17th International Scientific Conference 2025

Sessions of the Faculty of Education

https://doi.org/10.36007/5390.2026.205

DELIVERING AN ESP COURSE IN LECTURE FORMAT CHALLENGES OF TEACHING BUSINESS ENGLISH AT BUEB

Erika HUSZÁR[46], Katalin KISS[47], Károly POLCZ[48], Marianna VÁLÓCZI[49]

ABSTRACT

The Department of International Business Languages at Budapest University of Economics and Business (BUEB) — recently restructured and renamed as the Office of Languages for Specific Purposes— has traditionally offered a wide range of ESP (English for Specific Purposes) courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Since the establishment of the Department, all ESP courses have been conducted in seminar format. In 2024, a new course titled English for Business and Social Studies was introduced as part of an initiative to expand ESP offerings to involve more students in language classes. Uniquely, this was the first course in the department's history to be delivered primarily in the form of lectures. The present study aims to critically evaluate the effectiveness of lecture-based instruction in ESP courses and argues that such a format is fundamentally incompatible with the specific requirements of ESP learners.

KEYWORDS

ESP, lecture method, Budapest University of Economics and Business, learner needs, pedagogical effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

The demand for teaching and learning English — particularly English for Specific Purposes (ESP) — has remained high for many years, especially within universities, where ESP plays a key role not only in communication but also in academic and professional development. However, in an effort to reduce costs, many universities, typically in Eastern European countries, including institutions in Hungary, have recently begun replacing traditional small-group seminar formats with large lecture-based courses. While the latter approach may be more cost-effective, it raises concerns about the pedagogical effectiveness of lectures in meeting the specific needs of ESP learners.

At Budapest University of Economics and Business, a new course titled *English for Business and Social Studies* was introduced as part of an initiative to broaden the ESP curriculum, primarily to attract a larger number of students. In its pilot year, the course was delivered in the form of lectures, supplemented by a small part of interactive tasks.

[46] Dr. Erika Huszár, Budapest University of Economics and Business, erika.huszar@uni-bge.hu
[47] Dr. Katalin Kiss, Budapest University of Economics and Business, katalin.kiss@uni-bge.hu
[48] Dr. Károly Polcz, Budapest University of Economics and Business, karoly.polcz@uni-bge.hu
[49] Dr. Marianna Válóczi, Budapest University of Economics and Business, marianna.valoczi@uni-bge.hu

Although the lecture method has been commonly used in higher education for a long time, its effectiveness in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses has been increasingly questioned in the literature. The present paper aims to critically evaluate the effectiveness of lecturing in ESP contexts, drawing on the experience of teaching the above-mentioned course, and to support the lecturers' view that a lecture-based format is poorly suited (if at all) to the specific needs of ESP learners.

LITERATURE REVIEW

ESP learners often have different levels of English proficiency and need language support that is closely matched to their academic or professional fields. To be effective, teaching in these settings should be learner-centered, based on specific needs, and flexible. However, the lecture format often overlooks these key principles. As Hyland (2006) points out, ESP works best when it includes interactive, task-based, and genre-focused activities that address learners' real-world communication needs. Lectures, by contrast, often rely on extended teacher talk with limited opportunities for student engagement, making it difficult to recognise and respond to learners' immediate difficulties.

Let us first consider the major characteristics of ESP courses as defined by Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) to better understand the frameworks within which such courses can be taught. 1. ESP is defined to meet specific needs of the learners; 2. ESP makes use of underlying methodology and activities of the discipline it serves; 3. ESP is centered on the language appropriate to these activities in terms of grammar, lexis, register, study skills, discourse and genre. These characteristics are referred to as absolute characteristics of an ESP course. In essence, the first point means that needs analysis is essential before designing an ESP course. The teacher must understand the learners' purpose for studying the language, i.e., whether it is for business writing, reading academic articles, participating in meetings, or other specific purposes. Teaching thus should be goal- oriented. The content, skills, and assessment must be tailored to learners' academic or professional goals. The second point implies that teaching should reflect how communication happens in the target field. For instance, medical students may require understanding of patient interviews, while business students might need to analyse case studies or give presentations. ESP teachers must become familiar with the discourse and practices of the relevant disciplines to select appropriate activities and texts. And, finally, the third point suggests that while teaching ESP, an instructor should pay attention to such details as vocabulary, grammar and functions which are not taught in isolation but rather as they are used in specific professional and academic contexts. Teaching ESP must target the specific language patterns, terminology and text structures that learners will encounter and need to produce in their field. All these characteristics emphasize that ESP is not just about teaching English, but it is about preparing learners to use English effectively in specific academic, professional, or vocational settings. Consequently, ESP teachers must customize content and methodology to learner needs; incorporate authentic, discipline-relevant materials and tasks, and teach language and skills in context, not in isolation.

