Students' and English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Language Needs and the Curriculum in the First Year at University of Duhok

Jwan Hussein Suleiman

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
July 2019
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Chair, Department of Foreign Language
Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master in English Language Teaching.

Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkay Gilanlıoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emre Debreli _____

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Naciye Kunt _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkay Gilanlıoğlu _____

ABSTRACT

This study explores how freshmen and English language teachers perceive the English language needs of first year students who are currently studying a general foundation course that is based on an adopted textbook at University of Duhok in Kurdistan region of Iraq. Following a target-situation and present situation approaches to needs analysis, this study uses a mixed method research design in which both qualitative and quantitative data are collected from three different sources: freshmen, English language teachers and decision makers. The quantitative part of the study is statistically analyzed using SPSS, while the qualitative part is thematically analyzed in order to come out with major ideas that were configured during interviews.

The results of the questionnaire indicated to the positive views of both students and teachers towards freshmen's language needs. In general, both students and teachers believe that freshmen need to have a general foundation course that covers both general knowledge of English and subjects that will feed their instrumental needs in present and future situations.

Relatively, the results of interviews reassured these ideas when the stakeholders stated clearly that freshmen at Duhok University need a general foundation course at tertiary level to be proceeded by an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course. Moreover, the results signified that the currently in-use course book does not fulfil students' academic, social and vocational needs and the reason was mainly attributed to the time allotted for this course which is believed to be insufficient.

These findings indicate that the currently in-use textbook, though general, does indeed fulfil students' needs to certain extent in comparison with students assumed proficiency level and the learning context. Consequently, we suggest this textbook be supplied by another material that will address students' academic needs, and the university provide a training for the teaching staff on how to teach this textbook and most importantly, the course be extended to at least two consecutive academic years. A future evaluation of the curriculum at this stage is highly recommended.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin şu anda Irak'ın Kürdistan bölgesinde bulunan Duhok Üniversitesi'nde kabul edilmiş bir ders kitabına dayanan genel bir hazırlık kursu okuyan birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin ihtiyaçlarını nasıl algıladıklarını keşfetme çabasıdır. İhtiyaç analizine bir hedef durumu ve mevcut durum yaklaşımını takiben, bu çalışmada, hem nitel hem de nicel verilerin üç farklı kaynaktan – birinci sınıf öğrenciler, İngilizce öğretmenleri ve karar vericiler – toplandığı karma bir yöntem araştırma tasarımı olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın nicel kısmı SPSS kullanılarak istatistiksel olarak analiz edilirken, nitel kısmı görüşmeler sırasında yapılandırılmış olan ana fikirlerle ortaya çıkması için tematik olarak analiz edilmiştir.

Anketin sonuçları, hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretmenlerin birinci sınıfın dil ihtiyaçlarına yönelik olumlu görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Genel olarak, hem öğrenciler hem de öğretmenler birinci sınıf öğrencilere hem genel İngilizce bilgilerini hem de araçsal ihtiyaçlarını besleyecek konuları kapsayan genel bir hazırlık kursuna sahip olmaları gerektiğine inanmaktadır.

Göreceli olarak, görüşmelerin sonuçları, paydaşların Duhok Üniversitesi'ndeki birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yükseköğretim seviyesinde bir genel hazırlık kursuna ihtiyaç duyduklarını ve sonra bir Akademik Amaçlı İngilizce (AAİ) kursuna devam etmeleri gerektiğini açıkça teyit etmiştir. Dahası, sonuçlar, kullanımdaki ders kitabının öğrencilerin akademik, sosyal ve mesleki ihtiyaçlarını karşılamadığını ve bunun temel

olarak yetersiz olduğuna inanılan bu ders için ayrılan süreye bağlı olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bu bulgular, halihazırda kullanımda olan ders kitabının, genel olmasına rağmen, yeterlilik düzeyine sahip öğrencilerle karşılaştırıldığında, öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını belirli ölçüde karşıladığını göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, bu metin kitaplarının öğrencilerin akademik ihtiyaçlarını karşılayacak başka bir materyal tarafından temin edilmesini ve öğretim elemanlarının bu ders kitabının nasıl öğretileceği konusunda eğitilmelerini ve en önemlisi, kurs süresinin en az iki ardışık akademik yılla en üst düzeye çıkarılmasını tavsiye ediyoruz. Bu aşamada müfredatın gelecekteki bir değerlendirmesi önemle tavsiye edilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İhtiyaç analizi, ders kitabı adaptasyonu, materyal değerlendirme, paydaşlar, ESP, EAP

DEDICATION

To the love of my life.... Bjare mn

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkay Gilanlıoğlu for his guidance and constructive feedback during the process of writing this research.

In addition, I want to thank both examining committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Naciye Kunt and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emre Debreli for their important feedback and insights on the thesis.

My sincere gratitude goes to the head of Foreign Language Education Department Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev for his constant support and advice during my MA study.

I also extend my appreciation to University of Duhok for giving me the permission to collect my data.

I am also genuinely grateful to all my colleagues (Samar, Halat, Bayan, Riham, Hashim, Maryam, Osama, and Maveen) for their unconditional support during my journey.

Last but not least, I wholeheartedly thank my family for their prayers and support. I am deeply grateful to my beloved husband and son for their unconditional love and their patience and support. This journey would not be completed without their encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this introductory chapter is to present the study that will be carried on in this paper. It provides an overview of the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, research questions and research purpose and objectives. Finally, the chapter defines some terms that are used inside the study.

1.1 Background of the study

English is now the global language and the significance of this language is realized all around the world in different fields like economics, politics, education and so on Crystal (2003) asserts the important role this language has among different countries and explores some reasons that lie behind the globalization of this language. Likewise, Crystal claims that the genuine status of this language, is not owed to the fact that it is spoken as the mother tongue in several countries but rather in its declaration as the second language in many countries which results in a greater number of non-native speakers which are more than the number of the native speakers of this language. Furthermore, Crystal assumes that this language has developed a special status in education when is being taught as a foreign language in over 100 countries; moreover, the statistics of the year 2000 showed that about a quarter of world's population are fluent and competent in English language which makes it the largest population which exceeds Chinese speakers who are able to write in one unified writing system. While more recent statistics estimate the number of speakers who use English as a foreign

language   to   be   around   400   million   speakers
(http://www.englishlanguageguide.com/facts/stats/). Crystal (2003) also refers to the

powerful base the English language has which is reflected in socioeconomic,

technology, politics and culture (since it is the first language of two of the most

powerful countries of the world, USA and UK); and without this strength less would

have been in favor of this global language and less would have been recorded on it in

the history.

The status of the English language has brought about a focus on learning and teaching

English for different purposes. For such purposes, carefully designed courses have

been offered and the existing ones have been updated by course designers. As a matter

of fact, this internationalization of English language and new developments in

educational psychology through shifting the emphasis from teachers to learners, has

made decision makers focus more on what learner is seeking to learn and what the

learners' present and target language needs are. Eventually, leading to the emergence

of new terms in English language teaching and one of those terms for example, is

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), which aims at

designing English language courses based on certain purposes that stakeholders have

in mind.

In education, where our main purpose lies, two main aspects need to be covered while

starting to think about developing a language course and these aspects include: the role

of English language in developing individual's education and the effectiveness of the

existing course and teaching materials (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986). To investigate the

first aspect (i.e., the role of English language in furthering students' education) Dubin

and Olshtain suggest that we first evaluate the real role of English in the education

system; i.e. whether English is used as a medium of instruction or not. In the context

of this study, English is not used as a medium of instruction; except in scientific departments and some of the social science departments in which materials are mostly given in English language. Whereas, students mainly depend on their general language knowledge to study materials in English and to lesser extent on the general English course they are taking as freshmen (in this study, the term freshmen is used to refer to all first year students except English language Learning and Translation departments of University of Duhok). The next step after the role of English language has been defined, as proposed by the two writers, is to evaluate the existing course that is given to students. Evaluating a course can be done through needs analysis means that involves all the stakeholders (Hidri and Coombe, 2016). In the context of this study, there is an already existed course that is not based on students' needs analysis; as a result, the researcher will look only at how stakeholders (by stakeholders we mean, freshmen, English language teachers who teach first year language course, and decision makers) perceive the language needs of first year college students.

The one and main step of any course evaluation starts with needs analysis (henceforth will be abbreviated as NA). Hidri and Coombe (2016) claim that both NA and evaluation are actually two sides of the same coin since both aim at meeting students' needs and course objectives. Needs analysis is defined by Richards and Schmidt (2010) as the process that determines the needs of a learner or a group of learners to learn a language and to arrange these needs according to their priorities. Both subjective and objective information can be used to achieve the goals of NA; and by subjective and objective information the writers point to data from questionnaires, tests, interviews, observation and so on. Brown (1995) tries to elaborate this definition and offers a more inclusive one as follows:

> "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." (Brown, 1995, p. 36)

By a "defensible curriculum" Brown refers to that curriculum that satisfies most of students and teachers' language learning and teaching requirements within a certain context. While "necessary information" indicates to all kinds of quantitative and qualitative information that could be obtained from stakeholders; and by "stakeholders" Brown refers to the people who have an interest in the curriculum like students, teachers, administrators and parents (Brown, 2016). Hence needs analysis process is getting more essential in designing and evaluating a course. If educational institutions are able to define the needs of their learners and teachers, then designing a proper course that fulfils those needs will be an easy task, otherwise lack of motivation and failure are the outcome. In other words, as Hutchinson and Waters (1987) state in one of their famous quotes "Tell me what you need English for and I will tell you the English that you need" (p. 8). This quote signifies the importance of being aware of what our learners need to learn or what they need language for, as a step to save efforts in designing courses that do not address what our learners seek in a language course. In the same respect, Raymond (2001) believes that both learners and teachers' perceptions lead to improving the quality of teaching. Therefore, it is very necessary to valuably consider learners' and teachers' view-points in order to improve English language courses because they are the main characters in this play.

As far as course evaluation is considered, this study aims to evaluate the textbook that is supplied by the university as a step that has not been done since the textbook was officially pointed as the core element of first year English language course syllabus.

This evaluation will be carried on in two ways: first, the results of needs assessment will be considered as an evaluation step by itself after we compare the results to what the course assumes to deliver; second, the perceptions of students and teachers regarding the extent to which these needs are fed by the textbook is another step.

1.2 First year at university

First year at university level has been referred to as "the transformational period" by Johnston (2010) since students who have recently finished high school, which is believed to be a different experience from university, are expected to adapt to the new culture and norms of the university life. This transformation influences students' life and personalities socially and intellectually. Students at this level may also witness other aspects of changes such as community change, especially in certain countries were mixed-gender classrooms are prohibited until university level (Tabook, 2014). All these changes will not affect the students only, rather being quite challenging for teachers as well, as they need to identify the needs of their students and accordingly draw their teaching methods and choose their teaching materials. In this sense, Leamson (1999) suggests that teachers who teach at this level should have a high proficiency level in English language to act as role models for their students in the future who might not have sufficient exposure to English language during the previous nor the upcoming academic years of their life.

1.3 Statement of the problem

The English language is taught as a foreign language in Kurdistan region of Iraq and it is a main course that is offered from kindergarten until tertiary level. However, many students find difficulty learning this foreign language and they attribute their failure mainly to the education system as they think neither the textbooks nor the teaching staff are qualified enough to enable them master this language. On the other hand, the

teachers also attribute the ineffectiveness of this course to the time allotted to the course as they believe it is very insufficient, and to students' low proficiency level. At university of Duhok, English language is taught as a general course in the first year of college to different departments and majors. This has made the language course appear as a complement and repetition to the English language classes the students have already taken at school level which does not have anything to do with their current education discipline. The question that arises here is how to make sure that the current in-use program or syllabus meets the needs of thousands of different students with different educational backgrounds and proficiency level without having done a needs analysis, nor evaluated the course prior to the selection of the textbook or even after it has been used for many years? This is what University of Duhok in Kurdistan region of Iraq needs to do in hope to modify the existing course to better suit the needs of freshmen and satisfy thousands of students who are studying different majors. Nevertheless, how teachers and students think about this course and whether this course satisfies students' needs is another question that no one has tried to answer before and this study will try to shed some light on this part.

1.4 Purpose of the study

As we have clarified the importance of evaluating English language courses to determine their effectiveness through NA which should be done prior to any course design or even while in-use; this study tries to confirm these essential points through the results that will be extracted from both qualitative and quantitative data of this study. The researcher finds it necessary to discover how freshmen and English language teachers at Duhok University view the language needs of that level and to what extent these needs are fulfilled through the general foundation English language course that is given in this university without having done a NA. Moreover, the results

of this study will configure the claims regarding the extent to which the needs of general language courses are specifiable. Additionally, the study aims at identifying some suggestions for future improvements in the language course given at this university. Besides this study attempts to fill the gap in the relevant literature as it triggers more investigations in language needs analysis and English language course evaluation in different contexts.

1.4 The research questions

This study tries mainly to answer the following questions:

1. How can the students' language needs in general courses be identified?

2. What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University?

3. What are the perceptions of teachers and students on these needs?

4. Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?

5. Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?

1.6 Significance of the study

Identifying the language needs of students and investigating the effectiveness of language courses in terms of students' needs are essential steps in updating the language materials inside education institutions. Moreover, as it was conceived earlier in the reviewed literature, course evaluations and need analysis are the bridge that fill the gap between the expected course objectives and the achieved objectives in reality after the course is finished. Hence, this study attempts to explore the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding the English language needs at tertiary level, how these needs are addressed in the given general course; and most importantly whether the needs of students are identifiable when involved in general language courses or not.

1.7 Definitions of terms

This section of the first chapter aims at defining certain terms and concepts that are repeatedly used during the course of this study.

Textbook Evaluation

The evaluation of textbook is defined by Chen as "the application of evaluation approaches, techniques and knowledge to systematically assess and improve the planning, implementation and effectiveness of programs." (2005, p.3)

Needs Analysis

The word 'need' or as indicated by other terms such as; "necessities, demands, wants, likes, lacks, deficiencies, goals, objectives and purposes" (Jordan, 1997, p.22), refer to what students assume they need to learn about a language. Needs analysis is considered as the basis for designing any English course no matter for what purpose it could be (Brown, 2016). There are several approaches that are covered under the umbrella of needs analysis. These approaches include: "target-situation analysis, present-situation analysis, deficiency analysis, strategy analysis, means analysis, language audit and constraints" (Jordan, 1997, p.22).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is defined by Brown (2016) as "the role of English in a language course or program of instruction in which the content and the aims of the course are fixed by the specific needs of a particular group of learners" (p. 5). Belcher (2006) refers to the important relationship between needs analysis and English for Specific Purposes, and thinks that needs analysis is the basis of any ESP course and based on those needs ESP courses are designed statement of the problem.

English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

English for Academic purposes is a one kind of English for Specific Purposes. In other terms, EAP is another purpose or need of learning English language and it is subdivided into three categories: English for science and technology, English for social sciences purposes and English for humanities purposes (Brown, 2016).

1.8 Summary

This opening chapter, has presented information regarding the background knowledge of our study, the main purpose and problem of this study, beside the questions that are the focus of our inquiry and the significance of this research. In the next chapter, The Literature Review, the related literature in each of the fields of language needs analysis, textbook adoption and textbook evaluation is presented.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter aims at reviewing the related literature in each of the fields of need analysis, course development and course evaluation. First, the chapter refers to the significance of needs analysis and introduces the most prominent approaches to needs analysis which will later work as framework for this study. Second, the chapter shades the light on the process of adopting a textbook and the essential role of textbook evaluation in addition to the purposes and benefits of evaluation; in addition offering a number of course evaluation approaches.

2.1 English language needs analysis (NA)

Tarone and Yule (1989) raise a question regarding teachers' constant dissatisfaction with the textbooks and teaching materials, in this respect, the writers report the speech of one of the teachers who said even though the learning materials were designed by him/herself, she/he will not use the same sources again without any adaptation and changes. The writers resorted this problem to the fact that teachers are aware of the fact that they need to adjust their methods and materials constantly to match the 'local needs of their students'. Tudor (1996) claims that this interest in learners' needs is reflected in movements such as humanistic and communicative movement that were centered around the learner due to a concern that was felt during 1960s and 1970s, despite the fact that the term " analysis of needs" was first introduced in India during 1920s (Cowling, 2007).

Hereafter, two main reasons were identified by Johnson (1994) which believed to be in favor of courses which are based on NA, one reason is the legacy this approach gained from the public aid in the United States during the mid of 1960s and the second reason is the power the applied linguistics science gained which was thought as a kind of protection against the 'common sense' based language planning. Among the advocators of this approach were Stevick (1971), Munby (1978) and the Council of Europe.

The advantages of NA are numerous but the most notable benefit is the way this process helps educators provide more accessible and beneficial sources for students (Long, 2005). Moreover, NA helps policy makers to develop effective curricular which is based on clarified and validated needs of students, which will later tie learning and teaching process together (Akyel & Ozek, 2010)

2.1.1 'Needs' in needs analysis

The word 'needs' refers to the reasons and aims behind learning which all courses in a way or another are based upon. These needs should always be feasible for a course to be based upon. In this respect, Brindley (1984) introduces two forms of needs which are the 'objective need' and the 'subject need'. By objective needs Brindley refers to those needs that can be specified by the teachers through assignments, assessments and students' data analysis that provide information regarding students' proficiency level and patterns of language use. While the subjective needs are those desires, wants and expectations that cannot be identified easily even if students speak off them (cited in Nunan, 1988). Respectively, two other kinds of needs are distinguished by Hutchiston and Waters (1987), the first kind is 'the target needs' which refers to what the learners need to do with the language in the target situation. This type includes what the learner must know in order to function effectively in the target situation; what the learner lacks

in order to provide it, and what students feel they want from a course. The analysis of this kind of needs will enable us to acknowledge what people do with the language through asking questions such as (why is the language needed? How will the language be used? Who will the learners use the language with? Where and when will the language be used?). The second type of needs is 'the learning needs' or in other words what the learning situation demands from the learners. The analysis of this kind of needs will let us know how learners learn by asking several questions which in turn will help us identify the learning needs of students. Such questions may include: why are the learners taking the course? How do the learners learn? What resources are available? Who are the learners?

Johnson (1994) introduces two other distinctive types of needs, those types are the 'felt' needs and 'perceived' needs. The author thinks that this distinction is useful since it specifies the source of needs. The 'felt' need is defined by Johnson as those needs that learners have. This kind of needs is thought to be simple expressions of future desired states which learners can directly assign them when asked through a direct question by planners. However, this kind of needs is most often devalued by the evaluators who think they are a kind of desires and wants. On the other hand, the 'perceived' need is the one which is considered as valuable since it is the outcome of what a certified expert think people may need. Albeit, this kind of needs has been referred to by different scholars by different names such as the 'normative need', 'real need' and 'objective need' the intentions are the same.

This current study resort to both "Target Needs" or "for what reasons students will use the language in future" (Hutchiston and Waters, 1987); and "Perceived Needs" or

"how the students perceive their language needs" (Johnson, 1994). Both kinds of needs are to be the subject of our investigation.

2.1.2 Needs analysis

When students, teachers and sponsors are aware of the language needs, this means they are aware of what specifically is lacking and henceforth will pursue. Hence, every course should be based on the analysis of learners' needs (Hutchiston & Waters 1987). The first appearance of the term 'needs analysis' in language planning goes back to 1970s as stated by Nunan (1988), when the scholar defines NA as a "set of procedures for specifying the parameters of a course of study. Such parameters include the criteria and rationale for grouping learners, the selection and sequencing of course content, methodology, course length and intensity and duration" (1988, p.45). Needs analysis is also defined by Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) as the "process of establishing the 'what' and 'how of a course" (cited in Oktay, 2010, p.21). Tarone and Yule (1989) state that the information which is extracted from a NA will answer the question regarding what areas of language a certain group of students need to learn. Therefore, NA should be the starting point for devising and developing curriculum which will shape the kind of learning and teaching that will later take place (Jordan, 1997). Hence, one major characteristic of this approach is thought to be the systematic assessment of learners' needs (Johnson, 1994).

