



Students' Perceptions Towards English Language Learning via Imperial English UK Program: Intermediate Level of Language Skills

Rayan Omar Azeez¹, Selar Othman Ali²

¹Department of English Translation, College of Language and Humanities Studies, International University of Erbil, Erbil, 44001, IRAQ

²Department of Highway and Bridge Engineering, Erbil Technical Engineering College, Erbil Polytechnic University, Erbil, IRAQ

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63841/iue32671>

Received 23 Jul 2025; Accepted 21 Sep 2025; Available online 25 Apr 2026

ABSTRACT:

Learning the English language is essential in 21st century. Nowadays, many university students still face difficulties in developing sufficient proficiency for academic and professional purposes in learning English language. The aims of the study is to find out student's perception toward Imperial English UK (IEUK) English language program, its impact, and usage after successfully completing intermediate level of the program. It contributes to understanding how structured English programs like IEUK can address the persistent problem of language proficiency gaps among university students and prepare them for academic and professional success. The number of participants were (25) students, aged between (18 to 22), both male and female students. A set of questionnaires has been used for the language skills such as listening, reading, writing and speaking. Using a skill-based framework aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) descriptors, the study analyzes students' self-reported capabilities across a wide range of sub-skills for each of the four macro skills. The participants were university students who joined the program in order to improve their English Language. The results show that the majority of the students expressed that the program was very useful, had a positive impact, and enhanced their language skills. Students demonstrated enhanced grammatical accuracy, vocabulary range, organizational competence, and functional communication abilities. Key areas of growth included note-taking, summarizing, paraphrasing, academic and creative writing, discourse management in speaking, and comprehension of longer and more complex texts. The discussion highlights the effectiveness of the program's communicative and task-based approach, as well as the integration of genre awareness, metacognitive strategies, and language use in real-world contexts.

Keywords: IEUK, Application, English Language Skills, Listening Comprehension, Speaking Proficiency, Reading Strategies, Academic Writing, CEFR Descriptors.



1 INTRODUCTION

Since early 2020, higher education institutions in the Kurdistan region of Iraq (KRI) have increasingly integrated technology in teaching and learning. This shift was both a response to the COVID-19 pandemic and part of broader efforts to align with global standards of educational reform and quality [1] [2]. Technology in 21st century is used as a tool in learning process. Januszewski (2001) [3] defines educational technology as a facilitation of students' learning through a systematic discovery, development, and exploration of a wide range of learning process. Richey (2008) [34] defines technology as ethical application of developing, utilizing, and controlling technical processes as well as a resource to promote learning and performing. Within this context, digital education refers to tools such as hardware, software, and instructional media that support the delivery of instruction [4]. These concepts are directly relevant to the present study,

which seeks exploring how technological applications influence students' perceptions of Imperial English UK (IEUK) language application.

IEUK is an academic British programme for learning English language. It adheres to a British curriculum and syllabus developed by experts with over 35 years of teaching experience. It is recognized by the UK government and is widely used in over 25 countries. The application's content is up to 21 books and delivered via phones, tablets, laptops, or computers. It consists of general English and Academic English section and 30 topics per section. IEUK application is labeled to the levels of beginner, elementary, intermediate, and advanced. After a successful completion of a level, students receive an internationally accredited certificate by the IEUK [5]. The programme is supported by five dedicated applications designed for distinct purposes of testing, student learning, teacher instruction, communication, and TESOL training. Together, these applications streamline placement, assessment, teaching, and engagement, while making the programme accessible across digital devices [5]. Importantly, the IEUK curriculum focuses on two broad and integrated skills sets: (1) general language skills such as reading, writing, listening, speaking, grammar, and vocabulary; and (2) academic skills including research, critical thinking, and academic writing. It emphasizes learner autonomy, critical thinking, and digital learning, with students tracking progress via the app and receiving certificates based on their CEFR level. By combining technology with comprehensive skill development, the IEUK programme aims to equip learners with both linguistic competence and transferable academic and professional abilities. The present study examines how students perceive these outcomes after completing the intermediate level of the programme, with emphasis on the four core language skills.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Mihaylova et al., (2022) [6] research on advantages and disadvantages of using mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) applications verses tradition methods for learning second language, found out that learners prefer using mobile applications more than traditional methods. Despite such preference, the authors noted several limitations, such as high risk of bias across studies, large statistically significant variation in the results across different studies, and results of most studies may not be reliably significant. Although the studies on MALL applications integrate learning principles such as feedback and recalling information repetitions, none of them directly examined the individual contribution of these components. In this study, in contrary, the authors used feedback section in IEUK application and considered all the students who were enrolled in the intermediate level. Moreover, Hasib and Badawi (2024) [7] research on the use of smartphone applications for English language learning concluded that the students found it more effective and interesting when integrating smartphone applications into their English learning process. Similarly, in his study on examining university students' attitudes and actual practices of MALL, Guadu (2025) [8] explored that the students held significantly positive point of views toward the use of smartphones for language learning, underscoring the increasing acceptance and perceived effectiveness of mobile technologies in EFL contexts. This suggests a growing acceptance of MALL among the learners and highlights the perceived usefulness of mobile technologies in supporting language acquisition.

The core language skills are basically known as 'macro skills' by language educators, which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing, while, 'micro skills' refers to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, which support and enhance mastery of the macro skills [9]. These skills are closely interconnected. They can be received or produced, and expressed either verbally or in writing [10]. They are related by the way they are communicated: either verbally or in writing, as well as the way they are received or produced [10].

Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014) [10] state that listening is commonly described as a receptive skill in the oral mode, requiring learners to process meaning actively rather than merely paying attention to sounds. Speaking is a productive oral skill that involves not only accurate pronunciation but also the ability to convey ideas clearly and appropriately in context. Listening and speaking complement each other in building communicative competence. Reading is the ability to process written texts, which can contribute significantly to vocabulary growth and, in turn, support other skills such as listening and writing. Writing is often considered the most challenging skill, even for native speakers, as it demands the organization of ideas, accuracy of language, and effective presentation.

