Exploring Usefulness of Needs Analysis in ESL Classrooms

Mr. Chandrakant B Modi

Research Scholar, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities

Pacific Academy of Higher education and research university,

Udaipur,

Rajasthan

&

Dr. Dinesh H Patel

Professor, Department of English,

B A College of Agriculture

Anand Agricultural University

Anand

Abstract

The present article attempts to explore usefulness of the concept of needs analysis in the ESL classrooms. It includes reviewing definitions and the theories laid behind the concept of Needs Analysis. Further, it was also attempted to review historical development, types and importance of NA.

Key Terms

Needs Analysis, ESL,

Introduction

In the last a few years there was a huge change noted in the field of course design with focus on student-centered activities rather than teacher-centered activities, and this happened because of the development in need based programs in language learning and teaching. The emergence of the concept of the needs analysis changed the scenario of the language teaching and course design and as a result identifying the needs of learners, what learners lack in terms of language and what are the things the learners must know are given importance. Needs analysis is the concept which helps language teachers to identify the present language competency of the language learners, future requirements, and the requirements of the professional fields in which the learners work as professionals. It makes the learners capable to deal in the real life situations. In addition to that the focus is shifted to the roles the learners are expected to perform after completing the formal education and joining the professional field.

The contributions of the scholars namely Hymes (1984), Labov (1970) and Widdoson (1983) were considered fundamental for the development in the Communicative Syllabus Design. Hymes (1971, 1973) in 'Communicative Competence' focused on the rules or directions to use without which the rules of grammar would be of no use. Labov (1970) also believed the same, the rules needed will reflect how things can be done with words and how it can be interpreted and expressed as action.

Furthermore, 'Cohesion in English' by Halliday and Hasan (1976) changed the scenario in teaching materials and materials development for advance level learners being a reference for the materials developers. Widdowson (1978) in 'Teaching Language as Communication' introduced altogether different teaching syllabus around a graded selection of rhetorical acts, which could be performed by the learner in using 'English for Specific Purposes'. These works would be beneficial to the researchers for the reference and base to develop the new materials in the field of the teaching. Furthermore, it would also be beneficial to the learners to meet the need to communicate in day to day situation.

The base on which the teaching curriculum is designed are three questions: What is to be learned? , How learning should be undertaken and achieved? To what extend is the former appropriate and the latter effective? A well-structured communicative curriculum intends to set language teaching with some specified purposes in a structured framework. To achieve the goal, however, the methodology plays significant role. Breen and Candlin (2001, p.9) introduced rationale in language teaching which are as…

A. Communication as a general purpose,
B. The underlying demands on the learner that such a purpose may imply,
C. The initial contributions which learners may bring to the curriculum,
D. The process of teaching and learning,
E. The roles of teacher and learners,
F. The role of content within the teaching and learning,
G. The place of evaluation of learner progress and evaluation of the curriculum itself from communicative point of view.

As discussed earlier the focus of language teaching from language structures to language functions and communication brought into light the learners and the needs of the learners. English has become a widely spoken language because of the global use in most of the fields. However, the learners learning English as Second Language even after years of formal learning of English, they are incapable of using English when it comes to communication. Therefore, the language for communication, i.e. function is given more importance than the knowledge of the language rules i.e. structure. The situation gave birth to the concept of needs analysis.

Theoretical issues

Needs analysis includes collecting information about learners and classroom activities to design a syllabus (Nunan, 1988). It is an important step for designing a language course. While designing a language course, it is essential for a teacher to have reliable information of their learner variables, in order to reduce the gap among learners, teachers, and teaching materials.

Historical background of needs analysis

The Needs Analysis in modern language teaching was initiated by the Council of Europe Modern Language Projects group. The language learning was promoted by the group in Europe and supported many partners for learning whose cooperation is important for creation of a coherent and transparent structure of provision for effective learning, relevant to the needs of the learners as well as of the society (Van Ek and Trim, 1988) The review on Needs Analysis (NA) suggests that, it has a long history in language teaching. As mentioned above, it was first proposed by the council of Europe Modern Language Project group before 1970s. The grammatical complexity of sentence structures was analyzed to design structurally graded syllabus but this syllabus was criticized as it was not concerned with the learners' needs at all (Fatihi et al, 2003).

