Fanshawe College

FIRST: Fanshawe Innovation, Research, Scholarship, Teaching

Faculty & Staff Publications - ELI

English Language Institute

2018

How do we teach them all? A needs analysis for a pre-sessional EGAP curricular review

Angela Meyer Sterzik
ameyersterzik@fanshawec.ca

Recommended Citation

How do we teach them all?
A Needs Analysis for a Pre-Sessional EGAP Curricular Review

Angela Meyer Sterzik
Fanshawe College

Abstract

Making EAP course outcomes congruent with post-secondary demands requires a needs analysis, in which a target situation analysis is imperative (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Hyland, 2016; Cabinda, 2013; Rosenfeld, Leung, & Oltman, 2001; Upton, 2012). This article details the theoretical considerations for a needs analysis, and reports the quantitative findings of a target situation analysis completed for a pre-sessional EGAP program at a Canadian College. 51 Professors from the college and a university completed questionnaires ranking academic tasks necessary for post-secondary success in all four language skill areas (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). 25 of the 43 language tasks were identified as 'approaching very important' and 'very important' to academic success at the tertiary level in Canada. The results indicated that major curricular changes were warranted, especially at the two most advanced levels, and examples are explicated.

Keywords: EAP, EGAP, needs analysis, target situation analysis, post-secondary education, curriculum development, Canada

Introduction

English is the language that has spread the most with globalization (Crystal, 2003; Liu, Chang, Yang & Sun, 2011; Steger, 2003), and as such, English preparatory programs have grown into a "multi-million dollar enterprise" (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002). In response to the increasing international student market, many post-secondary institutions offer an in-house English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program or have an agreement with another institution`s EAP program that is accepted in lieu of a standardised assessment such as IELTS or TOEFL. But what is successful completion of an EAP course? "Many ESL/EFL teachers and program administrators struggle with how to determine if learners have achieved the English language proficiency

necessary for the contexts in which they will use the language" (Green & Andrade, 2010, p. 322). Attempts to address these issues require a needs analysis (Atai & Nazari, 2011; Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Bruce, 2011; Cabinda, 2013; Flowerdew, 2013; Huang, 2010; Hyland, 2006, 2016; Liu et al., 2011), which is defined by Hyland (2006) as "the techniques for collecting and assessing information relevant to course design: it is the means of establishing the *how* and *what* of a course" (p. 73, italics in original), and is "[b]ehind every successful EAP course (p.74).

EAP programs begin with descriptions of both the present and future (Benesch, 2001; Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 2003; Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Bruce, 2011; Hyland, 2006). The present situation analysis defines students' current level of proficiency in relation to the appropriate EAP level. The target situation analysis (TSA) isolates the linguistic and task demands required for successful completion of post-secondary programs that the students intend to attend (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Bruce, 2011). For EAP course outcomes to be consistent with the target context(s), the linguistic demands must be clear (Alderson, 2000; Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Zheng & De Jong, 2011). Once a TSA is complete, the requirements can be translated into course outcomes to frame "the specific English language proficiency tasks required for competent academic performance at the undergraduate and graduate levels" (Rosenfeld et al., 2001, p. 1).

Detailing these objectives is complex and requires theoretical, methodological, and practical considerations (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016). Fortunately, there are over four decades' worth of EAP needs analysis research, including English for specific academic purposes (ESAP), and English for general academic purposes (EGAP) (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Hyland, 2016). The literature provides the researcher with the requisite components, considerations, and steps involved in a TSA (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016). Unfortunately, very few provide concrete examples of each component. Further, articles reporting findings in all four language skill areas are quite limited (Huang, 2010; Flowerdew, 2013). The singular report that includes all four skills located during this project was over a decade old and was completed for the new TOEFL (see Rosenfeld et al., 2001), which may not be transferable to EAP classrooms. The vast majority of EAP needs analysis research focuses on one or two language skills (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016) and most often writing (Flowerdew, 2013), variances between student and instructor perceptions (Liu et al., 2011), or makes recommendations for data collection methodologies (see Bocanegra-Valle, 2016 for an overview). Additionally, very few give specific examples of curricular changes based on findings, and the few that do, tend not to supply data (see Hyland, 2016 as an example). Lastly, the majority

of TSA research comes from in-sessional, during post-secondary, EAP programs which tend to employ ESAP. These gaps may disadvantage smaller, pre-sessional (preparatory), EGAP programs that are not housed within large, research-focused institutions with faculty trained in research. For these programs, a needs analysis can seem overwhelming. Hence, the purpose of this paper is three-fold:

1. to explicate the major components in a TSA
2. to present TSA findings in all four skill areas
3. to detail curricular changes based on the TSA

The TSA process described below is based on the stages presented by Bocanegra-Valle (2016): pre-data collection considerations, data collection and analysis, and application to curricular review.

Needs Analysis Process: Pre-Data Collection Considerations

Prior to beginning data collection, several factors must be considered: the context and population, the purpose of the analysis (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016), and the theory of language (Alderson, 2000; Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, 2009; Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Taylor & Geranpayeh, 2011; Wu & Stansfield, 2001).

Context and Population

In 2001, there were 33 students intending to demonstrate English proficiency through the EGAP program. In 2017, the program boasted over 300 students. Clearly, the student population has increased; subsequently, the number of post-secondary programs in which the students intend to study has also grown substantially. In addition, the faculty were tasked with a major curricular review because of a restructuring initiative by the college in the 2015-16 academic year. Needs analyses should not be used as a "one-off activity"; they should be cyclical and applied at different times for improvement (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016). The TSA data had, in fact, been collected a few years prior, but the program restructure required a much more detailed review of the data and many more curricular changes.

