

Uncovering Reading Needs of Non-English Majors of Tribhuvan University

Dr. Gopal Prasad Pandey

Reader in English Education, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal

Email: gpandeytu@gmail.com

Received: November 10, 2020; Revised & Accepted: December 12, 2020; Published: January 10, 2021

© Copyright: Pandey (2020).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating into reading problems and needs of non-major English students of Tribhuvan University (TU), Nepal. Needs analysis (NA) plays an integral role in the process of designing and carrying out any language course, whether it is English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or general English course, and its centrality has been acknowledged by several scholars and authors. One hundred and two non-English majors and fifteen English teachers of Tribhuvan University participated in this study. Questionnaires served as the main tools for conducting an NA. The findings revealed that both the groups of participants perceived all seven sub-skills of reading as ‘important’. There is consistency between students’ perceptions of importance of subskills of reading and teachers’ perception of importance of the sub-skills. Regarding the perceived competence, teacher participants found their students’ abilities to be “not very good” or even “poor” in the subskills which they considered ‘important’ or ‘very important’. They rated their students at levels lower than the ones students did. The study also revealed that the students are poor at reading instruction booklets, company brochures and user manuals.

Keywords: Reading Needs, Non-English Majors, Needs Analysis, ESP, Reading problems

Introduction

One of the principle aims of educators within English programs in higher education is to prepare English as a Foreign or Second language (EFL/ESL) students for their future professional life. Reading is “converting print into language and then to the message intended by the author” (Koda, 2007, p. 1). She further claims that “Comprehension occurs when the reader extracts and

integrates various information from the text and combines it with what is already known” (Koda, 2004, p. 4). Urquhart and Weir (1998, p. 4) say that “Reading is the process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print.” Grabe (2010) views reading as the most important skill required for people in multicultural and international settings, academic learning, and self-study situations. Benhart (2011, p. 19) states that millions across the globe routinely access expository information from the internet written in English—a second or foreign language for the overwhelming majority. It is one of the important skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students which they need to acquire to comprehend academic texts (Dreyer & Nel, 2003). So, in many foreign or second language programmes, reading receives a special focus. Students often have reading as one of the significant goals. They want to be able to read for information and pleasure, for their career, and for study purposes. People read for information to find out how to do something, for example, an instructional manual for a computer; or to learn about something, for example, a history or science textbook. We might need to know what time a lesson starts or when a bus or train arrives. People read as a part of communicating with someone, for example, an email or a text message. As Grabe (2010, p. 4) states:

Large populations of people have learned to read in second or third languages for a variety of reasons, including interactions within and across heterogeneous multilingual countries, large-scale immigration movements, global transportation, advanced education opportunities, and the spread of languages of wider communication.

We read something for our studies or our jobs. Reading is a combination of some or all these factors. We read for different purposes, we engage in many types of reading, particularly in academics settings. Grabe (2010) lists six major purposes of reading.

1. Reading to search for information (scanning and skimming)
2. Reading for quick understanding (skimming)
3. Reading to learn
4. Reading to integrate information
5. Reading to evaluate, critique, and use information
6. Reading for general comprehension (in many cases, reading for interest or reading to entertain)

Reading is something many of us take for granted (Grabe, 2010). It is remarkable that so much of the world's population can read – a little more than 80 percent of the world's population can read to some extent (Elley, 2001). They can read basic forms, read advertisements, read newspapers, and use basic reading skills in their work and daily lives when needed. Some percentage of these people can read at a much higher level of comprehension, learning new conceptual information from texts, synthesizing new information from multiple texts, critiquing information in texts, and using their comprehension skills to reinterpret texts (Elley, 1992).

In English for academic purposes (EAP) reading classrooms, the major focus has been on reading skill development. According to Ruegg and Naganuma (2019, p. 40);

The majority of class content in undergraduate degree programmes is acquired through reading required texts. This is evidenced by the concept of ‘reading for a degree’ and the use of the word ‘reading’ as a synonym for ‘studying’ in some varieties of English.

Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) identified a number of macro- and micro-reading skills that EAP students need to develop. The macro-skills include the ability to make use of learners’ existing knowledge to make sense of new material and fit new knowledge into their schema. These microskills include recognizing logical relationships, definitions, generalizations, examples, explanations and predictions, and distinguishing fact from opinion. All these capabilities require lots of practice in reading which, in turn, needs strong motivation to be sustained.

In Nepal, other than English majors, most students do not have to take English courses after the freshman year. At BBS level, they are required to take compulsory English in the first year. This has badly affected their results. The real situation is that in many content areas like Marketing, accountancy, Human Resource Management etc., professors like to use imported English textbooks designed for native English speakers. These texts written in English will become the learners’ major source of input for important concepts and theories. Coping with difficulties associated with this type of reading thus becomes part of everyone’s college life. Since there are no more required English courses after the first year in college, EFL instructors are usually not available to tide students over from a TALO (text as a linguistic object) to a TAVI (text as a vehicle of information) (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998) reading mode, leaving students to struggle on their own. This study thus aims to investigate the EAP reading needs and problems of non English majors, i.e. BBS level students of Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal. The study mainly focussed on the sub-skills BBS students need to develop and deficiencies concerning the skill and its subskills.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The formal concept of Needs Analysis (NA) in modern language teaching was first made by the Council of Europe Modern Language Projects group during the 1970s (Richterich, 1973/1980). The team was responsible for developing a new approach towards teaching the major European languages to European adults. The Council of Europe team felt that successful language learning resulted not from mastering linguistic elements, but from determining exactly what the learner needed to do with the target language. One of the terms, which the team came up with, was the “Common Core”. The common core suggests that language learners share certain interests despite their different goals in learning foreign languages. Research and studies conducted by the Council of Europe team resulted in the emergence of the communicative approach to language learning which replaced the situational approach dominant in language teaching and learning at

that time. In 1971, the Council recognized the importance of dividing the task of learning into smaller units, each of which could be credited separately, and also the necessity of basing curricula on learner needs rather than on language structures. One of the major outcomes of this policy was the “threshold level”, specification (Van Ek, 1975).

Needs analysis plays an integral role in the process of designing and carrying out any language course, whether it be English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or general English course, and its centrality has been acknowledged by several scholars and authors (Richerich & Chancerel, 1977; Munby, 1978; Chambers, 1980; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Berwick, 1989; Brindley, 1989; Johns, 1990; Robinson, 1991; West, 1994, 1997; Seedhouse, 1995; Jordan, 1997; Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Richards, 2001; Finney, 2002; Grier, 2005; Long, 2005). ESP is a branch of English Language Teaching (ELT) and a form of English language input for non-native speakers which aims to meet learners’ particular requirements (Morgan & Alfehaid, 2019, p.57).

NA has long been the cornerstone of ESP course design, materials development, and program implementation and assessment. Much has been written about the importance of devoting time to data collection before courses get underway; the benefits of periodically evaluating and revising existing ESP programs are also widely accepted. In the last few decades, various approaches have been advocated by ESP course designers including such modes as target situation analysis, deficiency analysis, means analysis, genre analysis and language audits (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; West, 1994, 1997) of particular note is the growing recognition of the value of analyzing the language and discourse (genres) of the target situations in which students are or will be studying or working (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998; Johns & Price-Machado, 2001). Its importance and usefulness has been acknowledged in the field of education. For instance, Grier (2005) attempted to integrate needs assessment with curriculum development. He states:

In order to develop curricula of quality, developers must have valid information on which to base their curricular decisions. The various methods of needs assessment are valuable tools that provide curriculum developers with this information. By incorporating needs assessments in their curricular decisions, curriculum developers can select options that benefit both the learners and society. (p. 65)

Throughout its history, ESP practitioners have been preoccupied with learner needs, with identifying learner wants and purposes as integral and obligatory elements in materials design (Johns, 1990 & Robinson, 1980, 1991). In their early years, needs assessments were fairly simple, precourse procedures (Munby, 1978). Recent needs assessments have grown increasingly sophisticated, however, as materials developers have become aware of the problematic nature of their task.

