A Survey of EAP Needs in Iran from the Viewpoints of Teachers and Students

[1]Naser Ranjbar
[2]Hassan Soodmand Afshar*

Abstract

Needs analysis can be regarded as the cornerstone of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) since designing courses based on the wants and wishes of different stakeholders addresses their needs and considers time and resources constraints. Moreover, paying close attention to EAP assessment in general, and EAP assessment needs in particular, sounds vital since they have not been considered sufficiently. The present study, thus, scrutinized Iranian university students' and teachers' needs in EAP classes. Additionally, it sought the learners' satisfaction degree toward EAP teaching and assessment. Moreover, the study investigated the materials and teaching and assessment methods employed in Iranian EAP classes. To this end, 436 university students and 50 EAP teachers were selected according to convenience sampling. Needs analysis questionnaires and observations were used to collect the data. The collected data were subjected to frequency and Chi-square analyses, the results of which showed that there were significant differences between the students' and the teachers' needs mostly in listening and grammar and that they had fairly similar perceptions of needs in reading, speaking, and writing. Nearly half of the students were not satisfied with the teaching and assessment methods. Besides, 50% of the students used SAMT (Saazman-e-Motale'e va Tadvin-e-kotob oloum-e-ensani-e-daneshgah ha in Persian) books, while 35.7% of them used handouts. Furthermore, 93% of the EAP teachers employed the principles of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) in their instruction. The findings of the present study can bring the Iranian EAP students' perceptions of needs into focus and help the teachers incorporate them into their syllabus. Moreover, taking students' and teachers' viewpoints of needs into account and considering the results obtained from the observations can help the EAP education improve.

1. Introduction

As English for academic purposes (EAP) is considered a distinct area of English Language Teaching (ELT), it needs different and distinctive methods for teaching and assessment and establishes different status of identity and responsibilities (Campion, 2016; Hyland, 2006). Taking the literature into account, multidimensional expertise, skills, and abilities are required to teach and assess EAP (Dressen-Hammouda, 2013; Hall, 2013) and the insufficiency of "ELT qualifications" for the successful fulfillment of EAP roles is evident (Campion, 2016, p. 62). Thus, EAP teachers need different types of abilities and knowledge to move from general English to EAP.

Teaching EAP or Technical/Specialized English (as called so in Iran) (Jafari Pazoki & Alemi, 2020) has long been considered as an important issue by the researchers of education in Iran; however, it can be argued that most of the efforts made to improve it have failed, and, as Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) maintain, Technical English classes at universities have not fulfilled the expectations of policymakers defined for teaching Technical English at the Iranian universities. Although a large amount of financial and human resources and time have been spent to train and prepare EAP teachers in Iran, and also to develop and compile Technical English language textbooks, the results are not so satisfactory as they should be (Tavakoli & Tavakol, 2018).

---
[1] PhD student of TEFL, ranjbar.nasser@gmail.com; Department of English Language, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran.
[2] Professor (Corresponding Author), soodmand@basu.ac.ir; Department of English Language, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran.

Fulcher (1999) states that, "a needs analysis of learners or a content analysis of the courses" is at work in EAP contexts (p. 221). For Brown (1995), needs analysis is 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" (p. 36). In fact, needs analysis is scrutinizing the students' needs and putting them in practice and priority in the classroom setting (Richards, Platt, & Platt, 1992). Additionally, Bachman and Palmer (1996) state that needs analysis "involves the systematic gathering of specific information about the language needs of learners and the analysis of this information for purposes of language syllabus design" (p. 102).

Testing in Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) is different from general testing in "authenticity of task" and "interaction between language knowledge and specific purpose content knowledge" (Douglas, 2000, p. 2). ESP assessment procedures range from formal tests to peer- and self-assessment (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). Douglas (2013) mentions four reasons for assessment in the ESP context which include providing an opportunity for the learners to indicate "what they have learned and what they can do with the language they have learned" (p. 367), helping teachers to confirm their assessment and make decisions regarding the needs of the program, offering some standards for the teachers and other stakeholders to monitor students' performance and progress, and finally ensuring the reliability of the assessment.

Iranian universities present general English and academic English courses both of which aim to prepare the learners to read and publish academic papers in English. In fact, reading and publishing academic papers are among the most important objectives of teaching English in higher education at Iranian universities (Tavakoli & Tavakol, 2018). Although the goal of preparing learners to meet their academic needs in English is assumed to be fulfilled at the end of the Bachelor of Arts/Science (BA/BSc) programs in various fields, dissatisfaction with the EAP program is reported in various studies (e.g., Soodmand Afshar & Movassagh, 2016, Tavakoli & Tavakol, 2018). Previous researchers (e.g., Atai, 2002, 2013; Atai & Mazlum, 2013; Hayati, 2008; Khany & Tarlani-Aliabadi, 2016) have already studied EAP status in Iran; nevertheless, EAP assessment has not received due attention yet. In addition to EAP teaching, the present study takes EAP assessment into account.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Needs Analysis

Lack of a distinctive convention over the definition of the term *needs* within Applied Linguistics has led to different approaches toward Needs Analysis (NA). Thus, providing an all-agreed-upon definition of needs is difficult. For Berwick (1989), needs means a measurable distance between what is going on and what might be which means that NA can fill this gap and ultimately lead to a more advantageous educational environment. For Fulcher (1999), NA is of high significance and plays an important role in language teaching and learning. We assume that NA is the cornerstone of all activities and tasks in EAP including curriculum development, syllabus design, material development, teacher education programs, etc.

Mak (2019), in a triangulated study using questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and a research-based assessment rubric, examined 81 undergraduate EAP learners and their instructors in terms of their perception of needs. The results suggested the existence of gaps between the students' understanding of their roles and performance in EAP, between the expectations of the students and their instructors, and the students' academic presentation competence. In another EAP needs analysis study, Generoso and Arbon (2020) examined 35 EAP graduate students and 17 teachers employing a needs analysis questionnaire, focus-group discussions, and semi-structured interviews. It was shown that students had difficulties with vocabulary, note-taking at the time of lectures, comprehending the passages while reading, and finding the proper words when reporting and writing. In the Iranian EAP context, Soodmand Afshar and Ahmadi (in press) investigated 220 Iranian Medical EAP students' and 50 EAP teachers' perception of needs through a Likert-scale

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The findings revealed a significant difference between the students and the teachers concerning their perception of needs. Nevertheless, both students and teachers considered reading comprehension as being of high importance in medical EAP. Furthermore, the students expressed their dissatisfaction with the medical EAP program they attended.

