

CONNECTING STUDENTS' AND LECTURERS' PERSPECTIVES ON ENGLISH LEARNING NEEDS

Zulwahyuni Namrullah*¹ Areski Wahid²

¹*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Bone, Indonesia,*

²*Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia*

Author corresponding email*: zulwahyuninamrullah@iain-bone.ac.id

Abstract

Understanding English learning needs from multiple educational perspectives is important for informing the design of context-sensitive Basic English instruction for non-English major students. While previous needs analysis studies have predominantly focused on learners' perspectives, limited attention has been given to the convergence between students' learning needs and lecturers' instructional priorities. This study investigated English learning needs from the perspectives of non-English major students and English lecturers to identify areas of convergence that could inform the design of a context-sensitive Basic English program. A descriptive survey design was employed involving 36 students and alumni, two English lecturers, a placement test, and a pilot-tested needs analysis questionnaire. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while lecturers' responses were synthesized thematically to identify instructional priorities and areas of convergence. The findings revealed that although students recognized the importance of English for academic and professional purposes, most demonstrated limited English proficiency. Grammar emerged as the greatest learning challenge, whereas speaking was identified as the highest priority for future communication. Students also expressed strong preferences for bilingual, interactive learning, and technology-supported learning. The lecturers' perspectives similarly aligned with these findings, particularly regarding the importance of communicative competence, grammar and vocabulary development, interactive learning, and digital learning resources. The convergence between students' and lecturers' perspectives suggests that these shared priorities may inform evidence-informed Basic English instructional planning. The study provides practical insights for English lecturers and curriculum developers seeking to design context-sensitive Basic English programs for non-English major students in Indonesian higher education.

Keywords: English learning needs, Need Analysis, Basic English program, non-English major students, instructional planning

INTRODUCTION

Designing effective English instruction for non-English major students has become an increasingly complex challenge in higher education (Basturkmen, 2023; Bolton, Hill, Bacon-Shone, & Peyronnin, 2023). As universities are expected to prepare graduates for global academic engagement and an increasingly competitive workforce, English is no longer viewed merely as a compulsory subject but as a fundamental competence that supports academic achievement, professional development, and lifelong learning (Bolton et al., 2023). Nevertheless, students entering non-English programs often possess diverse educational backgrounds, varying levels of language proficiency, and different learning expectations (Sari, Atmanegara, Manurung, Ali, & Amaliah, 2023). Such diversity requires English instruction that is responsive to learners' actual needs rather than relying solely on standardized institutional practices (Agustiana, Rahmatunisa, & Darsih, 2023; Basturkmen, 2018; Nation & Macalister, 2010; Richards, 2001).

Although many higher education institutions have incorporated English into their curricula, the effectiveness of English instruction for non-English major students continues to be questioned (Agustiana et al., 2023; Tanama Sitio, Hadiani, Nuryanti Permata, & Latipah, 2026). In many cases, English subject is expected to accommodate students with heterogeneous linguistic backgrounds within limited instructional time (Turgunova, 2024). Consequently, instructional objectives, learning materials, and classroom activities are frequently determined by institutional policies or teachers' assumptions rather than empirical evidence regarding students' learning needs. This mismatch may reduce the relevance of English instruction and

limit students' opportunities to develop competencies that are meaningful for their academic studies and future careers (Alhourani, 2021; U. & V., 2026).

Within English language education, understanding learners' needs has long been regarded as a fundamental step in designing effective instructional programs. Needs analysis provides systematic information about learners' present conditions, target expectations, learning preferences, and perceived challenges, enabling educators to make informed pedagogical decisions (Juan, 2014; Karman, Andas, Ibrahim, & Suhrah, 2024; Mizab & Ayad, 2025). Beyond identifying learners' needs, needs analysis provides an empirical foundation for curriculum planning, instructional design, material development, and evaluation (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Richards, 2001).

Although previous studies have provided valuable insights into English learning needs among non-English major students, much of the existing literature has focused primarily on learners' perspectives (Brzoza, 2020; Pang, Majid, & Narayanan, 2025). Some studies have incorporated multiple educational stakeholders, including teachers or lecturers (Damayanti, Derinalp, Asyifa, & Suryatama, 2024; Dou, 2024; Poedjiastutie & Oliver, 2017). However, relatively limited attention has been given to comparing students' reported learning needs with lecturers' instructional priorities in the context of Basic English program design, particularly in Indonesian Islamic higher education. This gap is also relevant to calls for English instruction in Indonesian Islamic higher education to be informed by evidence from multiple stakeholders (Rizal, Susanto, Maryam, & Frasandy, 2025). The present study addresses this gap by examining students' English learning needs alongside lecturers' instructional perspectives and identifying shared and complementary priorities between the two sources of evidence.

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah, IAIN Bone, an Indonesian Islamic higher education institution where English is offered as a compulsory subject in several non-English major programs, including Islamic Communication and Broadcasting, Islamic Guidance and Counseling, and Qur'anic Studies. The institutional context provides an appropriate setting for examining how students' reported needs and lecturers' instructional priorities can jointly inform context-sensitive Basic English program design.

In response to this gap, the study investigates English learning needs from both students' and lecturers' perspectives. Specifically, it seeks to identify students' perceived English learning needs, examine lecturers' instructional perspectives, and identify shared and complementary priorities relevant to Basic English program design. Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What English learning needs are perceived by non-English major students?
2. How do lecturers perceive the English learning needs of non-English major students?
3. What shared and complementary priorities emerge from students' English learning needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives for informing a Basic English program?

