

Evaluation of Speaking Curriculums at the Erbil Private Universities using Context, Input, Process and Product model

Lava Noori Ali

Department of English Language Teaching, College of Education, University of Tishk International, Erbil, Iraq.

noonilava@gmail.com

Dr. Suleyman Celik

Department of English Language Teaching, College of Education, University of Tishk International, Erbil, Iraq.

cheliksuleyman@gmail.com, suleyman.celik@ishik.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 2/2/2020

Accepted: 10/3/2020

Published: Winter2020

Keywords:

**Curriculum evaluation,
CIPP model,
Context
evaluation,
Input
evaluation,
Process
evaluation,
Product evaluation**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explain the effectiveness of the Speaking curriculum in English Language Teaching (ELT) Department in Private Universities in Erbil, Iraq. The theoretical background behind this evaluation study is Stufflebeam's evaluation model (1983), CIPP, Context, Input, Process and Product. Students' and instructors' perspectives are taken regarding the studying goals and objectives, used teaching methodologies, studying environment, materials and assessments of the courses. This study will help teachers to find out more engaging ways of teaching that focus on using the language more fluently and accurately rather than memorization. The objective

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.5.1.7

of this study is to recommend necessary changes, adaptations, or improvements required for the university curriculums. Participants were English department 169 students and 11 teachers in three private universities of Erbil-Iraq. The results showed that the speaking courses are satisfactory but they need some minor changes and improvements regarding course goals and objectives, course materials and instrumentation in order to obtain a better curriculum to fulfill the students' and teachers' expectations of the course.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY:

Qualified education is the fundamental pillar for guaranteeing profitable generations for the society. One of the priority requirements to achieve this is that students must be competent in speaking and communicating in the twenty-first century's lingua franca, English. Educators and researchers in the field of English Language Teaching are continually investigating to discover new ways of teaching and techniques that can facilitate English language learning. School, college, and university curriculums need to be up-to-date to meet the students' needs. Schools should be evaluated in order to find any lack to try to improve it. "Evaluation is the

process of determining the extent to which objectives are attained” (Aziz, n.d.). Moreover, Evaluation helps to supplement in forming a concrete understanding of programs aimed at products and student needs, or it delivers an examination of the program’s success. (Science, 2016)

One of the ways of improving, adjusting and adapting curriculums is the use of the CIPP model which stands for Context, Input, Process, Product approach, developed by Stufflebeam (1983) (Patil & Kalekar, 2014.). “The basic idea behind CIPP is that evaluation is designed not so much to prove that you are right, as to improve on what you are already doing.”(Nicholson, Journal, & Jan, 2016). According to Stufflebeam, the evaluation should provide appropriate and valid information of the curriculum for decision-makers, managers, educators, and policy boards of an organization. (Akpur, Alci, & Karataş, 2016)

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

To begin with, the English language consists of four skills, Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. The skills of Reading and Listening are Receptive Skills whereas Writing and Speaking are Productive Skills, learners have to generate pieces of language. Moreover, speaking is more complicated than writing for the majority of people. (Nunan, 2003) emphasizes that speaking is harder for two reasons. First, speaking occurs in real time; second, you are unable to change and review what you are saying while speaking. As mentioned earlier, speaking is often considered as the most complicated skill to learn, because speaking and thinking are done



simultaneously. As we speak, we have to monitor our output and correct our mistakes, as well as planning for what we are going to say next.

To resume, reasons affecting students not to speak the target language with ease are categorized into three categories by (Wang, 2014), cognitive factors, linguistic Factors and affective factors. Moreover, according to (Krashen, 1982), who proposed the Second Language Acquisition Hypothesis. In his Affective Filter Hypothesis, he mentions that motivation, language anxiety and self-confidence play important roles in language learning. Based on his contribution, if the motivation is low, self-confidence is low and anxiety is high, it becomes a blockage for language learning. These factors result in language anxiety. Foreign language anxiety is the “worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or utilizing a second language” (Young, 1999). It is one of the vital factors affecting target language production by students. Language anxiety may have positive and negative effects on students’ language acquisition. Language anxiety may affect students’ achievement negatively when learning the target language, this view is supported by (Awan, 2010). However, in designing a curriculum, speaking skills should be emphasized as to facilitate students’ learning and gaining confidence in speaking. “Speech has an important place in the curriculum.” (Allan A. Glatthorn, Floyd Boschee, Bruce M. Whitehead, 2016).