Rost (2011) [11] defines listening is an active and interpretive process. where students can improve their listening abilities. Learners should be encouraged to anticipate, monitor, and evaluate spoken input to create an engaging instruction environment [12]. Shedding light on the effective listening potential, Field (2008) [13] argues that learners can improve their listening skill by engaging with longer and more complex audio tasks, using authentic materials and task-based instruction to improve comprehension and retention. Additionally, improving critical listening and self-monitoring implies increased metacognitive awareness which is an important factor in fostering learner autonomy and long-term language acquisition [14]. In this study, the students demonstrated enhanced ability of integrating auditory input with visual or schematic information that suggests growth in multimodal processing. This is a crucial skill in today's digital learning environment. suggest that the IEUK program effectively supports the development of strategic, metacognitive, and multimodal listening skills that contribute to language proficiency.

Improving speaking skills aligns with Communicative Language Teaching principles that focuses on interaction and real-world tasks [15]. Improvement can also happen in grammatical accuracy, especially in tenses and conditionals, that reflect structured yet communicative grammar practice [16]. Task-based activities, as included in the IEUK programme, support lexical and functional language development [17], while improvements in fluency and interaction during discussions and Q&A tasks support Swain's (1985) [18] output hypothesis, that emphasises the role of speaking in language development. Improving speaking skill can further occur when the learners can handle complex tasks such as making predictions and summarizing—skills aligned with intermediate CEFR levels [19].

As far as oral proficiency is concerned, Skehan (2009) [20] states that English language programmes should foster growth across fluency, accuracy, and complexity to support learners become more confident and effective communicators. For a fluent reading to achieve, Grabe and Stoller (2011) [21] argue that there should be a balance of bottom-up strategies, such as word recognition, with top-down approaches, such as predicting and inferring. Students can improve extensive and intensive reading through practicing comprehensible and focused tasks [22]. This is further supported by Alderson (2000) [23] who states that learners can develop academic literacy by enhancing their abilities of understanding text structure, cohesion, as well as handling genre-based texts. On an advanced level, Wallace (2003) [24] indicates that progress in critical reading can be identified through inference and prediction that show growing engagement with texts beyond surface meaning. The IEUK programme has an integrated approach of combining strategy training, genre awareness, and critical engagement which are significant for developing comprehensive reading competence.

Learners' writing skill can be classified as CEFR B1-B2 when they develop their syntactic control (e.g., passive voice, article use), vocabulary range (e.g., quantifiers, adjective forms) [19], and reflect the benefits of integrating form-focused instruction with meaning-based writing tasks [22]. Besides, Hirvela and Du (2013) [25] state that students can illustrate better writing skill once they are able to summarise and paraphrase texts, which help them foster critical thinking and support academic literacy. This criterion along with a range of scaffolded writing tasks across genres narrative, descriptive, expository, grammatical development, and genre awareness [26] [27] are apparently integrated in the content of IEUK programme. The programme further introduces creative tasks, such as fictional storytelling, stylistic development, and linguistic experimentation, which combine everyday themes, theory and practice, and interactive methodologies [28].

While mastery of these four skills has long been considered the foundation of language education, more recent scholarship emphasizes that 21st-century learners require broader competencies. Erdoğan (2019) [29] notes that beyond listening, speaking, reading, and writing, students must also acquire critical thinking, collaboration, problem-solving, and intercultural communication skills to participate effectively in today's interconnected and globalized society. This shift reflects a growing recognition that language education is not solely about linguistic accuracy, but also about preparing learners to engage meaningfully in academic, professional, and social contexts. Recent studies echo the importance of *communicative competence* and *21st-century skills* in language learning. The communicative approach emphasizes real-life use of language and interaction, moving away from rote learning toward task-based and learner-centered instruction. Moreover, the integration of technology has transformed how these skills are taught, offering new opportunities for authentic communication, timely feedback, and self-directed learning.

In sum, the literature shows that while listening, speaking, reading, and writing remain the essential pillars of language proficiency, modern language teaching increasingly integrates cognitive, social, and technological skills. The challenge for educators is to balance traditional language instruction with approaches that foster critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and digital literacy—skills that are indispensable for learners in the 21st century.

3 METHODOLOGY

The data of this study is collected based on quantitative research method, which is questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to study phenomena that are not readily observable, such as perception [30]. In addition, questionnaires tool allows respondents to remain anonymous [31]. The questionnaire is based on feedback designed within the middle and at the end of the 30 topics in IEUK student's app. The feedback is regarded as a review of students' learning of the four language skills of English language, listening, reading, speaking, and writing at intermediate level only. It was electronically sent to students as a Google form to be easily answered and safely collected. The participants were required to rate their learning achievements and progress on a Likert scale from 1 to 4 as (1) indicates very well, (2) means well, (3) means with difficulty, and (4) means not achieved, respectively. The sample was chosen randomly by two institutions. The research population was 55 students, males and females, distributed to four levels (beginner, elementary, intermediate, and advanced) while the real sample who responded was 25 students in the intermediate level course. SPSS and Excel were used for data analysis and the statistical results for the pilot study passed the reliability test.

It is worth mentioning that the demographic variables are included in the study in order to show that the participants of the study are actually representative samples of the target population [32].

3.1 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The items of the questions were reviewed by two academic professors in the field of applied linguistics and linguistics, who assessed the validity in terms of structure, readability, and design. Also, the results have a high degree of reliability Cronbach's alpha 0.6 the value above as shown in the below table. The importance of dependability cannot be overstated, but it must be paired with validity. A test must also be valid in order to be considered dependable [33]. The data in this table shows how dependable each of these skills are. This suggests that Cronbach's high score for all formulations indicates that it is consistent and assesses the same concept.

Table 1. Reliability of Measurements for All Variables

Constructs	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Listening Skill	15	0.936
Reading Skill	10	0.897
Speaking Skill	22	0.959
Writing Skill	17	0.951

As shown in the above table, Cronbach's alpha of listening skill is (0.936), reading skill is (0.897), speaking skill is (0.959), and writing skill is (0.951). All items passed the reliability test, as all values are above the minimal Cronbach's alpha value, which is (0.50).

4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Data is analyzed using Excel and SPSS. Excel generated the collection of data while SPSS created the reliability, mean, and standard deviation. In order to answer the questions of the research and provide data with evidence that can be supported statistically, the information obtained was subjected to descriptive statistics and variance tests. The data is analyzed and clarified according to the four skills below.