This disagreement over what "needs analysis" means has resulted in the emergence of two different orientations to NA. The first one, is the 'product-oriented' meaning, in which the language needs of learners are seen to be the purposes which students might use the target language in communicative interactions. Hence, the aim of NA is to collect as much information as possible about the learners' current and future use of language before the learning process begins. The second interpretation of NA is

referred to as 'process-oriented' meaning, which understands the needs in terms of learners' needs as an individual in the learning situation. Hence, the scope of language needs extends beyond the target language behavior to include a number of affective and cognitive variables that affect the learning process (Johnson, 1994). However, it has been discussed by many scholars such as (Holec, 1980; Bowers, 1980; Coste, 1983) that a successful course design, one that is based on NA, takes into consideration both orientations (cited in Johnson, 1994).

This research will take into account both orientations (product and process) to understand in details what students are using the language for, in addition to what they need to learn about the language and what reasons and variables affect their learning process.

Moreover, the importance of NA lies in the fact that it fills the gap between what language syllabus presents and what exists in textbooks and what students needs in reality. The tools that are used in NA includes questionnaires, interviews and observations of both oral communication and written materials (Tarone & Yule, 1989) in addition to texts and informal consultation with qualified informants such as sponsors, teachers or former students (Tudor, 1996).

Nunan (1988) counts some advantages of NA that were proposed by Richards (1984) who claims that NA draw a method that can provide more input to the content, design and implementation of language programs. NA can also be used to develop the objectives and goals of language courses, furthermore, it can act as a tool of evaluation of existing language programs. The importance of constant reassessment of student' needs is stressed by Belcher (2006) who thinks that due to contentious changes in the

socio-cultural context of learning, NA is a must that will attain the efficiency of language courses.

2.1.3 Approaches to needs analysis

Across history, many approaches were proposed by scholars, however among those approaches there are the most affective and controversial. Below, a few approaches that were mainly the subject of discussion in the reviewed literature are presented:

2.1.3.1 Target- situation approach

This approach is proposed by Munby (1978) and is considered the most widely used approach and the best framework for target-situation analysis (TSA). This approach focuses on students' needs and performance at the end of a language course in terms of communication purposes, communicative setting, the means of communication language skills, functions, structures (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p.12). Though being approved by many scholars; the approach is not far from criticisms. One of the critics of this approach goes around the fact that it aims at collecting information about students rather than from students, in addition of devaluing teachers' judgments by not considering them at all (Jordan,1997).

2.1.3.2 Present-situation approach

As proposed by Ritchterich and Chancerel (1977/80), this approach refers to a systematic investigation of specifying the needs of adult learners who are learning a foreign language, it focuses mainly on the learners and their 'present situation' is examined thoroughly. Several areas are stressed in this approach including the way learners' needs emerge, taking different viewpoints into consideration in addition to the investigation of the learning context. The needs' investigation begins before the course starts and while the course is in process by including learners and the stakeholders in learning process. Moreover, this approach recommends the use of

several data collection tools to gather as much information as possible. Nevertheless, this approach also had its share of criticism. It is criticized for the lack of attention the approach pays to students' real-world language needs, beside overreliance on learners' perceptions of their needs (Jordan, 1997; Kaewpet, 2009).

2.1.3.3 Learning-centered approach

The advocates of this approach are Hutchiston and Waters (1987), who believe that a true approach to designing a course (an ESP course) must be based on an understanding of the processes of language learning rather than a focus on learners' needs. This approach assumes learning to be a kind of negotiation process that occurs between individuals and society (Jordan 1994). Moreover, the approach also focuses on learning needs through considering several factors such as: who are the learners, the socio-cultural background of learners, their age, gender, their background knowledge of the language content, their attitude towards English language and the culture of English speaking countries (Kaewpet, 2009).

2.1.3.4 Learner-centered approach

The proponents of this approach are Berwick (1989) and Brindley (1989) and the approach aims at identifying the language needs of learners through distinguishing the different kind of needs (i.e., felt needs vs. perceived needs, objective vs. subjective needs and product vs. process oriented analysis). The scholars refer to the needs which are assessed from learners perspective as "felt needs" while the needs that are assessed from experts viewpoint are indicated as "perceived needs"; the difference between felt needs and perceived needs stress the importance of learners' perceptions and view. In the process-oriented analysis, needs are viewed as what students are actually using during the course, in contradiction with product-oriented interpretation that assess what students will need in target situations. In the other hands, objective needs are

those needs that should be analyzed before a course starts and they differ from the subjective needs that can be assessed while the course is still running. Additionally, subjective needs, focus on the affective and cognitive factors such as learners' attitude and feelings, while the objective needs seeks the factual information about learners such as their proficiency level (Kaewpet, 2009).

2.1.4 Needs analysis in general courses

One of the main reasons of emerging NA is to design courses that are tailored to students' professional and academic needs. Such courses are referred to as "English for Specific Purposes" which is then subdivided into "English for Academic Purposes" and "English for Occupational Purposes" (Brown, 2016). However, it is assumed that NA is not taken as a priority in courses that teaches English language as a general course, due to the believe that we can not specify the needs of general English courses and because of the lack of available literature in analyzing the needs of English language learners in the context of a general course (Seedhouse, 1995) this believe is still not proved to be either right or wrong. Nonetheless, it has been argued by Barnard and Zemach (2003) as cited in Nafissi et al. (2017) that there is no clear cut between general and specific language courses despite the different methods of teaching these two different courses may entail. Relatively, Basturkmen (2010) argues that these two courses are indeed distinct in terms of their objectives and goal, as general courses may opt for internal or linguistic goals, the specific courses have external goals that extend beyond language classes and related to the instrumental motive for learning.

 In this respect, Seedhouse (1995) conducted a study on Spanish learners learning English language as a general course and the results of his study proved the fact that students of such courses are able to specify their needs. Moreover, researcher confirmed the importance of NA in designing, and evaluating general courses, in

addition to discard the less desired needs of students which eventually will help to design more affective general courses of language. Similarly, Cowling (2007) shares the same concern of devaluing NA in designing general courses and questions the undertaken of textbooks as the sole element of syllabus design without specifying what students may generally need in similar courses.

2.1.5 Studies on needs analysis

the role of NA is to help design new courses, evaluate the courses while in progress, develop courses that are specific for certain purposes (ESP, EAP) based on what students need or assume they need, and to compare whether the course objective meet students' needs or not. Due to these reasons and more, a lot of studies have been conducted on NA in ESP, EAP courses, but little on general courses in general, and non on foundation courses at tertiary level. Among the few studies been conducted on the English language needs of first year university students, is the Tabook (2014) study in which both target-situation approach and present-situation approaches to NA were applied in the analysis of the needs of the students. The focus of this study was to discover whether a mismatch between how teachers and students perceive language needs of university's first year students will result in students' failure and poor proficiency level in the future. However, the results showed that there was a slight mismatch between the perceived needs of students as both students and teachers think students need to learn a native-like pronunciation and grammar. The researcher repents the reason of students' poor English to this mismatch between what teachers think students need and what students think they need to learn about English language. The discrepancy between students' and teachers' perception of freshmen's language needs was also noted in Eslami (2010) in an EAP context in Iran. Despite the different approach the writer followed in analyzing the needs of students. The outcomes of this

study signify the importance of learner-centered approach since instructors only may not be fair judges on deciding leaners' needs.

Liu et al., (2011) investigates how first year university students in Taiwan perceive their needs of English language for general and specific purposes. The results of this study were analyzed based on Hutchinson and Waters (1987) subdivision of needs (i.e., necessities, wants and lacks). Two basic ideas were extracted from this study; the first one is that students do not think all skills of English language to be equally important, necessary or insufficient, nor the focus on one skill means their lack of competence. Second, the perceived needs of students appear to mismatch what the textbook and the whole course tries to cover. Similar results are shared with an earlier study by Chia et al., (1999) whose concern was to discover how university freshmen's perceive their language needs and the students suggested several ideas such as having a basic course of English language at tertiary level, specifically highlighting listening skill. The participants of this study also suggested having a course of language for academic purposes beside, taking language courses during all stages of colleges to fulfil their academic and professional purposes.

In an attempt to discover how English language teachers of foundation courses at a Saudi university perceive the needs of their students, Liton (2013) uses different tools like observations, interviews and questionnaire to find out how teachers' view students' needs at university level. The participated teachers reported a mismatch between students' needs and the way the course is designed and delivered; hence resulting in dissatisfaction in the future despite the long duration of the courses. Moreover, the teachers in this study suggest the courses be up-to-date with constant assessment of students' needs, in other words the teachers recommend learner-

centered courses in addition to courses that appeal to students of different levels of proficiency.

2.2 Textbook/ course-book adoption

The term 'textbook' is used in this paper to refer to the textbook that is used by the teacher and students as the basis for a language course and is considered as one of the essential elements in the success of any education program. Choosing the most appropriate textbook which includes materials and language skills that are adequate to students' proficiency level and satisfies their academic, social and vocational needs, guarantees the attainment of any course objectives. A textbook is defined by Tomlinson (2011) as the tool that provides the core materials for a language learning course which aims at providing as much information as possible to be used as the one and only source of information used by students. In order for a Textbook to be effectively used as the only source of information, it must include; grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, functions and the skills of reading and writing, listening and speaking. Moreover, Tomlinson (2011) distinguishes textbooks from learning materials; and refers to the latter as any teaching tool that facilitates language learning process including textbooks, workbooks, DVDs, YouTube, photocopied exercises and so on. These learning-aids will most likelihood maximize language intake and stimulate output. However, a textbook itself may contain several learning materials including, CDs, DVDs, workbook, teacher book, YouTube links and emails. In this respect we can refer to the textbook as a single learning material.

Ur (1996) counts some advantages of using a textbook and claims that textbooks provide a structure and a framework to both teachers and students in addition of including tasks and texts that are appropriate for most of the class which saves time

for the teacher; besides, textbooks provide knowledge to students with slightest cost. Textbooks are mobile and inclusive which are easy to be carried and include the most essential learning materials. Textbooks provide a guidance for novice teachers and help to develop a sense of autonomy in students who can follow their learning process and reflect upon it by using the textbook. However, textbooks may carry a lot of limitations as well, these drawbacks as referred by Ur include the inclusion of irrelevant tasks and topics that may not be of interest for the students, and a textbook can never satisfy the needs of the whole class. Adding to these limitations of textbooks, Richards and Renandya (2002) claim that textbooks have some other disadvantages which can be summarized as follow: course books do not present realistic language models and they fail to contextualize language tasks in addition to inadequately fostering the culture understanding and discourse competence.

To avoid these limitations, language teaching/learning institution either designs a special textbook for their students, based on NA, which is money, time and efforts consuming, or adopt the most appropriate textbook from market that best addresses the course objectives and students' needs. However, in cases of choosing ready-made textbooks, Cunningsworth (1995) suggests that it is best to follow certain procedures in order not to be trapped by the commerciality of potential textbooks. Among his suggestions, Cunningsworth, advises decision makers of piloting certain textbooks for a couple of years to make sure of their validity and applicability. Teachers' and students' views on these textbooks are of value and worth testing. If piloting and reaching teachers and students are hard to be attained and time consuming, course analysis or evaluation is another option that can provide details about the available textbooks.

In one of the most interesting comments we have come across about textbooks through our review, is a one by Maryam et al. (2016). The scholars posit how textbooks can be used as proofs for institutions and teachers on what they are providing. As a result, every institution and every decision maker compete over producing or providing the best textbook for their learners since this textbook stands as a representative for their services.

2.2.1 Criteria and features of adopted language learning/teaching textbooks

When needs analysis step is not completed or sometimes ignored by the policy makers due to several reasons including funding, time, the number of variable and the variety of the target learning context, those decision makers often adopt an already published textbook, and most of the education systems around the world resort to this method. However, these ready-made materials that are available in the markets should not be taken for granted and they should be evaluated and analyzed in order to make sure they fit the language learning program objectives. To do so, we should consider certain criteria and bear in mind the most appropriate features of a textbook we have planned for in order to be able to choose the best available option. Cunningsworth (1995) theorizes that the process of choosing a textbook involves identifying materials with the context in which it will be used in. Adding to these criteria, the scholar suggests that the objectives and aims of our teaching/learning programs be identified then be compared with the settings in which they will be used in.

Tomlinson (2003, pp. 21-22) proposes some features that are assumed to be available in all language learning materials, and these features are summarized below:

1. Materials should have an impact.

2. Materials should help learners feel comfortable and help developing learner's confidence.

3. What is being taught should be relevant and useful for learners.

4. Materials should require and facilitate learner self-investment.

5. Learners must be ready to acquire the points being taught.

6. Materials should expose learners to language in authentic use.

7. The learners' attention should be drawn to linguistic features of the input

8. Materials should provide learners with opportunities to use the target language to achieve communicative purposes.

9. Materials should take into account that the positive effects of instruction are usually delayed.

10. Materials should take into account that learners differ in affective attitudes and learning styles.

11. Materials should maximize learning potential by encouraging intellectual, aesthetic and emotional involvement which stimulates both right and left-brain activities.

12. Materials should provide opportunities for outcome feedback.

A similar list is suggested by Richards (2001) which emphasizes what precisely materials should reflect. To name few of these points: the materials should give the learners something to take from the lessons, the textbooks should promote a sense of autonomy and achievement in students, learning items should be interesting and novel and so on. All the features mentioned by Tomlinson and Richards refer to one important point which is 'how textbooks help learners to become proficient in language' which shares common goals with the Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996) that were designed to direct the learners' and teachers' attention to several areas that need to be focused on while learning and teaching a foreign language.

These areas include: Communication, Connections, Cultures, Comparisons and Communities, abbreviated as the five Cs (Hadley, 2001) which are all referred to in Tomlinson's list of characteristics.

2.2.2 The impact of textbooks on students and teachers

The process of adopting a course book is not less problematic than designing a textbook that is based on a need analysis. One of the issues in adopting an already existed textbook is the probability of deskilling teachers in developing, creating and preparing language materials for their students day by day, beside their ability to fulfil all students' needs; however, this view is contradicted by the dependency merit the textbooks may bring with it into the classroom for both teachers and students; and the ability to provide a structure for lessons (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994). When Hutchinson and Torres (1994) asked the participants of their study 'why do they want to use a published book?' the students referred to the textbook as a guide that helps them organize their learning. Moreover, the writer refers to the fact that teacher-made materials are less appreciated by the students even though they may include authentic features that are communicatively oriented. While the teachers of this study indicated to the textbook as a facilitator that helped them through organizing and setting questions and arguments for their classes. Moreover, the scholars refer to textbooks as a vehicle of excellent and effective change especially if the choices are based on their pedagogical and theoretical grounds. In one of the points mentioned by Tomlinson (2013) while referring to the features of the textbooks, the writer claims that learning materials should enable students to communicate in the target language and this will not be achieved unless the textbooks contain tasks that are designed to develop pragmatic and communicative competence of students (Ren & Han, 2016 and Ekin, 2013).

2.3 Evaluation and material evaluation

This part begins with a definition of the "evaluation" concept as it is stated in Longman Dictionary; which is defined as "The making of judgment about the amount, number, or value of something; assessment" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p.534). When we evaluate something, this evaluation is most probably based on certain and pre-assumed goals and objectives; then we evaluate the extent to which this thing matches our goals. No matter how results of this evaluation appear to be, since they are based on a systematic investigation including all the important variables, they will have a significant impact on what we plan to reach and change (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). Richards and Schmidt (2002, p.188) define evaluation as 'the systematic gathering of information for purposes of decisions making'; and assume that evaluation in English language programs, includes investigating the curriculum (objectives), materials and assessment system. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) view evaluation as a matching exercise consisting of the results of NA and the alternative solutions one may propose. Hence, evaluation is helpful in assessing whether course objectives are achieved or not, or whether the course is matching the goals it is designed for or not. Thus this evaluation will provide a feedback for the sponsors or decision makers on the sustainability of the course. Dickins and Germaine (1992) synthesize the importance of evaluation within education domain which should be systematic following certain guiding principles and criteria. Kiely and Dickins (2005) refer to two perspectives on 'evaluation'. The researchers view evaluation first, as a 'study' that functions both as a 'research' on a certain material or topic; or as an 'evaluation' that provides information for decision-making or judgment. Second, evaluation is indicated as a research of evaluation process. However, Tomlinson (2013) claims that evaluation is a subjective judgment that focuses mainly on the users of the course and makes

decisions about the effects of the course materials on its learners, and differentiates it from "analysis" which is viewed as the objective process that focuses mostly on materials. In this sense, the scholar distinguishes "evaluation" from "analysis" and posits that during investigation, questions regarding these two terms should be articulated differently to collect the needed data that support researchers' claims. Littlejohn (1998) (cited in McGrath, 2002) claims that through analysis we can anticipate the assumptions and beliefs that lie behind each textbook which can be discovered in a three level analysis. First, through analyzing the outlook of the textbook, by looking at the front and back covers, introduction, publication and a quick look at the materials. Second, the scholar suggests that we look more carefully at the extracts from the materials (student's book, teacher's book or any other attached materials). The third and last level of analysis includes looking at conclusions (in relation to the aims of the course), the expected role of students and teacher, the rationale behind the order and selection of materials and tasks. This kind of analysis, McGrath posits will enable us to understand the philosophy behind each textbook.

2.3.1 Purposes of textbook evaluation

Textbook evaluation is viewed by many scholars as a crucial step in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a certain textbook or material through analyzing the available materials, evaluating the needs of the learners and teachers, studying the learning context, and assessing the learning outcomes. Despite the fact that textbook evaluation might not be desirable to many policy makers since the results may violate their decisions and interests, nevertheless, a good evaluation that is based on a systematic check of all the available variables will save a lot of money and efforts. Sheldon (1988) considers textbooks as an essential element in the ELT program, and the selection of the appropriate textbook indicates "an executive educational decision

in which there is considerable professional, financial and even political investment" (1988, p.237). However, the scholar argues that most of the time these textbooks fail to satisfy the educational requirements and students' needs due to flaws in the design and the theoretical premises behind these textbooks. As a reason, a well-formed evaluation will enable policy makers to reconsider their priorities, moreover; evaluation will give the managers and teachers a critical view of the available textbooks in the markets to choose the best textbook that suits their objectives and students' needs.

Other purposes of evaluation are proposed by Dickins and Germaine (1992) such as: to investigate the shifts that have occurred within the teaching methodology and by means of evaluation, the teachers or the government can assess the effectiveness and the degree of success of this shift. Accountability is another reason of evaluation which aims at investigating the effectiveness and efficiency of a certain textbook, which is mainly done by the decision makers to decide on whether to continue with the same textbook or change it for good. According to Kiely (2009), one of the advantages of any evaluation is the explanation it may provide that will result in further developments in regard with language programs and materials. Sarem et al. (2013) adds to these advantages and claim that a thorough look to textbooks will qualify teachers to make the best use of the strong points it contains and try to eliminate and amend the shortcoming that are available within the exercises, tasks and the materials it contains. Moreover, this task will add to the professional development of the teachers and hence could be added to teachers' professional development trainings to help teachers develop critical insights into the features that these textbooks contain and the methods that help them adapt the existing materials (Cunningsworth, 1995).

Hutchiston and Waters (1987) claim that evaluation can play a valuable social role by showing the participants that their opinions and comments are of value.

2.3.2 Evaluation principles

In order to avoid weak and unreliable evaluations within the education domain, Williams (1983) suggests some criteria for EFL/ESL textbooks evaluation. First criterion is to choose a textbook that follows an up-to-date accepted methodology of foreign/second language teaching. Second, the textbook should be accompanied by a teacher guide for those teachers who do not have a complete control over the language to enable them interpret writers' intentions instead of translating words. Third, the textbook should be catered to students' language needs; here, the writer refers to the difficulty the course designers may face when the learning context contains multilingual students (the same case with our study). Lastly, the socio-cultural environment of learning should be studied well in order to avoid social and cultural clashes inside classrooms. Despite the necessity of setting certain criteria to follow while evaluating textbooks, Sheldon (1988) assumes that these global and culturally restricted criteria do not suit the local context and must be modified after all to insure its applicability. Following the same path, Dickins and Germaine (1992) recommend the evaluator to be principled in his evaluations through making explicit criteria to follow. With respect to material evaluation, the scholars suggest the evaluator ask certain question regarding the material before evaluating it. Such questions may include (what do materials mean for teachers and students, what is the role of material within the teaching and learning context and how should these materials be used). McDonough and Shaw (1993) set some parameters that help to assess materials before using them, which include: considering the suitability of the material with the syllabus and its objectives, to what extent these materials are generalizable, are the materials

adaptable to suit the context of learning, and lastly whether the flexibility factor is considered or not while adopting the materials. Cunningsworth (1995) and Tomlinson (2013) also established some guidelines for textbooks evaluation and these guidelines are quite similar to the ones suggested by previous scholars, to count some criteria: the course book should match the objectives of language-learning program and the needs of the learners, the course book should enable the learners to use the language for present and future personal purposes, textbooks should facilitate the learning process without imposing rigid methods, textbooks must have a clear role within the learning process, materials should stimulate emotional engagement and materials should promote visual imaging.

