landscape;

2. P for the people involved, including the speaker, addressor, hearer, and addressee;
3. E for the goals, including purpose, outcomes, and objectives; and
4. A for the action sequences, including the content and form of messages.

Of course, some people, like Chapelle and Douglas, say that the purpose of language for conversation is different from the purpose of language for teaching (LSAP). Chapelle came up with the idea of the "interactionist vision" of construct definitions. He believed that a definition that only looks at (a) the characteristics of language users and (b) the context, without considering how the two interact or the likely combination that they can reach together, is flat and uninteresting. When they meet at the Chapelle, it's possible that the quality of each of them will change, making feature components more absolute and independent of context. It will be necessary to describe how contextual features affect feature components. So, she asked for a theory about "how, in a broader framework of culture, the setting of a specific circumstance limits the language choices that a language user may make during a linguistic performance." However, she didn't give any evidence to support her claims about psychological facts. Douglas thought that there might be something called "knowledge of the Language for Specific Purposes," which might be different from other types of language knowledge. Douglas says that the LSP can only speak when it interacts with and is supported by outside contexts. The point being made here is that ESP's skills are different from Bachman's. Like Chapelle, Douglas didn't give any evidence to support his claims about how his ideas affected people's minds.

Johns and Salmani Nodoushan agreed that some of our experiences and settings are made up, and that LSP's ability may be a social fact. They also agreed with Swales that ESP happens "during conceptions." However, they added context to this list by adding validity, search-bases, learning/methodology, necessity, and language/text. In 2015, Johns and Salmani Nodoushan agreed with claims made in the 1990s that ESP is a "protean" because it changes when (a) the language, (b) the way it is taught, and (c) the subject studies change. They did say, though, that ESP needs to be even more flexible these days if it's to adapt to (a) the teaching and learning setting, (b) limited time, and (c) a wide range of material and professional studies involving students.

ESP IN EARLY 21st CENTURY

It is a general rule that every branch of study, including applied linguistics, is split into at least three areas: (a) theory, (b) methods, and (c) analysis.

Theoretical Developments

The development of ESP in the 20th century, especially after Chapelle proposed an interactionist view on how the ESP capacity is built, was supposed to inspire theorists and researchers to work on its theory and development. However, this area of study has stayed a child of ESP, except for LSPA. I think Hyland and Bhatia have ideas about "Metadiscourse" and "critical genre analyses,"

but these ideas are more like models for analysis than theories. To put it another way, the most important improvements in ESP in the 21st century are still in the areas of analysis and methodology. However, Swales' "discourse community" idea has had a big effect on ESP study over the last 20 years.

It's not a surprise that the "theoretical" side of ESP doesn't get enough attention. The main reasons for ESP are the worries of its practitioners about teaching methods and materials. The usefulness of these can only be judged by how they directly affect (a) the teaching process and (b) the results. But I have a controversial view about the "cars-and-drive" metaphor in the last section. I believe that ESP is only a useful application of language in a certain usage context and not a separate and self-supporting form of language. This is true unless a sociolinguistic view of ESP is taken on and argued in favour of a pidginized, creolized, and vernacular language. Fiorito says that researchers and ESP teachers have been the ones most interested in a scientific basis for teaching and learning ESP over the past few years. Instead of doing what Chapelle and Douglas did in 1998 and 2000, most ESP teachers and practitioners have chosen to focus on theoretical issues over the past 20 years. They are studying things like metadiscourse, genres, corporations, and so on through methodological and analytical study, which includes a number of studies.

Analytical Developments

It's important to note that the previous research on ESP history focused on five main changes: (a) the study of the register; (b) the study of rhetorical speech; (c) the study of the situation through the target language; and (d) the skills and tactics. Swales' genre analysis had a big impact on how rhetorical discourse studies were done in ESP research in the 21st century, as Johns points out. Many academics have helped with their study because of this, and genre has become an important part of ESP education and research. Many of the genre-based studies in ESP that have been done in the last twenty years or so have relied on the CRAS model to describe and explain the common discourses and/or rhetoric in academic writings, mainly with an educational goal in mind. It's not just ESP that uses genre to analyse speech structures; it's also been used in professional genres like TED talks, media science becoming more popular, and Bhatia has had an impact on many professional genre studies.

