

Language Needs Analysis for English Curriculum Validation

Leovigildo Lito D. Mallillin, Ph.D.

Gulf College Faculty of Foundation Studies Sultanate of Oman

ABSTRACT: *This study aims to identify the language needs analysis for English curriculum validation in the tertiary level. The descriptive method is utilized in the study and employed purposive sampling. This is also called judgmental sampling. A deliberate selection of individuals made by the researcher based on the predefined criteria. Three hundred forty nine (349) students were utilized as respondents to test their listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary, identifying errors and correct usage. Result showed that identifying errors skills, writing skills, correct usage, reading skills and listening skills were significantly affected by the respondents profile since the computed P-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05. However, speaking skills and vocabulary skills show that they are not significant to the profile of the respondents.*

Keywords: *Language need analysis, identifying errors, writing skills, correct usage, reading skills, listening skills, speaking skills and vocabulary skills*

I. INTRODUCTION

English is an international language spoken in many countries both as a native and as a second or foreign language. There is a need to explore this language especially to those who are non-native speakers. Schools develop language needs among their students for mastery of the language. You are not in, in the group if you cannot communicate with other people particularly when you are in group of people that has different language and only English is an acceptable language to communicate. The rapid increase on the use of English language of wider communication is observed. It is the language of air-traffic controllers at international airports all over the world. It is the language used most frequently for international mail and at international conferences. It is the principle of international commerce and international aid which indicates its importance (Smith, 2015).

Language needs analysis therefore is important to implement so that curriculum designers develop a learning process of the students based on their needs so that English acquisition could be more meaningful to the learners. This particularly addresses to those non-native speakers since English for them is a foreign language to where there is a need for mastery of the said subject. Needs analysis plays a vital role in developing English for specific purposes curriculum. The three most relevant functions in using English language were giving information, followed by providing services, and offering help (Prachanant, 2012).

Educational policy makers who acknowledge or legitimize the description of curriculum goals in need-based terms can implicitly acknowledge minority language speakers' right to use their mother tongue in certain situations, while at the same time stimulating them to functionally use the second language in other situations. As such, a description of language needs for specific societal domains can implicitly or explicitly underscore the richness of language variation and language diversity in a variety of multilingual spaces. A teacher reflects upon their teachings and decisions they draw from many sources, competence in the second language and culture, knowledge of how the curriculum is designed and implemented application of the subject knowledge to actual teaching, application of research findings to classroom teaching, understanding the power of technology in fully articulated language program, clinical experience and knowledge of the means by which teaching effectiveness is examined within the school context (Shrum, & Glisan, 2015).

Curriculum design and development of English language programs help the school in the implementation of their English subject for the students to learn the language based on their learning needs since English is their second language. Language awareness is intended to bridge the transition of the students in education language work, to provide a meeting place and common vocabulary for the different field of English language, to facilitate discussion of linguistic diversity, to develop listening skills as a prerequisite foreign language study along with confidence in reading, speaking and in writing (James, Garrett, & Candlin, 2014).

The exploration of learners' language learning needs is often circumvented. Even it is acknowledged explicitly that individuals may have proper learning needs in mind, an analysis of what it takes to speak and understand the target language is what seems to be needed the most. Whether it is notions or functions, vocabulary or grammar, language learning needs are not conceived of as essentially functional based, but are primarily seen as linguistic. Tasks a person has to fulfill are first of all seen as referring to the kinds of classroom activities that will enable the language learner to acquire particular elements of the target language. Task, however, may also stand for the kinds of activities that learners want to or have to be able to do in society with the new language they are acquiring. In this interpretation, a language teaching approach like a task based

approach attempts to take learners' language learning as its starting point by interpreting them first and foremost as an answer to the question why? The answer to this question will, in the first place, yield non-linguistic answers as a number of needs analyses with regard to the acquisition as a second language.

Language needs analysis has a vital role in the process of designing and carrying out of any language course, whether it is English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or general English course. The importance of carrying out a needs analysis for development of language among students is important to validate their learning process. 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. Needs analysis, carried out to establish the "what" and the "how" of a course, is the first stage in English for specific purposes (ESP) course development, followed by curriculum design, materials selection, methodology, assessment, and evaluation. Two key forces are seen as driving future needs analyses and curriculum development in ESP: technologization and transnationalization aspects of which are interrelated (Flowerdew, 2013).

