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**Introduction**

Indonesia has several types of educational institution either formal or non-formal with various backgrounds. *Pesantren*, as one type of Islamic educational institution, is the indigenous educational system that has been rooted in long-standing Hindu-Islamic traditions (Tahir, 2014) and can be traced back to the 18th century and further (Srimulyani, 2007). Not only as the oldest-existing Islamic education institution to teach Islamic values, *pesantren* has also become the symbols of authenticity of Indonesia (Zakaria, 2010); a sub-culture of Indonesian community particularly for Javanese people (Syafe’i, 2017). Despite the fact that Nilan (2009) described Indonesian *pesantren* are characteristically poor and the students live under strict conditions, they have been successful to be established Islamic educational institution (Zakaria, 2010).

The term ‘*pesantren*’ is derived from the word ‘*santri*’ (*pesantren* student), so *pesantren* refers to a place for *santri* to learn Qur’an; furthermore, another term ‘*pondok pesantren*’ is also well-known in which the word ‘*pondok*’ was from Arabic word ‘*funduk*’ that means dormitory so that it is also called ‘*pondok pesantren*’ (Srimulyani, 2007). The combination of term *pondok pesantren, pondok* or *pesantren* then refers to similar meaning; an Islamic educational institution and centres to function for intensive study of religious knowledge, Islamic traditions and to prepare potential Islamic scholar (Zakaria, 2010) with a boarding school system (Srimulyani, 2007).

Based on the learning process and subjects, *pesantren* can commonly be divided into two gropus: traditional Islamic boarding school (*pondok pesantren Salafiyah*) and modern Islamic boarding school (*pondok pesantren modern/khalafi*) (Al-Baekani & Pahlevi, 2018; Nilan, 2009). Besides, a *pesantren* generally contains *pondok* (boarding style facility) and a *madrasah* (day school) in which students spend two-third of day to study (Nilan, 2009). At first, *pesantren* was built for boys after completing their primary education, but in the early 20th century *pesantren* for girls (*pesantren putri*) started to serve in the line with the social changes (Srimulyani, 2007). It was around 14.000 *pesantren* in Indonesia in 2006 (Pohl, 2006). Moreover, in 2008, Ministry of Religious Affair reported that there was more than 21.000 *pesantren* with 4 million students (Zakaria, 2010). Then the number is increasing to be 27.000 *pesantren* schools throughout Indonesia in 2011 (Amri, Tahir, & Ahmad, 2017).

In traditional *pesantren*, *santri*’s daily learning activities are more focused on Qur’anic learning and session on studying *kitab kuning* (Islamic classical textbook) (Srimulyani, 2007). Al-Baekani & Pahlevi (2018) illustrated examples of the activities as *sorogan* and *bandungan*. The former refers to one-to-one teaching system which *kyai* (spiritual leader in pesantren) or *ustadz* (teacher or instructor) teaches, guides and assesses the quality of *santri*’s knowledge and recitation on Qur’an and/or Islamic books; meanwhile, the latter uses dictation, translation and discussion techniques while the students taking notes. On the other hand, modern *pesantren* still have managed a classic teaching approach after *madrasah* school hours (Nilan, 2009); while at the same time, they have modified their learning system by integrating two sides of knowledge: religious and academic. As a consequence, subjects such as math, English language, and economics and others are also taught in *pesantren* (Zakaria, 2010). Even Zuhairini et. Al (1986 cited by Nilan, 2009) stated that the *madrasa*h curriculum covers 30% religious subject and 70% secular study. For example, the foremost modern teaching system is *Pondok Pesantren Modern Gontor*, established in 1926 by Kyai Ahmad Sahal and his brothers, which offers subjects of religious sciences, general studies, and foreign language, such as Arabic and English (Solichin, 2018)

Concerning to the language use in *pesantren*, at least four languages are exposed and spoken, such as Indonesian language, Arabic, English and local languages (Tahir, 2014). Each language has its function in *pesantren* environment. In traditional *pesantren*, Arabic is more preferable to speak, but both Arabic and English are treated and used equally in modern *pesantern* (Wardani, Zein, & Saputra, 2019). In most cases nowadays, *santri* are usually acquired and assigned to speak Arabic and English as their daily basis (Wekke & Hamid, 2013) due to maintaining Islamic tradition and responding modernization as well as creating new branding and image of *pesantren* among modern society (Mujab & Yulia, 2018). Meanwhile, designing and managing language course in context-specific, such as *pesantren*, requires systematic procedures with careful consideration.

