

NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF ARCHITECTURE ENGINEERING STUDENTS

Afrouz Aeineh

English Department, Faculty of humanities, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran

E-mail: Afrouz_Aeineh@yahoo.com

Maryam Rezapour

English Department, Faculty of humanities, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran

E-mail: Rezapour_m70@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

English language teaching has become very important because of the global status of English and people all over the world are learning this language. The effective assessment of English language learners' needs, goals, and interests is integral to developing particular kinds of curricula and classroom instruction that lead to the optimal level of achievement at the end. Given the unavoidable importance of needs analysis in English for specific purposes (ESP) and English for academic purposes (EAP), this paper investigates the linguistic needs of architecture engineering students at five universities in Iran. More specifically, the study aims to identify students' perceptions towards the importance of English skills, evaluation of students' weaknesses in English, assessment of students' needs and suggestions for improving architecture engineering curriculum. 384 architecture engineering undergraduates and 15 teachers in the academic year 2013 filled out a questionnaire. The questionnaire related to both teachers and learners had one section in common. The results of the study indicated that English is very significant for the students and some skills are more important than others for them. However, the students' and teachers' perspectives are quite different considering the priorities. ANOVA was used to find out the differences between means of the preferred skills for both groups of students and teachers. In addition, Scheffe test was used to determine and compare the priority of skill preferences by each group. The study would benefit ESP/EAP teachers to recognize architecture engineering students' needs and preferred skills, provide proper teaching material and teaching methodology accordingly.

KEYWORDS: Architecture engineering, Needs analysis, Needs assessment, EAP

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, many questions burdened the scholars; questions such as: "why none of the methods had operated satisfactorily enough to meet the demands of the field? Why the contribution of linguistics, psychology, and other language related areas didn't lead the field to an acceptable level of success? From what other areas could the language teaching profession get help? What other disciplines could contribute to the progress of language teaching?" Because of the expansion of international communication, the demands for learning a foreign language were increasing. In addition, the field of language teaching was not well equipped enough to meet the

needs of the learners. These inefficiencies made language educators to reexamine the existing state of affairs and try to remodel the whole design of language teaching process. They started by examining the deficiencies of the existing methods of teaching and then they attempted to offer useful solution. During this time, fundamental changes occurred. It was argued that determining the expected performance of the learners has to be the first step. Then appropriate designs and effective techniques could be implemented in the classroom settings on the basis of the terminal performance. The emergence of ESP was one of the significant outcomes of these developments (Farhady, 1995).

ESP is an approach rather than a product. ESP is not a specific language, methodology or even teaching material. It is an approach to language learning and teaching, in which all decision as to content and method are based on learners' need and reason for learning. This means that ESP teachers have to design appropriate courses for different groups of learners. The foundation of all ESP is this question: why do these learners need to learn a foreign language? But it could be argued any course should start with this question, General or ESP. All courses are based on a sort of perceived need. Indeed, what distinguishes ESP from General English is not the existence of a need as such but rather an awareness of the need. That is, an awareness of a target situation that is a definable need to communicate in English (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

Dudley-Evans and St. John (1997) state that methodology of ESP teaching differs from that used in General Purpose English. They see methodology as the nature of the interaction between the ESP teacher and the learners. In their definition two aspects of ESP methodology is emphasized: 'all ESP teaching should reflect the methodology of the disciplines and professions it serves; and in more specific ESP teaching the nature of the interaction between the teacher and learner may be very different from that in a general English class.' So according to them specific ESP teaching has its own methodology.

Based on the hierarchical international model, ESP textbooks have been critically examined by MA students. The outcome indicated that the text books do not meet the ESP models. Most of the materials available is a patch work of copy and paste type with some modification and some traditional activities such as true/false, multiple choice, matching , and fill in the blank types which is a primitive way based on which a text book may be designed. In order to develop materials or textbooks, needs analysis specification at different levels should be conducted and accordingly appropriate materials need to be developed. Otherwise, the outcome would be of unsystematic which cannot meet the requirements needed for an educational program (Farhady, 1980).

