

Needs Analysis in an Academic Listening and Speaking Course:  
An Approach to English L2 Learners' Difficulties

Kazuyo Noda

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Abstract

This study investigated English as a second language students' language needs in an academic listening and speaking course at an American university and examined whether the course met their needs. Prior to the data collection, an examination of the course syllabus and interviews with the teachers were conducted to understand the course. Regarding the research method, methodological triangulation was used over two semesters, including the use of interviews, a questionnaire, and class observations. Participants included three interviewees, 78 respondents to the questionnaire, and 39 students in class observations. The data gathered from the participants revealed that there were gaps between their needs and the course content. The study identifies three important items that students should work on in the course (oral presentation, interactions with native speakers, and listening) and then discusses how these items could be incorporated into the course activities. Finally, pedagogical implications are suggested for the course.

## Introduction

English Language Institute (ELI) 80 is the advanced academic listening and speaking course at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM), which has focused on the improvement of English as a second language (ESL) students' academic speaking. Although this ability is important to them, the ELI 80 students also need to learn listening skills, because one of the goals of the course is to have students efficiently comprehend academic listening materials. The course should be revised so as to attain the goal. As a former ELI 80 student and observer of ELI classes, I hope to help teachers and administrators design a course that is maximally suitable for the students' purposes and the course goals by using this experience to the best advantage. The present study has two aims as an on-going course development project: (a) to investigate the needs of the ELI 80 students and (b) to examine whether the course is corresponding to their needs. The data gathered from the students presented a picture of the academic listening and speaking skills required in subject matter courses, students' difficulties in meeting those requirements, and the skills they most needed to work on. On the basis of the results of the needs analysis, an examination of the course was made, and then a revision of the current main course activities has been suggested. In the following sub-sections, the institutional context of the ELI 80 will be examined to better understand the purpose and organization of the course. Then, the literature will be reviewed on needs analysis to provide a theoretical framework for the study.

*ELI 80 Advanced Listening and Speaking Course*

English Language Institute (ELI) is located on the campus of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM). The primary function of the ELI is to provide English instruction for the ESL students who have been admitted to UHM and who are judged to be in need of further training in the English used in academic context. The international applicants to UHM must meet minimum TOEFL scores to show English proficiency necessary for their academic work. While UHM has a minimum entrance score on the paper-based TOEFL of 500, the score of 600 is the minimum for certain graduate programs. There are some international students who do not satisfy the requirement but who are officially admitted to UHM, because of the multiple sources of information used in deciding whether an applicant should be admitted (e.g., high school record, recommendation letters, statement-of-purpose essays). All international students who do not fulfill the TOEFL requirement are tested by the ELI for English placement. Placement into ELI courses, or exemption from ELI courses, is determined by the basis of the test results. Some students are exempted from instruction in the ELI, and the others are assigned to one or more ELI courses. The ELI course structure can be described now in more detail.

The ELI offers courses at different levels in (a) reading, (b) writing, and (c) listening and speaking. There are two levels of listening and speaking courses: (a) ELI 70 Listening and Speaking and (b) ELI 80 Advanced Listening and Speaking. ELI 80 is developed for the students who have considerable listening and speaking experience and advanced proficiency in English as an additional language. In the course, students are

provided with the opportunity to further improve their academic listening and speaking skills so as to enable them to follow lectures and participate orally in class in an American university setting. In each of Fall Semester 2010 and Spring Semester 2011, three in situ classes and one online class were offered in ELI 80. An examination of the ELI 80 syllabus and interviews with the ELI 80 teachers will be helpful to understand the course.

The ELI 80 syllabus listed student learning outcomes (SLOs) and main course activities, indicating that the main focus of the course would be speaking instruction. The course SLOs balance listening and speaking well (see Table 1); however, every main course activity except one was aimed at improving the students' speaking skills. In addition, the only main course activity for listening could not be adopted by all teachers because there were two types of main course activities: (a) common and (b) optional; and since the listening activity was optional, it was not always used. Table 2 describes (a) the common activities (*Textbook Facilitations, Discussion Circle, Individual Presentations*) and (b) the optional activities (*Expert Interview and Oral Report, Listening to Speech Assignment*). In short, listening activities were left to teachers' discretion entirely, and there was room for investigation into teachers' actual instruction in listening. Therefore, interviews with teachers were conducted to understand the course more thoroughly.

Interviews with the ELI 80 teachers showed that they did not have common listening activities because not all of them adopted the main course activity for listening, *Listening to Speech Assignments*. Even if the activity was adopted, it was used only as homework, having students listen to the materials at home and answer some questions.

None of the teachers had systematic listening activities in their classrooms. One teacher stated that the level of the students' listening comprehension ability was too diverse to satisfy all students' listening needs in class at the same time. Another was aware of the importance of listening instruction in class, but had not put it into action yet when the interview was conducted. The third teacher did not feel the need for listening instruction in class because of the students' advanced listening comprehension. The interviews with teachers revealed that the listening instruction in the classroom was less valued than speaking.

In sum, the examination of the ELI 80 syllabus and the interviews with the ELI 80 teachers indicated a reason to conduct the students' needs analysis. There were two issues concerning listening instruction: (a) there was not enough instruction offered in the classroom and (b) there was no systematic pattern to the instruction. Thus, to meet the students' needs, it was necessary to ascertain what the current students' needs were, especially what their academic listening needs were and whether there were any gaps between the students' language needs and the course.

Table 1

*The ELI 80 Advanced Listening and Speaking Course Student Learning Outcomes*

---

By the end of the course students will be able to:

1. demonstrate effective use of strategies for comprehending advanced academic lectures in English.
  2. critically evaluate speakers' perspectives, techniques, and arguments.
  3. make academic presentations (individually or in group or panel contexts) with a high degree of formal accuracy and cultural and stylistic appropriacy.
  4. autonomously lead academic discussions using academic English.
  5. demonstrate excellent use of advanced strategies for participation in academic discussions with expert users of English.
  6. state a range of strategies for using listening/speaking opportunities to develop academic vocabulary (in English) and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
  7. state a range of strategies for developing academic English and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
  8. self-assess their strengths in terms of listening/speaking abilities, as well as identify areas for continued development.
-

Table 2

*Main Course Activities*


---

Textbook Facilitations	Students are supposed to work with a small group to facilitate a class activity related to a topic from the course textbook for speaking.
Discussion Circle leader	As a discussion circle leader, each student is supposed to facilitate a small group discussion on an academic topic of his/her choice.
Individual Presentations	Students are supposed to give a short individual presentation (3 minutes) and a final presentation (8-10 minutes) on an academic topic of their choice.
Expert Interview and Oral Report	Students are supposed to interview an expert, either in an academic or professional field that is of interest to them. After the interview, they make an oral report in order to share their experience with their classmates.
Listening to Speech Assignments	This is assignment which students should do at home. They are supposed to listen to online speeches the teacher sends to them by e-mails and answer a few questions about the speech. This was offered four times a semester, and each speech was 10-15 minutes.