Researchers have looked at discourse structure in all kinds of genres and found that they have used both (1) the first text approach and (2) the first context approach. Bhatia, Flowerdew, Swale, and Askehave and Swales have all mentioned this. Researchers first choose a text or collection and then use it to look for (meta) discursive, generic, and rhetorical patterns. This type of analysis looks at writings in light of how they were written in clearly defined settings. The first one helps us learn more about the speech and language parts of texts in a certain academic area or profession. The second one helps us learn more about the context and shows how closely a text fits or departs from the context it covers. According to the first approach, genre studies at ESP should go beyond linguistic descriptions. Instead, these scholars want to know (1) why a genre exists in the way it

does and (2) how it achieves its goals. Paltridge points out that some scholars still prefer the text-first method and use Halliday's systemic functional framework for text studies.

Another important part of analytical progress was big steps forward in software and the Internet. These (a) made it possible and easier to store and analyse large groups of texts and companies and (b) helped make the results more general. Early research by Biber and Conrad, and Flowerdew gives a lot of examples. ESP has changed because of this new way of analysing language, which is also called corpus linguistics. The idea of "particular" language has come back to the fore, and now we may want to be really "authentic" and "exact". Because of corpus linguistics, we have to use multimodal technologies in our research. These technologies (a) affect our research and teaching in the most basic ways, and (b) determine how we prepare our students for these situations.

Researchers in ESP can now do studies that span cultures and fields thanks to advances in technology. Connor, for example, put together cross-cultural studies of the CARS model by Swales under the title "Contrastive Rhetoric" and "Intercultural Rhetoric". Metadiscourse studies have also gotten a lot better thanks to better technology. Compatible software tools let researchers look at metadiscursive traits (like hedging) in metadiscourse that is ideational, textual, or interpersonal. This means that digital technology can help decide what students need to learn, understand, and be able to do, as well as how long they need to spend learning their job.

Methodological Developments

In the last twenty years, there have been three main changes in the way ESP is taught: (1) content-based instruction (CBI), (2) content-based and integrated language learning (CLIL), and (3) genre-based instruction (GBI), though some would also include task-based instruction (TBI).

- **CBI**

The CBI dates back to 1965 and is often linked to language immersion programmes in post-colonial Canada. In their 1983 definition of CBI, Brinton et al. said that it combines language education with specific content to get students ready for "the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills". This means that the target language is not something to study, but a way to teach and learn about other things. But it looks like CBI and CLIL were mixed up. The view of Genesee about CBI is more correct.

In response to a question about what CBI might call "content," Genesee said that content is not academic and can be about "any subject, theme, or non-language problem of interest or significance to learners" as long as it can teach them enough. In the same way, Met said that CBI material should be hard and require students to think in order to develop the skills and abilities they need. Eskey also said in that CBI was not "the content itself but some form of the discourse of that content". According to Eskey, a CBI teacher will "acculturate students to the relevant discourse communities" and a CBI student will "to become acculturated to those communities."

Why is content-based teaching important? That's the main question that needs a strong answer. To deal with this problem, it is important to note that CBI has support from at least four different areas: (1) research on second language acquisition (SLA); (2) research on education strategies; (3) research on educational and cognitive psychology; and (4) research on programme outcomes. To begin, SLA study showed that learning a natural language is connected to understanding what it means. This means that language needs to be studied in context in order to be understood. Also, Lightbown and Spada showed that meaning discussion can help people learn a language better. Also, Krashen showed that CBI gives SLA data that is easy to understand. The SLA is also made better by the form-based material of CBI, Lyster and Swain. Cummins also supported CBI's cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). The CBI also paid for studies on SLA by Genesee and Lantolf and Appel. According to studies on teaching methods, the CBI (a) works well for group learning; (b) encourages and builds strategic learning strategies; (c) encourages learning strategies and rich language and learning skills; and (d) improves language abilities, skills, and capacities (e) encourages learners. Finally, studies in cognitive and educational psychology have also backed up CBI. Anderson's cognitive teaching theory had three stages of transition: cognitive, associative, and autonomous. These stages show that CBI has benefits in that it (a) helps with "prosecution" of knowledge and (b) leads to deeper thinking, more subsumable learning, and more reminders. Singer (1990) also showed that putting things in order by theme (which is a CBI strength) helps people learn more. According to Byrnes, CBI engages students more mentally and helps them develop a wider range of discourse skills compared to other teaching methods. Also, Csikszentmihalyi said that activities based on topic turn into "flow experiences." Lastly, research on programmes has shown that CBI (1) works better in immersion and bilingual, postsecondary ESL/FL settings and FLAC programmes; (2) makes the curriculum and class activities more flexible; and (3) makes it easier to make changes to both language and content learning.