The Study

Objectives. The study aims at conducting an NA of Nepalese BBS students to identify EFL reading needs and problems. Analyzing the specific needs of a particular learner group

serves as the prelude to a learner-centred approach to materials design, because it determines the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of ELT materials. NA was undertaken to

1. identify the students’ reading needs.
2. identify the students’ deficiencies concerning the skill and its subskills.
3. determine the extent to which student-participants’ opinions match with those of teachers in terms of perceived importance and competence.

Methodology

Instruments and elicitation procedures. Two different sets of sets of questionnaires, one for the students and a parallel one for the English teachers, were designed as tools for this purpose. Students' questionnaire focused on areas like (1) the student's profile (2) their EFL reading needs (3) a self –rating of perceived ability. The first part of the questionnaire was generally the collection of various types of biographical data which comprised name, address, age, sex, class, name of the campus, nationality, first language, other languages known and previous courses. That is, it was concerned with biographical information while the second was more personal, relating to the learners' preferences and perception of needs and attempted to record their self rating of competence in the reading subskills (appendix I).

The teacher questionnaire contained the same categories as the student questionnaire, but the item stems was different. For example, instead of “Rate the importance of learning each of the following for your academic studies, the stem read as “Rate the importance of learning each of the following for your students’ academic studies”. Similarly, instead of “Rate yourself in terms of each of the following”, the stem for the second column read as “Rate your students’ competence in terms of each of the following”. As in the students’ questionnaire, the background section of this set was designed to obtain the personal details of the participants. The second section of the set was intended to find out their perception of ‘importance’ of reading needs of students and assesses their students’ competence in terms of particular subskills of reading. Thus teachers’ questionnaire was intended to find out (a) the personal details of the participants (b) reading needs of the students and (c) assesses the ‘competence’ of students in terms of particular subskills of reading.

Participants. One hundred and two BBS first year students of Tribhuvan University, Nepal participated in this study. Out of 102 students, 47 were boys and 55 were girls. The majority of the students were the native of speakers Nepali and were in the age group 18-24 years. Most of the students came from government schools and had studied English at least for eight years. Similarly, the data was also gathered from fifteen English teachers from five campuses of Kathmandu valley.

Analysis and Discussion of Results

Students’ responses. In the questionnaire, participants were asked to assess the importance of a number of subskills in reading. They rated on a five point Likert Scale with the

following scales: very important (1), important (2), don't know (3), not very important (4), unimportant or superfluous (5). Similarly, for the second column meant for 'competence' they rated themselves in terms of reading subskills mentioned using a five point Likert Scale with the following descriptors: very good(1), good (2), don't know (3), not very good (4), poor (5).

Academic Purposes and future life	Use the following scale for Column 1: Very important (1), Important (2), Don't know (3), Not very important (4), Unimportant/ Superfluous (5) Rate the importance of learning each of the following for your academic studies	Use the following scale for Column 2 : Very good (1), Good (2), Don't know (3) Not very good (4), Poor (5) Rate yourself in terms of each of the following
1. Reading Sub-skills	Column 1: Importance	Column 2: Rating
a. newspapers, magazines (e.g., Business papers, Economist, The Kathmandu Post etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
b. academic texts (e.g., course books, journals) periodicals	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
c. lecture handouts, notices, letters, memos	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
d. reference tools (e.g., dictionaries), on the Internet (e-mail messages)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
e. instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
f. examination papers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
g. novels, fiction comics	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Others (Please specify and rate)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Results

The tables 1 and 2 below record students perceived needs and competence.

