Research Article

ENGLISH NEEDS FOR HOTELAND TRAVEL AGENT STAFF IN LUANGPRABANG, THE WORLD HERITAGE TOWN

1,* Latsanyphone Soulignavong and 2Bouangeune Souvannasy

1Head of Academic Division, Faculty of Letters, the National University of Laos, Laos.
2Senior lecturer, Faculty of Letters, the National University of Laos, Laos.

ABSTRACT

English is very important for both hotel and travel agent staff in LuangPrabang. This study intended to discover the need of the English in both sectors in order to know the real problems that the hotel and travel agent staff encounter and which English skills they really need in order to bring more effective work for their organizations. Therefore, two sets ofthe questionnaires were distributed to 139 participants (hotel staff=113 and travel agent staff=26). The data from two sets of questionnaires was analyzed by frequency, percentage, and mean. The results of the questionnaire show that the participants in both sectors had problems with translating from Lao to English, writing and pronunciation. The most needed language skills for both thehotel and travel agent staff are speaking, writing, and pronunciation. The most needed skill for the participants is speaking. The results also indicate that they were required to have other skill work in order to work more effectively.

Keywords: Needs analysis; English language; Hotels; Travel agents.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is akey sector for the country's socio-economic development, andin order to ensure the quality of tourism and accommodation for tourists, Lao Government has been putting efforts in promoting this sector continuously.Numbers of tourists coming to Laos are increasing from 87.571 in 1992 to 2.008.363 in 2009. The income was increased from 4milliondollars in 1992 to 267 million dollars in 2009 and it is expected to bring around 3 million tourists and 392 million dollars in 2015 (Lao National Tourism, 2010). Due to the increasing number of the tourists, this requires the Lao government to put more concern about how this sector could be improvedin order to provide the effective service for the tourists from different parts of the world. The Wanderlust travel magazine listed Laos as number 6 as the top 10 countries in the world. Laos still was on the list of the top 10 countries again in 2014 and 2015(The Wanderlust, 2012). In particular, LuangPrabang was awarded as the first top city that the tourists would like to visit in the world since 2011. It also got this reward again and again in 2012 and 2015 (The Wanderlust, 2011).Therefore, there was a growing number of hotel and travel agents in LuangPrabang to serve the increasing number of the tourists. Therefore, the English Language plays an important role in the hotel business as it is used to communicate with service staffs and visitors. As Crystal (1997) states that the English language is the world language, which people use it as the communication language more than other languages. Both public and private sectors also see the need of improving their employees' English language skills to match the tasks needed in their business. However, it is still not clear that what their employees ready need in terms of language skills, and other related skills to their work. Also no empirical studies on the need of English for hotel and travel agent staff in LuangPrabang are found despite the ample descriptive information. This study would

examine the English need of hotel and travel agent in LuangPrabang, with the following two research questions:

1. Whatare the real problems of using the English language for the hotel and travel staff?
2. What English skills are necessary for the hotel and travel staff?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Need Analysis

Based on the reviews of the definition of the need analysis, each would define the need analysis differently, which depends on the purpose of their own project.

Richards and Richard (2010, p.389) define needs analysis in language teaching as the process of determining the needs for which a learner or group of learners requires a language and arranging the needs according to priorities. Needs assessment makes use of both subjective and objective information (e.g. data from questionnaires, tests, interviews, observation) and seeks to obtain information on: *a* the situations in which a language will be used (including *who* it will be used *with*); *b* the objectives and purposes for which the language is needed; *c* the types of communication that will be used (e.g. written, spoken, formal, informal) and *d* the level of proficiency that will be required.Bachman and Palmer (1996, p.102) argue, "needs analysis or needs assessment, involves the systematic gathering of specific information about the language needs of learners and the analysis of this information for purposes of language syllabus design". Graves (2000) further states that needs analysis is a systematic and ongoing process of gathering information about students' needs and preferences, interpreting the information, and then making course decisions based on the interpretation in order to meet the needs.

---

*Corresponding Author: Latsanyphone Soulignavong,
1Head of Academic Division, Faculty of Letters, the National University of Laos, Laos.