The EAP program is pre-sessional, and prior to the restructure, had five, one-semester (16-week) levels. The program now has ten, eight-week levels which range from low beginner to advanced, and the exit levels are the three highest levels. The percentages required for language proficiency are dictated by the admissions committees for each post-secondary program. To illustrate, 70% in Level 8 is required to enter a college business fundamentals program; 75% in

Level 9 is the minimum for most two-year college diplomas; and 80% in Level 10 is required for diplomas in medical fields and undergraduate and graduate programs at a university. While specificity in EAP programs has been shown to improve students' success and motivation, there are many contexts in which specificity is problematic (Hyland, 2016), and the present program is one.

The program is classified as EGAP. The students come from multiple linguistic backgrounds and plan to study a variety of disciplines. Given the varied knowledge bases and specialized vocabulary that students will require, it is not possible to explicitly prepare them all in their desired content areas. In pre-sessional programs, and in-sessional programs in which students have not declared a major, it is difficult to develop curricula with commonalities that meet all of the students' needs (Hyland, 2016). Additionally, the EGAP faculty are trained in TESOL, linguistics, applied linguistics and education, rather than students' target fields of study. Thus, the program adheres to Spack's (1988) contention that content teaching should be left to the content experts. Approximately 80% of most texts consist of words from the General Service List (GSL) as compared to only 8-10% coming from the Academic Word List (AWL), and only up to 5% of a text is subject-specific (Nation, 2001). In addition, many 'semi-technical' items on the AWL have multiple meanings and varied frequencies depending on the discipline (Hyland & Tse, 2007). Therefore, the focus of the program is on 'general principles of inquiry and rhetoric' (Spack, 1988) and other 'register-level features' of academic discourse (Hyland, 2016) with the intent to maximize transferability to multiple academic contexts (Benesch, 2001; Hyland, 2006, 2016; Johns, 1997; Spack, 1988).

Considering the purposes of the curricula and the context, the target audience is adult (minimum 17 years) NNSs of English needing to demonstrate English proficiency for post-secondary studies at a college or university via the EGAP program. The educational backgrounds of the students are only relevant for the admissions requirements of the post-secondary institutions to which they plan to apply and not to the EGAP curricula. Once the context and population have been defined, the purpose of the needs assessment can be detailed.

Purpose

Students' preparedness for post-secondary studies in EGAP programs are based on formative and summative assessments which are (should be) directly linked to curricular objectives. However, the majority of research in language assessment is related to large scale assessments which is often

not applicable to classroom assessments (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007; Green & Andrade, 2010). Further, although classroom assessments are an everyday occurrence for language teachers, in order to foster appropriate inferences of students' post-secondary readiness, valid classroom assessments are a necessity. "One of the most common mistakes made in language testing is for the test writer to begin the process by writing a set of items or tasks that are intuitively felt to be relevant to the test takers" (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, p. 62). This practice can lead to assessments that do not assess or measure what they are intended to, which renders them inappropriate, or what was formerly labeled 'invalid' (Alderson & Banerjee, 2002; Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007; Shohamy, 2008). The bases for validity arguments in classroom language assessments are a well-defined target audience, assessment purpose, language theory, methodological approach, and target situation (Alderson, 2000; Alderson & Banerjee, 2002; Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Fulcher, 2010; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, 2009; Green & Andrade, 2010; Spaan, 2006; Zheng & De Jong, 2011). A well-defined target situation is imperative in EGAP curricular design because "[i]f the assessment criteria used in EAP tests do not reflect the criteria against which the students' performance will be judged in academic contexts, then the scores achieved are less easily interpretable with reference to the students' ability to perform tasks in those contexts" (Banerjee & Wall, 2006, p. 54). Therefore, the purpose of the target situation analysis was to identify the academic tasks and their linguistic components that students should be able to perform to succeed in their post-secondary programs (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016).

Language Theory

Valid and reliable EAP curricula begin with descriptions of theoretical models which inform the selection of the course outcomes which will frame the language assessments (Alderson, 2000; Alderson & Banerjee, 2002; Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Fulcher, 2010; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, 2009; Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Spaan, 2006). Models of language assessment describe the "known universe of constructs" (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, p. 37) and include statements about language knowledge and use as well as descriptions of the contexts and the language required within the contexts (Alderson, 2000; Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, 2009; McNamara, 1996; Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Zheng & De Jong, 2011). Frameworks are created by selecting specific aspects from the model that will be assessed (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007). In an EGAP classroom, the framework is the specific language tasks that will be taught and assessed and should be selected from the language model. However, "[i]f we are to make interpretations about

language ability on the basis of performance on language assessments, we need to define this ability" (Bachman & Palmer, 2010, p. 43).

The EGAP program is based on the same theoretical underpinnings of communicative competence and proficiency as the Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB). The CLB model of communicative proficiency is based on a blending of three communicative models (Pawlikowska-Smith, 2002): the model of communicative language ability (Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996), the pedagogical model of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrell, 1995) and the model of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983). All of these models discuss language as multidimensional; accordingly, language proficiency is viewed as more than a system of grammatical and structural rules (Stewart, 2005). Instead, language includes contextual aspects of communication. For instance, Hudson (2005) states that "[l]anguage takes place in a social context as a social act, and this frequently needs to be recognized in language assessment" (p. 205). Furthermore, Poehner (2011) argues that language is dialectic; and therefore, language assessments need to take this into account; we contend that the same is true for EAP courses. Once the theoretical components have been defined, data collection decisions can then be made.