Table 1 Students' perception of importance of reading subskills

Language	Students' rating of importance of subskills of reading								Mean	SD
	Percentages									
	V. Im [1]	Im [2]	DK [3]	N V. Im [4]	Unim [5]	V. Im + Im	DK	N V. Im + Unim		
reading										
A	66.67	32.35	0.00	0.98	0.00	99.02	0.00	0.98	1.35	0.54
B	71.57	26.47	1.96	0.00	0.00	98.04	1.96	0.00	1.30	0.50
C	33.33	47.06	12.75	5.88	0.98	80.39	12.75	6.86	1.94	0.88
D	53.92	40.20	2.94	2.94	0.00	94.12	2.94	2.94	1.55	0.69
e	24.51	44.12	16.6	10.78	3.92	68.63	16.67	14.71	2.25	1.06

			7							
F	79.41	18.63	0.00	1.96	0.00	98.04	0.00	1.96	1.25	0.55
G	13.73	43.14	21.57	15.69	5.88	56.86	21.57	21.57	2.57	1.09

Table 2 Results of self rating in reading sub-skills

Language	Students' rating of their own competence in subskills of reading									
	Skill	Percentages							mean	SD
		VG [1]	Good [2]	DK [3]	NVG [4]	Poor [5]	VG + G	DK		
Reading										
A	16.67	62.75	3.92	14.71	3.92	79.41	3.92	18.63	2.25	1.03
b	35.29	45.10	2.94	15.69	2.94	80.39	2.94	18.63	2.04	1.13
c	15.69	50.98	13.73	14.71	4.90	66.67	13.73	19.61	2.42	1.07
d	26.47	38.24	10.78	20.59	3.92	64.71	10.78	24.51	2.37	1.19
e	6.86	10.78	29.41	34.31	18.63	17.65	29.41	52.94	3.47	1.12
f	49.02	41.18	3.92	3.92	1.96	90.20	3.92	5.88	1.69	0.87
g	8.82	32.35	24.51	19.61	14.71	41.18	24.51	34.31	2.99	1.21

Discussion

In tables 1 and 2 the mean scores of perceived importance of subskills of reading and the results of self rating in the reading subskills are presented. As reflected in the table 1, 99.02 (V. Im +Im) and 98.04 (V. Im + Im) percentages of participants considered reading newspapers, magazines e.g., Business papers and academic texts that is, course books, journal and periodicals are ‘important’ for Nepalese BBS students. If we look at the mean scores for these subskills student participants rated them at 1.35 and 1.30 respectively on a five point scale indicating that subskills are important with inclinations towards ‘very important’ scale. Besides, it is evident from the table that reading reference tools (e.g. dictionaries, on the internet and e-mail messages was ‘important’ for the respondents. The table indicates that 94.12% (V.Im+Im) of the participants picked up “important” while rating this subskill. Almost all participants (98.04%) felt that English was important to read examination papers. On the other hand, the table also depicts that reading handouts, notices, letters, memos, and novels, fiction and comics are important for majority of the respondents. Reading handouts, notices, letters, and memos was important for over three quarter (80.39%) of respondents and reading novels, fiction and comics was important for 56.86 % of the respondents. Here it is important to note down that majority of the respondents had inclination towards “neutral” scale while rating the subskill- g, that is, reading novels, fiction and comics as the mean is 2.57. A very significant number of students (21.57 %) chose “don’t know” while rating the importance of this subskill. Similarly a significant number

of subjects (68.63%) considered that reading instruction booklets, user manual and company brochures was important but a slight tilt towards ‘neutral’ can be observed. The results show that all reading subskills are important for undergraduates as the participants rated almost all these subskills between 1.0 and 2.0 on a five point scale.

Table 2 displays how they rated their own competence in these subskills of reading. It can be seen from the table that the majority of the respondents rated that they were good at reading newspapers, magazines and academic texts as 79.41% and 80.39 percentages of the respondents respectively rated themselves as ‘good’ readers. However a considerable variation can be noticed in their ratings. 66.67 % of respondents rated themselves good in reading lecture handouts, notices, letters and memos. But a sizeable number of respondents (14.71%) reported that they were ‘not very good’ at reading lecture handouts, notices, letters and memos. So the overall rating inclines to ‘neutral’ as the mean is 2.42. 64.71% (V.G + G) of participants said that they were good at reading reference tools while 24.51% (Not VG + Poor) of them considered themselves “poor” at this subskill. It was found from the research that the participants were not very good at reading instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures. Only 17.65% of the students reported that they were good at this subskill. One aspect worth noting is over a half of the participants (52.94%) rated themselves as ‘poor’. We can also observe from the table 2 that fairly majority of the respondents (64.71%) were good at reading reference tools like dictionaries, on the internet and e-mail messages. Moreover, the table projects that the overwhelming majority (90.20%) of informants replied that they were good at reading examination papers. It can clearly be noticed from the results that students were neither good nor poor at reading novels, fiction and comics as the mean is 2.99. Only 41.18% of them informed that they were good at reading this subskill.