4.1 Listening Skill

The analysis of listening skill is based on mean, how often an item is used by the respondents; and standard deviation measures data dispersion.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Listening Skill

Listening Skill	Mean	Std. Deviation
LS-1	1.32	.476
LS-2	1.48	.770
LS-3	1.28	.458
LS-4	1.40	.577
LS-5	1.44	.768
LS-6	1.28	.458
LS-7	1.48	.586
LS-8	1.60	.764
LS-9	1.44	.507
LS-10	1.48	.586
LS-11	1.28	.458
LS-12	1.36	.569
LS-13	1.48	.510
LS-14	1.60	.577
LS-15	1.52	.586
Total	1.43	.426

17 students (68%) stated that they can listen for specific details and responded "Very Well" while 8 students (32%) responded "Well". No any students stated 'With Difficulty' neither "not achieved". The mean value of the item is 1.32 while the SD is .476 indicating that the students are able to listen for a specific detail when they listen to an English context very well. 16 students (64%) responded that they can listen for the general meaning "Very Well", while seven students (28%) responded that they can listen well for general meaning. There was only one student (4%) responded "With Difficulty", and "Not Achieved", respectively.

The mean value of the statement is 1.48 while the SD is .770 indicating that the students are able to listen for a general meaning when they listen to an English context very well. 18 students (72%) responded that they can follow a conversation (directions, interviews etc.). "Very Well", 7 students (28%) responded well to the same statement. The mean

value of the statement is 1.28 while the SD is .458 indicating that the students are able to follow a conversation very well. 16 students (64%), on the one hand, indicated they can listen and take notes "Very Well", and 8 students (32%) responded that they can listen and take notes well. One student (4%) responded that he can listen and take notes "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to listen at the same time take notes very well.

Regarding the ability to check own answers from a listening text, 17 students (68%) responded "Very Well", 6 students (24%) responded "Well" while only 1 student (4%) responded "With Difficulty" and "Not Achieved", respectively. The mean value of the item is 1.44 while the SD is .768 indicating that the students are able to check answers from a listening text very well. With regard to their ability to follow a longer text (lecture etc.), 18 students (72%) responded "Very Well", 7 students (28%) responded "Well". The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .458 indicating that the students are able to follow a long text while they listen very well. 14 students (56%) responded that they can identify and complete missing information, words and chunks of language "Very Well", 10 students (40%) responded "Well", while 1 student (4%) responded "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to identify and complete missing information, words, and chunks of language very well.

Concerning students' capability to listen to and reproduce a text, 13 students (52%) responded "Very Well", 10 students (40%) responded "Well". whereas only 1 student (4%) responded "With Difficulty" and "Not Achieved", respectively. The mean value of the item is 1.60 while the SD is .764 indicating that the students are able to produce a text while they listen very well. 14 students (56%) expressed that they can listen to people's opinions and compare them to their own "Very Well", and 11 students (44%) responded "Well". The mean value of the item is 1.44 while the SD is .507 indicating that the students are able to listen for the people's opinion and compare to themselves very well.

14 students (56%) stated that they can listen to match content to images "Very Well", but 10 students (40%) responded "Well". Only 1 student (4%) responded that he can do the matching "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to listen in matching the contents to the images very well. As far as listening to a description and identifying key information, 18 students (72%) responded "Very Well", and 7 students (28%) responded "Well". The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .458 indicating that the students are able to describe and identify key information when the listen very well. 17 students (68%) stated that they can listen to order ideas and events "Very Well", 7 students (28%) responded "Well", and only 1 student (4%) responded "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.36 while the SD is .569 indicating that the students are able to order ideas and events in listening very well. 13 students (52%) expressed that they can listen to information and use it to answer questions "Very Well", and 12 students (48%) responded "Well". The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .510 indicating that the students are able to listen to the information and answer the required questions very well.

Concerning the students' ability to understand people talking about future plans, 11 students (44%) responded "Very Well", 13 students (52%) responded "Well", while only 1 student (4%) response was "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.60 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to understand people when they talk about future plans well. 13 students (52%) stated that they can listen for details about a graph "Very Well", 11 students (44%) responded "Well", while only 1 student (4%) responded "With Difficulty". The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to listen for details about a graph very well.

The above detailed analysis indicates that the students made substantial progress in listening proficiency upon completion of the IEUK English language program in terms of improved in fundamental skills such as listening for specific details and general meaning which they are essential for building basic comprehension and understanding of spoken texts. Also, developing stronger skills in following conversations and which are vital for everyday communication to match content to images and follow future plans demonstrated growing proficiency in understanding real-life spoken input. Students improved in processing longer and more complex texts, including lectures and graphs. Their enhanced ability to take notes and order ideas indicates readiness for academic contexts. The ability to check one's own answers and compare opinions showed development in metacognitive and critical listening skill. Progress was also seen in identifying and completing missing words or language chunks, and reproducing texts closely linked to vocabulary recognition, grammar awareness, and retention of meaning. Students demonstrated improvements in extracting key details from descriptions, answering questions, and understanding events and time sequences, suggesting development in both bottom-up and top-down listening strategies. This is implied in the total mean values (1.43) while the standard deviation is 0.426.

4.2 SPEAKING SKILL

The analysis of speaking skill is based on Mean, how often an item is used by the respondents; and Standard Deviation measures data dispersion.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Skill

Speaking Skill	Mean	Std. Deviation
SS_1	1.40	.645
SS_2	1.44	.651
SS_3	1.48	.653
SS_4	1.24	.523
SS_5	1.44	.651
SS_6	1.40	.577
SS_7	1.44	.583
SS_8	1.48	.586
SS_9	1.52	.586
SS_10	1.52	.586
SS_11	1.56	.651
SS_12	1.48	.653
SS_13	1.52	.653
SS_14	1.52	.586
SS_15	1.52	.586
SS_16	1.64	.860
SS_17	1.64	.810
SS_18	1.64	.638
SS_19	1.56	.583
SS_20	1.84	.688
SS_21	1.36	.638
SS_22	1.36	.638
Total	1.500	.47165

The statements concerned with Speaking Skill focused on twenty-two aspects of Speaking Skill. 13 students (52%) stated that they can use the present and past simple tenses accurately “Very Well”, 10 students (40%) responded they can use them “Well”, but 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .645 indicating that the students are able to talk about past and simple tenses very well.

17 students (68%) stated that they can discuss opinions about a range of topics “Very Well”, 6 students (24%) responded “Well” while 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.44 while the SD is .651 indicating that the students are able to discuss opinion about different topics in speaking very well. Concerning the ability of asking and answering questions from a text they read or heard, 16 students (64%) responded “Very Well”, 7 students (28%) responded “Well”, and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to ask and answer questions from a text they read and hear very well.

