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Abstract
English has established itself as a global lingua franca. The global growth in the usage of English has resulted in many reforms within educational institutions. The study aims to ascertain and examine English needs for information technology purposes among professionals and learners on a wide scale. A quantitative descriptive approach with a survey research design was employed in the study, and it applied to the Cross-Sectional survey design. Mailed questionnaires were collected from 243 students’ and 23 professionals. According to the questionnaires, the result found that professional purposes for learning English are to complete written-project reports or papers, while students must communicate with the global community. The English learning outcome implied different aims. The professionals want to complete language instructions for information technology processing, but students expect information access to the products. Professional speaking abilities are concerned with asking clarifications in the group or personal meetings, yet students concern more in taking and receiving the phone calls. In the same manner as writing, professionals and students have the same expectation that is to produce formal reports in academic or professional situations. Both participants perceive the responses by reading ability concerned to the summarizing detail information. This study affirmed an interrelation between the English standing in professional IT and students’ IT positions in communication experiences in their present circumstances.
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1. INTRODUCTION
English language networking has developed into an indispensable tool for communication worldwide. Since English is a global lingua franca, it has spread across nations and connected people of disparate origin languages. English is taught as a foreign language to many citizens in Indonesia. The objectives include communicating with the global community, investing in the global economy, and using global intelligence. Tsou (2015) noted that the relevance of English proficiency is well-understood, and the actual concept more often begins as a foreign language. English retains its position as an international language in Indonesia. This condition suggests that the language would not substitute for second language status in university or professional settings. However, Wilches et al. (2018) clarified that it became critical to acquire English to manage basic human competence as a means of contact with foreign citizens. In typical situations, English may arise as a social skill because the social role associated with the actual language learning phase focuses on acquiring linguistics in a proper location.
A Language policy could integrate Indonesia’s profoundly diverse and multilingual culture (Renandya et al., 2018). The information technology (IT) industry has been expanding excessively in the centre of Indonesia’s strategic economic growth. Indonesia, the ASEAN community’s most populated region, attracts many leading IT sectors to grow. English instruction programs in higher education evolved from functional English to applicative language. Atmowardoyo et al. (2020) determined that English developed due to the connectivity problems that arise when foreigners and Indonesians communicate intensively. The ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) was an instrumental in convincing and inviting foreigners to visit the nation. Indonesian university students often encountered difficulties in their English studies, except those who participated in comprehensive English programs and engaged in foreign study programs. English lecturers must be aware of the different approaches, processes, and practices used to teach English as a second or foreign language. According to Songbatumis (2017), the potential difficulties faced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students were caused by the constraint of community use and the involvement of a small number of English speakers in the community. Muslem et al. (2018) discovered that the most common disadvantage was a lack of opportunities to learn English outside of the traditional curriculum due to the community’s limited engagement with English. This community could facilitate the need to sustain the language pedagogy phase of EFL students. Additionally, Abrar et al. (2018) stated that the narrow strategy to learn English contributed to another impediment to its language learning development.

The analysis of identifying needs and language goals was intrinsically linked. According to Rossikhina et al. (2019), English Specific Purposes (ESP) is a term that refers to a phenomenon that developed from a principle that every language teaching and learning curriculum should be adjusted to the information and communication implementation roles of the different societies of learners. According to Anthony (2018), ESP is a language education curriculum in which the essential criteria of qualified students determine the scope and goals of the program. ESP assists students to develop communication abilities that can be used in a range of instructional and systematic relationships. Throughout many ESP domains, the needs analysis study has been generally regarded as the foundation of the ESP growth method, demonstrated an exceptional understanding of needs analysis (Grudeva and Golovanova, 2015). Additionally, Hoa (2016) asserted that within the English sphere, providing a highlight requires beneficial knowledge that can be derived from teaching and learning.