Teachers’ Responses. In this section, the results of students’ EFL reading needs and competence as perceived by teacher participants are tabulated, discussed and analyzed.

Reading sub-skills	Column 1: Importance					Column 2: Rating				
a. newspapers, magazines (e.g., Business papers, Economist, The Kathmandu Post etc.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b. academic texts (e.g., course books, journals) periodicals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c. lecture handouts, notices, letters, memos	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d. reference tools (e.g., dictionaries), on the Internet (e-mail messages)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e. instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
f. examination papers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
g. novels, fiction, comics	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Others (Please specify and rate)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Results

Table 3 Teachers' perception of importance of reading subskills

Reading Sub-skills	Teachers' rating of importance of reading subskills								mean
	Percentages								
	V. Im [1]	Im [2]	DK [3]	N V. Im [4]	Unim [5]	V.Im + Im	DK	N V. Im +Unim	
a	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	1.40
b	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	1.07
c	53.33	46.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	1.47
d	40.00	40.00	6.67	13.33	0.00	80.00	6.67	13.33	1.93
e	20.00	46.67	13.33	13.33	6.67	66.67	13.33	20.00	2.40
f	40.00	46.67	0.00	13.33	0.00	86.67	0.00	13.33	1.87
g	46.67	26.67	13.33	13.33	0.00	73.33	13.33	13.33	1.93

Table 4 Teachers' rating of their students' reading competence

Reading Sub-skills	Teachers' rating of their students' competence								mean
	Percentages								
	VG [1]	Good [2]	DK [3]	N VG [4]	Poor [5]	V G + G	DK	N VG + Poor	
a	0.00	13.33	20.00	60.00	6.67	13.33	20.00	66.67	3.60
b	0.00	60.00	0.00	26.67	13.33	60.00	0.00	40.00	2.93
c	0.00	40.00	0.00	53.33	6.67	40.00	0.00	60.00	3.27
d	0.00	20.00	40.00	33.33	6.67	20.00	40.00	40.00	3.27
e	0.00	0.00	13.33	60.00	26.67	0.00	13.33	86.67	4.13
f	0.00	40.00	13.33	33.33	13.33	40.00	13.33	46.67	3.20
g	0.00	0.00	20.00	73.33	6.67	0.00	20.00	80.00	3.87

Discussion

The table 3 above projects that reading subskills “a”, “b” and “c” are important for Nepalese BBS students. There is a unanimous consensus among the teachers (100%) that items “a”, “b” and “c” are important for Nepalese BBS students. Similarly, the majority of participants said that subskills “d”, “e”, “f” and “d” are important for them. In other words, teachers considered that all subskills are important for Nepalese BBS students as the mean scores of all responses in each subskill cluster between 1.0 and 2.0 on a 5 point scale. A very sizeable number of teachers (66.67%) considered that reading subskill “e” is important. The overall response is nearly “important” as the mean is 2.40.0

The table 4 shows that students are either ‘poor’ or ‘not very good’ in “a”, ‘c’, ‘e’ and ‘g’. The mean scores of the responses to these subskills show inclination towards the scale “not very good”. Though the overall competence inclines to neutral (mean score = 2.93), in “b”, sixty percent of teachers rated them “good”. The item “e” has the highest mean score (4.13 on a scale of five) which implies that there is almost consensus among teachers (86.67 %) that students are

either poor or not very good at reading instruction booklets, user manuals, and company brochures. The majority of participants stated that students are ‘not very good’ at reading novels, fiction and comics. In the subskill “d”, 40% of the responses falls under the category “don’t know”. The table demonstrates that majority of the students are either “not very good or poor” in reading the subskills mentioned.