15 students (60%) expressed that they can make recommendations for other people “Very Well”, 8 students (32%) responded “Well”. Whereas, 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.24 while the SD is .523 indicating that the students are able to make recommendations for other people very well. The majority of students, 20 students (80%), expressed that they can use specific vocabulary to discuss a variety of topics “Very Well”, whereas 4 students (16%) responded “Well”. Only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to use specific vocabulary for discussion a variety of topics very well.

With regard to using gerunds (-ing forms) to talk about preferences, 16 students (64%) responded “Very Well”, 7 students (28%) responded “Well”, and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to use gerunds to talk about preferences very well.

16 students (64%) indicated that they can practice a dialogue and or/ role-play with partners “Very Well”, while 8 students (32%) responded “Well”. There was only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.44 while the SD is .583 indicating that the students are able to practice dialogue or roleplay with the partners very well. Moreover, 15 students (60%) expressed that they can ask and answer questions about a map, picture, and photo “Very Well”, 9 students (36%) responded “Well” but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to ask and answer questions about a map, picture, and photo very well.

14 students (56%) stated that they can use the first conditional and time clauses to talk about the future “Very Well”, 10 students (40%) responded “Well”, but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to use the first conditional and time clauses to talk about the future very well. On the one hand, 13 students (52%) expressed that they can contribute to a group discussion /and or presentation “Very Well” and 11 students (44%) responded “Well”. But only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to contribute to a group discussion /and or presentation very well.

18 students (72%) argued that they can use the present and past continuous tenses accurately “Very Well” 7 students (28%) responded “Well”, but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.56 while the SD is .651 indicating that the students are able to use the present and past continuous tenses accurately very well. 15 students (60%) stated they can hold a discussion in order to create an event “Very Well”, while 8 students (32%) responded “Well” and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to hold a discussion in order to create an event very well.

As far as their capability to use a range of functional language to complete different tasks (negotiation, persuasion, recommendation), 14 students (56%) responded “Very Well”, 9 students (36%) responded “Well” and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to use a range of functional language to complete different tasks very well. 13 students (52%) indicated they can summarize a short story; “Very Well”, while 11 students (44%) responded “Well”. Only 1 student (4%) found it “Very Difficult” to summarize a short story. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to summarize a short story. 13 students (52%) stated they can use comparative and superlative adjectives correctly with accurate pronunciation “Very Well” whereas 11 students (44%) responded “Well”. Only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to use comparative and superlative adjectives correctly with accurate pronunciation very well.

Concerning their ability to use the passive voice in a variety of tenses accurately, 13 students (52%) responded “Very Well”, 10 students (40%) responded “Well”, and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.64 while the SD is .860 indicating that the students are able to use passive voice with accurately very well. 13 students (52%) stated they can discuss hypothetical situations using the second conditional “Very Well”, 9 students (36%) responded “Well”, 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”, and 1 student (4%) responded “Not Achieved”. The mean value of the item is 1.64 while the SD is .810 indicating that the students are able to discuss situation with the use of second conditional very well.

11 students (44%) emphasized they can talk about future plans and events “Very Well”, 12 students (48%) responded “Well”, while 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.64 while the SD is .638 indicating that the students are able to talk about future plan well. 12 students (48%) argued that they can describe a place, food, eating habits, dates, and months “Very Well”, 12 students (48%) responded “Well”, and only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.56 while the SD is .583 indicating that the students are able to describe their daily routines very well.

With regard to expressing opinion, 8 students (32%) stated that they can do it “Very Well”, 13 students (52%) responded “Well”, and 4 students (16%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.84 while the SD is .688 indicating that the students are able to give opinions well. Moreover, 18 students (72%) indicated they can make predictions and ask and answer questions about them “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, while 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.36 while the SD is .638 indicating that the students are able to make predictions, ask and answer questions very well. 18 students (72%) stated they can ask and answer questions about future plans and events “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, and 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.36 while the SD is .638 indicating that the students are able to make predictions, ask and answer questions very well.

The total mean of speaking skill is 1.500 and std. deviation is .47165. This indicate that the students’ Speaking Skill were improved after completing the IEUK language program in terms of controlling over a range of grammatical structures such as present and past simple tenses, present and past continuous, first and second conditionals, passive voice in different tenses, comparatives and superlatives. Students demonstrated expanded vocabulary for various topics, greater ability to give opinions, and improved fluency in giving recommendations and summarizing stories. The ability to ask and answer questions, participate in role-plays, and hold discussions. Skills such as talking about future plans, describing habits, and making predictions indicate more cohesive and contextually appropriate speech. Overall, the findings support the conclusion that the program enabled students to develop not only grammatical and lexical competence but also pragmatic and strategic speaking abilities necessary for real-life communication.

4.3 READING SKILL

The analysis of reading skill is based on Mean, how often an item is used by the respondents; and Standard Deviation measures data dispersion.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Reading Skill

Reading Skill	Mean	Std. Deviation
RS_1	1.48	.510
RS_2	1.60	.500
RS_3	1.48	.586
RS_4	1.48	.586
RS_5	1.28	.542
RS_6	1.28	.542
RS_7	1.24	.436
RS_8	1.40	.764
RS_9	1.40	.645
RS_10	1.36	.638
Total	1.400	.418

The statements concerning with studying reading skill focused on ten main capabilities of the participants. Reading for general and specific meaning, 13 students (52%) responded they can do it “Very Well” and 12 students (48%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .510 indicating that the students are able to read for general and specific meaning very well. 10 students (40%) stated they can find specific information in a text and use it to answer questions “Very Well”, while 15 students (60%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.60 while the SD is .500 indicating that the students are able to find specific information in a text and use it to answer questions well.

14 students (56%) expressed they can match headings and information to correct paragraphs “Very Well”, 10 students (40%) responded “Well”, but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to match headings and information to correct paragraphs very well. Furthermore, 14 students (56%) indicated they can identify different parts of speech (noun, verb etc.) “Very Well”, 10 students (40%) responded “Well”, while only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to identify different parts of speech very well.

19 students (76%) stated they can identify reasons and examples in a text “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .542 indicating that the students are able to identify reasons and examples in a text very well. As far as information about places and directions is concerned, 19 students (76%) responded they can understand such information “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well” but only 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .542 indicating that the students understand information about places and directions very well.