The next phase of development in curriculum design focused on identifying the learners' needs (Munby as cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986). Munby (1978) in his Needs Analysis model, both the data related to learners' identity and the language needs of the participants were collected (Munby 1978, as cited in Nunan 1988). By the time, there was a significant shift from a narrow approach to a broader approach regarding NA, it has broadened the scope of NA and has resulted in a wide range of frameworks for NA. Now different types of frameworks for NA have been designed to identify different types of needs related to the language learning program.

Definitions of Needs Analysis

Different scholars have looked at needs analysis from different point of view and defined differently. Some of the important contributions of the scholars in terms of giving definitions of the needs analysis are given below.

Name and year of the Scholar	Definition
Nunan, D. (1983)	Techniques and procedures for collecting information to be used in syllabus design.
Richards, J. (1992)	The process of determining the needs for which a learner or a group of learners requires a language and arranging the needs according to priorities.
Fatihi, A. R. (2003)	A device to know the learner's necessities, needs and lacks
Brindley, G. (1984)	"Learner's wants, desires, demands, expectations, motivations, lacks, constraints and requirements."

Munby, (1978)	Introduced 'communication needs processor' which is the basis of Munby's approach to needs analysis.
Chambers (1980)	Introduced the term Target Situation Analysis.
Hutchinson and Waters (1987)	With the development of the Communicative Needs Processor (CNP) it seemed as if ESP had come of age. The machinery for identifying the needs of any group of learners had been provided: all the course designers had to do was to operate it.
Brindley &Berwick (1989)	Offer definitions of different types of needs and accounts of various problems and limitations in making use of this concept, including ways in which we might usefully distinguish between needs identified by analysts and those expressed or experienced by learners.
Robinson, (1991)	Present situation analysis may be posited as a complement to target situation analysis.
West, (1994)	In his state-of-the-art article, West (1994) gives a thorough overview of needs analysis in language teaching, including its history, theoretical basis, approaches to needs analysis, etc.
Johns, (1991)	For Johns (1991), needs analysis is the first step in course design and it provides validity and relevancy for all subsequent course design activities.
Iwai et al. (1999)	The term needs analysis generally refers to the activities that are involved in collecting information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the needs of a particular group of students.
Hamp-Lyons, (2001)	argues for the need to see needs analysis as a fundamental step to an EAP approach ...
Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998)	Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) suggest, needs were seen as discrete language items of grammar and vocabulary.

Haider Fauzia (2016)

It could be seen that Needs Analysis is still under a developing stage. It could be concluded that NA is a process to gather information from learners, teachers and language courses to find out what are the needs of the learners and how best those needs could be achieved.

Types of Needs Analysis
The classification of needs analysis by different scholars is as under.
Nunan (1988) mentioned two types of needs analysis,
1. Learner Analysis: It refers to the information about learners.
2. Task Analysis: It refers to the information about the tasks.

Richterich (1983) stated other two types of Needs Analysis

1. Subjective needs analysis: It carries subjective information that reflects the perception, goals and priorities of the learners.
2. Objective needs analysis: It carries objective information includes factual facts of the learners like biographical information on age, nationality and home language.

West (2003) gave a detailed classification of Needs Analysis taxonomies and its types

1. Target Analysis: It identifies the necessities of the learners, i.e. what the learners require to function effectively in the target situation.
2. Deficiency Analysis: It identifies the gap between the present situation of target learners and the knowledge they need to know or do at the end of the program.
3. Strategy Analysis: It identifies the learner's preferred learning styles.
4. Means Analysis: It deals with the logistics, practicalities and constraints of needs based language courses.
5. Language Audits: It is used in forming the basis of strategic decision on language needs and training requirements.