A Language Need Analysis (LNA) is a critical component of the planning process for foreign language education (Dirgeyasa, 2018). It aids comprehension and validation of legitimate questions. Pereira and de Oliveira (2015) accomplish it by endorsing the concept of needs analysis, which is identified as a study that demonstrated how existing competence and professionals influence conceptual development focusing on communication needs in language coursework. Other academics, like Anwar and Arifani (2016), concurred with this view. They emphasized that LNA motivated educators and practitioners to create much more affordable and accessible degree programs. This circumstance indicates that LNA is a feasible process, as participants are excellent sources of knowledge regarding either the language course content or the study field. The students benefit from this appraisal since curricula can be adjusted to their specific needs. This circumstance was connected to Hoffman and Zollman’s (2016) suggestion that systems should be developed to meet learners. As a result, it became essential to recognize the centrality of students in all facets of language learning. Farrell and Jacobs (2020) advocated for including learners in decision-making stages, claiming that a learner-centered strategy requires an awareness of their desires, goals, ambitions, and concerns.
In defining the English communication needs of a specific context, domain experts’ input is precious. As a result, Bolander and Sultana (2019) concluded that identifying what is implied by needs has been the priority when developing a needs analysis report. The foundational distinction between target needs (the skills needed to work in the target situation) and learning needs (the path to adhering abilities) was established by Mahboob and Lin (2016). The above classification is elaborated by McClain et al. (2021) into a conceptual framework of the needs model that involves the three main components. TSA (Target Situations Analysis) represented initiatives and activities wherein the participants used the target language. Learning Situation Analysis (LSA) came up with the dependent variable that could impact their performance (relevant educational experiences, motivational factors for attending the courses, and preconceptions). Fillmore and Snow (2018) explained that the Present Situation Analysis (PSA) identifies the participants’ achievements and vulnerabilities with accessing the foreign language, including the level of complexity they experience completing the needed functions in the chosen language.

Various studies have been conducted from Indonesian EFL viewpoints, focused on research into students’ needs. In each of these studies, the survey and questionnaire remained an important analysis instrument. Aeni et al. (2018) conducted a study on the educational requirements of maritime learners. According to the results, maritime language students from different universities regarded reading comprehension as a necessary skill. Additionally, writing, conversing, and speaking were listed as critical skills. They also shared dissatisfaction with the course’s content, saying that it fell short of their standards. Therefore, they demanded revisions and updates to the current ESP programs. Mohammadzadeh et al. (2015) reviewed and determined the foreign language qualifications for Master students in different fields of banking. The results reflected the public’s dissatisfaction. Ibrahim (2016) argued that EFL groups could be revised to better suit their technical and analytical circumstances. The survey and research results from Darmuki et al. (2015) showed the critical nature of integrating all necessary components of grammar, semantics, and pragmatics into this EFL program’s classroom.

Need analysis became central to develop structuralized curriculum in the education institution. This study has become an important aspect of English language teaching in the university context. Nonetheless, there is less contribution to the wider perspective among learners and professional workers. Most studies have exposed and investigated the English lecturers’ expectations without comparing the wider English language learners (Syakur et al., 2020; Asrifan et al., 2020). This paper reports on the English language learning feedback and needs from both learners and professionals in the information technology field. Consequently, all these core elements were accepted as a foundation for developing the research questions and instruments for the current analysis. As a consideration, the research would focus on 1) What language skills do professionals and students need in English for Specific Purposes (ESP)? 2) What are the professionals and students’ requirements for the English for Information Technology course?

