

Communicative English Skills Needs of EFL Undergraduate Students and the Perception of their Instructors about Students' Needs

Yenus Nurie Bogale¹

Abstract

This study examined EFL students' perceived language skills needs and compared students' preferences with their instructors' perception towards the importance of each skill to their students at Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. Questionnaires were administered and collected from an accessible population of 80 participants that was drawn from two colleges. Among thirty-seven instructors who were teaching the course "Communicative English Skills", twelve were selected using a systematic random sampling method by taking every third from a list of instructors assigned by the department. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The results showed that students valued receptive skills more than productive skills, whereas their instructors rated *writing* and *reading* as the two most important skills for student learning. The result also found that students and instructors showed discrepancies in their perceptual needs in listening and writing skills, in which students rated the listening skill as the most important next to reading and instructors rated writing skills as the most important. Implications for teaching communicative English Skills by integrating all the skills together and the necessity of further research are presented.

Keywords: *Needs, Skills, Communicative, Sub-skills, Perception*

Introduction

The importance of English as an international language to connect people in business, social and political communications has tremendously

¹ Assistant Professor (PhD in TEFL) Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Bahir Dar University.

increased for the last couple of decades. English has particularly showed its profound role in education to advance in science and technology. It has also become a medium of instruction in high schools, colleges, and universities in many countries of the world. As a result, developing the English language communicative proficiency of students is important for university students for academic purposes as well as in workplaces after graduation. Accordingly, “Communicative English Skills” has become a compulsory course offered for undergraduate students across universities in Ethiopia.

The course “Communicative English Skills” is a foundation course for higher education students. The following two interwoven rationales justify why communicative English skills matter and should be paid considerable attention. First, it paves favorable opportunities to practice the language for students across many fields and equips students with good communicative skills thereby attaining one of the major objectives of university education. Second, the course is expected to prepare students to be professionals who will be able to demonstrate their self-confidence and communicative potential in job related activities that will be held in English.

Regardless of all these requirements and expectations, a plethora of research has reported that many students graduating from universities in Ethiopia have little or no communicative competence in English. Recent studies showed considerable English language problems. For example, Jha (2014) reported that Ethiopian students often attribute their academic dismissal to their incompetence in English. Researchers also reported a wide gap between engineering students’ limited command of English academic literacy and their much more developed L1 academic literacy in Ethiopian universities. For instance, Medhanit (2020) examined students’

perceptions towards the course “Technical Report Writing” and revealed that there are problems of delivering the course according to the specified objectives and purposes due to students’ poor English language proficiency.

Research also reported writing skills and sub-skills were most needed by civil engineering students followed by reading and speaking skills (Aklilu, 2015). The reading ability of Ethiopian secondary and tertiary level students is deteriorating from time to time (Collins & Gillies, 2010; USAID, 2010). All in all, the empirical evidence reviewed for this study showed communicative English skills problems of university-level students, and hence implying the relentless vitality of examining the needs and problems of students.

The concept of Needs Analysis (NA) is well established in the literature, and needs analysis is an activity of identifying learners’ needs (Hyland, 2006). Given the impetus of needs analysis, a large body of local as well as international studies has been conducted on needs analysis (Ahmed, 2009; Aklilu, 2015; Biniam, 2013; Choi, 2012; Gborsong, Afful, Coker, Akoto, Twumasi, & Baiden, 2015). With respect to language needs analysis in language use settings, the purpose of conducting a needs analysis study is to identify learners’ language needs and requirements (Songhori, 2008).

Brown (1995) also defines needs analysis as the systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary in the language learning requirements of the students within the context of the particular institutions involved in the learning situation. Needs analysis refers to the procedures and activities of collecting information about students’ needs, then validating and prioritizing those needs to be the foundation for designing and evolving a curriculum that matches those needs (Richards, 2001).

Theoretical framework

Regarding language needs analysis research settings, several theoretical and conceptual frameworks have been suggested in the literature. However, all of them commonly share the same purpose: identifying language needs of learners. For example, Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) and Hutchinson and Waters (1987) confirmed that a number of models of needs analysis have all proposed a theoretical framework that can be used in analyzing the English needs of students for specific purposes.