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design to investigate English learning needs from the perspectives of non-English major students and English lecturers at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah, IAIN Bone, Indonesia. The survey design was selected because it enables the systematic collection of participants' perceptions regarding English learning needs, instructional priorities, learning preferences, perceived learning challenges, and expected learning outcomes within a specific educational context (Creswell, 2014). In addition to the questionnaire survey, a placement test was administered to provide a descriptive profile of students' initial English proficiency. The student questionnaire included both closed-ended and

open-ended items, with the latter used to provide contextual explanations for participants' responses. A separate questionnaire was administered to English lecturers to obtain their perspectives on students' learning needs and instructional priorities. These sources of descriptive data were analyzed and compared to develop a comprehensive understanding of English learning needs and to identify shared priorities and differences that could inform the design of a context-sensitive Basic English program (Brown, 2016; Pang et al., 2025). The study remained within a descriptive survey design; it did not employ a formal mixed-methods design because the open-ended responses were used to complement and contextualize the descriptive survey findings rather than being analyzed as a separate qualitative dataset.

Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah, IAIN Bone, Indonesia, where English is offered as a compulsory course in several non-English major programs, including Islamic Communication and Broadcasting (KPI), Qur'anic Studies (IAT), and Islamic Guidance and Counseling (BPI). The Basic English program intended to be developed from this needs analysis was primarily targeted at first-semester students. However, the main needs analysis involved a broader group of respondents with current or previous experience of English instruction at the faculty.

A total of 36 respondents participated in the main needs analysis, comprising 35 current students from semesters 1, 3, 5, and 7 and one alumnus. The student respondents represented IAT (16; 44.4%), KPI (13; 36.1%), and BPI (7; 19.5%). Participants were recruited through voluntary online participation and completed both the English placement test and the revised needs analysis questionnaire. Because participation was voluntary and no complete sampling frame of eligible participants was established, a conventional response rate could not be calculated. The placement test used the English Level Test provided by EnglishRadar and consisted of 60 questions covering grammar and vocabulary, communication skills, reading, and listening, with a maximum administration time of 60 minutes. The test provided CEFR-referenced results across A1–C2 proficiency ranges. Respondents were instructed to complete the test independently and submit a screenshot of their reported level. The reported CEFR sublevels were aggregated into their corresponding main levels for descriptive analysis (e.g., A1.1/A1.2 as A1 and A2.1/A2.2 as A2), without recalculating raw scores or applying researcher-defined cut-off scores.

Before the main survey, 15 students and alumni participated in a pilot test of the student questionnaire to assess item clarity, language comprehensibility, response options, completion time, and overall usability. Based on their feedback, minor revisions were made, particularly to the questionnaire instructions. In addition, two English lecturers were selected purposively based on their direct involvement in English instruction at the faculty and completed a separate lecturer questionnaire addressing students' learning needs, instructional priorities, and recommendations for Basic English program development.

Instrument Development

Two structured questionnaires were developed based on the theoretical framework of English learning needs analysis to capture learners' necessities, lacks, wants, and learning preferences (Brown, 2016; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Long, 2005; Nation & Macalister, 2010; Richards, 2001) adapted from the needs analysis dimensions discussed by Yassi & Kaharuddin (2018) in *Syllabus Design for English Language Teaching*. The framework was adapted to the context of non-English major students at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah. The student questionnaire was designed to capture respondents' demographic profiles, perceived English proficiency, English learning needs, learning preferences, perceived learning barriers, and expectations toward a Basic English program. The lecturer questionnaire

addressed lecturers' perceptions of students' English learning needs, instructional priorities, teaching strategies, and recommendations for Basic English program development. The questionnaire items were organized according to the needs analysis dimensions relevant to the objectives and context of the present study.

Before the main survey, the student questionnaire was pilot tested with 15 students and alumni to examine the clarity and comprehensibility of the items, appropriateness of response options, completion time, and overall usability (Creswell, 2014). The pilot participants provided feedback particularly on the instructions for completing the questionnaire. Based on this feedback, the instructions were revised to make the completion procedures clearer before the final questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire was theoretically grounded in the needs analysis framework proposed by Yassi and Kaharuddin (2018). No separate expert judgment or formal content-validation procedure was conducted, and internal-consistency reliability was not calculated. The pilot testing was therefore used to assess the practical clarity and usability of the questionnaire before its administration in the main study.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted from September 19 to 22, 2025, in two sequential phases. In the first phase, all 36 student and alumni respondents completed the English Level Test provided by EnglishRadar to obtain an indication of their initial English proficiency. The test was completed individually, and respondents were instructed not to use external assistance. They were also asked to submit a screenshot of their reported proficiency level as evidence of completion. Because EnglishRadar reports proficiency using CEFR sublevels, the reported sublevels were aggregated into their corresponding main CEFR levels for analysis; for example, A1.1 and A1.2 were classified as A1, while A2.1 and A2.2 were classified as A2. The same aggregation procedure was applied to the higher CEFR levels. This procedure was used only for descriptive reporting and did not involve recalculating test scores or applying researcher-defined cut-off scores.