2. METHOD
The study developed a qualitative case study approach to identify and understand the overall eligibility conditions of both professionals and students in information technology. It focuses on a specific analysis that employs probability-based sampling techniques and employs applicable sampling. The study investigated both professionals’ and learners’ views on the significance of English language skills. It applied a cross-sectional survey design that the collecting data happened only one time. This type of survey design accommodates a better perspective to the current opinions, expectations, assumptions, or experiences.
The research was conducted at Universitas Budi Luhur, Indonesia primarily for the Bachelor of Science in Information Technology program. A total of 243 undergraduate Information Technology students participated in the study. They were university students in their second and third year of study. Alumni as professionals in the IT sector (N: 34) from an affiliated institution were chosen for the research to gain a deeper understanding. They had at least one year of experience in the IT industry. The mailed questioner was utilized to collect data. The process consists of developing a questionnaire, addressing it out to the sample of the population, applying repeated approaches to the sample to achieve a significant response rate, reviewing for possible bias in feedbacks, and interpreting the data. Because of the short period of data collection time, the researcher managed the investigation and demonstrated the participants’ availability. The participants received convenience sampling. A Google Form application survey was utilized, and this internet-based survey instrument was selected due to its accessibility to both participants and researcher. All the responses are maintained online. Furthermore, the needs analysis questionnaire was employed using the questionnaire developed by Andi and Arafah (2017). The questionnaire consisted of thirty-seven items with five parts: the participants’ demographical data, participants’ perspective of learning English purposes, their feedback of English learning courses, and the participants’ needs in four language aspect capabilities. 49 questionnaire elements were described to language learning background and four skills, so it should be elected according to professional and students’ needs (Strongly Disagree =1; disagree=2; agree=3; and strongly agree=4). The content validity and reliability of the questionnaire were checked by Malicka et al. (2019), and high Cronbach’s Alpha results (0.805) were reported. All the questionnaires were translated to the Indonesian version. The internal coherence of the questionnaire was examined to be 0.91, which is acknowledged as acceptable with high reliability.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The following tables of general findings reflected the IT professionals’ and students’ needs for communicative competence in four English skills (speaking, writing, listening, and reading). Based on the results of the survey, the numerical values were as follows: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), and strongly agree (4). The survey items were classified and organized into categories to determine and investigate English language needs from a broad perspective, both professionally and academically. The table metrics are oriented towards the viewpoint on the intent of English language learning. According to the results in the table 1, professionals have the relevant range of S4’ mean with an 8.25 ranking. Students were instructed to choose an object from S1 60.75 with the same mean score. Professionals choose the lowest mean S5 ranking, but S6 has the lowest student range. When the number of participants grew, both practitioners and students decided that the most accurate descriptions of their English learning preferences and interactions could be used. Most of the objects on the table has the same proportion. It is greater than the Standard Deviation (SD), implying that the participants’ understanding of the proper distribution of each object is correct. On the contrary, the Nalliveettil and Alenazi (2016) research found that informatics students want to acquire English for academic purposes and assist later in their careers, particularly computer-related ones. Furthermore, the results indicate that they desire to speak English to encourage their passion for browsing the internet.
The findings reveal that both IT professionals and students had different perspectives on acquiring English proficiency for global communication capabilities. The condition is comparable with what Balaei and Ahour (2018) administered on students’ needs in Indonesia’s multi-complexity purpose. They discovered that the communicative skill at the class and office were recognized to be completely essential capabilities to acquire. The S1 item reflected the technical and educational experiences of the respondents. The highly agreed upon scale hit 47% (16) of expert participants but increased to 51% (123) of pupils. In contrast, firmly disagree captured 6% (2) and increased to 11% (26). These principles were understood to suggest that the technical and students’ perspectives were identical. Nonetheless, practitioners perceived the S4 item to be extended by 47% (33), while students perceived the S3 item to be extended by 49% (222). These parameters considered various views on the practicality of English in the workplace and interest in real college life. The specialist picked the lowest percentage, 6% (2), and expressed disagreement with S1, S2, and S7. Students identified S2, S3, and S4 as 4% (9.10 and 14). It is concluded that both practitioners and students want English learning to be more practical, and there is little evidence that standard English learning is solely concerned with systematic structuring sentences.

On the other hand, in Table 2, the primary English learning result was revealed, and both professionals and students are required to achieve proficiency in practicing English. Professionals focused and chose the highest finding over the S12 with an eight-mean ranking. Meanwhile, students ranked S10 with a mean score of 60.25 as the best.