Importance of Needs Analysis

The Needs Analysis is an important step towards observing students' needs and to help the implementation of educational policies. According to Nunan (1988) the information gathered through NA can serve the following purposes.

- NA can guide to decide the goals of the course and help in the selection of contents.
- The gap between teacher's and learner's expectation can be minimized by using NA to modify the syllabus and methodology.
- The gap between the teachers' and learners' expected teaching and learning approach can be identified.

Further, West (1994) claims that NA can play significant role in assisting the syllabus designer in designing the course keeping in mind the various types of learners and various needs of the learners. To support the argument Richards (2001) added that in a language teaching program NA can be used for following purposes,

- To find out the requirements of the learners in terms of language to perform specific role in the professional fields.
- To find out a gap between their present proficiency level and required proficiency.
- To find out problem areas of the learners.

Theoretical framework of needs analysis

There are special methods and techniques suggested for needs analysis depending upon the purpose of needs analysis. Haque (2014, p. 4) tried to explain the NA in his

work as, "If one tries to conduct a NA of the writing problem of the students at tertiary level, the information can be obtained from the following sources"

- Samples of students' writing.
- Test data on students' performance.
- Reports by teachers on typical problems students face.
- Data from students via interviews and questionnaire.
- Analysis of text books, teaching and academic writing.

Further, Dudley-Evans and John (1998) suggests that NA can also be used to observe the attitude of teacher and learners towards the innovation and modification in the curriculum.

- Information about why the learners are learning English, learners' attitude to learn English, their previous learning experiences and cultural background.
- Information about learners' preferred learning style.
- Information regarding the importance of particular skills for the learners and their preferred learning styles for learning those skills.

Nunan& Burton (1985) introduced a NA model based on the subjective and objective information. Their model consists of information from the following parameters.

1. Name
2. Occupation
3. Age
4. Nationality
5. Education
6. Proficiency
7. Communicative need
8. Learning goal

Even if it is *English for specific purposes* or *English for general purposes* NA plays significant role in the process of designing and carrying out any language course (Iwai et.al., 1999). Furthermore, Iwai et.al. (1999) believes that NA usually refers to gathering of information which ultimately be useful to the course designers to identify the special needs of the learners and designing the materials that will help to achieve the requirements. Brindley (1989) and Berwick (1989) refers to various definitions of NA and discusses the problems and limitations, they also discussed the needs recognized by the analysts and the experienced by the learners. John (1991) argued that NA is the first step in course design, it helps to make activities more relevant and course more concrete.

The concept of needs analysis as we see today is a modified according to the needs and requirement but it was Munby's *Communicative Syllabus Design* in 1978 when the situations and functions were set within the frame of the needs analysis. Munby's *Communicative needs processor*, Chambers (1980) introduced the concept of Target Situation Analysis. Later, the several words were introduced in the same field:

1. Present Situation Analysis,

2. Pedagogic Needs Analysis,

3. Deficiency Analysis,

4. Strategy Analysis or

5. Learning Needs Analysis,

6. Means Analysis,

7. Register analysis,

8. Discourse analysis, and

9. Genre Analysis.

Target Situation Analysis

Earlier needs analysis was mainly used for linguistic and register analysis and needs were seen as language items of grammar and vocabulary (West, 1998; Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998). After publication of Munby's *Communicative Syllabus Design* (1978) the change took place with taking learner's purposes as a significant support in framework of needs analysis. Later, the idea of target needs was given importance. The term Target Situation Analysis (TSA) was first used in 1980 by Chambers in his article where he tried to explain the terminology. Chambers (1980) simplified TSA as 'Communication in the target situation' (p. 29).

Communicative Needs Processor

The concept of Communicative Needs Processor (CNP) was presented by Munby (1978) in his work. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987, p. 54) stated, "With the development of the CNP it seemed as if ESP had come of age. The machinery for identifying the needs of any group of learners had been provided: all the course designers had to operate it" In Munby's CNP, the target needs and target level performance are established by investigating the target situation, and his overall model clearly ascertained the place of needs analysis as central to ESP, indeed it is considered as the necessary starting point in materials or course design (West, 1998). In the CNP, report is taken of "the variables that affect communication needs by organizing them as parameters in a dynamic relationship to each other" (Munby, 1978, p. 32).