Based on the framework established by Dudley-Evans (1997), it becomes evident that delivering *English for Business and Social Studies* course in a lecture format was pedagogically inappropriate. One of the key challenges the lecturers experienced was the large class size –often reaching 85 to 100 students – which made it impossible to conduct a meaningful needs analysis, which is a core requirement in ESP course design. Furthermore, the groups of students were highly heterogeneous, comprising learners from different academic backgrounds such as International Economics, International Relations, and Communication and Media. This diversity in disciplinary

knowledge and language proficiency levels meant that a one-size-fits-all lecture format could not address the specific linguistic and professional needs of each group. According to Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), effective ESP teaching relies heavily on feedback, interaction, and adaptability – elements that are essential in seminars but largely absent in large-scale lecture environments. The inability to tailor materials, assess student needs, or adapt teaching to discipline-specific contexts directly contradicts the principles of ESP pedagogy. Consequently, the lecture format failed to provide students the personalized, needs-based teaching that the course required.

Let us explore how ESP teaching has been addressed in other studies. The necessity to conduct needs analysis before designing ESP courses is also highlighted in Flowerdew's (1994) research. Although the research does not focus exclusively on ESP teaching, it provides important insights into the challenges of lecture comprehension in academic settings. Flowerdew (1994) emphasizes that academic lectures require complex processing skills, including listening, understanding structure, note-taking, and distinguishing main ideas from supporting details. For learners with limited proficiency in English this can be overwhelming. As the researcher further notes, language proficiency affects lecture comprehension. Students with lower English proficiency struggle to follow lectures, especially due to fast speech rate, unfamiliar vocabulary, use of discourse markers and implicit referencing. These difficulties make lectures a less effective way to teach students who need targeted language support, which is central to ESP courses. Overall, needs analysis is crucial to tailor content to learners' academic or professional contexts. "Any programme in academic listening should begin with a detailed needs analysis of the students' future academic requirements and current listening abilities." (Flowerdew, 1994, p.14). Flowerdew's (1994) work points out that teaching ESP through lectures can be problematic because it usually doesn't meet students' language level, way of thinking, or subject-specific needs.

Another research by Basturkmen (2010) also supports the viewpoint that ESP is most effective when it is discipline-specific – something lectures cannot adequately provide when students have mixed professional or academic goals. As he notes, "the diversity of disciplines within a class can pose problems for the ESP teacher in selecting course content that is relevant to all learners" (Basturkmen, 2010, p.62). Another significant point that Basturkmen highlights is that "ESP teaching tends to be learner-centered rather than teacher-centered" (Basturkmen, 2010, p.19). This again reinforces that a lecture format**,** which is inherently teacher-centered, conflicts with the pedagogical values of ESP.

Additional challenge that learners of ESP frequently encounter is the lack of solid knowledge in their fields of study The lecturer's limited understanding of individual students' subject-specific knowledge and their English proficiency can result in mismatches between instructional content and learner needs. This mismatch between lecture style and EAP (English for Academic Purposes) pedagogy is mentioned in the study carried out by Hamp-Lyons (2001). As the researcher argues, EAP instruction should focus on preparing students for the academic communication tasks they will encounter such as writing essays, participating in seminars, and giving presentations, which cannot be effectively taught through passive listening. "EAP must be closely aligned with the actual academic tasks that students must perform." (Hamp-Lyons, 2001, p.127). This means that in a traditional lecture, students are often passive recipients rather than active users of language, which limits opportunities for practicing those essential academic tasks. As for the tasks, "students need to be able to analyze and produce academic discourse, not simply be exposed to it." (Hamp-Lyons, 2001,p.128). However, lectures expose students to content but do

not provide them the step-by-step support they need to become confident users of academic English.

Pedagogical evidence also supports the shift from lecture-based ESP instruction toward more interactive formats. For example, Tatzl (2013), investigating English-medium master's programmes at an Australian university of applied sciences, highlights the pedagogical mismatch between lecture-based teaching and the language needs of non-native speakers. Among the key pedagogical challenges, the researcher mentions limited language support in lectures, explaining that lectures often prioritize content delivery over language scaffolding, leaving ESP learners struggling to follow complex academic input in English. As he notes, "students frequently expressed a need for more interactive and supportive learning environments rather than pure content transmission." (Tatzl, 2013, p. 256).

