THE JOURNAL OF TEACHING ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC AND ACADEMIC PURPOSES
Vol. 12, Nº 2, 2024, pp. 325–337

UDC: 331.103.1:005.3 https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP231231027S
Review research paper

IS THE ACTION LEARNING APPROACH SUITABLE FOR TEACHING ESP? THE MAIN PREREQUISITES FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN THE CASE OF AGRI-FOOD STUDENTS

Anamaria Supuran, Amalia-Ana Sturza, Simona Veronica Abrudan Caciora

University of Oradea, Romania

ORCID iDs: Anamaria Supuran https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3771-3680
Amalia-Ana Sturza https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0616-4076
Simona Abrudan Caciora https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9755-7359

Abstract. *In the last decade, there has been a tendency towards embracing the action learning approach in the case of the students attending study programs such as agriculture, forestry, and food engineering. The paper aims to establish if the methods and instruments specific to this approach can be transferred to the ESP lessons and check on the feasibility and limitations of this approach when teaching English for agriculture and food engineering. For this reason, a questionnaire was applied to check the student's understanding of the action learning approach and their capacity to identify specific action-oriented methods and select a series of methods to be introduced when teaching English. According to the obtained results, the study shows that most students have satisfactory information as regards the action learning approach and can identify and show a certain preference for specific methods that could be used within the ESP course. More than this, an analysis of the different categories of learning methods reveals that the students display a preference for those that develop skills such as observation, visioning, problem-solving, and co-learning. Thus, future studies may explore topics related to the way ESP teaching can further enhance the acquisition and development of specific skills (observation, visioning, reflection, dialogue, participation, co-learning, problem-solving and critical thinking) in the case of future professionals in agriculture, forestry, and food engineering.*

Key words: *ESP, ESP for agriculture, ESP for food science, action learning, learner-centered approach*

1. INTRODUCTION

The action learning approach originated in the field of management and organizational development. Reginald Revans is the primary figure associated with the development of the action learning approach in the 1940s. He wrote extensively on action learning, outlining its principles, processes, and applications in various contexts. According to its inventor "there is no learning without action and no (sober and deliberate) action without learning" (Revans 1998, 83). The same idea is taken further, and other researchers have discovered that people

Submitted December 31st, 2023, accepted for publication May 30th, 2024
Corresponding author: Anamaria Supuran, University of Oradea, Romania
E-mail: asupuran@uoradea.ro

learn most effectively when dealing with real problems that occur in their workplace (Day, 2000; Raelin, 1999; Reynolds & Vince, 2004).

The success of action learning in organizational contexts led to its adaptation in educational settings. Educators recognized the potential of this approach to engage learners actively in problem-solving, critical thinking, and reflective practices.

In ESP, learners often engage in language activities centered on problem-solving scenarios relevant to their specific field or profession. Both approaches recognize the value of learning through actively addressing challenges. By integrating language development with practical skills and addressing specific needs, these approaches enhance the effectiveness of learning experiences in professional or specialized settings. Thus, ESP is *"generally used to refer to the teaching of English for a clearly utilitarian purpose. This purpose is usually defined with reference to some occupational requirements …or vocational training programmes … or some academic or professional study"* (Mackay and Mountford 1978, 2)

Therefore, the action learning approach, as well as teaching ESP, found their way into higher education institutions, where they have been used within various study programs and contexts, including business education, engineering, medicine, psychology, leadership development, and lately in agriculture, forestry, and food science.

Arthur W. Chickering and Zelda F. Gamson stated that effective teaching encourages active learning, as "*students do not learn much just sitting in classes and listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers.*" In order to have significant learning experiences, "*they must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives.*" They also mention that active learning can also occur outside the classroom, and the students can contribute to the design of courses or teaching materials (Chickering and Gamson 1987: 4). In the case of ESP, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) have emphasized the importance of considering the methodological aspects of ESP teaching to cater for the individual needs of ESP learners. A recommendation addressed to ESP teachers refers to the "*need to accommodate individual differences of their students by using diverse classroom activities and teaching techniques to ensure efficient and effective teaching*" (Javid 2011b, 59).

Both Action Learning and ESP often involve collaborative learning experiences. In ESP, learners may collaborate on projects or engage in group activities to enhance their language proficiency. With its group problem-solving approach, action learning encourages participants to work together and learn from one another's experiences and perspectives.

