



Comparing expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in ESP: A longitudinal study

Selda Özer^{a *}

^a Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Nevşehir, Turkey

Abstract

The study aimed at determining and comparing expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course. The research was designed as a longitudinal study, quantitative research design and survey methodology were used to collect data in the study. The data on expectation were collected in September 2017 while the data on satisfaction were collected in May 2019, and paired-samples t test was used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “objectives”. Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. There were significant differences between expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “content”, “teaching-learning process”, “lecturer” and “assessment” in favor of satisfaction. There was not a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction in terms of “classmates”. However, the level of expectation was higher than that of satisfaction. While “overall” expectation level was medium, “overall” satisfaction level was high and there was a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. The results of the research were discussed in the light of the literature and suggestions were made for curriculum developers, lecturers teaching English in general, and English for Specific Purposes in particular, and researchers studying on expectation and satisfaction in language teaching.

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Keywords: Expectation, satisfaction, tourism students, ESP, longitudinal study

1. Introduction

English is inevitably the most frequently used language not only in daily communication but also in business world. Tourism is one of the fields that necessitate English as a medium. The more qualified the employees in tourism are, the better the sector serves, the more likely the tourists are satisfied, the more the region/country gets

* Selda Özer
E-mail address: sozer@nevsehir.edu.tr

about, the more the region/country attracts others. In addition, tourism sector employs new employees every year in Turkey since it is a growing sector day by day. As prospective employees of tourism, undergraduate tourism students need to be educated and trained well in terms of English language as well as other qualities. Students' expectations play a crucial role so as to achieve this goal. One of the best ways to determine expectations of students is needs analysis.

Needs analysis can be defined as a process of gathering information about language needs of students so as to determine the goals and content of a language course (Richards, 2017) or collecting and analyzing all relevant information to satisfy language learning needs of students systematically within the context of an institution involved in teaching-learning process (Brown, 2001). Needs analysis and the inclusion of students' perspectives are fundamental factors in curriculum development and evaluation (Poedjiastuti & Oliver, 2017). Scholars and educators consider needs analysis as a valuable tool for curriculum development since it is a device that can be used to link the students' present academic learning with their future needs (Brown, 2016).

Needs analysis in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is not a new concept dating back to 1960s and 1970s and conducted extensively in the mid-1980s (Robinson, 1991). Brindley (1989) divided needs into two as "objective" and "subjective" needs. While objective needs include students' language proficiency and patterns of language use, subjective needs include their desires, wants, expectations or other psychological manifestations. Whereas objective needs can be identified by lecturers, subjective needs cannot be identified easily (Richerich & Chancerel, 1980). Discussions, questionnaires, surveys, structured interviews, observations, analysis of authentic spoken and written texts and assessment can be used in needs analysis procedures (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Robinson, 1991; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

In terms of ESP, needs analysis is carried out to designate "what" and "how" of a course, and so it is the first stage in ESP curriculum development (Flowerdew, 2013). Needs analysis can be regarded as the foundation on which all other decisions about ESP should be made. According to Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), needs analysis is the cornerstone of ESP, which guides a focused course. Spence and Liu (2013) assert that needs analysis is precious to make sure whether what is learned in class is directly linked to the skills related to profession. Needs analysis is among the most crucial stage of ESP teaching, and it is an extensively used instrument to assess the relevancy and validity of curriculum design activities (Li, 2014). Along with objective needs such as objectives of the course, the current study deals with subjective needs such as teaching-learning process, techniques, materials and assessment. The current study aims at determining expectation and satisfaction levels of students within the framework of not only their objective needs but also subjective needs.

In designing a course, the initial and final surveys are appropriate tools of directing students' attention on their own learning process from the beginning to the end of the course. An initial needs analysis enables lecturers to be aware of profiles and preferences of their students (Russell, 2009). It also lays the foundation of the course (Martins, 2017) and helps lecturers to harmonize students' expectations with materials and activities. Surveys and interviews can easily be used to obtain feedback about student progress, and some alterations can be made in activities and course content (Russell, 2009; Richards, 2017; Weir & Roberts, 1994). Comparing students' opinions in the initial and final surveys can be used to involve students in the process (Russell, 2009). In other words, if students are actively involved in deciding on the objectives, content, teaching-learning process, learning tasks and assessment, learning is stimulated better.

Student expectations can be considered as a substantial affective variable in tertiary education, particularly in ESP courses. Expectations influence engagement, performance, learning outcomes and overall satisfaction (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). If expectations are not satisfied appropriately, it may decrease motivation, attendance and performance, but may increase anxiety, nervousness, disappointment and disengagement (Lobo & Gurney, 2014; Bordia et al. 2008; Bordia et al. 2006; Throp 1991). In addition, expectations are among the crucial factors in not only theory but also practice in language teaching and learning (Lin, 2012).

When the literature on expectation and satisfaction in English language was reviewed, it was observed that there were various studies. To illustrate, a study conducted in Australia with advanced level students revealed that unmet expectations affected their emotions, performance and learning behavior, which caused rebelliousness. In addition, lecturers stated that if expectations were not met, students were likely to exhibit poorer performance and experience negative affective outcomes, which hindered learning (Bordia et al. 2008). Another study carried out in Australia via a survey and semi-structured interviews with students found out that students' expectations from course content and teaching staff were considerably met. However, class attendance was low throughout the semester (Lobo & Gurney, 2014).

Bordia et al. (2006) analyzed student and lecturer perspectives on student expectations using interviews. Students expressed that if their expectations were fulfilled, they would be more confident in using English and more motivated to learn, attend, enjoy, participate and feel comfortable in the course. According to the lecturers, students thanked them for fulfillment of their expectations, showed positive attitudes towards the target culture, developed positive learning experiences, did extra study and considered lecturers as friends. Both students and lecturers agreed that fulfillment of expectations resulted in higher motivation.

A study held in Bangladesh reflected that students' expectations covered the course content, teaching-learning style and education management. The underlying factors of

expectations included professional need, educational background, social beliefs, personal goals and personality of the students. Moreover, the expectations contributed significantly to classroom behavior and performance (Haque, 2014). Ho (2014) examined computer science students' communication needs in terms of four language skills during their internship to design their ESP course at a university in China. The findings unearthed that students generally need presentation and meeting skills, reading emails and writing emails and reports. The students expected that the course content should cover their needs. Hui (2017) scrutinized the needs and satisfaction levels of students at a college in China and found out that English teaching did not reflect and meet the learning needs of students effectively.