Table 1: Dudley-Evans and St. John's (1998) needs analysis model

Approach	Specific Information for needs analysis
Language information about learners	Evaluates learners' current skills and language used (present situation analysis)
Learners lacks	Considers the gap between the present situation and professional information about learners
Learners' needs from course	Focuses on what is wanted from the course (short term needs)

Dudley-Evans and St. John's (1998) theoretical framework of ESP needs analysis model considers the vitality of examining learner's strengths and weakness in the target language and factors that affect learning such as reasons for learning, as it emphasizes the necessity of social interaction for effective language learning. This framework has been used to guide this study.

Needs Analysis Studies

Litticharoenporn (2014) examined the connections among teachers, students, and parents and what they perceive as important language skills

needed by high school graduation in Thailand. The results revealed that EFL students perceived in-class presentations/demonstrations in English (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something) as the most important skill for their learning. Gborsong et al. (2015) examined the communicative skills needs of undergraduate students in Ghana and reported that paragraph writing and essay development as the least useful components of communicative English skills course offered for undergraduate students.

A study by Chen, Chang and Chang (2016) has also shown discrepancy between employers' and students' needs regarding the importance of reading and listening skills in Taiwan where students showed the least preferences for the two receptive skills. Conversely, listening skills are one of the fundamental skills that employers look for in employees (Kaur & Lee, 2006); listening is considered a keystone that underlies all skills (Al-Thiyabi, 2014); and speaking and listening skills are essential for students attending overseas exhibitions (Tseng, 2014).

While previous local studies on needs analysis have focused on the needs of engineering, business and communication or university law students (Aklilu, 2015; Medhanit, 2020), little or no linguistic research has investigated the needs of undergraduate humanities and social science students. This study, therefore, seeks to examine the communicative needs of undergraduate students across the two fields at Bahir Dar University.

In light of all the literature review and the empirical evidence reviewed for this study, the following research questions were formulated.

- What are the perceptual needs of EFL undergraduate students with respect to the Communicative English Skills?
- What are the English instructors' perceptions of their students' English skills learning needs?

- Are there any significant differences between the students' perceptions and their instructors regarding their perceptions of student English skills needs?

Methods

Participants

There were a total of 318 students who were enrolled in two faculties, namely, Social Sciences and Humanities at the main campus of Bahir Dar University. All the students registered for the course “Communicative English Skills” as a compulsory course in the first semester of the 2018/19 academic year. Out of the total population of 318 students in the two faculties, stratified random sampling was employed to select the sample. The sampling frame was partitioned into the two faculties, and an accessible population of 80 participants was drawn from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Twelve out of thirty-seven instructors were also selected using a systematic random sampling method by taking every third element from a list of instructors assigned by the department.

Research Design

The design of this study is a descriptive survey with a quantitative approach to data collection and analysis. In this study, the analysis of survey results was aimed at the interpretative description of students' English language needs in the course “Communicative English”. This study provided a descriptive analysis of the students and their instructors' views on the communicative aspects of the course.

Data Collection

A questionnaire was the major data collection tool. The students' questionnaire was employed to obtain data on the needs and preferences of students and the instructors' questionnaire was administered to measure the views of instructors on the communicative needs of their students. Both questionnaires consisted of closed-ended as well as open-ended items. The open-ended items were utilized to gather information that was not obtained through the close-ended ones. Internal consistencies of the students' and instructors' questionnaires were determined using a Cronbach's alpha, and found to be .821 and .825, respectively.

Data Analysis

The survey questionnaire aimed at exploring the perceived communicative needs of university students who were enrolled in the two faculties with regard to Communicative English course. The data obtained from the students' and instructors' questionnaire was imported into SPSS. Both types of statistics were used to analyze the data. First, descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the students' perceived needs and the instructors' perceptions about the students' needs by computing the mean scores regarding each language skill. Then, an inferential statistic (i.e., independent samples *t*-test) was run to compare the students' perceived needs and the instructors' perceptions and to determine if there are any statistically significant differences.

Results

In order to address the research questions, the researcher collated the data obtained from both sources and compared EFL students' perceptual needs and their instructors' perception about the students' needs of Communicative English Skills.