---

Table 1. General finding of purposes learning English

| Purposes of Learning English in Higher Education Level | Professional IT (N:34) | Students IT (N:243) |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                      | 1 2 3 4               | Mean  SD            | 1 2 3 4               | Mean  SD            |
| Communicate with the global Community (S1)           | 2 4 8 16             | 7.5 6.19            | 26 29 65             | 123 60.75 45.1     |
| Learn and practice more on technology information resources (S2) | 0 4 23 2    | 7.25 10.6         | 9 87 27             | 86 52.25 40.2      |
| Accomplish activity-project in the field (S3)        | 1 9 13 4             | 6.75 5.31          | 10 11 83            | 118 55.5 53.8      |
| Complete written-project report or paper (S4)        | 3 8 6 16             | 8.25 5.56          | 14 27 74            | 111 56.5 44.5      |
| participate in the global academic context meeting (conference, internship, meeting with professionals) (S5) | 0 4 6 13    | 5.75 5.43         | 16 34 50            | 134 58.5 52.2      |
| Correspond with English speaking professionals in the field (S6) | 5 4 7 13    | 7.25 4.03         | 20 15 137           | 31 50.75 57.8      |

The findings reveal that both IT professionals and students had different perspectives on acquiring English proficiency for global communication capabilities. The condition is comparable with what Balaei and Ahour (2018) administered on students’ needs in Indonesia’s multi-complexity purpose. They discovered that the communicative skill at the class and office were recognized to be completely essential capabilities to acquire. The S1 item reflected the technical and educational experiences of the respondents. The highly agreed upon scale hit 47% (16) of expert participants but increased to 51% (123) of pupils. In contrast, firmly disagree captured 6% (2) and increased to 11% (26). These principles were understood to suggest that the technical and students’ perspectives were identical. Nonetheless, practitioners perceived the S4 item to be extended by 47% (33), while students perceived the S3 item to be extended by 49% (222). These parameters considered various views on the practicality of English in the workplace and interest in real college life. The specialist picked the lowest percentage, 6% (2), and expressed disagreement with S1, S2, and S7. Students identified S2, S3, and S4 as 4% (9.10 and 14). It is concluded that both practitioners and students want English learning to be more practical, and there is little evidence that standard English learning is solely concerned with systematic structuring sentences. On the other hand, in Table 2, the primary English learning result was revealed, and both professionals and students are required to achieve proficiency in practicing English. Professionals focused and chose the highest finding over the S12 with an eight-mean ranking. Meanwhile, students ranked S10 with a mean score of 60.25 as the best.
Table 2. General finding of outcome English for Information Technology

| The Essential English proficiency in Information Technology Field | Professional IT (N:34) | Students IT (N:243) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                               | 1  2  3  4  Mean   |        1  2  3  4  Mean |
| Career Improvement (S8)                                       | 3  6  5  15  7.25  | 5.31  12  33  41  117  50.75  45.8 |
| Business-trade global community Language (S9)                 | 4  6  5  13  7    | 4.08  9   71  34  86  50  34.9 |
| information Access detail to the Products (S10)               | 2  4  11  9  6.5  | 4.20  10  37  101  93  60.25  43.9 |
| Information Technology Processing Language instructional (S11)|                      | 6  6  8  14  8.5  3.78  14  43  63  97  54.25  34.8 |
| Learning more in Information technology knowledge (S12)       | 2  6  8  16  8    | 5.88  16  34  50  134  58.5  52.2 |
| Advanced with the latest trends in technology information content (S13) | 4  9  6  11  7.5  3.10  15  23  129  17  46  55.4 |
| Managing global professional teams (S14)                      | 3  5  7  11  6.5  3.41  8  31  47  132  54.5  54 |

The lowest mean point for professionals’ respect was 6.5 as S10 and S14. Students with a mean score of 46 to S13 received the lowest mean score. These mean scores show the participants’ worth in terms of meaningful achievement in studying English. The standard deviation outcome may be reported as implying that a low SD indicated that the score data point was more likely to be comparable to the mean value data collection. On the other hand, both high score SD demonstrated the correct allocation of the larger spectrum of values.