In developing language course program, the process involves making connection between the theories and principles of language learning and practice of designing lesson because it is essential to consider why a course is being taught and what the learners need to get from it (Nation & Macalister, 2010). As a result, an investigation to discover what the learner needs when learning language seems reasonable, as stated by Richards (2001) that ‘’a sound educational program should be based on analysis of learners’ needs”. A need analysis has to be an initial stage on curriculum or course design.

 Need analysis (NA), also called need assessment, refers to a systematic and ongoing process of gathering information about needs and preferences of the learners, interpreting it, and making decisions to designing a course program; then, evaluating the decisions (Graves, 2000). To be more detail, Brown (1995 cited by (Liu, Chang, Yang, & Sun, 2011) wrote that NA is as “the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that influence the learning and teaching situation”. Particularity in setting and context are emphasized since each language learning situation has specific characteristics and needs. Beside, Nation & Macalister (2010) concluded that NA determines what the learners know already and what they need to know to make sure that the course contain relevant and useful contents to learn. In a very simple word, NA is a set of procedures to collect information about learners’ need (Richards, 2001).

Concerning to needs, the concepts of needs bring various focuses. Hutchinson & Waters (1991) categorized needs into two: target needs and learning needs. The former refers to what the learners to do in the target situation; in contrast, the latter can be defined as what the learners need to in order to learn (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Moreover, target needs can be divided into three concepts, namely necessities, lacks, and wants.

**Table 1.** Types of Needs (Nation & Macalister, 2010)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Types of Needs | Descriptions and Related Questions | Tools |
| Necessities | Required knowledge.The demands of the target task.What is necessary in the learners’ use the language?  | Conducting interviewLearners’ documents such as assignment |
| Lacks | Present knowledge.Where learners are at present?What do the learners lack? | Looking at learners’ assignment task.Interviewing learners.Giving tests.Teachers using a think-aloud protocol |
| Wants | Subjective needs. Learners have their own views about what they think is useful for them.What do the learners wish to learn? | An interview or questionnaire |

The results of need analysis must help in designing language course. for example, the question like ‘where will the language be used’ can determine course objectives/goals, content materials, skill, and topics; then, the product of NA is a realistic list of language, or skill items considering the present proficiency, future needs and wants of the learners (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Need analysis should consider the aspects of reliability, validity and practicality. Reliable need analysis covers well-thought and standardized tools, and validity looks at what is relevant and significant to collect; while practical need analysis should be affordable and accessible for all parties (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Related to what time course designer conducts need analysis, NA can be organized before the course, at the initial stages of the course, and during the course (Graves, 2000; Nation & Macalister, 2010).

An extensive research and studies have showed that need analysis has been widely applied in designing language course in various language learning situations and purposes. For example, Bosher & Smalkoski (2002) conducted a need analysis in ﻿the Minneapolis campus of the College of St. Catherine before developing ﻿course *Speaking and Listening in a Health-Care Setting* for degree nursing program. In 2003, needs analysis for academic legal English courses was organized by Deutch (2003). In addition, ﻿a detailed description of the needs analysis (NA) stage in the development of a set of English language intensive courses at a large Japanese industrial firm was presented by Cowling (2007). Furthermore, Liu et al., (2011) ﻿has explored English as a foreign language (EFL) college students’ needs in English for General Purposes (EGP) and English for Specific/Academic Purposes (ESP/EAP) courses in Taiwan. For Indonesian contexts, the needs analysis dealt with tourism topics and analyzing needs on EFL writing class for higher education levels have been organized by Dirgeyasa & Ansari (2015) and Sundari, Febriyanti, and Saragih (2016) respectively.

Considering the abovementioned, *pesantren* offers specific context and language use particularly for English. Among other languages, according to all *pesantren* stakeholders, English seems to be a very important subject to learn (Fakhruddin & Megawati, 2018). However, the language course program should be well-organized based on the learners’ particular needs in particular situation. Therefore, this present research aims at analyzing and describing the needs of students in Pesantren Daar El-Huda located at Tangerang, Banten Province. It was conducted to collecting information about the learning and learners’ need before developing and running an English course program to improve the students’ English proficiency.