2.2. EAP in Iran

EAP in Iran refers to the English educational courses that are presented at higher education level (Atai, 2002; Atai & Nejadghanbar, 2017; Tavakoli & Tavakol, 2018) which have received unprecedented attention in recent decades from the government as they are assumed to facilitate the development of the country (Bahrami, Hosseini, & Atai, 2019). Atai (2006, p. 28) expresses that "bridging the gap between the students' General English Proficiency (GEP) and their ability to read authentic discipline-specific texts" is the main objective of the EAP program.

Having the experience of learning general English for at least six years prior to entering university in Iran, students encounter EAP courses at university that focus on the learning of academic vocabulary items, reading technical texts, and translations of discipline-specific articles and books. Materials are only related to students' own fields of study with discipline-specific vocabulary items and passages, and aim at equipping the learners to manage subject-specific textbooks in their technical courses (Mazdayasna & Tahririan, 2008). EAP courses are mostly taught by content teachers whose insufficient language proficiency (Soodmand Afshar & Movassagh, 2016) has always been a major problem. Besides, EAP courses are often ineffectual not only for the students, but also for the system of education since they are instructed based on traditional, forms-focused teaching methodologies (Farhady & Hedayati, 2009). In addition, as Soodmand Afshar, Tofighi, Asoudeh, and Ranjbar (2018) hold, what is educated in the Iranian EAP classes is not supportive of any specific instruction, because neither any appropriate goal is set by the teachers, nor do they implement the proper instructional methodology.

2.3. EAP Assessment

The concept of assessment literacy has begun to develop only recently (Inbar-Lourie, 2008; Malone, 2008) and is therefore still in its infancy (Fulcher, 2012). Davies (2008) and Fulcher (2012) define assessment literacy as EFL/ESL teachers' acquaintance with academic knowledge, useful skills, and understanding of related principles and procedures in assessment. Similarly, Malone (2013) defines assessment literacy as teachers' familiarity with testing definitions and the application of this knowledge to their classroom practices. Inbar-Lourie (2008) presents further definitions of assessment literacy as teachers' capabilities to apprehend the social role of assessment and the nature of language knowledge in relation to assessment practices. Scarino (2013) goes ahead as far as to call for the inclusion of teachers' personal beliefs about assessment into the notion of assessment literacy.

Along with EAP programs, EAP assessment practices are of high significance as they trigger learners' knowledge specifically (Huang, 2018), and need to be managed according to the knowledge and skills of the practitioners (Engelsen & Smith, 2014). According to Deluca and Johnson (2017), although more attention has been paid to EAP teaching which has inspired EAP specialists, EAP assessment is not rich enough within Applied Linguistics and requires researchers to fill the gap. The literature needs more studies to conceptualize both EAP assessment and EAP teachers' assessment literacy in order to add to the quality of English learning.

Dissatisfaction with various dimensions of EAP education in Iran has motivated many researchers (e.g., Atai & Nejadghanbar, 2017; Khany & Tarlani-Aliabadi, 2016; Tavakoli & Tavakol, 2018) to conduct studies which focused on the teaching of EAP at universities. However, these studies did not pay close attention to EAP assessment which is an inseparable part of EAP education. Moreover, since one of the expected needs of university students and also university graduates is learning English, identifying and solving problems of Technical English language teaching from various angles and vantage points including the books and resources used, teaching

methods, and testing and assessment dimensions sound vital. Thus, considering the above-cited factors, the present study was conducted to give us a detailed picture of what the current status of EAP in Iran is. The following research questions were postulated:

Research Question One: Is there any significant difference between Iranian EAP teachers' and students' viewpoints of needs in Technical English classes?

Research Question Two: To what extent are the Iranian EAP students satisfied with the status (i.e., current situation) of Technical English language teaching?

Research Question Three: To what extent are the Iranian EAP students satisfied with the status of Technical English language assessment?

Research Question Four: What teaching methods are employed in Technical English language teaching in Iran?

Research Question Five: What types of materials are used in Technical English language teaching in Iran?

3. Methodology

The present study enjoyed a mixed-methods design in which both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection, analysis, and interpretation were employed since mixed methods research is thought to yield a much more comprehensive result (Richards, 2003) which is more credible, valid, and generalizable. The study employed a sequential explanatory design (Cresswell, 2014) since the quantitative phase of the study was done first and the qualitative phase followed next. The sampling design of the study was a concurrent multilevel one based on what Collins, Onwuegbuzie, and Jiao (2007) defined since the data were gathered concurrently from both student and teacher participants.

3.1. Participants

The sample of the study included a pool of 436 university students and 50 technical English teachers of university. The mean age of the student participants was 24.68. The student participants were selected according to convenience sampling from six different Iranian universities including Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Yazd University, Quchan University of Technology, and Islamic Azad University of Quchan. The students who were available and whose consent was obtained took part in the study. That is, some students (nearly 23 percent of the whole) who did not agree to participate in the study were thanked and politely omitted. The students' demographic information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Information of the Student Participants

Info	Gender				University degree						Technical credit							
	Male		Female		BA/BSc		MA/MSc		PhD		2		3		4		5 or more	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Ss	185	42.5	251	57.6	250	57.3	72	16.5	114	26.1	206	47.2	182	41.7	22	5	26	6

Note. F: Frequency; P: Percentage

The teacher participants of the study consisted of 50 technical English teachers of university. All the participants were assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of the obtained data as well as the results of the study. The demographic information of the teacher participants is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Demographic Information of the Teacher Participants

	English teachers	Content teachers	Degree		Gender		Experience			Total
			Ph.D.	MA	Male	Female	5 to 15	15 to 25	More than 25	
Total sample	27	23	37	13	30	20	11	21	18	50
Observed sample	14	14	20	8	18	10	7	12	9	28

3.2. Instrumentation

The present study enjoyed three types of instruments in order to collect the desired data which were two versions of a questionnaire and classroom observations.

3.2.1. EAP Needs' Questionnaire

Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh's (2016) questionnaire (Appendices A & B), which included items on books and materials utilized in EAP classes, methods of teaching and assessing technical English, and students' satisfaction with the ways of teaching and assessing technical English is an instrument utilized in the present study which has also been used widely by various researchers both home and abroad. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first section, which is the students' version, includes 35 Likert-scale items in which EAP students' needs regarding different skills and subskills are investigated. It should be noted here that in the present study, 11 items regarding the status of EAP assessment at the university level and also students' suggestions about the ways through which EAP classes are assessed were added to the aforementioned questionnaire which was subjected to a principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation to revalidate it. The results of the test ensured the validity of the questionnaire with the KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy being 0.83 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity being significant (p=.000). Fourteen factors were obtained which accounted for 64.97 percent of the total variance. The reliability of the questionnaire was also recalculated running Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency estimation which turned out to be 0.80.