Putri et al. (2018) asserted that various activities became a prominent condition in English language learning. Concerning communication with the global community as the data in the study, the most critical activity in English language learning is building, practicing, establishing social relations with global communities, either academic circumstances or professional field. This workplace condition of business-trade global community language is unexpected as most significant business communication characteristics will affect interacting or corresponding with colleagues or clients.

S12 achieves the highest number of highly approved respondents with 47% (32) experts and 55 percent (234) students, according to the in-depth observation. In contrast, S11 provides 18% (6) practitioners, but students favored S12 to 18%. (14). The parameters show that both professionals and students learning English have a paradoxical experience with the S12 piece. Additionally, it leads S13 to agree with 26% (9) practitioners and S9 to agree with 29% (71) of students. The agreed-upon feature attracts S10 expert respondents at a rate of 32% (11), while students encounter S11 (40%) 217. All these things are essential for achieving English proficiency in the
modern era. From this vantage point, practitioners appear to possess more realistic English abilities than students of more scientific orientation.

| Speaking Skill Outcome | Professional IT (N:34) | Students IT (N:243) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
|                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | SD |
| Participating in the conversation. (S21) | 1 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 7.25 | 7.80 | 1 | 32 | 101 | 71 | 52.75 | 41.57 |
| Delivering a speech at the formal meeting (S22) | 0 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 5.77 | 4 | 69 | 74 | 93 | 60 | 38.73 |
| English Class activities in group meetings (S23) | 3 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 3.46 | 1 | 36 | 62 | 123 | 55.5 | 51.47 |
| Talking to the global professional occupation (hotel staff, travel agency, clerks, etcetera) (S24) | 0 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 6.5 | 7.18 | 8 | 18 | 127 | 61 | 53.5 | 54.12 |
| Participating in verbal presentation-discussion (S25) | 4 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 7.75 | 3.86 | 7 | 39 | 65 | 84 | 48.75 | 33.39 |
| Establishing relevant and coherent opinion (S26) | 3 | 9 | 5 | 16 | 8.25 | 5.73 | 5 | 42 | 93 | 82 | 55.5 | 40.17 |
| Communicating effectively in the formal meeting (talking to superiors, interview, internship, etcetera) (S27) | 1 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 7.75 | 5.85 | 6 | 69 | 71 | 87 | 58.25 | 35.75 |
| taking and receiving the phone call (S28) | 0 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 8.25 | 6.02 | 3 | 41 | 97 | 99 | 60 | 46.54 |
| Offering help to the colleague or someone nearby (S29) | 2 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 8.25 | 6.23 | 2 | 29 | 87 | 87 | 51.25 | 42.72 |
| Describing project or instructional procedure (S30) | 2 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 8.25 | 5.85 | 7 | 43 | 76 | 102 | 57 | 41.15 |
| Asking clarifications in the group or personal meeting (S31) | 3 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 8.5 | 4.20 | 8 | 21 | 42 | 114 | 46.25 | 47.28 |
| Informing verbally to the detailed information to the colleague (S32) | 2 | 4 | 16 | 7 | 7.25 | 6.18 | 4 | 2 | 84 | 95 | 46.25 | 50.14 |

