Academic English Needs and Practices of Faculty and Students at a Public University in Medellín (Colombia)

Necesidades y prácticas de inglés con fines académicos en profesores y estudiantes de una universidad pública en Medellín (Colombia)

Besoins et pratiques en matière d'anglais académique des enseignants et des étudiants d'une université publique à Medellín (Colombie)

Necessidades e práticas de inglês acadêmico entre professores e alunos de uma universidade pública em Medellín (Colômbia)

Doris Correa
Full Professor, School of Languages, Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia.
doris.correa@udea.edu.co
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2714-2493

Juan Carlos Montoya
Doctoral student, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, United States.
montoy22@purdue.edu
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2159-164X

Abstract

With the current internationalization trends, universities have taken a series of measures to improve academic English skills of faculty and students. Nonetheless, little has been done to determine what faculty and students' English language needs and practices actually are, how their needs relate to their practices, or how needs and practices differ by population. To fill this gap, researchers from a public university in Medellín sent a questionnaire to faculty and students via email inquiring about this. The results indicate that: (a) although there are differences in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and rank within each group, both groups need support with academic English skills such as writing and publishing academic texts, conference and grant proposals, and research reports; (b) there is a mismatch between what both students and faculty need and what they practice in English; and (c) even though, as expected, students need the development of all listed skills much more than faculty, there are three skills that stand out. These results suggest the need for universities to: (a) consider demographic variables when designing programs for these populations, (b) develop programs that prioritize what is needed by both groups over what is practiced by them, and (c) focus on students, as they are the ones more highly in need of all skills.

Keywords: academic literacies, English as a foreign language (EFL), English for academic purposes (EAP), literacy practices, English needs and practices

Resumen

Atendiendo a las actuales tendencias de internacionalización, las universidades han tomado una serie de medidas para mejorar las habilidades de profesores y estudiantes en cuanto al inglés académico. Sin embargo, poco se ha hecho para determinar las necesidades y prácticas reales de estudiantes y profesores en lo que respecta al inglés, la relación entre necesidades y prácticas, y las diferencias entre

Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura
Medellín, Colombia, Vol. 30 Issue 2 (May-August, 2025), pp. 1-22, ISSN 0123-3432
www.udea.edu.co/ikala

1

ambos grupos en cuanto a necesidades y prácticas. Para llenar este vacío, algunos investigadores de una universidad pública en Medellín, Colombia, hicieron estas preguntas a profesores y estudiantes por medio de un cuestionario enviado por correo electrónico. Los resultados indican que: a) a pesar de las diferencias de edad, género, etnia y escalafón docente dentro de cada grupo, ambos grupos necesitan apoyo con el desarrollo de habilidades académicas en inglés, como escritura y publicación de textos académicos, conferencias y solicitudes de becas, e informes de investigación; b) tanto profesores como estudiantes presentan una disparidad entre sus necesidades y sus prácticas en inglés; y c) aunque, como era de esperarse, los estudiantes tienen mayor necesidad de desarrollar las habilidades enunciadas que su contraparte, tres habilidades sobresalen. Los resultados indican la necesidad de que las universidades: a) tengan en cuenta las variables demográficas en el diseño de programas para estas poblaciones, b) desarrollen programas que den más prioridada las necesidades de ambos grupos que a sus prácticas, y c) se centren en los estudiantes, pues son el grupo con mayor necesidad de desarrollar dichas habilidades.

Palabras clave: literacidades académicas, inglés como lengua extranjera (ILE), inglés con fines académicos, prácticas letradas, necesidades y prácticas en inglés

Résumé

En réponse aux tendances actuelles à l'internationalisation, les universités ont pris un certain nombre de mesures pour améliorer les compétences en anglais académique des enseignants et des étudiants. Cependant, peu de choses ont été faites pour déterminer les besoins et les pratiques réels des étudiants et des enseignants en matière de langue anglaise, la relation entre ces besoins et leurs pratiques, et les différences entre les besoins et les pratiques de chaque groupe. Pour combler cette lacune, des chercheurs d'une université publique de Medellín (Colombie) ont posé ces questions aux enseignants et aux étudiants au moyen d'un questionnaire envoyé par courrier électronique. Les résultats indiquent que a) malgré les différences d'âge, de sexe, d'origine ethnique et de statut d'enseignant, les deux groupes ont montré un besoin de soutien pour les compétences en anglais académique, telles que la rédaction et la publication de textes académiques, de conférences et de demandes de subventions, et de rapports de recherche ; b) il existe une certaine disparité entre les besoins des enseignants et des étudiants et leurs pratiques en anglais ; et c) bien que, comme prévu, les étudiants aient un plus grand besoin de développer les compétences énumérées par rapport à leurs homologues, trois compétences se distinguent. Les résultats indiquent la nécessité pour les universités de : a) prendre en compte les variables démographiques dans la conception des programmes destinés à ces populations, b) développer des programmes qui donnent la priorité aux besoins des deux groupes à la lumière de leurs pratiques, et c) se concentrer sur les étudiants, car c'est le groupe qui a le plus besoin d'un tel développement de compétences.

Mots clés : littératies académiques, anglais langue étrangère (ALE), anglais avec des fins académiques, pratiques de littératie, besoins et pratiques concernant l'anglais

Resumo

Com as tendências atuais de internacionalização, as universidades têm adotado uma série de medidas para aprimorar as habilidades de inglês acadêmico de professores e alunos. No entanto, pouco se tem feito para determinar quais são realmente as necessidades e práticas de inglês dos professores e alunos, como essas necessidades se relacionam com suas práticas ou como as necessidades e práticas diferem de acordo com a população. Para preencher essa lacuna, os pesquisadores de uma universidade pública de Medellín enviaram um questionário por e-mail aos professores e alunos com perguntas sobre esse assunto. Os resultados indicam que: a) embora existam diferenças em termos de idade, gênero, etnia e nível docente, ambos os grupos precisam de apoio com habilidades de inglês acadêmico, como escrita e publicação de textos acadêmicos, conferências e propostas de subsídios e relatórios de pesquisa; b) há uma incompatibilidade entre o que os alunos e o corpo docente precisam e o que eles praticam em inglês; e c) embora, como esperado, os alunos precisem

2

do desenvolvimento de todas as habilidades listadas muito mais do que o corpo docente, há três habilidades que se destacam. Esses resultados sugerem a necessidade de as universidades: a) considerarem as variáveis demográficas ao elaborarem programas para essas populações, b) desenvolverem programas que priorizem o que é necessário para ambos os grupos em relação ao que é praticado por eles e c) concentrarem-se nos alunos, pois eles são os que mais precisam de todas as habilidades.

Palavras chave: letramento acadêmico, inglês língua estrangeira, inglês para fins acadêmicos, práticas de letramento, necessidades e práticas em relação ao inglês

3

Introduction

Within the last decades, English has become the language of business, marketing, science, international diplomacy, and media worldwide (Rao, 2019). In non-English speaking countries, it has been associated with competitiveness as it is believed that its command can help people obtain better jobs, better salaries, and better opportunities for sponsorship from higher education institutions, international agencies, and so on (Ortiz et al., 2019). Due to this phenomenon, and to pressure from powerful economic organizations such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which demand that developing countries improve their English scores at all educational levels to enter these organizations, many Latin American countries, such as Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Mexico have launched English programs for their citizens (Correa & González, 2016; González & Llurda, 2016).

Colombia, for example, has taken several measures which include mandating the teaching of English from Pre-K to 11 and at all university levels, establishing the levels of proficiency for each level according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (Peláez et al., 2020), and issuing a series of guidelines and internationalization standards for universities (Consejo Nacional de Educación Superior [CESU], 2014; Ministerio de Educación Nacional [MEN], 2022). According to these guidelines, university students from non-licensure programs must achieve a B1 level, students from licensure programs a B2 level, and students in English teacher preparation programs a C1 level (MEN, 2017). As for the standards, they prompt universities to increase their faculty's international mobility, research cooperation with international colleagues, co-authored research articles with international colleges, and overall international visibility (Benavides, 2021).