In the second section, through 21 Likert-scale items and four multiple-choice questions, teachers' views regarding the needs of EAP students were explored. Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) calculated the validity of the questionnaire through running KMO measure of Sampling Adequacy (which came to be .79) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (=0.000), as well as conducting a principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. They also estimated its Cronbach's alpha reliability to be .81.

It should be noted here that the questionnaires (i.e. both student and teacher versions) were constructed in Persian (the participants' mother tongue) in order to avoid any reluctance on the part of especially student participants to complete the questionnaires due to their insufficient proficiency level in English.

3.2.2. Observation

To gain a deeper understanding of the issue and the types of materials which were used in Technical English language teaching and to see what teaching methods were used in Technical English classes, 28 Technical English classes in different fields of study were selected and observed two times after receiving permission and consent from their teachers. In these observations, in order to keep track of the events which occurred throughout the observations, the first researcher took field

notes. Following each observation, the data were explored to summarize both the major and minor features of each class. In addition to the field notes, an observation checklist designed and validated by Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) was used (see Appendix C) to help us gain a more objective and a better understanding of the status of EAP education in Iran with an emphasis on the need of the Technical English teachers and students.

3.3. Procedure

During the first step of the study, 564 students were invited to take part in the study; however, 436 of them agreed with consent to participate. That is, the response return rate of the Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh's (2016) questionnaire was nearly 78%. All the 436 students had already passed the Technical English course or currently had it as a course of study. Moreover, 140 EAP teachers were invited to attend the study; however, only 50 of them agreed with consent to participate, meaning that the response return rate of the Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh's (2016) questionnaire was nearly 36%. The purpose of the instruments was clarified to the participants and they were assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of the results. They completed the questionnaires which took about 20 minutes for each participant and the collected data were analyzed quantitatively. During the second step of the study, the first researcher attended two different sessions of 28 Technical English classes to observe and monitor the methods and the materials the teachers used. This was conducted by paying close attention to the methods through which the teachers taught the students.

3.4. Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed through reporting descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation (SD), etc. and also through inferential statistics to compare the needs perceived by the students and the teachers regarding technical English and the status of teaching and testing Technical English in Iran.

The first research question which explored the difference between Iranian EAP teachers' and students' viewpoints of needs in Technical English classes, was answered conducting Chi-square analyses. The first 29 items in both teachers' and students' questionnaires are designed alike to find the differences between teachers' and students' viewpoints regarding needs in EAP classes. The second research question which examined to what extent Iranian EAP students were satisfied with the status of Technical English language teaching, was answered analyzing five items of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh's (2016) questionnaire (items 30 to 34). The descriptive statistics including the frequency and percentage of the data in this respect were reported. To answer the third research question as to the extent to which the Iranian EAP students were satisfied with the status of Technical English language assessment, items 35 to 46 of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh's (2016) questionnaire were analyzed. The descriptive statistics including the frequency and percentage of the data in this respect were reported. The fourth research question which examined the teaching methods employed in Technical English language teaching in Iran, was answered analyzing the results of the observation checklist by reporting frequency and percentage in tables. The fifth research question which examined the types of materials used in Technical English language teaching in Iran, was answered by reporting the results of observations which were analyzed through descriptive statistics comprising frequency analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

To answer the first research question of the study which was set out to find out whether there existed any significant difference between Iranian EAP teachers' and students' viewpoints of needs in Technical English classes, Chi-square analyses were conducted, the results of which are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The Results of Chi-square Analyses Comparing Teachers and Students' Responses to Items 1 to 29 of the Questionnaires

	Items	Mean		Pearson chi square value	df	Asymp. Sig.
		teachers	students			
Listening	1	3.74	1.21	2.15	4	.000
	2	2.99	1.10	3.26	4	.000
	3	1.27	1.59	2.84	4	.451
	4	1.25	1.47	6.26	4	.359
	5	4.10	2.19	4.12	4	.000
	6	2.36	2.64	6.15	4	.985
Speaking	7	1.59	1.12	3.84	4	.145
	8	4.30	2.01	5.32	4	.000
	9	1.95	1.38	2.98	4	.562
	10	4.25	1.98	4.12	4	.000
	11	2.58	2.45	6.25	4	.362
	12	1.20	1.30	4.12	4	.895
Reading comprehension	13	4.18	4.00	4.32	4	.974
	14	3.98	3.80	2.56	4	.954
	15	3.65	3.87	3.25	4	.197
	16	4.61	4.21	2.98	4	.617
Writing	17	2.42	2.09	4.12	4	.394
	18	4.09	1.91	4.25	4	.000
	19	4.30	2.10	2.65	4	.833
Vocabulary and grammar	20	2.03	4.12	3.25	4	.000
	21	1.98	2.08	3.87	4	.548
	22	2.75	1.20	4.39	2	.000
	23	3.25	1.19	5.32	3	.000
	24	2.84	1.15	2.12	2	.000
	25	2.78	1.17	3.69	2	.000
	26	3.10	2.01	3.59	3	.000
	27	2.91	1.24	2.47	2	.000
	28	2.47	1.34	3.21	2	.944
	29	2.87	1.30	4.61	2	.000

As shown in Table 3, there was a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of needs and those of students on items 1, 2, and 5 which were related to listening to general topics, speeches in conferences, and instructions in real situations respectively. The majority of teachers agreed that students needed those skills, whereas students disagreed. The other three items (3, 4, & 6) relating to listening ability did not differ among teachers and students. Both teachers and students found listening to class presentations, to English media, and classmates, teachers, and colleagues unimportant. This finding is not in line with the findings of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) who found that the majority of teachers did not perceive listening skill as a pressing need, while students perceived it as an urgent need. The teachers of the present study, on the contrary, assumed listening skill as an important need and the students did not perceive the need as important which might show the context-specific nature of needs.

Regarding the second part of the questionnaire which was about the speaking skill, teachers' perceptions of needs were not completely different from those of the students. The only significant difference was found to be in items 8 and 10, both of which were about possessing the ability to speak and ask and answer in seminars, conferences, and other academic contexts. In both of these

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74 (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

items, the teachers considered speaking as important while the students did not do so. The results obtained from the first two sections of our study are compatible with the findings of Mazdayasna and Tahririan (2008) who also found speaking and listening as two central skills in academic contexts, seminars, meetings, and presentations from the viewpoints of the teachers. However, the results in this respect were not in line with what Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) reported wherein the students considered speaking skill important for various purposes, but the teachers did not find it as an urgent need.