Later, Sandelands (1998) considers action learning as a form of "learning by doing," while Raelin considers it a developmental approach organized within a group setting that is capable of generating theory from relevant practical situations (Raelin 1997).

John Dewey offers the most comprehensive perspective on "experiential learning," which may represent the philosophical foundation of the action learning concept. Dewey believed that learning should be rooted in concrete, practical experiences and argued that education is most effective when it involves active engagement with the environment, allowing individuals to learn through direct experiences rather than abstract concepts. Dewey promoted reflective thinking as an integral part of the learning process. After engaging in action or experience, individuals should reflect on their experiences, consider the consequences of their actions, and extract meaningful insights (Dewey 1938). Reflection is a key component in both action learning and ESP. After engaging in language activities or addressing real-world challenges, learners are encouraged to reflect

on their experiences. This reflective practice enhances the learning process and helps individuals consolidate their understanding and skills.

In addition, the autonomy of the teacher's actions and the learner's active role are of utmost importance in the case of action learning. In this context, the authoritarian teacher figure is replaced by that of the facilitator/mediator or mentor, who needs to take into account learners' capacities in the sense that they will be able to be active participants (Koo, L. C. 1999). The ESP teacher has an even more challenging mission - embracing a multidisciplinary approach instead of just being limited to delivering linguistics and vocabulary-related information to the students. The ESP teacher must collaborate with the students and colleagues (teaching different disciplines) to remain constantly in touch with the latest research in the field so that the content delivered to students during the ESP class reflects the most updated information. John and Dudley-Evans (1991: 305) have reported that ESP courses are usually collaboratively run by language and content teachers, and "*ESP requires specialized or unique methodologies*." This fact will undoubtedly raise the student's motivation to learn ESP. However, some studies indicate that one role of the ESP teacher can be that of "*a facilitator rather than presenter of content*" (Hull, 2004: 1), whose primary role is to guide the learning process as well as to ensure the most appropriate learning environment for the students. It has been argued that ESP teachers are not "*specialists in the field, but in teaching English*" because their subject is English for the profession but not the profession in English (Milevica 2006).

Another perspective on action learning is offered by Bonwell and Eison, who consider active learning *"as any instructional method that engages students in the learning process*" (Bonwell and Eison 1991: 2). Learners are at the center of the learning process, and they need to learn through experiencing what they have learned in concrete situations. Both action learning and ESP (Dudley-Evans and St. John 1998) are highly learner-centered approaches), paying close attention to the multidimensional needs of the learners. They aim to develop learners' autonomy and independence by being responsible for their own learning. "*teachers and educational institutions should attempt to promote autonomy through practices that will encourage and enable learners to take more control of all aspects of their learning and will, thus, help them to become better language learners"* (Benson 2001, 109).

ESP focuses on developing language skills that directly apply to learners' professional or academic goals. Action learning, too, tailors its learning objectives to address the specific challenges and objectives of a given project or organizational context. The learning goals are aligned with the practical needs of the participants.

It has also been reported that ESP learners and action learning users should be actively involved in choosing the content materials, curriculum development, and teaching methodology to ensure maximum commitment and motivation of the program participants.

Furthermore, active learning is a process that makes learners mentally and physically active. O'Brien and Collins state, *"Active learning is the process of keeping students mentally, and often physically, active in their learning through activities that involve them in gathering information, thinking, and problem solving*" (O'Brien and Collins 2011: 5).

A more specific perspective on action learning applied in the case of the students attending agriculture and food science study programs is offered by the Nextfood action learning approach developed within the project called **Nextfood**: **Educating the next**

generation of professionals in the agrifood system (Horizon 2020, **Grant agreement:** No. 771738, www.nextfood-project.eu).

This approach is characterized by a shift from theory to phenomenon as the starting point for the learning process (experiential learning) and a shift in focus from knowledge transfer to building competencies needed to take informed and responsible action as the ultimate goal of learning. It is mainly based on Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory Learning, which stipulates that it is about acquiring knowledge and actively engaging with and reflecting on experiences. With this theory, Kolb emphasizes that learning is a continuous, lifelong process following a learning cycle (regardless of the moment learners enter the cycle) that must be completed as the learning process takes place (Kolb, 1984).

