# The Need for "Needs Analysis": A Tertiary Level EAP Course in Bangladesh

**Mohammad Mahmudul Haque**
*Senior Lecturer of English and Humanities, BRAC University, Dhaka*

***Abstract***
*This study evaluates a tertiary-level English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course titled "Introduction to Academic Reading and Writing" (ENG 102) offered at a Bangladeshi private university. It begins with an "environment analysis" section identifying the possible constraints of the curriculum, followed by a "needs analysis" section. For the latter, a questionnaire survey has been developed for its various stakeholders, namely "language teachers,""content-area teachers,""students," and an administrator. The questionnaire addresses issues like "course goals,""expectations from the course,""learning and teaching of various reading and speaking sub-skills," and so on. In addition, test scores and students' writing samples have been analyzed to identify various writing issues faced by the students. Finally, all the data collected have been triangulated to shed light on them from various standpoints by the above-mentioned stakeholders, and thereby to avoid any perspectival bias. The results of the student questionnaire indicate that students need to improve reading sub-skills like "skimming" and "scanning," and writing sub-skills like writing a "topic sentence" or"thesis statement". The results of the language teacher questionnaire indicate that higher-order reading sub-skills like "inferring," "synthesizing," and "text organization," have not been adequately covered in the present curriculum. The results of the content teacher questionnaire are similar to those of the language teachers in terms of "inferring," and "text-organization" skills, whereas the results of the administrator's questionnaire are partially similar to those of both language and content teacher questionnaires, revealing that the present syllabus does not adequately cover either the lower or higher-order reading or writing sub-skills. In response to these findings, the present study proposes extensive revision of the existing curriculum in that it should emphasize the sub-skills that have been identified above. Moreover, the study highly recommends the use of a wide variety of local as well as foreign materials (both prepared and authentic) to meaningfully engage the students in various language-related activities.*

In today's world, it is a reality that the scope of English for Specific Purposes (EAP) courses are not limited to the countries where English is the first language. With the global spread of English, EAP has emerged as quite an important addition to especially tertiary-level language curricula as a result of English being the medium of instruction for higher studies in many different countries around the world (Eslami, 2010). For example, Bangladesh, a country in the "outer circle" (Kachru, 1985, p. 11) among the three circles proposed by Kachru, considers English as "an official language in education and government" (Crystal, 2003). Therefore, proficiency in English is of utmost importance for its citizens to have access to higher education and the job market. In this regard, tertiary level students are considered to be the immediate beneficiaries of EAP courses as they help to prepare them for a relatively longer period of study in a chosen content area.

In many cases, one of the major reasons for students not being able to do well in different content areas is the lack of proficiency in English. One possible reason for such a situation could be the practice of developing an impressionistic or top-down curriculum without taking into account students' needs or abilities. In other words, the absence of systematic needs analysis may be one of the root causes behind the poor designing of the curricula. As Stufflebeam, McCormick, Brinkerhoff, and Nelson (1985) rightly point out, needs analysis is the process of "determining the things that are necessary or useful for the fulfillment of a defensible purpose" (p. 16).

However, despite a lot of serious theoretical discussions on how important needs analysis is, the actual practice of conducting needs analysis surveys is still a rarity as needs analysis is popularly considered to be a complex and time-consuming process in the reality of many educational contexts. The present context of the study, an EAP course titled ENG 102: Academic Reading and Writing, which is offered mandatorily across the departments of a private university, is no exception. The study reports the findings of a needs analysis survey that has been conducted amongst selected stakeholders pertaining to the course in question. It also reports the constraints to the needs analysis survey as identified through an environment analysis that was conducted earlier. The findings reveal the weaknesses of the present curriculum in that it does not amply focus on many of the problem areas of the students, and thereby recommends a revision of the curriculum. The general aim of the revised curriculum is to strengthen the academic reading and writing skills of the students through a meaningful synthesis between various reading and writing activities.