Munby's (1978) overall model is made up of the following elements:

1. Participants: information about the identity and language of the learners: age, sex, nationality, present command of target language, other languages known and extent of command;

2. Communication Needs Processor: investigates the particular communication needs according to sociocultural and stylistic variables which interact to determine a profile of such needs;

3. Profile of Needs: is established through the processing of data in the CNP;

4. In the Meaning Processor "parts of the sociocultural determined profile of communication needs are converted into semantic subcategories of a predominantly pragmatic kind, and marked with attitudinal tone" (Munby, 1978, p. 42);

5. The Language Skills Selector: identifies "the specific language skills that are required to realize the events or activities that have been identified in the CNP" (Munby, 1978, p. 40);

6. The Linguistic Encoder: considers "the dimension of contextual appropriacy" (Munby, 1978, p. 49), one the encoding stage has been reached;

7. The Communicative Competence Specification: indicates the target communicative competence of the participant and is the translated profile of needs.

From the above mentioned elements of the Munby's (1978) model, there eight parameters identified which gives detailed description of particular communication needs. The parameters specified by Munby (1978) are as under (as cited in Songhori, 2008):

- Purposive domain: this category establishes the type of ESP, and then the purpose which the target language will be used for at the end of the course.
- Setting: the physical setting specifying the spatial and temporal aspects of the situation where English will be used, and the psychological setting specifying the different environment in which English will be used.
- Interaction: identifies the learner's interlocutors and predicts relationship between them.
- Instrumentality: specifies the medium, i.e., whether the language to be used is written, spoken, or both; mode, i.e., whether the language to be used is in the form of monologue, dialogue or any other; and channel of communication, i.e., whether it is face to face, radio, or any other.
- Dialect: dialects learners will have to understand or produce in terms of their spatial, temporal, or social aspect.
- Communicative event: states what the participants will have to do productively or receptively.
- Communicative key: the manner in which the participants will have to do the activities comprising an event, e.g. politely or impolitely.
- Target level: level of linguistic proficiency at the end of the ESP course which might be different for different skills.

The Munby's (1978) Communicative Needs Processor aims to find about the linguistic form a prospective ESP, which the learner is likely to use in various situations in his target working environment. The effect of the processing data by means of Munby's model is, as Hutchinson and Waters (1987) discussed what the learner needs to identify in order to function effectively in the target situation. Most succeeding target needs analysis research was based on Munby's (1978) model for the reason that it offers comprehensive data banks and target performance (Robinson, 1991).

Munby's (1978) Communicative Needs Processor is followed by many researchers in the area of Target Situation Needs Analysis. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) provided a complete target situation analysis framework, consisted a list of questions, the

analyst should find answers to. For Hutchinson and Waters (1987, p.7) the analysis of target situation needs is "in essence a matter of asking questions about the target situation and the attitudes towards that situation of various participants in the learning process".

Munby's (1978) model has a few drawbacks like any other model. He provided a detailed list of micro functions in his CNP. One thing which he did not included was how to prioritize them or few factors which is recognized as important in recent context (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).West (1994, p. 9-10) mentions the shortcomings of the Munby's (1978) model in terms of four headings:

1. Complexity: Munby's attempt to be systematic and comprehensive inevitably made his instrument inflexible, complex, and time-consuming.

2. Learner-centeredness: Munby claims that his CNP is learner-centered. The starting point may be the learner but the model collects data about the learner rather than from the learner.

Constraints: Munby's idea is that constraints should be considered after the needs analysis procedure, while many researchers feel that these practical constraints should be considered at the start of the needs analysis process.

4. Language: Munby fails to provide a procedure for converting the learner profile into a language syllabus.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) also point out that it is too time- consuming to write a target profile for each student based on Munby's model. This model only considers one viewpoint, i.e. that of the analyst, but neglects others (those of the learners, user institutions, etc.). Meanwhile, it does not take into account of the learning needs nor it makes a distinction between necessities, wants, and lacks.