In the second phase, the revised student questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms to the same 36 student and alumni respondents. The questionnaire collected information on participants' backgrounds, English learning needs, learning preferences, perceived learning barriers, and expectations toward a Basic English program. A separate online questionnaire was administered to the two English lecturers to obtain their perspectives on students' English learning needs, instructional priorities, teaching strategies, and recommendations for Basic English program development.

Participation was voluntary. Before completing the questionnaires, participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided informed consent. Their responses were collected anonymously and used solely for research purposes. The placement-test results and student questionnaire responses were analyzed to describe respondents' initial proficiency and English learning needs, while the lecturer questionnaire responses were examined to identify instructional priorities. The findings from these sources were then compared to identify shared and complementary priorities between respondents' reported needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives.

Data Analysis

Data obtained from the placement test and questionnaire (with open-ended and close-ended questions) items were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, to summarize participants' responses. Placement test results were summarized to describe students' initial English proficiency, whereas questionnaire responses were organized into predefined dimensions of English learning needs, learning preferences, perceived learning

barriers, and instructional priorities as commonly employed in descriptive survey research (Creswell, 2014).

Responses to the open-ended questionnaire items were analyzed following the qualitative data analysis procedures of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). First, the researcher reviewed all responses to become familiar with the data and condensed the responses by identifying statements that were relevant to the research questions and grouping responses expressing similar ideas. Second, the grouped responses were organized and displayed according to recurring patterns related to English learning needs, learning preferences, perceived barriers, and instructional priorities. Third, the researcher examined the displayed data to identify recurring themes and patterns across participants' responses and compared these patterns with the findings from the closed-ended items. Conclusions were then drawn from the identified patterns and checked against the original responses to ensure that the interpretations remained grounded in the data. The analysis was conducted by the researcher, and no inter-coder reliability procedure was undertaken because the open-ended responses were used as contextual and supplementary evidence within the descriptive survey rather than as a separate qualitative dataset.

In this study, convergence was interpreted descriptively as the presence of shared themes or instructional priorities appearing in both students' and lecturers' responses. No numerical threshold or predefined degree of convergence was applied. The comparison was used to identify similarities and complementary differences between the two sources of data.

Finally, findings from the placement test, student questionnaire, and lecturer questionnaire were compared to identify shared and complementary perspectives that could inform the design of a context-sensitive Basic English program. Integrating multiple sources of information provided a broader basis for interpreting English learning needs and instructional priorities within the study context (Long, 2005)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This section presents the findings according to the three research questions. The first part reports students' perceived English learning needs based on the placement test and needs analysis questionnaire, followed by lecturers' instructional perspectives. The final part synthesizes both perspectives by identifying areas of convergence that may inform the design of a Basic English program.

Students' English Learning Needs

Participant Profile

The placement test was administered to 36 students and alumni from the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah participated in the needs analysis survey. The respondents represented three non-English major programs, namely Qur'anic Studies (IAT), Islamic Communication and Broadcasting (KPI), and Islamic Guidance and Counseling (BPI). Female participants constituted most of the respondents (22; 61.1%), while male participants accounted for 14 (38.9%). Regarding academic background, the largest proportion of respondents came from the IAT program (16; 44.4%), followed by KPI (13; 36.1%) and BPI (7; 19.5%). Most respondents had not participated in any English course outside the university (30; 83.3%), whereas only six respondents (16.7%) reported previous participation in external English courses. These findings indicate that the majority of participants relied primarily on university English courses as their main source of English learning.

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	22	61.1
	Male	14	38.9
Study Program	IAT	16	44.4
	KPI	13	36.1
	BPI	7	19.5
English Course Experience	Yes	6	16.7
	No	30	83.3

Current English Learning Condition

Students generally demonstrated a positive attitude toward learning English. Almost all respondents perceived English as an important subject for their academic studies and future careers, with 21 students (58.3%) rating it as *important* and 12 students (33.3%) as *very important*. Only three respondents (8.3%) considered English to be *moderately important*.

Despite this positive perception, students reported relatively low confidence in their current English proficiency. Nearly half of the respondents assessed their English ability as poor (17; 47.2%), while seven (19.4%) considered it *very poor*. Only four respondents (11.1%) perceived their English proficiency as *good*. These self-assessments were consistent with the placement test, which showed that most participants were at the A1 (Beginner) level. Collectively, these findings indicate that although students recognize the importance of English, many still require systematic support in developing fundamental language competencies before progressing to more advanced English learning.

Table 2. Current English Learning Condition

Variable	Category	n	%
Importance of English	Very important	12	33.3
	Important	21	58.3
	Moderately important	3	8.3
Self-rated English proficiency	Good	4	11.1
	Fair	8	22.2
	Poor	17	47.2
	Very poor	7	19.4
Placement Test	A1	19	52.8
	A2	8	22.2
	B1	6	16.7
	B2+	3	8.3

Linguistic Needs

Students identified several areas requiring priority attention in the proposed Basic English program. Among the six language skills and components investigated, grammar was reported as the most difficult area by 23 respondents (63.9%), followed by speaking (21; 58.3%), vocabulary (15; 41.7%), and listening (14; 38.9%). Reading and writing were selected less frequently, with 10 (27.8%) and 9 (25.0%) respondents, respectively.

When asked which language skills would be most important for their future careers, speaking emerged as the dominant priority, selected by 33 respondents (91.7%). Reading, writing, and listening, each received 15 selections (41.7%). These findings indicate an interesting pattern: while students perceived grammar as their greatest learning difficulty, they viewed speaking as the most important competency for achieving future academic and professional goals.

