

APPRAISING THE IMPACTS OF BUSINESS ENGLISH ON BENINESE LEARNERS' LINGUISTIC PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY OF UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM AND ISM-ADONAI

Servais Dieu-Donné Yédia Dadjo

Maître de Conférences, FLASH Adjarra, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Laboratoire GRAD, Bénin. 03 PB 3621 Cotonou. Tél : 00229 01 97 09 52 79

Mail : dadservais@gmail.com

Abstract

This research work assesses the impacts of business English on Beninese learners' linguistic performance in light of Krashen (1982)'s second/foreign language acquisition/learning theory. The paper stresses 315 learners of years 1, 2 and 3 as well as 14 lecturers from Université Polytechnique Internationale Obiang Nguéma Mbassogo, Ecole Supérieure de Management, Haute Ecole du Commerce et de Management, Institut Supérieur de Management Adonai for the purpose of appraising the impacts of business English on the learners. In other words, the study aims at analysing the curriculum and teaching methods used by the lecturers in order to assess their impacts on the learners. Based on a mixed method, the study reveals that in most private universities studied (71.42%), various fields of study are gathered to constitute English classes for an annual English course duration varying from 20 to 30 hours raising the critical issues of the heterogeneity of the class as well as the insufficiency of the annual course duration. The study also reveals that the course contents do not fully suit to learners' field of study raising thus one of the major challenges in managing heterogeneous classes. In addition, the study reveals a critical need for an elaboration of an official specific ESP curriculum for each field of study. The study concludes that the lack of specificity of the curriculum resulted from the heterogeneous classes affects negatively learners' motivation and interest and consequently their linguistic performance.

Key words: *affective filter, English for Specific Purpose, linguistic performance, motivation.*

Résumé

Ce travail de recherche évalue les impacts de l'enseignement de l'Anglais commercial sur la performance linguistique des apprenants Béninois à la lumière de la théorie d'acquisition/apprentissage de seconde langue ou langue étrangère proposée par Krashen (1982). L'étude se focalise sur 315 étudiants des 1^{ère}, 2^{ème} et 3^{ème} années et 14 enseignants de l'Université Polytechnique Internationale Obiang Nguéma Mbassogo, Ecole Supérieure de Management, Haute Ecole du Commerce et de Management, Institut Supérieur de Management Adonai dans le but d'évaluer les impacts de l'enseignement de l'Anglais commercial sur la performance linguistique des apprenants. En d'autres termes, l'étude vise à analyser les programmes d'enseignement et méthodes utilisés par les enseignants en vue d'évaluer leurs impacts sur les apprenants. Sur la base d'une approche mixte, l'étude a révélé que dans la plupart des universités privées étudiées (71,42%), différentes options sont regroupées pour constituer les classes d'Anglais d'une durée annuelle de 20 à 30 heures révélant les questions critiques de l'hétérogénéité de la classe de même que l'insuffisance de la durée annuelle de cours. L'étude a aussi révélé que les contenus des cours ne couvrent pas entièrement les spécificités des apprenants soulevant ainsi l'un des défis majeurs de la gestion des classes hétérogènes. De plus, l'étude a révélé un besoin crucial d'élaboration pour chaque filière, d'un programme d'enseignement officiel et spécifique. L'étude conclut que le défaut de spécificité du programme d'enseignement dû à l'hétérogénéité des classes affecte négativement la motivation et l'intérêt des étudiants et par ricochet leur performance linguistique.

Mots clés : *filtre affectif, Anglais de spécialité, performance linguistique, motivation.*

Introduction

Individuals labour daily across diverse domains not merely to fulfil their essential needs but also to advance the progress of their nations. Among these pursuits, business—defined as the provision of goods and services encompassing financial, commercial, and industrial dimensions (Hornby)—stands as a principal arena of endeavour. This field draws participants from multifarious backgrounds, necessitating continual interaction among them, which language singularly

facilitates. Given the heterogeneity of its actors, multilingualism emerges as an indispensable prerequisite for the sector's prosperity. Accordingly, globally dominant languages serve as *lingua francas* within international commerce. English, pre-eminent among the ten most spoken languages worldwide—ahead of Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, Russian, German, French, Portuguese, Japanese, and Hindi (Global Mobility Solutions)—exemplifies this dominance.