**Review of the Literature**

As indicated earlier, the process of curriculum design is time-consuming mainly because it involves a number of inter-related steps. Though different scholars and practitioners have suggested different steps, (Richards, 2001; Macalister & Nation, 2010; Litwack, 1979; Briggs, 1977; Nicholls, & Nicholls, 1972 etc.), almost all of them have agreed upon the following two steps:

1. Environment analysis
2. Needs analysis

1. ***Environment Analysis:*** Tessmer (1990, cited in Macalister & Nation, 2010) said, "Environment Analysis involves looking at the factors that will have a strong effect on decisions about the goals of the course, what to include in the course, and how to teach and assess it" (p. 14). Environment Analysis is also known as constraints analysis as every context has its own givens "facilitating or hindering a curriculum's success" (Paci, 2013, p. 426). That is why a thorough environment analysis may be a necessary pre-requisite to conducting a needs analysis. The findings will help a needs analyst not only to make informed decisions about how to approach the upcoming needs assessment but also about how to act upon them to rule out all the possible constraints.

2. ***Needs Analysis (Definition and Procedure):*** Needs assessment has been viewed as "a dialogue between people" (Graves. 2000, p. 98), and "people" may consist of "learners," "teachers," "administrators," and other stakeholders influencing the teaching-learning

decisions in classrooms. It helps teachers gather information about students' needs and abilities "in a manner that is appropriate, consistent, and conducive to learning" (Bailey, 1998, p. 2). Moreover, it helps teachers discover the gaps of current and desired states of the learners enabling them to help their students bridge the gaps (Graves, 2000, p. 101). Therefore, Brown (1995, p. 36) has suggested three basic steps of needs analysis:

i. Making basic decisions about the needs analysis
ii. Gathering information
iii. Using the information

i. Making basic decisions about the needs analysis: First, the decisions have to be made about who will be involved and what types of information should be gathered through needs assessment surveys. Brown (1995, p. 37) discusses four categories of people who may become involved in a needs analysis: a) the target group (people about whom information will be gathered), (b) the audience (people who will eventually act upon the analysis), (c) the needs analyst (people responsible for conducting the needs analysis), and (d) resource group (people who may serve as sources of information about the target group). The logical next step would be to decide on the approach or philosophy of the needs analysis. In this regard, Stufflebeam, McCormick, Brinkerhoff, & Nelson (1985) propose four different philosophies, which are (a) discrepancy philosophy (needs are viewed as differences or discrepancies), (b) democratic philosophy (any change desired by a majority of the group involved) (c) analytic philosophy (any change regarding what students will learn next based on what they already know), and (d) diagnostic philosophy (any necessary change the absence of which will be harmful for the students). However, these philosophies are not mutually exclusive as they may quite naturally interact with each other. A successful completion of the decision-making phase will lead to the next phase titled "gathering information."

ii. Gathering Information: Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985, p. 189) suggest that a needs assessment seeks information on:

1. The situations in which a language will be used (including *who* it will be used *with*)
2. The objectives and purposes for which the language is needed.
3. The types of communication that will be used (e.g., written, spoken, formal, informal)
4. The level of proficiency that will be required

The above list may not be exhaustive; however, it contains the type of information that are most important, and should be acted upon to develop an effective curriculum. Moreover, it is important to consider the types of questions to be used as Rossett (1982) identified five categories of questions that could be included to know the following: (a) problems (the ones experienced by the target people) (b) priorities (the skills that need to be prioritized) (c) abilities (skill sets of students to be determined by their test scores) (d) attitudes (students' feelings and attitudes towards the curriculum) and (e) solutions (how the problems/potential problems can be solved). At this point, it is important to decide on the types of instruments to be used to collect different types of information. Brown (1995, p. 48) suggests the following as instruments: (a) Tests, (b) Observations, (c) Interviews, (d) Meetings, and (e) Questionnaires

iii. Using the information: After all the necessary information has been collected, it is time to interpret them and eventually act upon them. Brown (1995), in this regard, points out that the data must be "analyzed, interpreted, and evaluated" before applying them to the practical realities of curriculum development (p. 55).