2.3.3 Types of evaluation

Johnson (1994) claims that evaluation can take different dimensions based on what they are tailored for, and these dimensions include summative vs formative and product vs process. Johnson believes that these dimensions complete each other and they should be dealt with as one entity rather than being exclusive. Back in history of 'program evaluation' as cited in Lynch (1996), in 1967 Scriven introduced these terms for the first time in relation with evaluation. Hence, summative evaluation is thought of to indicate to an evaluation that is designed to determine whether a program has succeeded or not after it has been completed; while formative evaluation is used to evaluate a program while still in use to suggest further improvements. Respectively the information extracted from these two different purposes of evaluation provide different hints about a program. Whereas the difference between product evaluation and process evaluation is related to the kind of information the evaluator should consider. Product-oriented' evaluation seeks to evaluate the outcomes of a program and investigate whether the goals of the program have been achieved or not through

questionnaires and students final test scores, however this kind of evaluation will not give the evaluator adequate information regarding what have happened during the course of instruction. Process-oriented evaluation on the other hand, focuses on the means that are adapted during the implementation phases of the program to achieve program objectives. We can conclude that summative evaluation concentrate on the product of a program whereas formative evaluation is concerned with the process and its development (Johnson, 1994 and Lynch, 1996).

Tomlinson (2003) suggests that we choose different types of evaluation based on the purpose the evaluator has in mind, in addition taking into consideration the complete circumstances of the targeted context in order to reach reliable and effective results. Correspondingly, procedures of evaluation are not generalizable since evaluations are distinct in their purposes, duration, means, subjects and degree of formality.

Weir and Roberts (1994) hypothesize that the scope of evaluation may differ due to the focal points of an educational evaluation, hence the object of the evaluation may include, for instance, teaching materials, staff and students' needs.

As far as material evaluation is concerned, McDonough and Shaw (1993) propose two kinds of evaluation, external evaluation and internal evaluation. Whereas the former offers an overview of the textbook from outside (cover, table of contents and introduction), the later looks more closely and provides detailed description of materials. Correspondingly, both Cunningsworth (1995) and Tomlinson (2003) introduce three types of material evaluation (with different terminology): first, Pre-use evaluation which might be somehow problematic as the writers assume, because it is based on prediction and one may not be able to collect sufficient amount of evidence

before the use of the book. This kind could be considered as a type of analysis, since it is not based on learners' and teachers' perceptions and learning outcomes. The second type is referred to as In-use evaluation which evaluates the materials while still in use to examine their effectiveness and decide whether to continue with the same book or replace it with another one. Post-use evaluation is the last type introduced by Cunningsworth and it manifests as a retrospective evaluation to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the in-use material after it has been used for a period of time. Ellis (1997) gives different names of these kinds of evaluation, and calls the Pre-use evaluation the 'Predictive' evaluation as it is indicated by its name, aims at deciding which materials to use before the course starts; and 'Retrospective' evaluation is used for Post-use evaluation to examine materials that have already been used; this kind of evaluation works as a validity test for predictive evaluation and may suggest for future improvements on the means of predictive evaluation. Moreover, the scholar suggests two ways of conducting these two kinds of evaluation, either by macro-evaluation, which seeks for the overall outcomes of the course and compares it with the objectives; or through micro-evaluation that investigates and assess a certain task within the textbooks in details.

2.3.4 Approaches to evaluation

McGrath (2002) introduces three main approaches of evaluation as listed below:

2.3.4.1 The impressionistic approach

As the name indicates, the evaluator constitutes an impression of the textbook which enables him to form a kind of introduction about the materials, its publisher, number of pages, topics, organization, and layout. However, this method is thought of as superficial as it evaluates only the outlook of the book discarding the weaknesses and strength of it. Nevertheless, this method is considered as not reliable since it does not

provide enough details regarding how it fulfils the teaching/learning requirements. This approach is quite similar to Littlejohn's level one analysis of materials. The retrospective evaluation suggested by Ellis (1997) is thought of as impressionistic evaluation in nature.

2.3.4.2 The checklist approach

This approach is considered by McGrath as a better alternative of Impressionistic approach as it is more systematic which makes the evaluator to point out what he wants to look for in advance deciding on what's important and what is not. Most often, checklists are based on predetermined and generalizable evaluating criteria, which can be qualitative (using open-ended questions to elicit subjective information) or quantitative (through Likert scale questions to stimulate objective information) (Mukundan et al., 2011). Moreover, this method is less cost consuming allowing to collect and record a big amount of information in a short time and in a convenient way to make the comparisons between the targeted materials more easy. Furthermore, the information is included in an explicit manner which is understood by all the participants of the evaluation process. Nevertheless, this method is not far from limitations, McGrath thinks that one of the drawbacks of this method is that each checklist is designed according to the designers' beliefs reflecting a certain time which are adaptable only to a specific context.

2.3.4.3 The in-depth approach

 This approach is also being referred to as (micro-evaluation) by Ellis (1997), which looks for the aspects of the language of instruction, students' learning needs and the requirements of the syllabus through analyzing, for instance, two units from the textbook in details as an empirical evaluation task. Cunningsworth (1995) describes this approach as 'active' in which the evaluator actively seeks for the information

regarding the material in accordance with his objectives. McGrath counts some potential challenges of this method and thinks that it is both time consuming and needs expertise which not all evaluators can afford. Besides, the units that one will choose as representative may not be so in all senses which will make the judgment subjective as it appears to be partially assessing the materials.

Adding to these approaches, we should keep in mind that a needs analysis-based evaluation is another method of material evaluation which was suggested by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) and Hidri and Coombe (2016) and could be a very effective and inclusive evaluation that helps uncover the most significant part of textbooks which is, the purposes they are designed for. Hence, investigating language needs of students and comparing them to the content of the textbook and inspect the extent in which this material addresses the identified needs could be a sufficient and effective approach to textbook evaluation.

2.3.5 Studies on English language textbook evaluation

A lot of researchers have evaluated ESL/EFL textbooks to find out to what extent these textbook fulfil students' and teachers' needs and what are the perceptions of teachers and students towards these textbooks since teachers and students are the key element who can decide on the success and failure of any education program.

Akil et al. (2018) conduct a study in which students were given the chance to express their beliefs regarding a teacher-made writing textbook and the writers consider these perceptions, which were mainly reflected in students' needs, as the base for this material evaluation. Overall, the results of this study indicate that students do believe that this teacher-made material is of value and think that it has enhanced their skills in writing; nevertheless, it needed some improvements in the design of the material. This

kind of evaluation is vital to be done by teachers who create their teaching tools in order to make sure that the tools are delivering what they are designed for.

 In an attempt to evaluate an EFL textbook that is used by one of the universities in Iran, Marzban and Zokaeieh (2017) developed a questionnaire and distributed among freshmen of this university, in addition to an evaluation checklist that was adapted from several resources and contained different criteria to obtain the necessary data. The results from this evaluative study showed that the textbook given by this university to freshman students contain both strong and weak points mainly related to listening and speaking skills which are the basic skills that are focused on in this textbook. Moreover, the scholars suggest that syllabus designers and evaluators can make use of the results of such studies to add, delete, adapt and adopt certain elements as a step to improve the textbook.

Mohammadi and Abdi (2014) evaluates one of the EFL textbooks that is given in several institutions in Iran to explore whether this textbook meets the needs of Iranian students or not through two questionnaires, one for students and one for teachers; in addition to a NA questionnaire for students. When the results from the evaluation questionnaires were compared to the students' NA tool, it was clear from the outcomes that the strengths of this textbook over weighted the limitations and both teachers and students who were asked about their perceptions regarding the use of this textbook thought that it is of value and worth considering since it contains interesting, challenging and motivating topics.

In line with the previous studies, Sarem et al. (2013) who evaluate an ESP textbook that is used for tourism using the checklist developed by Daoud and Celce-Murcia

(1979), claim that the evaluated textbook which is skill-based is indeed improving students' skills through focusing mainly on speaking and writing to attain the communicative objective of the course.

As far as school textbooks are concerned, there are a lot of studies that report the role of evaluation within this context, one of those studies is the one conducted by Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018). In this study the researchers try to find out how students and teachers evaluate a newly introduced textbook by the ministry of higher education through two questionnaires that were designed for this purpose. These two questionnaires were intended to focus on certain criteria within the textbooks namely, Practical considerations, language type, activities, skills, subject and content, cultural considerations and layout and design. The results of this study showed that both students and teachers have evaluated the textbook in almost an identical way. The participants thought that this textbook is useful. Nonetheless, it needs some modifications with respect to the cultural values that this book tries to teach.

Rashidi and Kehtarfard (2014) state that needs analysis-based evaluation is an integral part of textbooks evaluation especially in EFL contexts. Using a NA tool to identify students' needs and compare these most needed aspects of language learning to the extent which the targeted textbook support all these needs. The results of this study indicated that not all the needed aspects of language are presented in the textbook and thus modifications are recommended or the suggestion of adding another instructional materials to ensure the effectiveness of the textbook.

Similar results are reported by Awad (2013) who evaluates the 12th grade textbook in Palestine with respect to teachers' perceptions. The researcher found out that the

textbook used for this level is satisfactory to certain extent and could be used for the upcoming years with regard to some recommendations and modifications made by the decision maker.

Saricoban and Can (2013) evaluate the English language textbooks used for the grade nine in both local and international schools in a Turkish context in terms of language skills and language components. A quantitative checklist was developed by the scholars in accordance with the study objective and was given to in-service teachers who teach this course and the results from local and international schools were compared. The findings of the study indicated that the course book did contain adequate grammar information but the language skills and specially reading, writing and speaking need more improvement as they registered lower rate than grammar and listening.

Soori et al., (2011) evaluate high school first grade English textbook in an attempt to discover the extent to which this textbook match the common universal characteristics of ESL/EFL textbooks. The researchers found out that the degree of conforming the textbook to the common universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks is only 63% which is thought to be hardly satisfactory and need more investigation and redemption by policy makers.

 In an attempt to explore the role of teachers in evaluating textbooks through a state-of-art article, Ahmadi and Derakhshan (2016) assume that teachers are the key factor in the success of any education program and teachers can manage and evaluate this program especially the textbooks since they are the one who are using and adapting the textbooks. Moreover, textbook evaluation is considered as an essential element of

teacher's professional development and an integral part of teachers' work. All the reviewed works inside this chapter including (Azizfar, 2009; Guilani, Yasin, and Hua, 2011; Shabani and MansooriNejad, 2013; Ahour, Towhidian and Saeidi, 2013; Moghtadi, 2014 and Rashidi and Kehtarfard, 2014) refer to the advantages of textbook evaluation from different points of view since they uncover the limits of textbooks that should be improved for future use.

2.4 Summary

This chapter attempted to uncover the related literature in three fields which are the NA, textbook adoption and textbook evaluation. First it introduced these terms and stated the purposes behind undertaking these processes while choosing a textbook. Second it presented the mostly used approaches to NA, course-book adoption and evaluation. Finally, it reviewed studies conducted on these areas. The aim behind this chapter was to show the importance of NA in designing or adopting language learning materials, in addition to the significance of NA as a material evaluation tool.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this chapter is to describe the method that is manipulated in this study and introduces the tools that are used for data collection. The chapter discusses the rationale behind choosing certain methodology and correlates it to the objectives and study questions that are presented in chapter one beside the theoretical background presented in chapter two.

3.1 Research aims and questions

This study investigates the needs of students at present time while still involved in the learning process and later on in the future following first, a present-situation approach that is introduced by Ritchterich and Chancerel (1977/80) and is concerned with student current language learning needs of linguistics skills such as reading, and writing, listening and speaking; second, in addition to present situation approach, the study uses the target-situation approach that is presented by Munby (1978) to assess the future language needs of students. This later assessment of target needs will result in specific settings where students will find themselves in future (Nunan, 1988).

As far as the textbook evaluation is concerned, the researcher will evaluate the textbook based on the results of needs analysis which will be analyzed quantitatively using four general language needs that are categorized in the questionnaire (i.e. a need for general knowledge about the language, a need to learn the language for educational purposes, a need to learn the language for social purposes and for vocational purposes).

These results will later be compared to the interview's qualitative results which focus mainly on the extent which stakeholders believe this textbook meets these needs. Eventually, the compared quantitative and qualitative results will lead to a whole evaluation of the English foundation course in the targeted university.

For this reason, we attempt to cover as much information as possible about the English language needs of first year students as they are perceived by teachers, decision makers and students, through an adapted needs analysis questionnaire and interview questions. Our main goal is to define the needs of university freshmen and explore whether these needs are met in the current in-use textbook or not. In order to achieve our aim, the following research questions were addressed:

1. How can the students' language needs in general courses be identified?
2. What are the English language needs of first year students at Duhok University?
3. What are the perceptions of teachers and students on these needs?
4. Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?
5. Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?

3.2 Research design

Two tools of data collection; questionnaire and semi-structured interview questions are used in this study formulating a mixed-method research design. The rationale behind choosing certain data collection tool will be illustrated in the upcoming sections of this chapter.

Mixed method study is that kind of study that combines more than one method of data collection and analysis; i.e. qualitative and quantitative (Creswell, 1994) which is one of the most significant features of this kind of research. Some of the benefits of this research method are: it strengthen the reliability and validity of the study, and it enables the researcher to take out the best from the two methods in order to increase the strengths and eliminate the drawbacks. Furthermore, through utilizing the mixed method, researchers are able to analyze the data in various ways and they are also able to reach a vast and various number of participants (Dornyei, 2007). Nevertheless, a researcher who is conducting a study using a mixed method design, should be methodologically skilled enough in order to be able to handle both kinds of data.

3.2.1 Quantitative tool

The quantitative instruments used in this study are questionnaires. Questionnaires are the most common and widely used data collection tool in applied linguistics (Dornyei, 2007). The reason behind favoring this tool lies behind the fact that it does not require the researcher to be available during the data collection phase to administer by him/herself, while at the same time the collected data are easy to be analyzed by precise measurements resulting in reliable data; furthermore, this tool can be distributed among thousands of participants in a short span of time which is more practical and saves researchers a great deal of time and money since the analysis will be done using statistical computer software (Bryman, 1984; Dornyei, 2007; Cohen et at., 2008). Moreover, Graves (2000) believes that this tool can easily be adapted to different contexts, a research method with such features is referred to by Bryman (1984) as the 'Positivist' or 'Empiricist' research. Dornyei (2007) introduces some characteristics of this approach which are presented as follow:

- It largely depends on numbers which should be precisely defined in advance by the researcher otherwise they will sound meaningless.

- These numbers should be categorized according to the items presented in the tool.

- The quantitative study focuses mainly on variables.

- Statistical analysis is the most salient feature of quantitative study.

- Quantitative research procedures are generalizable across different context.

However, the easiness and straightforwardness of this tool should not be taken for granted as it should be tested for reliability and it should also be piloted to insure the validity of the instrument. Despite the many strengths of this method, it is not far from limitations. Tabook (2014) and Dornyei (2007) believe that as questionnaires are able to measure opinions and perceptions, they cannot measure the motive behind the responses as they are limited in length and depth of the responses, hence the exploratory capacity of quantitative research is a one that is inadequate and decontextualized.

3.2.1.1 Questionnaire design

For the sake of this study, a questionnaire was adapted from Hall and Cook (2015) (Appendices 5 & 6). The original questionnaire was designed in an attempt to examine the students' and teachers' perceptions regarding the needs of young adults indulged in English language courses all over Europe. In order to fit the context of the current study, the researcher did some major adaptations to the original copy. Some items in the original version are removed or paraphrased and some sections are combined; and eventually two versions of the same questionnaire were created, one for the first year university students and the other one for the English language teachers teaching first

year students. It is worth noting, that the two questionnaires are identical except for first part which is about personal information of participants. The language and wording are also different as the questionnaire addresses students' needs.

To ensure the validity of the last versions of the questionnaire, the opinion of two experts were taken and their feedback was considered as the bases for further improvements and refinement. While the internal consistency of the both versions were tested for reliability through piloting with a group of thirty three students; and the estimated Cronbach's coefficient Alpha of the students' questionnaire was 0.94, while the teachers' version of the questionnaire have been piloted with ten teachers and the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.77.

As the medium of instruction in the subjected university is not English; the students' questionnaire (see Appendices 10, 11, 14, 15) has been translated (back-translated) by two experienced and legitimated translators into both Arabic and Kurdish language. Moreover, both versions of the questionnaires are accompanied by a consent letter that states clearly the aim of the study and stresses the confidentiality and voluntarily participation in this study. The questionnaires consist of three sections:

Section A, mainly deals with personal information of participants. This section is not identical in both versions of the questionnaire. In students' questionnaire, we opt to know for how long the students have been learning English language, when they started learning and where they learn this language. This information is crucial for our study, to ensure whether these variables will have an impact on the results or not. On the other hand, this section in the teachers questionnaire, is divided into two parts, the first one is about the personal information such as the number of experience years,

while the second part is about teachers' professional context which includes questions such as: the age of learners and the proficiency level of students. This kind of information will again help us identify the variables affecting the results of this study.

Section B, this part of the questionnaire contains a group of thirty three statements in the form of Likert Scale; compromised with five Likert Scale including strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. The statements are divided between 'perceived needs of English language' and 'reasons for learning English language' which are relatively divided into four subcategories: a need to learn general knowledge about the language, a need to learn the language for educational purposes, a need to learn the language for social purposes and for vocational purposes.

Section C, is a blank box that enables the participants to express their thought by giving them the chance to comment or add any other information they believe to be relevant to the study. This part of the questionnaire is qualitatively interpreted with interview results.

3.2.2 Qualitative tool

Qualitative research has one distinct characteristic related to the nature of its emergent, which is believed that it is not restricted to any study design. In addition to the unique emergent nature of this study, the setting of the qualitative study is kept as natural as possible to maintain the naturalistic social object it opt to. The excerpt from qualitative study is a one that is subjective because it depends on the participants' views, feelings and experiences. Unlike the quantitative study, qualitative study depends on a small sample size which is considered by many scholars as a weak point of this kind of research. Meanwhile another weak point of this method is supposed to be related to the data analysis techniques which is highly dependent on researchers' subjective

interpretation that also is counted as a drawback of this study type. Nonetheless, this method is a one that requires intensive labor from researcher's side which in turn is more time consuming (Dornyei, 2007). Qualitative studies can take several shapes such as interviews, focus group discussions, different kinds of texts including field notes, journal or diary entries, documents, images and videos.

Interview is the qualitative method the researcher resorted to during collecting the second kind of data for this study. Unlike questionnaires, the unique feature of interview is that it is based on open-ended questions which aims at studying the social and humanistic side of life from individual perceptions, which counts on a moral duty from researcher's side and not generalized averages of responses (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Weir and Roberts (1994) claimed that interviews are a wealthy and detailed investigation means, and the information regarding participants perceptions are best studied through this method. Respectively, using interviews as a qualitative tool signals the move towards generating knowledge from interactions between humans rather than using humans as subjects that are manipulated to generate data. Interviews in this respect are considered as flexible data collection tools that include different sensory-channels such as verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard (Cohen et at., 2008). Thus, the main purpose of any interview is to provide different and alternative views on the issue being studied (Polkinghorne, 2005).

There are different kinds of interviews such as structured interviews, unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews and single or multiple-sessions (Dornyei, 2007). Cohen et al. summarize all the kinds of interviews being discussed in the related literature and introduces four main types such as: "the structured interviews, the

unstructured interviews, the non-directive interviews and the focused interview"
(2008, p.355).

The kind of interview used in this study is the semi-structured interview. The reason
behind this choice is that the format of the questions in this kind of interview are open-
ended and the researcher can elaborate on the questions, explain and direct the
interviewers to give further explanation and more details. Dornyei (2007) recommends
this kind of interview in cases where the interviewee is well aware of the subject s/he
is questioning which gives him/her a chance to broaden the scope of the answers
instead of getting ready-made answer type.