This is the reason why this study is being conducted to identify the analysis for English curriculum validation as based on the observation and experiences of the researcher.

Statement of the Problem

1. What is the profile of the respondents be described in terms of
 - 1.1 age,
 - 1.2 gender,
 - 1.3 years of studying English,
 - 1.4 exposure to English reading materials, and
 - 1.5 exposure to English movies or televisions?
2. What is the language performance of the students' respondents in terms of
 - 2.1 listening,
 - 2.2 speaking,
 - 2.3 reading,
 - 2.4 writing,
 - 2.5 vocabulary,
 - 2.6 identifying errors and
 - 2.7 correct usage?
3. Is there a significant relationship on the language performance of the respondents as associated with their profile?

Hypothesis

The researcher offered the following hypothesis:

- HA: There is a significant relationship on the language performance of the respondents as associated with their profile.
- HO: There is no significant relationship on the language performance of the respondents as associated with their profile.

II. METHODOLOGY

The Descriptive Methods of Research is being employed in this study because descriptive research is a multifaceted research approach. It can depict qualitative sources such as the use and analysis of language among the students' respondents in their listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary, identifying errors and correct usage. Descriptive research can be either quantitative or qualitative. It can involve collections of quantitative information that can be tabulated along a continuum in numerical form, such as scores on a test or the number of times a person chooses to use a certain feature of a multimedia program, or it can describe categories of information such as gender or patterns of interaction when using technology in a group situation (descriptive research, 2016).

The researcher employed purposive sampling. Purposive sampling (also known as judgment, selective or subjective sampling) is a sampling technique in which researcher relies on his own judgment when choosing members of population to participate in the study. Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method and it occurs when "elements selected for the sample are chosen by the judgment of the researcher. Researchers often believe that they can obtain a representative sample by using a sound judgment, which will result in saving time and money" (Purposive-Sampling Methodology, 2016). Three hundred forty nine (349) students were utilized as respondents as basis for English curriculum validation.

For data gathering purposes, the researcher used a set of questionnaire that elicited the needed data and information on matters that pertained to the topic under study. This consisted of different parts and each for

specific purpose. Part 1 collected data and information on the profile of the respondents and Part 11 collected data and information on listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary, identifying errors and correct usage. Each examination parts were composed of 1 to 10 items only. The respondents were given enough time to go over the questionnaire and answered the test based on their analysis, comprehension and understanding. In every examination part directions were given for the respondents to follow. This was to determine the curriculum validation of the English proficiency of the students.

III. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 Profile of the Respondents as to Age

Age	<i>f</i>	%	R
19 years and below	145	41.5	1
20 – 21 years	135	38.7	2
22 years and above	69	19.8	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents as to **Age**. As noted in the table, rank 1 belongs to the age bracket **19 years and below**, with a frequency of **145 or 41.5%** among the respondents. This shows that most of the respondents are eager to study English; however, their English level of learning affects them. Rank 2 belongs to the age bracket **20 – 21 years**, with a frequency of **135 or 38.7%** among the respondents. It emphasized here that respondents need to study more English particularly in their listening, speaking, reading and writing to include vocabulary, correct usage and grammatical structure to enhance their language skills. Rank 3 belongs to the age bracket **22 years and above**, with a frequency of **69 or 19.8%** among the respondents. These respondents are those irregular and second courser students in which they need to enhance their English as needed in their future.

Table 1.2 Profile of the Respondents as to Gender

Gender	<i>F</i>	%	R
male	156	44.7	2
female	193	55.3	1
Total	349	100	

Table 1.2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents as to **Gender**. As observed in the table, it shows that the distribution is almost equal; however, female dominates in number than male. **Female** got a frequency of **193 or 55.3%** among the respondents, while **male** got a frequency of **156 or 44.7%** among the respondents. This shows that female respondents are eager to enhance their language level; however, their learning process is not enough for their English capacity. Male respondents show that their English is not impressive but can express in themselves and they are insistent to learn English for their enhancement.