Methods

Needs analyses are complex and should employ a mixed-methodology approach including multiple stakeholders (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016). Therefore, multiple data sources and stakeholders were included in the TSA process (Atai & Nazari, 2011; Bocanegra-Valle, 2016; Bruce, 2011; Hyland, 2016; Huang, 2010): semi-structured interviews were conducted with a few program graduates currently attending post-secondary programs as well as several Professors who completed the survey, but due to space limitations, the qualitative analysis of the interviews will not be discussed. However, a detailed description of the major aspects of the quantitative data collection and its results follow.

Survey

A survey was the main source of data to identify the language-based tasks that students will perform in their future academic activities (Appendix A). In order to create questions for the survey, multiple secondary sources were collected and analysed for themes, such as Rosenfeld et al.'s (2001) findings, and a large number of post-secondary documents such as course outlines,

assignments, and rubrics across multiple disciplines from several colleges and a University. In addition, curricular and assessment materials from several other EAP programs were included. A qualitative analysis of those materials was completed to create survey questions which were framed by our theory of language. To specify, the questions were categorized in the four skill areas (reading, writing, listening and speaking) and focused on discourse level academic tasks and language functions as opposed to discreet grammatical structures or specific linguistic features. The survey included open-ended questions, but the majority were in a 7-pt. Likert scale format which ranged from 6 = crucially important to N/A which meant that students would never have to complete such a task in the respondent's course. Important to note is that the task-specific questions focused on the academic and language abilities that any student, not specifically NNSs, needs because the identification of the language skill requirements for any student is the essence of a TSA (Benesch, 2001; Bruce, 2011; Hyland, 2006; Rosenfeld et. al., 2001).

Procedures

The survey was piloted to several faculty members and revised based on their feedback. The stakeholders chosen for survey dissemination were the professors in the institutions that receive EGAP graduates as they could provide descriptions of the tasks "judged…to be important for competent academic performance across a range of subject areas" (Rosenfeld et al., p.1). An invitation to complete the survey with a description of the purpose was sent, via Survey Monkey, to professors at the college and a university. Recipients of the survey were informed that they may forward it to colleagues whom they knew had experience with NNSs in their courses. In addition to the electronic dissemination, a printable .pdf was made available by e-mail, and limited paper copies were available within the School of Language and Liberal Studies at the college. Consequently, a response rate is impossible to calculate as it is unknown how many professors received the survey. 51 surveys were returned in total (Table 1): 29 from college professors and 22 from university professors. Not all returned surveys were complete in each skill area; thus, surveys in which a skill are was left blank were omitted from the data of that section.

Table 1: Respondent Demographics (N = 51)

College	Faculty	Surveys Received	Percentage from Institution	Percentage of Total
	Language and Liberal Studies	25	86	49

	(Psychology, Communications, Writing, Sociology)			
	Business	4	14	8
University	Writing	6	27	11.7
	Business Management	3	14	5.8
	Economics	13	59	25.5

Results

Data Analyses

A percent zero analysis was run for all task statements on the survey. If half of the respondents chose N/A, meaning a task was not required, the task would be omitted from the data analysis. In order for a task to be necessary, it must be supported by a majority of the stakeholders as a legitimate performance requirement (Rosenfeld et al., 2001). No task statement was removed from data analysis. For all responses, the mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) were computed (Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Huang; 2010). M is used to supply an absolute importance index from which more important to less important statements can be differentiated (Rosenfeld et al., 2001). The SD provides an index of the variability of the ratings of each statement, and the SE calculates an estimation of the variability of each mean (Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Huang, 2010). The lower the SE, the more accurate M can be taken as an estimation of the population (Rosenfeld et al., 2001). Lastly, analyses were not run on subgroups (college versus university) as a minimum of 25 respondents is needed for data accuracy and stability (Rosenfeld et al., 2001), and fewer than 25 university professors returned surveys. A mean rating of 4.5, 'approaching very important' was chosen to identify the most important tasks and skills for several reasons. Tasks that were rated above 'rather important' were easily identifiable and represented respondents from virtually every faculty in this study. As the program is EGAP, the mandate is to prepare students for a variety of faculties and fields. Furthermore, a mean rating that is approaching 'very important' (5.0) for academic success is a clear basis for its inclusion into curricular outcomes. The professors in this study rated 25 of the 43 skill statements as 'approaching very important' or higher: nine in listening and speaking, seven in reading, and nine in writing. Tables 2 to 4 display the M, SD, and SE for each language skill area.

Language Skills

For listening and speaking skills (Table 2), college and university professors identified three skills

as 'very important' and six as 'approaching very important'. The three aural/oral skills rated as the most important were understanding oral instructions in classes or tutorial sessions (M = 5.39, SD = 0.98), understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lecture *with* visual reinforcement (M = 5.25, SD = 0.85), and asking for extra help, clarification, or explanations outside of class (M = 5.05, SD = 0.88). The remaining six skills rated as 'approaching very important' were evenly divided between listening and speaking. The listening skills approaching 'very important' are distinguishing between key points and less important information in lectures (M = 4.90, SD = 0.94), taking lecture notes that capture main ideas (M = 4.76, SD = 1.22), and 80% lecture comprehension without visual aids (M = 4.62, SD = 1.05). The three speaking skills rated as approaching very important are being able to confidently engage in group work in class or tutorials (M = 4.74, SD = 1.43), asking questions in class or tutorials (M = 4.62, SD = 1.16), and making presentations in classes (M = 4.56, SD = 1.26).