Method

The purpose of this study was to figure out the learner’s needs of English language teaching and learning at Pondok Pesantren Modern Daar El-Huda. This stage of need analysis was part of research and developing in designing an English language course program at this *pesantren*. The authors selected a framework of course development proposed by Kathleen Graves (2000) since it presents comprehensive and systematic stages in the process of developing a course program. The framework is in a form of a flow chart which involves eight elements in designing course (see Figure 1). The course designers are allowed to begin the process anywhere in the framework as long as it makes sense to them. For this present study, the researchers decided to take assessing needs as the initial stage of the overall language course program in *pesantren*. In conducting the need analysis, the authors carried out descriptive qualitative research approach.



Figure 1. A Framework of Course Development Process (Graves, 2000)

Pondok Pesantren Modern Daar El-Huda is a modern pesantren located in Jalan Parigi, Suka Bakti, Curug, Tangerang, Banten Province. It serves six levels of secondary schools (Class 1- 6). *Tsnawiyah* for class 1 to 3 is similar to SMP schools, and class 4 to 6 is called *Aliyah* as same as SMA schools. Having been firstly established in 2007, this *pesantre*n both *tsanawiyah* and *aliyah* has adopted full boarding system in which *santri* live 24 hours in *pesantren* to getting Islamic knowledge and studying *Salaf* books as well as practicing Islamic tradition and other life-skills. Besides, this *pesantren* has integrated and combined dual curriculum system (religious subjects and general subjects) and dual languages (Arabic and English). This year, more than 1000 *santri* has been registered and attended their school and education at Pesantren Daar El-Huda with not less than seventy *ustadz* (teachers) who dedicate their time and services to educate them.

For this current research, students, teachers, and the head of language center, as the stakeholders of this institution, were asked to be participants. To be more specific, twenty-eight *santri*-students from *Aliyah* aged between 15-19 years old were recruited to gain information about their needs in learning English in *pesantren*. Moreover, five English language teachers (3 males and 2 females aged between 21-39 years old) were requested to fill the questionnaire, and one teacher (47 years old and hold a master degree in English education) as the head of language center was interviewed to gather information about needs, environment, and situation of English teaching and learning in *pesantren*. The collection of the data was scheduled during February to April 2020 including interview. Due to the Covid-19 outbreak along Jakarta and Banten Provinces where the researchers live and *pesantren* locates, people in those provinces were told to stay at home. Therefore, the interview was then undergone by email and voice messages.

To collecting information as the research data, questionnaires either open-ended or closed-ended were made to gather information about what learners need in learning English. To avoid misunderstanding, the questionnaires were delivered in Indonesian language and distributed using Google Form survey administration. The process of need analysis consisted of six steps as initiated by Graves (2000), as seen on Figure 2. The information was outlined based on two dimensions: present (what is being taught) and future (what needs to be taught, why, and how it is being taught). The information was then listed into ten types as recommended by Graves (2000): 1) who the learners are, 2) the learners’ level of language proficiency, 3) the learners’ level of intercultural competence, 4) their interests, 5) their learning preferences, 6) their attitudes, 7) the learners’ goals and expectations, 8) the target contexts, 9) types of communication skills they will need and perform, 10) language modalities they will use. Moreover, questionnaires were developed either open-ended or closed-ended.

 

**Figure 2**. The Needs Assessment Cycle (Graves, 2000)

In analyzing the gathered data, the authors follow descriptive qualitative research framework. The steps of qualitative data analysis, as proposed by Creswell (2012), are 1) preparing and organizing the data for analysis, 2) exploring and coding the data, 3) coding to build the themes, 4) representing and reporting the findings, 5) interpreting the findings, and 6) validating the accuracy of the findings. In building the themes, the authors have modified the types of information of needs by Graves (2000) based on the data found. On the other hand, to validate the accuracy and credibility of the research, multiple sources of data (students and teachers) were used, and member-checking was also conducted to determine the trustworthiness of this study by distributing the findings to the head of the language center, as one of the participants, to check the accuracy and representation.

**Findings and Discussion**

This present study was an initial stage in developing language course program in Pondok Pesantren Daar El-Huda, Curug Tangerang, Banten Province. This stage is called need analysis. Through questionnaire and interview distributed to the students and teachers, some information about the needs of English teaching and learning have been gathered. The data were divided and presented into two dimensions: present and future. The present dimension consisted of current English learning in *pesantren*, perceptions about students’ English proficiency, perception about learning English, and the constraints in teaching and learning English. On future dimension, it involves purposes and objectives of learning English, preferences of teaching methods, recommended topics, and future necessity of learning English.