Most of the studies have been designed to assess students' needs in different fields. However, few researches have dealt with the needs of architecture engineering students. This study aims at finding out what architecture engineering undergraduates need in their academic study and what their priorities regarding English skills and sub-skills are.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) state that there is no difference between the two in theory; however, there is a great deal of difference in practice. ESP differs from EGP in the sense that the words and sentences learned and the subject matter discussed are all relevant to a particular field or discipline. The design of syllabuses for ESP is directed towards serving the needs of learners seeking for or developing themselves in a particular occupation or specializing in a specific academic field. ESP courses make use of vocabulary tasks related to the field such as negotiation skills and effective techniques for oral presentations (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). A balance is created between educational theory and practical considerations. ESP also increases learners' skills in using English.

Thus, ESP is centered on the language appropriate to the activities of a given discipline. According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987, p.19), "ESP is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner's reason for learning." In this connection, Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) explains that ESP may not always focus on the language for one specific discipline or occupation, such as English for Law or English for Engineering. University instruction that introduces students to common features of academic discourse in the sciences or humanities, frequently called English for Academic Purposes (EAP), is equally ESP.

English for Academic and Occupational Purposes

Hutchinson and Waters (1987), on the other hand, have developed a "Tree of ELT" in which the subdivisions of ESP are clearly illustrated. ESP is broken down into three branches: English for Science and Technology (EST), English for Business and Economics (EBE), and English Social Studies (ESS). Each of these subject areas is further divided into two branches: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP).

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) do note that there is not a clear-cut distinction between EAP and EOP on the basis of the considerations that (1) people can work and study simultaneously, and that (2) the language learnt in a teaching setting for academic purposes can be useful and employed by the learner in the occupational environment when he/she takes up, or returns to, a job. This may explain why EAP and EOP have been categorized under the same type of ESP. The end of both types seems to be similar: employment. However, this shall not lead to the conclusion that the means through which the same end is achieved are also identical. They are very different indeed.

Needs Analysis in ESP

Needs of themselves do not have an objective reality. Specifying needs is a matter of agreement and judgment not discovery. Needs may differ according to different contexts (Robinson, 1991). According to Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998), different types of needs may be a) what can students do at the end of the course (goal-oriented needs) b) what the students regard necessary to be learnt from a course c) what the learners need to do to actually acquire the language (a process-oriented definition of needs) d) what the learners themselves want to learn from a

language course (personal aims) e) need here is a lack (what the learners do not know) (cited in Robinson 1991).

Mostly teachers perceive the objective needs and the students the subjective needs. By objective needs, it is meant the factual information about learners, their correct language proficiency, language difficulties, and real-life communication. By subjective needs, it is meant cognitive and affective needs of the learners including personality, confidence, attitudes, learning strategies, etc. There may be a conflict between learners and teachers regarding the learning activities, strategies, materials and language content.

A needs analysis which focuses on students' needs at the end of a language course can be called a target situation analysis (TSA). Another type of needs analysis which is investigating weaknesses and strengths in a course is called present situation analysis (PSA). Three sources of information for needs analysis at this stage are students, language teaching establishment, and user-institution. In a PSA approach to needs analysis political factors should be considered as the initial phase of needs analysis. Thus needs analysis must be seen as a combination of TSA and PSA (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998).

Benesch (1996) suggests three sets of methodological problem related to needs analysis including the *problem of perception*, the *problem of principle*, and the *problem of practice*.

Perception of needs may involve stipulating who carries out the needs analysis. The doer may be an outsider who has an objective and impartial view to the needs. The disadvantage of this notion is that the outsider may bring some alien cultural preconceptions and may have different views on teaching and learning from the institution under analysis.