Another important aspect that underscores the disadvantages of using lectures for ESP courses is the cognitive overload. Students often struggle with the mental load of learning complex subject matter in a foreign language, especially when lectures are fast-paced. The results of investigation carried out by Tatzl (2013) showed that engineering students in ESP settings benefited significantly more from collaborative project-based learning and discussions than from lectures, as these methods enhanced their ability to apply language in authentic professional contexts. Similarly, studies by Anthony (2018) demonstrate that corpus-based and genre-based approaches essential to modern ESP pedagogy require active engagement with texts and tasks that lectures simply do not offer. Talking about the major challenges of ESP delivered in lecture format, the researcher mentions lack of individualization. As Anthony (2018) notes, lectures typically deliver general content to large groups, making it difficult to adapt to learners' specific language needs related to their field or profession. "ESP courses must be tailored to the specific goals, backgrounds, and proficiencies of the learners." (Anthony, 2018, p. 12). Also, a difficulty addressing genre-specific language is mentioned as an additional disadvantage of lectures. Anthony (2018) addresses the importance of genre awareness in ESP and the need for active listening saying that "ESP courses often focus on developing learners' awareness of the rhetorical structures and language features typical of the genres they are expected to produce or interpret in their specific fields" (Anthony 2018, p. 11). This supports the idea that genre-specific learning requires focused attention on discourse structures and functions, which is difficult to achieve in a traditional lecture format where students are passive listeners rather than active analysts or producers of texts.

All of the above observations clearly demonstrate that while lectures can be useful for teaching content to advanced learners with similar backgrounds, they are often not suitable for ESP courses, where students have different needs and require more targeted language support. The inherent limitations of the lecture format including its low interactivity, one-sided communication, and lack of adaptability to individual learner needs render it an ineffective and outdated strategy for ESP instruction.

In the next section of this study, we will present our findings based on lecturers' experience at Budapest University of Economics and Business in teaching *the English for Business and Social Sciences* course. These insights reflect the challenges and strategies involved in delivering ESP course in a lecture-based format.

DESCRIPTION OF *THE ENGLISH FOR BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES* COURSE AT THE BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

As indicated in the introduction, the subject was introduced in the first or autumn semester of the 2024/25 academic year, primarily to first year students as a mandatory course. More senior students, however, could also take it up as an elective course, or as a way of getting exemption from the language exam requirement. Meeting the latter requirement is a prerequisite for obtaining their degree. Those starting their studies from the 2024/25 academic year are no longer required to take a state language exam.

As the plan for the new course was only shared with the Office of Languages for Specific Purposes at the beginning of August 2024, the concerned instructors held an emergency meeting, put together a syllabus and divided the topics among us. We all developed PPT-s on the assigned topics and shared these materials with each other. During the semester we also all developed exam questions on the same topics.

The brevity of time did not allow for a needs analysis – also, we were convinced that the incoming student cohort will be so diverse that it could only be of very limited use. Our students are arriving with very different language skills, with different cultural backgrounds -we have a lot of students from South-East Asia, China, or Central Asia. At the university they are majoring in four areas: international economics, marketing, international relations and communications and media. Consequently, we decided to apply a content or topic-based approach, focusing on the vocabulary of such issues that are likely to be useful for all our students.

The management also had certain requests regarding the content of the course, for example, asked for the inclusion of an introduction to university life, and for the discussion of cultural differences. The syllabus finally included the following topics:

Week 1. Introduction to university life (the admission process, lectures and seminars, academic ranks, approaching instructors, etc.)

Week 2. Basic (macro)economic concepts. Interpreting and analysing graphs/charts/figures.

Week 3. Oral presentations in business.

Week 4. Communication in business (digital/oral communication), negotiation; intercultural differences in business

Week 5. Basic concepts of marketing, marketing communication

Week 6. Brands; online marketing, markets, e-commerce

Week 7. Globalisation, sustainability

Week 8. Job search, HR, workplace communication

Week 9. Business events; exhibitions, fairs, conferences, event management, networking

Week 10. Companies: operation, forms, types and documents

Week 11. Basic financial concepts; banking system, stock exchange

Week 12. Revision

Each topic was to be covered during a 90-minute session and we had one session per week. The part-time students covered the topics in four clusters on four Saturdays.