The shift from a traditional to an action-based educational system began in the Faculty of Environmental Protection five years ago when it became a member of the NEXTFOOD project consortium whose primary focus was to identify the most important skills necessary in the agro-food and forestry sectors as well as the design of different courses based on the action learning approach to educate the next generation of professionals in these sectors. One of the activities that still ensures the sustainability of this project even after its closure is the annual organization of a workshop on the action learning approach where high school students from VET partners, university students, teachers, professors, representatives of state institutions, farmers and other actors involved are invited. During this workshop, the organizers try to find out what are the main shifts that the educational system should produce, what are the hindering and supporting forces in the case of action learning approach, what are the best environments where different classes should take place, what are the best sources of information and finally what are the most suitable forms of evaluations when using this approach.

To enable the student to shift from theory to experiential learning, even in the ESP class, they must be placed at the core of the learning process, and the teacher must design all the materials according to the principles and methodology specific to the action learning approach.

Therefore, it is needed as some initial information to be collected from the students, such as the student's level of understanding concerning the "action learning" approach consisting of their capacity to identify action-oriented methods, indicate a preference for some specific methods and tools and detect the supporting and hindering forces for introducing the action learning approach in the ESP class.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was organized within the Faculty of Environmental Protection, University of Oradea, and the target group was represented by the first-year students attending two study programs: Agriculture and Food Science. The total number of students included in this research was 56 (35 female students and 21 male students) with a B1-C1 level of English proficiency. The students attending the study program in Agriculture have one hour of ESP per week, while those studying Food Science have two hours per week. In both cases, the goal of the ESP class is to enrich the vocabulary of the students with new specific terminology, improve the student's capacity to communicate at an academic level when taking part in international conferences, projects, or programs, enhance their capacity of understanding new literature in the field and writing research papers.

The methodological approach in this study consisted of organizing a workshop on action learning in the agro-food sector, during which the students were asked to fill in a questionnaire (see Annex 1) and answer two additional questions.

The questionnaire was designed into three sections: a demographic section including information related to gender, age, and origin (rural and urban); a section with general statements that check the student's understanding of the action learning approach in the ESP class (5 questions) and a final section consisting of ten statements that have in view the identification of specific action-oriented methods that could be relevant for teaching ESP, as well as their grading according to the level of preference to be used in the ESP courses. The scale used was from 1 to 5 (5 = strongly agree, 4 =agree, 3=neither agree/nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1= strongly disagree), and the average means have been calculated for each statement included in the questionnaire.

Given the fact that the students enrolled in the two study programs agriculture, respectively food science, come mainly from rural areas and there is a mixture of students regarding age and gender (more men in the case of students studying agriculture, only female students in the case of those studying food science), it was decided as the first section to include information on the gender, origin, and age of the students in case some relevant information could be linked to these aspects for further studies.

The second section had in view to check on the knowledge that students could have about the action learning approach at the respective moment. This section included five statements revolving around the definition of action learning, the environment where action learning can be performed, the persons and organizations who can use this approach, and how action learning can be used.

More precisely, this section includes the following statements:

1. In action learning, the participants select/are given some issues, analyze them, take some action, and reflect on that action.
2. Action learning helps learners to solve problems by asking the right questions.
3. Action learning involves "group-based learning."
4. The role of the teacher is reduced to that of a moderator/facilitator.
5. Action learning can be used both indoors (e.g., classroom, laboratory, office), outdoors (e.g., farm, food factory, kitchen, restaurant, hotel), and virtually (e.g., on different platforms).

The last section included ten statements and referred to ten different action-learning-specific methods students could practice during the ESP class. Learning methods like performing ***visioning exercises*** (e.g. *I can visualize a modern farm/the ideal food product and describe it in English*), ***organization of virtual trips*** (e.g. *I can watch a movie about an intensive farm/factory producing Parma ham and speak about it.*), ***game-based learning*** (e.g. *I can play, make strategies, and communicate with my group when playing Simplycycle* (board game based on environmental issues) and Cornucopia (internet game based on agricultural and environmental practices), ***engagement in problem solving*** (e.g. *I can find waste reduction solutions on a vegetal farm/local café and present the solutions in English*), ***role-playing*** (e.g. *I can act like a representative of a state institution/ consumer protection officer and have the dialogue in English*), ***co-learning within a group*** (e.g. *I can learn new things from my colleagues who are of different age, origin and background.*), practicing ***debate/dialogue*** (e.g. *I can have a dialogue in English with other colleagues in the group without judging their statements*), ***reflection exercises*** (e.g. *I can decide what went well and what went wrong during the class and provide feedback in English*), ***facilitator instead of***