As regards reading comprehension, there was no significant difference between the teachers and the students. Both groups perceived reading comprehension as an important need. The majority of the teachers and the students agreed that reading specialized textbooks, articles in specialized journals, reports and summaries, and English newspapers, magazines, and internet texts were necessary for the students to learn. This finding is aligned with that of Atai, Babaii, and Taherkhani (2017) who concluded that both teachers and students assumed reading English textbooks as the most important need for EAP classes. Even though Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) found significant differences between the teachers' and the students' perceptions of the need for reading comprehension and the demands of syllabi, they concluded that both the teachers and the students appreciated the significance of reading comprehension. Besides, Mazdayasna and Tahririan's (2008) findings are in line with those of the present study as they found that both the instructors and the students perceived reading comprehension as a real need.

Both teachers and students regarded writing as an important need in EAP education since it played a major role in publishing papers or composing texts for presentations (item 19). Both groups were also in agreement with taking notes during lectures (item 17). The only difference between the responses was found to be in item 18 wherein note-taking from the textbooks was considered as a clear need from the viewpoints of the teacher participants, but not so for the students. Responses to item 18 in our study were not aligned with the findings of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) who found writing to be important for the students and not the teachers.

Considering item 20, which was related to learning English grammar in EAP classes, there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the teachers and the students. While students took grammar as an important issue in EAP classes, teachers did not do so which supports the findings of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) who achieved the same results. Both groups in our study, however, asserted that learning technical and semi-technical vocabulary was in need of attention in EAP classes. In Evans and Green's (2007) terms, grammar and vocabulary are two urgent needs for EAP students which were also mentioned by the students in the present study.

Regarding the rest of the items, the teachers' responses were different from those of the students. Apart from item 28, which focused on the language of teaching, there was a significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups. The teachers mostly preferred group work, while the students focused on individual learning (item 22). Teachers believed that EAP classes should be offered when students are to some extent familiar with their specialized courses but students assumed that EAP should be offered at the beginning of the university (item 23). Regarding the extension of learning EAP, teachers mostly believed that EAP classes should last longer whereas students generally thought that they should not last so long (item 24). When it comes to item 25, there was a significant difference between the teachers' and the students' answers. Teachers mainly supported the idea of collaborative teaching while it was not so for the students. The participants' answers to item 26 showed that teachers preferred to have more EAP classes whereas the students chiefly considered fewer classes as the need of EAP education. As shown by items 23 and 27, teachers preferred EAP classes to be taken following the subject matters or along with them while students were not in much agreement with this idea. The only item here upon which both teachers and students agreed was number 28. They both thought that subject matters should be learned in both English and Persian.

The second research question sought the EAP students' degree of satisfaction with the status of Technical English language teaching. To answer the question, the frequency and percentage of

the students' responses to five items of the questionnaire (questions 30 to 34) were scrutinized and extracted, the results of which are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: The Results of Frequency Analyses of the Students' Responses to Items 30 to 34 of the Questionnaire

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		No Idea		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
30	25	5.8	134	31.3	131	30.6	86	20.1	52	12.1
31	34	8	163	38.4	115	27.1	82	19.3	31	7.3
32	32	7.7	137	32.9	101	24.3	99	23.8	47	11.3
33	30	7	115	27	151	35.4	89	20.9	41	9.6
34	33	7.9	142	34.1	116	27.9	88	21.2	37	8.9

Note. F= Frequency, P= Percentage

The answers to item 30 showed that 37 percent of the students were satisfied with the number of the students in the EAP classes and about 30 percent of them were neutral toward it. The rest of the students were not satisfied with the number of students. Similarly, Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016), also found that only half of the students were satisfied with the number of students in EAP classes. Analysis of the students' responses to item 31 revealed that nearly half of the students agreed with the content and materials worked and taught in EAP classes. This is a critical issue as it shows the students' attitudes toward the content taught which might affect their motivation. The rest of the students were almost equally neutral or disagreed with them. By the same token, Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) found that only 35 percent of the participants agreed with the content and materials taught in EAP classes. Regarding the teaching methodology adopted by the EAP teacher (i.e. item 32), nearly 40 percent of the students were satisfied. The plausible reason why less than half of the students were satisfied with the teaching methodology might be due to the issue that they had never had the opportunity of experiencing any alternative methods of English language teaching during their educational life at both school and university, which supports the findings of Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) in this respect. According to Horwitz (1990), the students' attitudes and viewpoints toward the teachers' methodology and teaching approaches are heavily influenced by the experience they have already had with the classroom. Approximately 24 percent of the students had no idea about the teaching methodology and the rest did not agree with the teaching methodology.

Concerning item 33, we found that 34 percent of the students agreed with the cultural issues presented in the classroom whereas nearly 30 percent of them were not satisfied with them. The other 35 percent of them had no idea about the cultural issues presented in the classroom. Similarly, Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) also found that the majority of the students had no idea about cultural issues in the textbooks and teaching methodology. The reason might be due to the fact that the Iranian students lack awareness of the important role culture might play in molding the attitudes toward a foreign language. Additionally, the majority of the Iranian textbooks are published locally and have no place for cultural issues (Soodmand Afshar & Movassagh, 2016). Regarding item 34, we found that 42 percent of the participants agreed with the textbooks in general while nearly 30 percent of them were not satisfied with them. Approximately 28 percent of the students had no idea about the textbooks adopted. This is a crucial issue that less than half of the students were not satisfied with the textbooks in general and another 30 percent had no idea. This

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

issue might affect the students' motivation in language learning. Textbooks which are introduced by language teachers are mainly favored by teachers themselves, but not by the students. A teacher might, in fact, teach a textbook for years without caring about the students' interest and needs as new textbooks might be challenging for them to adopt and teach.

The third research question delved into the students' opinions on the Technical English language assessment. The frequency and percentage of the students' responses to the pertinent questions in this respect (i.e., items 35 to 46) are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: The Results of Frequency Analyses of the Students' Responses to Items 35 to 46 of the Questionnaire

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		No Idea		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
35	27	6.5	102	24.7	141	34.1	90	21.8	53	12.8
36	35	8.2	94	21.9	127	29.6	96	22.4	77	17.9
37	126	29.4	126	29.4	30	7	105	24.5	41	9.6
38	41	9.6	79	18.6	110	25.9	139	32.7	56	13.2
39	35	8.2	126	29.6	110	25.8	112	26.3	43	10.1
40	41	9.6	109	25.5	101	23.7	128	30	48	11.2
41	50	11.7	135	31.7	108	25.4	99	23.2	34	8
42	93	21.9	142	33.4	108	25.4	55	12.9	27	6.4
43	18	4.1	50	11.7	81	19	140	32.8	138	32.3
44	101	23.6	183	42.8	108	25.2	25	5.8	11	2.8
45	99	22.7	183	42	77	17.7	42	9.6	25	5.7
46	85	19.9	137	32.1	100	23.1	68	15.9	37	8.5

Note. F= Frequency, P= Percentage

Item 35 sought the students' opinions about the way their performances were assessed overall. The respondents' answers showed that only 31 percent of them were satisfied with the assessment methodology in EAP classes. Thirty-four percent of them had no idea and nearly 35 percent of them were not satisfied with the assessment methodology. This finding is critical since the assessment methodology was not satisfactory for the majority of the students. The reason why the majority of the students were not satisfied with the assessment methodology might be due to the summative assessment that EAP teachers still employ in language classes. The students' responses to item 36 indicated that the majority of them were either dissatisfied with the idea that innovative forms of assessment were used by the teachers in EAP classes or had no idea about them.