Table 2: Listening and speaking competencies and rankings (N = 51)

LISTENING/SPEAKING COMPETENCIES	M	SE	SD
Asking Questions in classes or tutorial session	4.62	0.16	1.16
Answering questions in classes or tutorial sessions	4.49	0.15	1.13
Making presentations in classes or tutorial sessions	4.56	0.17	1.26
Understanding oral instructions in classes or tutorial sessions	5.39	0.13	0.98
Engaging confidently in group work in classes or tutorial sessions	4.74	0.15	1.07
Engaging confidently in group work to complete assignments outside of class	4.43	0.20	1.43
Conversing casually in class	3.74	0.17	1.24
Understanding slang/idiomatic English	3.74	0.15	1.11
Asking for extra help, clarification or explanations outside of class	5.05	0.12	0.88
Understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lectures *without* any visual reinforcement	4.62	0.14	1.05
Understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lectures *with* visual reinforcement	5.25	0.11	0.85
Distinguishing between key points and digressions or less pertinent information in a lecture	4.90	0.13	0.94
Taking lecture notes that capture key points	4.76	0.17	1.22

Table 3 presents the results for the reading competencies. Of the nine reading skills, four were rated 'very important' and three were rated 'approaching very important'. The two reading skills rated the most important by college and university professors were accurate comprehension of assignment and project information (M = 5.38, SD = 1.05), and at least 80% comprehension of course materials and academic journals (M = 5.20, SD = 0.95). Rated similarly, and both 'very important', were being able to keep up with the reading volume (M = 5.08, SD = 0.97) and being able to distinguish fact from opinion when reading (M = 5.06, SD = 0.96). The three reading competencies that were rated as 'approaching very important' were understanding discipline-specific vocabulary (M = 4.87, SD = 0.80), the ability to evaluate research sources (M = 4.83, SD = 1.35), and skimming for the gist and scanning for details (M = 4.71, SD = 1.11).

Table 3: Reading competencies and rankings (N = 49)

READING COMPETENCIES	M	SE	SD
Reading course materials and discipline-related journal articles with at least 80% comprehension	5.20	0.13	0.95
Keeping up with the volume of required textbook readings	5.08	0.13	0.97
Reading assignment / project information accurately	5.38	0.15	1.05
Reading without any translating into first language	4.34	0.17	1.22
Using an English dictionary effectively	4.26	0.17	1.22
Understanding discipline-specific meanings of vocabulary	4.87	0.11	0.80
Distinguishing between fact and opinion when reading	5.06	0.13	0.96
Evaluating sources when researching and reading	4.83	0.19	1.35
Skimming texts for an overview and scanning for specific information	4.71	0.16	1.11

Only one writing competency was rated 'very important', but eight were 'approaching very important' (Table 4). Producing written work that has been proofread, revised, and edited to an acceptable standard (M = 5.06, SD = 1.32) was the most important writing competency for the professors in this study. Accurately paraphrasing (M = 4.97, SD = 1.13), and successfully incorporating prior feedback to new written work (M = 4.95, SD = 1.16) were the highest rated of the writing competencies 'approaching very important'. The remaining six writing competencies 'approaching very important' were researching and writing 800-1250 word essays (M = 4.72, SD = 1.63), synthesising material from different sources that express competing viewpoints or areas of emphasis (M = 4.66, SD = 1.49), writing essay exams (M = 4.58, SD = 1.93), writing critical

analysis essays (M = 4.58, SD = 2.06), writing short answers on tests and exams (M =4.56, SD = 1.71), and communicating effectively in writing to the professor (M 4.54, SD = 1.07).

Table 5 presents the competencies rated as 'very important' to academic success at the tertiary level by the college and university professors in this study. Of the eight 'very important' competencies, four are in the reading domain, two are in the listening domain, and speaking and writing each have a single competency.

Table 4: Writing competencies and rankings (N = 48)

WRITING COMPETENCIES	M	SE	SD
Writing summaries of text chapters, presentations, journal articles, etc.	4.27	0.21	1.48
Synthesizing material from different sources that express competing viewpoints or areas of emphasis	4.66	0.21	1.49
Writing memos, business letters	3.47	0.25	1.76
Writing a critical review of a book or journal article	4.27	0.22	1.58
Writing short answers on tests and exams	4.56	0.24	1.71
Writing an essay exam (i.e. writing under a time constraint, without access to dictionaries or other reference materials)	4.58	0.27	1.93
summary essays	3.70	0.28	1.94
chronological essays	2.81	0.29	2.04
critical analysis essays	4.58	0.29	2.06
compare / contrast essays	3.93	0.29	2.04
classification essays	2.91	0.30	2.10
cause and effect essays	3.43	0.31	2.20
persuasive essays	4.35	0.28	1.99
Researching and writing a short (800-1250 word) essay	4.72	0.23	1.63
Researching and writing a longer (1500-3000 word) essay	4.27	0.27	1.87
Knowing and using MLA formatting	3.50	0.32	2.26
Knowing and using APA formatting	3.39	0.30	2.11
Accurately paraphrasing the ideas of others	4.97	0.16	1.13
Communicating effectively in writing with the professor when necessary (i.e. via e-mails or letters)	4.54	0.15	1.07
Producing written work that demonstrates an ability to proofread, revise, and edit to an acceptable standard	5.06	0.19	1.32
Successfully incorporating prior feedback when submitting new written work	4.95	0.16	1.16