This unparalleled status of English constitutes the principal rationale for its institutionalisation as a foreign language in the curricula of schools and universities across nations such as Benin. In response to the particularities of discrete disciplines, tailored pedagogical frameworks—termed English for Specific Purposes (ESP)—have been developed. Distinct variants thus proliferate: ESP-Business, ESP-Law, ESP-Transport, ESP-Hotel and Tourism, ESP-Telecommunication, ESP-Computer Science, and ESP-Agriculture, to cite but a select few. In Benin, private tertiary institutions proffer programmes spanning Banking and Finance, Auditing, Human Resources, Accountancy, Marketing, Transport, Hotel and Tourism, Telecommunications, and Computer Science, *inter alia*.

Regrettably, despite the universality of English instruction for all Beninese students irrespective of specialism, no standardised national curriculum for ESP exists. Lecturers consequently fashion bespoke syllabi, which they independently enact. This curricular heterogeneity warrants rigorous evaluation. It is within this exigency that the present study appraises the efficacy of ESP-Business pedagogy upon the linguistic proficiency of Beninese EFL learners, framed through the lens of Krashen's (1982) theory of second/foreign language acquisition and learning—one of the foremost paradigms addressing this domain through its five cardinal hypotheses, which elucidate the mechanisms of L2 attainment.

Specifically, the investigation scrutinises the teaching programmes and methodologies employed by EFL instructors vis-à-vis Years 1, 2, and 3 learners at the Université Polytechnique Internationale Obiang Nguema Mbassogo (UPI-ONM), École Supérieure de Management (ESM), Haute École du Commerce et de Management (HECM), and Institut Supérieur de Management Adonäi (ISM-Adonäi). The ensuing research questions stem from the aforementioned lacunae: In what manner do ESP curricula align with learners' disciplinary specialisms? How is ESP delivered across UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM, and ISM-Adonäi? What discernible effects does ESP exert upon learners' linguistic competence? Amidst the dearth of an official framework, the ad hoc programmes devised by individual lecturers fail adequately to encompass learners' diverse competencies. Compounding this, the preponderance of teacher-centred instructional paradigms yields suboptimal enhancement of linguistic performance.

This investigation is structured as follows: the introduction establishes the research exigency and objectives, whereupon Section 1 elucidates the theoretical framework, grounding the analysis in Krashen's (1982) theory of second/foreign language acquisition, alongside Chomsky's (1965) and Botha's (1981) notions of linguistic performance. Thereafter, Section 2 delineates the methodology, encompassing the target population, sampling procedures, and research instruments. Section 3 then presents the data derived from questionnaires administered to learners and lecturers, followed by Section 4, which furnishes the analysis and discussion of findings. The investigation concludes by synthesising principal insights with pertinent recommendations.

1. Theoretical underpinnings

The theoretical framework underpinning this research is Krashen's (1982) theory of second/foreign language acquisition and learning. Additionally, the domain of business English is interrogated through the prism of Chomsky's (1965) notions of linguistic performance.

1.1 Second/foreign language acquisition/learning theory

Numerous theories have been propounded by scholars to elucidate the processes of second/foreign language acquisition and learning. The paradigm that furnishes the bedrock for this investigation is Krashen's (1982), distinguished by its articulation of five seminal hypotheses that address the cardinal interrogatives concerning the mechanisms by which second or foreign languages are assimilated and mastered. These hypotheses encompass the acquisition-learning distinction, the natural order hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis.

- **The acquisition-learning distinction** stresses two distinct and independent ways through which adults develop competence in second language: the first way is language acquisition as a subconscious process, similar to the way children develop ability in their first language, through which adults acquire competence may be via natural, implicit or informal learning. The second way to develop competence concerns language learning which, also referred to as conscious knowledge of a second language, is an explicit learning process through which adults are aware of the rules and are able to talk about them (Krashen, 1982: 10).
- **The natural order principle** claims that the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predictable order. Indeed, acquirers of a given language tend to

acquire certain grammatical structures early, and others later (Krashen, 1982: 11).

- **The monitor principle** suggests that acquisition and learning are used in very specific ways. In fact, acquisition is responsible for language fluency whereas learning functions as a Monitor or editor since it makes changes in the form of utterances. This implies that formal rules, or conscious learning, play only a limited role in second language performance (Krashen, 1982: 16).
- **The input principle** claims that we acquire language only when we understand language that contains structure that is ‘a little beyond’ where we are now. Such acquisition is helped not only by our linguistic competence but also by our knowledge of the world and our extra-linguistic information (Krashen, 1982: 21).
- **The affective filter principle** states how affective factors relate to the second language acquisition process. The concept of an Affective Filter was first proposed by Dulay and Burt (1977). In fact, affective variables favouring success in second language acquisition include high motivation, self-confidence and low anxiety (Krashen, 1982: 31).