Table 3. Students' Priority Linguistic Needs*

Language Skill/Component	n	%
Speaking (career needs)	33	91.7
Grammar (most difficult)	23	63.9
Speaking (most difficult)	21	58.3
Vocabulary	15	41.7
Listening	14	38.9
Reading	10	27.8
Writing	9	25.0

*Percentages exceed 100% because respondents were allowed to select more than one option.

Learning Preferences

The findings further revealed that students preferred interactive and technology-supported learning experiences. The most frequently selected learning approaches were learning through audio and video (19; 52.8%), games and quizzes (17; 47.2%), social media-based learning (16; 44.4%), and role-play or direct conversation (15; 41.7%). Conventional text-based learning activities were selected less frequently.

Consistent with these preferences, instructional videos were considered the most helpful learning medium by 26 respondents (72.2%), followed by language learning applications (14; 38.9%), audio listening practice (11; 30.6%), and interactive e-modules (10; 27.8%).

Regarding instructional language, most respondents preferred a bilingual approach combining Bahasa Indonesia and English (28; 77.8%), while relatively few preferred instruction delivered entirely in Bahasa Indonesia (7; 19.4%) or entirely in English (1; 2.8%). These findings suggest that students expect English instruction that balances comprehensible explanations with opportunities to develop authentic English communication skills.

Table 4. Preferred Learning Experiences*

Item	n	%
Instructional videos	26	72.2
Audio/video learning	19	52.8
Games and quizzes	17	47.2
Social media-based learning	16	44.4
Role-play / conversation	15	41.7
Bilingual instruction (Indonesian + English)	28	77.8

*Multiple-response items; percentages may exceed 100%.

Learning Expectations

Students' expectations toward the proposed Basic English program reflected strong academic and professional aspirations. The most frequently selected expectation was the ability to communicate fluently in everyday conversations (27; 75.0%), followed by preparation for TOEFL or IELTS (22; 61.1%), confidence in delivering presentations in English (21; 58.3%), and the ability to read academic and religious texts in English (19; 52.8%).

Students also expected the learning materials to prioritize everyday conversations (24; 66.7%), basic TOEFL practice (19; 52.8%), and English for workplace communication (14; 38.9%). Furthermore, most respondents indicated that two hours per week (24; 66.7%) would be an appropriate duration for participating in the Basic English program. Collectively, these findings demonstrate that students expect a program that not only strengthens their basic language competence but also prepares them for authentic academic, professional, and international communication.

Table 5. Students' Learning Expectations*

Expectation	n	%
Speak fluently in daily conversation	27	75.0
TOEFL/IELTS preparation	22	61.1
Present confidently in English	21	58.3
Read academic/religious texts	19	52.8
Daily conversation materials	24	66.7
Basic TOEFL materials	19	52.8
Ideal study time (2 hours/week)	24	66.7

*Multiple-response items where applicable.

Lecturers' Instructional Perspectives

This subsection presents the perspectives of two English lecturers responsible for teaching English subject at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah. Rather than reporting individual responses separately, the findings synthesize the lecturers' shared views regarding students' English proficiency, instructional priorities, learning challenges, and recommendations for improving the proposed Basic English program.

The lecturers' responses were synthesized into four recurring themes representing their instructional perspectives: (1) perceptions of students' current English proficiency, (2) instructional priorities, (3) recommended teaching strategies and learning resources, and (4) recommendations for Basic English program development.

Students' Current English Condition

Both lecturers agreed that the overall English proficiency of non-English major students remained limited, although they differed slightly in their general assessment. One lecturer described students' proficiency as very low, while the other considered it adequate. Despite this difference in overall evaluation, both lecturers consistently emphasized that students have highly diverse language backgrounds and uneven prior knowledge.

Both lecturers also observed that students generally possessed adequate access to learning facilities, including smartphones, internet connectivity, and digital learning applications. However, they agreed that access to technology alone had not yet translated into satisfactory English proficiency, suggesting that instructional support remained essential for developing students' language competence.

Table 6. Lecturers' Perspectives on Students' Current English Condition

Aspect	Shared Findings
Overall English proficiency	Generally limited, with uneven prior knowledge
Learning facilities	Students generally have adequate access to digital learning resources
Main instructional challenge	Wide variation in students' initial English proficiency

Priority English Learning Needs

The lecturers identified communicative competence as the primary focus of English instruction. "Speaking" was consistently highlighted as the most important skill requiring improvement. In addition, both lecturers emphasized the importance of strengthening students' grammatical knowledge and expanding their vocabulary as foundational components supporting effective communication.

Regarding academic needs, both lecturers agreed that English was most frequently required for reading international references and academic journals. One lecturer additionally emphasized the importance of English for academic writing and article preparation, reflecting the increasing role of English in higher education.

Table 7. Lecturers' Priority English Learning Needs

Theme	Lecturers' Perspectives
Priority language skills	Speaking, grammar, vocabulary
Academic needs	Reading international references and journals
Additional academic function	Academic writing and article preparation

Teaching Strategies and Learning Resources

Both lecturers recommended interactive and student-centred learning approaches for the proposed Basic English program. Task-based learning was identified by both lecturers as an effective instructional approach. Additional strategies included games, role-play, project-based learning, and interactive quizzes to increase students' engagement and encourage meaningful language use.

