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Abstract: This research investigates the vocational school students’ needs on the implementation of English teaching and learning that is focused on the target needs and learning needs. By adapting Hutchinson and Waters’ model (1987), questionnaire consisting of parts A and B was administered to 32 students. Part A deals with the target needs centred on the learner’s necessities, lacks and wants that are effectively functioned in the target situation. In contrast, part B concerns about learning needs that encompass learning inputs, procedures, teacher’s and learners’ role, and setting. Additionally, interviews were also conducted with the students and an English teacher to gather data in order to examine in-depth results of the practices of English teaching and to uncover possible areas of students’ language difficulties in learning English. The results suggested that the students have different perceptions of their necessities, wants, and lacks. The findings also demonstrated the students’ learning needs including the learning inputs, teaching-learning procedures, the teacher’s and learners’ role, as well as the teaching-learning settings.
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INTRODUCTION

The government regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 29 of 1990 concerning secondary education, chapter I general provisions, article 1 (3), implies that vocational education should focus on the development of students’ skills in specific field. In article 3 (2), it is clearly stated that vocational education should give the priority to
prepare vocational high school (henceforth VHS) students to enter the workplace and developing professional behavior. In addition, the act of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System article 15 stating that vocational education is secondary education program for preparing learners for a specific job. Those above-mentioned regulatory statements perfectly recognize that education in VHS should equip the students with particular skills or, in other words, promote them to have professional skills in a specific field so that they are ready to compete in today’s workplace.

As aforementioned, teaching English in vocational education, particularly in secondary education, should be taken into account as English for Specific Purposes (henceforth ESP) program, as Widodo (2016) has argued. For this reason, the English instructions applied in ESP teachings should be totally different from general English (GE) instructions which is very general in nature; serving the students with the teaching of all four language skills and stressing them equally (Esfandiari, 2015; Rahman, 2015). ESP courses, on the other hand, are designed to meet the needs of learners and other stakeholders to communicate for work or study purposes in specific disciplines (Vogt & Kantelinen, 2013). In this sense, they are hardly trained to use English in a specific discipline or a particular communicative context (Liu, Chang, Yang, & Sun, 2011).

However, in the context of vocational education in Indonesia, the fact revealed that both school-based curriculum (KTSP) and the curriculum 2013 (K13) of VHS and general schools have the same English learning materials. More surprisingly, the English teachers in both VHS and general schools even use the same course books that are provided by markets that the contents are frequently inadequate to the VHS students’ needs (personal information, 10 January 2018). Further, they also share the same opinion that they had a lack of interest in designing materials that are fully relevant to their needs due to (1) unavailability of financial support from their institution, (2) the limitation of time, and (3) the lack of understanding on how to develop or design the teaching materials for a specific field.
This study takes place at one of private VHS in Jember in which it has only one program, computer engineering and networks (TKJ), which should provide the students with the skills of, for instance, designing computer networking and understanding components of computer and networking. Unfortunately, the English teacher tends to use the English course books from the government so that the students do not get the appropriate exposure of English that is highly required for their future. Furthermore, the texts in the course books served as the inputs for the students are very general so that they are not contextualized for the students of computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program. Whereas, as they enrolled in vocational education placing them into particular vocational areas, they should experience the texts, which are relevant to their vocational knowledge and skills (Widodo, 2016).

Another reason why the students do not get the appropriate learning experience of English is related to the teacher’s instructions. The instructions have been simply emphasized on teaching English grammar and reading exercises which do not contain the materials related to the students’ vocational area. This in turn is unable to deepen their vocational knowledge since such instruction will only prevent them to develop and perform their communicative skills better. Unsurprisingly, the students do not demonstrate sufficient knowledge of English at the area of computer engineering and network. In other words, those all factors lead to a mismatch between the vocational graduate’s academic competence and the work force requirement (Amin, Arifuddin, & Nurahmadi, 2017). Realizing these facts, it is a must for the VHS English teachers to develop English learning materials that meet their students’ learning needs clearly reflected in their actual teaching-learning situation. This can support them to achieve better performance in the real working environment.