Table 5: Competencies across language skills rated as 'very important' (above 5.0)

LANGUAGE SKILL	COMPETENCY	M

Listening	Understanding oral instructions in classes or tutorial sessions	5.39
	Understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lectures *with* visual reinforcement	5.25
Speaking	Asking for extra help, clarification or explanations outside of class	5.05
Reading	Reading course materials and discipline-related journal articles with at least 80% comprehension	5.20
	Keeping up with the volume of required textbook readings	5.08
	Reading assignment / project information accurately	5.38
	Distinguishing between fact and opinion when reading	5.06
Writing	Producing written work that demonstrates an ability to proofread, revise, and edit to an acceptable standard	5.06

Discussion

Overall, the results indicated that the receptive language domains, reading and listening, are the most important for post-secondary success, both in the number of skills identified as 'very important' and 'approaching very important'. Comparing the present study's importance ratings to Rosenfeld et al.'s (2001) undergraduate faculty ratings showed similarities and differences. Like Rosenfeld's respondents, professors in this study rated more receptive competencies as 'very important' than productive competencies. Both studies identified the importance of reading and understanding academic and course materials and the ability to identify main ideas of texts. Interestingly, both studies highlighted the need to read and understand assignment instructions accurately. Additionally, Huang's (2010) qualitative analysis of instructor and student responses found that "at both the graduate and undergraduate levels…skills in the reading domain were more important than skills in the speaking and/or listening domains" (p.532), and were especially difficult when coupled with critical reading expectations. This is not surprising given that "[i]ndependent reading accounts for as much as 85% of learning in college" (Bosley, 2008, p. 285). Listening skills are also essential to postsecondary success. The present study supports Rosenfeld's finding that comprehension of oral instructions is very important to academic success. In regard to lectures, the respondents in this study expected students to comprehend 80% of lecture content, which can be assumed to largely include four of the remaining five listening skills Rosenfeld found most important: "understand factual information and details", "understand the main ideas and their supporting details", "distinguish between important information and minor details" and "understand important terminology related to the subject matter" (Rosenfeld et al.,

2001, p.18). Although the present study did not inquire about inferences specifically, they are required to make distinctions of fact and opinion, as well as to mentally organise a text (written or oral) into its hierarchal structure (Kintsch, 1998; Meyer Sterzik, 2017; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). Thus, the data also support Rosenfeld's finding that making appropriate inferences while listening in academic contexts is very important. A contrast in receptive skills, however, is this study identified more reading competencies as 'approaching very important' and 'very important' (nine) than listening competencies (seven); Rosenfeld et al. (2001) found more listening competencies (seven) to be 'at least important' but only four in the reading domain. Perhaps this is due to an increase in web-enhanced and online course content since 2001, which often requires more reading than listening.

'Very important' writing and speaking competencies were not common to the two studies. The sole writing competency identified as 'very important' in the present study focused on producing written work to an acceptable standard; whereas, Rosenfeld's respondents identified producing well-organised written work. A speaking competency, asking for help or clarification outside of class, was ranked 'very important' in this study, but no speaking competencies were identified as such in the 2001 study. Furthermore, when including the speaking competencies that were rated 'approaching very important' in this study to the 2001 results, this study found three: confidently engaging in group work in class/tutorials, asking questions in class/tutorials, and making presentations, but there were no speaking skills included in the 'important skills' in Rosenfeld et al. (2001). This may be due to the move away from pure-lecture style post-secondary education in North America over the past 15 years; the academy has seen a growing number of courses and programs include tutorial and seminar classes in conjunction with lectures at the diploma and undergraduate levels.

Curricular Review

Level 10 is required for college degree programs, post-degree certificates, and undergraduate and graduate programs at a university, so it is the most relevant to this article, and examples of tasks and assignments based on the TSA data are explicated below.

Instead of discreet skills courses, the program restructure included the move to one, integrated course with three components: reading/writing/grammar (12 hrs/week, 60% of the overall grade), listening/speaking/pronunciation/ (6 hrs/week, 30%), and a general education credit course about Canada's history, people, culture, and government (4 hrs/week, 10%). The integrated

model supports the inclusion of extensive reading, reading to write, and reading to speak which have been supported by other needs analyses (Rosenfeld et al., 2001; Huang, 2010). Further, skills integration adheres to the CLT framework of our program; students are expected to use language with dialectic tasks that are as authentic to the target situation as is possible in an EGAP setting. As is best practice in EGAP, themes were chosen to present the content (Hyland, 2016). Level 10 EAP content is presented through the themes of applied linguistics and globalisation.