Importance of Need Analysis

Needs analysis plays an essential role for scholars in several matters dealing with the English for specific purposes, English for academic purposes and adult educational courses. It is one of the basic components of the curriculum development, which can be the sign of the success of the program because the need analysis is the first step in the curriculum development (Brown, 1995). Needs Analysis is considered as a basic principle of ESP (Robinson 1991, p.7) and most of the information on needs analysis initially came from ESP (West 1994, p.2). Hawkeyalso (1980) claims that needs analysis enables the course designer to achieve two things: to produce a detailed profile of what the learner needs to be able to do in English in an occupation or study for which he or she is being trained; and to produce a specification of the language skills, functions and forms required to carry out the communication described in the needs profile. As Richard (2001) mentions in his book that needs analysis is one of the basic components in the curriculum development. He also states thatneeds analysis in language teaching may be used for a number of different purposes, for example:to find out what language skills a learner needs in order to perform a particular role, such as sales manager, tour guide, or university student;to help determine if an existing course adequately addresses the needs ofpotential students; to determine which students from a group are most in need of training in particular language skills; to identify a change of direction that people in a reference group feel isimportant; to identify a gap between what students are able to do and what they need to be able to do and to collect information about a particular problem learners are experiencing (Richard, 2001, p.52). In particular, the need analysis is very useful for ESP because it places more emphasis on learners' needs rather other aspectsof learning the language. Based on Johnson (1989), although the roots of needs analysis derive from the learner–centeredness and ESP curriculum design, needs analysis has been widely applied in other fields of applied linguistics research. Besides using needs analysis to determine course content such as curriculum or syllabus in ESP and EAP, it can be a helpful tool in the planning of course duration, course intensity, teaching methodology, staff matters, the group of learners and any language policy or planning situation. In this study, needs analysis is considered as a tool to discover the information about the individual needs for learning the language. The prospective learners would like to learn from attending the particular course would be discovered. The results of needs analysis studies are important contributions to curriculum development in ESPsuch English for hotel, travel agent because the course would be able to provide appropriate contents.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Twenty hotels and seven travels agents in LuangPrabang were selected as the sample of this study. We used the lottery system to select the sample. Burns and Burns (2011, p. 199) states that "A sample chosen by a random process that guarantees each unit in the sampling frame an equal chance to be selected".The sample consisted of 139 participants (Hotel staff=113 and travel agent staff = 26). We focused on the hotels and travel agents that use main English language as the language of communication in their real work. There were 90 males and 41 females and other 8 did not answer the questions. There were four age groups of the participants: 60 participants (under 25 years old), 52 participants (from 25-30 years old), 16 participants (31-35 years old), and 4 participants (over 35 years old).

The qualifications of the participants were divided into 6 groups: 3 participants (lower secondary school), 28 participants (upper secondary school), 43 participants (diploma), 39 participants (bachelor), 3 participants(master), 9participants (others) and 14participants (no answer). We can see that the two biggest groups were from colleges and universities. These people have some certain year of experiences from less than 1-8 years. There were four groups of the year of working experience: 41 participants (less than one), 61 participants (1-3 years), 22 participants(4-7 years), 11 participants (over 8 years) and 4 participants (no answer). The biggest group was the one who has worked in both organizations for just 1-3 years. In addition, there were 67 full-time staff and 31 part-time staff, and 30 participants did not answer.

Instrument

Two sets of questionnaires were employed to collect data in this study. The first set was for the hotel staff and the second set was for the travel agent staff. Questionnaire is considered to be one of the data collecting tool because it could help the researchers to obtain reliable information through the good design questionnaire, which has been through careful process of selecting question types, writing question, piloting, distributing and returning of collecting certain types of information quickly and relatively cheaply as long as subjects are sufficiently disciplined to abandon questions that are superfluous to the main task (Bell, 1987). There are four main parts of both sets of the questionnaire. Part 1 was used to discover the general information (gender, age, qualification, experience, and others). Part 2 was used to gather opinion about the importance and necessity of the English language. Part 3 emphasized onthe English language need concerning to 4 English skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing), translation, pronunciation, vocabulary regarding hotels and travels, grammatical structure, and suitable phases. Part 4 intended to find out the information about the problems regarding communication and service for the client in both hotels and travel agents. The questionnaire included several types of the questionnaire namely a checklist, a 5-rating scale, and an open-ended form. The questionnaire was written in the Lao language in order to minimize problems related to ambiguity and misinterpretation. Before the questionnaire was distributed to the 20 hotels and 7 travel agents, it was piloted in two hotels and travel agency offices. Those people were asked to fill in the questionnaire and give comment and suggestions of the questionnaire. Then the researcher revised the questionnaire in order to gain more information from the participants. For the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha was calculated. The result revealed a .969 alpha reliability coefficient which was considered high. Therefore, it could be justifiable to claim that the data collecting instrument of the present study had both validity and reliability.

Data collection

After getting research approval from the National University of Laos in order to gain permission and cooperation to gather the data, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to both hotels and travel agents in LuangPrabang province. The data collection was carried out by the research team. The questionnaire was distributed to 20 hotels and 7 travel agents for the first day. Then the next day, the questionnaires were return to the research team.