1. **Current English learning in *pesantren***

From interview, it was revealed that learning English in *pesantren* has been managed through formal and informal activities. English subject has become one of subjects to teach at day school as mandated in national education curriculum.

*… Sehingga materi pondok dan materi umum 50%-50% dijadikan keseimbangan pada materi pembelajaran anak-anak pesantren.* (… Therefore, pondok (religious) subjects and general subject 50%-50% to be balance teaching materials for students in pesantren) (Q16-17).

*Di samping bahasa Arab, mereka juga mendapatkan bahasa Inggris*. (Besides Arabic, they [the students] also learn English (Q39).

In addition to be general subject in school curriculum, English activities was also applied for outside the classroom, such as speech competition, English speaking evening session, and TOEFL preparation and testing program in collaboration with international language center, LBI Universitas Indonesia. These programs were specified for class 5 and 6.

*Untuk kelas 5, ada spesifikasi untuk speaking English di sore hari kemudian kelas 6 ada TOEFL preparation yang nanti diujikan di universitas Indonesia di Lembaga bahasa Internasional Universitas Indonesia*. (for class 5, there is a specification for speaking English in the evening; moreover, in class 6, it is TOEFL preparation that will be tested in Universitas Indonesia at international language centre) (Q35-37).

1. **Perceptions on Students’ English Proficiency and Learning English**

At first, both students and teachers were asked about the students’ English proficiency to assess their ability. It covers language skills and elements. Teachers thought that students’ listening and speaking, with 2.6, were the lowest level of all. On the other hand, the students perceived that grammar knowledge and mastery as their weakest side. However, either teachers or students agreed that students’ reading skill and writing skill were seemingly good and their highest potential skills (see Figure 3).

 Figure 3. Perceptions on Student's English Proficiency

Poor: 1 Fair: 2 Good: 3 Very good: 4 Excellent: 5

Dealt with the perceptions about learning English and the learners, the majority of the teachers agreed that English is apparently easy to learn and teach and gives positive effect for students. Moreover, the teachers mostly agreed that their students enjoy learning English, and they are typically confident learners. However, students’ motivation reached the lowest scores (3.0) compared to all aspects.

Table 2. Perception on Learning English

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Teachers | Statements | Students |
| 3.2 | English is easy to learn and acquire | 3.4 |
| 3.2 | Learning English gives positive effect for me | 3.3 |
| 3.2 | I (student) love learning English | 3.1 |
| 3.2 | I (students) speak English with confidence | 3.1 |
| 3.0 | I (students) have high motivation to learn English | 3.2 |
| 3.2 | English is easy to teach | - |

Strongly disagree: 1 Disagree: 2 Agree: 3 Strongly agree: 4

Similar to the relatively positive agreement from teachers, students also perceived that English is easy to learn, and they love learning it. They thought learning English will benefit them. However, among the students, confidence and enjoyment in learning English reached the lowest scores on average (3.1), then followed by motivation to learn (3.2).

1. **The Constraints in Teaching and Learning English**

Related to the difficulty and constraints in teaching and learning English, teachers thought that English grammar and limited learning sources were the most difficult aspects they faced during teaching English. Then students’ motivation and teaching methods were gained 40% as another problems in teaching. Concerning to students’ motivation to learn, the same insight was revealed on interview. The teacher said that *“bahasa Arab itu dominan sekali dikalangan santri*” (Arabic is very dominant among students) (Q75). It means that Arabic is more preferable than English among students in *pesantren*.

Almost similar to their teachers, the students perceived that English grammar (42.9%) become the highest constraint they find in learning English. The other constraints gained 17.9% were motivation, materials, and learning facility.

Figure 4. Constraints in Teaching and Learning English

Furthermore, other constraints were considered less inhibit in English teaching and learning for both teachers and students, such as teachers’ competence and school environment. However, from the interview, it was revealed that the number of English teachers became an issue.

1. **Purposes and Objectives in Learning English**

On the questionnaire, students and teachers were asked the students’ purposes and objectives in learning English. it was revealed that both convincingly agree that learning English is to communicate with schoolmates. This item reached the highest score on both sides, students and teachers; 3.4 and 3.0 respectively. The interview report brought the similar result. The head of language center in pesantren stated that *‘Target kita bukan hanya mereka mampu mengerjakan soal UAN. Tapi target kita adalah bagaimana anak-anak mampu berkomunikasi dalam dua bahasa, terutama dalam hal ini adalah bahasa Inggris.”* (our target is not only enabling the student to succeed in national examination, but also facilitating them to be able to communicate in dual languages, particularly English in this case) (Q-90-92).