Table 1.3 Profile of the Respondents as to Years of Studying English

Years of Studying English	<i>F</i>	%	R
5 years and below	30	8.6	3
6 – 10 years	67	19.2	2
11 years and above	252	72.2	1
Total	349	100	

Table 1.3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents as to **Years of Studying English**. It shows in the table that rank 1 belongs to **11 years and above** with a frequency of **252 or 72.2 %** among the respondents. This shows that respondents have been studying and learning English throughout their lives but still lacking the mastery of the rules in English. Followed by **6 – 10 years** of learning English with a frequency of **67 or 19.2 %** among the respondents which means respondents are also eager to learn English. The least in rank is **5 years and above** with a frequency of **30 or 8.6 %** among the respondents. These respondents just learn English because it is a part of their requirements in studying.

Table 1.4 Profile of the Respondents as to Exposure to English Reading Materials

Exposure to English Reading Materials	<i>f</i>	%	R
never at all	14	4.0	4
once a day	221	63.3	1
once a week	99	28.4	2
once month	15	4.3	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents as to **Exposure to English Reading Materials**. As observed in the table, rank 1 is **Once a Day**, with a frequency of **221 or 63.3%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are exposed to English reading materials in which this could help them to learn in English particularly in reading and in learning vocabulary. Rank 2 is **Once a Week**, with a frequency of **99 or 28.4%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are busy in their studies and therefore their English learning will be affected, however, they are still exposed to English reading materials for their learning process. The least in rank is **Never at All**, with a frequency of **14 or 4%** among the respondents. They are not interested to learn English because it is a foreign language to them.

Table 1.5 Profile of the Respondents as to Exposure to English Movies or Televisions

Exposure to English Movies or Televisions	<i>f</i>	%	R
never at all	19	5.4	3
once a day	224	64.2	1
once a week	89	25.5	2
once month	17	4.9	4
Total	349	100	

Table 1.5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution among the profile of the respondents as to their **Exposure to English Movies and Televisions**. As gleaned in the table, rank 1 is **Once a Day**, with a frequency of **224 or 64.2%** among the respondents. This shows that though respondents are busy in their studies, they must see to it that they could watch English movies or television for them to learn more in English. According to them, watching English movies and television could enhance their English learning process. Rank 2 is **Once a Week**, with a frequency of **89 or 25.5%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents have still a chance to watch movies and televisions so they could refresh their English learning level among them. The least in rank is **Once a Month**, with a frequency of **17 or 4.9%** among the respondents. These respondents are striving to watch English movies and television for them to familiarize their English learning process among them.

Table 1.6 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Listening Skills

A. In Terms of Listening Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	12	3.45	3
Average (4 – 7)	186	53.30	1
Above Average (8 – 10)	151	43.27	2
Total	349	100	

Table 1.6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Listening Skills**. As noted in the table, rank 1 belongs to **Average**, with a frequency of **186 or 56.30%** among the respondents. This shows that most of the respondents belong to average in their language performance to their listening skills due to the reasons that that they are exposed to it. According to them, most of their time is exposed to listening. Rank 2 is **Above Average**, with a frequency of **151 or 43.27%** among the respondents. This shows that their English learning are much influenced with their exposure to listening skills. The last rank is **Below Average**, with a frequency of **12 or 2.45%** among the respondents. This is probably the reason why respondents fall in this category in which they are not interested to learn English.

Table 1.7 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Speaking Skills

B. In Terms of Speaking Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	202	57.88	1
Average (4 – 7)	142	40.69	2
Above Average (8 – 10)	5	1.43	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Speaking Skills**. As observed in the table, rank 1 is **Below Average**, with a frequency of **202 or 57.88%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are being affected in their speaking skills. They are not confident to speak because they are not familiar with the words they are using in speaking. According to them, they have limited knowledge in their speaking skills. They do not know how to use the proper words and rules in their speaking capacity. Rank 2 is **Average**, with a frequency of **142 or 40.69%** among the respondents. This shows that these respondents are confident to speak but not that much fluency. According to them, they still need to enhance their speaking skills particularly in their grammar and in their choice of words.