Data analysis

After checking the return questionnaires, these were coded and inputted. The researcher team used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS21) to analyze the data. The statistical devices employed in this study were as follows:

1) Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used to calculate the reliability of the questionnaire.
2) A 5-point Likert scale was used to score the levels of the English language difficulties and needs of hotels and travel agent staff based on the following criteria:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this session, it places more emphasis on the views of the hotel and travel agent staff regarding the importance of the language, comparing the views between hotel staff and travel agents staff towards the problem using the English language, the need for the English language in their real job, and other suggestions.

Importance of English

The results show that the majority of participants from both hotel and travel agents agreed that the English language was very important for their work (n=113, 81.3%). Only 12 participants thought that it was not important for their work because they rarely use the English language. However, 14 of participants did not provide any answer to this question. This result indicates that both hotel and travel agents staff see the essential of the English language in their real job.

Table 1 Scale Mean

Scale Mean range Difficulty level	Scale Mean range Need level
5 4.50-5.00 The most difficult	5 4.50-5.00 The highest need
4 3.50-4.49 The more difficult	4 3.50-4.49 High need
3 2.50-3.49 Moderate difficulty	3 2.50-3.49 Moderate need
2 1.50-2.49 Not so difficult	2 1.50-2.49 Low need
1 1.00-1.49 Not difficultly	1 1.00-1.49 The lowest need

Table 2 Compare in parts between hotels and travel agents

Skills	Hotel	Travel agent	Significant level
Listening	3.09	2.96	
Speaking	2.97	2.72	
Reading	3.13	3.00	No significant difference p>.05
Writing	3.53	3.28	
Translation Lao-English	3.58	3.32	.013 (p<.05)
Translation English-Lao	3.56	3.12	No significant difference p>.05
Pronunciation	3.45	3.50	
Vocabulary	3.23	2.75	003 (p<.05)
Grammatical Structure	2.95	2.71	No significant difference p>.05

Comparing the views between hotel staff and travel agent staff towards problem of using English

The result of comparing of nine main parts by One-Way ANOVA shows that the hotel staff and travel agent staff have some similarities and differences. The hotel staff had more problems in 3 skills (writing skill M=3.53; translation Lao to English M=3.58 and translation English to Lao M=3.56) as shown in Table 2. However, the most difficult skill for the travel agent is pronunciation (M=3.50). In addition, there is a significant difference with the travel agents in vocabulary with the significant level of .003 (p<.005) and translation Lao to English with the significant level of .013 (p<.005). The more details of each will be discussed in the next section.

Listening

Table 3 Difference in level of difficulty in listening skill between hotel and travel agent

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Listening	Between Groups	.342	1	.342	.640	.425
	Within Groups	72.067	135	.534		
	Total	**72.409**	**136**			

Table4 Listening part (item 1-6)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig.
1.	Listen to the conversation with the clients about tourism	3.04	3.00	
2.	Listen to the clients on phone	3.19	3.12	
3.	Listen and understand clients' needs	2.86	2.57	No significant difference p>.05
4.	Listening the details of bookings: hotel, plane, car, bus and others	3.02	2.64	
5.	Listen to the clients' personal details	3.09	3.28	
6.	Listen to the clients questions about the hotel and other services	2.91	3.04	

After using One-Way ANOVA to compare the between hotel and travel agents' staff, it shows that there is no significant (F=.640, p=.425) as shown in Table3.The mean score of hotel staff of the problem in listening is 3.09 compare with 2.96 for the travel agent staff. When having a closer look at each item in the listening part (item 1-6), the highest mean score is in item 2 (Listen to the clients on phone) M=3.19. The lowest mean score is item 3 (Listen and understand clients' needs) M=2.86.It indicates that when the hotel staff has to deal with the clients face to face, they seem not to have many problems. When they have to listen through the phone, it brings more difficulties for them.For the travel agent, the highest mean score of the travel agent is item 5 (Listen to the clients' personal details) M= 3.28. The lowest mean score is item 4 (Listening the details of bookings: hotel, plane, car, bus and others) M=2.64 as shown in Table 4. This is normal for the travel agents that they seem not to have the difficulty with details information about booking because it is the task that they supposed to deal with every day.

Speaking

The results of the data analysis by One-Way ANOVA show that there is no significant difference in speaking part between hotel and travel agent (F=2.107, P=.149) as shown in Table5.