The students' responses to item 37 revealed that nearly 60 percent of the students stated that most of the EAP assessment was done at the end of a course. Other students' responses to this item were different which might mean that the students had no idea about formative assessment. This shows that most EAP classes in Iran are followed by a final exam at the end of the course to which a lion's share of the course score is allocated.

Exploring items 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 showed that most EAP teachers did not confine themselves to one skill or component. As it is revealed in Table 5, 28 and 38% of the assessment in EAP classes focused on the structural points, and vocabulary items respectively. Thirty-five percent concentrated on reading comprehension and 43% brought translation into focus. Fifty-five percent believed that their EAP teachers employed a variety of different assessment methods.

Seeking the students' suggestions for EAP assessment, we found, based on the students' responses to items 43 to 46 that the majority of the students were not in favor of traditional methods of assessment and that they mostly preferred innovative assessment methods. This also held true for formative assessment and open-ended evaluation with which more than half of the students were satisfied (items 45 and 46). Comparing the students' responses to what actually happened in EAP classes (items 35, 36, and 37) and their suggestions (items 43 to 46) indicated that there was a mismatch between what happens in EAP assessment in Iran in reality and what the students prefer. This issue is critical since a mismatch between the methods employed and the students' interests

might reduce the students' motivation for language learning. Porcaro (2013) discusses the benefits of formative assessment in ESP and suggests adoption of weekly formative assessment rather than a completely summative assessment since the former "establishes each student's capabilities and allows the teacher to make appropriate adjustments for the class" (p. 37). Assessment affects learning because "what and how student learning is assessed identify what is valued or important for students to learn" (Looney, Cumming, van der Kleij, & Harris, 2018, p. 1). Engelsen and Smith (2014) noted that "the quality of practice is to a large extent directed by the practitioners' assessment knowledge and skills" (p. 92). Appropriate evaluation and assessment practices are frequent activities that develop learning practices and are beneficial for improvement in modern educational environments (Bowers, 2011; Cox & Olsen, 2009; Marzano, 2010). Additionally, our findings might show that the EAP teachers are not familiar enough with the principles of assessment. Blount (2016) maintains that teachers assume grading and assessment as the least important part of their job which "may be due to an increase in the use of standards and accountability, the time it takes to effectively grade or provide feedback, or the growing sense of ambiguity associated with grades" (p. 11). Focusing on the significance of assessment literacy, Popham (2009, p. 4) asserts "educators' inadequate knowledge in assessment can cripple the quality of education. Assessment literacy is seen as a sine qua non for today's competent educator".

The fourth research question explored the teaching methods which were employed in technical English language classes. The fifth research question sought the materials taught and used in EAP classes. To answer these questions, the results of the observation checklist reporting frequency and percentage are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: The Results of the Observation Checklist

	Items	Frequency	Percentage
1	Textbooks and sources used		
	SAMT	14	50
	Cambridge	0	0
	Paym-e-noor	3	10.7
	Other	1	3.5
	Handout	10	35.7
2	Methods		
	GTM	26	93
	Other	2	7

Observing EAP classes to find out what materials were employed in them, we found that half of the teachers used SAMT (a national publisher responsible for the production and publication of EAP books affiliated with the Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology (i.e., MSRT)) books which are often open to debate. Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) found that almost 58 percent of the participants used SAMT books. They maintained that this issue was critical because, firstly, SAMT books were designed based on the *conjectures of the authors* without any systematic and comprehensive need analysis. Secondly, all SAMT books followed the same inflexible one-size-fits-all layout and heavily focused on reading and writing skills, which consequently, made the books boring and tedious (for more information see Soodmand Afshar & Movassagh, 2016). On the other hand, nearly 36 percent of the materials were handouts which might be a positive point as they are more likely to be designed by the EAP teachers and according to the learners' needs and interests.

The results of observing 28 classes showed that almost all classes were taught based on the principles of GTM. The teachers mainly focused on translation and grammar. Textbooks and handouts consistently contained reading passages, grammar activities, and translation passages. Besides, the teachers also evaluated the learners by designing translation tasks and the assignments also heavily included translation. Moreover, a great share of the final exam was allocated to translation. The reason that EAP teachers in Iran employ GTM might be due to the fact that the students need to learn reading, translating, and writing in English so as to be able to read and

publish academic papers in their higher education. Moreover, communicative language teaching might be demanding on the part of the teachers (Savignon & Wang, 2003), who themselves have most possibly been trained through GTM.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The present study aimed at comparing needs in EAP from the viewpoints of the students and the EAP teachers, examining students' satisfaction with the EAP teaching and assessment, and exploring the materials and teaching and assessment methods employed in EAP education. The findings of the study made known that learners' perception of needs, teaching and assessment methods, and materials were in pressing need of attention and serious consideration in EAP education in Iran. First, there was a difference between teachers' and students' perception of needs which means that they had different understandings of the outcome of language teaching. Regardless of the fact that which group has a correct understanding of teaching English, this difference can affect the results of language learning negatively. Thus, various stakeholders should take the learners' needs into account. Apart from the final objectives of EAP education, the students have a better understanding of their abilities which is a part of their needs. In fact, the students may perceive the needs according to what they already know and what should be known. To be more specific about needs and to consider different individuals' needs are important issues which should be attended to and as a consequence, policymakers, teachers, and material designers should collaboratively negotiate the learners' needs precisely. Second, communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching are, to a large extent, neglected in most EAP courses in Iran and the EAP teachers heavily focus on GTM and teaching reading, translation, grammar, and vocabulary items. One of the purposes of EAP teaching in Iran is to prepare the students to attend international events that are mostly held in the English language which might imply that the students need other skills such as listening and speaking as they are supposed to participate in such events. These abilities are not concentrated on by EAP teachers in Iranian universities for the time being which needs due attention. Third, almost half of the students were not satisfied with the EAP teaching and assessment methods in Iran, which should also be taken into account since it might affect their motivation and learning quality negatively. Fourth, SAMT books taught at Iranian universities might be open to criticism and controversy as these books cannot seemingly fulfill the students' needs in different contexts. SAMT books are developed by a specific group of teachers and researchers and are mostly compiled in Tehran (the capital of Iran) and sent to different parts of the country. As the students of various universities are different regarding their language abilities, the books cannot appropriately meet the needs of all Iranian EAP students.