Present Situation Analysis (PSA)

To cope with the limitations of the Target Situation Analysis (TSA), Present Situation Analysis (PSA) considered as a complement (Robinson, 1991; Jordan, 1997). If target situation analysis attempts to collect the information on what the learners are expected to be like at the completion of the language course, present situation analysis tries to identify what they are like at the beginning of it. As stated "a PSA estimates strengths and weaknesses in language, skills, learning experiences" Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998, p. 125). If the purpose to which the students need to get is to be established, first the starting point has to be demarcated, and this is provided only by means of Present Situation Analysis.

The term PSA (Present Situation Analysis) was initially projected by Richterich and Chancerel (1980). In this approach the sources of information are the students themselves, the teaching establishment, and the user-institution, e.g. place of work (Jordan, 1997). The PSA can be conducted by means of established placement tests. On the other hand, the background information, e.g. years of learning English, level of education, etc. about learners can provide us with ample information about their present abilities which can thus be anticipated to some extent.

Needs analysis is seen as a blend of TSA and PSA. It is observed that within the realm of ESP, one cannot trust either on TSA or PSA as a reliable indicator of what is needed to improve learning and reaching the desired objectives. Therefore, other approaches to needs analysis have been proposed, such as Pedagogic Needs Analysis.

Pedagogic Needs Analysis

The concept *pedagogic needs analysis* was introduced by West (1998) as an umbrella term which gives a description of the three rudiments of needs analysis namely: Deficiency Analysis, Strategy Analysis or Learning Needs Analysis and Means Analysis. According to him, the fact that limitations of target need analysis should be compensated by gathering data about the learner and also the learning environment.

A) Deficiency Analysis

Hutchinson and Waters (1987), discussed what learners lack, which is in a way deficiency analysis. Similarly, Allwright (1982, cited in West, 1994), explained the approaches to needs analysis that has been developed to consider learners' present needs or wants, it may be termed as analysis of learners' deficiencies or lacks. "From what has already been said, it is obvious that deficiency analysis is the route to cover from point A (present situation) to point B (target situation), always keeping the learning needs in mind. Therefore, deficiency analysis can form the basis of the language syllabus (Jordan, 1997) because it should provide data about both the gap between present and target extra linguistic knowledge, mastery of general English, language skills, and learning strategies"(Sanghori,2008, p.11)

B) Strategy Analysis or Learning Needs Analysis

The Strategy Analysis or Learning Needs Analysis is a strategy the learners adopt to learn the extra language. The method focuses on the learners i.e. how they want to learn the selected language (West, 1998). From the mentioned approaches to needs analysis (TSA, PSA and Deficiency analysis) have less concern with learners' views on learning. Allwright (1982) has indicated the difference between needs (which students feel required), wants (which students feel urgently required) and lacks (the gap between the students' present level and expected or desired level). The argument further supported by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) by supporting learning centered approach which emphasizes learners' learning needs. If 'target situation analysis' is employed to observe what learners do with language (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987), the learning needs analysis will provide us with data of what learner need to do in order to learn(Hutchinson and Waters, 1987 p.54). The argument goes in favor of process oriented approach not product or goal oriented one. According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987, p. 16) "ESP is not a product but an approach to language teaching which is directed by specific and apparent reasons for learning". Bower (1980) who focused on the vital role of learning needs, "If we accept…that a student will learn best if what he wants to learn, less well what he only needs to learn, less well still what he either wants or needs to learn, it is clearly important to leave room in a learning program for the learner's own wishes regarding both goals and processes" (as cited by Jordan 1997, p.26)

C) Means Analysis

Means analysis tries examine those thoughts that Munby (1978) rejects (West, 1998), that is, matters of logistics and pedagogy that led to debate about practicalities and constraints in implementing needs-based language courses (West, 1994). Further, according to Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998, p. 125) means analysis leads to "information about the environment in which the course will run" and therefore attempts to familiarize ESP course to the cultural environment in which it will be run. One of the main issues means analysis is concerned with is:

> "Acknowledgement that what works well in one situation may not work in another" (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998, p.124), and that, as noted above, ESP syllabi should be sensitive to the particular cultural environment in which the course will be imposed. Or as Jordan (1997) says it should provide us with a tool for designing an environmentally sensitive course".