To achieve these indicators and obtain high-quality accreditation of their programs, many Colombian universities have modified their language policies to require that all students demonstrate English proficiency in order to graduate, whether by completing a series of regular English courses or through presentation of English proficiency exams (Usma et al., 2018). They have also launched English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs which familiarize students with how to perform general academic tasks in English, such as oral presentations, interviews, and applications (EAP) (Nausa, 2017) or how to be efficient within their disciplines (ESP) (Díaz-Ramírez, 2014). Moreover, they have established entry-level English requirements for faculty, and have offered faculty English courses that follow the same methodologies of these programs, once they are hired.

Despite these efforts, results from the national English test for future professionals, *Pruebas Saber Pro* 2021, show that by the end of their university studies, 10% of all students are below the CEFR A1 level, 52 % reach A2 (a basic level), 26% achieve B1, and only 11% attain B2 (Colombian Government, 2024). Similarly, internationalization and academic mobility are still an issue as demonstrated in the last QS ranking by Sapiens Research (2024) where Universidad de los Andes, the highest-ranked university in Colombia, scores 26.4% for internationalization of faculty, and 2% for internationalization of students. In other words, the new policies are not successfully increasing either students and faculty's English proficiency or their academic literacy, the latter of which refers to knowledge about the ways of saying (writing), doing, being, valuing and believing in the academy (Sebolai, 2016).

To address this issue, in 2022, scholars from a public university in Colombia opened the Center for Multiliteracies (CML). Its main objective was to provide a space where the entire university community (e.g., students, instructors, employees and alumni) could receive virtual and face-to-face support from English tutors with academic English practices that are not usually covered in English courses, such as how to design and deliver multimodal presentations,

4

revise their articles for publication, write theses, grant and conference proposals; apply to mobility programs, and so on. As they did this, they also launched a research project on faculty and students' academic English needs and practices. Specific questions addressed by this study were as follows: (a) What are the specific academic English needs and practices of faculty and students at this university? (b) How do faculty and students' needs relate to their practices? and (c) What is the difference between faculty and students in terms of their academic English needs?

Studies on faculty and students' academic English needs and practices at the international level have not been scarce during the last ten years. However, most of these studies have been conducted in Middle Eastern countries such as Iran (Boroujeni & Fard, 2013; Esfandiari et al., 2022; Moiinvaziri, 2014) and Saudi Arabia (Alqunayeer & Zamir, 2016; Alsamadani, 2017); Asian-pacific countries such as Indonesia (Arroyyani, 2022; Pranoto & Suprayogi, 2020; Rahmawati, 2018), the Philippines (Generoso & Arbon, 2020), Vietnam (Do, 2023), Malaysia (David et al., 2015), and South Korea (Choi, 2021); African countries such as Morocco (Hattani, 2019); and European countries such as Spain (Perez-Llantada, 2018) and Türkiye (Çelik & Topkaya, 2018; Dinçer & Koç, 2018), rather than Latin America, especially Colombia, or in Spanish-speaking countries.

Besides, most of these studies have addressed the needs and practices of students, not of faculty. For example, they have explored the linguistic skills that students claim to need the most, whether productive or passive (Alqunayeer & Zamir, 2016; Boroujeni & Fard, 2013; Pranoto & Suprayogi, 2020) on their specific reading and/or writing needs (Choi, 2021; Do, 2023; Esfandiari et al., 2022; Rahmawati, 2018); or their English needs in specific areas of knowledge such as public health (Arroyyani et al., 2022), medicine (Çelik & Topkaya, 2018) and engineering (Alsamadani, 2017; Hattani, 2019).

Only three studies were found to explore the academic English needs of faculty: those by Dinçer and Koç (2018) and Çelik and Topkaya (2018) from Türkiye, and Perez-Llantada (2018) from Spain. However, only the study by Dinçer and Koç (2018) explored the needs of faculty across campus. The other two focused on the needs of faculty from specific areas of study: medicine (Çelik & Topkaya, 2018) and earth sciences (Perez-Llantada, 2018).

In Latin America, the literature on students and instructors' academic literacy needs and practices in English is even more scant. A review of articles published in the last 10 years revealed only four pertinent studies in Latin America, two in the general region (Carabelli, 2021; Trujeque et al., 2021) and two in Colombia (Bedoya et al., 2015; Parra, 2014). However, the first study (Carabelli, 2021), conducted in Uruguay, reports on the specific needs of students in only one program or area of knowledge: dentistry. The second (Trujeque et al., 2021), implemented in México, focused on both students and faculty academic needs in English but before and after an intervention using task-based language teaching. The third, performed in Colombia by Parra (2014), was carried out at a technical and technological female institution, which means that the findings were related to the specific needs of students working towards technical certificates, rather than the needs and practices of students and faculty at research one universities. Finally, the fourth (Bedoya et al., 2015), conducted in Colombia with faculty taking a professional development course, focused more on faculty's opinion of themselves and of the program's weaknesses and strengths than on their academic English needs.

Having a clear picture of faculty and students' academic needs in English is important for several reasons. First, it will show whether the support that universities are currently providing to these groups is relevant to what is currently being done with English in academia or if this is focused on obsolete academic practices that are no longer part

5

of the twenty-first century students and faculty's toolkit. Second, it will identify specific measures that they need to take to provide more targeted support to these populations and to more easily achieve their goals of increasing the use of English in academic university practice.

The following sections provide a brief overview of the theories that served as the basis for the study, details about the survey that was sent and the way it was analyzed, and the findings and conclusions that can be drawn from this study.

Theoretical Framework

The study is based on academic literacy theories. The following paragraphs explain these theories and make a synthesis of studies that have been conducted in this area, particularly those that emphasize the academic needs and practices in English of students and faculty.

Academic Literacies

The field of academic literacies has shifted in the last twenty years. As explained by Lillis and Tuck (2016), it used to focus on the acquisition of a particular set of cognitive skills in reading and writing. However, it is now concerned with institutional academic practices and pedagogies, the experiences and perspectives of student writers, and their struggles, "as they tried to negotiate a pathway through the maze of tacit and sometimes contradictory expectations" (Lillis & Tuck, 2016, p. 32). It is also interested in "transforming the kinds of resources, genres and semiotic practices that are used/able in academia (...), the ways in which institutions conceptualize what it means to engage successfully in academic literacy practices" (Lillis & Tuck, 2016, p. 35).

The field shares with EAP the interest in "helping students—and increasingly academics—to succeed as writers and communicators in the increasingly globalized, English-dominant academy" (Lillis & Tuck, 2016, p. 36) and in researching

valued rhetorical practices in particular contexts. Nonetheless, it differs from EAP in several aspects. For example, contrary to EAP, it is more focused on practices than on texts, more preoccupied with needs analysis than with rationalist approaches (Lillis & Tuck, 2016), more worried about transformative and socially situated accounts of writing and text production than normative accounts of how to induct students into academic and disciplinary writing conventions (Lillis et al., 2015).

For students, being academically literate implies having the capacity to "switch practices between one setting and another, to deploy a repertoire of linguistic practices appropriate to each setting, and to handle the social meanings and identities that each evokes" (Lea & Street, 2006, p. 368). This implies not only knowing the texts that are privileged by the disciplinary communities to which they belong and the language, styles, genres, structures, grammar that characterize those genres, whether oral, written, or multimodal, but also being able to navigate and integrate a multiplicity of modes of expression, including the linguistic, audio, spatial, visual, and gestural (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015), into the increasingly multimodal/multimedia texts of the 21th century (e.g., multimedia presentations, videos, podcasts).