Kaur and Khan (2010) analyzed expectations and satisfactions of art and design students in a private college in Malaysia. Students expected to improve speaking, listening, reading and writing, respectively and they were 'moderately satisfied' with their current course. Kazar and Mede (2015) analyzed the needs of fine arts students at a private university in Turkey. Both lecturers and students stated that the initial objective of ESP program should include various tasks in four language skills and students should engage in these activities. Ulum (2020) unearthed that students of architecture at a newly founded university in Turkey expected to improve their production skills more than receptive skills. Ayas and Kırkgöz (2013) examined the needs and expectations of nursing and midwifery students in both academic and vocational English courses. The study revealed that students expected to improve four language skills but specifically listening and speaking rather than writing and reading. Students also reported that the materials were inadequate, and the teaching-learning process and the lecturers did not help them to learn vocational English.

Sari, Kuncoro and Erlangga (2019) examined ESP needs of students of informatics. They revealed that students wanted to learn English in order to find a job, they wanted to learn all skill, especially reading, and they have problems in vocabulary and grammar. Dinamika and Siregar (2016) investigated the needs of students to design a syllabus for tourism management students in Indonesia. The students wanted the course to include speaking, writing, listening and reading, respectively. Ibrahim (2016) investigated the needs of health students in Sudan. Both students and lecturers indicated that students learned English for academic purposes. All language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) and language areas (grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation) are important for students.

A study carried out in Vietnam analyzed ESP courses of civil engineering students. The findings displayed that content and language skills in ESP courses did not meet students' needs. Students expected the course to fulfill their current and future vocational and academic purposes. Students were not satisfied with coursebook and key terminology. They reported that they failed because of lack of practice on pronunciation

and speaking. They declared that they were not exposed to language skills adequately. On the other hand, materials were authentic and they were exposed to real language in professional life (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2017). Another study held in Vietnam revealed the difficulties in teaching ESP, and difficulties were related to students, teachers and environment and others (Hoa & Mai, 2016). Kim (2013) scrutinized the needs of engineering students in Korea to design an ESP course for them. Engineering professors, students and industry workers participated in the study. The study revealed that all participants wanted that the course should cover speaking skill. Students did not think that written expression and written comprehension are important; however, industry workers and engineering professors did.

Al-Issa (2017) focused on ESP courses for students of law and found out that students had expectations in terms of content and materials, and course design and implementation. In addition, the study revealed that the lecturers had a crucial effect in meeting students' expectations. Trejo (2007) revealed that students expected the lecturers to be both friendly and professional rather than just knowledge deliverers. Chu and Huang (2007) asserted that exploring students' expectations in English courses had a key role for lecturers as they selected and designed materials. The lecturers also chose instructional methods, which helped not only lecturers to improve their performance but also students to learn autonomously and dynamically.

Given the literature, while some of the previous studies covered expectations of international students, some of them clarified the expectations of students from general English course or expectations or needs of students in terms of four language skills in ESP. Moreover, some studies included just expectations of students. As an attempt to shed light on students' both expectation and satisfaction levels in ESP, the present study aimed at determining and comparing expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course. The following questions were sought in order to reach the aim of the study:

1. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of "objectives"?
2. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of "content"?
3. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of "teaching-learning process"?
4. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of "lecturer"?

5. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of “classmates”?
6. Is there a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course in terms of “assessment”?
7. Is there a significant difference between overall expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course?

2. Method

2.1. Research design

A longitudinal study with continuous or repeated measures to follow particular individuals over prolonged periods of time was applied in the research. Quantitative research design and survey methodology were used to collect data in the study. Survey methodology is a research model aiming to examine a situation as it exists in the nature. In other words, it is an approach that explains, describes and illustrates previous or current situations, individuals or objects in its own conditions (Karasar, 2003). In the current study, as expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in ESP were determined and compared in its own context, survey methodology was preferred.

2.2. The current context and ESP

When students start studying English at the department of tourism management at the faculty of tourism at the university, where the research was carried out, in the first year, they are considered to be at A1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. As indicated in the learning outputs of the program, students are expected to reach B2 level in reading, listening, speaking and writing skills. In order to achieve this aim, intensive English teaching program is carried out at the aforementioned department. Freshman students take 12 hours of general English in each semester. Sophomore students take 8 hours of general English in each semester. These courses mainly focus on developing four skills as well as grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation needed in every day English. Vocational English course is preceded by a comprehensive background of general English. Junior and senior students take 6 hours of vocational English course in each semester. Thus, students take 40 hours of general English course and 24 hours of vocational English course during their tertiary education.

The current study reported a research that attempted to examine needs and expectations of tourism undergraduate students in order to make appropriate decisions on how to design instruction in vocational English course since Chu and Huang (2007)

suggested lecturers use surveys to reveal students' expectations to help them and design the course and the teaching-learning process to meet their various expectations. The aim was to help the lecturer (as well as the course designer) be aware of the expectations of the students so that the course design would become implementable and could really meet the needs and expectations of the students. The results could also be a source of reference to design ESP courses for tourism students.

Given these assumptions, the lecturer initially determined the expectations of the students from vocational English course (Özer, 2018). "Highly Recommended I" and "Highly Recommended II" were determined as the course books by Materials Development Unit at School of Foreign Languages to be used in the Department of Tourism Management for four semesters. The lecturer utilized them as course books. Then, she designed the course for four semesters taking the students' expectations and the content of the course books into consideration. In addition, she sometimes used extra materials and activities. She ran the course in the line with the expectations both at the beginning and during the process since the lecturer expected to meet expectations of the students. Moreover, the lecturer intended to investigate to what extent the students' expectations were met.

2.3. Participants

The present study was conducted at a faculty of tourism at a state university in Turkey. The study included all junior students taking vocational English course in 2017-2018 fall semester (104 in total) and all senior students taking vocational English course in 2018-2019 spring semester (80 in total) at the department of tourism management. Some of the students were repeating the course, so they did not have to attend the courses. 82 students participated in the initial survey voluntarily. In the first application of the scale, students were asked to write their names on the questionnaire forms in order to pair the scales when the second application was carried out. 68 students participated in the final survey voluntarily, and students were asked to write their names on the questionnaire forms. Before the analyses, the questionnaire forms were paired. 12 questionnaire forms (being just the initial survey) that did not include both surveys were not included in the analyses. A total of 68 students constituted the participants of the study. 41 of the participants were female, and 27 of them were male. The ages of the participants ranged from 21 to 27, and the mean was 23,13 in the second application of the survey.