a teacher (e.g. *I can learn ESP using action learning approach even if the teacher is not a professional in my field of study*), ***asking the right questions*** (e.g. *I can ask questions (in English) whose answers can lead me to the best solution*) are all types of activities that are specific to the action learning approach.

The two additional questions that the students had to answer at a later stage during the same workshop were:

- What would be the supporting forces when introducing the *action learning* approach in the ESP class?
- What would be the hindering forces when introducing the *action learning* approach in the ESP class?

These questions were introduced after the application of the questionnaire because the answers could make us better understand the way students think about possible supporting and hindering forces when applying the action learning methods, considering that the answers were in accordance with their intrinsic values, personality traits, and education received until that moment.

3. Discussions and Results

Starting from the first section of the questionnaire, it is recorded that 56 students were included in the study from two study programs (agriculture and food science), and they were distributed according to their gender, age, and origin, as in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic data of the students studying agriculture and food science

Study programme	No. of students	Gender		Age			Origin	
		female	male	18-28	29-39	40-50	rural	urban
Agriculture	32	11	21	25	3	4	25	7
Food science	24	24	-	22	2	-	14	10
Total	56	35	21	47	5	4	39	17

The results concerning the definition of the action learning approach and the identification of its most important characteristics are presented in **Table 2**.

Table 2 General knowledge on action learning

Crt. no.	Statements on action-learning approach	Average mean
1	In action learning, the participants select/are given some issues, analyze them, take some action, and reflect on that action.	4
2	Action learning helps learners to solve problems by asking the right questions.	3.88
3	Action learning involves “group-based learning.”	3.96
4	The role of the teacher is reduced to that of a moderator/facilitator.	3.77
5	Action learning can be used both indoors (e.g., classroom, laboratory, office), outdoors (e.g., farm, food factory, kitchen, restaurant, hotel), and virtually (e.g., on different platforms).	4.11
	General knowledge on action learning (5 questions)	3.94

The results regarding the preference shown by the students towards some action learning-specific methods that could also be used when teaching ESP are shown in descending order in Table 3.

Table 3 List of action learning-specific methods according to the preference level

Crt. no.	Statements	Average score
1.	Visioning exercises *I can visualize a modern farm/the ideal food product and describe it in English.*	4.73
2.	Organization of virtual trips *I can watch a movie about an intensive farm/factory producing Parma ham and speak about it.*	4.65
3.	Game-based learning *I can play, make strategies, and communicate with my group when playing board or virtual games (Cornucopia/Simplycycle).*	4.50
4.	Engagement in problem solving *I can find waste reduction solutions on a vegetal farm/local café and present the solutions in English.*	4.42
5.	Role-playing *I can act like a representative of a state institution/ consumer protection officer and have the dialogue in English.*	4.19
6.	Co-learning within a group *I can learn new things from my colleagues who are of different age, origin and background.*	4.11
7.	Debate/dialogue *I can have a dialogue in English with other colleagues in the group without judging their statements.*	4.03
8.	Reflection exercises *I can decide what went well and what went wrong during the class and provide feedback in English.*	3.98
9.	Facilitator instead of a teacher *I can learn ESP using action learning approach even if the teacher is not a professional in my field of study.*	3.80
10.	Asking the right questions *I can ask questions (in English) whose answers can lead me to the best solution.*	3.77

Thus, the lowest score of 3.77 is recorded by the statement that has in view *asking the right questions*. This score can be explained by the old practices of the Romanian educational system during communism when the students were seen as "recipients" of the information transmitted by the teacher, who is rather seen as a "source" of information. During communism, the students were not encouraged to ask questions, hence their fear of not "bothering" the teachers with questions. More than this, the situation perpetuated even after communism, and the students remained inefficient in asking the right questions. Even in the case of the foreign language classes, the emphasis was not precisely on communication and enrichment of vocabulary but on writing and learning grammar rules.