Learning and assessment task authenticity were defined using the TSA findings. For example, in post-secondary reading, students must be able to read a large volume, comprehend academic journal articles, distinguish between fact and opinion, and evaluate research sources. For writing in the academy, students must be able to apply feedback to future writings, incorporate and synthesise sources, paraphrase accurately, and produce critical analysis essays of approximately four to five pages. These requirements have been used to frame the major essay assignment in Level 10. To illustrate, the applied linguistics unit includes readings on first and second language acquisition, pragmatics, language contact, and English dominance. Students are assigned a 1000-1250 word, summary-critical response essay for which they must read and include a minimum of three journal articles, one of which they summarise. The assignment consists of two drafts; students must effectively incorporate feedback from draft one into draft two in order to improve their grade. Additionally, referenced supports in each body paragraph must be from a minimum of two sources; the course text and other professor-supplied readings and lecture content are acceptable, but one source in each body paragraph must be an independently researched, academically-acceptable source. This requirement causes students to assess sources, paraphrase content, and synthesise information; all of these tasks are taught and practiced for both formative and summative feedback prior to essay submission. The rubric for the assignment has the same criteria as an essay assignment in an undergraduate liberal arts course the author has taught, and students are provided the rubric.

In order to include some degree of specificity and increase relevance to students' future studies or interests, which enhances learning (Hyland, 2016), students in level 10 choose the area of focus for their research essay. The essay assignment is specific for word-count, rhetorical structure, and research requirements, but students may explore an area of applied linguistics that is relevant to their future fields of study or is simply of interest to them. For example, a student accepted into the aviation diploma program wrote an essay on the development of global aviation

English; foreign trained health care professionals have researched dementia delays and other cognitive benefits with bilinguals; EFL teachers have focused on pedagogy, and many students who are parents and those who plan to study early childhood education, have chosen a topic specific to child second language acquisition. The structure of this essay assignment, while not wholly authentic in that students complete two drafts for grades, incorporates the major reading and writing competencies identified as necessary for post-secondary success. The TSA definitions and findings are further incorporated into the curriculum through tutorial-style discussions in the listening and speaking and the general education credit components of Levels 9 and 10. Lectures and authentic listening such as Ted Talks related to course themes are included, and students participate in graded and non-graded tutorial-style discussions in which they must refer to course content. Micro-level skills and knowledge such as grammatical structures, vocabulary, and mechanics, as well as strategic competencies such as skimming and circumlocution, and skills such as note-taking are embedded within the tasks and assignments. The assignment frameworks not only allow for these skills to be taught, they foster academic preparedness, transferable skills, and increase academic language proficiency while adhering to our context definition, theory of language, and methodological approach.

Limitations and EFL Implications

Although we acquired a substantial amount of data, several limitations may not allow for the data to be transferable to other contexts. The sample size was fairly small and consisted of professors from only two post-secondary institutions in Southern Ontario; a larger sample would be beneficial to compare results across institutions and perhaps programs. Additionally, while respondents represented multiple faculties and disciplines, a future study could target the faculties which receive the largest numbers of EAP graduates. The use of surveys, while practical and cost effective, are not without issue (Hyland, 2006). Questions tend to be broad as opposed to focused to specific learning environments (Huang, 2010), and, therefore, may not elicit data relevant to all learning situations (Huang, 2010; Bocanegra-Valle, 2016), which could negatively impact students entering programs with differing methodologies. Lastly, we would remove the questions about reading without translating and using a dictionary as the respondents were not second language acquisition experts, and there is some evidence that suggests translating is a metacognitive strategy that can foster comprehension (Kern, 1994), and NSs use dictionaries, especially when new to a field of study with unfamiliar jargon.

Standardised language proficiency assessments assess the linguistic readiness of NNSs for post-secondary studies in English, but subject-specific vocabulary, synthesising multiple sources, and critical analysis are not necessarily assessed in language proficiency tests. The current study has described the dialectic contexts in which the language is expected to be used in two North American post-secondary institutions. Therefore, EAP/ESP instructors in foreign language contexts may want to include some learning tasks that mirror those in the Western Academy to better prepare students who wish to study in North America. According to Richardson (1995), there are two major types of postsecondary educational models, and they tend to be culturally based. The first follows a reproductive model in which students are taught information so that they are able to reproduce it. The second type focuses on comprehension and expects students to apply the information to problems and new contexts. North American institutions are classified within the comprehending framework (Richardson, 1995; Taillefer, 2005). Students from a reproductive educational model may not be academically prepared for a comprehending educational model. For example, a common learning task in North American universities is a tutorial which includes open discussion. It is not lecture-based, and students are expected to give opinions on course content, agree and disagree with others' opinions, and synthesise information across multiple course readings and lectures. There are context and register 'acceptable' language chunks specific to tutorial-style discussions. Knowledge of and practice with these chunks would benefit those who may not have experienced such a task. Further, as per Hall's classification of cultures, high-context cultures are less likely to value independent opinions, especially when different from the norm; whereas, lower-context cultures such as Canada and the United States, tend to value opinions that differ from the norm if they are supported. To illustrate, when teaching critical reading, many of our advanced EAP students state that disagreeing with a published author, even if they have support for their disagreement, is difficult or uncomfortable. Additionally, post-secondary reading in Canada includes assessing texts and interpreting content in relation to other texts; many EAP students find these skills very difficult, but these skills can be learned (Meyer Sterzik & Fraser, 2012). Students from lower-context cultures should be, at minimum, introduced to these ideologies and educational practices if not given some practice.

The data from this study also showed that critical analysis essays were the most common across college and university programs in this study; disagreement and opposing points of view are an acceptable, if not valued, aspect of critical analyses. Students from academic environments

that do not share this practice may be at an academic disadvantage even if their language proficiency is sufficient. Thus, EFL students intending to attend North American post-secondary institutions should be made aware of these expectations and how to meet them. They cannot do so unless they know what is expected, and they have had opportunities to practice and apply feedback, especially if their educational context differs from the target situation.