- **CLIL**

While CBI and content and integrated language learning (CLIL) aren't exactly the same, people who aren't as knowledgeable about ESP may use them as different names for the same method. As was already said, CBI has its roots in post-colonial Canada language immersion programmes that focused on teaching the language rather than teaching content. Genesee said that in CBI classes, "any topic, theme, or non-language issue of interest or importance to the learners" could be taught, since the goal is to teach the language. CLIL, on the other hand, focuses on teaching language and intellectual subjects. The subjects taught in a CLIL school are academic ones, like biology, philosophy, history, etc. They are taught in a foreign language. In this way, CLIL can be thought of as a way to teach that combines language and academic material and teaches students how to learn both. Marsh says that CLIL is when subjects or parts of subjects are taught in a foreign language with two goals in mind: learning the topic and learning the language at the same time. Also, Coyle et al. said that CLIL is a "dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language."

Some people say that CLIL is a new idea from the 2000s to 2009, but it has been around since the 1960s. However, it has grown very quickly over the last 20 years around the world, especially in Europe. This is partly because it has helped both language and subject schooling improve. It might be more logical to think that universities, schools, and businesses have adopted CLIL not because it helps them teach, but because it can save them money and/or time. In terms of education, CLIL adds to the problems that students and teachers already face. Businesses, universities, and other organisations rarely find or hire professors who are fluent in both the language and the field they teach. It's also hard for students to pay attention to both language and subject at the same time because it adds to their cognitive load. However, those who are very supportive of CLIL have said that, even though it is hard, it is "more motivating and authentic for students and teachers". Some claims have not been properly tested in the real world yet; only a few studies have been conducted on the pros and cons of CLIL and the specific teaching methods used by its teachers.

It is important to tell the difference between CLIL and any other type of immersion or bilingual education, not just CBI. As Salmani Nodoushan says, CLIL is a type of pragmatism built on principles. It is also an eclectic "teaching style that combines topics with language pedagogy". Second, the language used in a CLIL school isn't a foreign language or a common language. Third, students in CLIL have to learn and be good at reading in their mother tongues before they can practise CLIL. On top of that, CLIL classes are usually regular and part of the school programme. Also, CLIL teachers aren't native speakers of the target language but are experts in the subject taught in CLIL classes; this is good for the topic because it helps students understand how people talk in the target language.

Coyle said that CLIL is built on four pillars: (1) content; (2) communication; (3) cognition; and (4) culture. It aims to (a) teach and teach; (b) learn and use language; (c) learn and think skills; and (d) become socially aware of oneself and others. Coyle's 4C method to education shows how broad CLIL is, which makes it hard for teachers to think clearly. This is what Coyle really offered as a way to help teachers who want to start teaching CLIL lessons. One problem with a description that is so broad is that it makes it hard for teachers to tell the difference between CLIL and good teaching. CLIL needs both language learning and certain topics to be covered at the same time. "Excellent teaching" refers to "how well" these things are taught. So, good practise in a CLIL classroom requires both the teacher and the students to think on their work and take part in successful learning. The teacher's job is to (a) teach certain subjects, (b) teach language, and (c) make sure that the students understand and learn both.

It's also important to note that CLIL is not a single method; it includes a number of effective ways to teach French, each with a different level of difficulty. A basic type of CLIL called "language bath" says that students learn a language when they are engaged in classes that use the target language. Complexer CLIL methods, on the other hand, say that immersion alone is not enough and that kids should do jobs and activities that are harder for their minds. For instance, Lyster said that kids won't learn language properly unless their teachers do focus-on-form tasks and correct them when they need it. Swain also came up with the "output hypothesis," which says that kids

won't learn a language unless they can make spoken and written content in that language. The "penta-pie model" is a lot more difficult in theory. According to this model, you can't teach a foreign language well if you don't (1) give your students meaningful input, (2) have them do formally focused processing, (3) have them do meaning-focused processing, (4) give them chances to produce, and (5) teach them about and use language learning strategies. This method was created by De Graaff et al. for CLIL lessons, and it says that all five parts should work together to help students learn the most.

In the past few years, there has been a movement in CLIL to learn disciplinary literature, which means to talk about genres and subjects. When it comes to methods, ESP and CLIL work together. Immersing students in a "ESP bath" won't guarantee that they will become experts in discipline literature. That's why discipline literature needs to be taught explicitly in the CLIL classroom, and teachers should get their students involved in activities and hands-on experiences to help them learn the language and subject best. Then CLIL can create a new way to learn that lets students learn both subjects and a language other than their first language at the same time. If you agree with what Johns and Salmani Nodoushan said, this method would meet the needs of learners in the 21st century because CLIL uses effective, ongoing needs assessment and an understanding of the goal scenario.