The primary component of success is a productive capacity. This capacity exposes uniqueness in a cohesive, reasonable, and practical manner without creating undue confusions. The mean score
shows that the respondents most definitely had before and after English learning experience. S12 earns an average ranking of 8.5, the best possible for a professional. On the other hand, students discover that they have S22 with a mean ranking of 60. The item with the lowest mean score advances to S24 with a 6.5 technical score and S12 with a 46.25 students’ score. Since the mean score is smaller than the standard deviation at this stage, these scores reflect the complete distribution. The SD meaning is a commonly used measure of variability for both practitioners and students. The findings are in line with Indrasari (2016) who illustrates the listening experienced by tourist workers in their job. It was discovered that being unable to comprehend foreigners’ accents was regarded as the most significant issue. Nevertheless, ascertaining a good interaction among students and peers is considered crucial to stay advanced with the latest technology information content trends, ultimately approving individual global recognizing education capabilities. Professionals and students would be involved in analytical thinking and decision-making, which required them to present their notions in good English language communication accordingly. Rahman (2015) concluded that the expanding requirement for the English language in higher education and the workplace is assumed to be an identical and inevitable activity in developed foreign academic or professional globally. Professionals’ and students’ speech proficiency set strong standards. Professionals chose item S2 at 53% (29), while students chose item S28 at a rate of 51% (222). The desired S27 and S25 hit 23% (8) and 25%, respectively (10). Meanwhile, S30 and S32 prove the same point at 38% (125) and 51%, respectively (211). Both parameters mean an assumption of speech skills, which results in increased opportunity today. Professionals who want to succeed in their professions must be able to connect efficiently. However, students considered it as the most effective method of establishing partnerships necessary to establish a future job. Writing in English is regarded as an essential ability for success in today’s trading-global financial industry. Numerous professionals will process as efficiently as possible, somewhat constrained by their English writing and sentence construction expertise. Comparing the findings of professionals and students enable students to understand their English writing abilities better. In table 3, it can be seen while students are expected to carry the experience to S35 with a score of 60.75, the maximum mean score with the specialist is 8.25. Each statement item was distributed evenly through respondents’ backgrounds and experiences. Nevertheless, listening to instructions in actual situations, the internet connection, and interactive media use in global information, English is universally accepted as a medium of education in many educational institutions. English grows into multifunction communicative and pedagogical services. It has been recognized by most nations as the obligation of implementing literacy. Because of the accelerated advancement of human advancement, Farrell and Jacobs (2020) explained that generations had deposed extensive and dominant diversity in all perspectives and educational institutions to maintain movement with the dynamic situation. The writing aspect links to the expectations placed on practitioners and students alike. In table 3, professionals are highly accepted factor that amounted to 14% (18) S36, whereas students are required to possess capabilities on S34 at the rate of 51% (238). The distribution of support, disagree and strongly disagree, described the practice of English language learning. Professionals perceive that written correspondence enables structural communication in electronic media, as shown by selecting the S34, S35, and S38 for 32%, 41%, and 35%, respectively. S36, S35, and S38 are chosen by 28%, 38%, and 37% of students, respectively. Both indicators result in a published submission on fair working standards. Meanwhile, students have accepted the right to
interact concisely through face-to-face or electronic communications for personal or community purposes.

### Table 2. Writing capabilities outcome

| Writing Skill Outcome                                                                 | Professional IT (N:34) | Students IT (N:243) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | SD |
| Writing correspondence formal and less formal in a professional context (S34)        | 2 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 6.25 | 4.03 | 3 | 59 | 51 | 125 | 59.5 | 50.18 |
| Making resume or report while reading the information (S35)                         | 0 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 6.25 | 6.94 | 9 | 51 | 72 | 111 | 60.75 | 42.52 |
| Producing formal reports in the academic or professional situation (S36)            | 0 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 8.25 | 7.5 | 1 | 46 | 72 | 92 | 52.75 | 39.30 |
| Creating the less formal written context in a professional situation (message, application chat forum, etcetera) (S37) | 0 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 6.75 | 4.57 | 3 | 31 | 101 | 78 | 53.25 | 44.39 |
| Creating documentation professional (schedules, brochure, marketing jargon, and etcetera) (S38) | 2 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 8.25 | 5.90 | 12 | 42 | 84 | 96 | 58.5 | 38.69 |
| Generating vocabulary appropriateness (S39)                                         | 0 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 8 | 7.07 | 5 | 58 | 127 | 52 | 59.5 | 51.75 |
| Expressing written idea properly (S40)                                              | 2 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 7.25 | 3.59 | 6 | 80 | 69 | 86 | 60.25 | 36.84 |
| Developing project mind map appropriately (S41)                                     | 3 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 3.74 | 13 | 68 | 82 | 79 | 60.5 | 32.23 |
| Paraphrasing text in formal and less-formal documentation (S42)                     | 4 | 5 | 13 | 8 | 7.5 | 4.04 | 10 | 62 | 81 | 86 | 59.75 | 34.74 |
| Synthesizing reference or information (S43)                                          | 0 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 7.75 | 6.02 | 5 | 42 | 131 | 62 | 60 | 52.89 |