To add, curriculum is “the program by which a school meets its educational goals. It includes planned and unplanned experiences, and involves the means and materials with which students interact” (Edward S. Ebert, 2011). It can be inferred that; the curriculum is any tool beneficial for meeting the goal of delivering a course. For

example, materials, methods, activities, course books, tests, etc. Besides, the purpose of the curriculum is to offer opportunities to the teachers who struggle in guiding their students to achieve the desired or pre-settled goals through the provided chances. Therefore, (Erden, 1998) defines curriculum evaluation as the process of collecting data about the productivity and efficiency of the curriculum, through using various assessment tools, analyzing the data, comparing with the settled criteria and decide on the curriculum's quality. Equally, (Özüdoğru, 2018) states that "Curriculum evaluation is essential to curriculum development, implementation and maintenance." The broadest objective of curriculum evaluation is to check if the course is the best possible. In addition, curriculum evaluation aims to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Another aim of curriculum evaluation is to decide whether the intended goals or objectives have been reached or fulfilled, or whether it is coinciding with the external standards. Therefore, responsible for program evaluation are external examiners or stakeholders. Teachers may evaluate their own classes as well, informally, by asking students questions or hand-outing checklists to fill out.

Subsequently, there are two types of evaluation; formative evaluation and summative evaluation. The former, formative evaluation is conducted to form the course to expand it. Further, it is obtaining information to enhance instruction's quality, it improves the process and product of instruction. Moreover, it aims to check instructional processes and learning progress to provide continuous feedback that identifies learning errors (Gronlund, 1985). In addition, formative evaluation is conducted during the instructional process, lets the teachers ensure that students are

reaching the instructional goals and ensures improvement ways. Later, summative evaluation is to draw a summary about the quality and quantity of a course in order to compare it with another course, compare it with previous evaluations or to ensure that the course is meeting the criterion set by stakeholders. As (Aziz, 2018) claims “summative evaluation ensures whether necessary processes have been carried out and objectives are being met.”

Besides, there are several evaluation models. Each model is serving a purpose and is useful for a specific angle of the curriculum. Each one is a type of evaluation approach. (Allan A. Glatthorn, Floyd Boschee, Bruce M. Whitehead, 2016) proposed a number of models for evaluating the curriculums, which are the following: Tyler’s Objective- centered Model, Stufflebeam’s Context, Input, Process, Product Model, Scriven’s Goal-free Model, Stake’s Responsive Model, Eisner’s Connoisseurship Model and Bradley’s Effectiveness Model

- **Stufflebeam’s Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) evaluation model:**

In the first place, the CIPP model is an evaluation model developed by Stufflebeam in 1983. He is a proponent of an decision-oriented evaluation approach. (Worthern, B. R., 1997) states that it aids to make the best possible decisions by administrators. It can be conducted systematically, fulfilling the overall needs of evaluation as (Aziz, 2018) claims. It was administrated to improve learning process to improve it (D. L. and A. J. S. Stufflebeam, 1985). Basically, the acronym CIPP model stands for Context, Input, Process and Product evaluation. Each component asks a question which are:

1. What needs to be done?

2. How should it be done?
3. Is it being done?
4. Did it succeed?

Responses of these four questions are beneficial in formative and summative purposes. In a formative manner, the reports might be used from time to time to aid the responsible people in the program's focus, plan, guide and decide on the program's effectiveness. At the end of the program, the formative reports can be combined and used to provide an accountability report for the program's stakeholders and interested parties. The primary goal of the model is to help in improving programs through on-going and decision-oriented assessments. It also fulfills the program's needs for accountability. This model supports applying mixed methods for collecting data, both qualitative and quantitative.