1.2 Linguistic Performance

The concept of linguistic performance was introduced by Chomsky (1965), who delineates a fundamental dichotomy between linguistic competence and linguistic performance. He posits that competence constitutes the subconscious mastery of grammatical rules enabling a speaker to produce and comprehend language, whereas performance pertains to the actual deployment of language within authentic, real-world contexts. Within this theoretical ambit, the present study endeavours to scrutinise the business English curricula and

pedagogical methodologies employed by lecturers, thereby evaluating their efficacy upon the linguistic performance of learners at UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM, and ISM-Adonai. It merits particular emphasis that Botha (1981) identifies a panoply of extraneous factors impinging upon linguistic performance. These encompass the speakers-hearers' innate linguistic knowledge, the intrinsic attributes and constraints of their articulatory and perceptual apparatuses, alongside their mnemonic faculties, powers of concentration and attention, and broader cognitive capacities; furthermore, their socio-dialectal milieus and social standing, their distinctive idiolects, and sundry psychosomatic variables—including physical health, emotional disposition, and kindred states—exert commensurate influence.

2. Methodology of the study

This section delineates the methodological framework of the study, encompassing the target population, sampling procedures, and research instruments.

2.1 Target Population

The target population comprises Beninese learners and lecturers from the Université Polytechnique Internationale Obiang Nguéma Mbassogo (henceforth UPI-ONM), École Supérieure de Management (henceforth ESM), Haute École du Commerce et de Management (henceforth HECM), and Institut Supérieur de Management Adonai (henceforth ISM-Adonai). More precisely, the investigation centres upon learners enrolled in Years 1, 2, and 3, alongside EFL lecturers, with a view to scrutinising the business English curricula and pedagogical methodologies deployed by the latter in order to appraise their ramifications for learners' linguistic performance.

Sampling

This study encompasses 315 learners from Years 1, 2, and 3, alongside 14 lecturers drawn from UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM, and ISM-Adonai. Specifically, the cohort comprises 111 learners in Year 1, 105 in Year 2, and 99 in Year 3. It merits underscoring that lecturers and learners constitute the principal protagonists within the teaching-learning dialectic. The former discharge pivotal functions, comprising the guidance and facilitation of the latter in language assimilation and the cultivation of requisite skills and competencies applicable within authentic contexts. Consequently, the contributions of both cohorts are of paramount pertinence to this investigation, affording corroboration or refutation of the data elicited from each constituency.

2.2 Research Instruments

The research instruments deployed for data elicitation in this investigation comprise questionnaires. Specifically, two tailor-made questionnaires were crafted and disseminated respectively to learners and lecturers. Each incorporates a carefully balanced blend of open-ended and closed-ended questions. The resultant responses are expounded in Section 3, pertaining to the presentation and analysis of data.

3. Data presentation

As delineated in the preceding section, the data for this research were obtained from questionnaires administered to 315 learners across Years 1, 2, and 3, in addition to 14 lecturers. A compendium of nine questions was directed to the learners with a view to eliciting particulars concerning their disciplinary specialisms, the duration of their English language instruction, their motivational drivers, levels of interest, pedagogical expectations, the pertinence of topics and curricular content,

requisite language proficiencies, and prevailing teaching methodologies.

- **Results from the Questionnaires Addressed to the Learners**

The findings derived from the questionnaires administered to learners are presented below:

Responses to the Questionnaire Addressed to Year 1 Learners

Year 1/ Field study	of	Questions				
		1. What is your field of study?	2. How long have you been learning business English?	3. How could you describe your motivation for learning business English?	Low	Middle
	Size	1 year	2 years			
Bank and finance	23	23	00	5	15	3
Marketing	24	24	00	6	14	4
Informatics	17	17	00	4	9	4
Human Resource Management	16	16	00	4	9	3
Transport	13	13	00	3	8	2
Audit and Accountancy	18	18	00	4	10	4
Total	111	111	00	26	65	20

Year 1/ Field of study	4. Why are you interested in business English?			5. Do the course contents meet your expectation s?	
	Language skill improvement	Professional purposes	Business purposes	Yes	No
Bank and finance	8	3	12	14	9
Marketing	6	4	14	13	11
Informatics	4	3	10	9	8
Human Resource Management	5	2	9	10	6
Transport	3	2	8	4	9
Audit and Accountancy	5	3	10	5	13
Total	31	17	63	55	56

