

NEEDS ANALYSIS: STRATEGIES FOR LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Abdussalam Sani

School of General Studies, Kano University of Science and Technology, Wudil, Nigeria.

talk2baabsalam@gmail.com

+2348132551670

Umma Sanusi Badawi

School of General Studies, Kano State Polytechnic, Nigeria.

badawiumma@gmail.com

+2348060292543

Isma'il Aliyu Waziri

School of Secondary Education, Aminu Kano School of Islamic and Legal Studies, Nigeria.

ismailaliyu@gmail.com

+2348069144170

Nabila Tijjani Zahradeen

School of General Studies, Kano State Polytechnic, Nigeria.

Beelanzahra36@gmail.com

+2348036277444

Abstract

Needs Analysis (also known as Needs Assessment) has a vital role in the process of designing and carrying out any language course, whether it be English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or General English as its centrality has been acknowledged by several scholars and authors (Munby, 1978; Richterich and Chancerel, 1987). Also, the importance of carrying out a needs analysis for developing tests and teaching is emphasized and catered by the analysis. Based on Munby's work, Chambers (1980) introduced the term Target Situation Analysis. From that time, several other terms have also been introduced: Present Situation Analysis, Pedagogic Needs Analysis, Deficiency Analysis, Strategy Analysis or Learning Needs Analysis, Means Analysis, Register analysis, Discourse analysis, and Genre Analysis. This article attempts to present an overview of the aforementioned approaches to Needs Analysis as a basis for language teachers to enhance their teaching profession.

Keywords: Needs Analysis, Target Situation Analysis (TSA), Present Situation Analysis (PSA), Pedagogic Needs Analysis (PNA).

Introduction

According to 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. Brindley (1989) and 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. 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.

According to Iwai *et al.* (1999), formal needs analysis is relatively new to the field of language teaching. However, informal needs analyses have been conducted by teachers in order to assess what language points their students needed to master. In fact, the reason why different approaches were born and then replaced by others is that teachers have intended to meet the needs of their students during their learning. From the field of language teaching the focus of this article will be on English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Clearly, the role of Needs Analysis in any ESP course is indisputable. For Johns (1991), it is the first step in course design and provides validity and relevancy for all subsequent course design activities. Though needs analysis, as we know it today, has gone through many stages, with the publication of Munby's *Communicative Syllabus Design* in 1978, situations and functions were set within the frame of needs analysis. In his book, Munby introduced the 'communication needs processor' which is the basis of his approach to needs analysis. Based on Munby's work, Chambers (1980) introduced the term *Target Situation Analysis*. From that time, several other terms have also been introduced: *Present Situation Analysis*, *Pedagogic Needs Analysis*, *Deficiency Analysis*, *Strategy Analysis* or *Learning Needs Analysis*, *Means Analysis*, *Register analysis*, *Discourse analysis*, and *Genre Analysis*. This article attempts to present an overview of the aforementioned approaches to needs analysis as a basis for language teachers.

Target Situation Analysis (TSA)

Needs Analysis was firmly established in the mid-1970s (West, 1998). In the earlier periods, it was mainly concerned with linguistic and register analysis, and as Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) suggest, needs were seen as discrete language items of grammar and vocabulary. With the publication of Munby's *Communicative Syllabus Design* (1978), Needs Analysis moved towards placing the learner's purposes in the central position within the framework of Needs Analysis.

Consequently, the notion of target needs became paramount and research proved that function and situation were also fundamental. The term *Target Situation Analysis* (TSA) was, in fact, first used by Chambers in his 1980 article in which he tried to clarify the confusion of terminology. For Chambers, TSA is “communication in the target situation” (p.29). In his work, Munby (1978) introduced *Communicative Needs Processor* (CNP).

In Munby's CNP, the target needs and target level performance are established by investigating the target situation, and his overall model clearly establishes the place of needs analysis as central to ESP; indeed the necessary starting point in materials or course design (West,1998). In the CNP, account is taken of "the variables that affect communication needs by organizing them as parameters in a dynamic relationship to each other" (Munby, 1978: 32). Munby's 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 socio-cultural 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 socio-cultural determined profile of communication needs are converted into semantic subcategories of a predominantly pragmatic kind, and marked with attitudinal tone" (Munby, 1978: 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: 40);
- 6. The Linguistic Encoder:** considers "the dimension of contextual appropriacy" (Munby, 1978: 49), once 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 Model, the predominant one or at least the one that has been referred to by other researchers of needs analysis is the Communication Needs Processor (CNP), which is the basis of Munby's approach to needs analysis and establishes the profile of needs through the processing of eight parameters; the processing of which gives us a detailed description of particular communication needs (Munby, 1978). The parameters specified by Munby (1987) are: purposive domain, setting, interaction, instrumentality, dialect, communicative event, communicative key and target level.