3.2.2.1 Interview questions

This part of the study contains several questions which the participants were asked to
orally comment on them with a prior consent over participating voluntarily in the
interview. The interview questions will be used as the bases for qualitatively
evaluating the textbooks and materials supplied by the target university. The interview
questions are also adapted from Hall and Cook (2015) (see Appendices 8 & 9) and
were evaluated by an expert and piloted with two teachers and two students to ensure
their comprehensiveness. Eight identical interview questions were prepared for this
part of the study. Four questions contained close ended items, where the stakeholders
were asked to make a choice and answer with yes or no and then elaborate their
answers; and the other four questions were open ended questions. The rationale behind
this mixture of questions is that the researcher wanted some definite answers to be
used as the bases for our textbook evaluation, while the open ended questions will give
the interviewees a chance to organize their ideas and illustrate their answers which in
return will add to the validity of our study (Aberbach & Rockman, 2002). Since the
medium of instruction in the targeted university is not English, the interview questions

prepared for students were translated into Kurdish and Arabic (see Appendices 13 & 17).

The researcher has recorded the interviews as an attempt to cover all the important points referred by the participants (Dornyei, 2007) and later transcribed the recorded interviews and mainly four themes were extracted from them. Moreover, for the validity and reliability of the answers, the transcripts were analyzed and coded by another researcher to reach the inter-coder agreement.

3.3 The setting of the study

The study is conducted at University of Duhok in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. This university was founded in 1992 with only two colleges, now it has 18 faculties and 78 departments with 21265 undergraduates from different ethnic groups (Kurds, Arabs, Turkmen, Assyrians, Keldan and others) and religion (Muslims, Christians and Yezidi). However, the interest of this study is only first year students whose population is about 4800 students. The medium of instruction in this university is not English language though in social sciences and applied science departments the textbooks and curriculum are mainly in English language, nonetheless the instructors resort to other languages (mainly Kurdish and Arabic) while giving instruction.

Although the academic year at university level starts at the beginning of September, due to delay in registration process and admission procedures, first year students do not take classes until the end of November. So the academic year for first year students begins with November and lasts in July divided between two semesters.

First year English language course in this university is a general foundation course. The course is mainly based on a textbook titled (Foundation English for University

Students) that is designed by Terry Philips, Anna Philips and Regan in conjunction with Kurdistan region ministry of higher education and Duhok University to be covered in 180 hours during the course of one academic year. The whole curriculum compromises with a course book, work book and teachers' book. The course book is divided into four themes, i.e. Education, Psychology and sociology, Work and business, Science and nature, and the physical world. The main aim of this course is to prepare students to study completely or partly in English medium at tertiary level, or to join the world of academic English, on the Internet and in print.

3.4 Data collection procedures

Data collection underwent certain stages, started after EMU's Scientific and Publication Ethics Committee (BAYEK) granted the researcher the approval to pursue with this study (see Appendix 1), followed by a confirmation letter from University of Duhok (UoD) to the researchers request to gather the needed data at their university after the researcher have stated clearly in her request the purposes of the study (see Appendix 2). The next stage was the distribution of the questionnaire which was done by four English language teachers working at this university. The instructions regarding how to distribute the questionnaire, the purpose and the confidentiality of the study, and to whom should it be given were all clarified by the researcher herself in a two hour meeting with the intended facilitators in order to avoid confusion and ensure transparency. While the interviews were conducted by the researcher herself.

3.4.1 Sampling

Cluster Random Sampling was used in this study in reaching our students participants. The reason why this sampling procedure was chosen is due to the large number of the study population which were dispersed among different faculties. Moreover, the sampling procedure used in reaching the teachers and decision makers was

convenience sampling, since the aim of the study was to reach only the teachers who are currently teaching English language course to first year students or those who had taught first year students with the same textbook during the last few years. The rationale behind choosing this method in sampling was the practical criteria these teachers had and the easiness to access them (Dornyei, 2007) since the researcher had not enough time to reach a larger and more variant group and was not living at the same city during the implementation of the study.

3.4.2 Participants

The participants of this study consisted of three groups. The first group were twenty nine English language teachers overall. Twenty seven teachers were those who have graduated from English language teaching department at university of Duhok and teaching English language course in other departments and to other disciplines; and two teachers were those teachers whose majors are not English language but are currently teaching first year students the English language course. The participated teachers were master degree holder, bachelor holders in English language teaching (who are assistant researchers at the same university) and PH.D students in English language teaching department.

The second group of participants were the first year university students who are enrolled in different academic majors for the academic year 2018-2019. A total of 336 students participated in this study.

The third group of participants were the decision makers at this university. These decision makers have approved on using the proposed English language textbook as the bases of first year English language course syllabus. The three decision makers were PH.D holders, two in English language teaching (one of them is currently the

head of English language teaching department at UoD) and one in applied science (currently the Head of Electronic Engineering Department).

3.5 Data analysis

Two kinds of data analysis were implemented in this study, the quantitative analysis and the qualitative analysis. In order to be able to analyze the data correctly, first of all, the rates of responses were calculated and hence the average response rate to the students' questionnaire was 82.5% and the rate of response to teachers' questionnaire was 100%.

3.5.1 Quantitative data analysis

The quantitative analysis is done through using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) program version 22 which is considered as the most widely used program in analyzing data from education researches (Muijs, 2004). Frequencies, means and standard deviations are calculated through descriptive statistics. While the comparative part of the analysis between the students and teachers' questionnaire is be done through the use of independent-sample T Test.

3.5.2 Qualitative data analysis

The researcher analyzed the collected data from the open-ended questions in the semi-structured interviews and the comment section in the questionnaires qualitatively through thematic analysis which is considered as the most flexible method used in analyzing qualitative data (Creswell, 1994 and Patton, 1987), first through transcribing the recordings and then categorizing the similar answers and coding them under certain themes. Thematic analysis has been defined by Braun and Clerke (2006) as a data analysis technique that is used in "identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes your data sets in (rich)

detail. However, it goes further than this and interprets various aspects of the research topic" (p. 79).

The results from this qualitative analysis will be compared with the results of questionnaire and hence the matches and mismatches among the views of different participants will be explored. Whereas, the four questions that included close ended answers, are numerated manually and will used to evaluate the textbook.

3.6 Summary

This chapter introduced the methodology in which the study is implemented through and the tools that are chosen to best address the research questions. Furthermore, the context of the study was described in detail along with the study participants and data collection and analysis means.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter analyzes the collected data upon the discussed methodology in chapter three. First quantitative data that are collected through questionnaires will be analyzed numerically and results will be presented, second the themes and basic notions that are extracted from interviews and open ended comments will be qualitatively analyzed.

4.1 Research questions and data analysis techniques

For more clarification and before starting the data analysis procedures; data analysis techniques that are used in this study in accordance with the research questions and the tools that are used are illustrated in the following table.

Table 4.1: research questions and data analysis techniques

Research Questions	Tools	Data Analysis Techniques	Descriptions
1. How can the students' English language needs in general courses be identified?	Questionnaire	Descriptive Statistics	-To find the mean Score for Students and Teachers' perceptions regarding English language needs of 1st year university students
2. What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University?	Questionnaire Interview question 1	Descriptive Statistics Thematic analysis	-To find the mean Score for Students and Teachers' perceptions regarding English language needs of 1st year university students.

Research Questions	Tools	Data Analysis Techniques	Descriptions
			-To see how stakeholders perceive the language needs of 1st year university students
3. What are the perceptions of teachers and students on these needs?	Questionnaire	Independent-Samples T Test	-To compare between students and teachers' perceptions regarding English language needs of 1st year university students
4. Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?	Quantifying the responses from interviews	Thematic Analysis & Manually collected responses	-To evaluate the textbook and materials being used for teaching English language.
5. Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?	Interview	Thematic Analysis	-To explore whether teachers are able to address the language needs of their students by the end of the course.

4.2 Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were used for the purpose of this study: one for university freshmen and one for English language teachers. The two questionnaires consisted of three parts. Part one (i.e., personal information) and part two (i.e., Likert scale items) which were quantitatively analyzed through SPSS and the third part which included 'any further comments' were qualitatively analyzed with the interview questions.

Before analyzing the data, the reliability of the results was calculated and the Cronbach's Alpha of students' questionnaire was rated as 0.87 while for the teachers' it was 0.90.

4.2.1 Students' questionnaire

Section A: Personal information

Overall, 360 questionnaires were distributed, but only 330 questionnaires were returned correctly. The number of the participated students were divided between 133 males (40%) and 197 females (59%); where their age ranged mostly between 17 years old to above 22 years and the majority (38.8%) being 19 years old. This information is presented in tables (4.2 and 4.3)

Table 4.2: Student gender

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	133	40.3
	Female	197	59.7
	Total	330	100.0

Table 4.3: Student age

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	17 Years	2	.6
	18 Years	69	20.9
	19 Years	128	38.8
	20 Years	72	21.8
	21 Years	15	4.5
	22+ Years	44	13.3
	Total	330	100.0

The question regarding the number of years students have studied English language, 61% of students stated they have studied English for 10 to 14 years while 17% stated they have studied English for 5 to 9 years only. This difference is due to a change in the plan of education ministry regarding the years of studying English language, since some students started studying English from fifth grade while others started in first

grade at primary level. The ratio of students started learning English between age five to nine was 57%, where 32% started learning English between age of 10 to 14. As far as the place of learning English is concerned, 42% of students admitted they only study English as a part of their university study, while 18% of students claimed they learn English through additional courses outside university; and 17% of students admitted that they learn English not through regular classes rather on their own as shown in tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6.

Table 4.4: Years studied English

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0-4 Years	18	5.5
	5-9 Years	58	17.6
	10-14 Years	202	61.2
	14+ Years	52	15.8
	Total	330	100.0

Table 4.5: Age when started learning English

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0-4 Years	13	3.9
	5-9 Years	190	57.6
	10-14 Years	108	32.7
	15-19 Years	16	4.8
	20+ Years	3	.9
	Total	330	100.0

Table 4.6: Place of learning English

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	14	4.2
	Part of my studies at my college /university	141	42.7
	Additional lessons outside my college /university	24	7.3
	Part of my studies at my college /university and additional lessons outside my college/ university	62	18.8
	I do not learn English in lessons and classes, I learn English alone	57	17.3
	I never learned English	24	7.3
	Other (Please specify)	8	2.4
	Total	330	100.0

As far as the option related to the curriculum description was concerned, 40% of students admitted they take English language course and other courses in English; while 52% of students said they are taking the English course in addition to other course (not in English) this information is illustrated in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Describe curriculum at your university

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	I study English only	25	7.6
	I study English and other academic subjects	173	52.4
	I study English and other academic subjects in English	132	40.0
	Total	330	100.0

Section B: English language needs of students

This section of the questionnaire in both students and teachers' version are designed to answer the study questions 1, 2 and 3 which are as follow:

1. How can the students' language needs in general courses be identified?
2. What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University?

3. What are the perceptions of teachers and students on these needs?

This part of the questionnaire consists of thirty three closed items with a five point Likert scale starting with agree and ending with strongly disagree, however for the sake of practical analysis each of two items were combined into one item only. Eventually having only three Likert scale points (Agree, Neutral and Disagree). The statements within this section were also divided into four categories which were arranged as follow:

1. Question 1 to 13 are about students need to know general English language knowledge and skills

2. Questions 14 to 24 are about the need to learn English for social purposes.

3. Questions 25 to 28 are about the need to learn English for vocational purposes.

4. Questions 29 to 33 are about the need to learn English for educational purposes.

The results from this section of students' version revealed that the majority of students perceive the language needs positively since almost all the students strongly agreed or agreed with the presented items in the questionnaire. The average mean for the students' questionnaire was 1.3 out of 3 which means that the students mostly agreed with the given statements in the questionnaire regarding what they think they need to learn about English language. These results are shown in table number 4.8.

Table 4.8: Section B English language needs

Questions	Agree/ Strongly agree in %	Neutral in %	Disagree/ strongly disagree in %	Mean
1. I need to have native-like pronunciation	91.5	4.5	13	1.12
2. I need to use native-like grammar	82.4	9.1	8.5	1.26
3. I need to be familiar with native-speaker idiomatic language	81.2	14.2	4.5	1.23

4.	I need to use native-speaker idiomatic language	82.7	10.9	6.4	1.24
5.	I need to know about British, US or other English-speaking culture	54.2	20.3	25.5	1.71
6.	I need to know about the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary).	63.9	20.3	15.8	1.52
7.	I need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	74.5	14.2	11.2	1.37
8.	I need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	72.4	16.4	11.2	1.39
9.	I need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	68.8	18.5	12.7	1.44
10.	I need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	68.2	19.1	12.7	1.45
11.	I need to learn British variety	59.4	18.5	22.1	1.63
12.	I need to learn American variety	60.0	17.3	22.7	1.63
13.	I need to learn International English	85.5	5.2	9.4	1.24
14.	I need to be able to use English in online written communication (e.g. email, texting, tweeting and messaging)	94.8	2.4	2.7	1.08
15	I need to be able to use English in online spoken communication (e.g. via Skype or Face Time).	84.5	7.3	8.2	1.24
16	I need to learn English for online communication	89.4	7.0	3.6	1.14
17	I need to learn English language to be able to communicate with native speakers.	84.2	7.9	7.9	1.24
18	I need to learn English to be able to communicate with other non-native speakers who speak English	83.0	7.6	9.4	1.26
19	I need to learn English to be able to understand English media and films	78.2	10.6	11.2	1.33

20	I need to learn English to be able to participate in online social networks (e.g. Snapchat, Facebook, Instagram or WhatsApp	90.3	5.2	4.5	1.14
21	I need to learn English to be able to participate in online games	78.2	11.2	10.6	1.32
22	I need to learn English to be able to travel to the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries	59.7	20.3	20.0	1.60
23	I need to learn English to be able to understand UK, USA or other English-speaking cultures	80.6	10.6	8.8	1.28
24	I need to learn the English to be more respected by my own age group	85.2	8.2	6.7	1.22
25	I need to learn English related to a specific job or career.	66.4	22.4	11.2	1.45
26	I need to learn English to have more job opportunities in future	63.9	17.9	18.2	1.54
27	I need to learn English to be able to find work in my home country	74.5	8.5	17.0	1.42
28	I need to learn English to be able to find work in countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people.	93.9	3.6	2.4	1.08
29	I need to learn English in order to appear more knowledgeable or sophisticated.	93.9	3.0	3.0	1.09
30	I need to learn English to get good grades at college or university.	71.8	19.1	9.1	1.37
31	I need to learn English to pass IELTS or a similar international English language proficiency tests	58.8	20.6	20.6	1.62
32	I need to learn English for study purposes in my own country.	84.5	11.2	4.2	1.20
33	I need to learn English for study purposes in other countries	81.5	10.3	8.2	1.27

First category: To exactly know what our students need the most to learn about English language, we categorized item 1 until item 13 in the questionnaire under the notion of 'the need of learning general knowledge about this language'. The agreement rates within this category were quite high starting from 91% till 54%. The majority of

students (91.5%) agreed on the need of having a native-like pronunciation, this item scored the highest mean within this category with 1.12. Respectively, (82.4%) thought they need to use native like grammar. In terms of being familiar with idiomatic language, again most of the participants, about (82%) agreed that they need to be familiar with and use native speakers' idiomatic language. Comparatively, only half of the students (54.2 %) agreed on item 5 *(I need to know about British, US or other English-speaking cultures)* which is the lowest percentage of agreement in the students questionnaire with a mean of 1.71; and only (63.9%) agreed on item 6 *(I need to know about the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary).* In respect to items 7 and 8, about (73%) believe they need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in both spoken and written English. With a slight difference, (68%) believe that they need to use new words, phrases and expressions in both spoken and written English. Items 11, 12 and 13 were about the variety of English students think they need to learn and the majority (85.5 %) believe they need to learn the international variety hence scoring the second highest mean within this category with 1.24; this followed by a favor towards the American variety with (60%), and with a very little difference with British variety which was rated as (59.4 %).

The highest means scored by item 1 and 12 indicate that students believe they need to have a native like pronunciation and the majority of students prefer to learn the international variety. Moreover, students made clear that they need to learn grammar accurately and they need to learn idiomatic language used by native speakers. Comparatively, to a lesser extent students supposed they need to know about British and USA cultures or how English language native speakers use English. As far as a

need to learn new vocabularies are concerned, again not all students agreed on items 6, 7, 8 and 9 which contained means ranging from 1.52 to 1.37.

The second category of statements which begins with item 14 and ends with item 24 are concerned with a need to use English for social purposes. Items 14, 15 and 16 are about a need to use English language in online written, spoken and general communication which the majority of students ranged between 94%- 84% agreed with and it is the highest agreement this questionnaire observed with 1.08 mean. When asked about the need to communicate with native and non-native speakers of English language, again about (83.5%) agreed to this need. Items number 19 and 21 were about a need to learn English language to understand the media and films and to enable students participate in online games which exactly same ratios of students agreed on with (78.2 %). Whereas (90.3%) of the participants believed they need to learn English to be able to participate in online social networks. However, only (59.7%) thought they need to learn English to be able to travel to UK, USA and other English speaking countries. Unlike item number 5, item 23 *(I need to learn English to be able to understand UK, USA or other English-speaking cultures)* witnessed a great agreement which about (80.6%) of students agreed on. The last item in this category which is *(I need to learn English to be more respected by my own age group)* was also greed on by (85.2%) of the students.

The three highest means recorded within this category which are item 14 with 1.08, item 20 with 1.14 and item 16 with 1.14, referred to the students' need to learn English language for online communication and the same is true for items 23, 15, 17 and 18. Moderately, item 24 encountered a high agreement with 1.22 mean in which students assumed learning English language will make their friends respect them more.

Relatively, fewer students thought they need to learn English language to understand English media and films or participate in online games with a mean of 1.33.

The third category of the statements is related to the need to learn English language for vocational purposes which are presented in items 25, 26, 27 and 28. When students were asked whether they need to learn an English related to a specific job or career to be able to find work in their own home country, only (66.4%) agreed to it. With a close percentage, only (63.9%) of the students thought they need to learn English to find job opportunities in the future. Though (74.5%) of the students believed they need to learn English to find work in their own home country, at a time when (17%) of students disagreed with this item. Contradictory, (93.9 %) believed they need to learn English to find work in countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people and this is the highest ratio of agreement within this category with a mean of 1.08. Henceforth, indicating to the importance of English language all around the world as being a must in finding job opportunities and students are well aware of this need.

The fourth category in students' questionnaire is related to the need to learn English for educational purposes. The majority of students (93.9%) believed they need to learn English in order to appear more knowledgeable or sophisticated with a highest mean recorded within this category with 1.09; followed by items 32 and 33 which recorded approximately (82.5%) of students' agreement who thought they need to learn English for study purposes inside and outside their country. Additionally, only (71.8%) agreed on item 30 *(I need to learn English to get good grades at college or university)*, and about half of the participants agreed on item 31 *(I need to learn English to pass IELTS*

or a similar international English language proficiency tests) recording a mean of 1.62.

As a result, the majority of students appear to agree on the language needs stated in the questionnaire and hence the means of the 33 items ranged between 1.08 and 1.63.

4.2.2 Teachers' questionnaire

Section A: Personal information

This section in the teachers' questionnaire consisted of two sub-sections:

A: Personal Information

Overall twenty two teachers have filled the questionnaire, 7 males (31%) and 15 females (68 %). 50% of the participated teachers have between 0-4 years of experience, followed by 27% of those teachers who have between 5-9 years of experience. The number of teachers claimed they speak an international English was rated 40% followed by British English with 36% and then American English with only 18%; these numbers are calculated in tables 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11.