Table 3. Purposes and Objectives of Learning English

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Teachers | Statements | Students |
| 2.4 | Learning English to get a good score | 2.9 |
| 2.0 | Learning English to get higher grade  | 2.7 |
| 2.2 | Learning English to join a competition  | 2.7 |
| 1.8 | Learning English to pass the national examination | 2.9 |
| 2.8 | Learning English to continue study | 3.3 |
| 3.0 | Learning English to speak and communicate to others from many countries | 3.3 |
| 2.6 | Learning English to get higher score at TOEFL/TOEIC/IELTS tests | 3.0 |
| 2.8 | Learning English to read English books/films/novels | 3.3 |
| 3.0 | Learning English to communicate with schoolmates | 3.4 |

Strongly disagree: 1 Disagree: 2 Agree: 3 Strongly agree: 4

Other objectives that gained relatively high scores were ‘learning English to speak and communicate to others from many countries’ and ‘learning English to continue study’ and ‘learning English to read English books/films/novel’. These objectives that motivated students to learn English show that they need English for real life purposes and daily communication. On the other hand, the objectives, such as getting good score, winning competition, passing national examination were less preferable and selected.

1. **Preferences of Teaching Methods and Topics**

Concerning to effectiveness of teaching methods and recommended topics for English course, both students and teachers were also asked to give their preferences. Either teachers or students brought similar agreement that making dialogue and conversation as the most effective and preferable method in English course, with score 3.2 and 3.0 respectively.

Figure 5. Preferences of Teaching Methods

Not effective at all: 1 less effective: 2 effective: 3 very effective: 4

Moreover, for students, other methods were groupwork, writing paragraph, and reading texts. On the other side, the teachers thought that presentation, reading texts, and group discussion were more effective for teaching English. Meanwhile, individual work, debate and storytelling were considered less effective for them.

**Figure 6**. Recommended Topics for Learning

Besides the teaching methods, students and teachers were asked to give their suggestion dealt with content materials or topics for English course. Teachers recommended topics about education, science and technology, and Indonesian cultures. On the other hand, the topics related to family life, school life, and education were more preferable among students.

1. **The Future Necessity in Teaching and Learning English**

Both participants were asked to several items dealt with their future needs in teaching and learning English. According to the teachers, all items listed were important and necessary. However, they were expecting English language course program that can implement full English teaching system as the most necessary.

**Table 4.** The Future Necessity in Teaching and Learning English

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Teachers | Statements | Students |
| 3.8 | Grammar mastery | 3.3 |
| 3.6 | Vocabulary mastery | 3.4 |
| 3.6 | Reading Comprehension | 3.1 |
| 3.8 | Writing various types of genre | 3.3 |
| 3.8 | Listening various English learning sources | 3.3 |
| 3.8 | Speaking and communicating in English | 3.2 |
| 3.6 | Appropriate textbooks/materials | 3.1 |
| 3.6 | Supportive learning environment | 3.2 |
| 3.8 | Engaging teaching methods | 3.1 |
| 3.8 | Challenging learning activity | 3.1 |
| 3.8 | Attractive outing language program | 3.1 |
| 3.8 | Good learning facilities | 3.2 |
| 3.8 | Technology to enhance language learning  | 3.0 |
| 4.0 | Full English teaching system | 3.3 |
| 3.6 | Longer duration of learning session | 3.0 |

Not necessary at all: 1 less necessary: 2 necessary: 3 very necessary: 4

on the students’ point of views, they thought that all items mentioned were important and necessary. Then, vocabulary mastery became the most important item in learning English. Other necessary items were grammar mastery, writing genre, listening English sources, and full English teaching system.

All in all, English teaching and learning program in Pondok Pesantren Daar El-Huda has been managed either formal learning in classroom as mandated by school curriculum or informal activities outside. However, to achieve wider purposes and global objectives in learning English, both teachers and students handle some constraints, such as motivation, method, learning sources, and grammar difficulty. They are looking for English course that enabling them to communicate language with the closest community, such as schoolmates. Moreover, they are expecting to make conversation and dialogues to share the nearest and latest topics related to family life, school life, education, science and technology on their surroundings. At last, they are waiting English program that elevates their vocabulary so that the students can speak only English using real language and expressions for everyday needs, but, at the same time, they also speak Arabic for daily communication.