The lecturers also emphasized the importance of integrating digital learning resources into the future learning module. Both recommended the inclusion of instructional videos or audio recordings and independent learning guides. One lecturer further suggested incorporating glossaries, chapter summaries, and interactive quizzes to enhance students' learning experiences.

Table 8. Recommended Teaching Strategies and Learning Resources

Component	Shared Recommendation
Teaching approach	Task-based learning
Interactive activities	Games, role-play, discussions, projects
Digital resources	Video/audio learning materials
Learning support	Independent learning guide
Additional features	Glossary, chapter summaries, interactive quizzes

Expectations for the Basic English Program

Both lecturers preferred the use of bilingual instruction combining Bahasa Indonesia and English in the future learning module. They considered bilingual explanations appropriate for supporting students with diverse proficiency levels while gradually encouraging greater use of English.

Overall, the lecturers recommended that the Basic English program should prioritize fundamental grammar, everyday vocabulary, and communicative English while maintaining strong relevance to students' academic needs. They also emphasized that the learning materials should be practical, accessible, and capable of supporting independent learning beyond classroom instruction. The lecturers' responses showed a strong emphasis on communicative competence supported by fundamental language knowledge and interactive learning experiences. These priorities closely correspond to students reported English learning needs, providing a basis for identifying areas of convergence between learners' expectations and lecturers' instructional perspectives.

Shared and Complementary Priorities in Students' and Lecturers' Perspectives

The comparison of students' English learning needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives revealed several shared priorities across linguistic needs, learning approaches, and expected learning outcomes. The comparison also showed differences in emphasis, particularly regarding academic English. These similarities and differences provide complementary information for informing the design of a context-sensitive Basic English program.

Table 9. Shared and Complementary Priorities in Students' and Lecturers' Perspectives

Theme	Students	Lecturers
Speaking	Highest priority for future communication	Highest instructional priority
Grammar	Greatest learning difficulty	Fundamental instructional priority
Vocabulary	Limited vocabulary identified as a barrier	Vocabulary development emphasized
Bilingual instruction	Preferred by most students	Recommended by both lecturers
Interactive learning	Prefer videos, games, discussions	Recommend task-based and interactive learning
Digital learning resources	Prefer videos and e-learning	Recommend video/audio and self-learning guides
Academic relevance	Expect TOEFL and academic English	Emphasize journal reading and academic writing

The comparison of the two sources of data was presented through a data display to identify shared and complementary priorities between students' reported needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives (Miles et al., 2014). Several shared priorities were identified, particularly in speaking, grammar, vocabulary, bilingual instruction, interactive learning, and digital learning resources. At the same time, the two groups showed different emphases regarding academic English: students highlighted TOEFL preparation and academic English, whereas lecturers emphasized academic writing and journal reading. These similarities and differences were considered in interpreting the findings and identifying instructional priorities that could inform the design of a context-sensitive Basic English program.

Discussion

Students' English Learning Needs in the Context of Basic English Instruction

The findings suggest that English learning needs among non-English major students extend beyond basic linguistic knowledge to include communicative demands related to academic and future professional contexts. This pattern can be interpreted through Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) distinction between necessities, lacks, and wants, as students' reported needs reflect both their current language limitations and the competencies they expect to develop for future use. This interpretation is consistent with Sari et al. (2023), who found that English needs among non-English major students are closely related to academic and future professional purposes. In the present context, these findings suggest that a Basic English program may address immediate language difficulties while incorporating communicative purposes relevant to students' anticipated academic and professional contexts.

The gap between respondents' relatively limited proficiency and their broader learning expectations further highlights the need to align program content with both present learning limitations and anticipated academic and professional demands. Similar patterns have been reported among non-English major students who recognize the importance of English despite limited proficiency (Agustiana et al., 2023; Sari et al., 2023). Therefore, English learning needs in this context involve both addressing current language limitations and preparing learners for future academic and professional participation.

The relationship between grammar and speaking requires cautious interpretation. Grammar was identified as the greatest learning difficulty, whereas speaking emerged as the highest instructional priority. These findings do not by themselves establish that students perceive grammar as a foundation for speaking. Rather, they indicate that grammatical difficulties and the need for speaking development are both important considerations in planning Basic English instruction. Richards (2001) emphasizes that language knowledge and skills can be developed through integrated and meaningful learning experiences, while Nation and Macalister (2010) argue that curriculum design should balance learners' immediate language problems with the communicative purposes for which English will be used. Recent

research among Indonesian undergraduate students similarly suggests that grammar instruction becomes more meaningful when integrated into active and communicative learning environments (Anisah, 2025; Lubis, Triarisanti, & Sulaiman, 2026). Hence, the proposed Basic English program may integrate grammar instruction into communicative tasks rather than treating grammar primarily as a separate body of rules.

The preference for bilingual and interactive learning suggests that instructional support is particularly important in a context where students have varying levels of English proficiency. Flexible use of Bahasa Indonesia alongside English may function as a scaffold that supports comprehension while allowing students to gradually increase their use of English. This interpretation is consistent with recent evidence from Southeast Asian higher education showing that flexible first-language use can support comprehension and classroom participation (Pham, Tran, & Barnett, 2026; Sahan, Galloway, & McKinley, 2025). The preference for digital and interactive resources also points to the value of extending learning beyond conventional classroom activities through videos, e-learning resources, games, and task-based activities. Similar needs have been reported in recent studies emphasizing authentic digital resources and interactive learning for non-English major students (Alim, Deliza, Tiana, Pratiwi, & Sukarno, 2025; Lubis et al., 2026). These findings suggest that the Basic English program may combine bilingual scaffolding with interactive and digitally supported learning opportunities.