In contrast, developing English learning materials that meet the students’ future workplace requirements is challenging. This requires the need analysis that should be done by ESP learners or educators to meticulously investigate effective ESP materials for students at
vocational school. The need analysis can help them to clarify and validate the learners’ true needs, as Akyel & Ozek (2010) have argued. By understanding the results of need analysis, they are able to translate the learners’ needs into linguistics and pedagogical terms in order to teach an effective course (Tzotzou, 2014).

Studies of needs analysis have been undertaken over the last three decades (Widodo, 2016) and a number of contemporary researches on this issue have mushroomed in many different countries, such as Greece (Chostelidou, 2010; Tzotzou, 2014), Iran (Aliakbari & Boghayeri, 2014; Atai & Shoja, 2011; Boroujeni & Fard, 2013; Eslami, 2010; Mohammadi & Mousavi, 2013; Moiinvaziri, 2014), Spain (Benavent & Sánchez-Reyes, 2015; Peters & Fernández, 2013), Sudan (Elsaid Mohammed & Nur, 2018), USA (Bosher & Smalkoski, 2002; Serafini, Lake, & Long, 2015), Japan (Cowling, 2007), China (Guiyu & Yang, 2016; Li, 2014; Wu, 2012; Zhu & Liu, 2014), Turkey (Akyel & Ozek, 2010; Kayiran & Bağçeci, 2018), KSA (Abdalla & Mohammed, 2016; Al-Hamlan & Baniabdulrahman, 2015; Al-Qahtani, 2015; Alsamadani, 2017; Fadel & Rajab, 2017), Taiwan (Chen, Chang, & Chang, 2016; Lu, 2018), Thailand (Bosuwon & Woodrow, 2009; Prachanant, 2012), and Indonesia (Nimasari, 2018; Poedjiaustutie & Oliver, 2017; Sabarun, 2019; Salam, 2017). Those literatures reflect the centrality and the inevitable role of need analysis in establishing an ESP course.

Although the importance and usefulness of need analysis have been acknowledged around the world, it is hardly surprising that only a small number of contemporary studies have been reported in the context of vocational education in secondary level, particularly in Indonesia. To fill this void, this study elucidates the students’ needs through need analysis in the context of vocational high school. This is due to the raise of awareness to elevate English teaching quality in VHS in which the ultimate goal is to increase students’ academic competence to prepare them to have strong character as professional workers in today’s workplace.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Need analysis (NA), particularly in English Specific Purpose (ESP), is not a new concept because of its long history dating from the 1970s and its constant evolution (Flowerdew, 2013; Widodo, 2015). NA cannot divorce itself from the process of designing any language course. In general, it forms a key part of the design of any ESP course that operates with the learner-centered approach (Read, 2008). It is the starting point, prerequisite, and the cornerstone of ESP Course design (Ali & Salih, 2013; Astika, 1999; Dudley-Evans & St. John in Chostelidou, 2010; Jordan in Ulum, 2015; Zhu & Liu, 2014). In another attempt, Salehi, Davari, & Yunus (2015) also claimed that NA is an essential step in establishing ESP course. It is then concluded that NA has been considered as the crucial factor and an integral part of establishing an ESP course as it is only through the process of need analysis researchers, course designers, and material developers are able to determine and refine the content for an ESP course that meet the learners’ need.

To further understand this point, the following lines will highlight the multi-faceted definition of NA quoted from several scholarly articles. NA is defined as a stage conducted by a course developer to identify what specific language and skills the group of language learners will need to determine and refine the content for the ESP course (Basturkmen, 2010). For Nunan, as quoted by Ali & Salih (2013), need analysis is ‘techniques and procedures for collecting information to be used in syllabus design’. According to Hyland (in Kuo, 2016), NA is ‘the techniques for collecting and assessing information relevant to course design: it is the means of establishing the how and what of a course.’ In educational programs, NA focuses on the learning needs of students, and then, once they are identified, needs are translated into learning objectives, which in turn serve as the basis for further development of teaching materials, learning activities, tests, program evaluation strategies, etc. (Brown, 2009).
To make it clearer, Dudley-Evans and St. John (as cited in Rahman, 2015) provided an emphasis with regard to the concept of NA by adding three aspects of the purposes of NA; (1) to know learners as people, as language users and as language learners, (2) to know how language learning and skills learning can be maximized for a given learner group, and (3) to know the target situations and learning environment so that data can appropriately be interpreted. Furthermore, Richards (in Widodo, 2016) lists six main purposes of NA; (1) to find out what language skills a learner needs in order to perform a particular role, such as sales managers, tour guides, or university students; (2) to help determine if an existing course adequately addresses the needs of potential students; (3) to determine which students from a group are most in need of training in particular language skills; (4) to identify a change of direction that people in a reference group feel is important; (5) to identify a gap between what students are able to do and what they need to be able to do; and (6) to collect information about a particular problem learners are experiencing.