The highest score of 4.73 is recorded in the case of *visioning methods*. This is a surprising score for an educational system that has never encouraged or practiced methods meant to stimulate imagination, creativity, and innovation. There is an acute need for visioning exercises in both fields. On the one hand, farmers try to find solutions to produce food in more sustainable and creative ways due to the high level of pollution around the world and the increasing population on the globe; on the other hand, the food industry which tries to improve the quality of the present food products, come up with new food products capable of supporting and improving the human health (functional food), but also with finding solutions to prevent the food waste.

The following preferred methods, in descending order, make reference to the *organization of virtual trips* on farms or food factories with a score of 4.65, *game-based learning* by using different mobile applications or board games with a score of 4.50, *engagement in problem-solving* and finding solutions for farmers or food companies with a score of 4.42, *role-playing* (acting as stakeholders in agriculture and food industry) with a score of 4.19, *co-learning within a group of students with a score of* 4.11. The high scores in these situations can be explained by the students' familiarity with these methods during the ESP class. Starting with the first semester of ESP, the students are exposed to learning activities in groups of 3-4 persons in different contexts: filling in an observation sheet after watching a short movie about the way different food products are produced or after a virtual visit on a family farm; writing a short report on the solution/s found to different problem/s; acting like a food inspector or farmer; playing Simplycycle board game that has in view to increase the student's awareness on the dangerous materials found in different food packages.

The *debate/dialogue*, *reflection exercises*, and the *transformation of a teacher into a facilitator* have recorded low scores. The result of 4.03 in the case of the *debate/dialogue* can be explained by the fact that students have not practiced dialogue as a non-judgmental form of communication but rather as a simple form of communication.

The other two results, the organization of some reflection moments (3.98) and transformation of the teacher into a moderator/facilitator (3.80) represent the resistance to change that any person experiences when exposed to something new and does not know how to deal with it. The reflection was never part of the activities organized in any classroom in the Romanian educational system, even if it has started to be very valued lately. In the same manner, it is difficult for a student to accept the transformation of a teacher into a facilitator, meaning that the teacher is no longer a source of information but a person who guides the students in their learning process.

Behind these methods, there is an interesting association with skill development that is so needed in the future specialists in the agriculture and food industry. Having a closer look at these methods, it can be stated that they could all lead to the formation or improvement of some competencies such as observation, communication, reflection, visioning/creativity, dialogue, problem-solving, critical thinking, co-learning, and facilitation. Thus, asking the students to think about the ideal food product and describe it by making reference to all their senses (color, size, smell, texture and taste) can be an excellent visioning exercise meant to support the students by bringing elements of innovation in the process of new food products design alongside with the development of their technical vocabulary. Alternatively, the organization of a virtual trip on a farm where the students can observe the daily activities of the farmer, the animals raised or crops cultivated within the farm, and the problems the farmers must solve to make their activity more efficient, accompanied by an observation sheet delivered in advance by the teacher, could enhance the observation competence of

the students and in the same time the capacity of the student to communicate all these ideas in English.

According to the group of agro-ecologists from the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU) (Lieblein et al., 2012) who were also actively involved in the Nextfood project, competencies such as observation, reflection, visioning, dialogue, and participation are vital in preparing the next generation of professionals at a European and global level. To a great extent, these competencies overlap with a framework for key competencies in academic education in sustainability developed by Wiek et al. (Wiek et al. 2011).

Thus, the association of certain types of activities with the competencies they may develop can open up new paths for further research. Consequently, the ESP teachers can develop new learning materials that can support the development or further enhancement of the most relevant key competencies for the sectors wherein the students will perform after they enter the labor force.

The answers to the two additional questions regarding the supporting and hindering forces are relevant for identifying the main prerequisites of introducing learning methods specific to the action learning approach in the ESP class. They are both important because the supporting forces will indicate all those factors that trigger the change and facilitate the implementation of the action learning. In contrast, the hindering forces are those forces that prevent the change due to several factors that may block the whole process.

The students offer a diversity of examples concerning the supporting forces ranging from general observations (relaxed and informal atmosphere, nice setup of the classroom, desire to change something) to more specific ones (time for discussions and reflection, shifting from a passive to an active role, willingness to try new ways of learning/working/teaching methods).