In conclusion, the findings of the present study showed that there was a gap between the teachers and the students regarding needs, teaching and assessment methods, and the materials employed. As Soodmand Afshar and Movassagh (2016) maintained, an awareness of the voice of students and also the teachers themselves is expected on the part of curriculum developers and material designers to be incorporated in EAP classes and to tackle the present problems of EAP teaching and assessment. This is in accordance with what Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2009) stated as the main aim of assessment of any type of materials which is *accountability* along with the development and progress of the course which is at the heart of any evaluation and assessment program. By accountability, it means that all stakeholders' ideas and tastes should be incorporated in needs analysis programs and materials development.

References

Atai, M. R. (2002). ESAP curriculum planning in Iran: An incoherent educational experience. *Special Issue of the Journal of Persian Literature and Human Sciences of Tehran Teacher Training University, 1*, 17-34.

Atai, M. R. (2006). EAP teacher education: Searching for an effective model integrating content and language teachers' schemes. *Proceedings of PAAL Conference*, (pp. 23-41). Kangwong National University, Chuncheon, Korea. Retrieved from: http://www. paaljapan. org/resources/proceedings/PAAL11/pdfs/03.

Atai, M. R. (2013). English for specific purposes: International trends and Middle East concerns. In R. Akbari & C. Coombe, (Eds.), *The Middle East Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 150-184). Dubai, United Arab Emirates: TESOL Arabia Publications.

Atai, M. R., Babaii, E., & Taherkhani, R. (2017). Exploring Iranian EAP teachers' pedagogic content knowledge and teaching practices and students' beliefs about EAP teachers' methodology. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 6(1), 1-27.

Atai, M. R., & Mazlum, F. (2013). English language teaching curriculum in Iran: Planning and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24(3), 389-411.

Atai, M. R., & Nejadghanbar, H. (2017). Exploring Iranian ESP teachers' subject-related critical incidents. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 29*, 43-54.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bahrami, V., Hosseini, M., & Atai, M. R. (2019). Exploring research-informed practice in English for academic purposes: A narrative study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 152-165.

Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blount, H. P. (2016). The keepers of numbers: Teachers' perspectives on grades. *The Educational Forum, 61*(4), 329-334.

Bowers, A. J. (2011). What's in a grade? The multidimensional nature of what teacher-assigned grades assess in high school. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 17*(3), 141-159.

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campion, G. C. (2016). 'The learning never ends': Exploring teachers' views on the transition from general English to EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 59-70.

Collins, K. M. T., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2007). A mixed methods investigation of mixed methods sampling designs in social and health science research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*, 267–294.

Cox, K. B., & Olsen, C. (2009). Putting classroom grading on the table - A reform in progress. *American Secondary Education, 40*(1), 67–83.

Cresswell, J. (2014). *Research design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25, 327-348.

DeLuca, C., & Johnson, S. (2017). Developing assessment capable teachers in this age of accountability. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(2), 121-126.

Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing language for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, D. (2013). ESP and assessment. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 367-384). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2013). Ethnographic approaches to ESP research, in B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 502-517). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in ESP: a multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engelsen, K. S., & Smith, K. (2014). Assessment literacy. In C. Wyatt-Smith, V. Klenowski, & P. Colbert (Eds.), *The enabling power of assessment: Designing assessment for quality learning* (pp. 140-162). New York, NY: Springer.

Evans, S., & Green, C. (2007). Why EAP is necessary: A survey of Hong Kong tertiary students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(1), 3-17.

Farhady, H. & Hedayati, H. (2009). Language assessment policy in Iran. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 29*, 132-141.

Fulcher, G. (1999). Assessment in English for academic purposes: Putting content validity in its place. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 221-236.

Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *9*(2), 113-132.

Generoso, J. C., & Arbon, A. M. M. (2020). Language needs analysis: An EAP curriculum design to develop foreign students' English skills. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *17*(2), 428-445.

Hall, D. R. (2013). Teacher education for languages for specific purposes, in C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 5537-5542). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Hayati, M. (2008). Teaching English for special purposes in Iran: Problems and suggestions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 7*(2), 149-164.

Horwitz, E. K. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp. 15-31). Middlebury: Northeast Conference.

Huang, L. S. (2018). A call for critical dialogue: EAP assessment from the practitioner's perspective in Canada. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *35*, 70-84.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing, 25*(3), 385-402.

Jafari Pazoki, S., & Alemi, M. (2020). Engineering students' motivation to learn technical English in ESP courses: Investigating Iranian teachers' and students' perceptions. *RELC Journal, 51*(2), 212-226.

Khany, R., & Tarlani-Aliabadi, H. (2016). Studying power relations in an academic setting: Teachers' and students' perceptions of EAP classes in Iran. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 21*, 72-85.

Kiely, R., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2009). Evaluation and learning in language programs. In K. Knapp, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (pp. 663-685). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Long, M. H. (2005). Overview: A rationale for needs analysis and needs analysis research. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Looney, A., Cumming, J., van Der Kleij, F., & Harris, K. (2018). Reconceptualising the role of teachers as assessors: Teacher assessment identity. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *25*(5), 442-467.

Mak, S. H. Y. (2019). Analyzing the needs of EFL/ESL learners in developing academic presentation competence. *RELC Journal*, 1-18, 0033688219879514.

Malone, M. E. (2008). Training in language assessment. In E. Shohamy & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language testing and assessment* (pp. 225-239). NewYork: Springer Media.

Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing*, *30*(3), 329-344.

Marzano, R. J. (2010). *Formative assessment and standards-based grading*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research.

Mazdayasna, G., & Tahririan, M. H. (2008). Developing a profile of the ESP needs of Iranian students: The case of students of nursing and midwifery. *Journal of English for Academic purposes*, *7*(4), 277-289.

Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice, 48*, 4–11.

Porcaro, J. W. (2013). Teaching English for science and technology: An approach for reading with engineering English. *English Teaching Forum, 2*, 32-39.

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 41*(3), 223-249.

Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing, 30*(3), 309-327.

Soodmand Afshar, H., & Ahmadi, M. (2020). Students' needs or teachers' wishes? A triangulated survey of medical EAP in Iranian context. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 12*(2), 53-72.

Soodmand Afshar, H., & Movasagh, H. (2016). EAP education in Iran: Where does the problem lie? Where are we heading? *Journal of English for Academic Purpose, 22*, 132-151.