Students' Overall Communicative Skills Needs and Instructors' Perceptions of Students' Needs

Table 2: Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perceptions about Students' Communicative Skills Needs

English Skills	Group	No.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean Difference	Sig.
Reading	Students	80	3.63	.719	.182	.409
	Instructors	12	3.45	.645		
Speaking	Students	80	2.86	.711	-.295	.180
	Instructors	12	3.15	.667		
Listening	Students	80	3.15	.571	.995	.000
	Instructors	12	2.15	.419		
Writing	Students	80	2.47	.647	-1.418	.000
	Instructors	12	3.88	.356		
Overall	Students	80	3.02	.336	-.136	.175
	Instructors	12	3.16	.173		

As Table 2 illustrates, the students showed the highest priority on every skill, indicating that the students perceived almost all the skills were very important. However, in comparison among the four English skills, the majority of the students considered receptive skills reading and listening with an average mean of (3.63) and (3.15) respectively very important, whereas writing with an average mean of (2.47) was perceived to be the least important skill. The overall means of the students' questionnaire regarding the four English skills show that reading skill was the most preferred communicative skill.

Although the students put a great deal of importance on all the skills, the comparison of the mean values of the students' needs with respect to communicative English skills necessary for their academic achievement revealed that writing skills as the students' least important skill. This result shows that writing skill was not considered to be a crucial skill by

the students, indicating that the students disregarded the importance of writing skills though this skill is the most pertinent skill required for academic success.

Table 2 also summarizes responses of instructors on their students' Communicative English Skills' needs and indicated that "Writing" skill with a mean of 3.88, "reading" skill with a mean of 3.45 and "Speaking" skill with a mean of 3.15 were the three most important problems of their students. "Listening" skill was not chosen by the majority of the instructors, indicating they have a reservation with the use of the listening for their students who study in various fields.

Students' English Skills and Sub-skills Needs and Instructors' Perceptions of Students' Needs

An attempt was made to make further investigations into the EFL students' needs of the sub-skills of each major skill from their own and teachers' perspectives. Accordingly, the comparison of perceptions about the sub-skills each English language skill is presented sequentially.

Reading Sub-skills Needs

Table 3: Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perceptions about Students' Reading Sub-skills needs

Reading Sub Skills	Group	No.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean Difference	Sig.
Critical reading and reasoning	Students	80	4.45	.634	.450	.027
	Instructors	12	4.00	.739		
Reading for specific information: scanning	Students	80	3.85	1.032	.517	.108
	Instructors	12	3.33	.985		
Reading for gist: skimming	Students	80	3.64	1.070	-.029	.930
	Instructors	12	3.67	1.073		
Understanding text and distinguishing text style	Students	80	3.31	1.259	-.021	.957
	Instructors	12	3.33	1.073		
Dealing with unfamiliar words	Students	80	2.91	1.333	-.004	.992
	Instructors	12	2.92	1.311		

Table 3 also shows the mean values of students' responses with regard to their perceived needs on reading sub-skills in ascending order. Inferring

from the data, it is evident that the majority of the students with a mean range of 2.91 to 4.45 chose reading skills as the most important skill. With respect to the reading sub-skills needs, the majority of the students with a mean of 4.25 agreed that critical reading and reasoning skills as the most useful components of the course Communicative English skills. The mean values of students' responses vary ranging from moderately important to the item: dealing with unfamiliar words with a mean value of 2.91 to very important to the item: critical reading and reasoning with a mean value of 4.45. Reading was most preferred by the students with all the sub-skills such as critical reading and reasoning, understanding text and distinguishing text style, reading for specific information: scanning and reading for gist: skimming received the most important values. Overall, all the items except dealing with unfamiliar words were reported to be under the category of the most important reading sub-skills.

Regarding instructors' perceptions of students' "Reading sub-skills" needs, instructors were asked to respond to questions that ask them about their perceptions on their students' reading sub-skills that need to have improved the most, and the results showed that "critical reading and reasoning" with a mean of 4.00 and Reading for gist: skimming with a mean of 3.67 were what the instructors perceived the two most important reading sub-skills that their students need to have improved most. On the other hand, the two remaining reading sub-skills: Reading for specific information and understanding text and distinguishing text style: scanning each with a mean of 3.33 received moderate importance, whereas the item "Dealing with unfamiliar words" was reported to be the least important reading sub-skill that instructors disregarded its importance for their students.