2.4. Instruments and data collection

Within the scope of the research, a five-point Likert scale was developed by the researcher in order to determine expectations of the students from vocational English course, and to what extent their expectations were met. In 2017-2018 fall semester, students were asked an open-ended question as "What are your expectations from

vocational English course?”. 33 students taking the course for the first time at the faculty of tourism wrote their opinions voluntarily. When the opinions of students were analyzed via content analysis, there occurred 4 main categories as “objectives”, “content”, “teaching-learning process” and “assessment” (Özer, 2018). After the literature was reviewed (Özer & Yılmaz, 2017; Lobo & Gurney, 2014), the category of teaching-learning process was divided into three sub-categories as “teaching-learning process itself”, “lecturer” and “classmates”. Therefore, the draft questionnaire form constituted 60 items with six subscales. The draft scale was examined by three experts, one of whom was from the department of curriculum and instruction. Taking their opinions into consideration, 6 items were omitted from the scale. A total of 54 items with six subscales were included in the final scale.

The survey was carried out at two different times because studies analyzing student expectation and satisfaction at the end of a course may result in some problems (Hawkins & Hastie, 1990). One of the most crucial of them is that students have to remember their prior expectations in order to evaluate whether or not their expectations have been met at the same time. It will be difficult for them to be able to recall accurately what their expectations were before taking the course. Hindsight bias asserts that people often do not recall what they thought in the past accurately and they deflect it as they have believed initially (Hawkins & Hastie, 1990) and memories of students about their expectations before taking the course may be biased after taking the course (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006). Therefore, the current study was designed to determine students' expectation levels before taking vocational English course at the beginning of the third year and their satisfaction levels after taking the course at the end of the fourth year.

Table 1. The number of items and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale

Scale/subscale	Expectation		Satisfaction
	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha	Cronbach Alpha
Objectives	17	.96	.97
Content	9	.95	.96
Teaching-learning process	6	.87	.84
Lecturer	9	.97	.97
Classmates	5	.90	.93
Assessment	8	.92	.88
Overall	54	.99	.98

The initial survey was applied at the beginning of 2017-2018 fall semester (in September 2017) to determine expectation levels of the students. The final survey was applied at the end of 2018-2019 spring semester (in May 2019) to determine to what extent their expectations were met. The only difference between two scales applied to the students at two different times was the question root. In the initial survey, the first item was written as “I expect that vocational English course will contribute to my personal

development”; however, in the final survey, the same item was written as “Vocational English course contributed to my personal development”. The number of items and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of each subscales and overall scale at two times are given in Table 1.

2. 5. Data analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 22.0. was used to analyze the data in the current study. Prior to analyses of the data, it was examined whether the data were normally distributed. As normal distribution was confirmed, paired-samples t test was used to compare the expectation and satisfaction levels.

In the evaluation and interpretation of the mean scores, range width formula suggested by Tekin (2002) and used in many studies in education (Özer, 2019a; Özer, 2019b; Yaman and Tekin, 2010; Dede and Yaman, 2008; Yenilmez, 2008) was taken into consideration. Range width was calculated by division of the difference between maximum (5) and minimum score (1) that can be obtained from the survey into the number of Likert options (5). In other words, range width was estimated using $5-1=4$, $4/5=0.80$ and interpreted as follows:

1-1.80: “Very low”,

1.81-2.60: “Low”,

2.61-3.40: “Medium”,

3.41-4.20: “High” and

4.21-5.00: “Very high”.

3. Results

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “objectives” are given in Table 2. Expectation was medium ($X=3.31$, $SD=1.11$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.71$, $SD=1.10$) for “contribute to personal development”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.09$, $p=.04<.05$). Both expectation ($X=3.41$, $SD=1.14$) and satisfaction ($X=3.75$, $SD=1.15$) were high for “contribute to improve self-confidence”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.73$, $p=.08>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Similarly, expectation ($X=3.57$, $SD=1.17$) and satisfaction were high ($X=3.71$, $SD=1.02$) for “contribute to improve presentation skills in English”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.65$, $p=.51>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

Table 2. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of objectives

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of objectives						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
1. contribute to personal development	3.31	1.11	3.71	1.10	2.09	.04
2. contribute to improve self-confidence	3.41	1.14	3.75	1.15	1.73	.08
3. contribute to improve presentation skills in English	3.57	1.17	3.71	1.02	.65	.51
4. contribute to speak fluently	3.59	1.17	3.74	1.01	.81	.41
5. contribute to communicate easily	3.59	1.16	3.63	1.13	.21	.83
6. contribute to improve current English level	3.62	1.18	3.74	1.18	.61	.53
7. contribute to improve vocabulary	3.69	1.24	3.75	1.12	.32	.74
8. contribute to improve grammar	3.25	1.38	3.63	.92	2.07	.04
9. contribute to improve writing skills	3.40	1.19	3.81	1.11	2.34	.02
10. contribute to improve reading-comprehension skills	3.59	1.13	3.99	1.12	2.40	.01
11. contribute to improve listening-comprehension skills	3.62	1.18	3.81	1.01	1.02	.30
12. contribute to improve pronunciation	3.60	1.27	3.94	1.07	1.73	.08
13. contribute to professional life	3.59	1.22	3.97	.97	1.89	.06
14. facilitate internship and work life	3.54	1.17	4.01	.95	2.34	.02
15. facilitate finding jobs	3.51	1.29	4.00	.93	2.58	.01
16. contribute to earn more money in professional life	3.22	1.15	3.54	1.11	1.88	.06
17. contribute to daily life	3.32	1.19	3.71	1.08	2.28	.02
Overall	3.49	.95	3.78	.86	1.90	.06

Not only expectation ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.17$) but also satisfaction ($X=3.74$, $SD=1.01$) was high for “contribute to speak fluently”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.81$, $p=.41>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. In the same way, expectation ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.16$) and satisfaction ($X=3.63$, $SD=1.13$) were high for “contribute to communicate easily”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.21$, $p=.83>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Both expectation ($X=3.62$, $SD=1.18$) and satisfaction ($X=3.74$, $SD=1.18$) were high for “contribute to improve current English level”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.61$, $p=.53>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

Expectation ($X=3.69$, $SD=1.24$) and satisfaction ($X=3.75$, $SD=1.12$) were high for “contribute to improve vocabulary”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.32$, $p=.74>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. However, expectation was medium ($X=3.25$, $SD=1.38$) and satisfaction was high ($X=3.63$, $SD=.92$) for “contribute to improve grammar”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.07$, $p=.04<.05$). Likewise, expectation was medium ($X=3.40$, $SD=1.19$)

but satisfaction was high ($X=3.81$, $SD=1.11$) for “contribute to improve writing skills”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.34$, $p=.02<.05$).