**Methodology: Participants and Instruments**

This section is divided into the following sections:

1. Learner Profile
2. Needs Analysis Survey

***1. Learner Profile***

The target population is a mixed ability group ranging from mid-to-upper intermediate level Bangladeshi students, who will be entering into their first year of tertiary level education on completion of their 12 year of pre-tertiary education. The learners are mostly linguistically homogenous with a few exceptions of indigenous students (1% or less). Therefore, almost all the students' L1 is Bangla except for the indigenous ones who speak different indigenous languages at home with their family and friends, but study Bangla in a second language setting (exposure to Bangla is available outside of classrooms) and English in a foreign language setting (exposure to English is limited to only classrooms). Therefore, the learners operated in a foreign language environment, which restrict their exposure to English.

As for the methodology of teaching English, it is important to remember the methodological shift that has taken place from the previous Grammar Translation Method to a weak version of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) with a view to "improving the quality of ELT" (Sarwar, 2008, para 22). However, there is still a great scarcity of CLT-trained teachers in the pre-tertiary level, and this may have resulted in ineffective classroom teaching. This, arguably, becomes largely responsible for the students' proficiency being miserably low.

***2. Needs Analysis Survey***

**2.1 Why and how.** The present paper documents the results of the needs analysis of the students of ENG 102, which is compulsory for all students of the university across the departments. The need for the course stems from the fact that students fail to demonstrate satisfactory academic reading and writing skills in different content areas as manifested in their poor average performance in those courses confirmed by the test scores of those courses. The content teachers advocate for a thorough needs analysis to determine the actual needs of the students so that students can be trained to implement those skills in their content areas. The researcher, as a former teacher of ENG 102, agrees with the content teachers in that a thorough needs analysis is necessary to revise the course content and thereby to make the course truly beneficial for the students.

**2.2 Stakeholders.** To increase the validity of the results, in addition to the students and teachers of the target course, teachers of various content courses, and an administrator took part in the survey. Therefore, the stakeholders who participated in the survey are:

(a) students of the 2 sections of the course (50)
(b) language teachers presently teaching the course (8)

(c) content teachers who teach in different content areas, (6)
(d) the Chair of the Department, who also taught the course several times (1)

Apart from the survey results, several test results and the results of an analysis of students' writing samples were also taken into account. Finally, all the data were triangulated to avoid any perspectival bias as an "attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint" (Cohen and Manion, 2000, p. 254).

**2.3 The structure of the needs analysis survey**

2.3.1. Course Profile
2.3.2. Environment analysis
2.3.2.1. Possible constraints
2.3.2.2. The treatment of the constraints in the curriculum
2.3.3. Needs Analysis (instruments: questionnaire, test scores, students' writing samples)
2.3.3.1. Developing a questionnaire (MCQ and qualitative)
2.3.3.2. Doing a pilot study (with two students and one teacher)
2.3.3.3. Conducting the study (via emails with the students, teachers, and the administrators)
2.3.3.4. Summarizing the responses as found from the questionnaire (both quantitatively and qualitatively)
2.3.3.4.1. Student questionnaire responses
2.3.3.4.2. Language teacher questionnaire responses
2.3.3.4.3. Content teacher questionnaire responses
2.3.3.4.4 Administrator questionnaire responses

***2.3.1 Course Profile***

The course has 6 sections, each being taught by a different teacher. The course falls under EAP (English for Academic Purposes), which is a branch of ESP (English for Specific purposes). The teaching content is matched to the requirements of the learners as Robinson (1991) discusses a few critical features that EAP classes have:

- First, EAP is goal directed – the students are not learning English for the sake of it, but because they need to use the language;
- Second, EAP courses are based on needs analysis, which aims to specify as closely as possible exactly what it is that students have to do in English; and
- EAP learners tend to be adults rather than children. Most EAP students are over 18 and they will have made a difficult decision to study in an English medium university. (pp. 2-5)

Keeping the above-mentioned features in mind, and also what Brown (1995) said, "it is not humanly possible to gather *all* possible information on … needs" (p. 40), the needs analysis survey aims at analyzing the needs of the learners regarding a few selected issues which may affect everyday teaching of the course. It is hoped that the results will be used to address the identified needs of the learners in a more context-specific manner.