For faculty, developing academic literacies involves honing the skills that will help them do class work, advance professionally, do research, and consolidate their status. These skills include writing articles for publication in indexed journals (Lillis & Tuck, 2016), writing conference and research proposals, doing oral presentations of their work, participating in research networks and meetings and so on.

For university faculty and students who are speakers of English as a foreign or an international language, it means learning to do these things in English, not merely for Western English-speaking audiences or for their disciplinary communities but also for other international and local audiences. Additionally, it means understanding that

6

these practices are not neutral or a-political and their mastery is not going to guarantee them social mobility and social goods, as Luke (1996) warns us. However, they may better position them for some of the work they have to do both as students and as professionals in local and international contexts: they could have easier access to disciplinary texts in English (Rao, 2019), more possibilities to publish in indexed journals and to participate in international conferences and research projects (Mur-Dueñas, 2019).

Indeed, even though in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, certain disciplinary communities such as law and accounting in Colombia use their first language for research and production, there is a wide range of discourse communities, including engineering and technology, medicine, trade and commerce, education, and tourism which rely on English proficiency for their research and employment, and cannot really thrive in the academic world without it (Rao, 2019). Besides, those communities that do not depend on English to thrive could benefit from developing their academic literacies in English, given the international character of the language and the fact that it is the preferred language of business in many non-English speaking countries (Rao, 2019). But the question remains: how much do students and faculty from universities in non-English speaking countries actually need these academic literacy practices to succeed in academia? As mentioned earlier, research on this topic is limited. However, the existing studies provide valuable insights, which are described below.

Studies on Faculty and Students' Academic English Needs and Practices

Although conducted elsewhere and within specific areas of knowledge, studies on faculty and students' academic needs and practices in English provide important revelations. Indeed, apart from the typical need for development in the four skills: vocabulary, pronunciation and grammatical knowledge, a group of these studies has shown students' need for the development of other academic skills in English. These skills include giving oral presentations, reading articles, writing specific field-specific reports, taking exams, note-taking, participating in classroom conversations, attending seminars, workshops, and conferences, interacting with English speaking teachers, researchers, and professionals in their field, and performing better in their different jobs (Alsamadani,2017). They also comprise writing academic papers in English (Choi, 2021), doing assignments, taking tests, studying the material before coming to class (Rahmawati, 2018), writing essays, research papers, assignments and lab reports (David et al., 2015), summarizing books, writing descriptive, expository, and argumentative essays, and writing proposals and theses (Esfandiari et al., 2022). As for the needs of faculty, the one study on this topic by Dinçer and Koç (2018) shows that faculty require English for writing research papers, reading articles, collaborating with foreign partners, participating in international conferences, following field updates, doing translations, delivering presentations, and writing research papers.

In Latin America, the few studies conducted with Spanish speaking university students also reveal key details about their academic needs in English. According to these studies, students need English to read scientific articles, understand conferences, communicate in the language, travel, teach (Trujeque et al., 2021), read research articles, access different Internet sites, attend congresses, study or live in other countries, talk with colleagues from around the world, treat patients from different countries, and have access to the literature from their fields (e.g., catalogs, materials, technological instruments, instructions, and academic articles) (Carabelli, 2021).As for faculty, they need it for doing research, interacting with foreign people, training, and self-updating (Trujeque et al., 2021)In Colombia, the only study to specifically address the topic, by Bedoya et al. (2015), suggests that faculty need English for publishing research articles, engaging in international academic and

7

cultural exchanges, applying for positions as full-time professors at universities, and participating fluently in conversations (Bedoya et al., 2015).

Method

This study falls within the category of survey research. As explained by Creswell and Guetterman (2018), in this procedure "researchers collect quantitative, numbered data using questionnaires (e.g., mailed questionnaires) or interviews (e.g., one-on-one interviews) and statistically analyze the data to describe trends about responses to questions and to test research questions or hypotheses. They also interpret the meaning of the data by relating results of the statistical test back to past research studies" (p. 385). Besides, survey researchers are not interested in cause and effect or predicting outcomes but in describing trends in the data and correlating variables. Accordingly, in this study, we collected information from students and faculty at a university in Medellín, Colombia, by means of an e-mailed questionnaire, and statistically analyzed the responses to be able to describe trends in the data and correlating variables. We also compared the results they obtained with those obtained in past studies.

Data Collection

Questionnaires were sent out and collected from 39.997 students and 8.267 faculty in nine branches of a public university in Medellín, Colombia. The distribution started on May 3, 2022 and went on until February 27, 2023. They were sent as a Google form in Spanish so that participants could easily respond to it. The initial recipients of the questionnaire were the university vice-rectors, deans, vice-deans, program directors and coordinators who had previously met with the PI and had committed to re-sending the questionnaire to the faculty and students from their programs, via email. The email contained an explanation of the following: what the CML was, the purpose of the survey (to make decision related

Table 1 A Summary of Parts and Questions in Both Surveys

Categories	Number of Survey Questions to Students	Number of Survey Questions to Instructors
Demographic profile	6	6
Academic practices	12	14
Academic needs	12	12
Perceived students' academic needs	N/A	12
Opinions & suggestions	3	3
Total questions	33	47

to the services that needed to be provided), the limits of its use (only for academic, administrative and research purposes), the way the responses would be treated (anonymously, in aggregate form), how they would be presented (in oral and written reports and in conferences and articles on faculty and students' needs), the completion time (about 15 minutes), and the expected return date.

The specific questionnaire sent to students consisted of 33 questions divided into four sections. The one sent to faculty differed from that sent to students in that it contained an additional category which explored their perception of students' needs, increasing the number of questions to 47 (Table 1).

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, we proceeded category by category. That is, we first looked at the English practices that were most common to faculty and students and drew conclusions. Then, we looked at their needs, and started asking questions about the data: What are the skills that each group does not practice but strongly needs or viceversa? Are there any substantial differences based on age, sex, ethnicity or rank? After that, we compared faculty and students' responses in terms of their expressed needs for different services. Finally, we asked ourselves what those findings implied in

terms of the support that the university, through its Multiliteracy or other centers, needed to provide for both faculty and students.

Participants

The survey respondents comprised 121 faculty and 457 students across 24 different faculties, schools, institutes and corporations of the university. In terms of faculty, most respondents were from social sciences (51%), followed by medical and health sciences (20%), humanities and arts (7%), natural and exact sciences (7%), engineering and technology (5%) and agricultural science (4%).

Also, most respondents were hired as adjuncts (46%), followed by those hired as tenure track (40%), and lecturers (12%). In terms of gender, there was a greater percentage of female respondents than of male respondents; (57%) and (42%), respectively. As for age, faculty were 10,74% between 22 and 34 years old, 42.98% between 35 and 44, 33.06% between 45 and 54, and 13.22% between 55 and 65. Finally, most faculty identified themselves as Mestizos (individuals of mixed European and Indigenous American ancestry) (47.6%) and (31.9%) did not report their ethnicity. Regarding other ethnicities, 17.7% identified as White, and 4.10% identified as Black, a category in which we included Raizal from Archipelago of San Andrés (0.82%), Afrocolombian (1,64%), Mulatto (0.82%), and self-reported as Black (0.82%).

In terms of the students' areas of knowledge, most of the respondents were from the social sciences (36%), or from medical and health sciences (24%), followed by engineering (12%), humanities and arts and agricultural sciences (10%) and natural and exact sciences (9%). Also, as with faculty, most students identified as either female (57%) or male (40%), with only 0.88% identifying as non-binary, 0.44% as other, and 0.66% as preferred not to say. In terms of ethnicity, most students did not claim any. Among those who did claim one, 31% reported to be Mestizos, 10% White, 7% Black, and 3% Indigenous. Given the small number of

faculty and students in some areas of knowledge, it was not possible to draw conclusions on the specific needs and practices of students and faculty by area of knowledge.