Year 1/ Questions

Field of study	6. Which chapters do you think most useful for you?			7. Which language skill(s) have you developed through business English learning?			
	Intro- duction to	Sec- tor of economy	Com- pute r sci- ence	Lis- tening	Speak- ing	Read- ing	Writ- ing

	com- merc e						
Bank and fi- nance	12	06	05	05	9	05	04
Marketi ng	13	05	06	06	10	04	04
Infor- matics	00	00	17	04	8	03	02
Human Re- source Manag ement	09	04	03	04	7	03	02
Trans- port	07	03	03	03	04	03	03
Audit and Ac- count- ancy	03	12	03	05	8	03	02
Total	44	30	37	27	46	21	17

Year 1/ Field of study	8. Which teaching method(s) does your lecturer adopt?			9. Which teaching method is the most useful for you?		
	Teacher-centered instruction	Student-centered instruction	Technology-based method	Teacher-centered instruction	Student-centered instruction	Technology-based method
Bank and finance	15	04	04	03	15	05
Marketing	14	05	05	03	16	05
Informatics	11	03	03	02	10	05
Human Resource Management	08	05	03	03	08	05
Transport	07	04	02	02	06	05
Audit and Accountancy	12	03	03	03	10	05
Total	67	24	20	16	65	30

Responses to the Questionnaire Addressed to Year 2 Learners

Year 2/

Field of study	4. Why are you interested in business English?	5. Do the course contents meet your expectations?			
		Language skill improvement	Professional purposes	Business purposes	Yes
Bank and finance	4	14	4	14	12
Marketing	3	15	5	16	11
Informatics	3	10	3	6	10
Human Resource Management	2	10	4	6	10
Transport	2	9	1	4	8
Audit and Accountancy	4	10	2	4	12
Total	18	68	19	50	55

Year 2/ Field of study	Questions of	Questions					
		1. What is your field of study?	2. How long have you been learning business English?	3. How have you been learning English?	4. How could you describe your motivation for business learning?	5. How could you describe your motivation for business learning?	6. How could you describe your motivation for business learning?
	Size	1 year	2 years	Low	Middle	High	
Bank and finance	22	00	22	3	17	2	
Marketing	23	00	23	4	15	4	
Informatics	16	00	16	2	9	5	
Human Resource Management	16	00	16	3	10	3	
Transport	12	00	12	2	9	1	
Audit and Accountancy	16	00	16	3	11	2	
Total	105	00	105	17	71	17	

Year	Questions						
2/ Field of study	6. Which chapters do you think most useful for you?			7. Which language skill(s) have you developed through English learning?			
	Forms of business organization and management	Sector of economy and Money	Informatics and Communication	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Bank and finance	13	05	04	05	8	05	04
Marketing	13	05	05	06	10	04	03
Informatics	00	00	16	04	8	03	01
Human Resource Management	10	03	03	05	5	03	03
Transport	05	05	02	03	04	03	02
Audit and Accountancy	03	03	10	04	8	02	02

Total	44	21	40	27	43	20	15
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Year 2/

Field of study	8. Which teaching method(s) does your lecturer adopt?			9. Which teaching method is the most useful for you?		
	Teacher-centered instruction	Student-centered instruction	Technology-based method	Teacher-centered instruction	Student-centered instruction	Technology-based method
Bank and finance	16	04	02	02	15	05
Marketing	15	06	02	02	15	06
Informatics	10	03	03	03	05	08
Human Resource Management	09	05	02	03	08	05
Transport	05	05	02	02	05	05
Accountancy	12	02	02	03	08	05
Total	67	25	13	15	56	34

Responses to the Questionnaire Addressed to Year 3 Learners

Year 3/ Field of study	Questions 1. What is your field of study? Size	2. How long have you been learning business English?			3. How could you describe your motivation for learning business English?		
		1 year	2 years	3 years	Lo w	Middl e	Hig h
Bank and finance	20	00	00	20	4	13	3
Marketing	22	00	00	22	3	16	3
Informatics	15	00	00	15	2	10	3
Human Resource Management	15	00	00	15	2	9	4
Transport	11	00	00	11	1	8	2
Accountancy	16	00	00	16	3	10	3
Total	99	00	00	99	15	66	18

Year 3/

Field of study	4. Why are you interested in business English?			5. Do the course contents meet your expectations?	
	Language skill improvement	Professional purposes	Business purposes	Yes	No
Bank and finance	2	15	3	12	8
Marketing	2	16	4	15	7
Informatics	1	11	3	7	8
Human Resource Management	2	10	3	7	8
Transport	2	8	1	3	8
Accountancy	4	10	2	4	12
Total	13	70	16	48	51