Language course design is a grounded process that develop a course for specific students within a specific context (Graves, 2000). Along with Kumaravadivelu's idea (2006) about pedagogy of particularity, it emphasizes lived-experiences between the students and teachers when teaching and learning language. In short, language pedagogy should embrace that a particular group of teachers teaching particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals in particular institutional context located in particular sociocultural environment. English teaching and learning in *pesantren* show uniqueness with its teaching system and curriculum which adopt both Islamic and general subjects as well as practicing Islamic traditions.

At *pesantren*, language competition in school environment and communication is inevitable and natural. The students speak several languages; the local language, national language, and foreign languages (Tahir, 2014). English should compete with not only local and national languages but another foreign language, Arabic. The fact that Arabic is more preferable among the students at *pesantren* supports the study by Wardani et al., (2019) and presumably indicates some insights. Being more proficient speakers in Arabic may become more prominent and reputable for students at *pesantren*. This could be a challenge to English course designer to set up content materials, learning activity and language expressions that embrace Islamic values and traditions.

Beside the above-mentioned, like common problems found in many places, several aspects, such as grammar, learning sources, method and motivation, come to be barriers and challenging for teachers in managing their language program. Motivation has been consistently found to be positively correlate with successful learning outcome at various contexts and level of second language development (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). However, it stands to be clear what kind of motivation leads the students to be successful in learning language and what situation can occur. As depicted by Lamb, (2002), his study shows that students may have a strong motivation, yet not all of them made progress in language learning. At this current study, students are motivated more to be able to communicate with others in school environment. This result is quite different to the study by Yulia (2013) in Yogyakarta Province. Her study revealed that national examination was usually to be a driving force for the students to learn English. Furthermore, difficulty in English grammar has become an issue mostly for foreign language contexts. The similar results have been proven on the research by Hadijah (2014) and Rahmatunisa (2014). For speaking skill and writing skill, grammatical structures come at the first and the highest place as a cause of learning English difficulty.

This current study reveals that, according to the teachers and students, English language course should apply full English system. The policy of only English gains many supporters. Philipson (in Auerbach, 2016) stated that English will be best taught in monolingual system; the more English, the better the result. Berlitz, who initiated Berlitz’ Direct Method, highly recommended the teachers to use L2 only in language classroom (Hariri, 2015). The monolingual approach of second language teaching (English) also gains support from Krashen (1981 cited by Alshehri, 2017) who stated that the second language learning follow the same route as acquiring the mother tongue so that the first language should be avoided. However, the use of only English in language classes and schools in Indonesia may face impediment due to some factors. In fact, English is not everyday language among Indonesian people in general, and the quality of English language teachers is presumably insufficient to facilitate full English system; they are not active users of English (Lie, 2007). As a consequence, these learning and teaching situations should be carefully considered in designing language program.

In the context of learning English in *pesantren* within its uniqueness and characteristics, the adoption of the principles of English as international language, called as lingua franca approach by Kirkpatrick (2014), seem sensible and rational. It considers the native speaker of English and culture is not the linguistic and cultural target. The goal is to enable the students to use English successfully in lingua franca contexts so they will naturally sound like multilinguals. Contents and topics should be relevant to regional and local cultures to build intercultural competence as well as include listening materials to familiarize them with the speech styles and pronunciation of their fellow multilingual users in Asia (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Bearing these principles in mind, English course can be designed to serve entire culture, tradition, practices and sources including Islamic values and local traditions at *pesantren*.

The process of need analysis results in a set of course objectives and goal and a list of content materials, skill and topics (Nation & Macalister, 2010). As a result, the English course program aims at enabling the students to communicate in English to share their feelings, knowledge, opinions, and thoughts using language discourse for *pesantren* environment with speaking as the highest portion. The contents and topics can be related to Islamic practices and traditions in Indonesia and other regions, prominent Islamic scholars in world history and other latest issues on Islamic world. Language communicative functions that use for everyday communication, such as expressing wishes, giving/asking fact and information, and writing caption, should be gradually presented and used in various communicative activities.

The data from need analysis have been presented and interpreted. It shows that English language course is necessary, and its existence is expecting to enhance students’ interest and motivation to speak and use English among the use of Arabic in *pesantren*. Need analysis is the initial steps in course design. Therefore, next stages have to be taken including formulating goal/objectives, developing materials, and designing assessment plan, as also called syllabus design.
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