19 students (76%) indicated they can read a range of genres of text “Very Well”, while 6 students (24%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.24 while the SD is .436 indicating that the students can read a range of genres of text very well. 18 students (72%) expressed they can read information in a text and give an opinion “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .764 indicating that the students are able to read information in a text and give an opinion very well.

17 students (68%) argued they can predict content of a news article from headlines “Very Well”, 6 students (24%) responded “Well”, but 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .645 indicating that the students are able to can predict content of a news article from headlines very well. As for information about people's jobs, routines and lifestyles, 18 students (72%) responded they can understand it “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, but 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.36 while the SD is .638 indicating that the students are able to understand information about people's jobs, routines and lifestyles very well.

The total mean of students Reading Skill is 1.36 and SD is .638. The evaluation of students’ reading proficiency post-completion of the IEUK English language program reveals significant progress across all ten assessed reading skill. The findings suggest improvement in a range of cognitive and linguistic competencies, from literal understanding to interpretative and evaluative reading. Students demonstrated noticeable improvement in reading for gist and detailed understanding, which forms the foundation of both extensive and intensive reading. Students became more adept at finding specific details and using them to answer questions. This is essential for academic reading and examination contexts. Students showed better understanding in matching headings to paragraphs, indicating their improved ability to recognize thematic organization and discourse markers. Students enhanced their ability to identify parts of speech and distinguish between reasons and examples that support deeper comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. The ability to understand information about places and directions and people’s jobs and routines reflects improvement in contextual interpretation and real-world text engagement. Students showed increased confidence in reading a range of genres, which broadens their exposure to varied language features, styles, and registers. Students also developed higher-order reading skill such as forming opinions based on a text and predicting content from headlines, indicating growth in inference and interpretation.

4.4 Writing Skill

The analysis of writing skill is based on Mean, how often an item is used by the respondents; and Standard Deviation measures data dispersion.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Writing Skill

Writing skill	Mean	Std. Deviation
WS_1	1.28	.542
WS_2	1.28	.542
WS_3	1.36	.638
WS_4	1.24	.523
WS_5	1.28	.458
WS_6	1.40	.577
WS_7	1.40	.577
WS_8	1.52	.653
WS_9	1.68	.690
WS_10	1.68	.690
WS_11	1.60	.500
WS_12	1.56	.507
WS_13	1.64	.860
WS_14	1.56	.583
WS_15	1.52	.586
WS_16	1.48	.510
WS_17	1.60	.645
Total	1.4753	.44925

19 students (76%) stated they can write about themselves and people they know “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .542 indicating that the students can write about themselves

very well. 19 students (76%) also stated they can take notes from a text, a recording or while someone is speaking “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .542 indicating that the students can take notes from a text, a recording or while someone is speaking very well.

18 students (72%) argued they can organize their ideas in a text “Very Well”, 5 students (20%) responded “Well”, while 2 student (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.36 while the SD is .638 indicating that the students are able to organize ideas in a text very well. Concerning completing and/or writing sentences using appropriate grammar and vocabulary, 20 students (80%) responded they can do it very “Well”, 4 students (16%) responded “Well”, While 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.24 while the SD is .523 indicating that the students can complete and write sentences using appropriate grammar and vocabulary very well.

18 students (72%) indicated they can write about their daily routine “Very Well”, and 7 students (28%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.28 while the SD is .458 indicating that the students are able to write about my daily routine very well. 16 students (64%) stated they can write questions accurately in a variety of tenses “Very Well”, 8 students (32%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to write questions accurately in a variety of tenses very well. 16 students (64%) indicated they can write a summary from a text “Very Well”, 8 students (32%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.40 while the SD is .577 indicating that the students are able to write a summary from a text very well.

14 students (56%) stated they can paraphrase sentences and/or short texts “Very Well”, 9 students (36%) responded “Well”, but 2 student (8%) responded “With Difficulty” and “Not Achieved” accordingly. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .653 indicating that the students are able to paraphrase sentences and/or short texts very well. 11 students (44%) argued they can use quantifiers with countable and uncountable nouns “Very Well” and “Well”, respectively, and 3 students (12%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.68 while the SD is .690 indicating that the students are able to use quantifiers with countable and uncountable nouns very well. 11 students (44%), on the one hand, indicated they know the difference between *-ed* and *-ing* adjectives “Very Well” and “Well”, respectively. 3 students (12%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.68 while the SD is .690 indicating that the students are able to know the difference between *-ed* and *-ing* adjectives very well.

10 students (40%) stated they can write a report “Very Well”, while 15 students (60%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.60 while the SD is .500 indicating that the students are able to write a report well. 11 students (44%) indicated they can use appropriate articles “Very Well”, while 14 students (56%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.56 while the SD is .507 indicating that the students are able to use articles appropriately well. 13 students (52%) expressed their ability to write a fictional story using descriptive adjectives “Very Well”, 10 students (40%)

responded “Well”, but 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.64 while the SD is .860 indicating that the students are able to write a fictional story using descriptive adjectives very well. 12 students (48%) stated they can use the passive voice in writing “Very Well”, 12 students (48%) responded “Well”, while 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.56 while the SD is .583 indicating that the students are able to use the passive voice in writing very well.

13 students (52%) expressed they can write questions for a quiz “Very Well”, 11 students (44%) responded “Well”, but 1 student (4%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.52 while the SD is .586 indicating that the students are able to write questions for a quiz very well. Concerning their ability to write a letter of complaint using appropriate register, 13 students (52%) responded “Very Well” and 12 students (48%) responded “Well”. The mean value of the item is 1.48 while the SD is .510 indicating that the students are able to write a letter of complaint using appropriate register very well.

Finally, 12 students (48%) stated they can write a short description about themselves, another person, and/ or places they know “Very Well”, 11 students (44%) responded “Well”, but 2 students (8%) responded “With Difficulty”. The mean value of the item is 1.60 while the SD is .645 indicating that the students are able to write a short description about themselves very well.