Expectation ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.13$) and satisfaction ($X=3.99$, $SD=1.12$) were high for “contribute to improve reading-comprehension skills”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.40$, $p=.01<.05$). Expectation ($X=3.62$, $SD=1.18$) and satisfaction ($X=3.81$, $SD=1.01$) were high for “contribute to improve listening-comprehension skills”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.02$, $p=.30>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Similarly, expectation ($X=3.60$, $SD=1.27$) and satisfaction ($X=3.94$, $SD=1.07$) were high for “contribute to improve pronunciation”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.73$, $p=.08>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

Not only expectation ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.22$) but also satisfaction ($X=3.97$, $SD=.97$) was high for “contribute to professional life”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.89$, $p=.06>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. On the other hand, expectation ($X=3.54$, $SD=1.17$) and satisfaction ($X=4.01$, $SD=.95$) were high for “facilitate internship and work life”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.34$, $p=.02<.05$). In the same vein, expectation ($X=3.51$, $SD=1.29$) and satisfaction ($X=4.00$, $SD=.93$) were high for “facilitate finding jobs”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.58$, $p=.01<.05$).

Expectation was medium ($X=3.22$, $SD=1.15$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.54$, $SD=1.11$) for “contribute to earn more money in professional life”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.88$, $p=.06>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. On the contrary, expectation was medium ($X=3.32$, $SD=1.19$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.71$, $SD=1.08$) for “contribute to my professional life”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.28$, $p=.02<.05$). Overall expectation ($X=3.49$, $SD=.95$) and overall satisfaction ($X=3.78$, $SD=.86$) were high in terms of “objectives”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.90$, $p=.06>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “content” are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of content

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of content						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
18. be appropriate to students' level	3.29	1.23	3.88	1.19	2.87	.00
19. include listening activities	3.57	1.17	4.01	1.20	2.34	.02
20. include speaking activities	3.49	1.20	3.90	1.25	1.85	.06
21. include reading activities	3.62	1.19	3.88	1.16	1.34	.18
22. include writing activities	3.59	1.22	3.84	1.15	1.14	.25
23. include professional terms/vocabulary	3.54	1.32	3.93	1.16	2.12	.03
24. be organized from general to specific	3.25	1.40	3.93	1.17	3.07	.00
25. not include just grammar	2.85	1.47	4.13	.97	6.62	.00
26. be appropriate to daily life	3.56	1.35	3.82	1.14	1.26	.21
Overall	3.41	1.08	3.92	1.00	2.95	.00

Expectation was medium ($X=3.29$, $SD=1.23$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.88$, $SD=1.19$) for “be appropriate to students’ level”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.87$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation ($X=3.57$, $SD=1.17$) and satisfaction ($X=4.01$, $SD=1.20$) were high for “include listening activities”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.34$, $p=.02<.05$). Expectation ($X=3.49$, $SD=1.20$) and satisfaction ($X=3.90$, $SD=1.25$) were both high for “include speaking activities”, but there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.85$, $p=.06>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

Expectation ($X=3.62$, $SD=1.19$) and satisfaction ($X=3.88$, $SD=1.16$) were high for “include reading activities”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.34$, $p=.18>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Similarly, expectation ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.22$) and satisfaction ($X=3.84$, $SD=1.15$) were high for “include writing activities”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.14$, $p=.25>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation ($X=3.54$, $SD=1.32$) and satisfaction ($X=3.93$, $SD=1.16$) were high for “include professional terms/vocabulary”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.12$, $p=.03<.05$).

Expectation was medium ($X=3.25$, $SD=1.40$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.93$, $SD=1.17$) for “be organized from general to specific”, and there was a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=3.07$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation was medium ($X=2.85$, $SD=1.47$) but satisfaction was high ($X=4.13$, $SD=.97$) for “not include just grammar”, and there was a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction

($t=6.62$, $p=.00<.05$). Both expectation ($X=3.56$, $SD=1.35$) and satisfaction ($X=3.82$, $SD=1.14$) were high for “be appropriate to daily life”, and there was not a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.26$, $p=.21>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Overall expectation ($X=3.41$, $SD=1.08$) and overall satisfaction ($X=3.92$, $SD=1.00$) were high in terms of “content”, but there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.95$, $p=.00<.05$).

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “teaching-learning process” are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of teaching-learning process

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of teaching-learning process						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
27. give importance to speaking and communication	3.51	1.31	3.99	1.12	2.25	.02
28. offer enjoyable activities	3.56	1.26	3.94	1.09	1.89	.06
29. give importance to pronunciation	3.66	1.18	4.04	1.04	2.13	.03
30. use Turkish as well as English	2.99	1.15	2.46	.74	2.96	.00
31. contribute to creativity	3.31	1.11	3.60	1.23	1.47	.14
32. use various instructional techniques	2.57	.98	3.63	1.15	5.55	.00
Overall	3.49	1.06	3.91	.96	2.47	.01

Both expectation ($X=3.51$, $SD=1.31$) and satisfaction ($X=3.99$, $SD=1.12$) were high for “give importance to speaking and communication”, but there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.25$, $p=.02<.05$). On the other hand, expectation ($X=3.56$, $SD=1.26$) and satisfaction ($X=3.94$, $SD=1.09$) were high for “offer enjoyable activities”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.89$, $p=.06>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation ($X=3.66$, $SD=1.18$) and satisfaction ($X=4.04$, $SD=1.04$) were high for “give importance to pronunciation”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.13$, $p=.03<.05$).

Expectation was medium ($X=2.99$, $SD=1.15$) but satisfaction was low ($X=2.46$, $SD=.74$) for “use Turkish as well as English”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of expectation ($t=2.96$, $p=.00<.05$). Although expectation was medium ($X=3.31$, $SD=1.11$) and satisfaction was high ($X=3.60$, $SD=1.23$) for “contribute to creativity”, there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.47$, $p=.14>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation was low ($X=2.57$, $SD=.98$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.63$, $SD=1.15$) for “use various instructional techniques”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=5.55$,

$p=.00<.05$). Overall expectation ($X=3.49$, $SD=1.06$) and overall satisfaction ($X=3.91$, $SD=.96$) were high in terms of “teaching-learning process”, but there was a significant difference between the levels of expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.47$, $p=.01<.05$).