The aim of Munby's CNP is to find as thoroughly as possible the linguistic form a prospective ESP learner is likely to use in various situations in his target working environment. The outcome of the processing data by means of Munby's model, as Hutchinson and Waters (1987) opine is what the learner needs to know in order to function effectively in the target situation. Most subsequent target needs analysis research was based on Munby's model for the reason that it offers comprehensive data banks and target performance (Robinson, 1991).

Many researchers in the field of target situation needs analysis followed Munby's CNP. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) provide a comprehensive target situation analysis framework, which consists of a list of questions the analyst should find answers to. For Hutchinson and Waters (1987), 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” (p.59).

Like any other model/approach, however, Munby’s model is not without its critics. He provided detailed lists of micro functions in his CNP. What he did not include was how to prioritize them or any of the affective factors which today are recognized as important (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998). 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)

Present situation analysis may be posited as a complement to target situation analysis (Robinson, 1991; Jordan, 1997). If target situation analysis tries to establish what the learners are expected to be like at the end of the language course, present situation analysis attempts to identify what they are like at the beginning of it. As Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998: 125) state, "a PSA estimates strengths and weaknesses in language, skills, learning experiences." If the destination point to which the students need to get is to be established, first the starting point has to be defined, and this is provided by means of PSA.

The term PSA (Present Situation Analysis) was first proposed 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 carried out by means of established placement tests. However, the background information, e.g. years of learning English, level of education, etc. about learners can provide us with enough information about their present abilities which can thus be predicted to some extent.

Needs analysis may be seen as a combination of TSA and PSA. As noted, within the realm of ESP, one cannot rely either on TSA or PSA as a reliable indicator of what is needed to enhance learning and reaching the desired goals. Consequently, other approaches to needs analysis have been proposed, such as *Pedagogic Needs Analysis*.

Pedagogic Needs Analysis

The term “pedagogic needs analysis” was proposed by West (1998) as an umbrella term to describe the following three elements of needs analysis. He states the fact that shortcomings of target needs analysis should be compensated for by collecting data about the learner and the learning environment. The term ‘pedagogic needs analysis’ covers *deficiency analysis, strategy analysis or learning needs analysis, and means analysis*.

Deficiency Analysis

What Hutchinson and Waters (1987) define as *lacks* can be matched with deficiency analysis. Also, according to Allwright (1982, quoted in West, 1994), the approaches to needs analysis that have been developed to consider learners’ present needs or wants may be called 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.

Strategy Analysis or Learning Needs Analysis

As it is apparent from the name, this type of needs analysis has to do with the strategies that learners employ in order to learn another language. This tries to establish how the learners wish to learn rather than what they need to learn (West, 1998). All the above-mentioned approaches to needs analysis, TSA, PSA, and to some extent deficiency analysis, have not been concerned with the learners' views of learning. Allwright who was a pioneer in the field of *strategy analysis* (West, 1994) started from the students' perceptions of their needs in their own terms (Jordan, 1997). It is Allwright who makes a distinction between *needs* (the skills which a student sees as being relevant to himself or herself), *wants* (those needs on which students put a high priority in the available, limited time), and *lacks* (the difference between the student's present competence and the desired competence). His ideas were adopted later by Hutchinson and Waters (1987), who advocate a learning-centered approach in which learners' learning needs play a vital role. If the analyst, by means of target situation analysis, tries to find out what learners do with language (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987) learning needs analysis will tell us "what the learner needs to do in order to learn" (*ibid*: 54). Obviously, they advocate a process-oriented approach, not a product- or goal-oriented one. For them, ESP is not "a product but an approach to language teaching which is directed by specific and apparent reasons for learning" (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987: 16). What learners should be taught are skills that enable them to reach the target, the process of learning and motivation should be considered as well as the fact that different learners learn in different ways (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).

Means Analysis

Means analysis tries to investigate those considerations that Munby excludes (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). Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998: 125) suggest that means analysis provides us "information about the environment in which the course will be run" and thus attempts to adapt to ESP course to the cultural environment in which it will be run.

One of the main issues means analysis is concerned with is an "acknowledgement that what works well in one situation may not work in another" (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998: 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. Swales (1989, quoted in West, 1994) lists five factors which relate to the learning environment and should be considered by curriculum specialists if the course is to be successful. These considerations are: classroom culture, EAP staff, pilot target situation analysis, status of service operations, study of change agents.