In addition to sharing the same syllabus we also tried to harmonise our teaching methods. All our classes included an introduction to the topic done by the lecturer, the detailed PPTs of which were shared with the students after the class. Although we focused on vocabulary building, we tried to achieve this goal in a multifaceted way, so when time allowed, we also watched relevant videos, read topical business news, had discussions, and did extra vocab building exercises, e.g. matching business terms with their definitions. The classes often started or were finished with Kahoot tests to revise the key vocabulary we discussed.

The course ended with a written exam, which, due to the large number of students, was computer-based and consisted of multiple choice, true -false or matching questions, tasks. If they fail an exam, the students are entitled to take the exam two more times at BUEB.

METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

At the end of the 2024/25 academic year's spring semester, one of the authors compiled a questionnaire of 20 questions, and asked the other four lecturers of the subject to fill it in.
The first question regarded the lecturers experience in ESP Business English teaching – all five of us taught the subject for more than 20 years.

At question 2 we put down how many lecture courses we did during the two semesters of the 2024/25 academic year. Two teachers did 4-4 courses and one of us 2 courses and two of us 1-1 course only. These figures include the 2 courses offered for part-time ("correspondence") students as well, of which we had one in the first semester and one in the second semester. We progressed with putting down our opinions regarding the syllabus. On a 1-5 scale, three lecturers rated their satisfaction with the topic selection of the syllabus with a 3, two of us gave a 4.

Two lecturers suggested the omission of the Introduction to university life topic (topic 1), claiming that it has neither relevant vocabulary, nor content. Four lecturers would omit the communication in business topic (topic 4), as there is a separate negotiation skills course which includes the introduction and discussion of cultural differences, while communication skills cannot be taught in a lecture format. Instead, four lecturers would devote more time to the remaining business topics, while one of us would add mergers and acquisitions as an extra topic, since such issues are very often discussed by the media.

Question 6-11 inquired about the reception of the various task types that we used. According to two lecturers the Kahoot tests were the best received element as the students always enjoy games, one lecturer found the videos and their discussions most popular, one lecturer said that the students paid most attention to the PPT-based introduction, one lecturer saw that the vocab building tasks held the students' attention the most.

Unfortunately, there was no activity without drawbacks. Although generally popular, there were students in every group who did not even log into the Kahoot tests. In very group, some students were apparently just gazing at the introductory PPTs and few reacted to the instructor's occasional questions. As for the discussion of business news, there was little time for them, the reading part was usually assigned as homework, but most of the students who did make the effort found the subsequent discussions enjoyable and useful. The watching and discussion of videos was also problematic because of the varying language levels – for many students one viewing was not enough to grasp the meaning. Because of this, four lecturers only included 1- 2 videos in the course. Finally, the extra vocabulary building exercises (gap filling activities, matching tasks, etc.) were integrated by all of us into the course, with relative success. To save time, after allowing some time for the task, the lecturers shared the answers and answered the upcoming questions.

Question twelve inquired about the possible advantages of the lecture format over the seminar format. None of us could mention any such advantage. As one of us put it, we tried to apply the methodology of communicative language teaching to a lecture of 70-100 people, which is like squaring the circle. When asked about the difficulties of the format, we all stated that the varying language levels created too serious an obstacle. Moreover, as most of the students were freshmen, they often lacked the necessary professional background. In addition, although the international relations or communication and media majors' line of study includes few business topics, they also had to complete the course.

Questions 14 and 15 inquired about the success rates of students.

The following table summarises the exam results of the students of three of the authors of the current paper. (The other two lecturers left the Office of Languages for Specific Purposes at the end of semester I and semester II. They did not share their students' results with us but answered all the other questions of the questionnaire. They only did one-one course.)