### *2.3.2 Environment Analysis*

The researcher did an environment analysis to find out the possible constraints and suggest appropriate solutions. One added advantage of the researcher was his close familiarity with the environment since he had taught in this context earlier and was aware of the possible contextual issues. However, he consulted the teachers and the Chairperson of the department to come up with a list of possible constraints and discuss the solutions with them. The constraints, and possible solutions to those, that he came up with in consultation with all the concerned people are below:

*2.3.2.1 Possible constraints*

1. The teachers may not be well-trained in teaching an EFL course due to their background in literature. It was not too long ago when studying English meant studying only English literature. Since Applied Linguistics/TESOL has been introduced relatively recently, not all universities offer an MA in it. Therefore, the English departments are still literature-dominated and produce literature graduates who take up language teaching as a convenient profession on completion of their MA in English.
2. Learners tend to switch to Bangla in and outside class since speaking in English is unnecessary and sounds artificial as almost all of them speak Bangla as their L1.
3. There is an issue of linguistic and national pride, and many learners may be negative towards the use of English in a postcolonial setting.
4. A good number of learners may have a negative attitude towards the target language culture (it refers to the mainstream culture of USA, UK, and Australia) due to religious reasons.

*2.3.2.2 The treatment of the constraints in the curriculum*

1. Since it is impractical to expect a good number of well-trained language teachers as the universities in the country are not producing enough of them, the researcher would like to make it a requirement that the teachers take an in-house training course with an experienced faculty member so they can be trained to teach the course contents in a more pedagogically effective manner.
2. Learners may be encouraged to speak in English with their peers and teachers in and out of class while speaking their L1 with others, such as family members. In order to increase exposure to the target language, curriculum revision will be recommended, and one of the recommendations will be to form a conversation club and a book club in which, besides reading books, students will discuss in English various current issues and will be encouraged to write short responses to books or review a book.
3. Teachers may raise learners' awareness that their L1, under no circumstances, will be replaced by their L2. They need to learn English to be able to use it for national/international communication. This critical awareness about bilingualism will help the learners strike a balance between their L1 and L2.
4. To address the issue of cultural hegemony (target language culture dominating/ replacing the native language culture), the curriculum will make sure to use various

types of culture, including the local language culture, to drive the point home that English is not associated with the so-called "dominant western culture," but can be associated with many different cultures in which English is spoken.

### *2.3.3 Needs Analysis*

*2.3.3.1 Developing a questionnaire.* The researcher conducted the needs analysis through a questionnaire. As Brown said, questionnaires are more efficient for gathering information on a large scale (1995, p. 50). Also, for the respondents, to fill in a structured questionnaire requires little time. The answers are relatively objective and easy to analyze and discuss (Best, 1977). Moreover, since during the time of the survey, the researcher was physically away from the target context, questionnaires may be the only feasible means to reach all the stakeholders given the logistic constraints. As for the structure of the questionnaire, it is not the same for all the stakeholders and adapted to extract as much information as possible from each type of stakeholder. A description of each of the questionnaires is below.

The students' questionnaire had four parts, namely part A, B, C, and D. Part A asked for their expectations from the course and how it will help them achieve their goals. Part B asks them to choose topics from a given list to know about their topical preferences. Part C is common for all the stakeholders that asks for their opinions about a set of sub-skills. Part D asks how they were taught reading and writing skills previously to build off of those skills.