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “lecturer” are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of lecturer

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of lecturer						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
33. be friendly to students	3.44	1.18	3.94	1.24	2.76	.00
34. help and guide students	3.79	1.35	3.94	1.20	.71	.47
35. encourage student participation	3.68	1.34	3.87	1.29	.98	.32
36. give appropriate feedback needed by each student	3.43	1.13	3.85	1.27	2.23	.02
37. deal with each student	3.43	1.21	4.00	1.15	3.19	.00
38. be equipped	3.68	1.30	4.09	1.07	2.05	.04
39. provide satisfactory answers to questions	3.51	1.25	4.06	1.18	2.87	.00
40. have knowledge about tourism	3.62	1.25	3.99	1.00	1.91	.06
41. teach new subject in connection with previous ones	3.40	1.21	4.10	1.05	3.76	.00
Overall	3.55	1.10	3.98	1.03	2.54	.01

Expectation ($X=3.44$, $SD=1.18$) and satisfaction ($X=3.94$, $SD=1.24$) were high for “be friendly to students”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.76$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation ($X=3.79$, $SD=1.35$) and satisfaction ($X=3.94$, $SD=1.20$) were high for “help and guide students”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.71$, $p=.47>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation ($X=3.68$, $SD=1.34$) and satisfaction ($X=3.87$, $SD=1.29$) were high for “encourage student participation”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.98$, $p=.32>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation.

Although expectation ($X=3.43$, $SD=1.13$) and satisfaction ($X=3.85$, $SD=1.27$) were high for “give appropriate feedback needed by each student”, there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.23$, $p=.02<.05$). Similarly, expectation ($X=3.43$, $SD=1.21$) and satisfaction ($X=4.00$, $SD=1.15$) were high for “deal with each student”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=3.19$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation ($X=3.68$, $SD=1.30$) and satisfaction ($X=4.09$, $SD=1.07$) were high for “be equipped”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.05$, $p=.04<.05$). In the same vein, expectation ($X=3.51$, $SD=1.25$) and satisfaction

($X=4.06$, $SD=1.18$) were high for “provide satisfactory answers to questions”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.87$, $p=.00<.05$).

On the other hand, expectation ($X=3.62$, $SD=1.25$) and satisfaction ($X=3.99$, $SD=1.00$) were high for “have knowledge about tourism”, but there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.91$, $p=.06>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation was medium ($X=3.40$, $SD=1.21$) and satisfaction was high ($X=4.10$, $SD=1.05$) for “teach new subject in connection with previous ones”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=3.76$, $p=.00<.05$). Overall expectation ($X=3.55$, $SD=1.10$) and overall satisfaction ($X=3.98$, $SD=1.03$) were high in terms of “lecturer”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.54$, $p=.01<.05$).

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “classmates” are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of classmates

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of classmates						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
42. give importance to the course	3.59	1.21	3.25	1.25	1.55	.12
43. attend the course regularly	3.29	1.29	3.31	1.08	.07	.94
44. participate actively in the course	3.40	1.21	3.32	1.08	.34	.73
45. do homework/assignments on time	3.25	1.18	3.31	1.16	.28	.77
46. be sympathetic in case of any mistakes (not make fun of anyone)	3.78	1.18	3.65	1.16	.62	.53
Overall	3.46	1.02	3.36	1.01	.51	.60

Expectation was high ($X=3.59$, $SD=1.21$) but satisfaction was medium ($X=3.25$, $SD=1.25$) for “give importance to the course”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.55$, $p=.12>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of expectation was higher than that of satisfaction. Both expectation ($X=3.29$, $SD=1.29$) and satisfaction ($X=3.31$, $SD=1.08$) were medium for “attend the course regularly”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.07$, $p=.94>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was a bit higher than that of expectation. Expectation ($X=3.40$, $SD=1.21$) and satisfaction ($X=3.32$, $SD=1.08$) were medium for “participate actively in the course”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.34$, $p=.73>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of expectation was higher than that of satisfaction.

Not only expectation ($X=3.25$, $SD=1.18$) but also satisfaction ($X=3.31$, $SD=1.16$) was medium for “do homework/assignments on time”, and there was not a significant

difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.28$, $p=.77>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation ($X=3.78$, $SD=1.18$) and satisfaction ($X=3.65$, $SD=1.16$) were high for “be sympathetic in case of any mistakes (not make fun of anyone)”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.62$, $p=.53>.05$). However, the level of expectation was higher than that of satisfaction. Overall expectation was high ($X=3.46$, $SD=1.02$) but overall satisfaction was medium ($X=3.36$, $SD=1.01$) in terms of “classmates”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=.51$, $p=.60>.05$). Nevertheless, the level of expectation was higher than that of satisfaction.

The findings regarding expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of “assessment” are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of assessment

Expectation and satisfaction levels in terms of assessment						
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t	p
	X	SD	X	SD		
47. include assigning homework to improve students' creativity	3.34	1.32	3.81	1.08	2.55	.01
48. include projects	3.03	1.28	3.37	1.22	1.60	.11
49. include presentations	3.06	1.39	3.39	1.14	2.52	.01
50. include easy questions in the exams	3.34	1.27	3.71	1.13	1.77	.08
51. check all assignments	3.15	1.33	4.09	1.01	5.12	.00
52. include various assessment techniques as well as written exams	3.00	1.43	3.90	.83	4.34	.00
53. include speaking exams	3.01	1.28	3.82	1.02	3.81	.00
54. take the whole process into account (such as homework, assignment, attendance and participation)	3.07	1.26	3.93	.93	5.11	.00
Overall	3.14	1.06	3.57	.88	2.75	.00

Expectation was medium ($X=3.34$, $SD=1.32$) but satisfaction was high ($X=3.81$, $SD=1.08$) for “include assigning homework to improve students' creativity”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.55$, $p=.01<.05$). Both expectation ($X=3.03$, $SD=1.28$) and satisfaction ($X=3.37$, $SD=1.22$) were medium for “include projects”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.60$, $p=.11>.05$). Nonetheless, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Although expectation ($X=3.06$, $SD=1.39$) and satisfaction ($X=3.39$, $SD=1.14$) were medium for “include presentations”, there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.52$, $p=.01<.05$).

Expectation ($X=3.34$, $SD=1.27$) and satisfaction ($X=3.71$, $SD=1.13$) were high for “include easy questions in the exams”, and there was not a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction ($t=1.77$, $p=.08>.05$). However, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. Expectation was medium ($X=3.15$, $SD=1.33$) and

satisfaction was high ($X=4.09$, $SD=1.01$) for “check all assignments”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=5.12$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation was medium ($X=3.00$, $SD=1.43$) and satisfaction was high ($X=3.90$, $SD=.83$) for “include various assessment techniques as well as written exams”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=4.34$, $p=.00<.05$).