Speaking Sub-skills Needs

Table 4: Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perceptions about Students' Speaking Sub-skills Needs

Speaking Sub Skills	Group	No.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean Difference	Sig.
Appropriacy of diction in dialogues and arguments	Students	80	3.56	1.168	-.354	.000
	Instructors	12	3.92	.996		
Reporting, giving formal speech and Presentations	Students	80	3.33	1.240	-.425	.000
	Instructors	12	3.75	1.422		
Pronunciation and intonation	Students	80	2.79	1.270	-.629	.000
	Instructors	12	3.42	.669		
Using markers in spoken discourse	Students	80	2.55	1.359	.133	.000
	Instructors	12	2.42	1.240		
Using the correct word form and order	Students	80	2.05	1.078	-.200	.000
	Instructors	12	2.25	1.215		

The results of this study pertaining to speaking sub-skills show that the students perceived needs widely varied from least important- Using the correct word form and order with an average mean of 2.25 to most important-appropriacy of diction in dialogues and arguments with mean scores of 3.56. The descriptive statistics in Table 4 show that the two most important speaking sub-skills chosen by the students were found to be Reporting, giving formal speech and Presentations, which is followed by the item appropriacy of diction in dialogues and arguments with mean scores of 3.56 and 3.33 respectively. This result indicates that most of the students who participated in this study showed their propensity to prioritize the speaking sub-skills use of the English language for their academic achievement. It particularly showed that the students were primarily concerned with the ability to deliver formal speech.

The instructors' responses regarding the needs of speaking sub-skills were similar to their students' views. Regarding this, the majority of the instructors held a belief that the appropriateness of diction in dialogues with a mean of 3.92, and arguments and reporting, giving formal speech and presentations with a mean of 3.75 were the two most important

speaking sub-skills that should be emphasized for their students in the course. Conversely, the instructors rated the two items: Using the correct word form and order with a mean value of 2.25 and using markers in spoken discourse with a mean value of 2.56 under the least important category.

Listening Sub-skills Needs

Table 5: Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perceptions about Students' Listening Sub- skills needs

Listening Sub Skills	Group	No.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean Difference	Sig.
Listening for gist	Students	80	4.35	.713	1.933	.000
	Instructors	12	2.42	.699		
Listening for specific information and note taking	Students	80	3.75	.974	2.000	.000
	Instructors	12	1.75	.754		
Recognition of contracted forms in connected speech	Students	80	3.21	1.144	.463	.191
	Instructors	12	2.75	1.055		
Discriminating sounds of grammatical structures	Students	80	2.36	1.275	.113	.769
	Instructors	12	2.25	.866		
Interpreting stress and intonation	Students	80	2.05	1.078	.467	.149
	Instructors	12	1.58	.669		

The choice of listening skill as the third most favored category (See Table 2) indicates that the students could manage the listening comprehension problems related to classroom and public lectures. With respect to the mean score of each item in the listening category, the first two most preferred sub-skills were listening for gist and listening for specific information and note taking with an average mean of 4.35 and 3.75 respectively. One possible explanation for these choices, therefore, can be that the students these two listening sub-skills are more pertinent to achieve academic achievement in their fields of study. On the contrary,

the students showed the least preference on the other two items: Interpreting stress and intonation and discriminating sounds of grammatical structures with a mean value of 2.05 and 2.36 respectively. This shows that the students seemed to disregard the listening skills related to word sounds, rhythms, and intonation, which are, indeed, out of the foci of content area courses.

The instructors considered listening as the least important skill with an average mean of 2.15. However, when the data obtained from the instructors is examined for the specific listening sub- skills, it was evident that unlike their students' perceived needs, the instructors prioritized two of the five items: Recognition of contracted forms in connected speech with a mean of 2.75 indicating that this sub-skill of listening was moderately important for their students. On the other hand, the remaining four items: Recognition of contracted forms in connected speech, discriminating sounds of grammatical structures and interpreting stress and intonation with were perceived to be the least important listening sub-skills.