"As Kampen et al. accurately said, CLIL pedagogy is often linked to new, student-centered ways of teaching. Many people believe that focusing on the student is important for learning foreign languages ". As has been said before, ESP used to focus on the students, but lately it has changed its focus to "learning." People who want to add CLIL to ESP need to say which point of view they would choose: (a) student-centered, (b) student-centered, or (c) a mix of the two. It's important to note that while CBI and CLIL may seem similar in ESP settings, CBI is so focused on "content" that it doesn't care about (a) the value and/or genres of content creators or (b) the strategies that teach students how to effectively use the content area. Some authors, like Casanave and Tardys, said that CBI makes it hard for their communities to have conversations during the student initiations stage.

- **Genre-Based Teaching In ESP**

The main reason for genre-based education was a response to the way White and Arndt taught. White and Arndt say that writing is a process with six connected steps: (1) focusing on why you are writing; (2) organising your thoughts so that they make sense to the reader; (3) drawing up, or changing from writer to reader; and (4) reviewing, or pulling away from, the text from the text's point of view.

Genre-based educators said that White and Arndt's approach to process is too narrow-minded because it doesn't take into account (a) the specific needs of different writing tasks and (b) how writing changes in different situations. The people who were against the genre-based approach, on the other hand, said that it was too focused on the product and assumed that there were fixed text

patterns. The people who were against the gender-based approach said that it made students look for fixed patterns and formulas that they could then use in their work.

Flowerdew tried to combine the process approach with genre-based teaching so that this kind of criticism wouldn't happen. He says that the fixed rule-government patterns of some genres should be seen as models that can be used with variations in the text-making process. He also said that genre-based education is about genres, not the end results. Badger and White also said that genre-based processes and methods should work together to get the best results because they support each other but do not replace each other.

Johns said that the genre-based approach has two purposes: (1) to stress the importance of genre sensitivity; and (2) to end with the acquisition of genres. The first one makes sure that students learn how to deal with new situations and tasks, and the second one makes sure that they get the professional skills they need to do their work. Hammond and Mackin-Horarick said that genre-based education gives students access to the knowledge, skills, tactics, texts, and discourses they need to be a part of and be accepted by the discourse groups they want to join.

However, some people tell us about the possible risks of teaching "genres of power" in a way that is based on genre. Power genres in professional settings might be thought of as discursive and acknowledged language acts that are meant to create an imbalance of authority and/or power. The term "genres of power" comes from sociology. La Kratz defines them as culturally recognised ways of speaking or writing that always include the difference between power and authority in the constitutional pragmatic definition. Luke tells us in a roundabout way that teaching set patterns of a certain genre in a genre-based classroom could lead to students repeating the status quo without question. However, Belcher says that (a) teaching specific genres gives students the tools they need to develop their professional skills and (b) gets them ready for professional participation in the work, study, and daily life worlds of the people they want to work with.

OBJECTIVES IN TEACHING ESP

The primary purpose of the teaching and learning process is to allow students to obtain knowledge in its broad meaning. Regarding ESP Basturkmen says that there are five general goals which are also applicable to the ELP and which are a basis and should be achieved by particular teaching processes:

- To show how subject-specific wording is used.
- To build up performance skills that are needed.
- To teach concepts that are important.
- To get better at smart thinking
- To make people more critical thinkers.

These goals will be looked at one by one by the researcher.

- a) Reveal subject-specific language use: The goal here is to show the kids how the language is used in the real world.
- b) Develop performance competencies: This goal is about language learners and the skills they need to be successful. Stern's classification says that this orientation can be put into the category of a proficiency goal.
- c) Teach the basics: The goal is to focus on improving students' work or information in addition to their language skills. "Stern's classification says that the goal of teaching underlying knowledge can be put into the cultural knowledge objective category."
- d) Improve your creative thinking. Effective communication is possible because "strategic competence is the link between context of situation and language knowledge".
- e) Foster critical awareness: "This objective can be linked to the cultural knowledge and affective objectives in Stern's classification." The goal is to make students aware of the situation and its culture.

Stern's goals for language learning and Basturkmen's goals for ESP have a lot in common. When the right method is used along with the teaching and learning process, language can be mastered by using it correctly.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this work is to create an ESP writing course for engineering students that will help them with their school and work writing. College graduates who learned English as a mother tongue are not allowed to study English in engineering school. They may not have had enough experience with learning and working skills at engineering schools, which could explain why they can't write English well and have low self-esteem. Some also don't know simple grammar. To get good scores in English, they record and copy the tests that the teacher gives. Teachers can't get better at writing by learning things by heart.