Expectation was medium ($X=3.01$, $SD=1.28$) and satisfaction was high ($X=3.82$, $SD=1.02$) for “include speaking exams”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=3.81$, $p=.00<.05$). Expectation was medium ($X=3.07$, $SD=1.26$) and satisfaction was high ($X=3.93$, $SD=.93$) for “take the whole process into account (such as homework, assignments, attendance and participation)”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=5.11$, $p=.00<.05$). Overall expectation was medium ($X=3.14$, $SD=1.06$) and overall satisfaction was high ($X=3.57$, $SD=.88$) in terms of “assessment”, and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.75$, $p=.00<.05$).

The findings regarding overall expectation from and satisfaction in the course are given in Table 8.

Table 8. *Overall expectation from and satisfaction in the course*

Overall expectation from and satisfaction in the course					
	Expectation		Satisfaction		t
	X	SD	X	SD	
Overall course	3.40	.92	3.78	.81	2.56
					.01

Overall expectation from vocational English course was medium ($X=3.40$, $SD=.92$) and overall satisfaction in the course was high ($X=3.78$, $SD=.81$), and there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction ($t=2.56$, $p=.01<.05$).

4. Discussion, conclusions and recommendations

The aim of the study was to determine and compare expectation and satisfaction levels of tourism undergraduate students in vocational English course. The research was designed as a longitudinal study, quantitative research design and survey methodology were used to collect data in the study. The data on expectation were collected in September 2017 while the data on satisfaction were collected in May 2019, and paired-samples t test was used to analyze the data.

The findings of the study revealed that students’ satisfaction level for “objectives” was higher than that of expectation although there was not a significant difference. Students

expected that vocational English course would contribute to their personal development and professional life. The findings can be interpreted that students need English as a medium of communication in their professional life, and they are aware of this need because they will speak English, as a lingua franca, to communicate with the customers by either speaking or writing messages and e-mails in English when they start to work in tourism sector. The satisfaction level implied that the course contributed to their personal development and professional life, and their expectation was exceeded. Students also expected to improve their grammar and writing skills in vocational English course. In parallel with the current findings, Lobo and Gurney (2014)'s study on student expectations at tertiary level found out that all students expected to improve their language skills, 46% of them mentioned writing as the first skill, and 32% of them expected to improve grammar. Similarly, Ho (2014) displayed that students expected from the course to include writing emails and reports. In another study, 67.8% of the students expected to improve writing and translation from their ESP course (Hui, 2017). On the other hand, Bordia et al. (2008)'s study concluded that only 3.07% of the students expected to improve grammar, and Kim (2013)'s research displayed that students did not expect to improve writing. The satisfaction level of the students in the current study reflected that the course provided students improve their writing skill and grammar.

Students expected to improve their self-confidence, presentation skills in English, level of English, vocabulary, listening-comprehension, reading-comprehension, speaking and pronunciation by taking vocational English course. Similarly, in a study in China, 82.2% of the students expected to improve listening and speaking, and 77.12% of them expected to improve reading through ESP courses (Hui, 2017). In addition, another study revealed that 42% of the students interviewed expected to improve speaking and vocabulary, and 37%, 32% and 16% of them expected to improve their English skills in general, their communication skills and their confidence and self-esteem, respectively (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). Bordia et al. (2008) reached a conclusion that speaking (41.54%) was the most popular skill that the students expected to learn, it was followed by listening (20%), writing (10.77%) and vocabulary (9.23%). Similarly, Ayas and Kırkgöz (2013) revealed that students expected to improve four language skills, but specifically listening and speaking rather than writing and reading. However, Ulum (2020) found out that students expected to improve speaking and writing skills rather than listening and reading.

The current study showed that students' satisfaction level was higher than that of expectation in terms of improving their self-confidence, presentation skills in English, level of English, vocabulary, listening-comprehension, reading-comprehension, speaking and pronunciation. In another study, for satisfaction, 37% of the students expressed that their expectations about writing skills were met, 21% of them pointed out that their expectations about presentation skills were met, and 70 % of them stated that their expectations about skill development were met (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). Bracaj (2014)

asserted that a piece of material tends to improve more than one skill, such as listening, reading and vocabulary at the same time. Thus, students improved their self-confidence, presentation skills in English, level of English, vocabulary, listening-comprehension, reading-comprehension, speaking and pronunciation by taking the course.

The study showed that there was a significant difference for “content” between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. Students expected that the content would include not only grammar but also listening, speaking, reading and writing activities and professional terms/vocabulary. In the same way, the findings of Lobo and Gurney (2014)’s study represented that only 21% of the students expected that the lectures would cover mainly grammar, and most students expected to develop their proficiency with language skills separately or with a combination of two or more skills. However, the most cited skills were writing and speaking (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). Another study found out that speaking and listening were the most desired skills with the percentage of 61.5 (Bordia et al., 2008). A study carried out by Ho (2014) found out that students expected that the course should include reading, oral presentation and meeting skills. Similarly, Dinamika and Siregar (2016) found out that students needed to use appropriate vocabulary and expressions in tourism to speak the guests and they needed to write some documents, such as application forms, CVs, notes, reports, letters and e-mails. For Dinamika and Siregar (2016), listening skill is useful for students to be able to comprehend the guests’ demands and utterances, and reading skill is important to enable students understand the meaning of written texts, such as messages from phone, brochures, complaint letters and statistical graphs. Health students in Sudan declared that both language skills and language areas are notable (Ibrahim, 2016). Students of civil engineering in Vietnam expected ESP course to fulfill their current and future vocational and academic purposes. They declared that materials were authentic and they were exposed to real language in professional life. However, they were not satisfied with coursebook and key terminology. They reported that they were not exposed to all language skills adequately (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2017). In Malaysia, 96% of the art and design students expected ESP course to include speaking, 95% of them expected the course to include listening, and 80% of them expected the course to include reading and writing. However, they were moderately satisfied with the course (Kaur & Khan, 2010).

The study found out that there was a significant difference for “teaching-learning process” between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. Students expected that pronunciation, speaking and communication would be given importance in teaching-learning process. Similarly, another study indicated that most preferred activities were communicative activities, group work, pair work and roleplays (Bordia et al., 2008). Students expected activities to be enjoyable. Likewise, students of law in Oman expected excitement, enjoyment, amusement, fun and entertainment in their courses (Al-Issa, 2017). On the other hand, Lobo and Gurney (2014) found out that students did not expect to enjoy the courses.

In the current study, students expected to use Turkish as well as English; however, there was a significant difference between expectation and satisfaction in favor of expectation. Since students' expectations are generally based on either their previous language learning experiences or their future goals and needs (Bordia et al. 2006), the finding can be evaluated as the result of their previous experiences. Some of the students may have wanted only to pass the exams, and some of them may have wanted not to have difficulty in learning.