Integrating Students' and Lecturers' Perspectives for Evidence-Informed Basic English Program Design

One of the notable findings of this study is the convergence between students' English learning needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives. Although students and lecturers approached English learning from different educational positions, both groups consistently emphasized speaking, grammar, vocabulary development, bilingual instruction, interactive learning activities, and digital learning resources as important priorities for the proposed Basic English program. This convergence indicates that these priorities were shared across the two stakeholder groups and may provide an additional empirical basis for instructional planning within the study context.

The present findings support the argument that effective needs analysis should incorporate perspectives from multiple stakeholders rather than relying solely on learners' perceptions. While students can identify their learning difficulties, expectations, and preferences, lecturers contribute complementary pedagogical knowledge derived from classroom practice, curriculum implementation, and instructional experience. Consequently, integrating these perspectives offers a more comprehensive understanding of English learning needs than relying on either stakeholder group alone. This interpretation is consistent with Long's (2005) conception of needs analysis as the systematic collection of information from multiple sources, as well as Brown's (2016) view that curriculum decisions should be informed by empirical evidence gathered from different stakeholders. Recent work on language program development similarly argues that needs analysis should be understood as a systematic process of collecting and validating evidence for defensible curriculum design rather than merely documenting learners' preferences (Bocanegra-Valle, 2025).

The findings also extend previous empirical studies on English learning needs. Earlier research has successfully identified learners' linguistic needs, learning preferences, and language difficulties among non-English major students (Agustiana et al., 2023; Sari et al., 2023). Likewise, Dou (2024) explored both students' and teachers' perspectives on English course development. However, relatively few studies have explicitly examined the “areas of convergence” between students' learning needs and lecturers' instructional priorities as the primary basis for curriculum development. A notable exception is the work of Poedjiastutie

and Oliver (2017), who demonstrated that incorporating multiple stakeholder perspectives (including students, teachers, and employers) provides richer information for improving English programs than relying on a single group of respondents. Their findings indicate that different stakeholders contribute complementary perspectives that support policy making, curriculum development, and classroom instruction, a conclusion that is strongly reinforced by the present study.

An interesting aspect of the present findings is that the differences observed between students and lecturers were complementary rather than contradictory. Students tended to prioritize immediate learning outcomes, such as improving speaking confidence, preparing for TOEFL, and communicating effectively in everyday situations. In contrast, lecturers placed greater emphasis on academic reading, academic writing, and transferable language skills required for higher education. Rather than representing conflicting expectations, these differences reflect the distinct educational roles of each stakeholder group. Students naturally focus on learning outcomes that are directly relevant to their current experiences and future aspirations, whereas lecturers consider broader curricular objectives and long-term academic development. This complementary relationship supports recent discussions in language program development, which argue that curriculum design becomes more relevant and sustainable when it integrates learner expectations with institutional and pedagogical considerations (Bocanegra-Valle, 2025; Ranasinghe, 2024).

The convergence identified in this study therefore has important implications for Basic English program development. Instead of treating students' needs and lecturers' instructional priorities as separate sources of information, curriculum developers may use the convergence between these perspectives to establish instructional priorities that are simultaneously learner-responsive and pedagogically feasible. This finding is consistent with recent literature reviews by Bocanegra-Valle (2025) and Meilyani, Rinalgi, Nandha, & Qamariah (2025) emphasizing that needs analysis should be viewed as a continuous and participatory process involving multiple stakeholders throughout curriculum development rather than as a preliminary step conducted only before a course begins.

Overall, the present findings suggest that integrating students' and lecturers' perspectives can provide a broader evidence base for instructional planning. Rather than relying only on learners' reported preferences, considering multiple educational perspectives may provide additional empirical support for determining learning objectives, instructional strategies, learning materials, and assessment practices within a context-sensitive Basic English program. This finding illustrates how stakeholder perspectives can be incorporated into evidence-informed English program planning within higher education.

Implications for Designing a Context-Sensitive Basic English Program

The shared and complementary priorities identified between students' English learning needs and lecturers' instructional perspectives provide context-specific evidence that may inform the development of a Basic English program within the context investigated in this study. Rather than relying on standardized English syllabi or institutional assumptions, the findings suggest that instructional planning should consider learners' reported needs, lecturers' pedagogical priorities, and the specific educational context in which English is taught. This implication is consistent with the needs analysis principles proposed by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) which position learners' needs as an important basis for curriculum development. It also aligns with Richards (2001) who argues that effective curriculum planning should be informed by systematic evidence regarding learners, learning contexts, and instructional goals. Recent discussions in ESP further emphasize the importance of designing language programs around learners' study- and work-related language needs rather than predetermined general English content (Basturkmen, 2023, 2025a). However, these implications should be understood within

the context of the present study and should not be generalized beyond similar educational settings without further evidence.

One important implication concerns the formulation of learning objectives. The shared priorities identified across the two respondent groups suggest that communicative competence may be an important objective of the proposed Basic English program. However, communicative competence should not be interpreted narrowly as conversational fluency. It can encompass grammar, vocabulary development, academic reading, presentation skills, and basic academic writing to support students' academic and future professional communication. This interpretation is consistent with Basturkmen's (2023, 2025) discussion of ESP and EAP, which emphasizes preparing learners for authentic academic and workplace communication by addressing the linguistic demands of their target contexts.