The analysis of writing skill implies that the student’s potential of writing skill was enhanced and developed throughout the language course of IEUK, as the mean value is 1.4753 and SD is .44925. Students demonstrated growth in both functional and academic writing tasks, as well as increased control over form, structure, and style. Students improved in writing about themselves and others and describing daily routines, indicating progress in producing narrative and autobiographical texts in the present simple and past tenses. Students showed increased ability to organize ideas logically and complete sentences with accurate grammar and vocabulary, reflecting a stronger understanding of paragraph structure and cohesion. Notable improvement was observed in grammar-focused skills such as writing accurate questions, using quantifiers correctly, differentiating -ed and -ing adjectives, applying articles, using passive voice. Students became more proficient in note-taking, summarizing, and paraphrasing, all of which are critical for avoiding plagiarism and producing coherent academic texts. The program also encouraged fictional storytelling and functional writing tasks, including writing reports, quiz questions, and letters of complaint using appropriate register. These outcomes reflect versatility and adaptability to different genres and audiences.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of All the Above-mentioned Skills Based on their means and std deviation values

Skills	mean	SD
Reading skill	1.400	.418
Listening skill	1.430	.426
Writing skill	1.475	.449
Speaking skill	1.500	.471

Table 6 shows students’ feedback on the four skills of IEUK English language program starting from reading skill where students had highest performance to speaking skill where students had the lowest performance.

5 DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that the students’ performance of the four skills of English language has improved upon their completion of IEUK program. The observed improvement reflects the IEUK English language program’s effectiveness in fostering both comprehension and strategic listening competence. These results are consistent with research emphasizing that listening skill is not a passive skill but an active process [11]. Decoding words and grammar (LS_1, LS_7), combined with prediction and inference (LS_2, LS_14), appear to have been reinforced in the program. This aligns with Vandergrift and Goh's (2012) [12] model of teaching listening through integrated strategy instruction, where students are taught to anticipate, monitor, and evaluate what they hear. Note-taking (LS_4) and ordering ideas (LS_12) suggest that students are better able to engage with longer and more cognitively demanding listening texts which is essential for academic success. These improvements are from exposure to authentic listening materials and task-based instruction, which research has shown to be effective in improving comprehension and retention [13]. Students’ enhanced ability to listen critically (LS_9) and self-monitor (LS_5) is consistent with the development of metacognitive awareness in listening an important component in second language acquisition [14]. This type of reflective engagement is associated with higher levels of autonomy and improved long-term learning outcomes. The students’ high multimodal processing ability, as seen in tasks of matching audio to images (LS_10) and interpreting data from graphs (LS_15), is particularly relevant in digital learning environment. The findings highlight a well-rounded progression in students’ listening abilities, supported by a curriculum that integrates strategy-based instruction, authentic input, and reflective learning.

The IEUK program appears to meet CEFR B1–B2 level standards for listening, including understanding extended speech, recognizing points of view, and following complex instructions [19]. The curriculum likely benefits from scaffolded

learning progression and repeated exposure to graded input, which facilitate deeper linguistic and cognitive development. The programme has successfully equipped students with both foundational and advanced listening skill necessary for academic and real-world success. For future iterations, the programme could enhance progress by incorporating more formative feedback, self-evaluation tools, and interactive listening technologies.

The analysis further demonstrates that students made substantial progress in their speaking skill after completing the IEUK programme. It appears to be aligned with communicative language teaching (CLT) principles, emphasizing interaction, real-world tasks, and student autonomy [15]. Grammatical competence, often considered foundational for accuracy in speaking [16], saw measurable improvement through structured yet communicative practice. Mastery of key tenses, conditionals, and the passive voice allowed students to express themselves more precisely and confidently. The development in lexico-semantic and functional language use (SS_4, SS_5, SS_13) underscores the value of task-based learning and scaffolded speaking activities [17]. The ability to perform speaking tasks such as recommendations, event planning, and storytelling suggests that students internalized both the language and communicative strategies required for diverse contexts. Improvements in interactional fluency particularly in dialogic activities such as group discussions (SS_10) and Q&A tasks (SS_3, SS_22) align with Swain's Output Hypothesis [18], which suggests that producing language helps students notice gaps and refine their linguistic accuracy. Moreover, the students' ability to make predictions, talk about hypothetical and future events, and summarize texts indicates higher-order speaking skill aligned with CEFR descriptors for intermediate levels [19]. These skills are essential for academic speaking tasks and participation in more formal discourse. From a curriculum design perspective, the program appears to offer balanced development across fluency, accuracy, and complexity key dimensions of oral proficiency [20]. Through a combination of role-plays, presentations, and collaborative tasks, students likely experienced rich input and meaningful output opportunities, which supported the internalization and automatization of language. Students effectively used language for practical functions such as negotiation, persuasion, and recommendation, aligning with CEFR B1-B2 descriptors for spoken interaction [19]. The students' enhanced speaking abilities reflect the success of the IEUK programme in promoting a wide range of spoken communicative competences. By integrating grammar, vocabulary, and discourse functions in contextually meaningful ways, the programme helped students become more confident, fluent, and accurate speakers. Future programme enhancements might focus on more personalized feedback and expanded opportunities for spontaneous speech to further boost real-time processing and fluency.

The observed progress in reading proficiency reflects the IEUK programme's focus on both functional reading competence and critical literacy development. The program appears to employ balanced reading instruction, incorporating both bottom-up (e.g., word recognition and grammar analysis) and top-down (e.g., predicting and inferring) strategies, which are essential for fluent reading [21]. The students' performance (RS_1 and RS_2) in both extensive and intensive reading skill, is due to exposure to large volumes of comprehensible texts to build fluency and tasks that train them to retrieve details efficiently [22]. The IEUK programme likely provided both, given the improvement in general and specific reading comprehension. The ability to match headings and paragraphs (RS_3) and analyze grammatical structures (RS_4) indicates that students have improved their understanding of text structure and cohesion, which are vital for academic and exam-related tasks [23]. The development in genre reading (RS_7) is particularly important, as it exposes students to different text types, increasing their adaptability and awareness of genre conventions. Reading across genres also builds discourse competence, helping students understand varying purposes and audiences. Higher-order reading skill such as inferring opinions (RS_8) and predicting content (RS_9) show progress in critical reading, a skill often underdeveloped in EFL contexts but vital for academic and real-world success [24]. These skills suggest that students are engaging more actively with texts rather than reading passively.