The language teachers' questionnaire also had four parts. Part A asked the teachers if the curriculum adequately prepared the students for the target context, and if not, what else could be incorporated. Part B, C, and D are similar to the students' questionnaire.

The content teachers' questionnaire is relatively short and it has three parts. Part A is similar to part A of the language teachers' questionnaire. Part B is the statement tables, which is part C in the other questionnaires. Part C asks them to give an example of students' ability to demonstrate a given reading/writing skill.

The administrator's questionnaire is mostly the same as the teachers'.

In part C (part B in content teachers' questionnaire) in the questionnaire, a respondent had to tick an appropriate box from five options for each item. For analysis, the responses were converted into mathematical figures as follows: Entirely disagree=1, Disagree=2, Not sure=3, Agree=4, Entirely agree=5. Their responses to the use of strategy will be analyzed quantitatively.

*2.3.3.2 Doing a pilot study.* The researcher conducted a pilot study by emailing the student questionnaire to two selected students, and the teacher questionnaire to one teacher of a similar course of a different institution, requesting them to fill out the questionnaires. As he received the filled-in questionnaires after 3 days, the researcher realized that one of the students did not understand the word "scanning," so he decided to give a definition of the term and put the term in parenthesis. In the teacher questionnaire, the statements in the table (which are closed-ended) were in section D and the open-ended questions in section A, but the teacher to whom the survey questionnaire was emailed suggested that the researcher

put the closed-ended questions first so that participants can add any point to the open-ended questions. The researcher made both the changes as suggested.

*2.3.3.3. Conducting the actual study.* The researcher emailed the student questionnaire to two of his former colleagues to distribute them among the 50 students in each of their classes, and the questionnaire for the language teachers to 6 of their colleagues (including the 2 who distributed the questionnaires in their class). The questionnaire developed for the content teachers were given to 4 of the researcher's colleagues in the department of history, business administration, anthropology, and English literature. Also, he emailed the questionnaire developed for the administrator to the Chair of the English Department. In less than a week's time, he received all the completed questionnaires. From the students'questionnaires, only two were half-completed, and 3 were completed incorrectly. Therefore, only 45 of the student questionnaires were analyzed. The rest of the stakeholders completed their questionnaires properly.

*2.3.3.4 Summarizing the responses as found from the questionnaire.*

2.3.3.4.1 Student questionnaire responses: In the responses found in part A, B, and D (the responses in part C have been analyzed quantitatively), the researcher found that most of the students expected that the course would teach them an exhaustive list of academic skills related to reading and writing that they would need once they begin their degree in their chosen content area. Most of the students were taught reading skills through literary texts, and had to process higher order reading skills even though many of them lacked the lower order ones. Most of them said that they need to improve their ability to skim and scan a text (which they also said in part C). As for writing skills, they were mostly taught through the product approach, and there was no systematic teaching on how to develop various parts of an essay, for example. Almost all of them said that they need to improve their sense of a topic sentence and thesis statement. For the choice of topics, most of them picked "Family Issues and marriages," "Happiness,", "Media," and "Man and Woman."

2.3.3.4.2: Language teacher questionnaire responses: In response to part A, B, and D, most of the language teachers said that the present curriculum needed revision in that it did not adequately cover the reading sub-skills of "inferring," "synthesizing," and "text organization," which most of the students had problems with. They suggested incorporating more authentic materials, reiterating the importance of enough practice of the mentioned skills. As for the writing sub-skills, the teachers thought that the curriculum should emphasize teaching of various parts of an essay with a special focus on transition signals which were very important academic skills for the target context. For the choice of topics, most of the teachers found "Life and Death," "Media," "Happiness," and "Food and Eating Habits" interesting to teach.