Students did not expect that various instructional techniques would be used in vocational English course but they were used. Similarly, in another study, 21% of students did not expect the lectures to involve so many activities (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). Furthermore, in the process of teaching ESP, İbrahim (2010) suggested to employ a variety of activities such as interviews with experts using the target language exclusively, field visits, problem solving, presentation, practical hand-on activities and role-plays. In Dinamika and Siregar (2016)'s study, students expected more material to practice their speaking and writing skills, and the materials should be specific for tourism management. The finding may be considered that course books and other materials used in the teaching-learning process were sufficient in the current context because ESP materials have a role to specify teaching-learning process, and they may lead to using new learning/instructional techniques supporting both learners and teachers (Bracaj, 2014). Moreover, Kazar and Mede (2015) revealed that both lecturers and students thought that students should engage in different tasks. Therefore, it may be suggested that the materials used in vocational English course be used in the following years.

The study revealed that there was a significant difference for "lecturer" between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. In parallel with the finding, Lobo and Gurney (2014) reached a finding that 74% of the students expressed that the lecturers were either meeting or exceeding any expectations that they initially had of them. In the current study, students expected from the lecturer to be friendly, give appropriate feedback, help and guide students, encourage student participation. The literature supports the finding (Trejo, 2007). In the same vein, another study revealed that 52 % of the students expected from the courses to be quite interactive, and 36% of them expected that the lecturer would offer more help and support (Lobo & Gurney, 2014). Students also expected that their lecturer would teach new subject in connection with previous ones and they were satisfied. The finding is consistent with Hutchinson and Waters (1987)'s suggestion that materials should be a bridge between existing knowledge and new information. Thus, the finding may be interpreted that the lecturer made use of the material well during teaching-learning process. On the other hand, in a study with nursing and midwifery students, students expressed that the materials were inadequate and the teaching-learning process and the lecturers did not help them to learn vocational English (Ayas & Kırkgöz, 2013).

Another expectation of the students from the lecturer was that she would have knowledge about tourism, and they were satisfied after taking the course. As Chien and Hsu (2010) argue, the ideal teachers/lecturers of ESP must not only be capable of English language but also have the knowledge of a specific profession in order to teach an ESP course effectively. Moreover, Chovancoca (2014) assert that the lecturers should give importance to students' needs, wants and expectations. Therefore, the finding of the current study may be resulted from that the lecturer had learnt the expectations of the students before they took vocational English course, and because she has been teaching ESP courses for 14 years.

Students' expectation level for "classmates" was higher than that of satisfaction although there was not a significant difference. Students expected from their classmates to give importance to the course, attend the course regularly, do homework/assignments on time, participate actively in the course. However, the satisfaction level implied that their expectations were not met. Likewise, in Lobo and Gurney (2014)'s study, 21% of the students expected the courses to be much better attended, but their classmates did not attend the course regularly. Moreover, some lecturers in an Australian study indicated that students may be physically present in the classroom, yet they may not pay much attention to activities done (Bordia et al. 2008).

The findings of the study revealed that there was a significant difference for "assessment" between expectation and satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. According to Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998), assessment in ESP is an aid to learning. From this point of view, assessment in vocational English course can be regarded to give an opportunity for students to learn during assessment process.

Students expected that assessment would include various techniques such as speaking as well as written exams and the whole process (such as homework, assignments, attendance and participation). According to İbrahim (2010), lecturers should make use of a variety of assessment techniques in ESP context. Moreover, for Tratnik (2008), assessment in ESP aims at measuring and evaluating students in terms of reading, listening, speaking and writing in the target language, and how well they can do it. Assessment should also rely on direct evaluation of language ability in communication in all four language skills. Lecturers should devise various assessment tasks enabling students to comprehend the link between different uses of language (Tratnik, 2008). Thus, assessment procedures in the current study could be considered to have achieved these since students' satisfaction levels are higher than their expectations. In addition, students expected that assessment would include projects and presentations. Similarly, in Lobo and Gurney (2014)'s study, 32% of the students expected that their courses would cover presentation work. Students also expected that the exams would include easy questions; however, the level of satisfaction was higher than that of expectation. In a

study, 10% of the students expected the course to be easier than other courses (Lobo & Gurney, 2014).

Finally, there was a significant difference between overall expectation and overall satisfaction in favor of satisfaction. Likewise, Lobo and Gurney (2014) found out that 32% of the students stated that their expectations were met, and 21% of them declared that the course exceeded their expectations. It is notable to meet students' expectations because when their expectations are not met, they may display disruptive behaviors such as contradicting or interrupting other students. This can result in an intimidating classroom setting for other students and they may stop voicing their opinions or concerns; therefore, they may not achieve their actual potentials (Bordia et al. 2008). In brief, one of the most crucial aspects of expectations is that students learn items from the curriculum as long as they are oriented to their expectations (Bordia et al., 2006).

The current study has some limitations. First of all, the study is limited to the students taking vocational English courses in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 fall and spring semester. Next, the findings are restricted to the questionnaire form developed for the study by the author. The current study is based on a self-report format, which may be another limitation. Further research may interview lecturers who lecture the course and they may reflect their overall experiences in teaching vocational English in terms of expectation and satisfaction levels of students. In addition, further research may interview employers in the sector, which may reflect whether the expectations of employers and those of students match. Classroom observations may be used as an additional data collection tool as well as lecturer interviews to triangulate data. Another limitation of the study is that students may have not answered the questionnaire items objectively as they were still students when the survey was conducted. Further research may collect the final data after the graduation of the students.

The study collected the data at two different times (before and after taking the course) rather than at once after the students took the course in order to avoid hindsight bias. However, further research may conduct the survey at multiple times such as at the beginning and end of each year, and after the graduation. Bordia et al. (2006)'s study revealed from interviews with lecturers that students do not always express their expectations at the beginning of the term. They sometimes find it difficult to define and identify them (Nunan, 1988). Some students express their opinions in middle of the term, and some students state their expectations after they get to know the lecturer well. In this perspective, conducting the research at multiple times may give a comprehensive feedback to both the lecturers and the researchers.

Finally, students may have some unrealistic expectations that are unable to be met just within a short time frame of the course as Bordia et al. (2008) indicated. Lecturers should explain to students why such expectations cannot be met. The explanations may direct students to think about these expectations again and to create more realistic

expectations. Furthermore, each student's list of expectations cannot be met by lecturers. Nevertheless, sympathizing with students and offering alternative ways to meet their expectations can help minimize any negative effect.