Results

Results from this study provide important details regarding the specific academic English needs and practices of students and faculty at this university, the relationship between those needs and practices, and the difference between students and faculty in terms of their needs in English. The following paragraphs provide details about these findings.

Faculty Academic English Needs and Practices

An analysis of the faculty's survey provides an interesting picture of the general academic English needs of faculty, of how these needs vary depending on rank, age, and gender; and of how these needs relate to their practices. In terms of general needs, the statistical analysis reveals that all English skills, except for writing emails and other communications ($Md = 3$, $Mo = 1$); designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks for students ($Md = 3$, $Mo = 1$); reading comprehension of academic texts ($Md = 2$, $Mo = 1$); and preparing employment and study applications ($Md = 2$, $Mo = 1$), were perceived as needed by the faculty, as indicated by the median and mode values between 4 and 5, as shown in Table 2.

However, not all the 7 skills with $Mo = 5$ were equally essential. An analysis of median and percentages shows that the four most essential English skills were writing and publishing research reports ($Md = 4$, 65%), writing grant proposals ($Md = 4$, 61%), writing academic texts ($Md = 4$, 60%), and writing conference proposals ($Md = 4$, 56%). Also, there were some unexpected general English needs which appeared when they were given the option to mark "other." The most frequent of these were the following: participating in meetings with different sponsors and peers (n=11), translating

9

Table 2 Faculty's Academic English Needs

Skills	Mean	Mode	%
Writing and publishing research reports	4	5	65
Writing grant proposals	4	5	61
Writing academic texts	4	5	60
Writing conference proposals	4	5	56
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	4	5	43
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	4	5	41
Developing research strategies	4	3	40
Preparing for standardized tests	4	5	40
Writing emails and other communications	3	1	33
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	3	1	33
Reading comprehension of academic texts	2	1	28
Preparing employment and study applications	2	1	21

manuscripts to be submitted for publication in international journals (n=7), proofreading these articles (n=4), and developing oral fluency (n=4). Moreover, when we factor in rank, we see that

there are a few differences in terms of the English needs of tenure track, lecturers, and adjuncts (see Table 3).

As can be observed in Table 3, lecturers are in strong need of all English skills, as reflected by a Mo=5 in all of them. Meanwhile, tenure track faculty, do not seem to be in great need of English skills such as preparing employment and study applications (Mo=1, p=0.006), reading comprehension of academic texts (Mo=1, p=0.003), developing research strategies (Mo=1, p=0.002), preparing for standardized tests (Mo=1, p=0.008); and designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks, although in this last category the difference between them and lecturers is significant (Mo=2, p=0.069).

As for adjuncts, despite statistically significant differences in some of the categories, they share the tenure track faculty's low concern for English skills in preparing employment and study applications (Mo=2, p=0.011), reading comprehension of academic texts (Mo=1, p=0.029); and

Table 3 Academic English Needs of Faculty by Rank

Skills	Mode			T-test		
	Tenure Track	Lecturers	Adjunct	Adjunct vs Lecturers	Adjunct vs Tenure Track	Lecturers vs Tenure Track
Writing academic texts	5	5	5	0.036	0.285	0.143
Writing conference proposals	4	5	5	0.023	0.441	0.062
Writing grant proposals	5	5	5	0.033	0.458	0.063
Writing and publishing research reports	5	5	5	0.016	0.428	0.029
Writing emails and other communications	3	5	1	0.030	0.250	0.027
Preparing employment and study applications	1	5	2	0.043	0.011	0.006
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	3	5	3	0.264	0.297	0.475
Reading comprehension of academic texts	1	5	1	0.014	0.029	0.003
Developing research strategies	1	5	3	0.020	0.007	0.002
Preparing for standardized tests	1	5	5	0.198	0.001	0.008
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	2	5	1	0.062	0.276	0.069
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	5	5	5	0.100	0.365	0.146

designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks. Nonetheless, contrary to tenure track faculty and lecturers, they do not seem to consider writing emails and other communications in English a priority (Mo=1, p=0.25).

In terms of which English skills are needed the most by all groups, a look at the percentages shows that their top priorities are writing and publishing research reports (TT=64%, L=79%, A=60%), followed by writing grant proposals (TT=60%, L=71%, A=55%, writing academic texts (TT=60%, L=64%, A=55%), and writing conference proposals (TT=55%, L=64%, A=53%), all of which got over 50%. Nonetheless, lecturers also add to this list of priorities developing research strategies; and designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies, both of which score 57%.

As for age, a look at Table 4 reveals several major differences in terms of faculty age.

As can be seen, faculty older than 45 do not seem to need support with writing emails and other communications in English (Mo=1) while faculty younger than 44 do seem to need this support (Mo=3, and Mo=5). Indeed, when comparing the two groups the T–test analysis reveals a statistically significant difference between the groups of 22–34 and 45–65 (p=0.0398).

Also, faculty older than 35 need more support (Mo=1) than younger faculty 22 to 34 (Mo=5) with reading comprehension of academic texts in English, as proven by the T–test analysis which issues a statistically significant difference (p=0.0142) between the two groups. A second difference is found between faculty older than 45 and the younger generation as faculty older than 45 claim to need developing research strategies (Mo=5) more than younger faculty (Mo=1) and there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups (p=0.00186). A third significant difference is between older faculty,

11

Table 4 Academic English Needs of Faculty by Age

Skills	Mode				T-test					
	22—34	35—44	45—54	55—65	22—34 35—44	22—34 45—54	22—34 55—65	35—44 45—54	35—44 55—65	45—54 55—65
Writing academic texts	5	5	5	5	0.2654	0.127	0.189	0.2256	0.323	0.4646
Writing conference proposals	5	5	5	5	0.3579	0.373	0.373	0.1512	0.3229	0.4066
Writing grant proposals	5	5	5	5	0.2081	0.074	0.074	0.1843	0.3608	0.4219
Writing and publishing research reports	5	5	5	5	0.2618	0.147	0.147	0.2612	0.3833	0.4396
Writing emails and other communications	3	5	1	1	0.1895	0.039	0.039	0.1001	0.1674	0.4892
Preparing employment and study applications	2	2	1	1	0.4036	0.143	0.143	0.0751	0.0095	0.0943
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	3	3	5	3	0.1652	0.261	0.261	0.3445	0.2705	0.3864
Reading comprehension of academic texts	5	1	1	1	0.1521	0.014	0.014	0.0280	0.0168	0.2344
Developing research strategies	5	5	1	1	0.0096	0.0	0.0	0.0462	0.0373	0.3103
Preparing for standardized tests	5	5	5	2	0.4696	0.281	0.281	0.1382	0.0035	0.0327

Table 4 Academic English Needs of Faculty by Age (Continued)

Skills	Mode				T-test					
	22–34	35–44	45–54	55–65	22–34 35–44	22–34 45–54	22–34 55–65	35–44 45–54	35–44 55–65	45–54 55–65
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	1	5	2	1	0.4847	0.367	0.367	0.3181	0.2758	0.3967
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	1	5	5	1	0.3307	0.427	0.427	0.3352	0.1723	0.2591

ages 55–65 and the rest of the faculty, ages 22 to 54, and it has to do with preparing for standardized tests in English.