Soodmand Afshar, H., Tofighi, S., Asoudeh., Ranjbar, N. (2018). The impact of alternative assessment knowledge, teaching experience, gender, and academic degree on EAP teachers' assessment literacy. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(2), 1-15.

Tavakoli, M., & Tavakol, M. (2018). Problematizing EAP education in Iran: A critical ethnographic study of educational, political, and sociocultural roots. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 31*, 28-43.

Appendix A: EAP Needs' Questionnaire (Students' Version)

باسمه تعالی

پرسشنامه ی نیاز سنجی در آموزش زبان تخصصی دانشگاه ها

با سلام و احترام؛

این پرسشنامه درصدد است تا نیاز دانشجویان را در زمینه ی آموزش زبان تخصصی دانشگاهی بسنجد. در راستای نیل به این هدف خواهشمند

است به سؤالات ذیل پاسخ مناسب دهید.

نام و نام خانوادگی (اختیاری) : .... سن: .... جنسیت: مرد☐ زن ☐

تحصیلات: دانشجو یا دارای مدرک کارشناسی ☐ دانشجو یا دارای مدرک کارشناسی ارشد ☐

دانشجو یا دارای مدرک دکتری ☐

رشته ی تحصیلی: .... دانشگاه محل تحصیل: ....

تعداد واحد گذرانده در درس زبان انگلیسی عمومی: .... نمره ی درس: ....

تعداد واحد گذرانده در درس زبان انگلیسی تخصصی: .... نمره ی درس: ....

آیا علاوه بر دروس زبان عمومی و تخصصی دانشگاهی، در دوره های آموزش زبان انگلیسی دیگر مانند کلاس های آموزشگاه های زبان

شرکت کرده اید؟ بله☐ خیر ☐

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت شنیداری دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای گوش دادن به .... نیاز دارند.
					۱. مکالماتی با موضوعات عمومی
					۲. سخنرانی های در سمینار

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes
ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74
(Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					۳. سخنرانی های داخل کلاس
					۴. مباحثی که در رسانه ها مطرح می شوند
					۵. دستورالعمل ها در محیط های واقعی
					۶. هم کلاسی ها، اساتید، و همکاران

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت گفتاری
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای................. نیاز دارند.
					۷. شرکت کردن در بحث های آکادمیک
					۸. صحبت کردن در سمینارها، جلسات، و کنفرانس ها
					۹. پرسش و پاسخ در داخل کلاس
					۱۰. پرسش و پاسخ در سمینارها
					۱۱. صحبت کردن با متخصصین و افراد حرفه ای در محیط واقعی
					۱۲. صحبت کردن با هم کلاسی ها، اساتید، کنفرانس دهندگان و ...

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت خواندن و درک مطلب
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای .... نیاز دارند.
					۱۳. خواندن کتاب های تخصصی
					۱۴. خواندن مقالات انگلیسی در مجلات تخصصی معتبر
					۱۵. خواندن گزارش ها و خلاصه ها
					۱۶. خواندن روزنامه ها، مجلات و متون اینترنتی انگلیسی

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت نوشتاری
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای................. نیاز دارند.
					۱۷. نکته برداری از سخنرانی ها و کنفرانس ها
					۱۸. نکته برداری از کتب و مطالب درسی
					۱۹. نوشتن مقالات علمی یا متونی جهت ارائه

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					دستور زبان و واژگان
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای................. نیاز دارند.
					۲۰. یادگیری دستور زبان
					۲۱. یادگیری واژگان تخصصی و نیمه تخصصی

۲۲. دانشجویان در کلاس های زبان تخصصی ترجیح می دهند به صورت .... مطالعه کنند.
الف) فردی   ب) گروه های دو نفره   پ) گروه های چند نفره

۲۳. کلاس های زبان تخصصی باید در ترم .... ارائه شوند.
الف) دوم   ب) سوم   پ) چهارم   ت) پنجم یا بالاتر

۲۴. کلاس های زبان تخصصی چقدر باید ادامه داشته باشند؟
الف) یک ترم   ب) دو ترم   پ) سه ترم یا بیشتر

۲۵. کلاس های زبان تخصصی باید توسط چه کسی تدریس شوند؟
الف) اساتید زبان انگلیسی   ب) اساتید دروس تخصصی   پ) هر دو

۲۶. شما ترجیح می دهید چند جلسه کلاس زبان تخصصی در هفته داشته باشید؟
الف) یک جلسه   ب) دو جلسه   پ) سه جلسه   ت) چهار جلسه

۲۷. شما ترجیح می دهید چه زمانی درس زبان تخصصی را بگذرانید؟

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

الف) قبل از واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی خودم   ب) بعد از واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی خودم

پ) همزمان با واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی خودم

۲۸. من ترجیح میدهم واحد های درسی را به زبان .... فرا بگیرم.

الف) فارسی   ب) انگلیسی   پ) هر دو

۲۹. من ترجیح میدهم درس زبان تخصصی شامل .... باشد.

الف) لغات و عبارات عمومی   ب) لغات و عبارات تخصصی و نیمه تخصصی   پ) هر دو

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	میزان رضایتمندی عمومی
					۳۰. از تعداد دانشجویان کلاس رضایت دارم
					۳۱. از مضمون و محتوای مطالب درسی که در کلاس کار می شود رضایت دارم.
					۳۲. از روش تدریس استاد زبان تخصصی رضایت دارم.
					۳۳. از نکات فرهنگی که در کلاس های زبان تخصصی ارائه می شود رضایت دارم.
					۳۴. در کل از کتاب درسی و مطالب تدریس شده رضایت دارم.

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	وضعیت سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی
					۳۵. در مجموع، از روش سنجش و ارزشیابی اساتید زبان تخصصی رضایت دارم.
					۳۶. استاد درس زبان تخصصی جهت سنجش و ارزشیابی درس، از روش های نوین سنجش مانند روش کارپوشه، روش جایگزین، سنجش پویا و... استفاده می کرد.
					۳۷. استاد درس زبان تخصصی، تنها از آزمون پایان ترم برای سنجش و ارزشیابی کلاس استفاده می کرد.
					۳۸. در درس زبان تخصصی، ارزشیابی پایان ترم به سوالات دستور زبان محدود می شد.
					۳۹. در درس زبان تخصصی، ارزشیابی پایان ترم به سوالات واژگان و اصطلاحات محدود می شد.
					۴۰. در درس زبان تخصصی، ارزشیابی پایان ترم به سوالات درک مطلب محدود می شد.
					۴۱. در درس زبان تخصصی، ارزشیابی پایان ترم به سوالات ترجمه محدود می شد.
					۴۲. در درس زبان تخصصی، ارزشیابی پایان ترم به تلفیقی از سوالات دستور زبان، واژگان و اصطلاحات، درک مطلب، و ترجمه محدود می شد.