As previously described, NA is highly considered to be an indispensable part in a systematic ESP curriculum design. The data obtained from NA will thus be a benchmark or standard for ESP curriculum designers to develop new curriculum and/or reevaluate the existing curriculum. The precise and accurate data gathered from NA will efficiently cater the needs of the learners that possibly have different educational backgrounds, levels of language proficiencies, countries, and goals. To summarize, the results of NA will provide the basis for instructors or curriculum designers to set the teaching goals or objectives, select and develop learner-centered teaching materials and content, and, also, explore what the most appropriate approaches of teaching and learning to be employed.

To take this matter further, it is strictly essential here to review the classifications of the term “needs” as proposed by many different scholars. With regard to these classifications, Juan (2014) provided a review about the major classifications of “needs” proposed by many
different scholars. First, Berwick (1989) divided the term “need” into two separate terms, perceived needs and felt needs. The initial term refers to as the objectives set according to others’ learning experiences, and the felt needs as the learner’s own needs. In this instance, perceived needs were the thoughts of experts about the educational gaps in other peoples’ experiences and the latter means the “wants” and “desire” of the learners.

Another classification of needs type was proposed by Brindley (1989) and Robinson (1991). They offered the concepts of objective needs and subjective needs. According to them, objective needs are those that are inferred from the ‘factual information’ of learners, which include their language proficiency when attending the courses, the perceived language difficulties and their demand of language in real communication situations. On the contrary, subjective needs refer to as the needs that are inferred from the ‘affective and cognitive factors’ of the learners including the learners’ personality, self-confidence, personal cognitive styles, expectations, and self-esteem during the learning process.

Another concept of “need” that is frequently cited by many scholars was suggested by Hutchinson & Waters (1987). They introduced the concept of “target needs” and “learning needs”. The former refers to the learner’s necessities, lacks and wants for functioning effectively in the target situation; while the latter, learning needs, concern about the learner’s motivation and attitudes, interests, personal reasons for learning, learning styles, resources and time available. To further understand this point, they provided a clear definition of necessities, lacks, and wants. First, ‘necessities’ are referred to as what the learner has to know in order to function effectively in the target situation. Second, ‘lacks’ refer to the gap between the existing proficiency of learners and the target proficiency of learners. Lastly, ‘wants’ are the subjective perception of learners that they want to learn from the language courses.

Learning needs are defined as what the learners need to do to master the required knowledge and skills. Moreover, it is also worth
mentioning here that the learners’ information such as their interests and background, their knowledge, skills and strategies and their motivation for learning should also be taken into consideration when identifying the learning needs (Alqunayeer & Zamir, 2016). To sum up, target needs are referred to as what the learner needs to do in the target situation (necessities, lacks and wants) and learning needs concern with what the learner needs to do in order to learn (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

This present study follows the Hutchinson & Waters’ (1987) model of Needs Analysis that covers the three subcategories of target needs (i.e. necessities, lacks and wants) and the learning needs including teaching-learning styles, appropriate or ineffective teaching and learning methods, teacher’s and learners’ role, and in-class activities.

**METHOD**

This multi-method approach which involved both quantitative and qualitative research methods attempted to explore the needs of the students at the school in learning English. It was conducted one private school in Jember, Indonesia. An English teacher and 32 students (10 males and 22 females) aged between 15 and 17 participated in this study. They were purposively selected as they were deemed representative to present in-depth data the writer sought to study. Hence, the findings of this study could not be generalized for other classes within the same site of the study.