As expected, faculty older than 55 did not claim to need this skill (Mo=2) while faculty younger than 55 did (Mo=5), with a statistically significant difference of p=0.00625). The next difference is between faculty ages 35 to 44 and the rest of the faculty. This group claimed to need more support with designing, implementing, and evaluating written tasks in English (Mo=5) than their peers (Mo=1 and 2). Even though the difference is not statistically significant there was a 12% difference between this group and the rest. The last difference was between faculty ages 35–54 and younger and older faculty. The latter claimed to need more help (Mo=5) than younger or older faculty with designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other literacies in English (Mo=1). Although there was not a statistically significant difference (p=0.36647 and p=0.19438), there was indeed an 11% difference between this group and the 22–34 group.

In terms of gender, the analysis shows that there is only one significant difference between males and females' needs.

Indeed, as shown on Table 5, most English skills are important for both male (M) and female (F) participants as seven of the twelve categories have a mode between 4 and 5: writing and publishing research reports in English; writing grant proposals in English; writing academic texts in English; writing conference proposals in English;

preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations in English; designing, implementing and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies; and preparing for standardized tests. Contrastingly, there are three English skills which do not appear as essential for either group: writing emails and other communications (F & M, Mo=1), reading comprehension of academic texts (F & M, Mo=1), and preparing employment and study applications (Mo=F=2, M=1). The only significant difference between the two groups is when it comes to designing, implementing, and

Table 5 Faculty Academic English Needs by Gender

Skills	Female		Male		T-Test
	Mode	%	Mode	%	
Writing and publishing research reports	5	64	5	67	0.393
Writing grant proposals	5	63	5	59	0.440
Writing academic texts	5	61	5	57	0.433
Writing conference proposals	4	57	5	55	0.459
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	4	57	3	35	0.468
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	5	44	5	41	0.496
Developing research strategies	3	43	1	37	0.241
Preparing for standardized tests	5	41	5	39	0.370
Writing emails and other communications	1	31	1	35	0.388
Reading comprehension of academic texts	1	30	1	25	0.464
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	1	30	5	37	0.205
Preparing employment and study applications	2	17	1	27	0.342

12

evaluating written tasks in English, which females do not find as important (Mo=1) as males do (Mo=5).

In relation to faculty English needs by ethnicity, the study shows that there are at least three categories that all ethnicities consider important as they have a Mo=5 (see Table 6). Those categories are writing grant proposals; writing and publishing research reports; and designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies. In addition, there are some English skills that most groups consider unimportant such as preparing employment and study applications (Mo=1 for all and Mo=3 for black), preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations (Mo=1, 2 or 3), and reading comprehension of academic texts (Mo=1 & 3).

In terms of differences, an analysis of Mode reveals that writing academic texts in English is important for all groups (Mo=5) except for Blacks (Mo=2),

writing conference proposals in English is very important for Mestizos and no self-reported ethnicity (Mo=5) but not so much for Blacks and Whites. Also, writing emails and other communications in English is especially important for Mestizos (Mo=5) but not so much for Blacks, Whites, or no self-reported ethnicity (Mo=1, 2 and 3). Finally, preparing for standardized tests in English is important for White and Mestizos (Mo=5) but not so much for Blacks and no self-reported ethnicity (Mo=1 and 3).

Finally, regarding how faculty needs relate to their practices (see Table 7), an analysis of percentages shows that there are at least five English skills that they need more than they practice. Those skills

Table 6 Faculty Academic English Needs by Ethnicity

Skills	Mode			
	Black	White	Mestizo	No self-reported ethnicity
Writing academic texts	2	5	5	5
Writing conference proposals	2	1	5	5
Writing grant proposals	5	5	5	5
Writing and publishing research reports	5	5	5	4
Writing emails and other communications	2	1	5	3
Preparing employment and study applications	3	1	1	1
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	N/D	1	2	3
Reading comprehension of academic texts	N/D	1	1	3
Developing research strategies	2	2	5	3
Preparing for standardized tests	1	5	5	3
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	2	1	5	1
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	5	5	5	5

Table 7 Faculty Academic English Needs and Practices

Skills	Needs		Practices		T-test
	Mode	%	Mode	%	P(T<=t) 0.05
Writing academic texts	5	60	2	50	6.2252E-11
Writing conference proposals	5	56	2	28	1.127E-18
Writing grant proposals	5	61	2	23	9.0408E-28
Writing and publishing research reports	5	65	2	37	2.635E-18
Writing emails and other communications	1	33	4	66	0.29165499
Preparing employment and study applications	1	21	2	20	0.00088076
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	5	41	1	41	1.0846E-08
Reading comprehension of academic texts	1	28	4	63	5.4698E-06
Developing research strategies	3	40	2	45	3.9923E-05
Preparing for standardized tests	5	40	1	24	7.1562E-12
Designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks	1	33	1	45	0.00723343
Designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies	5	43	1	48	2.5598E-06

13

are writing and publishing research reports (65-37%), grant proposals (61–23%), academic texts (60–50%), and conference proposals (56–28%), and preparing for standardized tests (40–24%). There are also at least five English skills that they practice more than they need. Those skills are reading comprehension of academic texts (4–1); writing emails and other communications (66–33%); reading comprehension of academic texts (63–28%) developing research strategies (45–40%); designing, implementing and evaluating written tasks (45–33%); and designing, implementing and evaluating tasks that promote other English literacies (48–43%). This difference between faculty needs and practices is confirmed by the T-test analysis which reveals that there are statistically significant differences in all categories except for writing emails and other communications in English (p=0,29165499).

Students' Academic English Needs and Practices

As with faculty, an analysis of students' English needs and practices provides interesting insights as to their general needs; their needs by age, gender, and ethnicity; and the relation between needs

Table 8 Students' Academic English Needs

Skills	Median	Mode	%
Preparing for standardized tests	5	5	80
Writing undergraduate and graduate thesis	5	5	79
Writing and publishing research reports	5	5	77
Preparing employment and study applications	5	5	73
Writing grant proposals	4	5	71
Writing conference proposals	4	5	70
Writing academic texts	4	5	69
Developing research strategies	4	5	69
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	4	5	68
Developing study and organization skills	4	5	66
Reading comprehension of academic texts	4	5	65
Writing emails and other communications	4	5	61

and practices (see Table 8). In terms of general English needs, the analysis shows that students strongly need support with all the English skills (Mo=5 and 4, 80 to 61%), that preparing for standardized tests is the skill they need the most (80%). Most interestingly, students rank writing undergraduate and graduate thesis in English as their second greatest need (Mo=5, 80%), writing and publishing research reports in English as the third highest need, and writing grant proposals in English as the fifth need, in spite of the fact that students at the university are not compelled to write their thesis in English, except for those students at the School of Languages pursuing undergraduate or graduate programs, which only account for 8% of the students who claimed to need this service (n=359).

Furthermore, in terms of general English needs, when given the opportunity to add other needs to the list provided, a significant number of students claimed to need support with the improvement or development of English skills (n=71), and a small amount of them said they would need support specifically with learning more vocabulary (n=9), interacting with native speakers (n=7), and learning content-based English (n=3).