Halliday and Cooke (cited in Jordan, 1997) propose an *ecological approach* to ESP. They suggest a means analysis which researches into the local culture: its pattern of thinking and learning. Yet an insider may take the responsibility of doing the needs analysis but again there are degrees of incidences, not absolute incidences. The last point here is that the source of information for needs analysis would be the students, the language-teaching institution, and those who are concerned with students' educational and vocational status. There might exist conflict between these sources of information depending on how they view ESP.

The principle of data collection is another issue (Benesch, 1996). If the analysts believe in a pedagogical approach which focuses on linguistic forms, the needs analysis would be the grasp of linguistic forms and linguistic analysis of target-level texts. Students' needs will be expressed in terms of language items to be taught then. In EAP the investigation is focusing on skills and subskills. Nowadays in the fields of EAP and ESP we are concerned with the processes which students engage in and the strategies they employ. A process-oriented needs analysis, then, would focus on information about these processes and strategies.

In the realm of practice of needs analysis, a teacher may use different techniques to collect information about students' needs. These techniques may be using questionnaires, conducting

detailed interviews, doing participant observation, or using tests and press ads. Of course if an in-depth study over a period of time is required, a case study might be conducted.

From conducting a needs analysis it is important to plan that. The first step may be to gather all the possible information about the learner before deciding how the information will be analyzed and for what purposes it will be used. One problem is the difficulty of extracting usable information from sponsors or employers because the sponsors may be out of touch with the perspective students' actual needs. So needs analysts must use their existing stock of knowledge and make professional guesses.

It is worthy to say that needs to be repeated during the life of each course since students' PSA may change during the course. Coleman (1990, cited in Benesch, 1996) suggests a two-stage needs analysis: The first stage would reveal the complexity and dynamism of the organization then , at the second stage, attention would be paid to the specific needs of the organization's constituent units. Accordingly, Hawkey (1993, cited in Benesch, 1996) stresses the importance to the project of the great amount of willing co-operation that he received from all concerned: students, English teachers, administrators.

Celce-Murcia (2001) suggests different techniques for data collection in needs analysis of ESP. Here I have outlined some of these techniques:

1. *Questionnaires and Surveys*
2. *Interviews of experts, students, and other stakeholders*
3. *Observation, job-shadowing, and analysis*
4. *Multiple intelligence and learning style surveys of the students.*
5. *Modes of working*
6. *Spoken or written reflections by the students_ or their supervisors_ before, during, or after instruction (cited in Celce-Murcia 2001).*

According to Carter (1983) there are three common features of ESP: authentic material, purpose-related orientation and self direction. Dudley-Evans (1997) stated intermediate or advance levels are more suitable for ESP courses as it makes the use of authentic materials more feasible. Students can be encouraged to do research using a variety of recourses including internet. Carter (1893) mentioned purpose-related orientation refers to simulation of target communicative tasks involving reading, note taking and writing. Self-direction intends to turn learners into users as believed Carter (1983). Students need a certain degree of freedom to decide on what and how to study. Learners should be taught how to learn and how to access new information in a new culture (Cited in Dudley-Evans, 1989).

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) mention that target needs (i.e. what the learner needs to do in the target situation) and learning needs (i.e. what the learners need to do in order to learn) can be distinguished. They emphasize that both target situation needs and learning needs must be taken into account. If we look at the target situation in terms of necessities, lacks and wants, it will be more helpful. 'Necessities' are the needs determined by the demands of the target situation. In other words, it is what the learner has to know to have a better performance in the target situation.

'Lacks' mean knowing what the learner knows already, so that you can then determine the necessities that the learner lacks. By 'Wants' it is meant that learners are aware of their needs and they know what their needs are. Here, the learners' view may conflict with the perceptions of other interested parties such as course designers, sponsors and teachers (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

Needs analysis according to Dudley Evans establishes what and how of a course and evaluation establishes the effectiveness. They are both dynamic and ongoing. Munby (1978) recognized that function and situation were both fundamental. The current concept of needs analysis according to Dudley Evans(1998) include target situation analysis, objective needs, personal information about learners wants (subjective needs), English language information about learners language skills and language use, present situation analysis(the learners lacks and learning needs), knowledge of skills used in target situation linguistics, discourse and genre analysis (the analysis of what is finally wanted).