In addition, the data were gathered from research participants via questionnaire and interview, as Basturkmen (2010), Hutchinson & Waters (1987), Long (2005), and Orr (2001) have suggested. The questionnaire distributed to the students was designed by consulting experts in the concerned fields. It was comprised of two parts which were intentionally designed anonymous to release the participants’ anxiety when they were answering the questionnaire so that their answers were much closer to the real situation. Part A of questionnaire with 7 items aimed at exploring the participants’ target
needs: necessities (item 1-4), lacks (item 5-6), and wants (item 7). Part B of questionnaire consisted of 15 items was designed to explore their perceptions on learning needs: 4 basic skills learning inputs (item 8-13), English teaching-learning procedures (item 14-19), teacher and learners’ role (item 20-21), and setting (item 22). Meanwhile, semi-structured interviews with both the English teacher and the students were conducted in their native language as suggested by Ghany & Latif (2012). Each student/teacher was interviewed individually for 15-30 minutes on average. All of the interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and analyzed in light of the research question of the study. Furthermore, the data derived from questionnaires were analyzed by using descriptive statistical methods including the frequencies and percentages for all items of the questionnaires. Meanwhile, the verbal data resulted from interviews was analyzed qualitatively. Then, the findings were analyzed, interpreted, linked up with the previous studies, and conclusions were finally drawn.

FINDINGS

The findings exemplify target needs and learning needs as the research foci.

Target Needs

Necessities

First of all, prior to the identification of the learners’ necessities, the questionnaire was designed to identify the learners’ goals (short-term and long-term goals) in learning English. Item (1) was designed to identify the learners’ short-term goal. The findings from distributed questionnaire revealed that there were 10 (31.25%) students need to learn English in order to be able to use grammar accurately. Meanwhile, the students claimed that they needed to learn English in order to be able to speak fluently were 9 (28.12%) students. When the participants were asked about their long-term goal, a large majority (71.87%) reported that they learned English in
order to continue their study while some of students (9 or 28.12% students) stated that they learned English in order to get a job.

Further, in an attempt to explore the learners’ necessities, the questionnaire covered the contents of learning materials and the topic that the students need to support their future job. According to the analysis of the students’ responses of item (3), just over 90.62% preferred English learning materials which contain expressions and responses to communicate in English fluently.

Item (4) in the questionnaire was about the topics of the English learning materials the learners’ wants. Again, instead of choosing English learning materials that take a topic related to world of work in office, a majority of students chose English learning materials that contained a topic related to daily life (twenty five or 78.12% students).

Want

The results obtained from item (7) noticeably indicated that most of the students (twenty or 62.5%) wanted their English learning materials which helped them to be fluent in English spoken and written, whereas some of students (six or 18.75%) stated that they wanted their English learning materials that help them to improve their grammar knowledge. There were only four students (12.5%) wanted their English learning materials that help them to understand meanings and use words, sentences and expressions appropriately and two of them (6.25%) wanted their English learning materials that help them to master technical terms in computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program.

Additionally, when asked for the students’ opinion on their wants regarding to the materials, the findings revealed that the materials that support their future job which contain expressions and responses to communicate in English fluently as the most important thing they wanted to have. The materials that were able to improve their grammar knowledge became the second place and some of them chose not to answer because of their reluctance to offer opinion.
Lacks

The analysis of item (5) revealed that a significant percentage (93.75%) expressed that their English proficiency was classified as elementary. Meanwhile, the analysis of item (6) that was designed to investigate the current language struggles revealed that over half of the participants (71.87% or twenty three students) confessed their weaknesses were on how to use English grammar correctly, whereas only six students (18.75%) confessed that they did not know how to use the terms or expressions in certain contexts appropriately.

In relation to the average of the students’ English proficiency level, the English teacher answered that the students’ English proficiency level is elementary as expressed in the following excerpt:

“…the average of English proficiency level is very low.”

Likewise, a significant number of students responded, “I think my English proficiency is elementary.” This means that the results from interview and questionnaire revealed the same results.

Furthermore, the results from interviews concerning the aspect of the areas of students’ language difficulties in learning English confirmed the same results as well. The interview transcription with the teacher said: “… I feel that the primary problem the students have is related to the grammar usage.” Likewise, the interview transcription with the students also indicated that a majority of the students encountered difficulties in how to use grammar correctly as they said: “… the lack of grammar.”