Writing Sub-skills Needs

Table 6: Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perceptions about Students' Writing Sub-skills Needs

Writing Sub Skills	Group	No.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean Difference	Sig.
Editing and proofreading	Students	80	2.76	1.183	-1.321	.000
	Instructors	12	4.08	.793		
Summarizing, paraphrasing and Organizing	Students	80	2.34	1.030	-2.579	.000
	Instructors	12	4.92	.289		
Using markers in written discourse	Students	80	2.68	1.088	-1.408	.000
	Instructors	12	4.08	.669		
Writing style and format	Students	80	2.71	.957	-.621	.010
	Instructors	12	3.33	.651		
Paragraph Development and Essay Writing	Students	80	1.84	.947	-1.163	.000
	Instructors	12	3.00	.953		

Of the five writing sub-skills provided in the questionnaire, only the item: Editing and proofreading had the highest mean score (2.76), followed by the item: Writing style and format with a mean of (2.71). This indicates that the students didn't have communicative problems regarding writing skills.

The data obtained from instructors regarding the writing sub-skills revealed instructors' propensity in favoring all items of the writing sub-skills provided in the questionnaire. The mean values of individual items range from 3.00 to 4.92. Concerning this, the first two "Writing sub-skills" that the instructors preferred to be the most important for their students were summarizing, paraphrasing and organizing with a mean of 4.92 and editing and proofreading with a mean of 4.08.

Discussions

This study has shown a disparity between perceptions of instructors and students regarding which language skills were most important to the students' academic achievement. Based on the findings, the students prioritized reading and listening skills, which was partially consistent with a plethora of research that showed receptive skills as students' most important skill for content area courses (Hossain, 2013; Kim, 2013) and reading as the most important skill (Gözüyesil, 2014). Contrary to the view that the students chose listening skill as their most important skill emerged the results obtained from instructors that revealed this skill as the least important skill. Given the instructors' least reported needs for listening skill, the result of this study seems to be embarrassing as it is generally an established fact that listening is a keystone that underlies all skills (Al-Thiyabi, 2014).

Writing skill was another major disparity that the respondents expressed varied perceptions as to which language skills were the most important. To illustrate, the students and instructors differed in their responses on whether or not writing was the most important components of the communicative English skills course. The majority of the students across the two fields chose writing as the least important skill, however it attracted the attention of the instructors who chose it as the most important skill of all, asserting that writing skill is, indeed, the most useful tool for their students' academic success as students are required to produce many kinds of writing: notes during class sessions, written assignments, term papers" (Biber & Conrad, 2009; as cited in Gborsong et al., 2015).

Similar to the students' perception of writing skills as the least important for their academic achievement was instructors' lack of concession on the item: paragraph Development and Essay writing with the lowest mean of 3.0, indicating that the instructors seem to endorse that tasks related to such writing sub-skills were not necessary for their students. In the same line, Gborsong et al. (2015) reported that paragraph writing and essay development as the least useful components of communicative English skills course offered for undergraduate students. However, the researcher took a very cautious approach to this finding as the English writing proficiency of Ethiopian university students are currently reported as incompetent (Jha, 2014). Further, the result of this study that revealed writing as the least preferred communicative skill sharply contradicts with Zeleke's (2017) conviction that the writing proficiency of university level students was limited that exhibited various weaknesses.

This survey research also seeks to examine whether there is a significant difference between the needs of students and instructors on their perceptions towards the four language skills and sub-skills needs. An independent t-test was employed to determine if there exists any statistical

significance on their perceptual needs. Two significant overall differences emerged between students and instructors on their perceptual needs of the four language skills-on listening and writing skills. This can be interpreted that the students and their instructors had different views with regards to whether these two major skills are the most important skill for student learning in the course communicative English skills. Apparently, as the results of this study elucidate, students and instructors showed discrepancies in their perceptual needs in listening and writing skills, which students rated the listening skill as the most important next to reading and instructors rated writing skill as the most useful component of all the four skills.

Concomitant with this statistically significant difference was the statistically significant differences that the respondents had on the two sub-skills of listening: listening for specific information and note taking and recognition of contracted forms in connected speech and all sub-skills of writing at a significant value of 0.000. The instructors' priority on some skills reported in this study is contradictory to a study that revealed English teachers as showing that they considered all the skills equally important (Buriro & Soomro, 2013). On the other hand, the students seemed to disregard writing skill as it was chosen their least perceived needs. However, this result is contradictory to the study of Tseng (2014) who examined the needs of Taiwanese Arts students and found that conversation and writing as the most important English skills.