They aren't able to write proper emails, homework, journal papers, or project notes. It is impossible for them to do well in school and at work. To do well on written tasks that boost your confidence, you need to learn how to write. People aren't chosen unless they know the main ideas. It's interesting that different companies have to spend a lot of money on written training and college interviews as part of the hiring process. Writing skills are important for both employers and students, so engineering students should be able to write. In this class, students learn skills that will help them in their future jobs. Both general and specialised students need to be taught how to do their homework without being allowed to study on their own. It's hard to teach engineering kids how to write. This task would also be harder because of the limited time.

REFERENCES

1. ALBERT P'RAYAN, (2008)" Engineering English: A Critical Evaluation", Annamalai University.

2. Antony, Omana. (2013) "Technology-Assisted Language Learning." Role of ICT in English Language Teaching and Learning: Observations and Ruminations: 93-105. Print.
3. B. Hunter, S. L. Laursen and E. Seymour (2010), Becoming a scientist: The role of undergraduate research in students.
4. Christe, NV (2012), An interpersonal skill learning taxonomy for program evaluators', Journal of Public Affairs Education, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 739-756.
5. Chang YY. (2010) English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reactions from Taiwanese undergraduate students. Taiwan Int ESP J; 2:55-84.
6. D. Rus, (2016) A Didactic Approach to Writing Skills in a Technical Learning Environment, Procedia Technology, 22 1191-1196.
7. Dana Rus, (2015)" Developing Technical Writing Skills to Engineering Students", Procedia Technology Volume 19, 2015, Pages 1109-1114.
8. Evangeline, JCK and Ganesh. K, (2014) "Technical Writing – Redefining the English syllabus to meet the Growing Demand for competent Engineers", IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Volume 19, Issue 3, Ver. III, PP 27-31.
9. Hashem Ahmed Alsamadani, (2012)" Needs Analysis in ESP Context: Saudi Engineering Students as a Case Study", Advances in Language and Literary Studies.
10. Huang, Y.-H. (2016) Examining the Usefulness of an ESP Textbook for Information Technology: Learner Perspectives. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering, 2798-2805.
11. Hossain, J. (2013) ESP Needs Analysis for Engineering Students: A Learner Centered Approach. <http://presidency.edu.bd/uploads/Article003.pdf>.
12. Kherfi, B & Gueziz, M. A. A (2016) Designing ESP course: Setting objectives for business learners (Published Dissertation) (Faculty of Letters and Languages, Ouargla University).
13. Lewis Norman, (2010) Speak Better Write Better English. Delhi: Goyal Publishers
14. Marcela Díaz Ramírez, (2014)" The Impact of Project Work and the Writing Process Method on Writing Production", [SciELO Analytics](#).
15. Özgür Şahana, Mustafa Çobanb, Ece Zehir Topkayac, (2014)" A Language Needs Analysis of Engineering Undergraduate Students at a Technical University: A Multidimensional Approach", ELT Dept., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey.
16. Piyatida Changpueng and Fasawang Pattanapichet, (2015)" An Analysis of English in the Workplace: The Needs of Engineers in Writing in English", Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts Vol.15(3): 151-176.
17. Soraya Rajabi and Saeed Ketabi, (2012) "Enhancing Students 'Use of Cohesive Devices: Impacts of PowerPoint Presentations on EFL Academic Writing", Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 1135-1143.
18. Terry Fellner, (2011)" Developing an ESP Presentation Course for Graduate Students of Science and Engineering", Center for Research and Development in Higher Education Saga University.
19. T. Dudley-Evans, M.J John, Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-

- Disciplinary Approach, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, (1998), 4-5, 171-173.
20. Tatiana Nekrasova Beker Anthony Becker Angela Sharpe, (2012) "Identifying and teaching target vocabulary in an ESP course", TESOL International Association.
 21. W. Crombie, E.S.P. (1991): Fact or Fiction? Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, Alicante, 4 25-36.
 22. Wanyi, Liu., Taogang, Liu., Sumin, Yang. (2011) "Computer Assisted Language Learning. E-business and E-Government, (ICEE)." IEEE Conference Publication.: 1-4. Web. 5 June.
 23. Zygmunt, T. (2016). Language education for sustainable development. Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education,7(1),112-124.