Table 5 Difference in speaking part between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Speaking	Between Groups	1.310	1	1.310	2.107	.149
	Within Groups	83.960	135	.622		
	Total	85.270	136			

Table 6 Speaking part (Item 7-14)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig.
7	Conducting telephone conversations with clients	3.21	3.16	
8	Providing information about travel plans (e.g. itineraries, tour programmes)	3.04	2.62	No significant differencep>.05
9	Suggesting travel information (e.g. information about tourist attractions, accommodation, restaurant, insurance, etc.)	2.77	2.60	
10	Giving details about transportation (e.g. air, rail, and bus travel)	3.08	2.39	.004 (p<.005)
11	Giving clients directions	2.76	2.76	No significant difference
12	Inquiring clients' needs and decision	3.10	3.20	p>.05
13	Taking reservations	2.90	2.44	.027 (p<.005)
14	Giving details about foreign exchange	2.78	2.58	No significant differencep>.05

After analyzing all items in the speaking part by using One-Way ANOVA, the results illustrate that there is a significant different in two items (10 and 13). For item 10 (Giving details about transportation (e.g. air, rail, and bus travel), the level of the significant different is p =.004. The mean score of the hotel staff of this item is 3.08 compare with 2.39 for the travel agent. It means that the hotel staff still confront more problems with providing the details information regarding the transport. For item 13 (Taking reservation), there is a significant difference with the level of p=.027. Again the mean score of the hotel staff is higher than the travel agent staff (2.90 compared with 2.44) as shown in Table6.

Reading

Table 7 Difference in reading part between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Reading	Between Groups	.325	1	.325	.482	.489
	Within Groups	90.234	134	.673		
	Total	90.559	135			

Table 8 Reading part (Item 15-19)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
15	Reading written documents related to the tourism industry	2.95	3.00	
16	Reading news related to tourism Reading articles from tourism journals	3.25	3.08	
17	Getting detailed information of tourist documents	3.23	3.04	No significant difference p>.05
18	Reading information from the business letters, Internet, E-mails, telexes, faxes	3.25	2.84	
19	Reading brochures or tourist leaflets	2.99	2.76	

The overall result of reading part is similar to listening and speaking parts because there is no significant difference between two sectors: hotel and travel agents (F=.482, p=.489) as shown in Table7.By having a closer look at each item this part, it indicates that there is no significant different between two sectors. The mean score of both

sectors is around 3 or higher as shown in Table8. This shows that they still face much more difficulty when they must read for information, news and business letters and others.

Writing

Table 9 Difference in writing part between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Writing	Between Groups	1.246	1	1.246	1.916	.169
	Within Groups	86.458	133	.650		
	Total	87.704	134			

Table 10 Writing part(Item 20-23)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
20	Producing business letters, e-mail and faxes	3.47	2.96	.015 (p<.005)
21	Producing tourist leaflets or brochures	3.56	3.36	
22	Writing travel plans	3.54	3.32	No significant difference p>.05
23	Taking telephone message	3.03	2.79	

The results of analysis of the mean score of the writing part by One-Way ANOVA show that there is no significant difference between hotel and travel agents (F=1.916 and p=.169) as shown in Table9.After analyzing all items of the writing part, there is a significant difference in item 20 (p=.015). The hotel staff has a higher mean than the travel agent staff (3.47 compared with 2.96) as shown in Table10. It illustrates that the hotel staff has more problems when they support to produce business letters, e-mail, and faxes.

Translation English to Lao

Table 11 Difference in translation English to Lao between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Translate Eng-L	Between Groups	1.396	1	1.396	2.805	.096
	Within Groups	66.204	133	.498		
	Total	67.600	134			

Table 12 Translation English to Lao (Item 24-28)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
24	Translating information for clients	3.40	3.00	.022 (p<.005)
25	Translating written documents	3.62	3.56	
26	Translating news	3.78	3.58	No significant difference p>.05
27	Translating business letters and e-mail	3.60	3.25	
28	Translating signs and notices	3.27	2.79	.017 (p<.05)

The overall result of comparing the difference between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA illustrate that there is no significant difference (F=2.805 and p=.096) as shown in Table 11. However, when each item was analyzed, there is a significant different between both sectors in item 24 and item 28. The details are

as follows.The hotel staff seems to have more problems in the translation from English to Lao. For item 24, there is a significant difference between hotel staff and travel agent staff in the level of p=.022 (3.40 for the hotel staff compared 3.00 for the travel agent staff). This indicates that the hotel staff had more problems with translating information for clients. In addition, there is a significant difference in item 28 (p=0.17) as shown in Table 12. This shows that people also have more problems when they were asked to translate signs and notices. One possible reason is the travel agent staff seems to have more knowledge in the signs and notices because they are the one who have to provide the information for the tourists when they have to get around the city for the sightseeing and for other activities. Both hotel and travel agent staff have the similar trend of answer when they have to translate written document, news, business letters, and e-mail.