The next aspect is whether or not the materials in the textbook are relevant to the students’ vocational areas. The result of this question indicated that the teacher confessed that the materials in the textbook are substantially irrelevant to vocational areas, saying: “…The contents of the materials in the textbook are too general for the students. So, I frequently search the support materials from internet.” As for the students, their comments were so limited so that it was actually difficult to record their feelings in details.
Learning Needs

The questionnaire item 8 through 22 were designed to describe about the students’ learning needs dealing with the learning inputs, procedures, teacher’s and learner’s role, and setting.

Learning Inputs

In terms of listening inputs, item (8), the students preferred to have listening input in the form of dialog (71.87%) while the others preferred to have it in the form of monolog. In addition, there were seventeen students (or 53.12%) preferred that the length of the listening text should be (less or equal to 150 words); whereas fourteen students (43.75%) preferred that the length of the listening text should be medium (between 150 – 200 words).

For speaking, the students’ preferences for speaking materials told that most of them also wanted to have speaking materials in the form of dialog (59.37% students), nine (28.12%) of them preferred the speaking input in the form of a certain topic to be discussed in pairs, three (9.37%) students wanted the input for speaking in the form of information to be shared orally, and only one student (or 3.12%) wanted the input for speaking in the form of monolog.

Furthermore, the items (11&12) were designed to explore the reading input and its length. The analysis of item (11) revealed that the students’ need on the text containing the terms in computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program only expressed a percentage (15.62%). However, the majority (68.75%) reported that they chose a text with illustration picture for reading input. In addition, two (6.25%) students chose a text which has genres (descriptive, recount, procedure, and narrative) and, again, two of them chose functional text (memo, application letter, announcement, and brochure) for their reading input. Concerning with the length of the reading input (item 12), there were sixteen (50%) students reported that the length of the text should be short (150-200 words), ten (31.25%) students wanted that the length of the reading text
should be medium (200 – 250 words), and the rest wanted more than 250 words.

Writing input was examined through the questionnaire item (13). The analysis showed that the writing materials the students’ preferred were a list of words which will be used to write (65.25%). Some of them (25%) preferred to get explanation about the structure of the sentences in the text, whereas the rest chose a model or the example of text and pictures, diagrams, and graphics which will be used to write.

**English Instructional Procedures**

The next component of learning needs to be analyzed was procedure that basically refers to the activity the students need to do in accordance with the input. In so doing, the questionnaire was designed to record the four basic skills teaching-learning activities the students’ preferred. The findings could be briefly illustrated as follows: 62.5% students preferred listening to dialog and answering the questions, the types of speaking activities the students preferred were role play and practicing dialog and monolog, for reading activities they (87.5%) dominantly liked to find the meanings of vocabularies in the text and also finding the main ideas of the text while others liked reading text and answer comprehension questions, and, lastly, the writing activity they preferred was completing gaps in the sentence and arranging jumbled sentence to be a text (84.37%).

In addition to the four basic skills teaching-learning activities, the questionnaire was also designed for eliciting information related to the students’ preferences on the teaching of vocabulary and grammar. The item number (18) regarding to vocabulary teaching, a majority of students (seventeen students or 53.12%) declared that they preferred to list new words from text and looking up the meanings in the dictionary. Meanwhile, five (15.62%) students preferred matching English words with the meanings, whereas some of them preferred doing crossword.
Moreover, regarding to the grammar activities, they (56.25%) preferred correcting the mistake of sentence structure, seven of them (21.87%) preferred writing sentences as the given examples while the others liked to identify and correct the mistakes in sentences, and the others claimed that they preferred to identify the mistakes in the sentence.

**Teacher’s and Learners’ Role**

The teacher’s and learners’ role is the next component to be analyzed. In terms of teacher’s role, a significant percentage (62.5%) preferred their teacher to be a motivator and facilitator on their learning. Some of them indicated that they preferred their teacher teaching communicatively. As to the learners’ role, there were only fourteen (43.75%) preferred to be not only a good listener but also a good performer while only a small percentage (12.5%) indicated that they preferred to be responsive participants in teaching-learning activities. Some of them preferred to be passive participants.