Table 4.9: Teacher gender

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	7	31.8
	Female	15	68.2
	Total	22	100.0

Table 4.10: Years of experience as an English language teacher

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0-4 Years	11	50.0
	5-9 Years	6	27.3
	15-19 Years	1	4.5
	25+ Years	3	13.6

	Total	22	100.0

Table 4.11: What variety of English do you speak?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	American English	4	18.2
	British English	8	36.4
	International English	9	40.9
	Other	1	4.5
	Total	22	100.0

B: About your professional context:

This part under section one in teachers' questionnaire asks teachers questions regarding their learners and the curriculum in the targeted university. When teachers were asked about the age of their learners, 77% claimed that their age ranged from 18-23, and 63% of the teachers speculated that the English language level of their students is between beginners to pre-intermediate. Among these teachers, 63% teach only English, while 18% use English to teach other academic subjects. When teachers were asked how they describe their classes, 59% stated their learners share a common language, while 40% stated their learners do not share a common language, tables 4.12, 4.13, 4.14 and 4.15 clarify this information.

Table 4.12: Age of learners you teach most often

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Years	6-17	4	18.2	18.2
	18-23 Years	17	77.3	77.3
	24+ Years	1	4.5	4.5
	Total	22	100.0	100.0

Table 4.13: English language level of learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	0	1	4.5	4.5

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Beginner to Pre-intermediate	14	63.6	63.6
Intermediate to Advance	4	18.2	18.2
Not applicable	3	13.6	13.6
Total	22	100.0	100.0

Table 4.14: How you describe your work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	I teach English	14	63.6	63.6
	I use English to teach other academic subjects	4	18.2	18.2
	Other	4	18.2	18.2
	Total	22	100.0	100.0

Table 4.15: How you describe the class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Learners share a common first language	13	59.1	59.1
	Learners do not share a common first language	9	40.9	40.9
	Total	22	100.0	100.0

Section B: English language needs of students

The two versions of the questionnaire, the students version and the teachers versions, were both identical except for wording. So, this version also is consisted of four categories and respectively the results will be analyzed. Average response mean for teacher's questionnaire is 1.4 out of 3, which again show that teachers like students agreed to most of the assigned language needs in the survey. The results of teachers' questionnaire are illustrated in table 4.16:

Table 4.16: Section B students' English language needs

Questions	Agree/ Strongly agree in %	Neutral in %	Disagree / strongly disagree in %	Mean

1. Students need to have native-like pronunciation.	63.6	31.8	4.5	1.41
2. Students need to Use native-like grammar.	86.4	13.6	0	1.14
3. Students need to be familiar with native-speaker idiomatic language.	77.3	22.7	0	1.23
4. Students need to use native-speaker idiomatic language.	68.2	27.3	4.5	1.36
5. Students need to know about British, US or other English-speaking cultures.	63.6	31.8	4.5	1.41
6. Students need to know the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary).	50.0	36.4	13.6	1.64
7. Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	72.7	13.6	13.6	1.41
8. Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	72.7	22.7	4.5	1.32
9. Students need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	68.2	27.3	4.5	1.36
10. Students need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).	63.6	27.3	9.1	1.45
11. Students need to learn British variety.	50.0	27.3	22.7	1.73
12. Students need to learn American variety.	54.5	31.8	13.6	1.59
13. Students need to learn International English.	77.3	18.2	4.5	1.27
14. Students need to be able to use English in online written communication (e.g. email, texting, twitting and messaging).	90.9	9.1	0	1.09
15. Students need to be able to use English in online spoken communication (e.g. via Skype or Face Time).	81.8	9.1	9.1	1.27
16. Students need to learn English for online communication.	86.4	13.6	0	1.14
17. Students need to be able communicate with native speakers.	72.7	13.6	13.6	1.41
18. Students need to communicate with other non-native speakers who speak English.	86.4	4.5	9.1	1.23
19. Students need to understand English media and films.	81.8	18.2	0	1.18
20. Students need to learn English to be able to participate in online social networks (e.g. Snapchat, Facebook, Instagram or WhatsApp).	77.3	13.6	9.1	1.32

21. Students need to learn English to be able to participate in online games.	72.7	18.2	9.1	1.36
22. Students need to learn English to be able to travel to the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries.	27.3	27.3	45.5	2.18
23. Students need to learn English to be able to understand UK, US or other English-speaking cultures	72.7	18.2	9.1	1.36
24. Students need to learn English to be more respected by their own age group.	68.2	18.2	13.6	1.45
25. Students need to learn the English related to a specific job or career.	22.7	36.4	40.9	2.18
26. Students need to learn English to have more job opportunities in future.	90.9	9.1	0	1.09
27. Students need to learn English to be able to find work in their home country.	40.9	36.4	22.7	1.82
28. Students need to learn English to be able to find work in countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people.	59.1	18.2	22.7	1.64
29. Students need to learn English in order to appear more knowledgeable or sophisticated.	86.4	13.6	0	1.27
30. Students need to learn English to get good grades at college or university.	68.2	22.7	9.1	1.41
31. Students need to learn English to pass IELTS or a similar international English language proficiency tests.	59.1	36.4	4.5	1.45
32. Students need to learn English for study purposes in their own country.	63.6	27.3	9.1	1.45
33. Students need to learn English for study purposes in other countries.	81.8	9.1	9.1	1.27

The first category of questions witnessed a majority agreement, however, there were also clear tendencies towards neutrality as (63.6%) agreed to item 1 while (31.8%) showed a neutral status. Unlike item 1, the second item was agreed on by the majority of the respondents by (86.4%) with a mean of 1.14 being the highest mean within this category. Whereas, item 3 and 4 which are basically about being familiar with and to use the idiomatic language, was also agreed on by a large number of participants rated from 77% to 68%. When teachers were asked about students' need for learning about British, USA or other English speaking cultures, only (63.6%) agreed on it while

(31.8%) showed a neutral attitude. Exactly half of the participants (50%) agreed on item number 6 *(Students need to know the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary),* whereas 36.4 were neutral regarding this statement hence the recorded mean for this item was 1.64. Items 7 and 8 *(Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP)* and *(Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP)* have record the same agreement rate (72.7%)*;* however when teachers were asked whether students need to use these new words in written and spoken language, about (64.5%) have agreed on it. Statements regarding which language variety teachers think students need have witnessed diverse rates. The international variety is the variety that most of the teachers agreed on by (77.3%) with a mean of 1.27, this followed by American variety with (54.5%) with a slight difference with British variety by (50%).

The results from first category indicate that teachers believe that students need to have a native like grammar (item 2 with a mean of 1.14), students need to be familiar with native speakers' idiomatic language (item 3 with a mean of 1.23) and students need to learn the international English (item 13 with a mean of 1.27). Comparatively, lowest means were scored for item 6 with 1.64 and item 11 with 1.73.

The second category (i.e. the need to learn English for social purposes) again was agreed on by the majority of teachers with high percentages. The highest number of participants have agreed on item number 14 with (90.9%) with a mean of 1.09; followed by items 16 and 18 by (86.4%) then items 15 and 19 by (81.8%). Lesser agreement rates were noticed in items 17, 21 and 23 which scored similar rates with (72.7%). Item 20 which witnessed a high agreement in students' questionnaire, found

a lower agreement in teachers version with (77.3%). The lowest agreement rates scored in this category is in item 22 with only (27.3%) which claimed that students need to learn English language to be able to travel to UK, USA and other English speaking countries. Furthermore, (45.5%) disagreed with item 22 *(Students need to learn English to be able to travel to the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries)* which is again the highest disagreement in this questionnaire.

These results are quite similar to students' results of category 2, likewise; teachers also believed that students need to learn English for online communication (.e. spoken, written and both) and to be able to communicate with non-native speakers; this is proved by the scored means of items 14 with 1.09, 16 with 1.14, 18 with 1.23 and 15 with 1.27. However, unlike students' results, the highest scored mean (2.18) was recorded for item 22 which indicates that most of the teachers thought that students don't need English language to be able to travel to UK, USA and other English speaking countries. There is also a significant difference between the scores of item 24 between teachers and students' questionnaire. Meanwhile the mean of this item was 1.22 for students, the mean for this item in teachers questionnaire was 1.45 indicating that not all teachers assume that students' need to learn this language to be respected by their own age group.

The third categories of statements talk about the need to learn English language for vocational purposes. The rates of these categories fluctuates from one item to another. Item 26 scored the highest rate of agreements with (90.9%) and with zero disagreements; hereafter, scoring the lowest mean 1.09 which is followed by a huge difference in rates in items 24 with (68.2%) and 28 with (59.1%). The lowest number

of teachers agreed on item 25 with only (22.7%) and (40.9%) disagreements; hence scoring the highest mean 2.18, followed by item 27 with (40.9%) agreements only.

Correspondingly, the lowest mean for item 26 indicate that almost all teachers thought that students need to learn English language to have more job opportunities in the future; which not all students agreed on (the mean for this item in students' responses is 1.54). While the highest mean that is recorded in item 25 with 2.18 indicate that teachers believe students don't need to learn a specific English related to a job or career which again is not similar to students' recorded mean of this item which was 1.45.

The last category of the items which are about the a need to learn English language for educational purposes again recorded different rates of agreements. The highest number of agreements was scored by item 29 with (86.4%) with a mean of 1.27; this is followed by item 33 with (81.8%). Whereas items 30, 32 and 31 observed lower rates ranging between 68% and 59%.

The scores of this category in both students and teachers' questionnaire are quite similar except for item 32 where the recorded mean in students' version in 1.20 while in teachers' version is 1.45.

Overall, teachers' questionnaire have witnessed more disagreements and neutral status than students' questionnaire and this is clear from the percentages and means. The mean for teachers' questionnaire ranged between 2.18 and 1.09.

4.2.3 Comparison between the findings of two questionnaires

The main aim of this study is to investigate the extent which students and teachers' perceptions match and differ regarding students' language needs. Though the results

of Descriptive frequencies showed that both students and teachers have almost agreed on all the listed items with close rates; there were five items that had noticeable discrepancy in rates between students and teachers' questionnaire. These items include: item 22 under category 2; and items 25, 26, 27 and 28 under category 3 where the differences between the percentages were highly significant.

For more accuracy and to able to answer the second study question, we compared both students' and teachers' questionnaire via independent sample T Test through SPSS. We used the two categorical independent groups (which consisted of two categories, teachers and students), as shown in table 4.17 (see Appendix 18). To measure the T-test, we looked at the Sig. (2 tailed). Here, we set two hypotheses. The first was "Equal variances assumed" and "Equal variances not assumed". In the first hypothesis, we supposed that there was a significant difference between the responses of teachers and students. The second hypothesis considered there was no significant difference between the responses of teachers and students. To prove the first hypothesis, the 'Sig. (2-tailed) should be 0.05 or less. As the result was more than that (0.161), we denied the first hypothesis and accepted the second one. Thus, there was no significant difference between the responses of teachers and students. Both have more or less the same points of view.

4.3 Semi-structured interviews

Our aim behind conducting interviews was to make the stakeholders express their thoughts and believes regarding the textbook, students' needs and the whole curriculum through a social interaction, far from subjectivity through reflecting on their teaching/learning experience with this course. The answers of the respondents are attributed to the following three study questions:

2. What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University?

4. Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?

5. Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?

The total number of interview participants were 16 participants and the demographic information of the participants are demonstrated in the following table:

Table 4.17: Demographic information of interviewees

Stakeholders	Number of Participants	Gender	Academic Title	Age
Decision makers	3	2 male 1 female	Assoc. prof.	
Lecturers	7	3 Males 4 females	lecturers Ass. lecturers Ass. researchers	
Students	6	3 Males 3 Females		17-20

The interview questions of the three stakeholders were again identical except for students' questions which lacked one item. The questions were divided into two groups: group one with open ended questions which are analyzed thematically; whereas in addition to open ended questions, the first part of the second group consisted of closed ended answers.

The conversations were recorded and then transcript to be used as written discourses where they have been coded and eventually four main themes where yielded as shown in the table below:

Table 4.18: Interview themes

#	Themes	Sub-themes
1	"A basic English first"	"students need a good foundation" "the book is good starter"
2	"first year students are like babies"	"speaking is the new generations' greatest language need" "a thirst for communication"
3	"English based community"	"English is a tool to get a good job" "I need to learn English to use social media"
4	"a messy curriculum"	"the book is tailored for another culture" "the course is devalued by other departments" "Enough grammar!"

4.3.1 Open-ended interview questions

Interview questions group 1

What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University? This study question was addressed in the interview questions 1, 2 and 3 in the teachers and decision makers' interview and 1, 2 in the students' interview. To answer these questions, the respondents expressed their ideas using some metaphorical expressions which the researchers have used these expressions to answer the research questions. The following themes are extracted from their answers.

Theme 1 "A basic English first"

Both decision makers and teachers agreed on the fact that 1st year students do not have a good background knowledge regarding English language and their proficiency level is noticeably poor, as a result they suggested the university offer a foundation course

in the first semester and an EAP course in the second semester. There was also a consensus over the use of the foundation book that is currently used during the first semester and was referred by one of the decision makers as "a good starter". Moreover, there was an unanimously consensus over the shortage of time specified for this course, and they all agreed that the time of the course should be maximized since two hours per week are not enough to cover the whole textbook and will not be sufficient even in two semesters.

Theme 2 "first year students are like babies"

One of the teachers referred to first year students as "Babies" who have just met the university life and hence need to be encouraged and exposed to as much language as possible to enable them interact effectively in English contexts. While one of the decision makers claimed that in the new world there is "a thirst to communicate", the new generation do not stop at boundaries and the technology has made them reach the other end of world with the help of English language. In this respect, a student said that "speaking is the new generations' greatest language need and I need to speak to communicate with the world and get better jobs and education opportunities in the future." When interviewees were asked about which language skill should be the focus of the course, the majority referred to the active skills which are listening and speaking. Although one of the decision makers referred to the academic writing as crucial and she said "we expect our students to write academic reports with good language"; however, this was not what other stakeholders believed to be since most of them claimed that when students level up their speaking skill they can automatically write well.

Theme 3 "English based community"

The idea of English language status as the global language was dominant in the conversations and the essential role this language plays among nations and in individuals' lives was implied as one that cannot be denied. Likewise, the students referred to the use of English language for future purposes as one student said "nowadays, English is a tool to get a good job" while a group of students expressed their need for English language in social interactions as it became an integral part of technology.

Interview questions group 2

The following group of interview questions discuss the data analysis in terms of study questions number 3 and 4 which are as follow:

3. Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?

4. Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?

The answers that are manifested in these two questions were taken from interview questions numbers 4,5,6,7 and 8 and are categorized under the following theme.

Theme 4 "a messy curriculum"

When the stakeholders were asked whether the curriculum meet the needs of students (i.e. the educational needs, vocational needs and social needs) answers were diffused between agreements and disagreement. All the students agreed that this curriculum/ textbook does not fulfil their language needs and they mainly attributed the reasons to the insufficient amount of time and the way teachers teach, since teachers mainly focus on grammar. Hereafter, one of the students expressed his dissatisfaction with the way

this book is taught and said with a raising tone "enough grammar!" since they mainly have been taking grammar in the school level; though the curriculum at school level is based on a communicative approach.

While the teachers and decision makers agreed on that the textbook is good and may fulfil these needs to certain extent but not to utmost, except for two teachers who said that the book is "tailored for another culture which is different from ours" and thus some modifications should be undertaken. However, there was a consensus over how the language course should be given more attention from university's side and it has to be rescheduled in terms of time.

Moreover, Teachers were asked whether they are able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course and they mentioned some other hurdles such as the disunity in the university curriculum which has given the departments the chance to choose the way they want the language course be given. Three of the teachers said that the departments where they teach at devalue the course and sometimes they take their class's hours for other courses. In some departments the language course itself is divided between general English and EAP which is taught by one of other departments' members who is not specialized in English language teaching. The teachers said that this interfering from departments has even minimized their teaching time and made them teach the four skills in a non-integrative way which eventually lead to unsatisfactory course outcomes.

4.3.2 Interview questions with Yes/No

Each of question 1, 4, 5 and 6 in both interviews contained a close-ended part questions where participants were asked to answer with either Yes or No. This part of the interview is quantitatively analyzed. The aim behind this numerical quantification is

to evaluate the extent to which the textbook meet the target needs of students. For this purpose and because the number of participants were small, the answers were accumulated and percentages were considered.

The answers from this part of interview indicated that students equally agreed on the kind of course they need. Half of the participants thought student need a general English and the other half believed what first students need is a specific course related to their major (i.e. EAP course). All the six students participated in the interview assumed that this textbook will not prepare them for a proficiency exam, and one of the participants said that "this textbook is not enough for even a classical exam and we do not know what we should expect in term exams since the book is too general." While the majority of students (66%) thought that this textbook will enable them to communicate with both native and non-native speakers, however, the same number of students thought that this book will not help them to pursue a career in the future that demands English language.

Teachers and decision makers have also expressed their opinions whether they think the textbook provided by the university will enable students to approach certain goals in the future. The majority of these stakeholders (70%) supposed that students need a general course of English language, and hence the answer to the study's first question (i.e. what are the English language needs of first years student?) has been confirmed again. These stakeholders believe students need a general course of English language which is not specific to any discipline. Nevertheless, some of them suggested the course be divided between either two academic years or two semesters, one for general English and the other for the academic English. The three decision makers posited that when this curriculum was designed, it was planned that this textbook would be given

to the students for only one year and the proceeding years will be covered in an academic course (EAP); however this plan was not put into action due to several political and economic changes in the region which affected the education domain as well.

The other three questions witnessed an unanimously consensus between teachers and decision makers over the insufficient role of this textbook in developing English language knowledge and skills of students to pass a proficiency exam, interact effectively with both native and non-native speakers, and find a job that requires English language skills.

Overall, the results of this section of the interview indicate that both teachers and students believe that this textbook is not enough to enable students pass proficiency exams in terms of language knowledge and skills, neither will it enable them to find a job that demands English language skills. In terms of the ability of the assigned textbook to help students communicate effectively with native and non-native speakers of English language, 70% of teachers believed that this textbook will not help achieve this goal; while 66% of students thought the textbook does help them to reach this goal. The majority of teachers believed that students need a general English language course, whereas the number of students were divided between allies for general and specific courses.

4.4 Summary

The results obtained from both qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed in this chapter. The means to each answer along with standards deviation were discussed. The independent sample T Test was used to compare between the results of students and

teachers' questionnaire. Moreover, thematic analysis was used to identify most reoccurring ideas during the interviews. These results will be further discussed in the upcoming chapter.

Chapter 5

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the outcomes of this study in accordance with research questions, and the answer to each question is presented separately. The second part concludes the study and study's limitations and implication are illustrated in the third part of this chapter.

5.1 Discussion over findings

This section will present the findings of this study in accordance with study's questions.

5.1.1 Research question 1: How can students' English language needs in general courses be identified?

The results obtained from both students' and teachers' questionnaire regarding language needs indicate that both teachers and students are obviously aware of what freshmen need to learn about English language. This claim is proved by the differences in the means of each item that is presented in the questionnaires. For example, in the first category from students' version, the highest scored mean is for item 1 with 1.12 (I need to have a native-like pronunciation) and item 13 with 1.24 (I need to learn an international English); while least preferred item within this category is item 5 (I need to know about British, US or other English-speaking culture) with 54.2% agreements and 25.5% disagreements. While the teachers mostly voted for item 2 (students need to have a native-like grammar) with 1.14 mean, and both items 3 and 13 scored the same percentages 77% which indicate that teachers like students believe that freshmen

need to have an international variety and to know about native speakers' idiomatic language.

Analyzing the given statements within needs analysis tools similarly to what this study have done, will enable the decision makers to decide on what to include within teaching materials as being mostly favored by students and what to exclude as being least favored or less useful. But then again, these results made it clear that students' language needs in general course are identifiable; hence, matching with the results of Seedhouse's (1995) study which proved that language needs in general courses are identifiable.

5.1.2 Research question 2: What are the English language needs of first year students of Duhok University?

The data analysis of the two questionnaires indicate that both students and teachers were positive regarding the English language needs stated in the questionnaire since both students and teachers have almost agreed to all the items. Correspondingly, during the interviews, the majority of the stakeholders agreed that students need to learn general English language during the first two semesters of the academic year and then proceed with an English specific for academic purposes. In terms of general knowledge of English, both students and teachers believe that freshmen need to have native-like grammar, native-like idiomatic language and an international accent. The importance of having a native-like pronunciation is highly indicated by students and to a lesser extent by teachers.