Translation Lao to English

Table 13 Difference in Translate Lao to English between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Translate Lao-Eng	Between Groups	3.791	1	3.791	6.280	.013
	Within Groups	79.680	132	.604		
	Total	83.470	133			

Table 14 Translation Lao to English (Item 29-33)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
29	Translating information for clients	3.47	3.21	No significant difference p>.05
30	Translating written documents	3.57	3.25	
31	Translating news	3.71	3.21	.009 (p<.05)
32	Translating business letters and e-mail	3.65	2.96	.000 (p<.05)
33	Translating signs and notices	3.40	3.00	No significant difference p>.05

The results of the analyzing the translation from Lao to English show that there is a significant difference in this part in the level of p<.05 (F=6.280 and p=.013) as shown in Table 13.When having a closer look at each item, it is certain that there is a significant difference in two items (item 31 and item 32) in the level of p<.05. For item 31, the hotel staff had higher mean score than travel agent staff (3.71 compared with 3.21) with the significant level of p=.009 as shown in Table 14. This shows that the participants from hotel face a lot of difficulties when they have to translate the news. This is similar to the result of item 3, the hotel staff have much more problems with business letters and news compared with the travel agent staff with the significant level (p=.000). This would lead to the problem with giving service in the hotel because nowadays most people do the hotel booking and others through online service. Therefore, it is necessary for the hotel staff to consider the improvement in this part in particular.

Pronunciation

Table 15 *Difference in Pronunciation between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA*

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Pronunciation	Between Groups	.048	1	.048	.063	.801
	Within Groups	101.477	133	.763		
	Total	101.526	134			

Table 16 Pronunciation (Item 34-37)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
34	Pronouncing English consonant sounds	3.22	3.33	
35	Pronouncing English vowel sounds	3.18	3.29	No significant difference p>.05
36	Speaking English with appropriate word stress	3.38	3.25	
37	Speaking English with appropriate word intonation	3.45	3.42	

This pronunciation follows the similar trend as the listening, speaking, and reading as aforementioned. There is no significant difference between hotel and travel agent staff (F=.063 and p=801) as shown in Table 15. For the detailed analysis of each item also shows that there is no significant difference in all items in this part as shown in Table 16. Both hotel and travel agent staff seem to have difficulties in pronouncing English word properly. The mean score of all items in this part is over 3. Therefore, this part should be taken into the consideration when we have to think about development the course for the hotel and travel agent staff.

Vocabulary

Table 16 Difference in vocabulary between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Vocabulary	Between Groups	4.457	1	4.457	8.998	.003
	Within Groups	65.869	133	.495		
	Total	70.326	134			

Table 17 Vocabulary (Item 38-43)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
38	Knowing vocabulary related to the tourism industry	3.35	3.08	No significant difference p>.05
39	Knowing vocabulary related to transportation such as air, rail, and bus travel	3.24	2.38	.000 (p<.005)
40	Knowing vocabulary related to accommodation and food	2.79	2.00	.000 (p<.005)
41	Knowing vocabulary related to culture and festivals and holidays	3.15	2.79	No significant difference p>.05
42	Knowing vocabulary related to giving directions	2.91	2.62	
43	Knowing vocabulary related to history of the important places	3.50	2.83	.001 (p<.005)

One-Way ANOVA analysis of this part indicates that there is a significant difference between two sectors with the significant level of p<.05 (F=8.998 and p=.003) as shown in Table 16.After comparing the results of each item in this part, there is a significant difference in three items (39, 40 and 43) in the level of p<.05. The travel agent staff seems to have much more confident in using English when they have to deal with the vocabulary related to transportation, accommodation, and food, history and important places as shown in Table 17. This may be because the travel agent staff often use this kind of vocabulary when they have to deal with their clients in the field. Therefore, it is certain that these kinds of vocabulary are very useful for the hotel to study in order towork more effectively in their real job.

Grammatical structure

Table 18 Difference in vocabulary between hotel and travel agent staff by One-Way ANOVA

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Grammatical Structure	Between Groups	1.200	1	1.200	2.054	.154
	Within Groups	77.733	133	.584		
	Total	78.933	134			

Table 19 Grammar Structure (Item 44-52)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Sig
44	Greeting, welcoming customers and leave taking	2.50	2.17	
45	Expressing thanks, expressing regrets, or offering apologies	2.34	2.08	No significant difference p>.05
46	Dealing with complaints	3.12	3.00	
47	Giving advice and suggestions	2.77	2.61	
48	Making appointments	2.91	2.46	.031 (p<.005)
49	Expressing agreements and disagreements	2.92	2.54	
50	Expressing with cultural differences	3.28	2.88	.038 (p<.005)
51	Explaining obligations and necessity	3.45	3.38	No significant difference p>.05
52	Using telephone language	3.21	2.92	