**Setting**

Setting that involves the kinds of grouping the students will do the tasks and where they will do the tasks is the last component of learning needs in this questionnaire. The results of item (22) indicated that 46.87% (fifteen) students admitted that they preferred to do the tasks in groups, while eleven students (34.75%) agreed that they preferred to do the tasks individually, and the rest preferred to do whole class work and in pairs.

**DISCUSSION**

This need analysis study was undertaken with the aim of painting a picture of English language needs of vocational high school students using questionnaire, which consisted of parts A and B. The former comprises 7 items concerning with the learners’ target needs and the latter contains 15 items asking about their perception on learning needs), and semi-structured interview with the one
English teacher and the students. The data analysis revealed these following points of propositions.

In this study, the data regarded to the students’ target needs were collected from the analysis of questions number 1 to 7. For the aspects of short-term goals, the findings have clearly revealed that the top reasons for learning English are to be able to use grammar accurately and to speak fluently. Those mentioned findings are supported by previous studies (Al-hamlan & Baniabdelrahman, 2015; Chostelidou, 2010). Furthermore, for the long-term goal, the learners primarily express their intention to continue their study to higher education and to get a job. These findings correspond to the previous studies conducted by several scholars (Boroujeni & Fard, 2013; Liton, 2012; Nimasari, 2018; Poedjiastutie & Oliver, 2017).

For item 3, regarding to the learning materials the learners need, the findings have also revealed that the vast majority (90.62%) of students preferred English learning materials which contain expressions and responses to communicate in English fluently, similar to (Al-hamlan & Baniabdelrahman, 2015).

For item 4, 78.12% of students chose English learning materials that contained a topic related to daily life instead of English learning materials that take a topic related to world of work in office. These findings were consistent with Kim's (2013) findings reported that there were 53% students confessed that daily conversational English should be the most important content in engineering English. This implies that they are basically unaware of the importance of the ESP materials related to their program. In contrast to those findings, an earlier study by Nimasari (2018) has revealed that the participants like to have topics that are relevant to their program, informatics engineering.

Further, for Q5, 93.75% of students claimed that they suffered from low English proficiency. This result is consistent with Alastal (2012) & Ulum (2016), who clarifies that the participants do not have enough competencies in English language. Meanwhile, 71.87% of students confessed their weaknesses were on how to use English
grammar correctly (item 6). These findings of this study corroborate the findings of a number previous study that claim that the students’ most serious problem was lacking the grammar knowledge (e.g., Alqunayeer & Zamir, 2016; Moslemi, Moinzadeh, & Dabaghi, 2011; Prachanant, 2012).

On the contrary, the findings on Q6 contradict with the findings of Lu (2018) which reveals that the participants encounter difficulties in learning English due to vocabulary limitations, pronunciation problems, unfamiliar accents, and passive coping strategies. Similarly, the findings of this study also contradict with the research findings by Alastal (2012) reports that the causes of the students’ English language problems are (1) limited vocabulary (75%), (2) poor listening comprehension skill (72.8%), (3) poor reading comprehension skill (61.7%), (4) poor speaking skill (61.7%), (5) poor writing skill (55%), and (6) poor grammar (50%). Meanwhile, Chostelidou (2010) claims that writing is the most difficult skill (40.3%), oral communication (21.5%), grammar (18.2%), and listening and reading comprehension in the fourth and fifth with 15% and 3.5%.

In the light of the previous findings, what is notable is that the majority of the students tend to be unaware of the importance of ESP as they opt to choose the topics or materials usually served in General English (GE) course instead of choosing the topics or materials related to computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program.

Additionally, another interesting facts, the top-two purposes of learning English include (1) to have rich background knowledge to continue their study after graduating from vocational high school and (2) to improve their communicative skills since these skills are highly required to get a good job for their future career. These findings support the arguments of Lee (2016) that 83.3% of participants agreed that they want to learn English to be more educated and to get a good job after graduating from university (85.2%). An earlier study (Nimasari, 2018) has also reported the
similar findings that there were 67.37% students confessed that the reason why they study English is for their success future occupation. Also, this is in line with what has also been echoed by Boroujeni & Fard (2013) stating that the majority of the students (64.03%) consider higher education as their reason for studying English.