---

*Needs Analysis*

*General needs analysis.* Needs analysis is a procedure used to collect information about learners' needs, and a necessary phase in planning educational programs (Richards, 2001, p. 51). Learners' needs are considered mainly within two perspectives; the first one is that of philosophy, the other of social situation (Crookes, 2009, pp. 7-8). Existentialist ideas are appropriate to the idea of a philosophy of education as quite constitutive of oneself as the person one would like to be (Crookes, 2009, p. 97). As a philosophical approach in

20<sup>th</sup> century, it emphasizes “the freedom of human beings, a freedom to make themselves through planning, reflecting, choosing, and acting” (Crookes, 2009, p. 97). The idea suggests that teachers should allow students to take a positive role in the shaping of their own education and lives. From this perspective of the individual, learners’ needs and wishes should be addressed in the process of curriculum development. As the social background relevant to needs analysis, we must draw attention to international trends of globalization (Crookes, 2009, pp. 7-8; Richards, 2001, p. 23-24). After World War II, the teaching of English as a second or foreign language became an increasingly important. More and more people started to move across borders for the various purposes such as business, study, and immigration, often needing the command of second language. This social situation led to the emergence of the Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) movement, known in English-language teaching circles as ESP (English for Specific Purposes) (Richards, 2001, pp. 28-32). An important principle of ESP approaches to language teaching is that the purposes for which a learner needs a language should be used in planning an English course (Richards, 2001, pp. 32-33).

The philosophy of teaching and social background of these scholars mentioned above have given second language teachers a responsibility to determine students’ needs and design courses accordingly. Thus, needs analysis is regarded as an important part of the development of a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students (Brown, 1995, p. 35; Crookes, 2009, p. 8; Richards, 2001, p. 32). Moreover, it is necessary for curriculum designers to gain and analyze as much information as possible from

different sources using a variety of tools so as to best meet students' needs. Brown (1995, p. 36) defines needs analysis as "the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that influence the learning and teaching situation." Our focus will move to academic listening and speaking needs analysis.

*Academic listening and speaking needs analysis.* One category of ESP is English for academic purposes (EAP). There is much research that explored EAP needs analysis (e.g., Braine, 2001; Chan & Ham, 2007; Ferris, 1998; Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b; Iwai, Kondo, Lim, Ray, Shimizu, & Brown, 1999). Above all, an academic listening and speaking needs analysis is our present concern. Ferris and Tagg (1996a) investigated the expectations and requirements of professors at different U.S. institutions and across a range of contexts. The result indicated U.S. instructors' requirements varied across academic discipline, type of institution, and class size, and that the instructors' lecturing styles were becoming less formal and more interactive. Moreover, Ferris and Tagg (1996b) surveyed U.S. professors' views on ESL students' difficulties with listening and speaking tasks. Professors in their research responded that their ESL students had great difficulty with class participation, asking and responding to questions, and general listening comprehension. Therefore, the professors suggested that ESL instructors should provide students with opportunities to interact with native speakers or classmates who do not speak the same language. In addition, Ferris (1998) surveyed ESL students' views of academic listening

and speaking skills. Students reported that the classes they were attending often required class participation and small group interaction, and that the most difficult things were oral presentation, whole class discussions, and note-taking. These studies are very helpful to explore ESL students' academic listening and speaking needs. However, it is important to continue exploring the topic, first, because course designers have to consider the learning setting where a particular language program is administered, and secondly because "needs analysis should be an ongoing process throughout a course" (Richards, 2001, p. 33).

### *Research Questions*

The examination of the course syllabus and the interviews with the ELI 80 teachers indicated the main focus of the ELI 80 course was speaking instruction, and that the course might not be enough to improve students' academic listening skills. If there are any gaps between the ELI 80 instruction and the students' needs, it would be necessary to revise the course to make it maximally suitable for the students' purposes and the course goals. For this investigation, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What skills do the ELI 80 students prefer to learn in ELI 80?
2. Does the course meet the students' perception of their language needs? If not, what suggestions could be provided about the course?

### Methods

Triangulation was applied to the present study to increase the dependability and credibility of the data. The research strategy studies data from multiple-data-collection perspectives. As the use of multiple-data-collection methods contributes to the

trustworthiness of the data, it has been used in many needs analyses (e.g., Boshier & Smalkoski, 2002; Gilabert, 2005; Huh, 2006; Kikuchi, 2004; Long, 2005). Brown (2009, p. 284) suggests (a) the combinations of different perspectives, sources, data types, etc. should be carefully planned so that they can complement each other; and that (b) the combinations should be sequenced in such a way that each builds on what was learned from previous procedures to increase the quality of the information. With this suggestion in mind, methodological triangulation was used including the use of interviews, a survey questionnaire, and class observations over two semesters. In the following subsections, methods of each data-collection will be described under the following headings: interviews, questionnaire survey, and class observations.

### *Interviews*

Interviews were conducted as a preliminary method to explore what questions should be pursued in the overall project. The interview questions were: (a) what interviewees wanted or had wanted to learn in the ELI 80 course to improve their academic speaking and listening skills, and (b) what suggestions they had about the ELI 80 instruction. To elicit frank opinions from the interviewees, interviews were not recorded on a voice recorder; I took notes during the interviews. Individual interviews were conducted on campus in October 2010, and each was approximately 20 minutes long.

Participants were three students: one current ELI 80 student and two former ELI 80 students (see Table 3). One was a male graduate student, another was a female graduate student, and the third was a female undergraduate student. Their first languages were

Indonesian, Chinese, and Japanese respectively. They were in the Colleges of: Languages, Linguistics and Literature, Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, and Social Sciences.

Table 3

*Demographic Profile of Interviewees (N = 3)*

Participant	1	2	3
ELI 80	Current	Former	Former
Gender	Male	Female	Female
Level	Graduate	Graduate	Undergraduate
First Language	Indonesian	Chinese	Japanese
College	Languages, Linguistics and Literature	Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources	Social Sciences
Status	International	International	International
Age	30's	20's	20's

*Questionnaire Survey*

To design a survey questionnaire, the interviewees' opinions served as a useful reference. In addition, questionnaires developed by Ferris (1998) and Chan and Ham (2007) were consulted to address a wide variety of different types of questions. After the survey instrument had been formulated, it was reviewed by a professor in Second Language Studies at UHM, as well as the ELI director, to make the survey instrument as clear, non-leading, and valid in content as possible. The questionnaire consisted of Part A, Part B, and Part C (see Appendix A). Part A had eight demographic questions. Part B contained 28 questions about the subject-matter courses which the ELI 80 students were attending. Part C had 15 questions about the skills they needed to work on in ELI 80. Out of these 51 questions, 12 were multiple-option and open-ended questions (Part A, B-1, B-2, C-2, and C-

3). The remaining 39 questions were placed on a Likert-scale (Part B-3, B-4, and C-1).