2.3.3.4.3 Content teacher questionnaire response: In response to parts A and C, all the content teachers said that the course contents may need revision, and they agreed with the language teachers that most of the students were weak in the sub-skills of "inferring" and "text organization." They added that the course should teach the students how to

organize an academic essay using transition signals appropriately. Also, students should be taught how to cite various sources in their academic papers.

2.3.3.4.4 Administrator questionnaire response: The administrator agreed with the previous stakeholders in that students must improve their sub-skills of "skimming,""scanning," "inferring," and "text organization." Moreover, he added that as students are weak in activating their higher order skills, for example, "author's point of view" and "author's tone" should be used less since mastering the lower order skills were more important.

As for analyzing the quantitative part (part C; part B in the content teachers' questionnaire), the researcher decided to analyze the data in terms of mean scores since he is dealing with a good number of student/teacher participants. The survey results in terms of mean scores are presented in the following table format:

**Results**

| SL. | Statements | Student questionnaire results (mean score) | Teacher questionnaire results (mean score) | Administrator questionnaire results (mean score) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I/Students can identify the main ideas after reading a text | 2.90 | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| 2. | I/Students can find specific information (scan) in the text | 3.30 | 3.20 | 3.00 |
| 3. | I/Students can draw conclusions which are not explicit in a reading text based on the information given | 2.80 | 2.75 | 2.00 |
| 4 | I/Students can differentiate major/ essential information from the non-essential ones | 3.15 | 2.70 | 2.00 |
| 5 | I/Students can organize/synthesize information from a text | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.00 |
| 6 | I/Students can distinguish facts from opinions | 3.50 | 3.10 | 3.00 |
| 7 | I/Students can successfully predict the content of a reading text from its title. | 2.90 | 3.35 | 3.00 |
| 8 | I/Students can summarize a text in a few sentences | 3.20 | 3.10 | 3.00 |
| 9 | I/Students can identify the author's tone (if it is ironic or sympathetic, for example) as I read a reading text | 1.75 | 1.50 | 2.00 |
| 10 | I/Students can re-order the paragraphs of a jumbled reading text | 1.44 | 1.32 | 1.00 |
| 11 | I/Students can state the main idea of a paragraph clearly in one sentence | 2.10 | 2.00 | 2.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | I/Students can support the main idea of a paragraph by providing relevant supporting sentences in the same paragraph | 2.10 | 2.25 | 2.00 |
| 13 | I/Students can state the main idea of an essay (thesis statement) in the first paragraph of an essay | 1.90 | 1.50 | 1.00 |
| 14 | Each of my paragraphs in an essay is connected to the main idea of the text | 2.00 | 2.15 | 2.00 |
| 15 | I am/Students are skilled at organizing my ideas or expressing them logically using transition signals ("on the contrary,""however,""moreover," for example) | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.00 |
| 16 | I/Students think of my intended audience and what they expect from me in my writing | 2.10 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| 17 | I/Students know how to integrate references, or quotations from readings into my written assignments to support my opinions and/or ideas. | 1.90 | 1.80 | 1.00 |
| 18 | I/Students know how to integrate readings into my written assignments to support my opinions and/or ideas. | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.00 |
| 19 | I/Students know how to use sources effectively in my written assignments (e.g., textbooks, journal articles, audio files, etc.) | 1.45 | 1.35 | 1.00 |
| 20 | I/Students can use punctuations (comma, semi-colon, etc.) confidently and correctly. | 1.25 | 1.30 | 1.00 |

***KEY (Teachers' and Students' Attitude)***:
1.00-2.20 = they are very weak in the sub-skills/strategies,
2.21-3.30 = they need extensive practice in the sub-skills,
3.31-4.31 = they are skilled users of the strategies, and
4.32-5.00 = they are expert users of the sub-skills/strategies

The results of the assessment table show that, for all of the sub-skills (except no. 6), students, teachers, and administrator's mean scores were below 3.30, which shows that students are weak in these skills and need extensive practice in them. Moreover, students in this course took several weekly and 1 monthly tests, the results of which show that students seriously lack the sub-skills of skimming, scanning, inferring, text organization, and synthesizing. On the other hand, they were quite good at summarizing and answering factual questions. Their writing samples demonstrated that they had problems encapsulating the theme of a paragraph in a

topic sentence and also the theme of an essay in a thesis statement. Many of them used the transition signals incorrectly, and a good number of them did not use any transition signals at all. But they had strengths too. As a product of the grammar translation method, they made few grammatical errors. Also, there were a very few mechanics-related errors (punctuation) errors in their writing.