The findings also have implications for instructional strategies and learning materials. The shared preference for interactive learning, bilingual instruction, and technology-supported resources suggests that the proposed program may combine comprehensible explanations with opportunities to use English through discussions, role plays, collaborative tasks, problem-solving activities, games, and digital resources. Flexible use of Bahasa Indonesia alongside English may function as a pedagogical scaffold that supports comprehension while gradually encouraging greater use of English, consistent with recent research on bilingual and translanguaging practices in Indonesian and Southeast Asian higher education (Muttaqin, Margana, & Nurhayati, 2025; Sahan et al., 2025). Similarly, grammar and vocabulary may be embedded in communicative and academic tasks rather than presented primarily through decontextualized exercises. Such contextualized curriculum design is consistent with Nation and Macalister (2010), Richards (2001), and recent ESP scholarship emphasizing the alignment of language materials with learners' anticipated academic and professional practices (Basturkmen, 2025a, 2025b).

The findings further suggest that learning materials should be organized around authentic communicative situations rather than isolated grammatical topics. Grammar and vocabulary instruction may therefore be integrated into speaking activities, academic presentations, reading tasks, and workplace communication scenarios that reflect students' disciplinary backgrounds. Such contextualized materials are consistent with learner-responsive curriculum design, which recommends integrating language knowledge with meaningful communication and disciplinary practices (Nation & Macalister, 2010; Richards, 2001). Basturkmen (2025a, 2025b) similarly emphasizes that effective language materials should reflect the communicative practices that learners are expected to perform in their future academic and professional environments rather than relying on decontextualized language exercises.

The integration of student and lecturer perspectives provides a broader evidence base for instructional decision-making within the context investigated in this study. Comparing the two perspectives allows curriculum developers to identify shared priorities while also recognizing areas where instructional emphasis may differ. This approach can help inform decisions about learning objectives, instructional approaches, materials, and learning resources without assuming that the resulting priorities are universally applicable. Basturkmen (2025b, 2025c) similarly emphasizes the value of incorporating multiple perspectives in context-sensitive curriculum planning.

Taken together, these findings suggest several priorities that may inform the design of a learner-responsive, pedagogically feasible, and context-sensitive Basic English program within the context investigated in this study. Rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all approach, the findings indicate that program planning can draw on multiple educational perspectives and consider learners' academic, professional, and institutional contexts. In this sense, needs analysis provides an evidence-informed basis for formulating learning objectives, instructional

approaches, learning materials, and learning resources. The findings should not, however, be interpreted as evidence of program effectiveness, as the proposed program was not implemented or evaluated in this study. Further research involving program implementation and evaluation is needed to determine whether these priorities lead to improved learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated English learning needs from the perspectives of non-English major students and English lecturers at the Faculty of Ushuluddin and Dakwah, IAIN Bone, Indonesia, to provide an empirical basis for designing a context-sensitive Basic English program. The findings indicate that students' needs extend beyond basic linguistic knowledge to include communicative, academic, and future professional demands. Students also expressed preferences for bilingual instruction, interactive learning, and technology-supported resources, while lecturers emphasized the importance of communicative competence, vocabulary development, grammar, and contextualized learning. The comparison of the two perspectives identified shared and complementary priorities that can inform learning objectives, instructional approaches, materials, and learning resources for a Basic English program within this institutional context.

The study does not establish the effectiveness of the proposed program because the program has not yet been implemented or evaluated. Rather, the findings provide context-specific evidence that may support evidence-informed Basic English program design within the investigated institutional context.

Limitations

This study is subject to several limitations. First, the study was conducted within a single faculty at one Indonesian Islamic higher education institution, which limits the transferability of the findings to other institutions and academic contexts. Second, the main respondent group was relatively small and comprised 35 current students and one alumnus, while the lecturer perspective was based on only two English lecturers. The inclusion of one alumnus provided an additional perspective on prior English learning experience, but it does not represent alumni perspectives broadly. Third, the needs analysis relied primarily on participants' self-reported perceptions, which may not fully capture their actual language performance or learning needs. The placement test provided an additional indication of respondents' English proficiency, but its validity and reliability were not independently established in the present study. Therefore, the reported proficiency levels were used only as descriptive indicators rather than as independently validated proficiency measures. Fourth, the descriptive, non-intervention design did not involve the implementation or evaluation of the proposed Basic English program. Therefore, the findings provide context-specific evidence that may inform program design rather than evidence of program effectiveness. Future research should involve larger and more diverse samples across institutions and disciplines, include additional stakeholder perspectives where relevant, and implement and evaluate the proposed program through longitudinal or experimental designs to examine its applicability and effects on students' English learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Agustiana, V., Rahmatunisa, W., & Darsih, E. (2023). Adapting English Instruction: An Analysis of Non-Efl Students' Learning Needs. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v9i2.8726>