The reliability of Part B-3 was 0.96 (Cronbach  $\alpha = 0.96$ ), Part B-4 was 0.98 ( $\alpha = 0.98$ ), and Part C-1 was 0.84 ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ). The possible reason for the lower reliability of Part C-1 was assumed to be due to the variety of items. Overall, the high reliabilities of Part B-3, B-4, and C-1 showed the consistency of the responses to 39 Likert-scale items within a single form of a survey administered on a single occasion.

The survey was implemented in Fall Semester 2010 and Spring Semester 2011. I carefully deliberated about the timing of the questionnaire. If the questionnaire were to be distributed early in the semester, the ELI 80 students might not know about the requirements in subject matter courses, their difficulties, and the skills which they need to work on. Therefore, the implementation was approximately two months after each semester started. The way to distribute the questionnaire was different from class to class. One teacher handed it to each student at a teacher-student conference and had the student respond soon after the meeting. Another teacher asked her students to respond it at home and bring it to the next class. The others allowed me to visit the classes, explain the purpose of the project, and have the students answer it during the class.

Participants were enrolled in ELI 80 in either Fall Semester 2010 or Spring Semester 2011. The students attending on-line classes of the course were eliminated because their needs may be different from the in situ class students' needs. Thus, 89 students attending in situ classes of ELI 80 were asked to participate in the questionnaire survey, and 78 responded to the questionnaire. The return rate was 87.6%. Almost every

student (except absentees from the course) participated in this survey. As can be seen in Table 4, 59.0% of the participants were female, and 41.0% were male. Their ages had a mean of 26.8 and ranged from 16 to 60. Their first languages were: 25.6% Chinese, 23.1% Japanese, 15.4% Korean, 10.3% Vietnamese, 7.7% Indonesian, 6.4% Thai, and 2.6% German. The remaining 9.1% were composed of seven students, each having a different L1: Bengali, Burmese, Hindi, Khmer, Micronesian, Nepalese, and Tibetan. Their time in the United States had a mean of 20.0 months and ranged from two months to 32 years. The length of more than half of the students' stay in the U.S. was between one month and six months. Their studies ranged over 14 different areas (see Table 4 for details). Regarding class standing, they were almost equally divided into undergraduates and the others: 51.3% of the students were undergraduates, 47.4% were graduates, and the remaining 1.3% was a post baccalaureate unclassified. As for their status, 80.8% of the participants were international students, 16.7% were immigrants, and the remaining 2.6% were U.S citizens. Regarding academic speaking and listening skills, 73.1% of the participants responded that they had taken an academic listening and speaking course before they entered UHM.

All of the information from the survey questionnaire was coded for statistical analysis and entered into an *Excel* spreadsheet program. Statistical procedures employed included descriptive statistics for the various items on the survey (totals, percentages, means, standard deviations, modes, medians, midpoints, minimums, maximums, ranges), and Cronbach alpha to examine the internal-consistency reliability in the survey. In addition, the handwritten comments in open-ended items were categorized and tabulated.

Table 4

*Demographic Profile of Questionnaire Participants (N = 78)*

Characteristic	n	%	Characteristic	n	%
Gender			Area of Study		
Male	32	41.0	Social Science	17	21.8
Female	46	59.0	Languages, Linguistics, and Literature	15	19.2
Age			Natural Science	9	11.5
Teens	7	9.0	Business	8	10.3
20's	49	62.8	Travel Industry Management	6	7.7
30's	18	23.0	Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources	4	5.1
40's	2	2.6	Engineering	4	5.1
50's	1	1.3	Education	4	5.1
60's	1	1.3	Architecture	3	3.8
First Language			Arts & Humanities	2	2.6
Chinese	20	25.6	Health Sciences and Social Welfare	1	1.3
Japanese	18	23.1	Law	1	1.3
Korean	12	15.4	Medicine	1	1.3
Vietnamese	8	10.3	Pacific and Asia Studies	1	1.3
Indonesian	6	7.7	Others (unreported)	2	2.6
Thai	5	6.4	Level		
German	2	2.6	Undergraduate	40	51.3
Bengali	1	1.3	Graduate	37	47.4
Burmese	1	1.3	Post Baccalaureate Unclassified	1	1.3
Hindi	1	1.3	Time in U.S.		
Khmer	1	1.3	1 – 6 months	40	51.3
Micronesia	1	1.3	7 - 12 months	16	20.5
Nepalese	1	1.3	More than one year	1	1.3
Tibetan	1	1.3	More than two years	7	9.0
Status			More than three years	8	10.3
International	63	80.8	More than four years	6	7.7
Immigrant	13	16.7	Did you learn academic speaking/listening skills before		
U.S. citizen	2	2.6	you entered UHM?		
			Yes	57	73.1
			No	21	26.9

Note. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

### *Class Observations*

The third source of data was class observations, which was aimed at examining the consistency of the data gained through the interviews and the questionnaire survey. My main foci were: (a) class activities, (b) students' performance, and (c) their difficulties. Class observations were conducted in two different ELI 80 classes and one ELI 70 class once each in Spring Semester 2011 with teachers' consent. ELI 70 is a lower-level listening and speaking course, which was compared with ELI 80 so as to better understand the ELI 80 students' language needs. To observe students' typical activity in class, the lessons were not recorded on videotape. I sat near the door and took notes during the observations. Participants were 31 ELI 80 students (16 males and 15 females), and eight ELI 70 students (three males and five females).

## Results

### *Interviews*

Interviewees shared their opinions on both their difficulties in English in general, and how the ELI 80 instruction could be improved. First, their difficulty was following native speakers of English; two of three had a strong desire to follow the speech of native speakers in mediums such as telephone or Skype. Secondly, what they needed, or had needed, in the course was more opportunities to improve their listening comprehension ability. One participant said that speaking instruction dominated ELI 80. Besides the shared opinions by all three interviewees, the following were mentioned as items necessary to work on by one or two: note-taking skills; oral presentation skills; and more opportunities

to listen and speak outside the classroom. These interviewees' opinions were incorporated into the questionnaire.

### *Questionnaire Survey*

The results of the questionnaire survey will be reported as follows: (a) students' responses on the academic listening and speaking skills requirements in non-ELI courses (Questionnaire Part B-3), (b) students' responses on their difficulties in non-ELI courses (Part B-4), (c) students' responses on the skills they need to work on in ELI 80 (Part C-1 and C-2), and (d) students' responses to an open-ended item (Part C-3).

*(a) students' responses on academic listening and speaking skills requirements in non-ELI courses.* Every item except item 13 in Part B-3 was reported to be *Very important* or *Somewhat important* by more than 70 % of the participants (see Table 5). As it was difficult to identify which item was more important in subject matter courses, the items were ranked in the comparison of the means of the participants' perceptions of the requirements; items 1, 10, and 8 turned out to be top three important items (see Table 6).