The results of the grammar structure show that there is no significant difference between the hotel and travel agent staff (F=.054 and p=.154) as shown in Table 18. But when analyzing each item in this part, the results shows that there is a significant difference in item 48 and item 50 with the significant level of p <.05. For item 48, the participants from the hotel have the higher mean score than the travel agent staff (2.91 compared with 2.47) with p=.031. This illustrates that the hotel staff still have the problem using the grammar structure when making an appointment. In addition, the problem increases when the hotel staff has to deal with the explanation of the cultural differences (3.28 compared with 2.88), there is a significant difference between the hotel staff and travel agent staff in a level of p=.038 as shown in Table 19. In conclusion, both hotel and travel agent staff still confront with several problems regarding listening, speaking, reading, writing, translation, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar structure. The hotel staff seems to have much more problems than the travel agent staff in most of the part. Moreover, there is a significant difference in the part of translation Lao to English and vocabulary. Therefore, further research is needed for hotel and travel agent staff in order to produce the effective work.

Need of English language

Table 20 Needs in all parts

Skills	Hotel	Travel agent	Significant level
Listening	3.92	3.83	
Speaking	3.69	3.70	
Reading	3.67	3.65	
Writing	3.84	3.74	
Translation Lao-English	3.75	3.83	
Translation English-Lao	3.74	3.83	No significant different p>.05
Pronunciation	3.79	4.00	
Vocabulary	3.77	3.74	
Grammatical Structure	3.69	3.48	

The results of questionnaire analysis indicate that both hotel and travel agent staff require all English skills. Due to the mean score of all 9 parts are over 3.60. The highest mean score is the pronunciation 4.00 for the travel agent staff. The second highest score is in listening and both translation from English to Lao and Lao to English (M=3.83) as shown in Table20. For the hotel, the highest mean score is the listening skill (M=3.92). This follows with writing (M=3.84) and pronunciation (M=3.79).

Listening

Table 21 Listening part (Item 1-6)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig.
1.	Listen to the conversation with the clients about tourism	3.97	3.91	3.96	
2.	Listen to the clients on phone	3.87	3.65	3.83	
3.	Listen and understand clients' needs	3.74	3.83	3.76	No significant differencep>.05
4.	Listening the details of bookings: hotel, plane, car, bus and others	3.84	3.65	3.81	
5.	Listen to the clients' personal details	3.70	3.39	3.64	
6.	Listen to the clients questions about the hotel and other services	3.81	3.91	3.83	

The results of One-Way ANOVA show that there is no significant difference between hotel and travel agent staff in listening part as shown in Table 20. The staff in hotel and travel agent staff agree that they need to improve the listening skill. The highest mean of both sectors is item 1 (hotel M=3.97 and travel agent M=3.91) as shown in Table 21. They need to be able to listen to the conversation with the clients about tourism. This would be a useful tool for their daily jobs. The hotel staff also would like to listen to the clients on phone (M=3.87). Another highest mean of the travel agent staff is item 6, they would like to be able to listen to the clients' questions about the hotel and other services.

Speaking

Table 22 Speaking part (Item 7- 14)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
7	Conducting telephone conversations with clients	3.84	3.91	3.85	
8	Providing information about travel plans (e.g. itineraries, tour programmes)	3.71	3.82	3.73	
9	Suggesting travel information (e.g. information about tourist attractions, accommodation, restaurant, insurance, etc.)	3.58	3.78	3.61	No significant difference p>.05
10	Giving details about transportation (e.g. air, rail, and bus travel)	3.60	3.39	3.56	
11	Giving clients directions	3.44	3.30	3.41	

12	Inquiring clients' needs and decision	3.63	3.57	3.62	
13	Taking reservations	3.63	3.68	3.64	
14	Giving details about foreign exchange	3.50	3.27	3.47	

For the speaking part, the results of the One-Way ANOVA indicates that hotel and travel agent staff need to improve themselves in the speaking skill because the mean score of all items in the speaking part is over 3. The highest mean is item 7 (hotel M=3.84 and travel agent M=3.91) as shown in Table 22. This shows that the staff in both sectors still needs to be able to conduct telephone conversations with clients. This is very important for not only communicate with the clients not only face to face also communicate through telephone as well. When they need to talk to somebody on phone, they require more ability in English. Moreover, the travel agent staff also would like provide information about travel plans as the plan of item 8 is 3.82. For other items they still need improvement.