Based on what (D. L. Stufflebeam, 1983) states, the CIPP model should ask those questions in order to be effective, and should direct the questions in a comprehensive way. The questions to be used in the evaluation process and decisions of the CIPP model is demonstrated in the following table:

Aspect of evaluation	Type of decision	Kind of question answered
Context evaluation	Planning decisions	What should we do?
Input evaluation	Structuring decisions	How should we do it?



Process evaluation	Implementing decisions	Are we doing it as planned? And if not, why not?
Product evaluation	Recycling decisions	Did it work?

(Robinson, 2002)

Thus, (Wei, Kuo, Lin, & Yang, 2012) claims that “The CIPP model makes preparations for holistic evaluations and includes reconstructed systematic elements to meet universal evaluation needs.”

First, Context Evaluation is the first component of CIPP which examines needs, problems and opportunities within defined context or environment (D. L. and A. J. S. Stufflebeam, 1985). Context evaluation should be used to set goals for programs and assure that those goals are targeted to address the program’s needs and the obstacles. The reports driven form this type of evaluation helps in overviewing the process of goal setting (D. L. and G. Z. Stufflebeam, 2017), it assesses the environment of a program. It is often regarded as needs assessment. By defining the needs of a program, it aids the program decision makers in defining the program’s objective (Worthern, B. R., 1997).

In regard to speaking, context evaluation is analyzing students’ needs and problems. It is having a needs analysis for the students to establish the course or program’s goals and objectives. Questionnaires, document-analysis, system analysis, interviews, and diagnostic tests may be applied to draw a big picture of the students’ speaking problems, needs and opportunities.

Second, Input evaluation addresses the question “How should it be done? It “assess a program’s strategy, action plan, staffing arrangements, and budget for feasibility and potential cost-effectiveness to meet targeted needs and achieve goals” (D. L. and G. Z. Stufflebeam, 2017)It helps in planning programs through evaluating alternative strategies. The basic aim of input evaluation is to assess whether the pre-settled goals are being met. Another aim is to help decision makers think about alternative needs and circumstances to develop the plan working for them (D. L. and A. J. S. Stufflebeam, 1985).

Input evaluation may be done by investigating time and physical resources. Speaking skill course’s strategy, plan and pre-arrangements may be checked. There may be settled substitute ways to achieve the students’ needs and requirements for their speaking skills in input evaluation too. Resources, activities, strategies, methods for teaching speaking skills might be prepared in input evaluation.

Next, process evaluation addresses the question “Is it being done? It monitors, documents, and assesses the plan implementation. It examines whether implementing the program was done as it was required. The main goal of process evaluation is to offer feedback about the required changes if the program’s implementation is not adequate enough. Furthermore, it can provide information to the audiences who wish to learn about the program and to help program staff, evaluators in inferring outcomes of the program (Gredler, 1996). Moreover, Process evaluation monitors the project operation.

To add, process evaluation regarding speaking courses are monitoring the course's operation or the application process. It is investigating to find out the shortcomings in the course application. Process evaluation monitors: ICT usage in speaking classrooms, students' participation in class activities and what types of activities are being used in the course.

The final component is product evaluation which addresses the question "Did it succeed? It identifies and assesses costs and outcomes, intended and unintended, short term and long term (D. L. and G. Z. Stufflebeam, 2017). It provides feedback about the extent to which the preset goals are being reached. The questions related to this evaluation, as (D. L. Stufflebeam, 1983) describes, are, Did the program achieve its goals? Did it successfully address the targeted needs and problems? What were the unexpected outcomes, both positive and negative? Were the program's outcomes worth their costs? The main use of product evaluation is to decide whether the program to be maintained, repeated, or applied to other settings. It assesses the quality of the program. It differentiates between the expected outcome and the actual outcome of the program. Stufflebeam proclaims that the main goal is to make sure the extent to which the participants' needs were met.