Table 5

*Students' Responses on the Requirements in Non-ELI Courses (Part B-3)*

Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Oral presentation	72	3.46	0.79	4.2	5.6	30.6	59.7
2. Leading whole class discussions	72	2.96	0.91	6.9	22.2	38.9	31.9
3. Leading small group discussions	72	3.04	0.93	6.9	19.4	36.1	37.5
4. Participating in whole class discussions	72	3.32	0.78	1.4	15.3	33.3	50.0
5. Participating in small group discussions	72	3.39	0.76	1.4	12.5	31.9	54.2
6. Asking questions during class	72	3.10	0.75	2.8	15.3	51.4	30.6
7. Answering questions during class	71	3.00	0.91	5.6	23.9	35.2	35.2
8. Oral interactions with native speakers	71	3.46	0.75	2.8	7.0	31.0	59.2
9. Oral interactions with international students	72	3.25	0.87	5.6	11.1	36.1	47.2
10. Oral interactions with professors	71	3.46	0.73	1.4	9.9	29.6	59.2
11. Participating in debates	71	3.06	0.94	8.5	15.5	38.0	38.0
12. Taking notes during the lectures	72	3.35	0.81	2.8	12.5	31.9	52.8

*Note.* Survey Part B-3, items 1-12. There was no response to item 13. 1 = Not at all important. 2 = Not very important. 3 = Somewhat important. 4 = Very important. There were some participants who skipped this part because they were not attending non-ELI courses. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.

Table 6

*Students' Responses on the Requirements in Non-ELI Courses (Part B-3) (Mean order)*

Item	Mean	<i>SD</i>
1. Oral presentation	3.46	0.79
10. Oral interactions with professors	3.46	0.73
8. Oral interactions with native speakers	3.46	0.75
5. Participating in small group discussions	3.39	0.76
12. Taking notes during the lectures	3.35	0.81
4. Participating in whole class discussions	3.32	0.78
9. Oral interactions with international students	3.25	0.87
6. Asking questions during class	3.10	0.75
11. Participating in debates	3.06	0.94
3. Leading small group discussions	3.04	0.93
7. Answering questions during class	3.00	0.91
2. Leading whole class discussions	2.96	0.91

*(b) students' responses on their difficulties in non-ELI courses. Table 7*

summarizes the participants' responses to 12 items in Part B-4, in which they assessed their own difficulties with the requirements they had previously identified in Part B-3. More than 70% of the students reported that items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 11 were *Very difficult* or *Somewhat difficult*.

Table 7

*Students' Responses on Their Difficulties in Non-ELI Courses (Part B-4)*

Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Oral presentation	72	3.14	0.83	6.9	6.9	51.4	34.7
2. Leading whole class discussions	71	3.24	0.90	7.0	9.9	35.2	47.9
3. Leading small group discussions	71	2.99	0.89	7.0	18.3	43.7	31.0
4. Participating in whole class discussions	72	3.01	0.90	6.9	18.1	41.7	33.3
5. Participating in small group discussions	72	2.69	0.88	8.3	33.3	38.9	19.4
6. Asking questions during class	72	2.82	0.89	4.2	37.5	30.6	27.8
7. Answering questions during class	71	3.00	0.89	4.2	26.8	33.8	35.2
8. Oral interactions with native speakers	72	2.96	0.86	6.9	18.1	47.2	27.8
9. Oral interactions with international students	72	2.54	0.89	12.5	34.7	38.9	13.9
10. Oral interactions with professors	72	2.74	0.86	8.3	27.8	45.8	18.1
11. Participating in debates	72	3.32	0.82	2.8	13.9	31.9	51.4
12. Taking notes during the lectures	72	2.65	0.87	11.1	27.8	45.8	15.3

*Note.* Survey Part B-4, items 1-12. There was no response to item 13. 1 = Not at all difficult. 2 = Not very difficult. 3 = Somewhat difficult. 4 = Very difficult. There were some participants who skipped this part because they were not attending non-ELI courses. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.

*(c) students' responses on the skills they need to work on in ELI 80. Participants*

were also asked to consider the skills which they needed to work on in Part C-1 and C-2.

In Part-C-1, every item except *American culture* was reported to be *Very important* or

*Somewhat important* by more than 70 % of the participants (see Table 8). As it was

difficult to identify which item was more necessary for them to work on in ELI 80, the items were ranked in the comparison of the means of the participants' perceptions of the necessity. Part C-1 consisted of two types of items: items 1 to 10 were the skills they needed to improve in the classroom, and items 11 to 13 were the opportunities participants wanted outside the classroom. Thus, these two types of items were analyzed separately. First, items 1 to 10 were analyzed; Item 5, 3, and 7 were top three necessary items (see Table 9). Next, the results for items 11 to 13 were analyzed; more than 90% of the participants wanted more opportunities to speak and listen to English outside the classroom; and 70% wanted the materials to listen to at home.

In Part C-2, participants were asked to answer which skill was more necessary to learn speaking or listening, and why. The following result was obtained: 56.9% of the participants reported speaking to be more important to them; and the remaining 43.1% chose listening as the skill to improve more. Table 10 describes the main reasons from each group.

Table 8

*Students' Responses on the Skills They Need to Work on in ELI 80 (Part C-1)*

Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Online opportunities to listen to English	77	3.09	0.85	5.2	15.6	44.2	35.1
2. Listening strategies	78	3.49	0.7	1.3	7.7	32.1	59.0
3. Pronunciation for listening	78	3.64	0.58	0.0	5.1	25.6	69.2
4. Lecture note-taking	78	3.27	0.8	1.3	17.9	33.3	47.4
5. Pronunciation for speaking	77	3.65	0.58	0.0	5.2	24.7	70.1
6. How to participate in debates	78	3.31	0.73	0.0	15.4	38.5	46.2
7. Useful expressions for oral presentations	78	3.63	0.56	0.0	3.8	29.5	66.7
8. Useful expressions for leading discussions	78	3.45	0.62	0.0	6.4	42.3	51.3
9. Useful expressions for asking questions during class	78	3.22	0.73	0.0	17.9	42.3	39.7
10. American culture	78	2.81	0.88	7.7	26.9	42.3	23.1
11. Interesting materials to listen to at home	78	3.04	0.95	7.7	19.2	34.6	38.5
12. More opportunities to listen to English outside the class	78	3.6	0.63	1.3	3.8	28.2	66.7
13. More opportunities to speak English outside the class	78	3.72	0.48	0.0	1.3	25.6	73.1

*Note.* 1 = Not at all necessary. 2 = Not very necessary. 3 = Somewhat necessary. 4 = Very necessary.

Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.