A look at students' needs by age (Table 9) is also very telling as it shows that, although all the student participants need all English skills (Mo = 4 or 5 in all categories), there are some differences according to age groups. Indeed, an analysis of percentages reveals that students aged 25 to 34 are the ones in need of more support in English (percentages of 70 to 51) and that students aged 45 to 54 are the ones needing less support (percentages 33 to 11). On the other hand, unexpectedly, the T-test analysis shows statistically significant differences among students ages 15 to 24 and 25–34 in all English skills except for preparing employment and study applications (p=0.063, 10%), preparing for standardized tests (p=0.080, 12%), and writing undergraduate and graduate thesis (p=0.152, 13%). Nonetheless, a look at the percentages reveals that there are significant percentual differences in these categories as well. This is significant

Table 9 Academic English Needs of Students by Age

Skills	Mode				T-test					
	15–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	15–24 25–34	15–24 35–44	15–24 45–54	25–34 35–44	24–35 45–65	35–44 45–54
Writing undergraduate and graduate thesis	5	5	5	5	0.152	0.473	0.029	0.245	0.241	0.241
Preparing for standardized tests	5	5	5	5	0.080	0.223	0.304	0.075	0.499	0.197
Preparing employment and study applications	5	5	5	5	0.063	0.075	0.478	0.020	0.278	0.208
Writing and publishing research reports	5	5	5	5	0.003	0.314	0.252	0.037	0.094	0.342
Writing grant proposals	5	5	5	5	0.000	0.439	0.485	0.034	0.126	0.482
Writing conference proposals	5	5	5	5	0.000	0.121	0.420	0.007	0.116	0.306
Writing academic texts	5	5	5	5	0.029	0.493	0.437	0.164	0.220	0.449
Developing research strategies	5	5	5	5	0.013	0.165	0.409	0.316	0.307	0.405
Reading comprehension of academic texts	5	5	5	5	0.045	0.382	0.148	0.121	0.355	0.144
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	5	5	5	5	0.005	0.067	0.251	0.460	0.382	0.413
Developing study and organization skills	5	5	5	4	0.029	0.393	0.456	0.214	0.292	0.478
Writing emails and other communications	5	5	4	5	0.070	0.439	0.475	0.122	0.223	0.485

as we hypothesized that the main differences would be between the younger students (ages 15–24) and the oldest (ages 45–54). Another statistically significant distinction is that between students 15–24 and 45–54 in the category of writing undergraduate and graduate theses (p=0.029, 37%). Finally, there are several statistically significant differences between students 25–34 and 35–44. These lie in the categories of writing conference proposals (p=0.007, 41%), grant proposals (p=0.034, 17%), research reports (p=0.037, 23%) and preparing employment and study applications in English (0.020, 26%).

As for gender (Table 10), the analysis shows that, in general, both male and female need a great amount of support with all English skills (Mo=5). Nonetheless, an analysis of percentages shows that female need slightly more support than male with all English skills (between 82–71% compared to 74–65%), being writing undergraduate and graduate thesis and writing conference proposals the categories where female distance themselves from male the most (8%).

The T-test analysis also showed statistically significant differences between male and female in English

Table 10 Academic English Needs of Students by Gender

Skills	Mode	%	Mode	%	T-test
Preparing for standardized tests	5	83	5	73	0.010
Writing undergraduate and graduate thesis	5	82	5	74	0.006
Writing and publishing research reports	5	80	5	73	0.039
Preparing employment and study applications	5	76	5	69	0.120
Writing conference proposals	5	73	5	65	0.009
Writing grant proposals	5	73	5	67	0.012
Writing academic texts	5	71	5	65	0.045
Developing research strategies	5	71	5	68	0.184
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	5	67	5	70	0.264
Reading comprehension of academic texts	5	66	5	65	0.468
Developing study and organization skills	5	65	5	67	0.467
Writing emails and other communications	5	64	5	58	0.134

15

skills such as writing academic texts (p=0.045), conference proposals (p=0.009), grant proposals (p=0.012), research reports (p=0.039), preparing for standardized tests (p=0.010), and writing undergraduate and graduate thesis (p=0.066).

An analysis of students' needs by ethnicity showed that all ethnicities require support in all categories (percentages between 86% and 52%. Mo=5), except for Indigenous students who showed a Mode=4 for writing grant proposals in English.

As hypothesized, Indigenous students were the ones with the highest need for support across most English skills, with percentages between 71 & 86% in all skills, except for writing grant proposals, where 6% more Mestizos claimed to have this need (see Table 11).

The difference between Indigenous and other groups is confirmed by the T-test analysis, where there are significant statistical differences between this group and Blacks (3 categories), Whites

Table 11 Academic English Needs of Students by Ethnicity

Skills	T-test									
	Black White	**Black Indigenous**	**Black Mestizo**	**Black No self-reported ethnicity**	**White Indigenous**	**White Mestizo**	**White No self-reported ethnicity**	**Indigenous Mestizo**	**Indigenous No self-reported ethnicity**	**Mestizo No self-reported ethnicity**
Writing academic texts	0.055	0.279	0.279	0.158	0.041	0.217	0.041	0.077	0.214	0.057
Writing conference proposals	0.227	0.124	0.124	0.212	0.052	0.060	0.027	0.234	0.300	0.310
Writing grant proposals	0.243	0.334	0.334	0.050	0.199	0.009	0.020	0.229	0.310	0.239
Writing and publishing research reports	0.289	0.397	0.397	0.236	0.277	0.102	0.078	0.401	0.365	0.410
Writing emails and other communications	0.258	0.038	0.038	0.495	0.013	0.283	0.094	0.016	0.050	0.115
Preparing employment and study applications	0.470	0.065	0.065	0.349	0.061	0.367	0.292	0.058	0.076	0.353
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	0.468	0.035	0.035	0.195	0.038	0.219	0.085	0.069	0.136	0.153
Reading comprehension of academic texts	0.134	0.093	0.093	0.208	0.017	0.363	0.094	0.014	0.063	0.049
Developing research strategies	0.260	0.047	0.047	0.339	0.017	0.142	0.053	0.046	0.091	0.165
Developing study and organization skills	0.035	0.179	0.179	0.121	0.007	0.191	0.041	0.014	0.068	0.072

16

Table 11 Academic English Needs of Students by Ethnicity (Continued)

Skills	T-test									
	Black White	Black Indigenous	Black Mestizo	Black No self-reported ethnicity	White Indigenous	White Mestizo	White No self-reported ethnicity	Indigenous Mestizo	Indigenous No self-reported ethnicity	Mestizo No self-reported ethnicity
Preparing for standardized tests	0.264	0.136	0.136	0.300	0.062	0.452	0.173	0.038	0.134	0.064
Writing undergraduate and graduate thesis	0.286	0.186	0.186	0.471	0.087	0.254	0.228	0.137	0.149	0.445

(7 categories), Mestizos (6 categories), and those who reported no ethnicity (2 categories). The only English skills in which no statistically significant difference between this group and the others was found were the following: writing and publishing research reports, preparing employment and study applications, writing undergraduate and graduate thesis. Conversely, most differences regarding English skills were found to be the following: writing emails and other communications, preparing multimedia texts, and developing study and organizational skills the last of which Indigenous students marked higher than everyone else.

As for Blacks, whose needs for support were also expected to be higher than average, they rank all categories like Whites, Mestizos and no self-reported ethnicity. This similarity is also confirmed by the T-test analysis which shows statistically significant differences between Blacks and Whites only in one category, Blacks and Indigenous in three categories, Blacks and Mestizos in three categories, and Blacks and no self-reported ethnicity in one category.

Regarding Whites, the statistical analysis shows that, apart from its differences with Indigenous students, the most significant differences are between this group and no self-reported ethnicity (6 categories), not between this group and Blacks as would be expected, given the marginalization to which this group has been historically submitted.

Concerning the relation between students' needs and practices, a mode and percentage analysis reveals that there is a mismatch between the English skills needed (Mo=5, percentages between 61 – 80%) and the English skills practiced (Mo=1 or 2, percentages between 4 –45%) (see Table 12).