Table 1. Exam results of the English for Business and Social Sciences course in the 2024/25 academic year

teacher/ group	number of students	failed for firts time	failed for first time (%)	failed	failed (%)	5 for first atttempt	5 for first attempt (%)	5 on retake	5 on retake (%)	didn't take the exam	didn't take the exam (%)
A I/1	80	35	43.8%	18	22.5%	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	9	11.3%
A I/2	77	29	37.7%	15	19.5%	2	2.6%	1	1.3%	7	9.1%
A II/1	93	42	45.2%	14	15.1%	4	4.3%	2	2.2%	8	8.6%
A II/2	79	33	41.8%	13	16.5%	4	5.1%	0	0.0%	3	3.8%
B I/1	80	33	41.3%	11	13.8%	3	3.8%	0	0.0%	2	2.5%
B I/2 part-time	55	3	5.5%	2	3.6%	10	18.2%	0	0.0%	11	20.0%
B II/1	93	23	34.7%	13	14.0%	3	3.2%	2	2.2%	6	6.5%
B II/2 part-time	105	24	22.9%	2	1.9%	11	10.5%	3	2.9%	4	3.8%
C I/1	71	29	40.8%	12	16.9%	3	4.2%	5	7.0%	4	5.6%
C II/1	96	41	42.7%	11	11.5%	2	2.1%	6	6.3%	3	3.1%

The first column of the table contains the code of the instructor (A, B or C) and in which semester of the academic year the course was held (semester I. or II.). As is apparent from the table, an unprecedented number of students failed the written exam for the first time. With the exception of the autumn semester's part-time group, the failure rate neared or even exceeded 40%. (The autumn part-time group asked for extra consultation occasions and practice tests and was tested on a limited material to avoid extreme results. The instructor was convinced that the language level of most students necessitated this approach.) It needs to be emphasised that a failure rate of 40% was unheard of at our department when the subject was taught in a seminar format.

Due to the possibility of multiple exam attempts, the final failure rate was considerably lower in each group, between 11.5% and 22.5 %, the part -time courses again benefiting from the already described more lenient approach.

Another striking phenomenon is the low number of fives, the highest grade in the Hungarian school system. With the exception of the part-time courses again, we had low one-digit results when calculating the percentage of fives achieved on the first exam attempt. Interestingly,

a few of those that failed their first or second exam attempt got fives finally, which can only be explained with the initial lack of motivation on the student's part.

In each group, some students didn't even try to take the exam, their number, proportion increasing further the number of those who could not complete the course. As is visible from the table, avoiding the exam was a popular choice in the autumn part-time group again (20%).

It is apparent from the table that the differences in results are primarily explainable with the full-time or part-time form of the course, and not with differences in teaching methods or the instructors' attitudes.

Despite our efforts, we all observed declining attendance during the course. Lower attendance, however, allowed for the use of more interactive teaching methods, e.g., we had more discussions. This shift considerably increased the interest and motivation of the persevering students, many of whom expressed their gratitude for the opportunity to speak, to practice the language.

All in all, it seems that too many of our students were satisfied with mediocre results on the exam, we could not motivate them to gain real in-depth knowledge of the discussed topics, or to broaden their vocabulary in these fields. For too many students the course proved to be an unsurmountable obstacle, they failed the exam or did not even try to pass it.

Questions 18-19 inquired about recurring patterns, positive or negative remarks in student evaluations. No such patterns were mentioned by any of us, but noticeable was the students' unwillingness to rate the course.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to analyse the pedagogical effectiveness of delivering an ESP course in lecture format, using the case of *the English for Business and Social Studies course* at the Budapest University of Economics and Business. By examining both theoretical perspectives and practical teaching experience, the study sought to evaluate whether lectures can adequately address the specific needs of ESP learners.

The findings clearly indicate that the lecture-based approach is misaligned with the core principles of ESP teaching and fails to provide the learner-focused support required in such contexts. The introduction of the abovementioned course in the lecture format for first-year students in the 2024/25 academic year revealed significant challenges and limitations despite the instructors' extensive experience in ESP teaching.

While lectures may serve as an efficient means of content delivery in large-scale academic contexts, they fail to address the central features of ESP: needs-based course design, interactivity, and discipline-specific language support. Both the theoretical frameworks of Dudley-Evans, Hyland, Basturkmen, Hamp-Lyons, Anthony, and others, as well as the practical experience of the lecturers involved in the pilot course, support the conclusion that ESP is most effective when taught in interactive, flexible, and learner-centered formats. Large lecture classes, by contrast, position students primarily as passive listeners rather than active learners, overlooking their diverse academic backgrounds, different levels of English proficiency, and specific communication needs.

The pilot course at BUEB thus underscores the importance of aligning instructional format with the pedagogical requirements of ESP. Instead of trying to force ESP principles into a lecture format**,** institutions should prioritize seminar-based, task-oriented, and genre-focused approaches that allow for active participation, feedback, and practical, field-related learning. Such formats not only promote higher levels of engagement but also prepare learners more effectively for the academic and professional communication tasks they will encounter. Finally, the experience of

teaching course at BUEB may serve as a cautionary example for universities considering cost-saving lecture-based courses in ESP, reminding that curriculum design should prioritize student learning and needs over cost-saving measures.