Table 9

*Students' Responses on the Skills They Need to Work on in ELI 80 (Part C-1) (Mean order)*

Item	Mean	<i>SD</i>
5. Pronunciation for speaking	3.65	0.58
3. Pronunciation for listening	3.64	0.58
7. Useful expressions for oral presentations	3.63	0.56
2. Listening strategies	3.49	0.70
8. Useful expressions for leading discussions	3.45	0.62
6. How to participate in debates	3.31	0.73
4. Lecture note-taking	3.27	0.80
9. Useful expressions for asking questions during class	3.22	0.73
1. Online opportunities to listen to English	3.09	0.85
10. American culture	2.81	0.88

Table 10

*The Opinions about Listening and Speaking Skills (Part C-2)*

Main reasons	
Speaking (56.9%)	<p>Speaking contains listening, and it more promotes language acquisition than just listening, I think.</p> <p>Stating my own opinion is really needed in classroom.</p> <p>I can practice listening by myself using CD and podcast, but I need other people's help to practice speaking.</p> <p>There are a lot of chances to give oral presentation in the class.</p> <p>It's hard for me to speak in public.</p> <p>I should practice more and get out of nerve.</p> <p>It's sometime too difficult to make audience understand what I am saying.</p> <p>Because with good speaking skill so you can communicate with others well.</p>
Listening (43.1%)	<p>If I couldn't know what the professors are talking about in classes, I will fail I guess.</p> <p>If you can't listen well, you can't join discussion or talking in the class/outside the class.</p> <p>Most of the time I just need to listen what the professors say in the lecture.</p> <p>I think different people has different accent and sometime it's hard to understand.</p> <p>Speaking is just saying out what you think so. I think it's easier.</p> <p>If I can listen very well, I will speak very well.</p> <p>I cannot remember what I hear.</p> <p>Even though you can speak good enough, if you can't listen what others say, you can't talk with them.</p>

(d) *students' responses to an open-ended item.* Finally, in Part C-3, participants were asked to make some comments on any other problems related to academic listening and speaking. Twenty-three students provided 25 handwritten comments. These comments were categorized and tabulated in Table 11. The results show that the area of concern most often mentioned by participants was listening. They had different problems of listening comprehension ability. In addition, the area of concern second most often mentioned was pronunciation.

Table 11

*Summary of Comments on Any Other Problems (Part C-3)*

Area	Problems	<i>n</i>
Listening	General listening comprehension ability	4
	Difficulty with following native speakers	3
	Difficulty with understanding foreign accents	2
	Struggles with note-taking	1
Pronunciation	Want to acquire native-like pronunciation	1
	Necessity to acquire intelligible pronunciation	5
Speaking	Lack of sufficient knowledge of appropriate expressions	3
Vocabulary	Lack of sufficient knowledge of vocabulary	4
Culture	Cultural differences (hesitation to speak, and so on)	1
Affect	Feel nervous while speaking English	1

*Class Observations*

The activities in one of the two ELI 80 classes I observed were discussions and a group presentation. First, students were provided a handout *Lecture Culture* and exchanged opinions in pairs about the differences between American culture and their culture in terms of behaviors by speakers or listeners. Next, after they looked through another handout *Academic Listening Strategies*, they discussed which strategies were important or difficult in small groups. Finally, four students made a group presentation using *Power Point*, and the others listened to the presenters quietly.

In the other ELI 80 class, students worked on a listening activity and participated in group discussions. The listening activity was aimed at raising students' awareness of different types of speech: formal and informal speeches. Students listened to two short speeches and then initiated an exchange of views in pairs in regard to: (a) the differences

between the speeches in terms of speed, articulation, and expressions, and (b) the ways to apply the knowledge to their oral presentations. Next, they were divided into small groups and discussed topics which discussion leaders prepared. After approximately 30 minutes of the discussion, the leaders reported a summary of the discussion to class on the basis of the notes they took during the discussion.

Students in the ELI 80 classes were very active: they could start discussions soon after the teacher's instruction, and they were listening to other members carefully and attempting to express their own opinions. On the other hand, there were a few students who seldom conveyed their personal opinions, asked questions, or requested for more information. In the group oral presentation, three out of four presenters provided information without speaking from notes, but we observed that their English pronunciation sometimes confused the audience, making some of them lose interest.

In the ELI 70 class, activities were note-taking, small group discussions, and shadowing. First, students practiced taking notes and talked about effective note-taking ways in pairs. And then they worked on shadowing, which was aimed at improving their oral fluency. After the teacher's explanation, they repeated their partners' utterances in pairs. The ELI 70 students' reaction to the teacher's instruction was not as good as the ELI 80 students'. The ELI 70 students' English comprehension seemed not to be enough to follow the instructor because it took them a few minutes to start activities. The differences in English comprehension and performance in class between ELI 70 and 80 were very obvious.

## Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether there were any gaps between the ELI 80 students' needs and the course. We can begin the discussion by answering the following two research questions:

1. What skills do the ELI 80 students prefer to learn in ELI 80?
2. Does the course meet the students' perception of language needs? If not, what suggestions could be provided about the course?

### *What Skills do the ELI 80 Students Prefer to Learn in ELI 80?*

The results of this study showed the following three important items the ELI 80 students needed to learn: oral presentation, oral interactions with native speakers, and listening. On the basis of the methodological triangulation, we shall discuss these items one by one. The first item is oral presentation skills. In the questionnaire survey, participants responded that subject matter courses heavily demanded oral presentation, with which they also reported having difficulty. Moreover, some students reported that they needed to practice speaking in public to reduce the tension during the speech. This response shows ESL students' anxiety about oral presentation and the importance of the instruction to help them feel confident in their oral presentation. It is true that in a class observation presenters were providing key points without looking at notes, and that there were only one interviewee that mentioned the skills; however, students need enough opportunities to practice speaking in public because of the importance of oral presentations in the U.S. academic community.

The second item is the skills to facilitate oral interactions with native speakers. In the questionnaire, participants reported that subject matter courses heavily demanded oral interactions with professors and peers. However, the skills they identified as very important in subject matter courses were not necessarily reported to be difficult. Oral interactions with international students or professors were not reported to be difficult. On the other hand, respondents reported having difficulty with oral interactions with native English-speaking peers. In addition, all of the interviewees had the same opinions about oral interactions with native speakers. In class observations, however, this was not observed because the ELI 80 students did not have to communicate with native speakers except with the teacher. It is worth examining students' difficulty in oral interactions with native speakers more closely.

Although it is not clear from the survey results why students do not consider it difficult to communicate with international students or professors, there are two possible reasons: (a) there is a difference in pronunciation between native speakers and non-native speakers; and that (b) one-on-one talks with professors, whether they are native speakers, is relatively easy because students can use communication strategies such as requesting professors to repeat themselves, or because professors talk more clearly and slowly than native English-speaking student peers. Regardless of what the case may be, it is a serious problem for the ELI 80 students who have difficulty in oral interactions with native speakers because communication with their English-speaking peers has a decisive impact on the completion of their program. In the U. S. academic context, instructors' teaching styles are

very interactive, and class participation through discussions and question-and-answer sessions in oral presentation has an important role. This teaching style may have made many students feel the need to work on *Pronunciation for speaking* and *Pronunciation for listening*, which were the top two items of the 13 skills to work on in ELI 80. All these things show the importance of the instruction to improve oral interaction skills with native speakers.