There is a distinction between EGAP and ESAP. The former refers to the skill and language that is common to all disciplines; the latter refers to characteristics that distinguish one discipline from other disciplines (Dudley-Evans, 1998). Widdowson (1983), however, makes a distinction between training and education; training refers to development of certain skills and specification schemata. However, education seeks to enlarge a general capacity to enlarge a general capacity to handle a wide range of needs. The common core EAP work is more relevant and it is used by more specific work (Cited in Dudley-Evans, 1989).

According to one study done on NA on computer engineering course, the researcher indicated that the EAP course under study was not either research based or discipline sensitive. Students level of skills and abilities were not considered which lead to student's dissatisfaction. Student's needs were neither identified nor operationalised. Therefore, no objectives were thought of accordingly. In addition, there was an obvious discrepancy between student's needs and the course understudy. As a result, renewing the content skills and methodology of learning of the course material by SAMT as the first step were suggested. Other problems were related to the lack of cooperation between the language teacher and the subject teacher.

Based on a comparative study done in Newzealand, the results showed the communication between teachers and students need to be more. Also, informal needs assessment through informal methods like classroom observation and self evaluation need a day to day work and encounter between teachers and students to lead to rich data for needs analysis. This is in line with Grant and Santon (2000), Brown (1997), Van Hest and Oud de Glas (1990).

Significance of the study

According to the results of the observations and questionnaire, students were dissatisfied with their EAP course and they asked for a reconsideration of the policy to meet their subjective and objective needs. They also complained that they don't see the use of learning materials in practice and they believed everything remained in theory. The findings can enable a more proper material preparation and motivation enhancement.

Objective of the study

The study aims to indicate the discrepancy exists between student's needs and the EAP courses. It also wants to highlight the measures that can be taken to reduce the differences and help both students and stakeholders to take a full benefit considering students needs. The point is to provide students with what they expect to learn which is the main focus of EAP. It will determine three important factors which are lacks, needs and necessities of the students.

Theoretical framework

The present study aimed at investigating needs, wants and lacks of architecture engineering students doing a course in associate and bachelor. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) provided a framework for investigating students' language needs. The frame requires gathering data on why students are taking the course, what recourses are present, who are the learners, where and when English courses take place. Analysis of the course book in terms of subjective and objective needs are needed to find out if the material matches the needs.

Theoretically, the result will shed light on the proper choice of material design, the one which can get the class to the objectives. Pedagogically, it has several advantages such as encouraging teachers to choose proper materials, to plan instructional program for teaching the students of civil engineering and providing suitable tests for the purpose of evaluation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What are architecture engineering students' English needs and preferred skills?

Are there any differences between what students really need and what teachers think they need?

Hypothesis

There are no differences between what students really need and what teachers think they need.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Statistical sampling of the research included 384 architecture students and 15 MA holder teachers. They were all from 5 universities in Iran namely, Guilan University, Non-state University of Guilan; Azad University of Rasht, Guilan; Shiraz University and Azad university of Lahijan. The students were to do an AD and a BA of architecture and they were from approximately the same age group. The interviewees comprised both genders.

Instruments

The instruments used to carry out this study were 2 questionnaires. The first questionnaire (Appendix 1) which was for the students and was in Persian language included two parts, the first part contained 9 questions and the second part had 11 questions. The second questionnaire (Appendix 2) only had one part which was similar to the first part of students' questionnaire and consisted of 9 questions. The two instruments were given to several domain experts in the field to

be scrutinized for the content and face validity. The recommendations made by the experts led the researches to make some modifications. The reliability indices for the instruments using Cronbach Alpha formula were 0.81 and 0.85.