Table 1.8 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Reading Skills

C. In Terms of Reading Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	35	10.03	3
Average (4 – 7)	217	62.18	1
Above Average (8 – 10)	97	27.79	2
Total	349	100	

Table 1.8 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Reading Skills**. As noted in the table, rank 1 falls on **Average**, with a frequency of **217 or 62.18%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents could comprehend what they are reading and analyses on the manner according to what is implied or stated. This emphasizes that their comprehension level enhances them in their English learning. Rank 2 falls on **Above Average**, with a frequency of **97 or 27.79%** among the respondents. This shows that most of them have high comprehension level in their reading skills. However, to others are not, since the last in rank is **Below Average**, with a frequency of **35 or 10.03%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents' at this level has a very low comprehension level.

Table 1.9 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Writing Skills

D. In Terms of Writing Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	53	15.19	3
Average (4 – 7)	218	62.46	1
Above Average (8 – 10)	78	22.35	2
Total	349	100	

Table 1.9 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Writing Skills**. As seen in the table, it shows that most of the respondents' falls on **Average** which is rank 1, with a frequency of **218 or 62.46%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are much particular in their techniques in writing. They are careful with what they are going to write particularly in their grammars and compositions so with their understanding on what they are writing. Rank 2 falls on **Above Average**, with a frequency of **78 or 22.35%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents have the knowledge and capacity on their writing skills level.

Table 1.10 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Vocabulary Skills

E. In Terms of Vocabulary Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	195	55.87	1
Average (4 – 7)	133	38.11	2
Above Average (8 – 10)	21	6.02	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.10 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Vocabulary Skills**. As observed in the table, most of the respondents are affected, since the result is **Below Average**, with a frequency of **195 or 55.87%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are not familiar with the words they encounter. It might be that the word they encounter is new to them. They did not encounter the term presented to them that resulted to below average. Rank 2 is **Average**, with a frequency of **133 or 38.11%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents in this level just guess their answer because the words also they encounter are unfamiliar with them. The least in rank is **Above Average**, with a frequency of **21 or 6.02 %** among the respondents but this is not enough for them because the result is minimal.

Table 1.11 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Identifying Errors Skills

F. In Terms of Identifying Errors Skills	<i>f</i>	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	67	19.20	2
Average (4 – 7)	268	76.79	1
Above Average (8 – 10)	14	4.01	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.11 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Identifying Errors Skills**. As noted in the table, most of the respondents belong to **Average** which is rank 1, with a frequency of **268 or 76.79%** among the respondents. Respondents show that they have no knowledge on what they are reading and analyzing especially on the correct position of grammar. They are also familiar with the correct sentence structures as revealed in the result of the table. Rank 2 is **Below Average**, with a frequency of **67 or 19.20%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are not familiar with the proper rules in grammar and structure of the sentences they encounter. The least in rank is

Above Average, with a frequency of **14 or 4.01%** among the respondents in which they have a little background and knowledge on identifying errors.

Table 1.12 Language Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Correct Usage Skills

G. In Terms of Correct Usage Skills	f	%	R
Below Average (0 – 3)	67	19.20	2
Average (4 – 7)	240	68.77	1
Above Average (8 – 10)	42	12.03	3
Total	349	100	

Table 1.12 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the language performance of the respondents in **Terms of Correct Usage Skills**. As revealed in the table, rank 1 falls on **Average Skills Level**, with a frequency of **240 or 38.77%** among the respondents. This shows that most of the respondents are familiar with the correct usage of grammar and correct positioning of the structures in the sentences they encounter, however, this is not enough for them in their English learning process. They are still confused on the verb agreement as emphasized on the data gathered. Rank 2 falls on **Below Average**, with a frequency of **67 or 19.20%** among the respondents. This shows that respondents are poor in analyzing the correct usage and skills of grammar particularly on the subject verb agreement and also the correct structure of the sentences they encounter.

Table 2.0 On the significant relationship on the language performance of the respondents as associated with their profile.

Dependent Variable	Multiple R	F-Value	Significant Value	Interpretation	Rank
1. Listening Skills	0.225	3.646	0.003	Significant	5
2. Speaking Skills	0.163	1.881	0.097	Not Significant	6
3. Reading Skills	0.232	3.910	0.002	Significant	4
4. Writing Skills	0.244	4.348	0.001	Significant	2.5
5. Vocabulary Skills	0.140	1.374	0.233	Not Significant	7
6. Identifying Errors Skills	0.318	7.379	0.000	Significant	1
7. Correct Usage Skills	0.244	4.358	0.001	Significant	2.5

Source: Appendix B (Multiple Regression Results)

Level of Significance: 0.05

As observed from the summary table of multiple regression and correlation analysis, it shows that identifying errors skills, writing skills, correct usage skills, reading skills and listening skills were significantly affected by the respondents' profile name: age, gender, number of years studying English, exposure to English reading materials and exposure to English movies and televisions. This is evidenced by their corresponding P-Values of 0.000, 0.001, 0.001, 0.002 and 0.003 respectively in which the results are greater than the significance level of 0.05.