Longitudinal research will help scholars to figure out the possible nature of expectations and the levels of satisfaction. The current study may be a crucial endeavor for further research. As stated in the introduction, unmet expectations may result in negative psychological and behavioral outcomes, which may affect learning negatively. The current study, therefore, contributes to creating a knowledge base for student expectations as an affective variable in language teaching/learning in general, and in vocational English teaching/learning in particular.

References

- Al-Issa, A. S. M. (2017). Meeting students' expectations in an Arab ICLHE/EMI context: Implications for ELT education policy and practice. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(1), 209-226.
- Appleton-Knapp, S. L., & Krentler, K. A. (2006). Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: the importance of managing student expectations. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(3), 254-264.
- Ayas, Ö., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2013). The academic and vocational English language needs of the school of health student. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 42(1), 39-55
- Bordia, S., Wales, L., Gallois, C., & Pittam, J. (2008). Antecedents and consequences of TESOL student expectations. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 15.1-15.18.
- Bordia, S., Wales, L., Pittam, J., & Gallois, C. (2006). Student expectations of TESOL programs: Student and teacher perspectives. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 04.1-04.21.
- Bracaj, M. (2014). Teaching English for Specific Purposes and teacher training. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(2), 40-49.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In Johnson, R. K. (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (2016). *Introducing needs analysis and English for Specific Purposes*. New York: Routledge.
- Chien, C., & Hsu, M. (2010). A case study of incorporating ESP instruction into the university English course. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1885-1888.
- Chovancoca, B. (2014). Needs analysis and ESP course design: Self-perception of language needs among pre-service students. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 38(51), 43-57.
- Chu, S., & Huang, C. (2007). Meeting college students' learning expectations. In *Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp. 78-85). Taipei: Crane Publishing Company.
- Dede, Y., & Yaman, S. (2008). Fen öğrenmeye yönelik motivasyon ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi (EFMED)*, 2(1), 19-37.

- Dinamika, S. D., & Siregar, E. B. A. (2016). Developing English syllabus for tourism management students. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4)*, 11th to 12th May 2016, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia, pp. 323-327.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, L. (2013). Needs analysis and curriculum development in ESP. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Malden, Ma: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (pp.325-346).
- Haque, S. (2014). Expectation of tertiary students of Bangladesh from ELT classrooms. *Journal of NELTA*, 19(1-2), 56-64.
- Hawkins, S. A., & Hastie, R. (1990). Hindsight: Biased judgments of past events after the outcomes are known. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 311-327.
- Ho, B. (2014). Communicating in English during computer science internships. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(7), 314-330.
- Hoa, N. T. T., & Mai, P. T. T. (2016). Difficulties in teaching English for Specific Purposes: Empirical study at Vietnam universities. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(2), 154-161.
- Hui, G. (2017). The learning needs analysis of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in college. *US-China Foreign Language*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ibrahim, A. S. E. M. (2016). ESP needs analysis: A case study of PEH students, University of Khartoum. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 13(12), 905-923
- Ibrahim, A. I. (2010). ESP at the tertiary level: Current situation, application and expectation. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 200-204.
- Karasar, N. (2003). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (12. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaur, S. & Khan, A. B. M. A. (2010). Language needs analysis of art and design students: Considerations for ESP course design. *ESP World*, 9(28), 1-16.
- Kazar, S. G. & Mede, E. (2015). Students' and lecturers' perceptions of the learning and target needs in an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) program. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 23(2), 479-498.
- Kim, H. H. (2013). Needs analysis for English for Specific Purpose course development for engineering students in Korea. *International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering*, 8(6), 279-288.
- Li, J. (2014). Needs analysis: An effective way in Business English curriculum design. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(9), 1869-1874.
- Lin, L. (2012). *Measuring adult foreign language learners' anxiety, motivational factors, and achievement expectations: A comparative study between Chinese as a second language students and English as a second language students*. (Unpublished dissertation). Cleveland State University, USA.
- Lobo, A., & Gurney, L. (2014). What did they expect? Exploring a link between students' expectations, attendance and attrition on English language enhancement courses. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 38(5), 730-754.
- Martins, H. (2017). Revisiting needs analysis: A cornerstone for Business English course. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 5(1), 57-63.

- Nguyen, H., & Nguyen, T. (2017). English for Specific Purposes (ESP): Perceptions of students and teachers of learning needs at a Vietnamese school. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(4), 793-803.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Özer, S. & Yılmaz, E. (2017). Mesleki yabancı dil (İngilizce) dersine yönelik nitel bir araştırma. *INES JOURNAL Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(11), 339-352.
- Özer, S. (2018). A qualitative study to determine expectations of students studying at a faculty of tourism from vocational English course. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 14(4), 15-25.
- Özer, S. (2019a). An investigation of attitude, motivation and anxiety levels of students studying at a faculty of tourism towards vocational English course. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 560-577. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.586246.
- Özer, S. (2019b). Self-efficacy perceptions of vocational students about cognitive objectives of English language course. *Maarif Mektepleri International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(2), 1-16.
- Poedjiastuti, D., & Oliver, R. (2017). Exploring students' learning needs: Expectation and challenges. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 124-133.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). *Curriculum development in language teaching* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richerich, R., & Chancerel, J.-L. (1980). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Robinson, P. C. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Russell, S. (2009). A survey of learner expectations and levels of satisfaction with a university intensive English language program. *Accents Asia [Online]*, 3(1), 1-35.
- Sari, R. K., Kuncoro, A., & Erlangga, F. (2019). Need analysis of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to informatic students. *JEELL (Journal of English Education, Linguistics, and Literature)*, 5(2), 26-37.
- Spence, P., & Liu, G.Z. (2013). Engineering English and the high-tech industry: A case study of an English needs analysis of process integration engineers at a semiconductor manufacturing company in Taiwan. *English for Specific Purposes* 32, 97-109.
- Tekin, H. (2002). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme*. Ankara: Yargı Yayıncılık.
- Throp, D. (1991). Confused encounters: Differing expectations in the EAP classroom. *ELT Journal*, 45(2), 108-118.
- Tratnik, A. (2008). Key issues in testing English for Specific Purposes. *Scripta Manent*, 4(1), 3-13.
- Trejo, O. (2007). Students' expectations of teachers. The case of students at Mexican university English department. *MEXTESOL Journal* 31(2), 57-64.
- Ulum, Ö. G. (2020). ESP needs analysis of Turkish learners of English in architecture. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 18, 443-456.
- Weir, C., & Roberts, J (1994). *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yaman, S. ve Tekin, S. (2010). Öğretmenler için hizmet-içi eğitime yönelik tutum ölçeği geliştirilmesi. *Bayburt Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 76-87.
- Yenilmez, K. (2008). Open primary education school students' opinions about mathematics television programmes. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 9(4), 176-189.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).