Comparison of needs and competence as perceived by teachers and students. The table 5 states the average mean scores of perceived needs and competence.

Table 5 Average of mean scores

Language skills	Teachers		Students	
	Im	Comp	Im	Comp
Reading Sub-skills	1.72	3.46	1.74	2.46

It is evident from the table that there is consistency between students’ perceptions of importance of these subskills and teachers’ perception of needs of those subskills. That is, the results confirm that there is close relationship between the way teachers responded to the questionnaires and students reported. As is apparent from the table, teachers rated their students between ‘neutral’ and ‘not very good’. But a slight tilt toward towards the scale ‘not very good’ can easily be observed. That is, teachers rated the students at a level lower than the one by the students.

The results presents that all subskills of reading are important for Nepalese BBS learners of English. Overall average values of all subskills for first column, i.e. rating results of ‘importance’ of subskills of reading fall between 1 and 2 on a scale of 5. Averages of all average values for the first column as rated by both group of participants i.e. teachers and students are 1.74 and 1.72 respectively.

Results of rating for the second column, i.e. competence as perceived by the participants vary. Average of all average values for this column falls between 3 and 4 on a scale of 5 when rated by the teacher participants and falls between 2 and 3 when rated by the student participants.

Conclusions

Reading is necessary component of academic learning, as well as a foundation for becoming an informed member of the broader community. Students read for variety of reasons. “Failure to achieve adequate reading proficiency denies students access to the essential tool for further learning. Students suffer academically when they are unable to make the transition from oral language skills to achieving basic decoding competence and comprehending various types of texts. In language learning reading promotes continuous expansion of vocabulary, full awareness of syntactic structures and forms of written discourse, development of cognitive skills and learner autonomy, and increasing comprehensive knowledge of any topic readers want to learn about. Therefore, teaching learners how to use reading strategies so that they can gradually become skilled readers and therefore improve their comprehension is a primary duty in our ELT classrooms. The main aim of the study was to find out the reading needs of Non-English Majors of Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal. It was found from the study that both the groups of

Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (NJMR)

Vol. 3, No. 3, December 2020. Pages: 13-26

ISSN: 2645-8470 (Print), ISSN: 2705-4691 (Online)

DIO: <https://doi.org/10.3126/njmr.v3i3.34879>

participants, i.e. teacher and student participants, perceived all subskills of reading as ‘important’ but students were ranked between “neutral and poor” in these subskills. The subskills which they perceived important were reading newspapers, magazines (Business papers, Economist, The Kathmandu Post), academic texts (e.g., course books, journals) periodicals, lecture handouts, notices, letters, memos, reference tools (e.g., dictionaries), on the Internet (e-mail messages), instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures, examination papers and novels, fiction, comics. Results of rating for the second column, i.e. ‘competence’ as perceived by the participants vary. Teachers indicated that students are almost “not very good” or even “poor” in some case in the subskills which they considered important.

REFERENCES

- Benhart, E. B. (2011). *Understanding advanced second language reading*. London: Routledge.
- Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48–62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL program design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, F. (1980). A re-evaluation of needs analysis in ESP. *ESP Journal*, 1(1), 25–33.
- Dreyer, C., & Nel, C. (2003). Teaching reading strategies and reading comprehension within a technology-enhanced learning environment. *System*, 31, 349– 365.
- Dudley Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elley, W. (2001). Literacy in the present world: Realities and possibilities. In L. Verhoeven & C. Snow (Eds.), *Literacy and motivation* (pp. 225-242). Manwah, NJ: Erbaum.
- Finney, D. (2002). The ELT curriculum: A flexible model for a changing world. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 69-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, J., Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (2010). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grier, A.S. (2005). Integrating needs assessment into career and technical curriculum development. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42 (1), 59-66.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (NJMR)