Table 12 Students' Academic English Needs and Practices

Skills	Need		Practice		T-test
	Mode	%	Mode	%	P vs N
Preparing for standardized tests	5	80	1	16	4.899E-208
Writing undergraduate and graduate thesis	5	79	1	7	1.457E-230
Writing and publishing research reports	5	77	1	6	3.618E-234
Preparing employment and study applications	5	73	1	11	7.602E-199
Writing grant proposals	5	71	1	4	7.795E-207
Writing conference proposals	5	70	1	5	8.18E-195
Writing academic texts	5	69	2	25	7.584E-123
Developing research strategies	5	69	1	22	3.91E-151
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	5	68	2	22	3.383E-135
Developing study and organization skills	5	66	2	36	5.3861E-95
Reading comprehension of academic texts	5	65	2	45	1.1024E-69
Writing emails and other communications	5	61	2	23	2.359E-103

17

The discrepancy is confirmed by the T-test analysis, which shows statistically significant differences in all categories. It is also understandable, given that people tend to avoid doing those things that they do not know how to do very well and vice versa. Nonetheless, in a university where the policy for the last ten years has been to increase English skills across disciplines, the opposite tendency (i.e., English being practiced a lot and being needed less) would be expected.

Faculty and Students' Needs

In terms of the difference between faculty and students' English needs, the analysis shows that, even though, as expected, students need the development of all English skills much more than faculty, there are three that stand out (see Table 13). These are developing research strategies (Mo: 3 & 5), reading comprehension of academic texts in

18

Table 13 English Needs of Faculty vs Students

Skills	Students		Faculty		T-test
	Mode	%	Mode	%	F vs Ss
Preparing for standardized tests	5	80	5	40	1.95E-13
Writing and publishing research reports	5	77	5	21	0.001567
Preparing employment and study applications	5	73	5	41	3.97E-26
Writing grant proposals	5	71	5	61	0.00
Writing conference proposals	5	70	5	56	0.00
Writing academic texts	5	69	5	60	0.00
Developing research strategies	5	69	3	40	3.47E-10
Preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations	5	68	5	41	2.54E-08
Reading comprehension of academic texts	5	65	1	28	1.65E-13
Writing emails and other communications	5	61	1	33	1.32E-08

English (Mo: 5 & 1), and writing emails and other communications (Mo:5 & 1).

Discussion and Conclusions

Results from this study suggest that, in general, both faculty and students need support with all the academic English skills listed on the survey. Nevertheless, they differ in some top priorities regarding English. For faculty, this includes writing and publishing research reports, grant proposals, academic texts, and conference proposals; and for students are preparing for standardized tests; and writing undergraduate and graduate thesis, research reports and grant proposals. Second, for both groups, the need for this support varies slightly depending on variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, and rank. Third, even though they have similar English needs, students need the development of three specific skills much more than faculty. Finally, there is a mismatch between what both students and faculty need and what they practice in English.

These results are significant for several reasons. First, they show that the English skills that faculty most need are not linguistic or pedagogical but academic literacy skills that are required to advance professionally and give more visibility to their research. These needs are consistent with university goals, they are just not being attended to properly. Similarly, in spite of the fact that students do mention English communicative skills (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, listening), the skills that students most mention are academic literacy skills that do not traditionally figure in English course programs as they are believed to be acquired autonomously (e.g., preparing for standardized tests, writing thesis, preparing employment and study applications) or to be a faculty, not a students' concern (e.g., writing conference, research or grant proposals).

Second, the results fill a gap in the literature in terms of the academic English needs of students and faculty from Latin American countries such as

Colombia by providing details on these needs and showing how they are similar or different to those already reported for these populations across the globe. They reveal, for example, that the academic English needs of students in Colombian public universities are similar to those of European, African, Middle Eastern and other Latin American students, in that Colombian EFL students also feel the need for English support with giving oral presentations; reading articles; preparing for exams; writing academic papers, research reports, proposals, and thesis; participating in conferences; and developing communication skills.

Nevertheless, they are different in that participants in those studies cite English needs that do not figure in this study, such as support with taking notes; participating in the classroom; attending certain engineering seminars, workshops and conferences; interacting with English speaking teachers, researchers, and professionals in their field; performing better in their jobs; studying materials before coming to class; doing assignments and lab reports; summarizing books; traveling; accessing different internet sites; teaching; studying; living in other countries; talking with colleagues from around the world; and having access to literature from their field. Similarly, participants in our study cite English needs that do not show in those studies, such as preparing employment and study applications, writing grant proposals, developing research strategies, preparing multimedia texts for oral presentations, developing study and organizational skills, and writing emails and other communications.

As for the needs of faculty, the two international studies found on the topic by Dinçer and Koç (2018), and Carabelli (2021) show very similar results to this study, as here, faculty also claim to need English support with writing research papers, reading articles, participating in international conferences, doing translations, delivering presentations, writing research papers, and interacting with foreign people. In contrast, in our study,

faculty do not claim to need English for training and self-updating, as Carabelli's participants, or for collaborating with foreign partners and following field updates, as was the case in Dinçer and Koç's (2018) study. Instead, they claim to need support with other English skills that do not show in Dinçer and Koç's (2018) study, such as writing grant proposals; designing, implementing, and evaluating tasks; developing research strategies; preparing for standardized tests; writing emails and other communications; and preparing employment and study applications. Finally, the results coincide with those of Bedoya et al. (2015) in that in our study faculty also need English support with publishing research articles, engaging in international academic and cultural exchanges, applying for positions as full-time professors at universities, and participating fluently in conversations. Nonetheless, our study goes further as it mentions many other needs that they do not.

Third, the results provide a picture of faculty English needs. As was clear in the introduction, most international studies only included students and if they did include faculty, it was only to learn more about the students' needs. Among the few that did include faculty, only one was done in Latin America (Mexico), which means that, up to now, the picture of faculty English needs was really bleak. Finally, the results illustrate the needs of students and faculty across the university, not in one specific area of knowledge. Knowing the English needs of faculty and students across areas is particularly important in universities that lack the resources to program English courses for each specific area, such as the public university where this study was conducted.

The results also have implications for both research and curriculum. First, the study suggests the need for universities to conduct an analysis of faculty and students' needs in English before launching programs for them, for two reasons: first, they may require the development of academic literacy skills (e.g., meetings, presentations,

19

article and grant proposal writing) that go beyond the four communicative skills, as was the case with the participants in this study. Indeed, although both groups mentioned the need to develop communicative skills, they also mentioned the need for the development of other skills that are not usually tackled in traditional language courses for faculty or students such as writing research, grant and conference proposals, and preparing for standardized tests in English. As the study shows, although there are some similarities across contexts (i.e., continents, countries, and higher education institutions), there are also some differences in academic English needs of both students and faculty that we cannot ignore.

Second, the study points to the value of considering variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, and rank when designing these programs for students and faculty since, as was evident in this study, there are some differences between the needs and practices of each group. Third, the study highlights the importance of prioritizing what is needed by both groups instead of what is practiced by them. That is, if both groups state they already have writing communications in English down, that needs to be given less priority in a curriculum than writing conference and grant proposals, and other skills they list as highly needed. Finally, the study suggests the need to focus on students as they are the ones more highly in need of all skills. Nonetheless, since faculty are the ones in charge of helping students develop all those skills, they would also need to be supported with the development of those skills students need.

Despite its contributions, the study had some limitations. These had to do with at least three aspects: (a) the number of faculty and students who responded to the questionnaire, which was not representative of the amount of students and faculty at the university in general or in each area of knowledge; (b) the fact that the questionnaire was responded mostly by students from the main campus, which leaves questions as to the needs of the community in the rural branches; and (c) the

lack of follow-up interviews which would have been useful to figure out responses that seemed odd, such as that of students needing English for thesis or dissertations.

As such, future studies on faculty and students' English needs and practices would need to make sure that there is a representative sample of the population, so that conclusions by area can be drawn. They would also need to include follow-up interviews with respondents to understand more deeply why they are qualifying these as main English needs. Finally, once actions are implemented, it would be important to conduct studies that showed to what extent faculty and students' English needs have been met and practices have changed.