Data collection procedure

For the purpose of the study a close ended questionnaire was prepared to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire was given to 20 architecture students for a pilot test. After revising the pilot questionnaire, the final translated questionnaire was given to 384 architecture student. The design of the questionnaire was based on 2 different models; Munby and a needs analysis questionnaire for non-English-background students (cited in Richards, 2001). This questionnaire included 19 questions and was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of one category which had 9 questions regarding the importance of English skills and sub-skills from students' point of view. The second part was divided into 3 categories namely, evaluations of architecture engineering students' proficiency in English, assessing architecture engineering students' need and suggestions for improving the English curriculum. For the questions of this part, frequency of the responses was calculated and reported by considering the highest and lowest percentage of the data collected. On the other hand, the questionnaire designed for the teachers consisted of 9 questions regarding the importance of English skills and sub-skills from the teachers' perspective. It was parallel to the first part of the version given to the students. It was administered to 15 teachers who taught architecture engineering students. All questionnaire sheets were collected and analyzed two weeks after their distribution had been over. The gathered data were fed into SPSS for the statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result includes two sections:

Part 1

Table 1 and 2 highlights the results obtained from the first 9 questions of the questionnaire, regarding the importance of 9 different skills and sub-skills from the students' perspective. Firstly, ANOVA was used to find out the difference between means of the skills which is shown in table 1, and then Scheffe test was utilized to prioritize the importance of skills from the students' perspective. The result obtained from Scheffe test is shown in table 2.

Table 1: (ANOVA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	287.782	8	35.973	55.552	.000
Within Groups	2230.798	3445	.648		
Total	2518.580	3453			

In order to find out the priority of skills and categorize them in groups, scheffe test was used (table 2). The labels of skills shown as figures in the first column of table 2 are as follows:

1= Speaking 2= Listening 3=Reading 4= Writing 5= Grammar

Table 2: (Scheffe)

VAR00001	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
5.00	384	2.5755		
4.00	384	2.7135		
6.00	384	2.7917		
8.00	384		3.1693	
9.00	384		3.2005	3.2005
3.00	384		3.2214	3.2214
2.00	383		3.2245	3.2245
1.00	384		3.3854	3.3854
7.00	383			3.4282
Sig.		.086	.086	.053

In table 2, the summary has been prioritized from the least to the most important items.

The result showed that the skills and sub skills of English language have different priorities for architecture engineering students. It means that there is at least one difference between the means of different skills of English language. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5 = \mu_6 = \mu_7 = \mu_8 = \mu_9$

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5 \neq \mu_6 \neq \mu_7 \neq \mu_8 \neq \mu_9$

It is possible to have three categories for these nine skills. All skills in a category have the same priorities. The mean of each category shows its priority.

Therefore, the importance of skills according to the priorities for the students is as follows:

1. Communication skills, 2. Speaking, 3. Listening, 4. Reading, 5. Intercultural competence, 6. Pronunciation, 7. Vocabulary, 8. Writing, 9. Grammar.

Teachers

Table 3 shows the results obtained from the first 9 questions (part 1) of the questionnaire, regarding the importance of 9 different skills and sub-skills from the teachers' perspective. ANOVA was first used to find out the difference between means of each skill and then Scheffe test was utilized to prioritize the importance of skills from the teachers' perspective. The result obtained from Scheffe test is shown in table 4. The summary has been prioritized from the last to the first.

Table 3: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	48.263	8	6.033	8.759	.000
Within Groups	86.095	125	.689		
Total	134.358	133			

Table 4: (scheffe)

Scheffe				
VAR00003	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
9.00	15	1.8000		
2.00	15	2.0667	2.0667	
4.00	15	2.1333	2.1333	
1.00	15	2.7333	2.7333	2.7333
7.00	15	2.8000	2.8000	2.8000
5.00	15		3.0667	3.0667
	15			3.4000
6.00	14			3.4286
3.00	15			3.4667
Sig.		.225	.225	.668

In table 4, the summary has been prioritized from the least to the most important items.