- Alhourani, A. Q. (2021). Investigating the Match and Mismatch between Students' Learning Styles and Teacher's Teaching Styles in a Saudi School: A Case Study. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 3(2), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2021.3.2.2>
- Alim, A. H., Deliza, A., Tiana, M., Pratiwi, D., & Sukarno. (2025). Needs analysis of speaking skills for Mathematics Education students in academic contexts. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 14(2), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v14i2.24284>
- Anisah, S. (2025). Unveiling the Preferred Methods in Grammar Learning: Beliefs from EFL Undergraduates. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 5(2), 415–426. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v5i2.2855>
- Basturkmen, H. (2018). Needs Analysis and Syllabus Design for Language for Specific Purposes. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–8). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0861.pub2>
- Basturkmen, H. (2023). English for Specific and Academic Purposes as Pedagogical Frameworks. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal20471>
- Basturkmen, H. (2025a). *Core Concepts in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009376723>
- Basturkmen, H. (2025b). ESP Teacher Development. In *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 225–241). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119985068.ch12>
- Basturkmen, H. (2025c). Learning a specialized register: An English for Specific Purposes research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 58(1), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000472>
- Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2025). Needs Analysis for Language Program Development and Administration. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Program Development and Administration* (pp. 289–302). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003361213-28>
- Bolton, K., Hill, C., Bacon-Shone, J., & Peyronnin, K. (2023). EMI (English-medium instruction) in Indonesian higher education. *World Englishes*, 42(3), 424–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12622>
- Brown, J. Dean. (2016). *Introducing needs analysis and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Brzoza, B. (2020). Different Proficiency, Same Class: Tackling Language Instruction in Heterogeneous ESP Courses in Vocational Schools 1. In *MEXTESOL Journal* (Vol. 44).
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches* (4th ed.; J. Young, Ed.). United Kingdom: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Damayanti, I. L., Derinalp, P., Asyifa, F., & Suryatama, K. (2024). Exploring English for Academic Purposes Program: Needs analysis and impact evaluation. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 11(3), 1616–1635. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.38329>
- Dou, A. (2024). Needs analysis of ESP courses from the perspective of students and teachers. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2024.070620>
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Juan, L. I. (2014). Literature Review of the Classifications of “Needs” in Needs Analysis Theory. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.2n.3p.12>
- Karman, K., Andas, N. H., Ibrahim, N. A., & Suhrah, S. (2024). A Learning Need Analysis in English Speaking Program for Students of Pondok Tahfidz Al-Qur'an. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 9(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v9i1.474>
- Long, M. H. (2005). *Second Language Needs Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lubis, A. H., Triarisanti, R., & Sulaiman, S. (2026). The Merits and Challenges of Flipped English Grammar Learning Among Indonesian First-Year Undergraduate Non-ELT Students. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v11i1.989>
- Meilyani, A., Rinalgi, D., Nandha, M. S., & Qamariah, Z. (2025). The Role of Needs Analysis in Designing Relevant Learning Outcomes for EFL Curriculum: Literature Review. *Datokarama English Education Journal*, 6(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.24239/dee.v6i1.113>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mizab, M., & Ayad, B. (2025). The Role of Needs Analysis in Designing Lessons Dovetailing with Workplace Demands. *Journal of Studies in Language*, 8(3), 17–36.

- Muttaqin, W. M., Margana, & Nurhayati, E. (2025). Translanguaging in higher education in Indonesia: a case study of multilingual competency development. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2585321>
- Nation, I S P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Design* (1st ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Pang, B., Majid, F. B. A., & Narayanan, G. A. (2025). Systematic Literature Review on Needs Analysis in ESP within Higher Education: Implications for Future Research. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 10(1), e003162. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v10i1.3162>
- Pham, M., Tran, K., & Barnett, J. (2026). Student preferences and practices regarding first language use in English medium education: A scoping review across Southeast Asian universities. *Higher Education*, 91(5), 1681–1698. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01490-4>
- Poedjiastutie, D., & Oliver, R. (2017). English Learning Needs of ESP Learners: Exploring Stakeholder Perceptions at an Indonesian University. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 28(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i1/1-21>
- Ranasinghe, R. M. S. K. (2024). Enhancing Curriculum Development through Needs Analysis: A Case Study of a Second-Year University English Language Teaching Programme in Sri Lanka. *Vidyodaya Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 09(02).
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press (p. 254). p. 254.
- Rizal, S., Susanto, F., Maryam, M., & Frasandy, R. N. (2025). Implementation of English for Specific Purposes through Content and Language Integrated Learning in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education. *Asian Journal of Human Services*, 29(0), 242–256. <https://doi.org/10.14391/ajhs.29.242>
- Sahan, K., Galloway, N., & McKinley, J. (2025). ‘English-only’ English medium instruction: Mixed views in Thai and Vietnamese higher education. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(2), 657–676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211072632>
- Sari, F., Atmanegara, Y., Manurung, J. E., Ali, H. V., & Amaliah, A. (2023). Analyzing non-English major students’ needs, attitudes, and English language learning strategies. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i1.19423>
- Tanama Sitio, I., Hadiani, D., Nuryanti Permata, N., & Latipah, Y. (2026). Need Analysis of an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Course for Indonesian Vocational Tertiary Students. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 9(1), 43–58.
- Turgunova, A. (2024). Challenges and innovations in teaching English for specific purposes (ESP) to non-linguistic majors. *InterConf*, (60(260)), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.19-20.08.2025.010>
- U., S., & V., R. (2026). Exploring ESL pedagogical strategies across diverse learning styles: insights from English language educators. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 11(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-026-00438-0>
- Yassi, A. H., & Kaharuddin, A. (2018). *Syllabus Design for English Language Teaching* (Second Edi). Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.