The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. High first-attempt failure rates indicate that the lecture format was not well suited to achieving strong learning outcomes for a diverse group of students with different language skills and professional backgrounds. With failure rates near or above 40% in most full-time groups, the course presented a major challenge for many students.
2. While the syllabus covered a broad range of business topics, including vocabulary-building exercises, Kahoot games, videos, and discussions, the diversity in student proficiency levels and prior knowledge limited the effectiveness of these methods. Part-time students benefitted from a more tailored approach (limited material, extra consultation), which resulted in markedly better outcomes.
3. Low attendance and the observation that many students were satisfied with mediocre results highlight the challenge of motivating first-year students to actively engage in learning and acquire deeper knowledge. Interactive elements, where possible, increased engagement among more motivated students but were insufficient to overcome the overall limitations of the lecture format.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the study suggests that large-group lecture formats may not be appropriate for highly diverse groups of students in ESP courses, particularly for first-year students with limited prior knowledge of business topics. Smaller groups, more individualized support, and a greater focus on communicative and interactive methods could improve learning outcomes. Focusing on core business vocabulary, using more targeted interactive activities, and offering part-time or seminar-style classes could improve student performance and motivation. Preparatory or bridging courses could also help reduce differences in language proficiency.

REFERENCES

Anthony, L. (2018). *Introducing English for specific purposes*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351031189

Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00026-5

Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2001). English for academic purposes. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 126–130). Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Tatzl, D. (2013). English-medium master's programmes at an Austrian university of applied sciences: Attitudes, experiences and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*(4), 248–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.07.003

APPENDIX
Questionnaire

1. **How long have you taught business English?**
2. **How many *English for Business and Social Sciences* courses have you held?**
3. **Overall, on a 1-5 scale, how satisfied are you with the topics discussed (the topics in the syllabus)?**
4. **What topic/s would you add to the syllabus and why?**
5. **Which topic/s would you omit from the syllabus and why?**
6. **Which part of the classes do you think the students liked the most?**
    - the lecturer's PPT-based introduction to the topic
    - the discussion of news/articles related to the topic
    - the videos and the related tasks
    - the Kahoot tests
    - further vocab building exercises. e.g. matching terms with their definitions
    - there was no significant difference in their reception
    - none
    - reception was different in every group.
7. **Describe in a few sentences your experience with the following element of the course: Your PPT-based introduction to the topic.** (How was it received by the students, how effective did you find it as a teaching method, etc.)
8. **Describe in a few sentences your experience with the following element of the course: the discussion of news/articles related to the topic.** (How was it received by the students, how effective did you find it as a teaching method, etc.)
9. **Describe in a few sentences your experience with the following element of the course: the discussion of videos related to the topic.** (How was it received by the students, how effective did you find it as a teaching method, etc.)
10. **Describe in a few sentences your experience with the following element of the course: the Kahoot test.** (How was it received by the students, how effective did you find it as a teaching method, etc.)
11. **Describe in a few sentences your experience with the following element of the course: further vocab building exercises. e.g. matching terms with their definitions.** (How was it received by the students, how effective did you find it as a teaching method, **etc.)**

12. **In your opinion, did the lecture format have any advantages compared to the seminar format we previously used in Business English teaching?**
13. **What was the main difficulty for you during the course(s)?**
14. **What percentage of your students successfully completed the course (received at least a passing grade) on the first attempt?** In the case of several courses, please enter the percentage for each course. (You can check this in the courses section in Neptun.)
15. **What percentage of your students successfully completed the course (received at least a pass on the first, second or third attempt)?** In the case of several courses, please enter the percentage for each course. (You can check this in the courses section in Neptun.)
16. **What percentage of your students got an excellent (5) grade for each course on the first attempt?**
17. **What percentage of your students got an excellent (5) grade for each course on the second and third attempt?**
18. **How did the students rate the course? Have you noticed a significant difference in the student evaluations, whether positive or negative, compared to previous Business English courses held in the seminar format?**
19. **Were there any recurring elements in the text-based student evaluations? (Something that several students evaluated as positive or negative.) If so, what?**
20. **If you have any further comments regarding the teaching of the *English for Business and Social Sciences* courses in lecture format, please write it here.**