Register, Discourse and Genre Analysis

In section Register, Discourse and Genre Analysis will be discussed in focus of ESP.

A) Register Analysis

Initially, during 1960s and 1970s, vocabulary and grammar were focused in the research in this area. The objective of register analysis in this area is that to make ESP course more appealing to the learners and their needs (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). Register analysis, also called "lexicostatistics" by Swales (1988, p.189, cited in Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998) and "frequency analysis" by Robinson (1991, p.23) focused on the grammar and "structural and non- structural" vocabulary (Ewer and Latorre, 1967, p.223, cited in West, 1998). The assumption behind register analysis was that, while the grammar of scientific and technical writing does not differ from that of general English, certain grammatical and lexical forms are used much more frequently (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).

It was noted that register analysis operates only for word and sentence level and is not applicable for other levels. Register analysis was criticized by few researchers, which is listed below:

- It restricts the analysis of texts to the word and sentence level (West,1998)
- It is only descriptive, not explanatory (Robinson, 1991)
- Most materials produced under the banner of register analysis follow a similar pattern, beginning with a long specialist reading passage which often lacks authenticity (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).

B) Discourse Analysis

The register analysis deals with only word or sentence level whereas discourse analysis works above sentence level to observe the way sentences are combined into discourse (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). Further, West (1998) adds that the reaction against register analysis emphasized on the communicative values of discourse rather than the lexical and grammatical properties of register.

The pioneers in the field of discourse analysis were Lackstorm, Selinker, and Trimble (1973), they tried to account for the special use of tenses in specialized texts rather

than on the sentence, and also on the writer's purpose rather than on form (Robison, 1991). In practice, according to West (1998), this approach tends to concentrate on how sentences are used in the performance of communication and to generate materials based on functions.

One of the limitations of the discourse analysis is that, its treatment remains incomplete, identifying the functional units of which discourse was composed at sentence/utterance level but offering limited guidance on how functions and sentences/utterances fit together to form text (West, 1998). There is also the threat that the findings of discourse analysis, which are concerned with texts and how they work as pieces of discourse, fail to take sufficient account of the academic or business context in which communication takes place (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).

C) Genre Analysis

There are some similarities between discourse analysis and genre analysis. Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998: 87) give a clear distinction between the two terms:

> "Any study of language or, more specifically, text at a level above that of sentence is a discourse study. This may involve the study of cohesive links between sentences, of paragraphs, or the structure of the whole text. The results of this type of analysis make statements about how texts -any text-work. This is applied discourse analysis. Where, however, the focus of text analysis is on the regularities of structures that distinguish one type of text from another, this are genre analysis and the results focusing on the differences between text types, or genres."

The term 'genre' was given by Swales (1981, cited in Robinson, 1991). His definition of genre is: "a more or less standardized communicative event with a goal or set of goals mutually understood by the participants in that event and occurring within a functional rather than a personal or social setting" (Swales, 1981, p.10-11, as cited in Robinson, 1991). Bhatia (2004) who is one of the researchers in the field of genre analysis has his definition of 'genre analyses' as the study of linguistic behavior in institutionalized academic or professional setting. In his article, Bhatia (2004) distinguishes four, though systematically related, areas of competence that an ESP learner needs to develop so as to get over his/her lack of confidence in dealing with specialist discourse. These four areas are:

- Knowledge of the Code which is the pre-requisite for developing communicative expertise in specialist or even everyday discourse.
- Acquisition of Genre Knowledge which is the familiarity with and awareness of appropriate rhetorical procedures and conventions typically associated with the specialist discourse community.
- Sensitivity to Cognitive Structures, that is, since certain lexical items have specialist meanings in specific professional genres, a number of syntactic forms may also carry genre-specific restricted values in addition to their general meanings codified in grammar books. Thus, it is imperative that the specialist learner become aware of restricted aspects of linguistic code in addition to the general competence he or she requires in the language.