In a more detailed comparison of reading sub-skills, the results of this study revealed that overall the students and their instructors highlighted the importance of considering critical reading and reasoning as a crucial reading sub-skill. The tendency of prioritizing the item: "critical reading and reasoning" as the first most important sub-skill in reading seemed to

have established evidence in the literature. Khabiri and Pakzad (2012) claimed that critical reading can bring about such a breadth and depth of meaning as readers get constantly involved in analyzing and interpreting the ideas of the writer and propose other ways of viewing the same ideas and arguments.

With regard to the students' most problematic area, writing skill was what instructors held to be the most beneficial for their students. Regarding the sub-skills of writing, almost all of the instructors agreed that it was important to develop the ability to summarize, outline and paraphrase written texts so that they could attain academic and scientific writings. This highest priority in their perceived need might stem from the notion that these sub-skills: summarizing, outlining, and paraphrasing proved to have a better impact for students to be more independent and successful readers (Khabiri & Pakzed, 2012).

Drawing upon the data on listening skills, two stranded themes pertaining to the two groups were found. The majority of the students chose listening skill as their most preferred skills. Given the participants were university students who are required to listen to various, lectures, presentations, tutorials, their perceived need on listening skills particularly to listening for gist and listening for specific information and note taking is not surprising.

Conversely, instructors reported that they did not value listening skills and sub-categories related to listening skills. A plausible explanation for instructors why they showed little or no interest in listening skills has to do with time constraint. It seems apparent that most instructors can hardly afford the time to adjust listening lessons as listening devices are not sufficiently available in the actual communicative English skills classrooms. Thus, the incongruence between students' needs and instructors' views about this important skill could be used as a

springboard for further discussions with students, curriculum designers and administrators.

In this study, both students and instructors held favorable preferences for reading and speaking skill. The quantitative data generated from the student and instructor questionnaire similarly wished for more emphasis on two sub-categories of speaking skills- appropriacy of diction in dialogues and arguments and reporting, giving formal speech and presentations. With this idea in mind, it is possible to claim that this common view of both groups of respondents is in tandem with the results of a study by Gborsong et al. (2015) that revealed oral communication as an indispensable skill in communicative English courses. Similar to the result of the present study, EFL students reported that they perceived in-class presentations/demonstrations in English (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something) as the most important skill for their learning (Litticharoenporn, 2014).

Conclusions

This survey study aimed examining EFL students' perceived needs regarding language skills and sub-skills and to compare students' preferences with their instructors' perception towards the importance of each skill to their students. To attain the desired objectives, three research questions were formulated. The results were presented pertaining to the order of the research questions. Based on the results, it was found that students valued receptive skills (reading and listening) more than productive skills (speaking and writing), whereas their instructors rated writing and reading as the two most important skills for student learning.

The result of the study also showed that both students and instructors held favorable preferences for reading and speaking skill. Two significant overall differences emerged between students and instructors on their perceptual needs of the four language skills-on listening and writing skills. Students and instructors showed discrepancies in their perceptual needs in listening and writing skills, which students rated the listening skill as the most important next to reading and instructors rated writing skill as the most useful component of all the four skills.

Implications

Instructors in this study opted to prioritize writing skills, which was a core choice gained from their experience of teaching. Given many university level students do not have the writing proficiency necessary to effectively communicate (Zelege, 2017), the most important emphasis given by instructors for writing skills can be taken together in regard to the process of delivering effective communicative English skills courses. However, what instructors addressed in this study regarding writing couldn't be comprehensive of the students as they rated writing as their least preferred skill.

Learning from a constructivist perspective is the active building of knowledge by the learner (Morris & Adamson, 2010), indicating that it is important to mutually understand students' perspectives towards writing and encourage them to focus on writing to their capacity to make sense of and apply it to further their learning. Therefore, an important implication from the present study is that instructors should work hard to prepare students and draw attention to the value and development of academic writing. The present study also holds implications for curriculum designers and administrators to integrate writing tasks into writing classrooms to extent which the writing process can give students direct

access to corpus information and serve them as a cognitive support as they write. Future studies can explore students and instructors' views on student language learning needs including many participants from other colleges, faculties, institutions, and schools of the university.