Year	Questions				7. Which language skill(s) have you developed through English learning?			
3/	6. Which chapters do you think most useful for you?				7. Which language skill(s) have you developed through English learning?			
Field of study	Succe ss in Busin ess and Mana gemen t	Accou ntancy	Bank Regul ations and Busin ess Letter writin g	Liste ning	Spea king	Rea din g	Wri ting	
Bank and financ e	03	07	12	05	8	05	2	
Marke ting	14	06	02	05	10	03	04	
Inform atics	00	00	15	04	8	02	01	
Huma n Resou rce Manag ement	10	03	02	05	5	03	02	
Transp ort	05	04	02	03	04	03	01	
Accou ntancy	02	10	04	04	8	02	02	
Total	34	30	37	36	43	18	12	

Year 3/ Questions

Field of study	8. Which teaching method(s) does your lecturer adopt?			9. Which teaching method is the most useful for you?		
	Teach er-center ed instru ction	Stude nt-center ed instru ction	Techno logy-based metho d	Teach er-center ed instru ction	Stude nt-center ed instru ction	Techno logy-based metho d
Bank and finance	15	03	2	2	14	04
Market ing	16	04	02	3	15	04
Inform atics	10	03	02	02	06	07
Human Resource Manag ement	08	05	02	02	08	05
Transp ort	05	05	01	02	04	05
Audit and Accoun tancy	12	02	02	03	07	06
Total	66	22	11	14	54	31

Table 1: Recap Statistical Results from the Questionnaires Addressed to the Learners

	Year 1 (111)	Year 2 (105)	Year 3 (99)
Learners' motivation degree in Business English			
Low level in English	26 [23.42%]	17 [16.19%]	15 [15.15%]
Middle level in English	65 [58.55%]	71 [67.61%]	66 [66.66%]
High level in English	20 [18.01%]	17 [16.19%]	18 [18.18%]
Learners' interest in Business English			
Language skill improvement	31 [27.92%]	18 [17.14%]	13 [13.13%]
Professional purposes	17 [15.31%]	68 [64.76%]	70 [70.70%]
Business purposes	63 [56.75%]	19 [18.09%]	16 [16.16%]
Expectations			
Expectation met	55 [49.54%]	50 [47.61%]	48 [48.48%]
Useful chapters			
Chapter 1	44 [36.63%]	44 [41.90%]	34 [34.34%]
Chapter 2	30 [27.02%]	21 [20%]	30 [30.30%]
Chapter 3	37 [33.33%]	40 [38.09%]	37 [37.37%]
Language skills developed			
Listening	27 [24.32%]	27 [25.71%]	36 [36.36%]
Speaking	46 [41.44%]	43 [40.95%]	43 [43.43%]

Reading	21 [18.91%]	20 [19.04%]	15 [18.18%]
Writing	17 [15.31%]	15 [14.28%]	12 [12.12%]
Lecturers' teaching methods			
Teacher-centered instruction	67 [60.36%]	67 [63.80%]	66 [66.66%]
Student-centered instruction	24 [21.62%]	25 [23.80%]	22 [22.22%]
Technology-based method	20 [18.01%]	13 [12.38%]	11 [11.11%]
Useful teaching methods for learners			
Teacher-centered instruction	16 [14.14%]	15 [14.28%]	14 [14.14%]
Student-centered instruction	65 [58.55%]	56 [53.33%]	54 [54.54%]
Technology-based method	30 [27.02%]	34 [32.38%]	31 [31.31%]

(Source: Dadjo, 2026)

- **Results from the Questionnaires Addressed to the Lecturers**

As mentioned earlier, the data for this research were likewise elicited from questionnaires administered to 14 lecturers from UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM, and ISM-Adonai. A series of twelve questions was propounded to these lecturers with the express purpose of ascertaining whether they deliver business English instruction, the designation of the private tertiary institution at

which they impart English, the disciplinary specialisms of their learners, the temporal span of their courses, the principal attributes of their instructional cohorts, the salient chapters or thematic units encompassed, the congruence of course contents with learners' fields of study, the prevalence of any official curriculum for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) within Benin, the imperative for devising a standardised national ESP curriculum, whether their learners attain fluency upon course completion, the precipitating factors militating against fluency development, and prospective recommendations conducive to the formulation of an official ESP curriculum in Benin. The findings emergent from this sequence of interrogatives directed to the lecturers are presented forthwith:

Table 2: Recap Responses from the Questionnaires Addressed to the Lecturers

Questions	Responses	
	Close ended questions	Open ended questions
1. Business English / ESP teaching	Yes 14 [100%] No [0%]	
2. Private universities		UPI-ONM 04; ESM 03; HECM 04; ISM Adonai 03
3. Fields of study		- Bank and finance 04, - marketing 03, - audit and accountancy 02, - transport 02, - informatics 02, - HRM 01,