Speaking course product evaluation is examining whether the goals related to speaking skill course is reached. It identifies the expected and unexpected results of the course. It analyzes the positive and negative effects and products of the course. It decides the sustainability of the course according to the formative and summative evaluation reports.

The study's main research question is "What is needed to be added, deleted, strengthened or continued?" The sub-questions related to the main question in congruence with Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model are the following:

- Context: Do the speaking curriculum's goals and objectives confirm the content dimension of the CIPP model?
- Input: What are the materials and instruments are to be used to meet the intended aims?
- Process: What are the teachers' perceptions with regard to the program's usefulness?
- Product: To what extent does the applied program meet the students' needs and expectations?

3. METHOD:

A. Design: In this case study, a mixed method study was utilized. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments were used to find the effectiveness of the speaking course curriculum utilizing Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model, context, input, process and product

B. Participants: In the current research, the participants were 180 students and instructors. Of the population, 169 were students and 11 were instructors. The data were collected during the first two weeks of November (fall semester) of the 2019-2020 academic year. It was thought that they can be helpful in understanding their perspectives toward the speaking skill course curriculum

- C. Data Collection:** The study was carried out in the English departments of private universities in Erbil. The language of instruction is English in the universities. On the other hand, the teachers' point of view was asked for the reason that they are the active participants of applying for the program, compared to the students, when evaluating the program according to the elements of the CIPP model. The other type of questionnaire were instructors of the English departments. There were 11 instructors, who were asked to fill the questionnaire. The responses were taken by the researcher herself.
- D. Materials:** Two sorts of questionnaires were used to collect data, both for students and for instructors concerning the speaking skill course curriculum. Interviews with 6 students and 6 teachers were conducted. The interviews were used to have more of the students' and teachers' perspectives about the speaking skill courses. The participants responded to the interview questions voluntarily. Besides, the speaking skill course syllabus was analyzed to check the effectivity and clarity of the course goals, objectives, contents and materials.
- E. Data Analysis:** In this case study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments were used. Gathered data through student and teacher questionnaire were processed through using a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 to analyze the reliability and descriptive statistics. All the close-ended item responses were entered for

a computer analysis, afterwards, percentages, means, medians, standard deviations and frequencies of the data were calculated.

As for the qualitative instrument responses, the data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with both students and teachers. They were analyzed through hand-coding qualitative research techniques. The curriculum evaluation rubric was again analyzed through hand-coding qualitative research techniques.

4. Findings and Discussion:

- **Do the speaking curriculum’s goals and objectives confirm the content dimension of the CIPP model?**

The aim of this research question was to diagnose the aims and goals of the speaking skill course curriculum. The three university’s curriculum and syllabus were analyzed in order to decide on the course goals and objectives. The main objective of the university A is to provide students chances to reach a level where they comprehend the overall message in the majority of the details in familiar issue situations. According to the course objectives stated in the syllabus, the objectives are, enabling students to communicate and interact with others with high fluency levels.

The B-university’s main aim is enabling students’ reading and comprehension skills improve to the desired level. The other objectives are giving the students practical aspects of the language study. the course provides practice in reading and responding to authentic English materials.

University C’s aim and objectives as mentioned in the syllabus are the following:

- Listen to others' opinions and reflect on the importance of listening to others.
- Broaden their understanding of their surroundings and the world, looking beyond their front door and out into the world at large with a greater understanding of the differences that exist between human beings.
- Demonstrate the accumulation of small communication skills that lead to true and effective communication outside the classroom in real-world environments.
- Demonstrate students' critical thinking skills.

Furthermore, in the teacher questionnaire, they were asked if the course goals and objectives are suitable and adequate, (66.7%) of the teachers perceive the aims and objectives of the speaking course were suitable for the English language department students, and only one third of the teachers are not certain about it (N=5). The mean for the aims and objectives of the course is (3.93).