Lastly, the differences in findings of this study to those of Rosenfeld et al. (2001), and Huang (2010), which included many more writing competencies, support Huang's (2010) and Bocanegra-Valle's (2016) cautions of using needs analysis research as a basis for curriculum development; some findings may be transferrable and appropriate in multiple contexts and programs, but some may not be. Caution also need be taken in relation to the timeliness of the research; tertiary education methods, practices, and expectations are not static; they change with technology, research, and different cohorts. These factors may cause different language competencies and skills to be ranked differently across countries, institutions, or faculties.

Conclusion

This paper has detailed the Target Situation Analysis completed by one college's EGAP faculty. The findings in each skill area have informed our curricula, pedagogy, and assessments to the benefit of our students. The changes are too new to allow for empirical data on student and faculty perceptions, nor student performance in the target situations. However, anecdotal data has been very positive from a variety of stakeholders, and we believe our program better serves our increasing number of learners across increasing academic fields of study. Since the curricular review, the university, with which we have an articulation agreement, has added several Graduate programs that accept successful completion of Level 10 (80%) as demonstration of English language proficiency. Hopefully, this study will assist EFL/EGAP programs' curricular reviews to the benefit of students wishing to study in the North American Academy. The tertiary-level academic expectations and practices in North America should not be valued higher than those in any other context (Benesch, 2001), but EFL students who wish to attend postsecondary institutions in North America must be aware of, and able to use language within, the parameters and expectations of the academy to succeed.

Acknowledgements

team members Corinne Marshall, Kristibeth Kelly, Hongfang Yu, Bernadette Pitt, Rita Terron, and Janice Craik, and to Khaled Barkaoui for his guidance, feedback, and suggestions on all things theoretical. An earlier version of this paper was presented at TESOL Asia's International Conference on ESP, new technologies, and digital learning at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

References

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Alderson, J.C. & Banerjee, J. (2002). Language testing and assessment (part 2). *Language Teaching,* 35, 79-113.

Atai, M.R., & Nazari, O. (2011). Exploring reading comprehension needs of Iranian EAP students of health information management (HIM): A triangulated approach. *System,* 39,   30-43.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice.*   Oxford: OUP.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford: OUP.

Banerjee, J., & Wall, D. (2006). Assessing and reporting performances on pre-sessional EAP courses: Developing a final assessment checklist and investigating its validity. *Journal of   English for Academic Purposes,* 5, 50-69.

Belcher, D. D. (2006). English for specific purposes: Teaching to perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study, and everyday life. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 133-156.

Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2016). Needs Analysis. In Hyland, K. & Shaw, P. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*. Electronic version. Routledge.

Bosley, L. (2008). "I don`t teach reading": Critical reading instruction in composition courses. *Literacy Research and Instruction,* 47, 285-308.

Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M. (2003). *Content-based Second language Instruction* (Classics Ed.) MI: University of Michigan Press.

Bruce, I. (2011). *Theory and concepts of English for Academic Purposes*. New York, NY:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Cabinda, M. (2013). The need for a needs analysis at UEM: Aspects of and attitudes towards change. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(4), 415-427.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication,* (pp. 2-27). Harlow, UK: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics,* 6(2), 5-35.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, L. (2013). Needs analysis and curriculum development in ESP. In B. Paltridge & S.Starfield (Eds.), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (325-346). West Sussex,UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2009). Test architecture, test retrofit. *Language Testing,* 26(1), 123-144.

Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Green, B.A., & Andrade, M.S. (2010). Guiding principles for language assessment reform: A model for collaboration. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 9, 322-334.

Huang, L-S. (2010). See eye to eye? The academic writing needs of graduate and undergraduate students from students' and instructors' perspectives. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 517-539.

Hudson, T. (2005). Trends in assessment scales and criterion-referenced language assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25,* 205-227.

Hyland, K. (2016). General and Specific EAP. In Hyland, K. & Shaw, P. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*. Electronic version. Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2006). English for Academic Purposes. New York, NY: Routledge

Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 1, 1-12.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an "academic vocabulary"? *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(2), 235- 253.

Johns, A.M. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing Academic Literacies*. Cambridge: CUP.

Kern, R. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 16, 441-461.

Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A Paradigm for Cognition.* New York: CUP.

Laversuch, I.M. (2008). Putting Germany's language tests to the test: An examination of the development, implementation, and efficacy of using language proficiency tests to Mediate German citizenship. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 9(3), 282 – 298. Liu,

J. Y., Chang, Y.J., Yang, F. Y., & Sun, Y.C. (2011). Is what I need what I want? Reconceptualising college students' needs in English courses for general and specific/academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(4), 271- 280.

Meyer Sterzik, A. (2017). *Going beyond the text: The inferencing processes of skilled readers in L1 & L2 across reading tasks* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). York University, Toronto, Canada.

Meyer Sterzik, A. & Fraser, C. (2012). RC-MAPS: Bridging the comprehension gap in EAP reading. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29 (2), 103-119.

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pawlikowska-Smith, G. (2002). *Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000: Theoretical framework.* Ottawa: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks.

Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 22-37.

Poehner, M. E. (2011). Validity and interaction in the ZPD: Interpreting learner development through L2 dynamic assessment. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 21(2), 244- 263.

Richardson, J. (1995). Cultural specificity of approaches to studying in higher education: A comparative investigation using the approaches to studying inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 300-308.