Vol. 3, No. 3, December 2020. Pages: 13-26

ISSN: 2645-8470 (Print), ISSN: 2705-4691 (Online)

DIO: <https://doi.org/10.3126/njmr.v3i3.34879>

- Johns, A. (1990). English for specific purposes: Its history and contribution. In Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 67-77). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Johns, A., & Price-Machado, D. (2001). English for specific purposes: Tailoring courses to student needs –And to the outside world. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 43–54). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge, CB2: Cambridge University Press.
- Keiko, K., & Zehler, A. M. (2008). *Learning to read across languages*. New York: Routledge.
- Koda, K. (2004). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koda, K. (2007). Reading and language learning: Crosslinguistic constraints on second language reading development. *Language Learning*, 57, 1-44.
- Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 19–76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, G., & Alfheid, A. (2019). The Evaluation of an English for Specific Purposes Course Taught to Pre-Sessional Undergraduate Students in Tandem with General English. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 15(3), 56-98.
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. New York: Longman.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richterich, R. (1973/1980). Definition of language needs and types of adults. In J. Trimm, R. Richterich, J. Van Ek, & D. Wilkins (Eds.), *Systems development in adult language learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe/ Oxford: Pergamon.
- Richterich, R., & Chancerel, J. L. (1977). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe/Oxford: Pergamon.
- Robinson, P. (1980). *ESP: English for specific purposes*. Pergamon Press.
- Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Ruegg, R., & Naganuma, N. (2019). Development of Reading Skills in an EAP Programme: A Longitudinal Study. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 15(1.1), 39-61.
- Seedhouse, P. (1995). Needs analysis and the general English classroom. *ELT Journal*, 49 (1), 59-65.
- Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice.
- Van Ek, J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- West, R. (1994). Needs analysis in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 27 (1), 1-19. doi:10.1017/S0261444800007527

West, R. (1997). Needs analysis: State of the Art. In R. Howard, & G. Brown, (Eds.), *Teacher education for LSP* (pp. 68–79). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Appendices

Appendix I: Questionnaire for Students

Name : Nationality :
 Address : Class:
 Age : Sex :
 First language: Other languages :
 Previous courses : Name of the campus:

Academic Purposes and future life	Use the following scale for column 1	Use the following scale for column 2
	1. Very important 2. Important 3. Don't know 4. Not very important 5. Unimportant/ Superfluous Rate the importance of learning each of the following for your academic studies.	4. Very good 5. Good 6. Don't know 7. Not very good 8. Poor Rate yourself in terms of each of the following.
1. Reading	Column 1: Importance	Column 2: Rating
1. newspapers, magazines (e.g., Business papers, Economist, The Kathmandu Post etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. academic texts (e.g., course books, journals periodicals)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. lecture handouts, notices, letters, memos	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. reference tools (e.g., dictionaries), on the Internet (e-mail messages)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. examination papers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. novels, fiction comics	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Others (Please specify and rate)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix II: Questionnaire for Teachers

Name (optional):	Designation:
Address:	Age /Sex :
Nationality:	Educational Qualification:
Experience:	TEFL courses/ training:
Educational background:	First language:
Other languages:	Preferred course length:
Preferred learning arrangement:	Preferred methodology:
Learning style:	Name of the campus:

Academic Purposes and future life	Use the following scale for column 1 1. Very important 2. Important 3. Don't know 4. Not very important 5. Unimportant/ Superfluous Rate the importance of learning each of the following for your students' academic studies.	Use the following scale for column 2 1. Very good 2. Good 3. Don't know 4. Not very good 5. Poor Rate your students' competence in terms of each of the following.
1. Reading	Column 1: Importance	Column 2: Rating
a) newspapers, magazines (e.g., Economist, The Kathmandu Post etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
b) academic texts (e.g., course books, journals) periodicals	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
c) lecture handouts, notices, letters, memos	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
d) reference tools (e.g., dictionaries), on the Internet (e-mail messages)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
e) instruction booklets, user manuals and company brochures	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
f) examination papers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
g) novels, fiction, comics	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Others (Please specify and rate)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5