- **What are the materials and instruments are to be used to meet the intended aims?**

The goal of this question is to indicate the applied equipment in the programs. A special section of the teacher questionnaire was dedicated to the teaching aid materials. To get more of the teachers' perception toward teaching materials and how much they use it in delivering their classes, a question was formed of eight teaching materials: projection, TV/Video, Dictionary, Course Books,

Language/ Computer Labs, Pronunciation Activities, Drama and Worksheets. The table displays the teachers' opinion of the given materials. As it is shown in the table,

about half of the teachers 46.7% “often” use projection and 35.7% of the teachers “often” use TV/Video as well. More than half of the teachers (60%) “always” use coursebooks in delivering their courses while (46.7%) “always” use worksheets and (60%) “never” use computer labs for speaking courses. Pronunciation activities got “often” and “always” usage by the teachers (26.7%), “never” and “sometimes” were by (33.3%) for using drama activities. However, the dictionary is used “sometimes” by (40%) of the teachers.

- **What are the teachers’ perceptions with regard to the program’s usefulness?**

The aim of this question was to understand teachers’ thinking about productivity if the speaking course. In the second section of the teacher questionnaire, seven questions about the program’s effectiveness, aims and objectives along with teachers’ expectations of the English curriculum regarding the four skills of English. From the teachers, nine of them agree about the effectiveness and satisfaction of the program (63.3%). The mean if the teachers’ perceptions of the overall program is (3.78)

- **To what extent does the applied program meet the students’ and teachers’ needs and expectations?**

In the second section of the teacher questionnaire, questions number 10,11,12 and 13 were designed to investigate teachers’ expectations of the English curriculum in terms of the English four skills. According to findings, 53.2% of the teachers think that the English curriculum meets their expectations in terms of listening skill. English curriculum meets 46.7% if the teachers’ speaking expectations, but 40% are not sure about it. More than three quarters 78.5% agree and strongly agree that their reading

expectations are being met by the English curriculum in contrary to writing which most of the teachers 73.3% are uncertain about meeting their expectations.

Regarding the four skills of the English language, students have various aspects of views. The following table shows that (50.6%) of the students “agree” and “strongly agree” that English courses meet their expectations related to listening skills, while 83 students think that English courses meet their expectations regarding speaking skill (53.5%), which is the productive skill of listening skill. As for reading skill, which is a receptive skill, 82 students “agree” and “strongly agree” that their expectations are being met (48.3%), but (28.2%) are uncertain about it. Additionally, (51.2%) of the students’ writing expectations are fulfilled in their English courses (N=87).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The objective of context evaluation was to respond the question asking about the speaking course curriculum’s goals and objectives. Data were obtained by examining the goals and objectives of the speaking course curriculum. The results of the context dimension showed that the goals are stated evidently in the curriculum but they need to be explained more and in detail to provide a clear picture of what the whole program is going to attain at the end of the course. (Willekens, 2012) states that “If the syllabus maps where you and your students are going, then the course goals are the destination. Well-constructed goals convey the purpose of the journey to students (and can help you clarify it for yourself, on occasion), and they also can provide the starting point for course design.”



The next research question attempted to exemplify the course instruments teachers use to deliver the speaking course and the frequency of their usage. The teaching aid instruments mentioned in the questionnaire were projection, TV/Video, Dictionary, Coursebooks, language/ computer labs, pronunciation activities, drama and worksheets. Based on the findings, the coursebook was the teaching aid teachers mostly use in classrooms, while what the majority of the teachers do not get used of is computer labs. Afterward projection and worksheets are being used by about half of the teachers. A mixture of the teaching instruments is deniable to exploit to make the speaking skill course profitable and effective, especially visual aid materials. Relatively, (Shabiralyani, Hasan, Hamad, & Iqbal, 2015) proclaim the importance of visual aids education system. They claim that to enhance students' learning process, visual aids are needed to make their learning easier and interesting. Visual supports are the superlative device for making teaching effective. Research question 3 aimed to decide on the effectiveness of the speaking course according to the teachers' perspectives. Of the participants, about 65% of the teachers agreed that the speaking course was satisfactory. However, some alternations concerning the speaking course should be made. The product dimension of this study was exploring teachers' and students' point of view of whether their skill expectations are being met by their English courses. As it can be seen in the results. The skill that teachers' expectations are being fulfilled is reading while the skill that got the lowest percentage was speaking skill. Speaking is the skill that teachers are not contented with and they think that there should be an improvement in delivering the course to have a better result. On the other hand, students' expectations are also being analyzed. According to the



findings, it can be realized that all the skills' expectations are being met at a similar range.