However, from what have been analyzed, the teacher only places the heavy emphasis on teaching grammar instead of applying diverse communicative activities in his classroom. It is very similar to the findings reported by Poedjiastutie & Oliver (2017) found that students’ oral communication skills are not well-developed due to the ‘focus-on-grammar’ teaching in which the students have to memorize many grammatical patterns rather than encourage them to learn how to use them in many different contexts. Consequently, the classroom shows a lack of students’ involvement because of the lower use of student-centered activities by teacher. It is therefore that, similar to Alqunayeer & Zamir (2016) and Lu (2018), they are unable to achieve the adequate proficiency levels.

Regarding to the students’ learning needs, a vast majority (71.87%) of students preferred to have listening input in the form of dialog; 53.12% of students preferred the length of the listening text should be less or equal to 150 words; 59.37% of students also wanted to have speaking materials in the form of dialog; 50% students reported that the length of the reading text should be short (150-200 words); 68.75% reported that they chose a text with illustration picture for reading input; for writing, a majority (65.25%) of students preferred a list of words which will be used to write; the writing activity they preferred was completing gaps in the sentence and arranging jumbled sentence to be a text (84.37%); 87.5% dominantly liked to find the meanings of vocabularies in the text and also finding the main ideas of the text; 62.5% students preferred listening to dialog and answering the questions; 53.12% declared that they preferred to list new words from text and looking up the meanings in the dictionary; 56.25% of students preferred correcting the mistake of sentence structure for grammar activities; 62.5% of students preferred
their teacher to be a motivator and facilitator on their learning; 43.75% of students preferred to be not only a good listener but also a good performer; and 46.87% of students believed that they preferred to do the tasks in the classroom.

From the information collected, it indicates that the majority of the students believed that using dialog for listening and speaking are more helpful, the teacher should also provide more attention on a text with illustration picture for reading input and, for writing input, a list of words to be used to write. Moreover, the teacher should also pay more attention to provide the students with the activity to complete the gaps and arrange jumbled sentence to be a text and an explanation about the structure of the sentence will lead to boredom.

For English grammar instruction (Q19), the majority of the students preferred correcting the mistake of sentence structure. This implies that grammar should be taught inductively, also known as a rule-discovery learning approach, by starting with presenting some examples of sentences and the learners understand grammatical rules from examples (Widodo, 2006) and devoting more attention on correcting the mistake of sentence structure. However, these findings contradict with the grammar instruction in two Sudanese universities, as reported by Abdalla & Mohammed (2016), that is taught deductively where the students are given the rules and they are asked to apply the rules. Likewise, with regard to English grammar instruction, the undergraduate students of computer engineering from 13 universities in Iran were also taught deductively, as reported by Fard-Kashani & Jahromi (2015).

Concerning the teacher’s role (Q20), it was found that a significant percentage preferred their teacher to be a motivator and facilitator on their learning, similar to Nimasari’s (2018) findings. Moreover, the research by Chostelidou (2010) also confirmed this phenomenon, who has suggested the teacher role as a facilitator. As a motivator, s/he should engage the students by inspiring their interest and curiosity about the topic by means of considering interesting facts in the scope of the theme and elicits their prior
knowledge by recalling their personal experience (Kudryashova, Gorbatova, Rybushkina, & Ivanova, 2015). Then they assert that as facilitator a teacher should simulate professional situations/problems and encourage the students to synthesize/create alternative solutions. In this way, s/he will be able to encourage the students’ autonomous learning in his/her classroom (Alonazi, 2017). Consequently, to support this active learning, the teacher should demonstrate respectable and unblemished character since his/her role as a motivator and facilitator.

For item no. 21, the learners’ role, the findings emerging from questionnaire reveal that the majority of the students preferred to be actively participated in classroom activities. These result accords with the findings of Al-Hamlan & Baniabdelrahman (2015) found that students like the opportunity to be actively involved in the process of lesson development in the classroom.