In terms of language skills, the stakeholders stressed the need to maximize listening and speaking time since the new generation is believed to be eager to communicate which is respectively supposed to be the single most prominent item agreed on by both

participant groups in the questionnaires. Relatively, there is a major agreement by all stakeholders over a need to learn this language for social purposes specifying the online written and spoken communication. Moreover, the need to learn English language for vocational purposes was agreed on basically in two items; i.e. to find works in other countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people and to find more job opportunities in the future. The last category of statements which are related to the need to learn English language for educational purposes, both groups of participants assume that freshmen need to learn English language for study purposes inside and outside the country. The idea that knowing this language will make the students appear more knowledgeable and sophisticated is another emphasized point by the participants. Hence refereeing to the significance of this language status in the eye of new generation is another point that is being stressed on during the interviews. Likewise, the stakeholders believe that world has become an English-based community and the vital role of this language is indispensable.

5.1.3 Research question 3: What are the perceptions of teachers and students on these needs?

The results of the Independent sample T Test indicated that the ratio and means from students and teachers' questionnaires were nearly identical, hence no major differences between students' and teachers' perceptions regarding English language needs are observed which in turn are asserted by the results of interviews as well. The two groups of participants have less or more the same views of freshmen's language needs. However, there were only few differences in the means of items under category three. For example, 66% of students have agreed to item 25 *(students need to learn the English related to a specific job or career)*, while 40% of teachers have disagreed to this and only 22% have agreed to it. This discrepancy justifies the difference in answers

to interview question 1 *(In your opinion, which is more important for first year students- a general knowledge of English language or an English that is specific for their discipline?)* and students' tendency toward a specific course.

Overall, both students and teachers' perceptions regarding freshmen's English language needs are identical as referred to in the above section of (the answer to study question 1).

5.1.4 Research question 4: Does the curriculum meet the needs of students?

In order to be able to answer this study question we have recourse to two ways of investigation. First, we have asked the stakeholders directly to answer whether they think the followed textbook fulfil freshmen's language needs in terms of (the kind of the course students need and a need to learn English language for social, vocational and educational purposes)

In terms of the kind of the course, though the given textbook is a general foundation course and the majority of teachers and decision makers believe it is what their students need; students do not prefer to study this general course and the majority stated clearly that they need a (specific course, a specific course related to a job or career).

As far as the question related to whether this textbook or curriculum will enable students to pass proficiency exams is concerned, all the students and the majority of teachers declined the efficacy of this material for this purpose. The same answer applies to interview question number *6 (Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university contain the language knowledge and skills students need to pursue a career in the future that requires students to know English language? Yes or no? Why?).* In contrast with these two questions, students believe that the targeted textbook and material do supply students with language knowledge and skills that will

enable them to communicate with native and non-native speakers of English, though this view was opposed by most of the teachers.

In general and with unanimous consensus, the stakeholders believe that freshmen need a general English language course since the majority of teachers stated that the level of their students range between beginners to pre-intermediate and they still need some kind of foundation course at this level. Though the given course is a general one, but it still cannot fulfil the three basic needs of the students.

5.1.5 Research question 5: Are the teachers able to address the needs of their students by the end of the course?

The answer to this question is implied within the interview questions 7 when teachers were asked how they describe the way language course is taught at the department they teach. Most of the teachers claimed that they follow the given textbook but they also agreed that this textbook is not enough for students in terms of the subjects it covers. Teachers believed that due to basic level of their students they need to focus more on grammar and speaking which is again against students' wish who said they need grammar no more. Though some teachers claimed that they integrate some extra materials that are best related to students' discipline, but again to a very elementary level which is not sufficient.

All the stakeholders believed that the assigned time for this course is very short and the number of hours should be maximized in order to cover as much topics as possible. Besides, the participants have recommended a specific English language course that best match students' discipline which should be given in the following academic years.

We can also conclude from the answer of previous question and assume if the teachers are religiously following the targeted textbook which proved that it does not fulfil the basic language needs of first year students, then teachers are unable to meet the needs of their students by the end of the course due to the type and number of subjects this textbook covers and the time specified for this course.

5.2 Practical implications

The findings of this study mainly imply that investigating English language needs of freshmen is a very essential and basic step in designing any language course even if it is a general course. The NA process should be regularly done by educational institutions to ensure the affectivity of their courses. If the NA process is hard to be implemented and a textbook is adopted as the core of the course, then this textbook should be analyzed and evaluated to ensure whether it meets the needs of students over different years or not.

The outcomes of this research indicate that the majority of stakeholders assume that freshmen need a general language course which covers all areas regarding the knowledge of English language and appeal to social, vocational and educational purposes. Nevertheless, the stakeholders also believe that the current textbook in-use, though general and is designed to meet these needs, does not fulfil students' social, vocational and educational purposes to extreme. Hence, we question the reasons behind this perception and wonder if the textbook content, time allotted for the course or the teaching methods are the reasons behind this kind of failure; or even if the students and teachers' proficiency level has contribute to this dissatisfaction.

As a result, we suggest that the time assigned for the course be maximized to at least four hours per week. Each hour can be assigned to one language skill; a point that is raised by the majority of the stakeholders. Nonetheless, within the description of this course book it has been made clear that the whole course book could be covered only in 180 hours; which is not the time that is dedicated to this course in almost all the departments. Second, all English language teachers should be given training on how to teach this course since the training was given only during the first year of launching the textbook and most of the teachers who participated in that training are no longer teaching this course and the new teachers are newly graduated assistants. Third, it can be more practical if another chapter was added to this textbook. A chapter that meet the specific academic language needs of students, i.e. an EAP chapter as a supplementary material. The reason behind our last suggestion is that the targeted textbook does contain a chapter regarding work and business in which they address issues related to job interviews, how to make a CV, how to write a personal statements, how to look for best available job opportunities and how to choose a career. This chapter, I believe if taught to utmost according to textbooks objectives can cover to certain extend the language needs for vocational purposes. Hence, the textbook can meet the general and specific language needs of students. As far as a need for social purposes is concerned, this purpose is also targeted within theme 1 and theme 2 of this textbook. In this way, the deficiencies that surround this foundation course can be eliminated until a well-designed language course is prepared that meets the different needs of freshmen of all departments and majors.

5.3 Limitations of this study

This study contain several limitations. First, the number of participants in the interviews was very small. We wonder if more participants were included in the

qualitative part of the study the results would remain the same or not, since the evaluation part of the textbook is based only on these participants' view. Relatively, the number of English language teachers participated in the questionnaire was only twenty two teachers. It would have been more helpful if more teachers participated in the questionnaire, albeit they were the teachers who have taught this level in previous years.

Second, the researcher has tried to meet the targeted university's rector and vise-rector for scientific affairs as curriculum decision makers but her request was denied due to their busy schedule. This meeting would have clarified the reasons behind adopting this textbook and whether there are any plans to change or modify this course or not, an inquiry which was not answered by the participated decision makers.

Another limitation is that not enough studies are available on needs analysis of general English language courses, this has hindered the researcher to compare and contrast between the findings of researches in different contexts

5.4 Suggestions for further studies

Since the aim of this study was to investigate how students and teachers perceive English language needs of freshmen as a primary step; it was observed that this foundation course has not been evaluated since its launch. Accordingly, we suggest further research on the language course evaluation at this university. Moreover, as needs are subject to constant changes due to changes in context, we suggest that at least every four years a similar study be conducted to keep the curriculum up-to-date in the assigned university.

Moreover, further research is recommended on needs analysis of general English language courses as the related literature contains only few old studies.

5.5 Conclusion

English language has gained a global status among nations. As a result, this language has become the language of technology, education, trade, science and politics. Moreover, this language has become one form of prestige which made people more curious and eager to learn. Hence, the demands on language courses have increased which in turn made decision makers think more about how to develop language courses and the methods that will lead to obtain the courses' objectives and students' success. First stage that is suggested by the scholars in this field is a language needs analysis. This process when carried will help identifying students' language needs and the goals and purposes behind learning this language. Second stage is to either design, adapt or adopt the learning materials. Third stage is to evaluate the chosen materials to make sure they address the set of needs that were identified during the first stage.

Respectively, this study has investigated the perceptions of freshmen and English language teachers regarding the needs of the students indulged in the general English foundation course at Duhok University. The researcher has used a present-situation approach and a target-situation approach to needs assessment to explore the current and future language needs of students. The study is conducted at University of Duhok which uses a general foundation course of English language for all faculties and departments. The source of information of this study was triangulated for more validity and eventually, English language teachers, freshmen and curriculum decision makers have participated in this study.

The quantitative findings obtained from this study signify that both students and teachers held similar positive views regarding English language needs. The two participants think that students need a course that improve their pronunciation, focus on international variety of English, develop their idiomatic language, improve their communication skills, and help them to develop their language in a way that will enable them find career and study opportunities inside and outside their country in the future.

While the qualitative results imply that the majority of stakeholders believe that students need a general course. The stakeholders assumed that the current in-use textbook does not fulfil their academic, vocational and social needs consequently needs to be modified or changes. The curriculum at this university is described as one that is messy and need to be rescheduled since the teachers and students made it clear that the students' needs are not addressed by the end of the course.

The researcher concludes from these outcomes that since the majority of stakeholders believe students need a general course while the in-use textbook is been evaluated as not useful to ultimate; several suggestions were made by the researcher namely, maximizing the time of the course, train novice teachers on how to teach this course, and add a new chapter related to EAP to enhance the quality of the course and meet basic needs of freshmen at this university.

REFERENCES

Aberbach, J. D., & Rockman, B. A. (2002). Conducting and coding elite interviews. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *35*(4), 673-676.

Ahmadi, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2016). EFL teachers' perceptions towards textbook evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(2), 260. doi:10.17507/tpls.0602.06

Akil, M., Hamra, A., Atmowardoyo, H., & Tjalla, M. (2018). Evaluating a New Writing Material: Students' Perception towards the Use of a Teacher-made Coursebook. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 9*(3), 525-533.

Akyel, A. S., & Ozek, Y. (2010). A language needs analysis research at an English medium university in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 969-975.

Awad, A. (2013). Evaluating English for Palestine 12 in terms of the EFL/ESL textbook evaluating checklist from the teachers' perspectives in Nablus Directorate schools. *An-Najah Univ. J. Res.(Humanities), 27*(11), 2013.

Azarnoosh, M., Zeraatpishe, M., Faravani, A., Kargozari, H. R., & SpringerLink (Online service). (2016). *Issues in materials development*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers. doi:10.1007/978-94-6300-432-9

Belcher, D. D. (2006). English for specific purposes: Teaching to perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study, and everyday life. *TESOL quarterly, 40*(1), 133-156.

Barnard, R. and Zemach, D. (2003). Materials for specific purposes. In Nafissi, Z., Rezaeipanah, F., & Monsefi, R. (2017). Pre and Post Test Evaluations of Students in the Needs-Analysis Based EAP Course at Undergraduate Level. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(1), 207-214.

Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave: New York.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Brown, J. D. (2016). *Introducing needs analysis and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.

Bryman, A. (1984). The debate about quantitative and qualitative research: a question of method or epistemology? *British journal of Sociology*, 75-92.

Chen, H. T., & Chen, H. T. (2005). *Practical program evaluation: Assessing and improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Sage.

Chia, H. U., Johnson, R., Chia, H. L., & Olive, F. (1999). *English for college students in Taiwan: A study of perceptions of English needs in a medical context. English for Specific purposes, 18*(2), 107-119.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2008). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London;New York;: Routledge.

Cowling, J. D. (2007). Needs analysis: Planning a syllabus for a series of intensive workplace courses at a leading Japanese company. *English for specific purposes, 26*(4), 426-442.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language. United Kingdom*: Cambridge University Press.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford, England: Heinemann.

Daoud, A., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 302- 307). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Dickins, P. R., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation*: *Kevin Germaine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford;New York, N.Y;: Oxford University Press.

Dubin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning*. New York; Cambridge [Cambridge shire];: Cambridge University Press.

Ekin, M. T. Y. (2013). Do current EFL coursebooks work for the development of L2 pragmatic competence? The case of suggestions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 1306-1310.

Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT journal, 51*(1), 36-42.

Eslami, Z. R. (2010). Teachers' Voice vs. Students' Voice: A Needs Analysis Approach to English for Acadmic Purposes (EAP) in Iran. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 3-11.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Hadley, A. O. (2001). Teaching for cultural understanding. *Teaching language in context, 3rd Ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle*.

Hayes, D. (2000). Cascade training and teachers' professional development. *ELT journal*, *54*(2), 135-145.

Hidri, S., & Coombe, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Evaluation in foreign language education in the Middle East and North Africa*. Springer.

Liton, H. A. (2013). EFL Teachers' Perceptions, Evaluations and Expectations about English Language Courses as EFL in Saudi Universities. *Online Submission, 6*(2), 19-34.

Hutchinson, T. and A. Waters (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: Learning – Centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The Textbooks as Agent of Change. *ELT Journal 48*(4), 315-328.

Illés, É. (2008). What Makes a Coursebook Series Stand the Test of Time? *ELT journal, 63*(2), 145-153.

Johnson, R. K. (1989). *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, B. (2010). *The first year at university: Teaching students in transition*. GB: Open University Press.

Jordan, R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Kaewpet, C. (2009). A framework for investigating learner needs: Needs analysis extended to curriculum development. *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching, 6*(2), 209-220.

Kiely, R., & Dickins, P., R. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. New York; Antony Rowe Ltd.

Kiely, R. (2009). Small answers to the big question: Learning from language programme evaluation. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 99-116. doi:10.1177/1362168808095525

Khodabandeh, F., & Mombini, R. (2018). Iranian EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions towards the First Grade High School English Textbook (Vision1). *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice, 11*(22), 141-167.

Leamnson, R. (1999). *Thinking about teaching and learning: Developing Habits of learning with first year college and university students*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Liu, J. Y., Chang, Y. J., Yang, F. Y., & Sun, Y. C. (2011). Is what I need what I want? Reconceptualising college students' needs in English courses for general and specific/academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4), 271-280.

Long, H.M. (2005). *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marzban, A., & Zokaeieh, S. (2017). Local Evaluation of an EFL Textbook:'Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking'. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(10), 874-883.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide.* Cambridge, USA;Oxford, UK;: Blackwell.

McGrath, I., (2002). *Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching.* Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Mohammadi, M., & Abdi, H. (2014). Textbook evaluation: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 1148-1155.

Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS.* London: Sage Publications.

Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English Language Textbook Evaluation Checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 4*(6), 21-28.

Nafissi, Z., Rezaeipanah, F., & Monsefi, R. (2017). Pre and Post Test Evaluations of Students in the Needs-Analysis Based EAP Course at Undergraduate Level. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(1), 207-214.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching.* Cambridge [England]; New York;: Cambridge University Press.

Oktay, Y. B. (2010). *A Descriptive Case Study of the Academic English Needs of Freshman Engineering Mathematics Students from Three Different Perspectives.* LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *52*(2), 137.

Rashidi, N., & Kehtarfard, R. (2014). A needs analysis approach to the evaluation of Iranian third-grade high school English textbook. *SAGE Open*, *4*(3), 2158244014551709.

Raymond, S. (2001). *Excellent teaching: Perceptions of Arab, Chinese and Canadian students.* In Clough, P. & Nutbrown, C. (Eds.). *Voices of Arabia: Essays in educational research.* (pp.17-30). Sheffield, UK: University of Sheffield Papers in Education.

Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks. *Elt Journal, 70*(4), 424-434.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002*). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). London;New York;: Longman

Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards JC, Renandya WA. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London:Longman.

Sarem, S. N., Hamidi, H., & Mahmoudie, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation: A case study of evaluating an ESP course-book: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(2), 372-380.

Sarıçoban, A., & Can, N. (2013). An Evaluation of the 9th grade local and the international English coursebooks in terms of language skills and components. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 997-1001.

Seedhouse, P. (1995). Needs analysis and the general English classroom. *ELT Journal, 49*(1), 59–65.

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT journal, 42*(4), 237-246.

Soori, A., Kafipour, R., & Soury, M. (2011). EFL textbook evaluation and graphic representation. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 26*(3), 481-493.

Tabook, E. (2014). *Language Needs Analysis of Foundation Year Students: A critical investigation into students' and teachers' perceptions of language needs and the curriculum in the foundation year at Salalah College of Technology, Oman.* (Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Sheffield).

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner: Approaches to identifying and meeting the needs of second language learners.* New York;Oxford;: Oxford University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Material Development in Language Teaching* (Second Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2009). Principles and procedures of materials development for language learning. *Metodologias e Materiais para o ensino do Português como Língua Não Materna*, 45-54.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Material Development in Language Teaching* (Second Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London;New York;: Continuum.

Tudor, I. (1996*). Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge;New York, NY;: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weir, C. J., & Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT*. Cambridge, Mass., USA;Oxford, UK;: Blackwell.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal, 37*(3), 251-255.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Graduate institute approval letter

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi
"Erdem, Bilgi, Gelişim"

Eastern Mediterranean University
"Virtue, Knowledge, Advancement"

99628, Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS /
Famagusta, North Cyprus,
via Mersin 10 TURKEY
Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995
Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919
E-mail: bayek@emu.edu.tr

Etik Kurulu / *Ethics Committee*

Reference No: ETK00-2019-0082   19.03.2019

Subject: Application for Ethics.

RE: Jwan Hussein Suleiman

Faculty of Education

To Whom It May Concern:

On the date of **19.03.2019**, (Meeting number **2019/09-16**), EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (BAYEK) has granted, Jwan Hussein Suleiman from the, Faculty of Education to pursue with her MA. thesis work **"Students' and English language teachers' perceptions of language needs and the curriculum in the first year at Duhok University."** under the supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. İlkay Gilanlıoğlu. This decision has been taken by the majority of votes.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Fatma Güven Lisaniler

Director of Ethics Committee

FGL/ns.

Appendix 2: Confirmation letter from UoD for data collection

UoD
University of Duhok
International Relations Office (IRO)

No. 1159
February 5, 2019

Attn.: To whom it may concern

CONFIRMATION

Dear Sir / Madam,

This is to confirm that University of Duhok has no objection about **Ms. Jwan Hussein Suleiman**, master student at the Eastern Mediterranea Universty, request to collect the needed data for her Master thesis at our university.

Accept our sincere wishes and regards.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lukman H. Hasan
Vice President for Scientific Affairs and Postgraduate Studies
University of Duhok (UoD)

University of Duhok (UoD)
Zakho Street 38
1006 Al Duhok
Kurdistan Region - Iraq
Office: +964 62 722 7060
Website: www.uod.ac
E-mail: relations@uod.ac

Appendix 3: Confirmation letter from UoD for piloting

UoD
University of Duhok
International Relations Office (IRO)

No. 3021
April 2, 2019

Attn.: To whom it may concern

CONFIRMATION

Dear Sir / Madam,

This is to confirm that University of Duhok has no objection about **Ms. Jwan Hussein Suleiman**, master student at the Eastern Mediterranea Universty, request to pilot tools of her Master thesis at our university.

Accept our sincere wishes and regards.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mevan Arif Abdulrahman
Vice President for Students Affairs
University of Duhok (UoD)

University of Duhok (UoD)
Zakho Street 38
1006 Al Duhok
Kurdistan Region - Iraq
Office: +964 62 722 7060
Website: www.uod.ac
E-mail: relations@uod.ac

Appendix 4: Consent form for the questionnaire

Consent form for the Questionnaire

Dear Student/ Teacher,

I am a master student at English language teaching department at Eastern Mediterranean University conducting my master thesis on the topic of *Students' and English language teachers' perceptions of language needs and the curriculum in the first year at Duhok University*. This interview aims to discover your perceptions towards English language needs of first year students, besides the curriculum given in this level.

Your participation is completely voluntary. No risks and no direct benefits are anticipated as a result of your participation in this study. You are free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason and there will be no negative consequences. In addition, if you do not wish to answer any particular question or questions, you are free to decline.

It is very important that you answer all the questions sincerely. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and they will be used only for research purpose. Extracts from the questionnaire which you would not be personally identified may be used in any conference presentation, report or journal article developed as a result of the research.

Further information can be obtained directly from me or my thesis supervisor. Thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Jwan Hussein Suleiman
MA Student
Department of Foreign Language Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: jwan.hussein89@gmail.com

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ilkay Gilanlioglu
MA Thesis Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr

Consent Form

I confirm that I have read and understood the main purpose of this questionnaire, and how my answers will be used. Thus, I agree to take part in this questionnaire.