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	پیشنهادات در خصوص روش سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی
					۴۳. ترجیح می دهم سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی فقط به روش سنتی پایان ترم محدود شود.
					۴۴. ترجیح می دهم در سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی، از روش های نوین سنجش مانند روش کارپوشه، روش جایگزین، سنجش پویا و... استفاده شود.
					۴۵. ترجیح می دهم در سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی، علاوه بر امتحان پایان ترم، امتحان میان ترم، کوئیز و .... نیز گنجانده شود.
					۴۶. ترجیح می دهم در سنجش و ارزشیابی درس زبان تخصصی، به جای آزمون های چند گزینه ای، از آزمون ها و سوالات تشریحی و استنباطی استفاده شود.

با سپاس فراوان

در پایان، اگر تمایل دارید در انجام ادامه ی پروژه همکاری نمایید، شماره تماس خود را یادداشت نمایید ....

Appendix B: EAP Needs' Questionnaire (Teachers' Version)

باسمه تعالی

پرسشنامه ی نیاز سنجی در آموزش زبان تخصصی دانشگاه ها

با سلام و احترام ؛

این پرسشنامه درصدد است تا نیاز دانشجویان را در زمینه ی آموزش زبان تخصصی دانشگاهی بسنجد. در راستای نیل به این هدف خواهشمند

است به سؤالات ذیل پاسخ مناسب دهید.

نام و نام خانوادگی (اختیاری) : ....   سن: ....   جنسیت: مرد☐   زن ☐

وضعیت استخدام: حق التدریس ☐   هیات علمی ☐   سابقه تدریس درس زبان تخصصی: .... سال

مرتبه علمی: مربی ☐   دانشجو یا دارای مدرک دکتری☐   استادیار ☐   دانشیار ☐   استاد ☐

رشته ی تحصیلی: ....   دانشگاه محل تدریس: ....

در چه سطح یا سطوحی تدریس میکنید؟   کارشناسی ☐   کارشناسی ارشد ☐   دکتری ☐

کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت شنیداری دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای گوش دادن به .... نیاز دارند.
					۱. مکالماتی با موضوعات عمومی
					۲. سخنرانی های در سمینار
					۳. سخنرانی های داخل کلاس
					۴. مباحثی که در رسانه ها مطرح می شوند
					۵. دستورالعمل ها در محیط های واقعی
					۶. هم کلاسی ها، اساتید، و همکاران
کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت گفتاری دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای........................ نیاز دارند.
					۷. شرکت کردن در بحث های آکادمیک
					۸. صحبت کردن در سمینارها، جلسات، و کنفرانس ها
					۹. پرسش و پاسخ در داخل کلاس
					۱۰.پرسش و پاسخ در سمینارها
					۱۱.صحبت کردن با متخصصین و افراد حرفه ای در محیط واقعی
					۱۲.صحبت کردن با هم کلاسی ها، اساتید، کنفرانس دهندگان و ...
کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	

					مهارت خواندن و درک مطلب
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای .... نیاز دارند.
					۱۳. خواندن کتاب های تخصصی
					۱۴. خواندن مقالات انگلیسی در مجلات تخصصی معتبر
					۱۵. خواندن گزارش ها و خلاصه ها
					۱۶. خواندن روزنامه ها، مجلات و متون اینترنتی انگلیسی
کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					مهارت نوشتاری
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای................... نیاز دارند.
					۱۷. نکته برداری از سخنرانی ها و کنفرانس ها
					۱۸. نکته برداری از کتب و مطالب درسی
					۱۹. نوشتن مقالات علمی یا متونی جهت ارائه
کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم	
					دستور زبان و واژگان
					دانشجویان زبان تخصصی به زبان انگلیسی برای................... نیاز دارند.
					۲۰. یادگیری گرامر زبان
					۲۱. یادگیری واژگان تخصصی و نیمه تخصصی

Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes　　　　　ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, 2021, 10(1), 54-74　　　　　(Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

۲۲. دانشجویان در کلاس های زبان تخصصی ترجیح می دهند به صورت .... مطالعه کنند.

الف) فردی　　　　　ب) گروه های دو نفره　　　　　پ) گروه های چند نفره

۲۳. کلاس های زبان تخصصی باید در ترم .... ارائه شوند.

الف) دوم　　　　ب) سوم　　　　پ) چهارم　　　　ت) پنجم یا بالاتر

۲۴. کلاس های زبان تخصصی چقدر باید ادامه داشته باشند؟

الف) یک ترم　　　　ب) دو ترم　　　　پ) سه ترم یا بیشتر

۲۵. کلاس های زبان تخصصی باید توسط چه کسی تدریس شوند؟

الف) اساتید زبان انگلیسی　　　　ب) اساتید دروس تخصصی　　　　پ) هر دو

۲۶. شما ترجیح می دهید چند جلسه کلاس زبان تخصصی در هفته داشته باشید؟

الف) یک جلسه　　　　ب) دو جلسه　　　　پ) سه جلسه　　　　ت) چهار جلسه

۲۷. شما ترجیح می دهید چه زمانی درس زبان تخصصی را به دانشجویان ارائه دهید؟

الف) قبل از واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی آنها　　　ب) بعد از واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی آنها　　　پ) همزمان با واحد های درسی رشته تخصصی آنها

۲۸. من ترجیح میدهم واحد های درسی رشته ی تخصصی را به زبان .... تدریس کنم.

الف) فارسی　　　　ب) انگلیسی　　　　پ) هر دو

۲۹. من ترجیح میدهم درس زبان تخصصی شامل .... باشد.

الف) لغات و عبارات عمومی　　　　ب) لغات و عبارات تخصصی و نیمه تخصصی　　　　پ) هر دو

با سپاس فراوان

در پایان، اگر تمایل دارید در انجام ادامه ی پروژه همکاری کنید، شماره تماس خود را یادداشت نمایید.........................

Appendix C: Observation Checklist

1. Type of teacher (EFL, content teacher, both)

2. The language used in class (Persian, English, both)

3. The assessment method adopted by the teacher (summative, formative, both)

4. Textbooks and materials used (local, international, teacher's-provided handout)

5. Pair/group work pattern (individual/pair/group work)

6. Interaction between students and teacher, or among students

7. Language Skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) and Components (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation) emphasized and worked on in class

8. The types of assignment given to students

9. The methodology adopted by the teacher (GTM, CLT, Others)