References

Alsamadani, H. A. (2017). Needs analysis in ESP context: Saudi engineering students as a case study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(6), 58. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.6p.58

Alqunayeer, H. S., & Zamir, S. (2016). Needs analysis of Saudi EFL female students: A case study of Qassim University. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v5n1p87

Arroyyani, R., Widiyati, D. N., & Maryani (2022). A needs analysis of ESP for public health students. *Esteem: Journal of English Study Programme*, *5*(2), 161–171. https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v5i2.8535

Bedoya, P. A., Valencia, L. M., & Montoya, J. C. (2015). Students' needs analysis in an EFL program for university professors. *HOW Journal*, *22*(2), 11–36. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.22.2.118

Benavides, J. E. (2021). Level of English in Colombian higher education: A decade of stagnation. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, *23*(1), 57–73. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n1.83135

Boroujeni, S. A., & Fard, F. M. (2013). A needs analysis of English for specific purposes (ESP) course for adoption of communicative language teaching: A case of Iranian first-year students of educational administration. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, *2*(6), 35–44. https://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v2(6)/Version-3/H0263035044.pdf

Carabelli, P. (2021). English for academic purposes related to dentistry: Analyzing the reading comprehension

process. *Profile, Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 23*(2), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n2.86965

Çelik, H., & Zehir Topkaya, E. (2018). Professional and personal English language needs analysis of faculty members and postgraduate assistants at faculty of medicine. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 14*(1), 24–35. https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.344975

Choi, L. J. (2021). Implementing English for medical purposes (EMP) in South Korea: Nursing students' ongoing needs analysis. *Nurse Education Today, 104.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.104989

Colombia, Ministry of Education (MEN). (2017). *Resolución 18583 de 2017* [Resolution 18583 of 2017]. https://www.icbf.gov.co/cargues/avance/compilacion/docs/resolucion_mineducacion_18583_2017.htm

Colombia, Ministry of Education (MEN). (2022). *Propuesta de indicadores para la internacionalización de la educación superior* [A proposal of indicators for higher education internationalization]. https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1780/articles-408425_recurso_9.pdf

Colombia, National Council for Higher Education (CESU). (2014). *Acuerdo por lo superior 2034.* Propuesta de Política Pública para la excelencia de la educación superior en Colombia en el escenario de la paz [A public policy bill for the excelence in higher education in Colombia in a peace scenario]. https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1621/articles-344500_Brochure_acuerdo_Superior.pdf

Colombian Government (2024). *Resultados únicos Saber Pro* [Final results professional competence examination]. [report]. https://www.datos.gov.co/Educaci-n/Resultados-nicos-Saber-Pro/u37r-hjmu/data_preview

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2015). The things you do to know: An introduction to the pedagogy of multiliteracies. In *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design* (pp. 1–36). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137539724_1

Correa, D., & González, A. (2016). English in public primary schools in Colombia: Achievements and challenges brought about by national language education policies. *Education Policy Analysis Archives 24*(83), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2459

Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2018). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson.

David, A. R., Thang, S. M., & Azman, H. (2015). Accommodating low proficiency ESL students' language learning needs through an online writing support system. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, Special Issue 1,* 118–271. https://journalarticle.ukm.my/9355/1/118-127_LANGUAGE_LEARNING-Rowena.pdf

Díaz-Ramírez, M. I. (2014). Developing learner autonomy through project work in an ESP class. *HOW Journal, 21*(2), 54–73. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.21.2.4

Dinçer, A., & Koç, H. K. (2018). Designing and evaluating a faculty development program on English language needs: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Higher Education and Science, 8*(3), 593–604. https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2018.300

Do, H. M. (2023). An analysis of EFL students' writing needs: Considerations for writing task-based course design. *REFLections, 30*(2), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v30i2.266643

Esfandiari, R., Meihami, H., & Jahani, F. (2022). Exploring Iranian postgraduate EFL students' academic writing experiences and expectations: A dynamic narrative approach. Teaching English as a second or foreign language. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 25*(4), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.25100a4

Generoso, J. C., & Arbon, A. M. (2020). Language needs analysis: An EAP curriculum design to develop foreign students' English skills. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 17*(2), 428. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.8.428

González, A., & Llurda, E. (2016). Bilingualism and globalisation in Latin America: Fertile ground for native-speakerism. In F. Copland, S. Garton, & S. Mann (Eds.), *LETs and NESTs: Voices, views, and vignettes* (pp. 90–109). British Council.

Hattani, H. A. (2019). ESP needs analysis at the Moroccan university: Renewable energy engineering students at EST Fes as a case study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 4*(1), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v4i1.218

Lea, M., & Street, B. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory into Practice, 45*(4), 368–377. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11

Lillis, T., Harrington, K., Lea, M., & Mitchell, S. (2015). Introduction. In *Working with academic literacies: Case studies towards transformative practice*

21

(pp. 3–22). Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0674.1.3

Lillis, T., & Tuck, J. (2016). Academic literacies: A critical lens on writing and reading in the academy. In K. Hyland & S. Philip (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 30–43). Routledge.

Luke, A. (1996). Genres of power? Literacy education and the production of capital. In G. Williams, & R. Hasan (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 308–338). Longman.

Moiinvaziri, M. (2014). Students' voice: A needs analysis of university general English course in Iran. *Journal of Language Studies*, *14*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.17576/GEMA-2014-1401-05

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2019). The experience of a NNES outer circle novice scholar in scholarly publication. In P. Habibie & K. Hyland (Eds). *Novice writers and scholarly publication: Authors, mentors, gatekeepers* (pp. 97–134). Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95333-5_6

Nausa, R. (2017). Syntactic mechanisms in the transition from academic written to oral discourses. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *19*(2), 234–249. https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.11765

Ortiz, J. M., Usma, J. A., & Gutiérrez, C. P. (2019). Critical intercultural dialogue: Opening new paths to internationalisation in higher education. In U. Lundgren, P. Castro, & J. Woodin (Eds.), *Educational approaches to internationalization through intercultural dialogue* (pp. 71–85). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429444289-6

Parra, D. A. (2014). *English language learners' perceptions of their target and learning needs in a technical and technological female institution in Colombia.* [Master's thesis], Universidad de La Sabana-Chía, Colombia. ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Global. https://intellectum.unisabana.edu.co/bitstream/handle/10818/10155/Diana%20Angélica%20Parra%28TESIS%29.pdf

Peláez, O., Montoya, J. C., & Castrillón, E. (2020). The elusive pervasiveness of English in higher education: The case of Colombia. *Revista Espacios*, *41*(33), 212–228. https://www.revistaespacios.com/a20v41n33/a20v41n33p18.pdf

Perez-Llantada, C. (2018). Bringing into focus multilingual realities: Faculty perceptions of academic languages on campus. *Lingua*, *212*, 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2018.05.006

Pranoto, B. E., & Suprayogi, S. (2020). A need analysis of ESP for physical education students in Indonesia. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, *9*(1), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v9i1.2274

Rahmawati, H. (2018). English literacy culture of university level EFL learners: How literate are they? *Journal of English Education, Linguistics and Literature, 5*(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v5i1.947

Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English, 4*(1), 65–79.

Sapiens Research (2023, June 27). QS Top Universities. https://www.topuniversities.com/world-university-rankings

Sebolai, K. (2016). Distinguishing between English proficiency and academic literacy in English. *Language Matters*, *47*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2015.1124281

Trujeque-Moreno, E. E., Romero-Fernández, A., Esparragoza-Barragán, A., & Villa-Jaimes, C. J. (2021). Needs analysis in the English for specific purposes (ESP) approach: The case of the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla 1. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *45*(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v45n2-17

Usma, J., Ortiz, J. M., & Gutiérrez, C. (2018). Indigenous students learning English in higher education: What are the challenges? *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 23*(2), 229–254. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v23n02a03

22