References

- Abiy Yigzaw. (2012). The impact of students' self-regulated language learning on their reading achievement: Grade 9 students in focus. *ELT Research Journal*, 1(3), 175-188.
- Afful, J. B. A. (2007). Academic Literacy and Communicative Skills in the Ghanaian University: A Proposal. *Nebula*, 4, 141-159.
- Ahmed, N. (2009). Analyzing the spoken English needs in Pakistani academic legal settings. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 31 (2): 449-469.
- Aklilu, G. (2015). An Investigation of the Present Situation Communicative Needs in an ESP Context: Civil Engineering Students in Focus. *English for Specific Purposes World*. 48(16): 1-19.
- Al-Thiyabi, M. (2014). Need Analysis for EFL Listening Skills at the EII. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 43 (15), 1-32.
- Biniam, T. (2013). English Language Need Analysis of Medical Students in Relation to Academic Requirements at Haramaya University. Unpublished M.A Thesis.
- Brown, D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. New York: Heinle&Heinle.
- Buriro, G. S. & Soomro, A. F. (2013). Assessing the academic literacy and learning needs of undergraduate engineering students at Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology (QUEST) Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 7 (2), 83-96.

- Chen, I., Chang, Y. & Chang, W. (2016). I Learn What I Need: Needs Analysis of English Learning in Taiwan. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 4 (1), 1-5,
- Choi, J. (2012). Self-Access English Learning Needs: Student and Teacher Perspectives. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*. 2(5): 389-396.
- Collins, P. & Gillies, J. (2010). Using Opportunity to Learn and Early Grade Reading Fluency to Measure School Effectiveness in Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nepal. USAID Washington. Retrieved 20 October 2016 from: www.equip123.net/.../e2-school-....
- Dudley, E. & St Johns (1998). *Developments in ESP: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gborsong, P. A., Afful, J. B. A., Coker, W., Akoto, O. Y., Twumasi, R., & Baiden, A. (2015). A Needs Analysis of Undergraduate Students of Communicative Skills: The Case of Tertiary Institutions in Ghana. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 5, 413-424.
- Gozuyesil, E. (2014). An analysis of engineering students' English language needs. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4182-4186.
- Hossain, J. (2013). ESP needs analysis for engineering students: A learner centered approach. *Presidency University*, 2 (2), 16-26.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An advanced resource book*. London, England: Routledge.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.07.005>
- Jha, S. (2014) Shall we teach English as a subject or as a language? *Education Practice and Innovation*, 1 (1): 7-24.
- Kaur, S., & Lee, S. H. (2006). Analyzing Workplace Oral Communication Needs in English among IT Graduates. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 5 (1), 12.

- Khabiri , M & Pakzad, M. (2012). The Effect of Teaching Critical Reading Strategies on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Retention. . *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)* 4 (1), 73- 106.
- Kim, H. (2013). Needs Analysis for English for Specific Purpose course Development for Engineering Students in Korea.*International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering*, 8 (6), 279-288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/ijmue.2013.8.6.28>
- Litticharoenporn, P. (2014). Oral and Aural English as a Foreign Language Needs at an International School.*Second Language Studies*, 32(2), 26-75.
- Mangal, S. K. (2005).*Advanced educational psychology*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.
- Medhanit, B. (2020). A Needs Analysis of ESP in Textile Engineering Profession in Ethiopian Context, *PASAA*, 59 (1), 181-203.
- Morris, P. & Adamson, B. (2010).*Curriculum, schooling and society in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Songhori, M.H. (2008). Introduction to Needs Analysis. *English for Specific Purpose world*, 4, 1-25 Retrieved from: www.esp-world.info
- Tseng, M. C. (2014). Language Needs Analysis for Taiwanese Arts Students: What do young artists need to know? *International Refereed Research Journal*, 5(1), 25-36.
- USAID (2010). Ethiopia Early Grade Reading Assessment: Retrieved from: <http://www.equalls2.org/resources..>
- Zeleke A. (2017). Ethiopian Public University Entrants' Writing Skills in English Language: The Case of Hawassa University Entrants. *International Journal of Development Research*, 7 (9), 15089-15092.