REFERENCES

- Akpur, U., Alci, B., & Karataş, H. (2016). Evaluation of the curriculum of English preparatory classes at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model, *11(7)*, 466–473. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2638>
- Allan A. Glatthorn, Floyd Boschee, Bruce M. Whitehead, B. F. B. (2016). *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation*. United States of America: SAGE Publications.
- Awan, R. (2010). An Investigation Of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety And Its Relationship With Students' Achievement. *Journal of Colege Teaching & Learning*, *7(11)*, 33–40.
- Aziz, S. (n.d.). Implementation of CIPP Model for Quality Evaluation at School Level : A Case Study, *5(1)*, 189–206.
- Aziz, S. (2018). Implementation of CIPP Model for Quality Evaluation at School Level : A Case Study. *Journal of Education and Educational Developement*, *5(1)*, 189–206.
- Edward S. Ebert, R. C. C. (2011). *School: An Introduction to Education*. United States of America: Wadsworth.
- Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme [Curriculum Evaluation in*



Education]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program Evaluation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gronlund, N. E. (1985). *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press.

Nicholson, T., Journal, S., & Jan, N. (2016). Using the CIPP Model to Evaluate Reading Instruction model to evaluate Using the GPP, *32*(4), 312–318.

Nunan, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching* (First edit). Singapore: McGraw Hill.

Özüdoğru, F. (2018). Analysis of curriculum evaluation studies conducted in foreign language education : 2005-2016. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *14*(2), 113–134.

Patil, Y., & Kalekar, S. (2014.). CIPP MODEL FOR SCHOOL EVALUATION Mr. Yogesh Patil, Mr. Sunil Kalekar Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya, Aranyeshwar, Pune 9, 2, 2615–2619.

Robinson, B. (2002). CIPP Approach to Evaluation COLLIT Project: A background Note from Bernadette Robinson. In *Collit*.



- Science, A. (2016). European Journal of English Language Teaching EVALUATION OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM - USING CIPP (CONTEXT , INPUT , PROCESS AND PRODUCT) MODEL, 114–137.
- Shabiralyani, G., Hasan, K. S., Hamad, N., & Iqbal, N. (2015). Impact of Visual Aids in Enhancing the Learning Process Case Research: District Dera Ghazi Khan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(19), 226–233.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). The CIPP Model for Program Evaluation. In M. and S. D. L. Madaus, F.F., Scrivem (Ed.), *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Education* (pp. 117–141). Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. and A. J. S. (1985). *Systematic Evaluation*. Boston: Kluwe-Nijhoff.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. and G. Z. (2017). *The CIPP Evaluation Model: How to Evaluate for Improvement and Accountability*. New York: Guilford Publication.
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing Accuracy and Fluency in Spoken English of Chinese EFL Learners, 7(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p110>
- Wei, H., Kuo, L., Lin, H., & Yang, H. (2012). Evaluating Innovation by CIPP Model. *Recent Advances in Communications, Circuits and Technological Innovation*, (116), 137–142.
- Willekens, F. (2012). *How to create a syllabus*.
- Worthern, B. R., S. J. R. & F. J. L. (1997). *Program Evaluation Alternative Approaches*

and Practical Guidelines. New York: Longman, Inc.