4. Course duration		20 h : 02; 25 h : 04; 30 h ; 08
5. Main characteristics of the class		- Homogeneous: 04 [28.57%] - Heterogenous: 10 [71.42%]
6. Main chapters or topics you cover		- Production, commerce and trade - Business organisation and communication - Advertisement and marketing - Banking and Insurance - Commercial correspondences and grammar
7. Course contents suitability with learners' field of study	Yes 8 [57.14%] No 06 [42.85%]	
8. Existence of official teaching program for ESP in Benin	Yes 00 [0%] No 14 [100%]	
9. Need for an elaboration of an official teaching program for ESP	Yes 14 [100%] No 00 [0%]	
10. Fluency developed at	Yes 01 [07.14%]	

the end of the course	No 09 [64.28%] Somewhat 04 [28.57]	
11. Reasons for failure in fluency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient time and inappropriate time table, - Lack of equipment and materials, - Lack of practice out of the classrooms, - High anxiety - Difficulties with field related knowledge, - Poor language proficiency
12. Suggestions that can contribute to the elaboration of an official teaching program for ESP in Benin		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An effective need analysis must be carried out with educational authorities support for curriculum design training and implementation - Training and political support - Integrating ITCs - Specialised curriculum design training - Partnering with national and international human resources (expertise)

(Source: Dadjo, 2026)

4. Data analysis and discussion of the findings

The recapitulative statistical outcomes displayed in Table 1 above encapsulate the multifaceted data elicited from learners across Years 1, 2, and 3. Specifically, Questions 1 and 2 were formulated to ascertain particulars pertaining to learners' disciplinary affiliations and their tenure in business English tuition, while Question 3 was contrived to gauge the intensity of learners' motivation vis-à-vis business English. The tabulations disclose that highly motivated cohorts constitute 18.01%, 16.19%, and 18.18% in Years 1, 2, and 3 respectively, whereas those exhibiting moderate motivation account for 58.55%, 67.61%, and 66.66%. Aggregating the highly and moderately motivated segments yields an average motivation prevalence of 76.56% in Year 1, 83.8% in Year 2, and 84.84% in Year 3. These figures intimate that, pursuant to Krashen's (1982) second/foreign language acquisition/learning theory, the affective filter—engendered by deleterious emotions or antecedents that impede L2 assimilation—is manifestly attenuated. Ergo, this predisposition affords lecturers a propitious vantage for imparting business English, inasmuch as they may attenuate learners' anxiety and self-consciousness by cultivating an ambience of gratification, thereby engendering optimal didactic conditions.

In the same vein, Question 4 was designed to exhume the substantive rationale underpinning learners' predilection for business English. The disaggregation reveals that 27.92%, 17.14%, and 13.13% in Years 1, 2, and 3 respectively evince interest predicated upon linguistic proficiency augmentation, whilst vocational imperatives motivate a mere 15.31% in Year 1, escalating to 64.76% and 70.70% in Years 2 and 3. Conversely, entrepreneurial imperatives preponderate at 56.75% in Year 1, dwindling to 18.09% and 16.16% in Years 2 and 3. These delineations are profoundly revelatory, underscoring the

imperatives lecturers must heed in curricular orchestration. Broadly, Year 1 learners evince paramount entrepreneurial orientation, whereas Years 2 and 3 cohorts are impelled predominantly by vocational exigencies. This elevated interest quotient similarly attenuates the affective filter, mitigating barriers to L2 assimilation.

In analogous vein, Question 5 probes whether curricular content satiates learners' expectancies. The yields indicate sub-50% congruence across strata—49.54%, 47.61%, and 48.48% in Years 1, 2, and 3 respectively—exacting vigilant scrutiny. Learners' specialisms span banking and finance, marketing, informatics, human resource management, transport, auditing, and accountancy; the amalgamation of six disparate domains within singular cohorts, subjected to uniform ESP provision, ineluctably engenders curricular imprecision.

Question 6 interrogates the salience of discrete chapters for learners. Year 1 tabulations confer utility upon Chapters 1, 2, and 3 at 36.63%, 27.02%, and 33.33% respectively; Year 2 at 41.90%, 20%, and 38.09%; Year 3 at 34.34%, 30.30%, and 37.37%. Conspicuously, no chapter garners unanimous approbation (100%), a lacuna attributable to cohort heterogeneity. Reiteratively, the ESP purveyed to such amalgamated assemblages evinces deficient specificity. Imperatively, bespoke curricula calibrated to individual specialisms are requisite; a monolithic core curriculum ineluctably frustrates comprehensive expectancy fulfilment. This curricular diffuseness deleteriously erodes motivation, engagement, and, ipso facto, linguistic outputs and proficiency.