- Exploitation of Generic Knowledge, that is, it is only after learners have developed some acquaintance or, better yet, expertise at levels discussed above, that they can confidently interpret, use or even take liberties with specialist discourse.

Though register analysis is a product of findings of register analysis and discourse analysis, it is far better than both. According to Bhatia (2004), the benefit of a genre-based approach to the teaching and learning of specialist English, is that the learner does not learn language in isolation from specialist contexts, but tries to make relevant connection between the use of language and the purpose of communication. The learner is always aware of the question, why do members of the specialist discourse community use the language in this way?

There are different approaches to needs analysis which attempts to meet the needs of the learners in the process of learning a second language. Not a single approach to needs analysis can be a reliable indicator of what is needed to enhance learning. A modern and comprehensive concept of needs analysis is proposed by Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998, p. 125) which encompasses all the above-mentioned approaches. Their current concept of needs analysis includes the following:

- Environmental situation - information about the situation in which the course will be run (means analysis)
- Personal information about learners - factors which may affect the way they learn (wants, means, subjective needs)
- Language information about learners - what their current skills and language use are (present situation analysis)
- Learner's lacks (the gap between the present situation and professional information about learners)
- Learner's needs from course - what is wanted from the course (short-term needs)
- Language learning needs - effective ways of learning the skills and language determined by lacks
- Professional information about learners - the tasks and activities English learners are/will be using English for (Target Situation Analysis and objective needs)
- How to communicate in the target situation – knowledge of how language and skills are used in the target situation (register analysis, discourse analysis, genre analysis).

Now days, there is an awareness of the fact that different types of needs analyses are not exclusive but complementary and that each of them provides a piece to complete the jigsaw of needs analysis. All the works done in ESP have sought to promote the communicative nature of language teaching, because starting with register analysis, ESP teachers have been very concerned with the needs of students as they have used the language, rather than language per se. For this reason, today needs analysis should

not be (and is not) of concern only within the field of ESP, but also that of General English because the needs of the learners is of paramount importance in any language process.

Needs analysis plays a significant role in second language or foreign language learning classes. It is important because needs analysis teachers, learners, teaching materials, teaching procedures-all make a harmonious relationship that enhances learners' learning. But in our country no study is carried out for the language needs of the learners. The teacher soften do not understand what learners' language needs are. On the other hand learners become confused about what they are actually learning and why they are learning so. For these reasons, even after completing graduation, the proficiency level of the learner in English remains poor. But all these problems can be handled effectively through a study of the language needs of the students.

Conclusion

The review of related literature of the concept of Needs Analysis in ESL classrooms, it becomes obvious that the use of needs analysis facilitate the teachers and course designers to identify the linguistic needs of the learners. Further, the Target Situation Analysis and Present Situation Analysis also helps teachers as well as course designers to consider the present linguistic level of the learners and where are expected to be at the end of the course. Therefore, to conclude it could be depicted that the concept of Needs Analysis plays significant role in developing language of ESL learners.

References

Allwright, R. 1982. 'Perceiving and pursuing learners' needs' in M. Geddes and G. Sturtridge (eds.). *Individualization*. Oxford: Modern English Publications. 24- 31.

Berwick, R. 1989. 'Needs assessment in language programming: from theory to practice (48-62)', in R.K. Johnson (ed.) *The Second Language Curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bhatia, V. 2004. *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre Based View*. London: Continuum.

Bowers, R.1980. 'The individual learner in general class (66-80)' in H.B. Altman and C.V. James (eds.), *Foreign Language Teaching: Meeting Individual Needs.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Breen, M.P. & Candlin, C.N.1980. 'The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching'. *Applied Linguistics. 1 /2: 89-112*.