Reading

Table 23 Reading part (item 15-19)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
15	Reading written documents related to the tourism industry	3.68	3.57	3.66	
16	Reading news related to tourism Reading articles from tourism journals	3.72	3.57	3.70	
17	Getting detailed information of tourist documents	3.71	3.70	3.71	No significant difference p>.05
18	Reading information from the business letters, Internet, E-mails, telexes, faxes	3.73	3.61	3.71	
19	Reading brochures or tourist leaflets	3.58	3.36	3.54	

The results of the data analysis show that both sectors: hotel staff and travel agents would like to improve reading skill in order to work more effectively, especially, item 17 (getting detailed information of tourist documents) has the average mean score is 3.71 and item 18 (reading information from the business letters, Internet, E-mails, telexes, faxes) as the average mean score is 3.71 as shown in Table 23.

Writing

Table 24 Writing part (Item 20-23)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
20	Producing business letters, e-mail and faxes	3.84	3.45	3.78	
21	Producing tourist leaflets or brochures	3.73	3.43	3.68	No significant difference p>.05
22	Writing travel plans	3.68	3.59	3.67	
23	Taking telephone message	3.67	3.77	3.68	

In the writing part, the staff of the hotel and travel agents would like to improve this part like listening, speaking and reading parts. The highest mean score of the hotel staff is item 20, which is 3.84

(*producing business letters, e-mail and faxes*) as shown in Table 24. But the travel agent staff would like to take telephone message because they have to deal with several tasks through the telephone conversation.

Translation

Translate from Lao to English

Table 25 Translate from Lao to English (Item 24-28)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
24	Translating information for clients	3.74	3.73	3.74	
25	Translating written documents	3.74	3.96	3.77	No significant difference p>.05
26	Translating news	3.77	3.87	3.79	
27	Translating business letters and e-mail	3.85	3.83	3.85	
28	Translating signs and notices	3.64	3.57	3.63	

For the translation from Lao to English part, the majority of the participants would like to improve this skill similar to other skill aforementioned. The average means score of hotel and travel agents staff is over 3.60 in all item in this part. The mean score of both sectors does not have any significant difference. The travel agents would need more ability to work on the translation of the written document (M=3.96). However, the hotel staff would need to able to translate business letters and e-mail (M=3.84) as shown in Table 25.They also would like to be able to translate the news, information for clients and written document as well.

Translate from English to Lao

Table 26 Translate English to Lao (Item 29-33)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig.
29	Translating information for clients	3.75	3.70	3.74	
30	Translating written documents	3.75	3.78	3.76	No significant difference p>.05
31	Translating news	3.73	3.87	3.75	
32	Translating business letters and e-mail	3.77	3.83	3.78	
33	Translating signs and notices	3.64	3.61	3.63	

For the results of the translation from Lao to English, both the travel agents would need more translation ability in several matters, for example, translating business letters and e-mail (M=3.78), translating written documents (M=3.76), translating news (M=3.75), translating information for clients (M=3.74) as shown in Table 26. There is no significant difference between the hotel staff and travel agent staff.

Pronunciation

The detailed analysis of the pronunciation part indicates that there is a significant difference between the hotel staff and travel agent staff in item 35 with the significant level of p =.018 (3.58 compared with 4.13). The travel agent staff requires more abilities in pronouncing English vowel sounds. The mean score of other three items was

above 3.80 as shown in Table 27.These results illustrate the travel agent staff may need more ability in English pronunciation.

Table 27 Pronunciation (Item 34-37)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
34	Pronouncing English consonant sounds	3.69	3.86	3.72	No significant difference p>.05
35	Pronouncing English vowel sounds	3.58	4.13	3.68	p=.018
36	Speaking English with appropriate word stress	3.69	3.91	3.73	No significant difference p>.05

Vocabulary

The results of this part show that the participants from both hotel staff and travel agent would like to know more about English words. For instance, the hotel staff would like to know vocabulary related to transportation such as air, rail and bus travel (M=3.95) and they also would like to know vocabulary related to the tourism industry. But the travel agents has a lower mean in this item (M=3.57). In addition, the participants from the travel agents would need to know vocabulary related to culture and festivals and holidays. However, these participants would not have the problem in knowing vocabulary related to giving directions (M=3.50) and knowing vocabulary related to the history of the important places (M=3.43) as shown in Table 28. This is because the nature of their work they should know more about it in order to make the communication more effectively.