Progress in context-based reading tasks (RS_6 and RS_10) shows improvement in functional literacy, especially relevant for navigating everyday English-language contexts like travel, workplace, and lifestyle-related communication. The IEUK programme's emphasis on diverse text types, strategic reading practices, and student autonomy appears to have effectively supported the development of a well-rounded reading skilset. The findings demonstrate clear advancement in students' reading skill, reflecting the IEUK English language programme's success in developing both foundational and higher-order literacy skills. By integrating comprehension strategies, genre awareness, grammatical focus, and critical thinking, the program has fostered robust reading competence among students. The observed progress in writing proficiency indicates that the IEUK programme successfully fostered development in both linguistic accuracy and communicative effectiveness. The breadth of writing tasks and scaffolded instruction likely contributed to the improvement in students' abilities across narrative, descriptive, expository, and functional genres. Writing tasks like WS_1, WS_5, and WS_17 align with early stages of second language writing development, where students gain confidence by writing about familiar topics [26]. The ability to personalize writing helps build fluency and lexical variety, a necessary base for more complex writing tasks. Students' progress in writing questions (WS_6), using passive structures (WS_14), and article usage (WS_12) points to improved syntactic awareness. This aligns with Nation (2009) [22], who emphasized the importance of form-focused instruction integrated with meaning-focused output.

Additionally, mastery of quantifiers (WS_9) and adjective forms (WS_10) reflects growth in grammatical range and vocabulary control—key indicators of writing proficiency according to CEFR descriptors at B1–B2 levels [19].

Academic writing development was evident in skills such as note-taking (WS_2), summarizing (WS_7), and paraphrasing (WS_8)—critical for avoiding plagiarism and synthesizing information [25]. The ability to summarize and paraphrase suggests that students developed reading-to-write strategies and critical thinking abilities—hallmarks of academic literacy. Tasks such as writing a report (WS_11), quiz questions (WS_15), and a formal letter (WS_16) demonstrate students' improved genre awareness and ability to shift tone and register according to purpose and audience. This indicates exposure to genre-based instruction, which has been shown to effectively improve students' communicative competence in writing [27]. The skill of writing fictional stories using descriptive adjectives (WS_13) supports creative thinking and linguistic resourcefulness. Creative writing also encourages experimentation with narrative techniques and vivid language—important for stylistic development. The IEUK English language programme facilitated holistic growth in students' writing skill, supporting both foundational grammatical competence and advanced academic literacy. Through a structured curriculum that integrated personal writing, formal tasks, grammatical development, and textual organization, students gained the tools necessary for effective written communication in both academic and real-life contexts.

The programme presents a rich framework to students because it is a different curriculum that combines theory and practice, themes from every-day life, individual and group tasks, and a variety of pedagogical approaches to deliver the content through a digital platform instead of classical ways of language learning through books or other paper-related resources. It also presents challenges for the students because the content of the IEUK programme is completely different from paper-related resources of English language that are used for teaching and learning the language at universities and institutes in the KRI. The delivery methods of lecturing, videos, and interactive exercises support students' engagement and cater to different learning styles [28].

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Students' perceptions toward the IEUK programme indicate positive feedback, particularly in terms of how the content enhances the four language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Students demonstrated measurable improvement in both receptive and productive language skills. In listening and reading, students developed stronger comprehension strategies, including identifying key information, following extended discourse, and interpreting various genres and formats. Speaking progress was evident in the increased use of accurate grammar, fluency in interaction, functional language use, and the ability to discuss a range of topics. Writing skill improved through enhanced grammatical control, organizational ability, and competency in both academic and creative written tasks.

The students were interested in the interactive and engaging nature of the programme, which allows for flexible and self-paced learning. They noted that the variety of exercises and resources provided catered to different learning styles, helping them improve their language proficiency. Although, some students expressed a desire for more personalized feedback or deeper levels of interaction on their learning, particularly for speaking and writing skill. Overall, the IEUK programme can be an effective tool of supporting the development of the four language skills, but there is potential for further refinement to enhance its impact, especially in areas requiring real-time feedback and assessment.

This research can inform educators on how to tailor IEUK, whether as online or in-class courses, to better suit the needs and priorities of students. By incorporating relevant content, using engaging delivery methods, and ensuring clear pronunciation, educators can create a more effective learning environment. The sample size, participant demographics, or research methods might influence the generalization of the findings because this is the first research has been conducted on using IEUK English language programme in the KRI. As IEUK is formally adapted as the main English language programme at language centers of higher education institutes since 2024, future research can be conducted to explore other areas of language learning with a larger or more diverse group of students. Additionally, investigating the long-term impact of the course on students' language proficiency would be valuable.

FUNDING

No funding

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank the research participants for their valuable contribution.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest. Only time constraints.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data availability statement should provide information on where and under what conditions the data directly supporting the publication can be accessed. Sample data availability statements are available at the following site: <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1bKQplsdKiPpw44p2oWqapMQfPk7k51C9qplAZL7XI28/edit>

REFERENCES

- [1] S. O. Ali, "Higher Education Reform: A Study of Quality Assurance and Reform Policy of Higher Education in the Kurdistan Region – Iraq," Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Southampton, Southampton, UK, 2017.
- [2] S. O. Ali, "Quality assurance and effectiveness in Kurdistan higher education: the reform process," *Int. J. Educ. Pedagog. Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 1308–1311, 2012.
- [3] A. Januszewski, *Educational Technology: The Development of a Concept*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://link.springer.com/>
- [4] H. Ellington and P. Race, *Handbook of Educational Technology*. London, UK: Kogan Page, 1993. [Online]. Available: <http://books.google.com>
- [5] Imperial English, Imperial English UK, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.imperial-english.com/>
- [6] M. Mihaylova, S. Gorin, T. P. Reber, and N. Rothen, "A meta-analysis on mobile-assisted language learning applications: Benefits and risks," *Psychologica Belgica*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 252, 2022.
- [7] S. F. Hasib and S. Badawi, "Kurdish EFL learners' perceptions about the Use of Smartphone Applications for Language Learning," *J. Univ. Hum. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 51–57, 2024.
- [8] Z. B. Guadu, "Students' Perceptions and Implementation of Mobile Assisted Language Learning: Two Universities in the Amhara Region of Ethiopia in Focus," *Zhongguo Kuangye Daxue Xuebao*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 12–19, 2025.
- [9] R. O. Azeez and L. K. Barany, "EFL teachers' awareness and opinions on the 21st century's creativity and innovation skill," *Acad. J. Nawroz Univ.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 271–280, 2022.
- [10] H. Aydoğan and A. Akbarov, "The four basic language skills, whole language & integrated skill approach in mainstream university classrooms in Turkey," *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 5, no. 9, p. 672, 2014. [11] [25] M. Rost, *Teaching and Researching Listening*. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2011.
- [11] M. Rost, *Teaching and Researching Listening*. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2011.
- [12] L. Vandergrift and C. C. M. Goh, *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition in Action*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012.
- [13] J. Field, *Listening in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [14] C. C. M. Goh, "Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications," *RELC J.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 188–213, 2008.
- [15] J. C. Richards, *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [16] R. Ellis, *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [17] D. Willis and J. Willis, *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [18] M. Swain, "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development," in *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, S. Gass and C. Madden, Eds. Newbury House, 1985, pp. 235–253.
- [19] Council of Europe, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [20] P. Skehan, "Modeling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis," *Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 510–532, 2009.
- [21] W. Grabe and F. L. Stoller, *Teaching and Researching Reading*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- [22] I. S. P. Nation, *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.
- [23] J. C. Alderson, *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [24] C. Wallace, *Critical Reading in Language Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- [25] A. Hirvela and Q. Du, "Why am I paraphrasing?: Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading," *J. Engl. Acad. Purp.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 87–98, 2013.
- [26] K. Hyland, *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [27] K. Hyland, *Genre and Second Language Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press, 2007.