This carries into the third item, listening skills. In interviews, former students responded that they had needed more opportunities to improve their listening comprehension in ELI 80. In class observations, I found an ELI 80 student who had difficulty participating in a small group discussion because of his listening comprehension ability. In fact, he responded that he needed to learn listening skills more than speaking in a questionnaire item, where approximately half of the participants expressed the same thought. In addition, 10 out of 25 comments in an open-end item of the questionnaire were concerned about listening while only three were about speaking. These results clearly show the ELI 80 students' high level of expectations for listening instruction.

In sum, the data gathered from participants presented a picture of the academic listening and speaking skills they particularly needed to learn in ELI 80: (a) oral presentation skills, (b) oral interaction skills with native speakers, and (c) listening skills. We will now proceed to examine whether the course meets the students' needs, and where it does not, we will also discuss how the course could be revised to meet their needs and provide suggestions about the course.

*Does the Course Meet the Students' Perception of Language Needs? If Not, What Suggestions could be Provided about the Course?*

The ELI 80 course can be modified to satisfy students' needs. It can provide students with many opportunities to learn (a) oral presentation skills through the course activities, *Textbook Facilitations* and *Individual Presentations*. The course, however, does not provide enough opportunities for students to improve (b) oral interaction skills with native speakers or (c) listening skills. Although the course activities, *Expert Interview* and *Oral Report* and *Listening to Speech Assignment* have the potential to work for (b) and (c), they are not common among all classes. Moreover, *Expert Interview* is only a one-shot activity, and *Listening to Speech Assignment* is homework. The homework assignment is only a supplement to regular listening activities in the classroom because students may keep listening in vain to grasp the big picture of the speech, or to recognize the spoken form of the word or phrase in the particular utterance. Field (2008) claims "Instead of assuming that 'more = better,' the language teacher needs to establish precisely what techniques and strategies the successful L2 listener employs and the unsuccessful one does not" (p. 80). Therefore, the quality of the listening activity should be improved through systematic instruction in the classrooms instead of just providing students with opportunities to practice by themselves. The perceived gaps in the ELI 80 instruction can shed some light on how we can make improvements in the course, such as suggested below.

Let us then move to a discussion of activities to be incorporated into the current course. We suggest raising students' awareness of native speakers' pronunciation so as to

improve both oral interaction skills with native speakers and listening skills. Pronunciation forms a link to listening (Gilbert, 1995; Morley, 1991; Nation & Newton, 2009; Pennington & Richards, 1986; Ur, 1984). In particular, learners' ability to determine the full forms underlying connected speech is important in decoding native speaker speech (Brown & Kondo-Brown, 2006; Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 1996; Ito, 2006a). Research shows the effectiveness of teaching connected speech for improving listening comprehension among English learners in foreign language learning contexts (Brown & Hilferty, 2006; Ito, 2006b; Matsuzawa, 2006). Connected speech includes word stress, sentence stress and timing, reduction, strong and weak forms of words, elision, intrusion, assimilation, transition, liaison, and contraction (Brown & Kondo-Brown, 2006, pp. 2-4). This type of speech occurs in all levels of native speakers' speech (Brown & Kondo-Brown, 2006, p. 5), which is very different from clearly pronounced and articulated ones such as the ELI instructors' speech. Thus, "the simple awareness of their existence can help enormously in enabling students to better understand the language they hear" (Brown, 2006, p. 20), which is believed to facilitate oral communication between ESL students and native speakers. I will now proceed to the implementation.

In teaching connected speech to the ELI 80 students, there are three things to note: (a) focus on the reception, (b) long-term perspective instruction, and (c) a student-centered approach. The first point to notice is that teachers should not focus on students' production of connected speech, but students' ability to decode it for listening comprehension. As long as their utterances are intelligible, students should not be required to strive to achieve a

native-like pronunciation, because native-speakerism or native-speaker authority may hinder comfortable relationships between students and native speakers. Native-speakerism is the belief that native speakers within the English-speaking West represent a Western culture from which spring the ideals of the English language such as correct pronunciation (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). The underlying theme of native-speakerism is the ‘othering’ of students from outside the English-speaking West according to essentialist regional or religious cultural stereotypes (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). Therefore, the assumption of native-speaker authority makes non-native speakers feel inferior to the native speakers and hesitate to use their own English (Matsuda, 2003, pp. 722-723). The view opposite to native-speakerism is Kachru’s (1986) World Englishes (WE). What WE interpretations attempt to do is to develop a model that legitimizes a pluralistic view of English, and the WE paradigm tries to place all varieties of English on par with each other without any one being a reference point (McKay, 2010, p. 91). From the perspective of curriculum development, Brown (in press) suggests including models of outer-circle and expanding-circle users of English so students may realize that English does not belong exclusively to the inner-circle (p. 7). It must be noted that careful instruction is required in introducing connected speech.

The second point to note is that connected speech should be taught with a long-term perspective in mind. Research shows the effectiveness of four-weeks of instruction in connected speech for improving listening comprehension as measured by various types of reduced-focus dictation tests (Brown & Hilferty, 2006; Ito, 2006b; Matsuzawa, 2006). However, there was no significant difference found between the treatment group and the

control group on a typical multiple-choice listening comprehension test after four-week instruction in connected speech (Brown & Hilferty, 2006). Although connected speech may have made up only a very small part of the listening test, it is believed that four weeks was not enough to improve the whole listening comprehension. Pennington and Richards (1986) state that “learning is a gradual process to the target language system over time and a progression from controlled to automatic processing” (p. 218). Furthermore, they claim the following:

Immediate results from pronunciation training may not be achieved if the learner has not reached an appropriate stage in phonological development ... Such training may, however, assist in the development of new articulatory habits and contribute to the reorganization of higher level systems, or schemata, eventually resulting in a change in performance (pp. 218-219).

Therefore, teachers should design an instructional component for the entire course, not just several weeks. One-shot activities, alone, cannot improve students’ listening comprehension. Instruction over the whole semester will be necessary to raise students’ awareness of connected speech.

The third point to notice is that students should be given opportunities to actively learn connected speech. Not only should students receive the information from the teacher through such activities as dictation, but also they should be actively involved in a process of knowledge construction so as to make their learning more effective. One approach to teaching is having students conduct an interview with a native-speaker outside the classroom,

record the interview, analyze some aspects of connected speech, and make an oral report to share their investigation with their classmates. This activity can also provide students another opportunity to improve oral presentation skills. This is illustrative only, but worth considering.