**Discussion**

Triangulation of the data collected up to this point show that all the stakeholders who participated in the survey agreed that in (a) reading, students need to improve mostly on their ability to skim, scan, infer, organize a text, synthesize information from two texts, summarize a text, and in (b) writing, students need to learn how to write a topic sentence, a thesis statement, use transition signals, integrate reading materials into writing, and cite sources appropriately. The test results and a close examination of the writing samples confirmed students' lack of proficiency in the above-mentioned writing sub-skills. Therefore, it is very important that the curriculum address these reading and writing sub-skills of the learners to equip them best as they begin their content area courses.

As for the course materials and the medium of instruction, the study would not like to recommend any set textbook, but materials and tasks drawn from various local and international language-teaching resources. As for the use of L1, which, in the present context, is Bangla, the present curriculum suggests that Bangla be used judiciously, meaning that it could be used to explain a vocabulary or grammar item, but the medium of instruction and tasks should be in English. Finally, the study underscores that a more rigorous evaluation plan be devised to ensure a minimum level of proficiency for all students.

**Conclusion**

Since tertiary-level EAP courses are goal-directed and influence students' performance for a relatively longer period of time, it is essential that the curriculum of such courses be designed practically, addressing all the key communication issues faced by the students. In order to figure out the needs and challenges of the students, a systematic needs analysis is not only important but absolutely essential. Moreover, a pre-needs analysis environment analysis is equally important to tackle the anticipated constraints to be faced by the needs analyst. The findings of the needs analysis survey do not only help the curriculum designer as well as the teachers develop an understanding of the students and their problems, concerns, and expectations from the course, but also enable them to strike a balance accommodating the academic skills in terms of high and low priority.

**References**

Bailey, K. (1998). *Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decisions, and directions.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Best, J. W, & Kahn, J. V. (1986). *Research in education*. 5th ed. New Delhi: Prentice- Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

Briggs, L. (1977). *Instructional design: Principles and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Brown, J (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (2000). *Research methods in Education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eslami, Z. R. (2010). Teachers' voice vs. students' voice: A needs analysis approach to English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Iran. *English Language Teaching 3*(1), 3-11.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Quirk, R. and H. Widdowson (eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and the literature.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 11-30.

Litwack, D. M. (1979). Procedure: The key to developing an ESP curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly 13*, 383-391.

Macalister, J., & Nation, I. S. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nicholls, A., & Nicholls, H. (1972). *Developing curriculum: A practical guide.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Paci, M. (2013). Needs analysis and environment analysis: Designing an ESP curriculum for the students of the Polytechnic University of Tirana. *Journal of Educational and Social Research 3*(7).

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of Applied Linguistics.* London, UK: Longman.

Richards, J. C. (Ed.). (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide.* London, UK: Prentice Hall.

Rossett, A. (1982). A typology for generating needs assessments. *Journal of Instructional Development 6*(1), 28-33. doi:10.1007/bf02905113.

Sarwar, F. (2008, July 20). The drawbacks of grammar-translation method (gtm) for a developing country like Bangladesh at present and its solution. Retrieved from http://www.universityinfoonline.com/?p=455.

Stufflebeam, D. L., McCormick, C. H., Brinkerhoff, R.O., & Nelson, C.O. (1985). *Conducting Educational Needs Assessments.* Boston, MA: Kluwer Nijhoff.