All the answers collected from the students have been summarized in the list below. It includes ideas ranging from the physical description of the environment (place, time, atmosphere) to the need for change triggered by a state of open-mindedness, interactive dialogue among participants, shifting from a passive to an active role, and trying new ways of learning/teaching.

Supporting forces:

- relaxed and informal atmosphere;
- dialogue within an interactive group;
- time for discussions, analysis, exploration, and reflection;
- material/scientific/technical support from teachers/ facilitators;
- desire to change something;
- use different methods and materials to reach goals;
- all students summarize their learning at the end of the lessons after a reflective moment;
- being willing to participate;
- shifting from a passive to an active role;
- being part of a change process in the field;
- accepting open-mindedness;
- willingness to try out new ways of learning/teaching;
- organization of a classroom to have a space that allows cooperative and group work.

The hindering forces could also be identified in opposition to the supporting forces. This time, the students were more specific in identifying the hindering forces, and they made reference to infrastructure, teachers stuck in old practices, the need for more specific methods

in the case of teaching ESP, and the need for sufficient content knowledge of the ESP teacher. The complete list of the hindering forces can be read below.

Hindering forces

- lack of time for reflection due to the complex and stuffed syllabus/curriculum and interruptions in the class;
- poor infrastructure;
- some teachers are stuck in old practices/methods/ information;
- our educational system does not have the strings to be pulled in order to implement the action learning concept;
- difficulty in organizing field trips (many approvals and signatures required, lack of money);
- some methods cannot be applied in ESP, especially those that should be organized outside or in the lab, but visioning exercises or virtual trips can replace them;
- difficulty in bringing in relevant stakeholders during an ESP class;
- not all the students have the same level of proficiency in English;
- taking responsibility for their learning process;
- accepting uncertainty, complexity, incomplete knowledge;
- ESP teachers might not have enough content knowledge;
- stepping out of the comfort zone – facilitator/teacher;
- class size;
- Curriculum materials (syllabus, handouts, textbooks, teacher's guide) do not follow the action learning approach.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The findings suggest that the students understand the notion of action learning intuitively, being able to identify the most important characteristics of this approach (problem-solving, taking action, reflection, collaborative learning, asking the right questions, different learning environments, transformation of the teacher in a facilitator), fact that makes us confident in the easy transfer of some action learning methods to the ESP class.

Among the ten experiential learning methods, visioning exercises, virtual trips, games, and problem-solving are the most preferred learning methods. In opposition, the organization of reflection moments, the transformation of the teacher into a facilitator, and asking the right questions are the least popular due to the students' resistance to change and lack of familiarity with the respective situations.

In addition to the information collected from the students, as regards their preference or lack of preference for specific learning methods, the supporting and hindering forces needed to make the desired change represent a valuable indicator for the teacher on how to proceed and deal with the challenges in the planning phase of the ESP lessons. They also represent a starting point, or the prerequisites, for designing ESP materials, which could be suitable when applying the action learning approach.

At a more general level, these forces highlight the need for change from traditional to more specific and efficient educational approaches/methods and the barriers that could slow down or even stop the respective shift.

Further studies can be planned based on the possible differences between the students attending the two study programs due to their gender, origin, and age group. A different

research direction could highlight the interconnection between the learning activity type and the competence it could develop or enhance (e.g., observation, visioning, reflection, dialogue, collaborative learning).

REFERENCES

Benson, P. *Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Longman. 2001.

Bonwell, Charles C. and Eison, A. James. *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development. 1991.

Chickering, W. Arthur and Gamson, F. Zelda. "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education". *AAHE Bulletin*, (March 1987): 3-7

Collins, W. John and O'Brien, Nancy Patricia. *The Greenwood Dictionary of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood. 2003.

Day, V. David. "Leadership development." *Leadership Quarterly 11*, (2000): 581-613.

Dewey, John. *Experience & Education*. Collier Books: New York, USA. 1938.

Dudley-Evans, T & St John. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge University Press.1998.