The present study indicated that there were gaps between the ELI 80 students' language needs and the course. I identified three important items which should be incorporated into the main course activities among all classes, which were oral presentation skills, oral interaction skills with native speakers, and listening skills. I also suggested raising students' awareness of native speakers' connected speech. Finally, I discussed pedagogical implications, that is, three things to note in teaching connected speech: (a) focus on the reception, (b) long-term perspective instruction, and (c) student-centered approaches. These will be a direction in the ongoing ELI 80 course development.

### Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was: (a) to investigate the ELI 80 students' needs and (b) to examine whether the course met their needs. To increase the dependability and credibility of the data, methodological triangulation was applied to the research including the use of interviews, a questionnaire, and class observations. The data gathered from the participants showed that there was a need to revise the focus on speaking instruction and main course activities. Our suggestion is to incorporate activities to raise students' awareness of connected speech so as to improve both their listening comprehension ability and oral interactions with native speakers.

It is important to consider some of the limitations of the study. First, one of the limitations has to do with sampling procedures for interviewing. Interviewees were not selected randomly from the population, and the sample size may not have been large enough to generalize their views on the ELI 80 students' needs and the course. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the data cautiously in order to appreciate the students' needs. Secondly, some questionnaire items could be improved; items lacked specific statements, which resulted in very high means. This made it difficult to identify which skills students especially needed to work on in the course. Thirdly, as space is limited, we have concentrated on three very important items as skills students need to learn and paid scant attention to the others, for example participating in small group discussions. There is room for further discussion. Finally, students' interpretation of "native speakers" should have been investigated further because of the distinctive locality of Hawai'i. Hawai'i creole English, widely spoken in the State, might have an impact on students' difficulties in following native speakers. This should be investigated in further studies in the ELI 80 students' needs analysis.

In spite of these limitations, I believe that the use of methodological triangulation was very effective in validating the data because interviews, a questionnaire, and class observations were used sequentially. The individual interviews with students were very useful in developing the questionnaire items as a preliminary method. In the questionnaire survey, approximately 90% of the ELI 80 students participated over two semesters. Moreover, the consistency of the data gained through the interviews and the questionnaire

was examined in class observations.

This study originated with my experience as an ELI 80 student. The course was very helpful for me to survive my first semester in UHM, but the main focus of the course was speaking and there was no sufficient instruction in listening. Therefore, I strongly hoped to explore the ELI 80 students' needs. The data gained in this project showed that many students had the same opinions as me. The ELI 80 students' listening comprehension may not be as high as believed by teachers. Therefore, it is important to be persistent in establishing precisely where and how the breakdown of understanding occurs even in an advanced listening and speaking course. As Brown (1995) states, curricula should keep developing to be "a framework that helps the students to learn as efficiently and effectively as possible in the given situation" (p. 19). I hope that the present needs analysis creates an opportunity for those in charge of ELI 80 to keep developing the course for the current and future students.

#### Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. James Dean Brown and Dr. Richard Day for valuable advice on this study. The Survey Research Methods course and the Program Development course offered by Dr. Brown inspired me to conduct the ELI 80 students' needs analysis and built the foundations for the research, and the Second Language Listening and Speaking course offered by Dr. Day was of great help for me to further develop the needs analysis. I am also indebted to Mr. Kenton Harsch, the ELI director and the ELI teachers for permission to conduct this project and for their helpful comments.

## References

- Bosher, S., & Smalkoski, K. (2002). From needs analysis to curriculum development: Designing a course in health-care communication for immigrant students in the USA. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 59-79.
- Braine, G. (2001). Twenty years of needs analysis: Reflections on a personal journey. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 195-207). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Brown, J. D. (2006). *Authentic communication: Whyzit importan' ta teach reduced forms?* *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> annual JALT Pan-SIG conference*. Shizuoka, Japan: Tokai University College of Marine Science. Retrieved April 19, 2011, from <http://jalt.org/pansig/2006/HTML/Brown.htm>
- Brown, J. D. (2009). Foreign and second language needs analysis. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 269-293). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brown, J. D. (in press). EIL curriculum development. In L. Alsagoff, S. McKay, G. W. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. London: Routledge.

- Brown, J. D., & Hilferty, A. (2006). The effectiveness of teaching reduced forms for listening comprehension. In J. D. Brown & K. Kondo-Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on teaching connected speech to second language speakers* (pp. 51-58). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Brown, J. D., & Kondo-Brown, K. (2006). Introducing connected speech. In J. D. Brown & K. Kondo-Brown, (Eds.), *Perspectives on teaching connected speech to second language speakers* (pp. 1-15). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chan, E., & Ham, K. (2007). *EAP listening and speaking: From needs analysis to evaluation*. Honolulu: English language Institute, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Retrieved November 1, 2010 from <http://www.hawaii.edu/eli/research/research-papers/>
- Crookes, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Ferris, D. (1998). Students' views of academic aural/oral skills: A comparative needs analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 289-318.
- Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996a). Academic oral communication needs of EAP learners: What subject-matter instructors actually require. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1), 31-58.
- Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996b). Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students:

- Problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 297-320.
- Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Gilbert, R. (2005). Evaluating the use of multiple sources and methods in needs analysis: A case study of journalists in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia (Spain). In M. H. Long, (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 182-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Gilbert, J. (1995). Pronunciation practice as an aid to listening comprehension. In D. J. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin, (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 97-112). San Diego: Dominie.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 385-387.
- Huh, S. (2006). A task-based needs analysis for a business English course. *Second Language Studies*, 24(2), 1-64.
- Ito, Y. (2006a). The significance of reduced forms in L2 pedagogy. In J. D. Brown & K. Kondo-Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on teaching connected speech to second language speakers* (pp. 17-25). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Ito, Y. (2006b). The comprehension of English reduced forms by second language learners and its effect on input-intake process. In J. D. Brown & K. Kondo-Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on teaching connected speech to second language speakers* (pp. 67-81). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Iwai, T., Kondo, K., Lim, D. S. J., Ray, G. E., Shimizu, H., & Brown, J. D. (1999). *Japanese*

- language needs analysis 1998-1999*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved April 13, 2011 from <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/handle/10125/8950/NW13.pdf?sequence=1>
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The Alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kikuchi, K. (2004). Triangulating perceptions of learners' needs: An alternate way of conducting needs analysis. *2004 JALT Pan-SIG Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT. Retrieved March 30, 2011 from <http://jalt.org/pansig/2004/HTML/Kikuchi.htm>
- Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 19-76). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37 (4), 719-729.
- Matsuzawa, T. (2006). Comprehension of English reduced forms by Japanese business people and effectiveness of instruction. In J. D. Brown & K. Kondo-Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on teaching connected speech to second language speakers* (pp. 59-66). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- McKay, S. (2010). English as an international language. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language Education* (pp. 89-115). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Morley, J. (1991). The pronunciation component in teaching English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly* 25(3), 481-520.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge.