Young, D. J. (Ed.). (1999). *Affect in foreign language and second language learning : a practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

تقييم مناهج التحدث في جامعات أربيل الخاصة باستخدام نموذج السياق والإدخال والمعالجة والمنتج

ملخص البحث

الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو شرح فعالية منهج التحدث في قسم تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعات الخاصة في أربيل ، العراق. الخلفية النظرية وراء دراسة التقييم هذه هي نموذج تقييم (ستفليبم، CIPP 1983) ، السياق والإدخال والمعالجة والمنتج. تؤخذ وجهات نظر الطلاب والمعلمين فيما يتعلق بأهداف الدراسة وأهدافها ، ومنهجيات التدريس المستخدمة ، والبيئة الدراسية والمواد وتقييم الدورات. ستساعد هذه الدراسة المعلمين في العثور على طرق أكثر جاذبية للتدريس تركز على استخدام اللغة بطلاقة وبدقة أكثر من الحفظ. الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو التوصية بالتغييرات أو التعديلات أو التحسينات اللازمة في المناهج الجامعية. وكان المشاركون في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية 169 طالباً و 11 مدرساً في ثلاث جامعات خاصة في أربيل - العراق. أظهرت النتائج أن دورات المحادثة مرضية ولكنها تحتاج إلى بعض التغييرات الطفيفة والتحسينات فيما يتعلق بأهداف الدورة وأهدافها ومواد الدورة التدريبية وأدواتها من أجل الحصول على منهج أفضل لتلبية توقعات الطلاب والمعلمين في الدورة.

پوخته

ئامانج له م لیکۆلینه وهیه شیکار کردنی کاریگه‌ری کارنامه‌ی خویندنی وانه‌ی قسه‌کردنه له به‌شی زمانی ئینگلیزی له زانکۆ تایبه‌ته‌کانی هه‌ولێر-عێراق. زانیاری تیۆری ئەم لیکۆلینه‌وه‌یه به‌نده له سه‌ر مۆدیلی هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی سه‌ته‌فلیم (۱۹۸۳)، CIPP, ده‌ق, گه‌یاندن, پرۆسه و به‌ره‌م.

بیرورای قوتابیان و مامۆستایان وه‌رگیراون له باره‌ی ئامانج و مه‌به‌ستی خویندن, شیوازی وانه و تنه‌وه, ژینگه‌ی خویندن, مه‌تریال و هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی کۆرسه‌که. ئەم لیکۆلینه‌وه‌یه یارمه‌تی مامۆستایان ده‌دات بۆ دۆزینه‌وه‌ی شیوازی کاریگه‌ری وانه ووتنه‌وه که جه‌خت له‌سه‌ر به‌کارهێنانی زمان ده‌کاته‌وه به‌ راستی و ڕه‌وانی زیاتر له شیوازی له‌به‌رکردنی وانه‌کان. ئامانجی ئەم لیکۆلینه‌وه‌یه پێشنیارکردنی گۆرانکاری, گونجاندن یان به‌ره‌و پێشچوونی پێویست بۆ کارنامه‌ی خویندنی زانکۆکان. به‌شداربووه‌کان له به‌شی ئینگلیزی ۳ زانکۆی تایبه‌تی هه‌ولێر-عێراق بوو که بریتین له ۱۶۹ قوتابی و ۱۱ مامۆستا. ئەنجامه‌کان ده‌ریانخستوه که کۆرسی قسه‌کردن له ئاستی پێویست دایه به‌لام پێویستی به هه‌ندیک گۆرانکاری بچوک و به‌ره‌و پێشبردن هه‌یه له لایه‌نه‌کانی ئامانج و مه‌به‌ستی کۆرس و مه‌تریال و ئامی‌ری به‌کار هاتووی کۆرس, به مه‌به‌ستی به ده‌ست هێنانی کارنامه‌ی خویندنی باشت‌تر بۆ به‌دیهێنانی چاوه‌ڕوانیه‌کانی قوتابی و مامۆستا له کۆرسه‌که.

کلیله ووشه‌کان: هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی کارنامه‌ی خویندن, CIP مۆدیله, هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی ده‌ق, هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی گه‌یاندن, هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی پرۆسه, هه‌لسه‌نگاندنی به‌ره‌م