The tables of skills shown as figures in the first column of table 2 are as follows:

1= Speaking 2= Listening 3=Reading 4= Writing 5= Grammar

6= Vocabulary 7= Communication skills 8= pronunciation

Therefore, the priorities of the importance of skills for the teachers are as follows:

Reading, 2.vocabulary,3. Pronunciation, 4. Grammar, 5. Communication skills, 6.speaking, 7.writing, 8. Listening, 9.intercultural competence.

Part 2

*Question 10, What English problems are **you** currently facing? (You can choose more than one option)*

Poor Listening Comprehension	Poor speaking ability	Poor Writing	Reading comprehension	Poor Grammar	Limited Vocabulary	Poor pronunciation	total
No= 48 11%	No=57 13%	No= 66 15%	No= 27 6%	No= 81 19%	No=105 25%	No=45 11%	429

As the participants could choose more than one option, the total number of responses rose to 429.

Question 11, what medium of instruction should be used for teaching English in your course?

Completely English	Completely Persian	Mostly English	Mostly Persian	both	Persian but technical terms in English	Total
112 29%	24 6%	139 36%	1 0%	104 27%	5 2%	384

Question 12, what would you think the emphasis of the reading aspect in the English course should be?

Reading articles	Reading comprehension	Translation skills	Reading English books	total
220 57%	121 32%	22 6%	21 5%	384

Question 13, what would you think the emphasis of the listening aspect in English course should be?

Understanding conversations	Documents related to their field of study	Understanding presentation	Improving pronunciation	total
189 49%	140 37%	20 5%	35 9%	384

Question 14, what would you think the emphasis of the speaking aspect in the English course should be?

conversation	Participating in conferences	presentation	discussion	Total
210 55%	62 16%	14 4%	98 25%	384

Question 15, what would you think the emphasis of the writing aspect in the English course should be?

Writing for practical purposes	Doing projects	Writing research	Improving spelling	Total
85 22%	75 19%	164 43%	60 16%	384

Question 16, Should the materials in the English course be relevant to architecture major?

Yes	No
292 76%	92 24%

Question 17, what is the best way of learning?

Large groups (more than 6)	In pairs	Small groups (3-6)	The whole class	Total
30 8%	58 15%	176 46%	120 31%	384

Question 18, Do you think the current curriculum should be changed?

Yes	No	total
282 73%	102 27%	384

Question 19, If you answered yes, what changes should be made in the curriculum?

Making materials easier	Increasing time	Focus more on formative assessment	Focus more on summative assessment	total
87 31%	30 11%	150 53%	15 5%	282

Discussion

The problematic areas in order of difficulty listed by the students were vocabulary, grammar writing, speaking, listening, pronunciation and reading comprehension. In spite all these difficulties, they were keen on holding classes mostly in English language, other priorities was using only English as the medium of instruction, half Persian half English respectively. Minority of students believed the language used in classrooms should be totally Persian, Persian but technical vocabulary should be explained in English and finally, mostly Persian.

The most important point in reading was listed as reading article and reading comprehension. The percentages obtained were considerably higher than translation and reading other English books. In terms of listening skill, about half of the students were keen on understanding conversations. However, more than a third mentioned understanding films and other documentaries related to their course of study. Regarding speaking more than half of the population found conversing in English vital although one third was interested in participating classroom discussions. Students mainly believed that their focus in writing skill should be on writing articles as they will need to write an article especially when studying for a master degree.

Concerning material development, surprisingly three fourth of the participants agreed that the materials should be related to their major although the rest didn't believe in the total relationship. Learning in groups was the point of about a half. However, the rest thought it should happen with the whole class.

Importantly majority thought that teaching methodology needs reconsideration, the percentage accounted for over 70 percent of the population. They strongly felt the need for a change.