Name: Surname:
Date: Signature:

Appendix 5: English language needs- learners' questionnaire

English Language Needs

A Questionnaire for English Language Learners

A. Personal Information

1. Gender: ☐ Male   ☐ Female

2. How old are you?

☐ 17   ☐ 18   ☐ 19   ☐ 20   ☐ 21   ☐ 22+

3. How long have you been learning English?

☐ 1-4 years   ☐ 5-9 years

☐ 10-14 years   ☐ 14+ years

4. How old were you when you started learning English? (tick ONE)

☐ 0 – 4   ☐ 5 - 9   ☐ 10 – 14   ☐ 15-19   ☐ 20+

5. Where do you study English? (tick ONE)

☐ As part of my regular college/ university studies

☐ In extra classes outside my college/university

☐ As part of my college/university classes AND in extra classes outside my college/university

☐ I don't study English in lessons or classes; I only study English by myself

☐ I don't study English at all

☐ Other (Please Specify) --

6. How would you describe the curriculum in your university? (tick ONE)

☐ I study only English.

☐ I study English and other academic subjects.

☐ I study English and other academic subjects in English.

B. Students' English language needs

The following section of the questionnaire is concerned with your views about when you need to use English language and the kind of English you need to learn.

Here is a list of statements about the kind of English language knowledge and skills you need. Tick ONE box for each statement to summarise your views.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I need to have native-like pronunciation.					
2. I need to use native-like grammar.					
3. I need to be familiar with native-speaker idiomatic language.					
4. I need to use native-speaker idiomatic language.					
5. I need to know about British, US or other English-speaking cultures.					
6. I need to know about the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary).					
7. I need to be able to use English in online written communication (e.g. email, texting, tweeting and messaging).					
8. I need to be able to use English in online spoken communication (e.g. via Skype or FaceTime).					
9. I need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
10. I need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
11. I need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
12. I need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13. I need to learn British variety.					
14. I need to learn American variety.					
15. I need to learn International English.					
16. I need to learn English for online communication.					
17. I need to learn the English related to a specific job or career.					
18. I need to learn English language to be able communicate with native speakers.					
19. I need to learn English to be able to communicate with other non-native speakers who speak English.					
20. I need to learn English to be able to understand English media and films.					
21. I need to learn English to be able to participate in online social networks (e.g. snapchat, Facebook, Instagram or WhatsApp).					
22. I need to learn English to be able to participate in online games.					
23. I need to learn English to be able to travel to the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries.					
24. I need to learn English to be able to find work in my home country.					
25. I need to learn English to be able to find work in countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people.					
26. I need to learn English to be able to understand UK, US or other English-speaking cultures.					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
27. I need to learn English in order to appear more knowledgeable or sophisticated.					
28. I need to learn English to get good grades at college or university.					
29. I need to learn English to have more job opportunities in future.					
30. I need to learn English to pass IELTS or a similar international English language proficiency tests.					
31. I need to learn English to be more respected by my own age group.					
32. I need to learn English for study purposes in my own country.					
33. I need to learn English for study purposes in other countries.					

Further additions and comments:

Thank you for your contribution which is highly appreciated.

Appendix 6: English language needs- teachers' questionnaire

English Language needs

A questionnaire for English Language Teachers

A- Personal Information

1. Gender ☐ Male ☐Female

2. Years of experience as an English language teacher:

☐ 0-4 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 10-14 ☐ 15-19 ☐ 20-24 ☐ 25+

3. What variety of English do you speak?

☐ American English ☐ British English

☐ International English ☐ Other

B- About your professional context

1. Age of learners you teach most often: (tick ONE)

☐ 6 – 17 ☐ 18 – 23 ☐ 24+

2. English language level of the learners you teach most often: (tick ONE)

☐ Beginner to Pre-intermediate

☐ Intermediate to Advance

☐ Not applicable – I regularly teach both higher and lower-level students

3. How would you describe your work as an English language teacher? (tick ONE)

☐ I teach English

☐ I use English to teach other academic subjects

☐ Other (Please Specify) --

4. How would you describe the classes you teach? (tick ONE)

☐ Learners share a common first language.

☐ Learners do not share a common first language.

C- Students' English language needs

The following section of the questionnaire is concerned with your views about students' English language needs.

Here is a list of statements about students' English language knowledge and skills. Tick ONE box for each statement to summarise your views.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Students need to have native-like pronunciation.					
2. Students need to Use native-like grammar.					
3. Students need to be familiar with native-speaker idiomatic language.					
4. Students need to use native-speaker idiomatic language.					
5. Students need to know about British, US or other English-speaking cultures.					
6. Students need to know the way other non-native English speakers use English (e.g. their accent, grammar and vocabulary).					
7. Students need to be able to use English in online written communication (e.g. email, texting, twitting and messaging).					
8. Students need to be able to use English in online spoken communication (e.g. via Skype or FaceTime).					
9. Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
10. Students need to be familiar with new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
11. Students need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in spoken English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
12. Students need to be able to use new words, phrases and expressions in written English (e.g. LOL, ASAP).					
13. Students need to learn British variety.					
14. Students need to learn American variety.					
15. Students need to learn International English.					
16. Students need to learn English for online communication.					
17. Students need to learn the English related to a specific job or career.					
18. Students need to be able communicate with native speakers.					
19. Students need to communicate with other non-native speakers who speak English.					
20. Students need to understand English media and films.					
21. Students need to learn English to be able to participate in online social networks (e.g. snapchat, Facebook, Instagram or WhatsApp).					
22. Students need to learn English to be able to participate in online games.					
23. Students need to learn English to be able to travel to the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries.					
24. Students need to learn English to be able to find work in their home country.					
25. Students need to learn English to be able to find work in countries where English is not the first language of the majority of people.					
26. Students need to learn English to be able to understand UK, US or other English-speaking cultures					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
27. Students need to learn English in order to appear more knowledgeable or sophisticated.					
28. Students need to learn English to get good grades at college or university.					
29. Students need to learn English to have more job opportunities in future.					
30. Students need to learn English to pass IELTS or a similar international English language proficiency tests.					
31. Students need to learn English to be more respected by their own age group.					
32. Students need to learn English for study purposes in their own country.					
33. Students need to learn English for study purposes in other countries.					

Further additions and comments:

Thank you for your contribution which is highly appreciated.

Appendix 7: Consent form for interview

<center>**Consent form for the interview**</center>

Dear student/ Teacher

I am master student at English language teaching department at Eastern Mediterranean University conducting my master thesis on the topic of *Students' and English language teachers' perceptions of language needs and the curriculum in the first year at Duhok University*. This interview aims to discover your perceptions towards English language needs of first year students, besides the curriculum given in this level.

Your participation is completely voluntary. No risks and no direct benefits are anticipated as a result of your participation in this study. You are free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason and there will be no negative consequences. In addition, if you do not wish to answer any particular question or questions, you are free to decline.

It is very important that you answer all the questions sincerely. Upon your consent I would like to record this interview, however, no other use will be made of the recording without your written permission. Also, no one except the researcher and her supervisor will be allowed to access the original recording.
The audio recording made for this interview will be used only for analysis. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purpose. Extracts from the interview which you would not be personally identified may be used in conference presentation, report or journal article developed as a result of the research.
Further information can be obtained directly from me or my thesis supervisor. Thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Jwan Hussein Suleiman	Assist. Prof. Dr. Ilkay Gilanlioglu
MA Student	MA Thesis Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education	Department of Foreign Language Education
Faculty of Education	Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University	Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: jwan.hussein89@gmail.com	E-mail: ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr

Consent Form

I confirm that I have read and understood the main purpose of this interview, and how my answers will be used. Thus, I agree to take part in this interview.

Name: Surname:

Appendix 8: interview questions for teachers and decision makers

Interview Questions for Teachers and Decision Makers

Adapted from (Hall and Cook, 2015)

Decision Maker ☐   Teacher ☐

Gender: ☐ Female   ☐   Male

Ethnicity (please specify):

Academic Title:

1. In your opinion, which is more important for first year students- a general knowledge of English language or an English that is specific for their discipline?
2. In your opinion, what are the greatest English language needs of first year students?
3. In your opinion, which language skills should be the focus of the course? Why?
4. Do you think the textbook and material provided by the university contain the language knowledge and skills students need to pass English language proficiency exams? Yes or no? Why?
5. Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university (i.e., The General Foundation Book for University Students) contain the language knowledge and skills students need to communicate effectively with native and non-native speakers of English language? Yes or no? Why?
6. Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university contain the language knowledge and skills students need to pursue a career in the future that requires students to know English language? Yes or no? Why?
7. How would you describe the way English language is taught at your department?
8. Do you think you are able to address the language needs of your students by the end of the

Appendix 9: Students interview questions

Students Interview Questions

Gender: Female ☐   Male ☐

Age:

Ethnicity:

1. In your opinion, which is more important for first year students- a general knowledge of English language or an English that is specific for their discipline?

2. In your opinion, what are the greatest English language needs of first year students?

3. In your opinion, which language skills should be the focus of the course? Why?

4. Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university contain the language knowledge and skills students need to pass English language proficiency exams? Yes or no? Why?

5. Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university contain the language knowledge and skills that will enable you to communicate effectively with native and non-native speakers of English language? Yes or no? Why?

6. Do you think the textbook and materials provided by the university contain language knowledge and skills which will enable you to pursue a career that requires English language skills? Yes or no? Why?

7. How would you describe the way English language is taught at your department?

8. Do you think your teacher is able to address the language needs of students by the end of the course?

Appendix 10: questionnaire consent letter in Kurdish

فورما رازیبوونێ ل سەر پرسیارنامێ

قوتابیی هێژا،

ئەز قوتابیا ماستەرنیمە ل پشكا زمانێ ئنگلیزی ل زانكویا رۆژهەلاتا ناڤین (EMU) ئەز یا نامەكا ماستەرێ دنڤیسم ب ناڤ و نیشان هزرو بوچوونێن قوتابیا و ماموستایێن زمانێ ئنگلیزی سەبارەت پێدەڤیێن زمانی و دیسان پرۆگرامێن خاندنێ بێ قوناغا نێكێی ل زانكۆیا دهوك. مەرەسا فنێ چاڤ پێكەڤتنێ ئەوە هەلوبستن ئە دەربارەی پێدەڤیێن زمانێ ئنگلیزی یێن قوتابیێن قوناغا نێكێ دیسان هەلوبستن ئە دەربارەی پرۆگرامێ دەربارەی پرۆگرامێ دهێتە دان ب فێ ناستی.

پشكداریا ئە با خوەبەخشانەیە. چ مەئرسی و قازانج نا هێنە چاڤەریكرن ومك پشكداریا ئە د فنێ ڤەكولینێدا هەر گاڤا ئە بڤێت خو ئە كێشی تو بێ ئازادی بێ هیچ ئەنگەرەكی بدەی و خو ڤەكێشاڤا ئە ج دەرئەنجامێن ئەنریفی نا بن. هەروەسا ئەنگەر ئە خواست پرسیارەكی یان كومەكا پرسیارا بەرسڤ ئە دەی تو بێ ئازادی ئە دی ڤەكولینێ پاشنەگەری.

گەلەك یا گرنگە بەرسڤا هەمی پرسیارا ب دڵ راستی بدەی. كەسایەتیا ئە و بەرسڤێن ئە یێن كەسی ئە بێن دپارستی بن و ب تنێ بو مەرەسێن ڤەكولینێ هێنە بكار نینان. دبیت هەندەك پارچێن ڤەكولینێ كو كەسایەتیا ئە تێنا دیار ئە بیت دەمار كونفرانسەكێ نا بهلنە پێش كێشكرن، راپورت یان گوڤارا دبیت بهلن پێش نێكشان ئە سەر ئەنجامێن فنێ ڤەكولینێ. بەرسڤێن ئە بو چ مەرەسێن دی نا هێن بكار نینان تا رەمزصاهندیا ئە یا نڤیسی ئە نە هێت وەرگرتن. دیسان كەسەكی دی ژ ڤەكولەریا و سەرپەرشتیێ وی زێدەتر ماف نینیە بگەههێتە ریكوردێن رەسەن.

بو پتر بێزانینان تو دشلی راستەوخو پەیوەندیی ب من یان سەرپەرشتی ڤەكولینا من بكەی. سوپاس بو بەشداری و هاریكاریا هەوە.

پ.هـ.د. ئیلكای جیلانلی ئوغلو	ژوان حسین سلیمان
سەرپەرشتی نامە ماستەرێ	قوتابیا ماستەرێ
پشكا قێركرنا زمانێن بیانی	پشكا قێركرنا زمانێن بیانی
ڤەكولتیا پەروەردی	ڤەكولتیا پەروەردی
زانكویا رۆژهەلاتا ناڤین EMU	زانكویا رۆژهەلاتا ناڤین EMU
ئیمێل: ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr	ئیمێل: jwan.hussein89@gmail.com

فورما رازیبوونێ

ئەز پشت راست دكەم من مەرەسا سەرەكی یا فنێ هزرە گروپێ خاند و تێگەههشتم، و كا بەرسڤێن من چەوا دێ هێن بكار نینان. زیەر هەندین ئەز رازی بوم بەشداری بم دفنێ هزرە گروپێدا.

ناڤێ سێ قولی:

مێژوو:

Appendix 11: Students' questionnaire in Kurdish

<div dir="rtl">

پێدڤیێن زمانێ ئینگلیزی

پرسیارنامه ئانكو راپرسی بو فێرخازێن زمانێ ئینگلیزی (۳۳ پ)

ا ، پێزانینێن كەسی

۱. رەگەز: □ نێر   □ مێ

۲. ژین ته چەندە؟   □ ۱۷   □ ۱۸   □ ۱۹   □ ۲۰   □ ۲۱   □ ۲۲ +

۳. ئەڤە چەند ساله تو ئینگلیزی دخوینی؟

□ ٤-۱   □ ٥-۹

□ ۱٤-۱۰   □ ۱٤ +

٤. ژین ته چەند بوو دەمێ ته دەست ب فێربوونا زمانێ ئنگلیزین كری؟ (تێکی هەلبژیره)

□ ٤-۰   □ ٥-۹   □ ۱٤-۱۰   □ ۱٥-۱۹   □ ۲۰ +

٥. تو ئنگلیزیێ ل كیری دخوینی؟ (تێکی هەلبژیره)

□ بەشكه ژ خاندنا من یا كولیژ/ئزانكویێ.

□ د وانێن دی بێن ژ دەرڤەی كولیژ/ئزانكویا خۆ.

□ بەشكه ژ خاندنا من یا كولیژ/ئزانكویێ و د وانێن دی بێن ژ دەرڤەی كولیژ/ئزانكویا خۆ.

□ ئەز ئنگلیزیێ دیڤۆل و وانا� ناخوینم، من ب خۆ ئینگلیزی یا خاندی.

□ من ب نێكجاری ئینگلیزی نه خاندیه.

□ تشتەكی دی (هیڤیدارین دەستنیشان بكه) ....

٦. تو كارناما خاندنێ (منهج) ل زانكویا خۆ چەوا وسف دكەی؟ (تێکی هەلبژیره)

□ بتنێ ئنگلیزیین دخوینم.

□ ئنگلیزی و بابەتێن دی بێن ئەكادمی دخوینم.

□ ئنگلیزی و بابەتێن دی بێن ئەكادمی ب ئنگلیزی دخوینم

</div>

ب. پێداڤیێن فێرخوازێن زمانی ئینگلیزی

پشکا یهێت: ژ پرسیارێنامیی گرێدای تمرینتن تەوه سەبارەت پێداڤیێن فێرخوازێن زمانی ئینگلیزی و جۆرێن ئینگلیزیا تو یێدڤی خواری.

ل قوره لیستەکا گرنتان با هەمی سەبارەت زانست و شیاننین فێرخوازێن زمانی ئینگلیزی. بۆ هەر گوتنەکی چنزگوشتەکی هەلبژێرە بو دیارکرنا کورتیمەکی ل سەر نەرینێن ته.

ب توندی دگەل نیم	دگەل نیم	بین لایهن	دگاهم	ب توندی دگاهم	
					١. پێدڤیه دەنگسازیا (pronunciation) من وەکی یا زمانی دەیکنی بیت.
					٢. پێدڤیه ریزمانا من وەکی یا زمانی دەیکنی بیت.
					٣. پێدڤیه نەز شارەزای دەستەمائزێن دەربرینی بلن زمانی دەیکن بم.
					٤. پێدڤیه نەز دەستەمائزوێن دەربرینەخین زمانی دەیکنی بکاربینم.
					٥. پێدڤیه نەز کەمپوترین بریتانی، ئەمریکی یان وەلاتێن دی بێن ب ئینگلیزی دناخەن بزانم.
					٦. پێدڤیه نەز بزانم کەسانێن دی بێن بیانی چەوا ئینگلیزین بکارئینن (وزاراڤی وان [accent] ، ریزمان، و پەیڤان)
					٧. پێدڤیه من شیبان هەمن نەز ئینگلیزین بکاربینم دداوستاندن نڤیسکاربین نۆنلاین وەک (ئیمێل، نڤیساندن، تویتریدا و ئەماندا)
					٨. پێدڤیه نەز بشێم ئینگلیزین د داوستاندن نامەڤانی لین نۆنلاین دا بکاربینم وەک (سکایپ و فەیس تایم FaceTime)
					٩. پێدڤیه نەز پەیڤ و دەستواژێن لی نەوین دناخەن دا بکاردهین بزانم وەک (LOL,ASAP)
					١٠. پێدڤیه نەز پەیڤ و دەستواژێن لی نەوین د نڤیسین دا بکاردهین بزانم وەک (LOL,AS)
					١١. پێدڤیه نەز بشێم پەیڤ و دەستواژێن لی نەوین دناخەن دا بکاردهین بکاربینم وەک (LOL,ASAP)
					١٢. پێدڤیه فێرخواز بشێم پەیڤ و دەستواژێن لی نەوین دنڤیسین دا بکاردهین بکاربینم وەک (LOL,ASAP)

ب توندی دگەل نیم	دگەل نیم	بی لایەن	دگەلم	ب توندی دگەلم	
					۱۳. پێدەقە نەز زاراڤی بریتانی فێربم.
					۱۴. پێدەقە نەز زاراڤی ئەمریکی فێربم.
					۱۵. پێدەقە نەز زاراڤین نەخشولەتی فێربم.
					۱۶. پێدەقە ژبو دانوستاندنێن تودلاین نەز قەری ئنگلیزبین بم.
					۱۷. پێدەقە نەز ئنگلیزیەمکا دایمەت ب شولەکی یان پیشەبەکی قە فێربم.
					۱۸. پێدەقە نەز بشێم دالوستاندنی دگەل وان کەسان بکەم بێن زمانی وان بین دەیکی نە ئنگلیزی.
					۱۹. پێدەقە نەز بشێم دالوستاندنی دگەل وان کەسان بکەم بێن زمانی وان بین دەیکی نە ئنگلیزی و ب ئنگلیزی دئاخڤن.
					۲۰. پێدەقە نەز بشێم د ڤیدیا و فلمێن ئنگلیزی بگەهم.
					۲۱. پێدەقە نەز قەری زمانی ئنگلیزبین بم داکو بشێم پشکداربین د تورین تودلاین بێن جڤاکی بم وەک (سناپ چات، فەیسبووک، ئنستگرام و واتس ئاپ)
					۲۲. پێدەقە نەز قەری زمانی ئنگلیزبین بم داکو بشێم پشکداربین د گەمێن تودلاین دا بکەم.
					۲۳. پێدەقە نەز قەری زمانی ئنگلیزبین بم دا بشێم گەشتێ بکەمە بریتانیا، ئەمریکا یان ولاتێن دی بێن ب ئنگلیزی دئاخڤن.
					۲۴. پێدەقە نەز قەری ئنگلیزبین بم دا بشێم شولەکی ل ولاتێن خو ب دەستڤ خو قە بم.
					۲۵. پێدەقە نەز قەری زمانی ئنگلیزبین بم داکو بشێم ل ولاتێن خو کارەکی بدەستخوڤە بێنم.
					۲۶. پێدەقە نەز قەری ئنگلیزبین بم دا دکەڤورین ولاتێن وەک بریتانیا، ئەمریکا یان ولاتێن دی بێن ب ئنگلیزی دئاخڤن بگەهم.
					۲۷. پێدەقە نەز قەری ئنگلیزبین بم دا وەک کەسەکی زانار و تێگەهشتی تر دیار دبازیکەم.