Register, Discourse, and Genre Analysis

In this section the focus will be on the description of the language in ESP. The terms *Register Analysis*, *Discourse Analysis*, and *Genre analysis* will be discussed

Register analysis

Changing approaches to linguistic analysis for ESP involve not only change in method but also changing ideas of what is to be included in language and its description (Robinson, 1991). One of the earliest studies carried out in this area focused on vocabulary and grammar (the elements of sentence). This stage took place mainly in the 1960s and early 1970s and was associated with the work of Peter Strevens, Jack Ewer, and John Swales. The main motive behind register analysis was the pedagogic one of making the ESP course more relevant to learners' needs (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). Register analysis, also called "lexicostatistics" by Swales (1988: 1, quoted in Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998) and "frequency analysis" by Robinson (1991: 23) focused on the grammar and "structural and nonstructural" vocabulary (Ewer and Latorre, 1967: 223, quoted 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).

Discourse Analysis

Since register analysis operated almost entirely at word and sentence level, the second phase of development shifted attention to the level above the sentence and tried to find out how sentences were combined into discourse (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). Also, West (1998) says that the reaction against register analysis in the early 1970s concentrated on the communicative values of discourse rather than the lexical and grammatical properties of register.

The pioneers in the field of discourse analysis (also called rhetorical or textual analysis) were Lackstorm, Selinker, and Trimble whose focus was on the text rather than on the sentence, and on the writer's purpose rather than on form (Robinson, 1991). In practice, according to West (1998), this approach tended to concentrate on how sentences are used in the performance of acts of communication and to generate materials based on functions.

One of the shortcomings of the discourse analysis is that its treatment remains fragmentary, 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 danger 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).

Genre Analysis

Discourse analysis may overlap with genre analysis. As Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998: 87) give a clear distinction between the two terms that any study of language at a level above sentence is a discourse study. This may involve the study of cohesive links between

sentences, of paragraphs, or the structure of the whole text. Where, however, the focus of text analysis is on the regularities of structures that distinguish one type of text from another, this is genre analysis and the results focus on the differences between text types, or genres.

The term 'genre' was first used by Swales (1981, quoted 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: 10-11, quoted in Robinson, 1991). Bhatia who is one of the researchers in the field of genre analysis has his definition of 'genre analysis' as the study of linguistic behavior in institutionalized academic or professional setting (Bhatia, undated).

In his article, Bhatia 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; acquisition of genre knowledge; sensitivity to cognitive structures; exploitation of generic knowledge.

Genre-analysis approach goes two steps beyond register analysis and one step beyond discourse analysis (though it draws on the findings of both). As Bhatia (undated) states the main 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 is encouraged to make the relevant connection between the use of language on the one hand and the purpose of communication on the other, always aware of the question, *why do members of the specialist discourse community use the language in this way?*

Conclusion and Recommendations

Different approaches to needs analysis attempt 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: 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).

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 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.

REFERENCES

- Allison, D., Corcos, R., and Lam, A. (1994). Laying down the Law? Reflecting on Course Design in Progress. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, Vol, 17, pp. 1-11.
- Berwick, R. (1989). Needs Assessment in Language Programming: from theory to practice. In: Johnson, R. K. (Ed). *The Second Language Curriculum* (pp.48-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatia, V. J. (undated). Applied Genre Analysis and ESP. Available at: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pubs/BR/functionalsec4_10.htm
- Brindley, G. (1989). The Role of Needs Analysis in Adult ESL Program Design. In: Johnson, R .K. (Ed). *The Second Language Curriculum* (pp.63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, F. (1980). A Re-evaluation of Needs Analysis. *ESP Journal*, 1/1, pp. 25-33.
- Dudley-Evans, T., and St. John, M. (1998). *Developments in ESP: A Multi-disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finney, D. (2002). The ELT Curriculum: A Flexible Model for a Changing World. In: Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (Eds). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 69- 79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fulcher, G. (1999). Assessment in English for Academic Purposes: Putting content validity in its place. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol, 20/2, pp. 221-236.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2001). English for Academic Purposes. In: Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. (pp. 126-130). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, T., and Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iwai, T., Kondo, K., Limm, S. J. D., Ray, E. G., Shimizu, H., and Brown, J. D. (1999). Japanese Language Needs Analysis. Available at: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/Networks/NW13/NW13.pdf>
- Johns, A. (1991). English for Specific Purposes: Its history and contribution. In Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp.67-77). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, J. (1984). *ESP in Perspective: A Practical Guide*. London: Collins ELT.
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Seedhouse, P. (1995). Needs Analysis and the General English Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 49/1, pp. 59-65.

Tarone, E. and Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

West, R. (1998). ESP- State of the art. Available at: www.man.ac.uk/CELSE/esp/west.htm