Regarding evaluation, most of the participants believed in mid-term examination. This can imply student's tendency toward formative assessment rather than summative one. In addition, around one third maintained that learning material including textbooks should be easier which is not surprising considering students general knowledge of English and the heterogeneity among them.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to identify teachers and students' perception towards the importance of English skills. It also evaluated students' understanding of their weaknesses in English, assessment of students' need and suggestions for improving architecture engineering curriculum. The importance of skills according to the priorities for the students was as follows: Communication

skills, Speaking, Listening, Reading, Intercultural competence, Pronunciation, Vocabulary, Writing, and Grammar.

Skills significance for the teachers was as follows: Reading, vocabulary, pronunciation, Grammar, communication skills, speaking, writing, Listening, intercultural competence. It is obvious that communication, speaking and listening skills are primary priorities for the architecture engineering students but it came in the fifth, sixth and eighth place for teachers teaching architecture students.

On the other hand, reading, vocabulary and pronunciation are considered as primary for teachers although they are not among the first priorities for the students. We can conclude that students' and teachers' perceptions are different. As a result, a balance should be made between both groups. It would be better if teachers considered students' wants and needs and focused more on communication and speaking skills.

Limitations of the study

Although the present study was carefully planned and implemented, some important limitations should be noted. To start with, the number of female and male participants was not equal. Another limitation was the students' English language proficiency was different from one another which could affect the result of the study.

REFERENCES

- Atai, M. R. (2000). *ESP revisited: a reappraisal study of discipline-based EAP programs in Iran*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Esfahan, Esfahan, Iran.
- Atai, M. R. (2002). Iranian EAP programs in practice: A study of key methodological aspects. *Sheikhbahaee ELT Journal*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Benesch, S. (1996). Needs analysis and curriculum development in EAP; an example of a critical approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30/3, pp. 62-80.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second foreign language (third edition)*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Farhadi, H. (1994). On the specificity of purpose in ESP. 479-489.
- Hoang Oanh, D.T. (2007) Meeting students' needs in two EAP programs in Vietnam and New Zealand: a comparative study. *RELC journal*, 324-349.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Hwang, Y., & Lin, S. (2010). A study of medical students' linguistic needs in Taiwan. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 6, 35-85.
- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A guide and recourse book for teachers*. CUP.
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Appendix 1 (Students' questionnaire)

دانشجویان گرامی

پرسشنامه ای که ملاحظه می فرمایید جهت سنجش نیازهای زبان انگلیسی دانشگاهی در رشته ی تحصیلی شما فراهم شده است. اطلاعات این پرسشنامه صرفاً جهت انجام تحقیق و به صورت کاملاً محرمانه خواهد بود. خواهشمند است به سوالات ذیل با دقت پاسخ دهید. پیشاپیش از همکاری شما دانشجویان عزیز متشکریم.

مشخصات فردی:

جنسیت ☐ زن ☐ مرد
سن
رشته ی تحصیلی
مقطع تحصیلی
زبان مادری
سطح زبان انگلیسی

بخش اول:

اهمیت استفاده از زبان در رشته ی مهندسی معماری

1. فکر می کنید مهارت گفتار تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
2. فکر می کنید مهارت شنیداری تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
3. فکر می کنید مهارت خواندن تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
4. فکر می کنید مهارت نوشتار تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
5. فکر می کنید یادگیری گرامر تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
6. فکر می کنید یادگیری لغت تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
7. فکر می کنید یادگیری مهارت های ارتباطی تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
8. فکر می کنید یادگیری تلفظ صحیح تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست
9. فکر می کنید آشنایی با فرهنگ های دیگر تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم است؟
خیلی مهم مهم تاحدی مهم مهم نیست

بخش دوم:

ارزیابی نقاط ضعف دانشجویان در زبان انگلیسی A.