Rosenfeld, M., Leung, S., & Oltman, P.K. (2001). *The reading, writing, speaking, and listening*

tasks important for academic success at the undergraduate and graduate levels (TOEFL   Monograph Series Report No. 21). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Shohamy, E. (2008). Overview: Language policy and language assessment: The relationship. *Current Issues in language Planning,* 9(3), 363 – 373.

Simner, M., & Mitchell, J., B. (2007). Validation of the TOEFL as a Canadian University Admissions Requirement. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology,* 22(2), 182-190.

Stewart, G. (2005). Issues in task-based assessment of communicative competence. *Contact: Special Research Symposium Issue,* 31(2), 29-44.

Steger, M.B. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Spaan, M. (2006). Test and item specifications development. *Language Assessment Quarterly,* 3   (1), 71-79.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly,* 22(1), 29-52.

Taillefer, G.E. (2005). Reading for academic purposes: The literacy practices of British, French, and Spanish law and economics students as background for study abroad. *Journal of Research in Reading,* 4, 435-451.

Taylor, L., & Geranpayeh, A. (2011). Assessing listening for academic purposes: Defining and operationalising the test construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 10, 89- 101.

Upton, T. A. (2012). LSP at 50: Looking back, looking forward. *Ibérica*, 23, 9-28.

Wu, W.M., & Stansfield, C.W. (2001). Towards authenticity of task in test development. *Language Testing,* 18(2), 187-206.

Zheng, Y., & De Jong, J.H.A.L. (2011). *Establishing construct and concurrent validity of Pearson Test of English Academic.* London, UK: Pearson.

Appendix A: Survey

Your institution: _____
Your program: _____
Your name: _____
Your position: _____

We would like to gauge the population and performance levels of students in your classes who are non-native speakers of English. Please provide some basic information about numbers of non-native speakers and about their achievement in your courses.

Approximately how many non-native speakers of English do you have enrolled in your classes each term? (Please provide an approximate number)	
Approximately what percentage of the students in your classes would you estimate to be non-native speakers? (Please provide an approximate percentage)	
Have you noticed an overall difference in levels of performance between native and non-native speakers who are students in your courses?	Y / N
What percentage of the non-native speakers in your classes do you estimate have been able to complete your courses successfully? (Please provide an approximate percentage)	

We would like to ensure that our upper level English for academic purposes (EAP) curricula provide graduating students with the skills that receiving institutions consider important for success. As a result, we would like you to consider the questions below as they might pertain to *any* first-year student, and not just for non-native speakers. Please evaluate how important the following language competencies are to the success of postsecondary students:

n/a = not applicable; 1 = not at all important; 2 = not especially important; 3 = somewhat important; 4 = rather important; 5 = very important; 6 = crucially important

 LISTENING/SPEAKING COMPETENCIES:

Asking questions in classes or tutorial sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Answering questions in classes or tutorial sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Making presentations in classes or tutorial sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Understanding oral instructions in classes or tutorial sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Engaging confidently in group work in classes or tutorial sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Engaging confidently in group work to complete assignments outside of class	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Conversing casually in class	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Understanding slang/idiomatic English	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Asking for extra help, clarification or explanations outside of class	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lectures *without* any visual reinforcement	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Understanding at least 80% of material delivered in lectures *with* visual reinforcement	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Distinguishing between key points and digressions or less pertinent information in a lecture	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Taking lecture notes that capture key points	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a

Can you identify other listening/speaking competencies and their levels of importance?

READING COMPETENCIES:

Reading course materials and discipline-related journal articles with at least 80% comprehension	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Keeping up with the volume of required textbook readings	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Reading assignment / project information accurately	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Reading without any translating into first language	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Using an English dictionary effectively	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Understanding discipline-specific meanings of vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Distinguishing between fact and opinion when reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Evaluating sources when researching and reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Skimming texts for an overview and scanning for specific information	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a

Can you identify other reading competencies and their levels of importance?

WRITING COMPETENCIES:

Writing summaries of text chapters, presentations, journal articles, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Synthesising material from different sources that express competing viewpoints or areas of emphasis	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Writing memos, business letters	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Writing a critical review of a book or journal article	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Writing short answers on tests and exams	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Writing an essay exam (i.e. writing under a time constraint, without access to dictionaries or other reference materials)	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Writing essays:							
summary essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
chronological essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
critical analysis essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
compare / contrast essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
classification essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
cause and effect essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
persuasive essays	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Researching and writing a short (800-1250 word) essay	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Researching and writing a longer (1500-3000 word) essay	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Knowing and using MLA formatting	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Knowing and using APA formatting	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Accurately paraphrasing the ideas of others	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Communicating effectively in writing with the professor when necessary (i.e. via e-mails or letters)	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Producing written work that demonstrates an ability to proofread, revise, and edit to an acceptable standard	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a
Successfully incorporating prior feedback when submitting new written work	1	2	3	4	5	6	n/a

Can you identify other writing competencies and their levels of importance?

Are there any strengths that you have come to associate with non-native speakers' performance in your courses? Please explain in the space provided.

Are there any weaknesses that you have come to associate with non-native speakers' performance in your courses? Please explain in the space provided.

Do you ever provide special consideration or accommodations to non-native speakers so that they can experience success in your classroom? If so, how?

Do you have any other comments you would like to make about non-native speakers in your institution and their language competencies?