However, speaking skills and vocabulary skills show that they are not significantly related to the respondents' profile which resulted to their corresponding P-Value of 0.097 and 0.233. The results are lesser than the level of significance of 0.05.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. Respondents in learning English vary depend on their interest, motive and desire in their learning process. Their number of years in learning language is not enough since their English is not impressive. The correct principles, rules and procedures in the proper usage of English are weak though basic English has been taught among the respondents. However, they are willing to learn because they need English in their future career especially in hunting for a job. Respondents are exposed to different English materials to exercise their English, but it is not sufficient to enhance their English learning process. Even to the extent of exposing themselves in watching English movies and televisions. This could help them in their English. Therefore, English can be learned through listening, speaking, reading and writing among the respondents.

2. Respondents answer reveal that their English learning show inconsistency depends on their knowledge of English. Listening skills respondents can comprehend and understand what they hear; however, they should be exposed more in listening skills for them to comprehend in their English listening skills. Speaking skills respondents are not confident because of lack of knowledge on the words they used. Their grammars are incorrect and can affect their speaking ability. In Reading Skills, some of the respondents can read but cannot comprehend especially those words that are unfamiliar with the respondents. Comprehension in reading must be given emphasis to improve their reading skills. In Vocabulary Skills, respondents are affected because the words they encounter are new and they cannot understand. This affects the respondents in their comprehension level. In Identifying Errors, respondents are not familiar with the proper rules and structure of

sentences being given to them. Therefore, they cannot analyze such structure. In Correct Usage Skills, respondents have a little bit background on the usage of grammar but not sufficient for their English skills.

3. As based on the result of the multiple regressions used to test the hypothesis of the study. It is evident that identifying errors skills, writing skills, correct usage, reading skills and listening skills were significantly affected by the respondents profile since the computed P-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05. However, speaking skills and vocabulary skills show that they are not significant to the profile of the respondents.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Profile of the respondents is encouraged to study, learn, practice, read, speak, write and listen in English while still young. This could help them enhance their language learning and useful in their future. They should also be encouraged to expose themselves in the English reading materials, like magazines, books and internet to learn more about English. Their exposure is not enough for their English learning process. This could help them develop their skills in studying English.
2. Language performance of students in terms of listening speaking, reading and writing is not impressive, therefore school must develop a curriculum particularly in listening, speaking, reading and writing. This could include students to expose in listening and speaking through acting, role playing and develop students' ability in impromptu speaking. This could develop confidence among the respondents.
3. Students are weak in speaking skills and vocabulary usage and their level of confidence is very low and not significant. Therefore, there must be a curriculum made for speaking skills, like drama, stage play, debate, oration and impromptu speaking and new vocabulary for their English language. A thorough study must be given emphasis on speaking skills and vocabulary usage. This could enhance English learning process of the respondents.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Flowerdew, L. (2013). Needs analysis and curriculum development in ESP. *The handbook of English for specific purposes*, 325-346.
- [2]. James, C., Garrett, P., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). *Language awareness in the classroom*. Routledge.
- [3]. Purposive-Sampling Methodology. 2016. Retrieved from <https://research-methodology.net/sampling-in-primary-data.../purposive-sampling/>
- [4]. Prachanant, N. (2012). Needs analysis on English language use in tourism industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 117-125.
- [5]. Savignon S. (2013). *Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice*. Retrieved July 20, 2016 from <https://achilleaskostoulas.com/>
- [6]. Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2015). *Teacher's handbook, contextualized language instruction*. Cengage Learning.
- [7]. Smith, L. E. (2015). English as an international language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 165-171.
- [8]. What is descriptive research. 2016. Retrieved from www.aect.org/edtech/ed1/41/41-01.html