Table 28 Vocabulary (Item 38-43)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig.
38	Knowing vocabulary related to the tourism industry	3.86	3.74	3.84	
39	Knowing vocabulary related to transportation such as air, rail, and bus travel	3.95	3.57	3.89	
40	Knowing vocabulary related to accommodation and food	3.67	3.73	3.68	No significant difference p>.05
41	Knowing vocabulary related to culture and festivals and holidays	3.75	3.83	3.76	
42	Knowing vocabulary related to giving directions	3.60	3.50	3.58	
43	Knowing vocabulary related to history of the important places	3.86	3.43	3.79	

Grammar structure

Table 29 Pronunciation Part (Item 44-52)

No	Details	Hotel	Travel agents	Average	Sig
44	Greeting, welcomingcustomers and leave taking	3.61	3.61	3.61	
45	Expressing thanks, expressing regrets, or offering apologies	3.47	3.57	3.48	No significant difference
46	Dealing with complaints	3.81	3.61	3.77	p>.05
47	Giving advice and suggestions	3.76	3.57	3.73	
48	Making appointments	3.58	3.35	3.54	
49	Expressing agreements and disagreements	3.55	3.09	3.48	
50	Expressing with cultural differences	3.72	3.61	3.70	
51	Explaining obligations and necessity	3.80	3.78	3.80	
52	Using telephone language	3.86	3.52	3.80	

The results of One-way ANOVA show that there is no significant difference between the hotel staff and travel agent staff. The hotel staff seems to require more grammar structure for using telephone language (M=3.86), dealing with complain (M=3.81), and explaining obligation and necessity (M=3.80). The highest mean score of the hotel staff is explaining obligations and necessary. Both sectors seem to have a similar need for the same kind of structure as shown in Table 29. In conclusion, the hotel and travel agents have a similar requirement in speaking, listening, reading, writing, translate English to Lao, translate Lao to English, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar structure. There is a significant difference in item 35 in the pronunciation part. The travel agent staff needs to have the ability in English vowel sound. This may be because this one would have them to work more effectively.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The result of the questionnaire indicates that the hotel and travel agent staff still face with several problems using English in their real job. They may have some similarities and differences, for example, the hotel staff had more problem with writing skill, translation. But the travel agent staff had more problems with pronunciation. Moreover, there is a significant difference between the hotel and travel agent staff in the translation Lao to English and vocabulary parts (p<0.05). Furthermore, the hotel and travel agent staff still require improving their English skill such listening, reading, writing and others because the mean score of each part is over 3.00.

Apart from the aforementioned results about the problems and the needs of English skills in the hotels and the travel agents, the participants also provide very useful suggestions in order to help improve the work in both sectors as follows:The hotel staff suggests that…

- The training of the concerning matters of their work should have more trainings in order to help their staff work better and gain more knowledge from those training.
- The hotel staff should be more patience because they have to meet with different kind of clients in everyday work. Therefore, it is necessary to learn to know about those people in order to satisfy them. This is because they are doing the service.
- The notification skill is also very important for the staff because some clients do not say what they really need but they may show through their actions, eyes and soon.
- The communication skill and body language are very useful for the service work.
- Learning to know the vocabulary about staff using at the hotel would be very helpful for the hotel staff.
- Learning to know about the vocabulary together with structure to explain would be very helpful for the hotel staff.
- The cultural awareness would be very important for the service staff.

The travel agent staff also has some suggestions that…

- Bigger problem is the explanation of the religious and geography and other topic related to LuangPrabang.
- Listening skill is the most important for them because they will be able to understand the clients' need.
- The confidence is the essential thing for doing the job.
- Ability to learn new knowledge from people around the world.

ACKNOLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Bachman, L.F.,&Palmer, A.S. (1996). Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, J. (1987). Doing your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science (2nd ed). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brown, J. D. (1995). The Elements of Language Curriculum. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Burns, R. B., & Burns, R. A. (2011). Business Research Methods and Statistics Using SPSS. London: SAGE Publications.

Crystal, D. (1997). English as a global language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graves, K. (2000). Designing Language Courses: a Guide for Teachers. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Hawkey, R. (1980).Syllabus Design for Specific Purposes. ELT Documents Special. Projects in Materials Design. London: The British Council.

Johnson, R.K. (1989). A decision-making framework for the coherent language curriculum. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), The second language curriculum (pp.1–23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Tourism Organization (2010), tourism management courses. Vientiane.

Richards, J.C. (2001). Curriculum Development in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. C. (1991). ESP Today: A Practitioner's Guide. Hertfortshire: Prentice Hall

Richard, J. C.,& Richard, S. (2010). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (4thedn):Longman Group UK Limited.

Wanderlust Travel Awards 2011:WINNERS ANNOUNCED Retrieved April 17th, 2013fromhttp://www.wanderlust.co.uk/magazine/awards/wanderlust-travel-awards/the-winners-2011 Access June 2022.

Wanderlust Travel Awards 2012: WINNERS ANNOUNCED Retrieved April 17th, 2013fromhttp://www.wanderlust.co.uk/magazine/awards/wanderlust-travel-awards/the-winners-2012Access June 2022.

West, R. (1994). 'Needs Analysis in Language Teaching'. Language Teaching Journal.27 (1), 1-19.

****