The dynamic method of combining communication skills was symbolized by reading an English note. Reading might even be needed as an available collection to adapt and refine the English language’s vocabulary, phrases, logic, and memory concepts. In table 4, it can be seen that students are expected to have an 8.5 mean score on S47 and S49, although they want to have a 60.5 mean score on S43. Additionally, from professionals’ standpoint, the lowest point result is S43 with 6.75, compared to the lowest mean score for students, S47 with 54.25. In general, the enlightened outlook shows that all mean scores exceeded the SD score. It means that each comment is distributed in an acceptable manner for both professionals and students.

Business frequently continues beyond boundaries of communicating effectively in the formal meeting, with English regularly transpiring as a global communication of information in global society nowadays. Jabbarova (2020) suggested that applying English in the corporation has numerous advantages, including accommodating the company’s success, establishing credence with partners and patrons, developing, and enhancing international contacts, intensifying capabilities, and leading a more significant wage improving global relationships within academic knowledge.
According to the department’s observations, the highest point for strongly agreeing, agreeing, disagreeing, and strongly disagreeing establishes distinct responses among professionals and students. The writer wholeheartedly concurs that respondents who study English should have a similar experience. It takes 100% (34) for the S47 and S49 but achieve a peak of 38% (211) for the S45. The factor of agreeing and disagreeing contributes to the outcome. Professionals usually score 50% on S48, while students score 46% on S46. These criteria bolster the case that writing is a necessary skill to learn for both professionals and students. They share striking similarities in their hopes or ambitions for learning English, most notably the capacity to comprehend English reading contexts.

**4. CONCLUSION**

This study aims to ascertain and comprehend the significance of English language abilities required for completing workplace competencies for both professionals and students employed in the information technology field. The comparative results indicate that English language skills are essential for obtaining employment and carrying out their responsibilities effectively. Regardless of the technical abilities an IT worker possesses, they must develop language skills to interact effectively with colleagues through online communications, community discussions, presentations, and text comprehension, among other things. Additionally, the IT representatives indicate the necessity for allowing internal English language education information.
This research demonstrates the parallelism between the English language’s status in professional IT and students’ IT position in terms of communication ability in their current environment. It denotes all Indonesian professionals and students who are proficient in the global English language medium. There is an ever-increasing need for top level interpersonal skills among IT professionals in the group, not only among IT peers but also through academic and corporate boundaries. Consequently, developing communicative skills in English facilitated successful workplace collaborations, and proficiency in the English language remains essential for organizations and professional achievements. In comparison, the absence of realistic contact interactions among IT students has inconsistent results and harms IT’s educational accomplishments with foreign ties and colleagues. Specifically, their advanced training is previously sufficient for their task requirements.

English instructors may precisely identify where the students expect the greatest assistance related to their lifestyle and work by analyzing the language needs. Teachers may also evaluate students’ overall competence level based on their proficiency samples and participation in any classroom discussion. Once English lecturers understand students’ requirements and present skill level, they may identify knowledge gaps and establish goals for their development. The requirements analysis helps to shape lessons such that each session brings the learner a step closer to reaching their goal level in each language learning skill. Lessons should also target the students’ particular objectives and evaluate if they need specific terminology to perform their work more successfully.
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