ب ترندی نگەلم نەبم	نگەلم نەبم	بێ لایەن	نگەلم	ب ترندی نگەلم	
					٢٨. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم دا تمرینێن باش لێ کوللێژا یان زانکویێن ب دەستکلە بینم.
					٢٩. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم دا ئەز من لێ پاشەرۆژی دەوڵمەن بتر بژن کاری همن.
					٣٠. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم دا بشێم د دەمزمورتا IELTS یان دەمزمورتێن هەقشێوە بێن بێشەمولاتی سەر کەفتی بم.
					٣١. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم دا هەڤاڵێن من بێن هەم تەسەنی من بتر رازی لێ بگرن.
					٣٢. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم بۆ نو مەرەسەلن خاندنێ لێ وەڵاتێن خۆ.
					٣٣. پێدڤیە دەمز فێری ئینگلیزیێن بم بۆ نو مەرەسەلن خاندنێ لێ وەڵاتێن دی.

هەر تێبینیەکا دی کە هەبیت:

سۆپاس بۆ بەشکداریا ته کو جهی رێزگرتنێ به.

Appendix 12: Consent letter for interview in Kurdish

فۆرما ڕازیبوونێ بۆ چاپیکەفتنێ

گۆتایی/مامۆستایێن بەڕێز

ئەز گۆتایا ماستەرزنمە لە پشکا زمانێ ئنگلیزی ل زانکویا ڕۆژهەلاتا ناڤین (EMU) ئەز باناڤەکا ماستەرزێ دەقیسەرپ داف و دیشان هزرو بوچونێن گۆتایبا و مامۆستایەن زمانی ئنگلیزی سەهبارەت پێفەڤین زمانی و نیسان پرۆگرامن خاندنێ بن گۆتاڵفا نیکی ل زانکۆیا دهوک. مەرسا فن چاڵ پێکەفتنێ لمەرە هەلویستن ئە دەربارەی پێفەڤین زمانێ ئنگلیزی بن گۆتایەن ئوتانەا ئەکی دیسان هەلویستن ئە دەرمارەی پرۆگرامن خاندنێ دان ب فن داستی.

پشکاریا ئە با خویەبخشاڵەیە، چ ماوارسی و ئازەنج نا هینە چاڵەریکرن وەک پشکداریا ئە د فن ڤەکۆلینێدا. هەر گاڤا ئە بڤێت ئە تە کیشی تو بن ئازادی بن هیچ ئەگەرەکی بدی و خو ڤەکیشتنا ئە چ دەرنەجامێن نەریتی تان. هەروەسا ئەگەر ئە خوەست پرسیارەکن یان گوهەکا بپرسیت با بەرسف ئە دەی تو ئازادی یاشتەنگەری.

گەلمک با گەردگە بەرسڤا هەمی پرسیارا با دل ڕاستی پەی چاڵپکەفتن ب ڕەز سەعتیا ئە دەو هفتە تومارکرن نەف تومارا دەنگی ب تنێ بۆ شلوڤکەرنی دەی هینە بکارزنان. کاسیتەکا ئە و بەرسفێن ئە بێن کەسی ئە دیار استی بن و ب تنێ بۆ مەرەستێن ڤەکۆلینێ هینە بکار زنان. دیت هەمەک پارچەن چاپیکەفتنێ ئە ئنا دیار ئە تینا دیار ئە بێت دەمر گوتراسمکی دا هینە پێش کێشکرن رئووۆزرت بان گوتارزن گوتارا دیت بێن پیشکیشان ل سەر ئەنجامێن فن ڤەکۆلینێ. بەرسفێن ئە تو چ مەرەسیل دی نا هێن بکار ئنان تا ڕەز سعتیا ئە با ناقیسی ئە ئنگرزن دیسان کەسەکن دی ل ڤەکۆلمی ی و سەر پەرەشتی وی زنەدی حاف ئیلیە پگەمەیە دیکۆزان رسەبان.

بۆ پتر پێزانیانان تو دخازی ڕاستەوخو پەیوەندین ب من یان سەرپەرشتی ڤەکۆلینا من بکەی، سوپاس بۆ بەخشداری و هاریکاریا هەوە.

بەهاد. ئیلکای جیلانلی ئوغلو	جوان حسین سلێمان
سەرپەرشتی نامە ماستەرزن	ئوتانیا ماستەرزن
پشکا فیرکرنا زمانێن بیانی	پشکا فیرکرنا زمانێن بیانی
ڤەکۆلکا پەروەردن	ڤەکۆلکا پەروەردن
زانکویا ڕۆژهەلاتا ناڤین EMU	زانکویا ڕۆژهەلاتا ناڤین EMU
ئیمێل: ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr	ئیمێل: jwan.hussein89@gmail.com

فۆرما ڕازیبوونێ

ئەز پشت ڕاست دکەم من مەرەسا سەرەکی یا فن هزرە گرتین خاد و تێگەهشتم، و کا بەرسفان بن چەوا دی هێن بکار ئینان. زیڤر هەڤدن ئەز ڕازی بوم بخشدار بم چاپیکەفتنا.

ناڤن سن نوڵی:

مژوور:

ڤاژور:

*

*

Appendix 13: Students' interview questions in Kurdish

پرسیارێن جاڤپێکەڤتنێ دگەل قوتابیا

رەگەز: مێ ☐   نێر ☐

رەگەز:

ناڤەروك:

١. ب دیتنا ئە چ گرنگترە بو قوتابیی قوناغا ئێکێ ـ زانینەکا گشتی ل سەر زمانێ ئینگلیزی هەبیت یان ژی ئینگلیزیەکا تایبەت ب بەشێ خو قە بزانن؟

٢. ب دیتنا ئە گرنگترێن پێدڤین زمانێ ئینگلیزی یێن قوتابیین قوناغا ئێکێ چنە؟

٣. ب دیتنا ئە کیژان شیانێن زمانی دڤێت پتر گرنگی پێ بهێت دان د کورسێ خاندنێ دا؟ بوچی؟

٤. تو هزر دکەی ئەو پەرتوک و مەتریەلێن ل زانکۆیێ دهێن دان زانیاریێن پێدڤی یێن قوتابی یێن تێدا ل ئەزموینێن شیانێن زمانێ ئینگلیزی دەرباز ببیت؟ بەلێ یان نەخێر؟ بوچی؟

٥. تو هزر دکەی ئەو پەرتوک و مەتریەلێن ل زانکۆیێ دهێن دان (مەبەستا من پەرتوکا قوناغا ئێکێ) زانین و شیانێن پێدڤی یێن قوتابی بشێت ب شێوەکێ درست دانوستاندنێ بکەت دگەل کەسانێن زمانی وان نێ دەیکێ ئینگلیزی هەرو هەسا یێن زمانێ وان نە ئینگلیزی؟ بەلێ یان نەخێر؟ بوچی؟

٦. تو هزر دکەی ئەو پەرتوک و مەتریەلێن ل زانکۆیێ دهێن دان زانین و شیانێن پێدڤی یێن تێدا قوتابی بشێت ل پاشەروژی کارەکی ب دەست خو بینیت کو زمانێ ئینگلیزی پێدڤی بیت؟ بەلێ یان نەخێر؟ بوچی؟

٧. تو چاوا رێکا وانە گوتنا زمانێ ئینگلیزی دبینی ل پشکا خو؟

٨. تو هزر دکەی ماموستایی نە شیانێن هەمی پێدڤیێن قوتابیا دیار کەت ل دوماهیا کورسێ خاندنێ؟

Appendix 14: Consent form for questionnaire in Arabic

استمارة الموفقة للأستبيان

عزيزي الاستاذ/الطالب

أنا طالبة ماجستير في جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسط قسم تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية (EMU) أعمل على كتابة رسالة ماجيستير بعنوان **تصورات طلاب ومدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية للأحتياجات اللغوية والمناهج الدراسية للسنة الأولى في جامعة دهوك.** هذا الأستبيان يهدف ت إلى اكتشاف موقفك تجاه احتياجات اللغة الإنجليزية لطلاب السنة الأولى، وإلى جانب ذلك اكتشاف موقفك تجاه المنهج في هذا المستوى.

مشاركتك الاختيارية تماما. لا يتوقع اي مخاطراو فوائد لمباشرة نتيجة لمشاركتك في هذه الدراسة. أنت حر أن تسحب في أي وقت دون إبداء أي سبب، ولن يكون هناك أي عواقب سلبية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، إذا كنت لا ترغب في الإجابة على أي سؤال أو أسئلة معينة، أنت حر في رفضها.

من المهم أن تجاوبة عاى جميع الأسئلة بصدق.هويتك وإجابتك الشخصية ستبقى سرية وأنها ستستخدم للأغراض البحثية فقط. يمكن استخدام مقتطفات من الدراسة الاستقصائية التي لا يمكن التعرف على هويتك الشخصية في أي مؤتمر أو يمكن تطوير تقرير أو مقال صحفي نتيجة هذا البحث. يمنع أي استخدام آخر للتسجيل دون إذنك المكتوب، أيضا، لا يمكن لأحد باستثناء الباحث والمشرف عليها سيسمح له بالوصول إلى الملفات الأصلية.

يمكن الحصول على المزيد من المعلومات مباشرة مني أو من مشرف الأطروحة. شكرا لك على المشاركة والتعاون

ب.م.د. نيلكاى جيلانلى نوغلو	جوان حسين سليمان
مشرف على الأطروحة	طالبة الماجستير
قسم تدريس اللغات الأجنبية	قسم تدريس اللغات الأجنبية
كلية التربية	كلية التربية
جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسطEMU	جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسطEMU

ايميل: ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr   ايميل: jwan.hussein89@gmail.com

122

Appendix 15: Students' questionnaire in Arabic

احتياجات اللغة

استبيان لمتعلمي اللغة الانكليزية

ا . المعلومات الشخصية

١. الجنس: ☐ ذكر   ☐ انثى

٢. كم عمرك؟ ☐ ١٧   ☐ ١٨   ☐ ١٩   ☐ ٢٠   ☐ ٢١   ☐ ٢٢+

٣. كم سنة وانت تدرس اللغة الانكليزية؟

☐ ٥-٩   ☐ ١-٤

☐ ١٤+   ☐ ١٠-١٤

٤. كم كان عمرك عندما بدأت بتعلم اللغة الانكليزية؟ (اختار واحدة)

☐ ٢٠+   ☐ ١٥-١٩   ☐ ١٠-١٤   ☐ ٥-٩   ☐ ٠-٤

٥. اين تتعلم اللغة الانكليزية؟ (اختار واحدة)

☐ جزء من دراستي في كليتي/جامعتي.

☐ دروس إضافية خارج كليتي/جامعتي.

☐ جزء من دراستي في كليتي/جامعتي و دروس إضافية خارج كليتي/جامعتي .

☐ لا اتعلم اللغة الأنكليزية في الدروس و الفصول،اتعلم اللغة الأنكليزية بمفردي.

☐ لم اتعلم اللغة الأنكليزية إطلاقا.

☐ أخرى (أرجو أن تختارها) ....

٦. كيف توصف المنهج الدراسي في جامعتك؟ (اختار واحدة)

☐ أدرس اللغة الأنكليزية فقط.

☐ أدرس اللغة الأنكليزية ومواضيع اكاديمية اخرى.

☐ أدرس اللغة الأنكليزية و المواضيع الأكاديمية الأخرى باللغة الأنكليزية

ب. احتياجات اللغة الأنكليزية للطلاب

الجزء الآني من الأستبيان متعلق بروتينك حول الوقت الذي تحتاج لإستخدام اللغة الأنكليزية، ونوع اللغة الأنكليزية التي تريد أن تتعلمها.

هنا مجموع من المقولات حول نوع المعرفة والمهارة الذي انت بحاجة اليها في اللغة الأنكليزية. أختر مربعا لكل مقولة لتلخص وجهة نظرك.

لا أتفق بشدة	لا أتفق	محايد	أتفق	أتفق بشدة	
					١. أنا بحاجة لتلفض كتلفض لغة الأم.
					٢. أنا بحاجة لقواعد اللغة كقواعد لغة الأم.
					٣. أنا بحاجة لمعرفة اللغة الأصطلاحية كلغة الأصطلاحية الأم.
					٤. أنا بحاجة لأستخدام اللغة الأصطلاحية كلغة الأصطلاحية الأم.
					٥. أنا بحاجة إلى معرفة الثقافة البريطانية، الأمريكية والثقافات الأخرى الناطقة باللغة الأنكليزية.
					٦. أنا بحاجة لمعرفة الطريقة التي يستخدمها الغير الناطقين بالأنكليزية في لغتهم الأنكليزية (مثلا اللهجة،قواعد اللغة و المفردات).
					٧. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون قادرا على استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية كتابة عبر الإنترنت (مثل البريد الإلكتروني، والرسائل النصية، tweeting والرسائل).
					٨. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون قادرا على استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية محادثة عبر الإنترنت (مثل سكايب و فيس تايم FaceTime)
					٩. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون على دراية بالكلمات، العبارات والتعبيرات الجديدة في اللغة الإنجليزية المنطوقة مثل (LOL, ASAP)
					١٠. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون على دراية بالكلمات، العبارات والتعبيرات الجديدة في اللغة الإنجليزية المكتوبة مثل (LOL, ASAP)
					١١. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون قادرة على استخدام الكلمات ،العبارات والتعبيرات الجديدة في اللغة الإنجليزية المنطوقة مثل (LOL, ASAP)
					١٢. أنا بحاجة إلى أن أكون قادرة على استخدام الكلمات ،العبارات والتعبيرات الجديدة في اللغة الإنجليزية المكتوبة مثل (LOL, ASAP)

لا أتفق بشدة	لا أتفق	محايد	أتفق	أتفق بشدة	
					١٣. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللهجة البريطانية.
					١٤. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللهجة الأمريكية.
	٠				١٥. بحاجة لتعلم "الإنكليزية الدولية".
					١٦. أنا بحاجة لتعلم الأنكليزية للمعاملة عبر الأنترنيت.
					١٧. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية المرتبطة بوظيفة أو مهنة معينة.
					١٨. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأكون قادرا على التواصل مع من لغته الأم اللغة الإنكليزية.
					١٩. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من التواصل مع الأخرين الذين يتكلمون اللغة الأنكليزية والأنكليزية ليست لغتهم الأم.
	٠				٢٠. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأكون قادرا على فهم رسائل الإعلام الأنكليزية والأفلام الأنكليزية.
					٢١. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من المشاركة في الشبكات الاجتماعية على الإنترنت (مثل سناب تشات، فيسبوك أو إنستجرام أو WhatsApp)
					٢٢. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من المشاركة في ألعاب الأنترنت.
					٢٣. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من السفر إلى المملكة المتحدة أو الولايات المتحدة أو غيرها من البلدان الناطقة باللغة الإنجليزية.
					٢٤. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من العثور على عمل في بلدي.
					٢٥. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من العثور على عمل في البلدان حيث اللغة الإنجليزية ليست اللغة الأولى لمعظم الناس.
					٢٦. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأتمكن من فهم ثقافة المملكة المتحدة، الولايات المتحدة أو الثقافات الأخرى الناطقة باللغة الانجليزية.
					٢٧. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كي أظهر أكثر دراية أو تطور.

لا أتفق بشدة	لا أتفق	محايد	أتفق	أتفق بشدة	
					٢٨. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأحصل على درجات جيدة في كلية أو جامعة
					٢٩. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأحصل على المزيد من فرص العمل في المستقبل.
					٣٠. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لاجتياز اختبار IELTS أو الأختبارات الدولية المماثلة في كفاءة اللغة الإنكليزية.
					٣١. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأحصل على مزيد من الأحترام من قبل فئتي العمرية.
					٣٢. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض الدراسة في بلدي..
					٣٣. أنا بحاجة لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض الدراسة في بلدان أخرى.

المزيد من الإضافات والتعليقات:

شكرا لك على مساهمتك التي تحظى بتقدير كبير.

126

Appendix 16: Consent letter for interview in Arabic

استمارة الموفقة للمقابلة

عزيزي الاستاذ/الطالب

أنا طالبة ماجستير في جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسط قسم تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية (EMU) أعمل على كتابة رسالة ماجستير بعنوان **تصورات طلاب ومدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية للأحتياجات اللغوية والمناهج الدراسية للسنة الأولى في جامعة دهوك**. هذا الأستبيان يهدف ث إلى اكتشاف موقفك تجاه احتياجات اللغة الإنجليزية لطلاب السنة الأولى، وإلى جانب ذلك اكتشاف موقفك تجاه المنهج في هذا المستوى.

مشاركتك اختيارية تماما. لا يتوقع اي مخاطراو فوائد لمباشرة نتيجة لمشاركتك في هذه الدراسة. أنت حر أن تسحب في أي وقت دون إبداء أي سبب، ولن يكون هناك أي عواقب سلبية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، إذا كنت لا ترغب في الإجابة على أي سؤال أو أسئلة معينة، أنت حر في رفضها.

من المهم أن تجاوبة عاى جميع الأسئلة بصدق. سيتم تسجيل المقابلة بعد موافقتك. التسجيل الصوتي لهذه المقابلة سيستخدم فقط للتحليل. هويتك وإجابتك الشخصية سيبقى سرية وأنها ستستخدم للأغراض البحثية فقط. يمكن استخدام مقتطفات من الدراسة الاستقصائية التي لا يمكن التعرف على هويتك الشخصية في أي مؤتمر ا ويمكن تطوير تقرير أو مقال صحفي نتيجة هذا البحث. يمنع أي استخدام آخر للتسجيل دون إذنك المكتوب. أيضا، لا يمكن لأحد باستثناء الباحث والمشرف عليها سيسمح له بالوصول إلى الملفات الأصلية.

يمكن الحصول على المزيد من المعلومات مباشرة مني أو من مشرف الأطروحة. شكرا لك على المشاركة والتعاون

ب.م.د. نيلكاى جيلانلى نوغلو	جوان حسين سليمان
مشرف على الأطروحة	طالبة الماجستير
قسم تدريس اللغات الأجنبية	قسم تدريس اللغات الأجنبية
كلية التربية	كلية التربية
جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسطEMU	جامعة شرق البحر الأبيض المتوسطEMU

ilkay.gilanlioglu@emu.edu.tr:ايميل   jwan.hussein89@gmail.com:ايميل

127

Appendix 17: Interview questions in Arabic

اسئلة المقابلة مع الطلاب

الجنس : ذكر ☐   انثى ☐

العمر:

القَومية:

١. في رأيك، ما هو أكثر اهمية بالنسبة لطلاب مرحلة الأولى- معرفة عامة باللغة الانكليزية او لغة انكليزية خاصة في اختصاصه؟

٢. في رأيك، ما هي اكبر احتياجات اللغة الانكليزية لطلاب المرحلة الاولى؟

٣. في رأيك، ما هي المهارات التي ينبغي ان يركز عليه المنهج؟ لماذا؟

٤. هل تعتقّد ان الكتب والمواد المقّدمة من الجامعة تحتَوي على المعرفة والمهارات اللغوية التي يحتاجها الطالب في اجتياز اختبارات اللغة الانكليزية؟ نعم او لا؟ لماذا؟

٥. هل تعتقّد ان الكتب والمواد المقّدمة من الجامعة تحتَوي على المعرفة والمهارات اللغوية التي يحتاجها الطالب في اجراء محادثات مع اشخاص لغتهم الام الانكليزية او اشخاص اخرين لغتهم الام ليست الانكليزية؟ نعم او لا؟ لماذا؟

٦. هل تعتقّد ان الكتب والمواد المقّدمة من الجامعة تحتَوي على المعرفة والمهارات اللغوية التي يحتاجها الطالب في الحصول على عمل يتطلب مهارات في اللغة الانكليزية؟ نعم او لا؟ لماذا؟

٧. كيف تصف الطريقة التي تدرس بها اللغة الانكليزية في قسمك؟

٨. في رأيك، استاذك قادر على معرفة احتياجات الطالب اللغوية في نهاية الكورس الدراسي؟

Appendix 18: the results of Independent Sample T Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	3.718	.102	-1.599	8	.161	-.12522	.07830	-.31682	.06638
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.599	3.543	.194	-.12522	.07830	-.35415	.10371

Independent Samples Test