Question 7 calibrates the language modalities most affirmatively augmented by business English pedagogy. Year 1 hierarchies speaking (41.44%), listening (24.32%), reading (18.91%), and writing (15.31%); Year 2 mirrors this with speaking (40.95%), listening (25.71%), reading (19.04%), and writing (14.28%); Year 3 accords speaking primacy (43.43%),

trailed by listening (36.36%), reading (18.18%), and writing (12.12%). Saliently, speaking emerges pre-eminent across Years 1–3, pursued by listening, reading, and writing; tellingly, no modality attains 50% affirmative impact, connoting sub-median efficacy.

Question 8 dissects lecturers' methodological predilections. Teacher-centred instruction preponderates at 60.36%, 63.80%, and 66.66% across Years 1–3, conjoined with student-centred approaches at subdued 21.62%, 23.80%, and 22.22%, and technology-mediated modalities at negligible 18.01%, 12.38%, and 11.11%. Uniformly, teacher-centred hegemony obtains, augmented marginally by student-centred and evanescently by technological adjuncts.

Manifestly, teacher-centred instruction—the modal paradigm—stands obsolete within the LMD and competence-based episteme embraced by Benin over a decade past. Contemporaneously apposite methodologies—student-centred and technology-infused—find vindication in Question 9 yields, which adjudge student-centred instruction supremely efficacious at 58.55%, 53.33%, and 54.54%; technology-mediated at 27.02%, 32.38%, and 31.31%; with teacher-centred adjudged least propitious at 14.14%, 14.28%, and 14.14% across Years 1–3.

Lecturer questionnaire findings disclose that 71.42% of surveyed private institutions amalgamate banking and finance, marketing, audit and accountancy, transport, informatics, and human resource management into heterogeneous cohorts for annual tuition spanning 20–30 hours. This conjuncture precipitates curricular misalignment, as divergent expectancies attenuate proficiency. Moreover, the exiguous duration—meagre within a Francophone milieu—precludes substantive proficiency accretion.

Curricular fare—typically encompassing production, commerce and trade, business organisation and communication,

advertisement and marketing, banking and insurance, commercial correspondence, and grammar—manifests 42.85% inadequacy vis-à-vis specialisms, emblemising lecturers' paramount challenge in heterogeneous milieus. Discrete curricula, accentuating disciplinary idiosyncrasies, are sine qua non for expectancy congruence.

Unanimously (100%), respondents affirm the non-existence of an official ESP curriculum in Benin, precipitating idiosyncratic lecturer contrivances. This curricular vicissitude undermines ESP pedagogy; an official, specialism-calibrated ESP syllabus is thus imperatively warranted.

Furthermore, 64.28% of learners evince fluency deficits post-course, attributable to curtailed duration and scheduling, paucity of materiel, extracurricular practice dearth, elevated anxiety, domain-specific knowledge lacunae, and baseline proficiency deficits. This betokens negligible proficiency augmentation. L2 mastery mandates protracted immersion and technological augmentation, acutely salient in Francophone Benin; their privation stymies advancement.

Overall, the inquiry has unearthed perspicuous insights. Learners' attenuated affective filter redounds to lecturers' advantage in engendering propitious milieus. Regrettably, curricular heterogeneity begets imprecision, necessitating specialism-tailored syllabi; monolithic provision ineluctably frustrates expectancies, motivation, engagement, outputs, and proficiency.

Conclusion

This investigation has rigorously appraised the ramifications of business English pedagogy upon the linguistic proficiency of Beninese learners, framed through the theoretical lens of Krashen's (1982) second/foreign language acquisition and learning paradigm. Employing a mixed-methods approach, data

were elicited from 315 learners spanning Years 1, 2, and 3, alongside 14 lecturers drawn from UPI-ONM, ESM, HECM, and ISM-Adonai, expressly to evaluate the efficacy of business English instruction upon learner outcomes. Stated differently, the inquiry has systematically dissected the curricula and pedagogical methodologies orchestrated by lecturers on the one hand, whilst concomitantly assaying their discernible impacts upon learners on the other.