Pennington, M. C., & Richards, J. C. (1986). Pronunciation revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 207-225.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Ur, P. (1984). *Teaching listening comprehension*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

## Appendix A

## Survey Questionnaire: EIL 80 Students' Views of Academic Listening and Speaking

## A. Demographic Information

1. What is your gender? (circle one)

Male / Female

2. What is your age?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your first language?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Which academic department do you belong to? (e.g., American studies, Chemistry, History, Psychology, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_

5. What is your current class standing? (circle one)

*Undergraduate* / *Graduate* / *Post Baccalaureate Unclassified (PBU)*

6. How long have you been in the United States?

\_\_\_\_\_ year(s) \_\_\_\_\_ month(s)

7. What is your status?

*International (visa)* / *Immigrant* / *U.S. citizen*

8. Did you learn academic speaking/listening skills before you entered UHM?

(circle one)

*Yes* / *No*

If you answered **Yes**, where did you learn these academic skills (e.g., language school in your country, language school in the U.S.A., HELP, high school, etc.)?

\_\_\_\_\_



4. Please circle an appropriate number about the difficulties you have in **Non-ELI courses**.

Difficulties in Non-ELI courses		Very Difficult	Somewhat difficult	Not very difficult	Not at all difficult
1	Oral presentation	4	3	2	1
2	Leading whole class discussions	4	3	2	1
3	Leading small group discussions	4	3	2	1
4	Participating in whole class discussions	4	3	2	1
5	Participating in small group discussions	4	3	2	1
6	Asking questions during class	4	3	2	1
7	Answering questions during class	4	3	2	1
8	Oral interactions with native speakers of English	4	3	2	1
9	Oral interactions with international students	4	3	2	1
10	Oral interactions with professors	4	3	2	1
11	Participating in debates	4	3	2	1
12	Taking notes during the lectures	4	3	2	1
13	If you have any other difficulties in Non-ELI courses, please write them here, and circle an appropriate number.  ( )	4	3	2	1

## C. Skills students need to work on

1. Do you think that these lessons are necessary for you? Please circle an appropriate number.

Skills students need to work on		Very necessary	Somewhat necessary	Not very necessary	Not at all necessary
1	Online opportunities to listen to English (e.g., Skype, etc.)	4	3	2	1
2	Listening strategies (how to improve listening comprehension ability)	4	3	2	1
3	Pronunciation for listening	4	3	2	1
4	Lecture note-taking	4	3	2	1
5	Pronunciation for speaking	4	3	2	1
6	How to participate in debates	4	3	2	1
7	Useful expressions for oral presentations	4	3	2	1
8	Useful expressions for leading discussions	4	3	2	1
9	Useful expressions for asking questions during class	4	3	2	1
10	American culture	4	3	2	1
11	Interesting materials to listen to at home (CDs, DVDs, Websites, etc.)	4	3	2	1
12	More opportunities to listen to English outside the class	4	3	2	1
13	More opportunities to speak English outside the class	4	3	2	1

2. Which skill is more necessary to learn to complete your program successfully? Why?

(circle one)

1. Speaking      2. Listening

The reason:

3. Other comments

If you have any other problems related to academic listening and speaking, please write them here:

## Appendix B

## Descriptive Statistics

Table B-1

*Students' Responses on the Requirements in Non-ELI Courses*

Q	Mean	Mode	Median	Midpoint	Min	Max	Range	SD	N	1	2	3	4
1	3.46	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.79	72	4.17	5.56	30.56	59.72
2	2.96	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.91	72	6.94	22.22	38.89	31.94
3	3.04	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.93	72	6.94	19.44	36.11	37.50
4	3.32	4	3.50	2.50	1	4	4	0.78	72	1.39	15.28	33.33	50.00
5	3.39	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.76	72	1.39	12.50	31.94	54.17
6	3.10	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.75	72	2.78	15.28	51.39	30.56
7	3.00	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.91	71	5.63	23.94	35.21	35.21
8	3.46	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.75	71	2.82	7.04	30.99	59.15
9	3.25	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.87	72	5.56	11.11	36.11	47.22
10	3.46	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.73	71	1.41	9.86	29.58	59.15
11	3.06	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.94	71	8.45	15.49	38.03	38.03
12	3.35	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.81	72	2.78	12.50	31.94	52.78

*Note.* Survey Part B-3, Items 1-12. There was no response to Item 13. 1 = Not at all important. 2 = Not very important. 3 = Somewhat important. 4 = Very important. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.

Table B-2

*Students' Responses on the Difficulties in Non-ELI Courses*

Q	Mean	Mode	Median	Midpoint	Min	Max	Range	SD	N	1	2	3	4
1	3.14	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.83	72	6.94	6.94	51.39	34.72
2	3.24	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.90	71	7.04	9.86	35.21	47.89
3	2.99	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.89	71	7.04	18.31	43.66	30.99
4	3.01	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.90	72	6.94	18.06	41.67	33.33
5	2.69	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.88	72	8.33	33.33	38.89	19.44
6	2.82	2	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.89	72	4.17	37.50	30.56	27.78
7	3.00	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.89	71	4.23	26.76	33.80	35.21
8	2.96	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.86	72	6.94	18.06	47.22	27.78
9	2.54	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.89	72	12.50	34.72	38.89	13.89
10	2.74	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.86	72	8.33	27.78	45.83	18.06
11	3.32	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.82	72	2.78	13.89	31.94	51.39
12	2.65	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.87	72	11.11	27.78	45.83	15.28

*Note.* Survey Part B-4, Items 1-12. There was no response to Item 13. 1 = Not at all difficult. 2 = Not very difficult. 3 = Somewhat difficult. 4 = Very difficult. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.

Table B-3

*Students' Responses on Skills the Students Need to Work on in ELI 80*

Q	Mean	Mode	Median	Midpoint	Min	Max	Range	SD	N	1	2	3	4
1	3.09	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.85	77	5.19	15.58	44.16	35.06
2	3.49	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.70	78	1.28	7.69	32.05	58.97
3	3.64	4	4.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.58	78	0.00	5.13	25.64	69.23
4	3.27	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.80	78	1.28	17.95	33.33	47.44
5	3.65	4	4.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.58	77	0.00	5.19	24.68	70.13
6	3.31	4	3.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.73	78	0.00	15.38	38.46	46.15
7	3.63	4	4.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.56	78	0.00	3.85	29.49	66.67
8	3.45	4	4.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.62	78	0.00	6.41	42.31	51.28
9	3.22	3	3.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.73	78	0.00	17.95	42.31	39.74
10	2.81	3	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.88	78	7.69	26.92	42.31	23.08
11	3.04	4	3.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.95	78	7.69	19.23	34.62	38.46
12	3.60	4	4.00	2.50	1	4	4	0.63	78	1.28	3.85	28.21	66.67
13	3.72	4	4.00	3.00	2	4	3	0.48	78	0.00	1.28	25.64	73.08

*Note.* Survey Part C-1, Items 1-13. 1 = Not at all necessary. 2 = Not very necessary. 3 = Somewhat necessary. 4 = Very necessary. Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. Question numbers correspond to the order they appear in the questionnaire.