Brindley, G. 1984. 'Needs analysis and objective setting in the adult migrant education program'. Sydney: Adult Migrant Education Service.

Brindley, G. 1989. 'The role of needs analysis in adult ESL program design (63-78)' in R.K.Johnson (ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Candlin, C.N. 1984. 'Applying a system approach to curriculum innovation in the public sector' in J.A.S. Read (ed.). *Trends in Language Syllabus Design.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Candlin, C.N. 1984. 'Syllabus design as a critical process' in C.J. Brumfit (ed.). *General English Syllabus Design*. Pergamon Press. The British Council.

Chambers, F. 1980. 'A re-evaluation of needs analysis'. *ESP Journal. 1/1: 25-33.*

Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. 1998. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes- an Interdisciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dudley-Evans, T., and St. John, M. 1998. *Developments in ESP: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Fatihi, A.R.2003. 'The role of needs analysis in ESL program design'. *South Asian Language* Review. *13/1-2: 39-59*

Halliday, M. A. K .and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hamp-Lyons, L. 2001. 'English for academic purpose (126-130)' in R. Carter and D. Nunan (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to teaching English to Speakers of other Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haque, N. 2014. 'A brief study on needs analysis'. *Express, an International Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Research.* 1/1:page.n.d

Hutchinson, T and Waters, A.1987. *English for Specific Purposes*: *A Learning Centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, T. and A. Waters. 2008. *English for Specific Purposes*: *A Learner Centered Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Hymes, D. 1971. *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. 1971. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D.1973. 'On Communicative Competence' in *Sociolinguistics,* J.B. Pride and J.Homes, (eds) Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Iwai, T., Kondo, K., Limm, S. J. D., Ray, E. G., Shimizu, H., and Brown, J. D. 1999. 'Japanese language needs analysis'. Retrieved from: http://www.nflrc.hawaii. edu/Networks/NW13/NW13.pdf

Johns, A. 1991. 'English for specific purposes: Its history and contribution (67-77)' in M. Celce-Murcia (ed.). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Jordan, R. R. 1997. *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1970). The study of language in its social context.

Lackstrom, J. E., Selinker, L. L. & Trimble, L. P. 1985. 'Grammar and technical English (58-68)' in J. Swales (ed.) *Episodes in ESP*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Lackstrom, J., Selinker, L. & Trimble, L. 1973. 'Technical rhetorical principles and grammatical choice'. *TESOL Quarterly. 7:127 – 137*

Munby, J. 1978. *Communicative Syllabus Design.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D and J. Burton. 1985. *Using Learner in Designing Language Courses: Workshop Guide.* Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre.

Nunan, D. 1988. *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge UniversityPress.

Nunan, D.1988. *The Learner-Centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D.1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards,J and T. Rodgers.1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Richterich R, Chancerel J.L.1980. *Identifying the Needs of Adults Learning a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Richterich, R. 1973. 'Definitions of Language type of adults'. In Trim et al (eds.) 1980. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richterich, R. 1983. *Case Studies in Identifying Language Needs*. Oxford: Pergamon/Council of Europe.

Robinson, P. 1991. *ESP Today: A Practitioner's Guide.* Prentice Hall. UK: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Swales, J. 1985. *Episodes in ESP*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Swales, J. 1988. 'Communication language reaching in ESP contexts'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 8/ 48 – 57.*

Van Ek. 1976. *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning In Schools*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

West, R. 1994. 'Needs analysis in language teaching'. *Language Teaching, 27/1: 1-19.*

West, R. 1997. 'Needs analysis: state of the art (68-79)' in R. Howard and G. Brown (eds.). *Teacher Education for LSP*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

West, R. 1998. ESP- State of the art. Retrieved from: www.man.ac.uk/ CELSE/ esp/west.htm.

Widdowson, H.G 1983. *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Widdowson, H.G. 1979. 'The Teaching of English as communication (15-19)' in C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (eds.). *The Communicative Approaches to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 15-19.

Widdowson, H.G.1978. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.