The findings demonstrate with resolute consistency that within 71.42% of the surveyed private universities, sundry disciplinary domains—notably banking and finance, marketing, auditing and accountancy, transport, informatics, and human resource management—are necessarily consolidated into heterogeneous cohorts, convening for annual tuition spanning merely from 20 to 30 hours. This conjuncture precipitates two cardinal exigencies: the pronounced heterogeneity of instructional assemblages, conjoined with the woefully exiguous duration of curricular provision. The analysis further discloses that 42.85% of curricular content manifests patent incongruity with learners' specialisms, thereby constituting one of the pre-eminent vicissitudes confronting lecturers in the stewardship of such variegated cohorts. Moreover, the inquiry underscores the stark lacuna of any official English for Specific Purposes (ESP) curriculum, contending that this curricular vicissitude ineluctably undermines the integrity and coherence of ESP pedagogy throughout Benin. With respect to methodology, lecturers manifest a marked predilection for teacher-centred instruction—deployed preponderantly, augmented by student-centred approaches at comparatively subdued incidence, and technology-mediated modalities at patently negligible proportions. Pertinently, teacher-centred instruction has been adjudged by respondents as the least propitious didactic paradigm for learners.

The investigation ineluctably substantiates the imperative for tailor-made, official ESP curricula precisely tailored to discrete disciplinary specialisms, inasmuch as business English purveyed within heterogeneous milieus evinces irremediable diffuseness. It has been cogently contended that a unitary core curriculum cannot comprehensively satiate learners' expectancies. More significantly, the curricular imprecision engendered by heterogeneous constituencies has been observed to erode learners' motivation and engagement deleteriously, with commensurate depreciation of their linguistic outputs and proficiency.

References

- Botha Rudolf P, 1981. *The Conduct of Linguistic Inquiry: A Systematic Introduction to the Methodology of Generative Grammar*. Mouton.
- Chomsky Noam, 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press
- Dulay Heidi, and Marina Burt, 1977. "Remarks on Creativity in Language Acquisition." *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language*, edited by Marina Burt et al., Regents, pp. 95-126
- Hornby Albert Sidney, 1989. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford UP
- Global Mobility Solutions, 2025. <https://gmsmobility.com>. Accessed March 2025
- Krashen Stephen, 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press
- Yule George, 1996. *The Study of Language*. 2nd ed., Cambridge UP

Appendices

Questionnaire Addressed to Learners:

I am carrying out research on **the Impacts of Business English Teaching on Beninese Students' Linguistic Performance**.

Please tick the square that best describes your opinions.

1. What is your field of study?
 - a. Bank and Finance . Marketing
Informatics
 - d. Audit and Accountancy . Transport
HRM
2. How long have you been learning business English?
One year Two years Three years
3. How could you describe your motivation for learning business English?
Low middle High
4. Why are you interested in business English?
 - a. To improve my language skills
 - b. For professional purposes
 - c. For business purposes
5. Do the course contents meet your expectations?
Yes No neither
6. Which topics you think most useful for you?
 - a. Introduction to commerce and forms of business organization
 - b. Sector of economy and Money
 - c. Computer science

d. None

7. Which language skill(s) have you developed through business English learning?

- a. Listening
- b. Speaking
- c. Reading
- d. Writing

8. Which teaching method(s) does your lecturer adopt?

- a. Teacher-centered instruction
- b. Student-centered instruction
- c. Technology-based method

9. Which teaching method is the most useful for you?

- a. Teacher-centered instruction
- b. Student-centered instruction
- c. Technology-based method

Questionnaire Addressed to Lecturers:

I am carrying out research on the Impacts of Business English / ESP Teaching on Beninese Learners' Linguistic Performance. Please, kindly tick the square that best describes your opinions or fill in the with the appropriate information.

1. Do you teach business English or English for specific purpose in any private university in Benin?

Yes

No

2. If yes, kindly name the private university / universities

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. What are the fields of the study of your learners in private universities?

- a. Bank and Finance
- b. Marketing
- c. Informatics
- d. Audit and Accountancy
- e. Tourism
- f. HRM
- Others
-

4. Kindly specify the course duration

- a. 20 h
- c. 30 h
- b. 25 h
- d. 40 h

5. What are the main characteristics of the class where you teach Business English?

- a. Homogeneous class (a class consisting of a single field of study)
- b. Heterogeneous class (a class consisting of two or more fields of study)

6. Kindly mention the main chapters or topics you cover ?

.....

.....

.....

7. Do these chapters suit to the different learners' field of study?

Yes No somewhat

8. Is there any official teaching program for Business English or ESP in Benin?

Yes No

9. Do you find relevant an elaboration of an official teaching program for Business English or ESP in Benin?

Yes

No

10. At the end of the course, are your learners able to speak English fluently?

Yes

No

newhat

11. If no, kindly mention the reason(s)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

12. Kindly make any suggestions that can contribute elaboration of an official teaching program for Business English or ESP in Benin

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....