[28] S. O. Ali, A. M. Mustafa, and A. H. Azeez, "Lecturers' and learners' perceptions on the 'New Headway' curriculum within the framework of higher education reform at Erbil Polytechnic University," *Int. J. Psychosoc. Rehabil.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 602–616, 2019.

[29] V. Erdoğan, "Integrating 4C skills of 21st century into 4 language skills in EFL classes," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 113–124, 2019.

[30] H. W. Seliger and E. Shohamy, *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1989.

[31] Z. S. Durer and E. Sayar, "An analysis of Turkish students' attitudes towards English in speaking classes: Voice your thoughts!," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 70, pp. 1574–1579, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.228>

[32] N. J. Salkind, "Spearman's correlation coefficient," in *Encyclopedia of Research Design*, vol. 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.scribd.com/document/427102862/Neil-J-Salkind-Encyclopedia-of-Research-Design-2010-SAGE-Publications-Inc-pdf>

[33] J. Wilson, *Essentials of Business Research: A Guide to Doing Your Research Project*. London, UK: SAGE Publications, 2014.

[34] R. Richey, "Reflections of the 2008 AECT definitions of the field," 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://link.springer.com/>

APPENDICES

Appendices 1. Intermediate Level- Listening Skill

Items	Questions	Very well	Well	With difficulty	Not achieved
LS_1	I can listen for specific details				
LS_2	I can listen for the general meaning				
LS_3	I can follow a conversation (directions, interviews etc.)				
LS_4	I can listen and take notes				
LS_5	I can check my own answers from a listening text				
LS_6	I can follow a longer text (lecture etc.)				
LS_7	I can identify and complete missing information, words and chunks of language				
LS_8	I can listen to a text and reproduce it				
LS_9	I can listen to people's opinions and compare them to my own				
LS_10	I can listen to match content to images				
LS_11	I can listen to a description and identify key information				
LS_12	I can listen to order ideas and events				
LS_13	I can listen to information and use it to answer questions				
LS_14	I can understand people talking about future plans				
LS_15	I can listen for details about a graph				

Appendices 2. Intermediate Level- Speaking Skill

Items	Questions	Very well	Well	With difficulty	Not achieved
SS_1	I can use the present and past simple tenses accurately				
SS_2	I can discuss my opinions about a range of topics				
SS_3	I can ask and answer questions from a text I have read or heard				
SS_4	I can make recommendations for other people				
SS_5	I can use specific vocabulary to discuss a variety of topics				
SS_6	I can use gerunds (-ing forms) to talk about preferences				
SS_7	I can practice a dialogue and or/ role-play with partners				

SS_8	I can ask and answer questions about a map, picture, and photo				
SS_9	I can use the first conditional and time clauses to talk about the future				
SS_10	I can contribute to a group discussion /and or presentation				
SS_11	I can use the present and past continuous tenses accurately				
SS_12	I can hold a discussion in order to create an event				
SS_13	I can use a range of functional language to complete different tasks (negotiation, persuasion, recommendation)				
SS_14	I can summarize a short story				
SS_15	I can use comparative and superlative adjectives correctly with accurate pronunciation				
SS_16	I can use the passive voice in a variety of tenses accurately				
SS_17	I can discuss hypothetical situations using the second conditional				
SS_18	I can talk about future plans and events				
SS_19	I can describe a place, food, eating habits, dates, and months				
SS_20	I can give my opinion				
SS_21	I can make predictions and ask and answer questions about them				
SS_22	I can ask and answer questions about future plans and events				

Appendices 3. Intermediate Level- Reading Skill

Items	Questions	Very well	Well	With difficulty	Not achieved
RS_1	I can read for the general and specific meaning				
RS_2	I can find specific information in a text and use it to answer questions				
RS_3	I can match headings and information to correct paragraphs				
RS_4	I can identify different parts of speech (noun, verb etc.)				
RS_5	I can identify reasons and examples in a text				
RS_6	I can understand information about places and directions				
RS_7	I can read a range of genres of text				
RS_8	I can read information in a text and give an opinion				
RS_9	I can predict content of a news article from headlines				
RS_10	I can understand information about people's jobs, routines and lifestyles				

Appendices 4. Intermediate Level- Writing Skill

Items	Questions	Very well	Well	With difficulty	Not achieved
WS_1	I can write about myself and the people I know				
WS_2	I can take notes from a text, a recording or while someone is speaking				
WS_3	I can organize my ideas in a text				
WS_4	I can complete and/or write sentences using appropriate grammar and vocabulary				

WS_5	I can write about my daily routine				
WS_6	I can write questions accurately in a variety of tenses				
WS_7	I can write a summary from a text				
WS_8	I can paraphrase sentences and/or short texts				
WS_9	I can use quantifiers with countable and uncountable nouns				
WS_10	I know the difference between -ed and -ing adjectives				
WS_11	I can write a report				
WS_12	I can use articles appropriately				
WS_13	I can write a fictional story using descriptive adjectives				
WS_14	I can use the passive voice in writing				
WS_15	I can write questions for a quiz				
WS_16	I can write a letter of complaint using appropriate register				
WS_17	I can write a short description about myself, another person, and/ or places I know				