Hull, M. (2004). *Changing the paradigm for medical English language teaching*. International Symposium of English for Medical Purposes, Xi'an, China. 2005. < http://www.usingenglish.com/teachers/articles/whose-needs-are-weserving.html> (21.07.2023)

Hutchinson, T., and Waters, A.. *English for Specific Purposes: A learning centered approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Javid, C. Z. (2011b). "Saudi medical undergraduates' perceptions of their preferred learning styles and evaluation techniques." *Arab World English Journal*, Vol.2, No. 2, (2011b): 40-70. <http://www.awej.org/awejfiles/_77_6_8.pdf> (21.07.2023)

Johns, A.; Dudley-Evans, T. "English for Specific Purposes: International in Scope, specific in purpose." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 2, (1991): 297-314.

Kolb, A. David. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Koo, L. C. "Learning Action Learning". *Journal of Workplace Learning* Vol. 11, No. 3. (1999): 89-94

Lieblein, Geir, Breland, T. Arvid, Francis, Charles and Ostergaard, Edvin. "Agroecology Education: Action-oriented Learning and Research". *J. Agric. Educ. Ext*. 18, (2012): 27–40.

Milevica B. "Teaching Foreign Language for Specific Purposes: Teacher Development." *31stAnnual Association of Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE) Conference*, Serbia. <http://www.pef.unilj.si/atee/978-961-6637-06-0/487-493.pdf > (21.07.2023)

Mackay, R. and Mountford, A. (eds.). English for Specific Purposes. London: Longman.1978.

Raelin, A. Joseph. "Action Learning and Action Science: Are They Different?"

Organizational Dynamics Vol. 26, No. 1, (1997): 21-34

Raelin, R. "Preface". *Management Learning, 30*, (1999): 115-125.

Revans, W. Reginald. *ABC of Action Learning. Empowering Managers to Act and Learn from Action*. Lemos and Crane. UK., 1998.

Reynolds, Michael, and Vince, Russ. "Critical management education and action-based learning". *Academy of Management Learning & Education 3*, (2004): 442-456.

Sandelands, E. "Creating an online library to support a virtual learning community" *Internat Research: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy* Vol. 8, No. 1, (1998): 75-80

Wiek, Arnim, Withycombe, Lauren Keeler and Redman, L. Charles. "Key competencies in sustainability: A reference framework for academic program development". *Sustain. Sci*. 6, (2011): 203–218.

ANNEX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE ON USING ACTION LEARNING METHODS IN THE ESP CLASSES

PART A. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

GENDER:	MALE	FEMALE	DON'T KNOW
ORIGIN:	URBAN AREA		RURAL AREA
AGE GROUP:	18-28	29-39	40-49
STUDY PROGRAM:	AGRICULTURE		FOOD SCIENCE

PART B – GENERAL KNOWLEDGE ON ACTION LEARNING APPROACH

Crt. no.	Statements on action-learning approach	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree/nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	In action learning, the participants select/are given some issues, analyze them, take some action, and reflect on that action.					
2.	Action learning helps learners to solve problems by asking the right questions.					
3.	Action learning involves "group-based learning."					
4.	The role of the teacher is reduced to that of a moderator/facilitator.					
5.	Action learning can be used both indoors (e.g., classroom, laboratory, office), outdoors (e.g., farm, food factory, kitchen, restaurant, hotel), and virtually (e.g., on different platforms).					

*The scale used is from 1 to 5 (5 = strongly agree, 4 =agree, 3=neither agree/nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1= strongly disagree).

PART C- ACTION LEARNING METHODS

Crt. no.	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree/nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	*I can visualize a modern farm/the ideal food product and describe it in English.*					
2.	*I can watch a movie about an intensive farm/factory producing Parma ham and speak about it.*					
3.	*I can play, make strategies, and communicate with my group when playing board or virtual games(Cornucopia/Simplycycle).*					
4.	*I can find waste reduction solutions on a vegetal farm/local café and present the solutions in English.*					
5.	*I can act like a representative of a state institution/ consumer protection officer and have the dialogue in English.*					
6.	*I can learn new things from my colleagues who are of different age, origin and background.*					
7.	*I can have a dialogue in English with other colleagues in the group without judging their statements.*					
8.	*I can decide what went well and what went wrong during the class and provide feedback in English.*					
9.	*I can learn ESP using action learning approach even if the teacher is not a professional in my field of study.*					
10.	*I can ask questions (in English) whose answers can lead me to the best solution.*					

*The scale used is from 1 to 5 (5 = strongly agree, 4 =agree, 3=neither agree/nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1= strongly disagree).