Concerning the aspect of settings (Q22), the findings revealed that the students have mixed perceptions toward in-class activities. Most of them agreed that they preferred to do tasks in groups instead of doing the task individually, in pairs, and whole class work. These results accord with the findings of Bedoya, Valencia, & Montoya (2015). They found that the participants feel more engaged in group activities rather than individual work. Similarly, these results are also in line with Nimasari's (2018) findings for informatics engineering students in Ponorogo, Indonesia, who opt to choose group work as well.

Reflected to the students’ English proficiency level, the teacher believed that the students’ English proficiency level is elementary. The students also confessed that they feel that their English proficiency is elementary. The findings keep in line with Bedoya, Valencia, & Montoya (2015) who affirm that the participants have very low level in English. In addition, the findings of this research corroborate the findings of Fard-Kashani & Jahromi (2015) that claim that the undergraduate students of computer and engineering suffered from low English proficiency.
The findings of the second questions of interview showed that the students face some problems with regard to grammar usage. This finding contradicts with the finding reported by Al-Hamlan & Baniabdelrahman (2015) breaking down the difficulties encountered by the students in more details caused by (1) teachers do not consider the differences between students and their knowledge, (2) students feel frustrated due to the inability to match with the class mates, and (3) that teachers do not facilitate learning process.

With regard to the students’ perceptions on the materials they want, they most mentioned were the materials that support their future job which contain expressions and responses to communicate in English fluently as the most important thing they wanted to have. This corresponds to the research findings by Alastal (2012) reporting that the majority of participants expect the materials of the language course that should be relevant to their field of study so that these materials can support them to be more competitive in the employment market.

The result of interview on the aspect of whether or not the materials in the textbook are relevant to the students’ vocational areas showed that the contents of the textbook are irrelevant to computer engineering and networks (TKJ) areas. These findings imply that there should be any revision and further development for the appropriateness of the ESP materials, as Nimasari (2018) has suggested. Interestingly, these findings are in line with the research findings by Abdalla & Mohammed (2016) finding out that the materials are not related to the vocabulary and special terms in the field of business administration. Moreover, since the materials cover few specialized business text and the topics presented are not related to the field of business administration, it is therefore that the materials are not helpful enough for the students to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.

CONCLUSION
Consistent with the research findings, there were several shortcomings in the practices of English teaching-learning at this institution. These shortcomings included: (1) a lack of opportunity to develop students’ oral communication skills due to the teaching-learning practices that are simply emphasized on teaching English grammar and reading exercises, (2) lack of quality textbooks, (3) small quantity of English learning materials that contain vocabularies and/or technical terms in the areas of computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program, and (4) the lack of students’ self-awareness of English language learning due to their perceptions toward English influenced by their surroundings. Thus, it can be interpreted that the practices of English teaching seemed not to work effectively as they failed to meet the learners’ expectations regarding to their target needs and learning needs. Not surprisingly, these conditions will hinder or prevent the development of learners’ competencies as they ought to be.

Due to the inadequacy of English taught to the students at this vocational high school, a great attention should be given to the practices of English teaching at this VHS in order to help the students improve their English skills. One of the ways is to put a great emphasis on practicing skills that is greatly needed for their future careers such as serving the learners with English learning materials that contain particular topics or technical terms related to the computer engineering and networks (TKJ) program. Also the syllabi, materials selection, and the English language instructions to be implemented in the classroom must be (re)designed carefully to accommodate all of the learners’ needs so that they will experience good academic atmosphere. It would be a valuable learning experience that will lead them to be professionals in their future job.

Considering the results of needs analysis in the above section, it is important to underline here that the findings of this study will hopefully provide insights for the teachers and increase the awareness of the importance of learners’ needs analysis as a tool for improving their leaning. It is a tool that can give teachers a clear view
regarding to the learners’ target needs (necessities, lacks, and wants) and their learning needs (learning inputs, procedures, teacher’s & learners’ role, settings). In this instance, according to the results of need analysis, they will be able to determine the better ideas about techniques as well as the teaching-learning strategies that they can adopt in their classroom.

On the whole, by acknowledging the learners’ needs the teachers or curriculum designers are able to fully aware of their learners’ needs, shortcomings and desires so that they can bridge the gap between their existing proficiency and target proficiency.
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