10. فکر می کنید در فرایند یادگیری زبان با چه مشکلاتی مواجه هستید؟ (انتخاب بیش از یک گزینه امکان پذیر است)
تلفظ ضعیف دانش لغت محدود نوشتار ضعیف مهارت گفتار ضعیف
گرامر ضعیف درک مطلب ضعیف مهارت درک شنیداری ضعیف موارد دیگر

ارزیابی نیازهای دانشجویان B.

11. به نظر شما درس زبان انگلیسی به چه زبانی باید درس داده شود
کاملاً به زبان انگلیسی کاملاً به زبان فارسی بیشتر به زبان انگلیسی هردو به یک اندازه
بیشتر به زبان فارسی زبان فارسی اما لغات تخصصی به انگلیسی

12. به نظر شما تاکید مهارت خواندن در کلاس زبان باید بر روی چه چیزی باشد؟
خواندن مقالات مرتبط با رشته ی شما
درک مطلب
تقویت مهارت ترجمه
خواندن کتاب های انگلیسی

13. به نظر شما تاکید مهارت شنیداری در کلاس زبان باید بر روی چه چیزی باشد؟
فهمیدن مکالمات روزمره
دیدن فیلم ها و مستندات مرتبط با رشته ی شما
فهمیدن ارائه های کلاسی
یادگیری تلفظ صحیح

14. به نظر شما تاکید مهارت گفتار در کلاس زبان باید بر روی چه چیزی باشد؟
مکالمه کردن به زبان انگلیسی
شرکت در کنفرانس
ارائه ی کلاسی
شرکت در بحث های کلاسی

15. به نظر شما تاکید مهارت نوشتار در کلاس زبان باید بر روی چه چیزی باشد؟
نوشتن برای اهداف عملی (نوشتن ایمیل، نامه و غیره)
انجام دادن پروژه های کلاسی
مقاله نوشتن
یادگیری طرز نوشتن کلمات

16. آیا کتاب ها و مواد آموزشی در کلاس زبان باید مرتبط با رشته ی تحصیلی تان باشد؟
بله خیر

پیشنهادهای برای پیشرفت برنامه ی آموزشی C.

17. من در کلاس زبان انگلیسی یادگیری به صورت را دوست دارم.
گروه های بزرگ (بیشتر از 6 نفر) 2 نفره گروه های کوچک با کل کلاس

18. به نظر شما آیا تغییری در برنامه آموزشی این درس باید ایجاد شود با توجه به مشکلاتی که دانشجویان از جمله خود شما دارید:

بله خیر
19. در صورتی که گزینه بله را انتخاب نموده اید، تغییراتی که باید حاصل شود را انتخاب کنید: (انتخاب بیش از یک گزینه امکان پذیر است)
آسان سازی مواد آموزشی
افزایش زمان کلاس
تمرکز بیشتر بر روی امتحانات میان ترم

تمرکز بیشتر بر روی امتحان پایان ترم
موارد دیگر

اطلاعات بیشتر در صورت تمایل

اگر ما در انجام تحقیق نیاز به اطلاعات بیشتری از شما داشتیم، آیا مایل خواهید بود در مصاحبه شرکت کنید؟

بله
خیر
اگر گزینه ی بله را انتخاب نموده اید لطفا بخش زیر را تکمیل کنید:

نام و نام خانوادگی

شماره تماس

Appendix 2 (Teachers' questionnaire)

Demographics

Sex: male ☐ female ☐ age

How many years have you been teaching? Years

Importance of using English

Indicate your attitude to rate the importance of each of the following items.

Use the following scale:

1= unimportant 2=somewhat important 3=important 4=very important

1. How important do you think the speaking skill is for your students?
2. How important do you think the listening skill is for your students?
3. How important do you think the reading skill is for your students?
4. How important do you think the writing skill is for your students?
5. How important would you think learning grammar is for your students?
6. How important would you think learning vocabulary is for your students?
7. How important do you think communication skills are for your students?
8. How important would you think the pronunciation is for your students?
9. How important do you think knowing about other cultures is for your students?