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Introduction

After the realization of the inefficiency of traditional general-purpose language courses for higher education and specific areas such as business, aviation, there is a need for more specific instruction taking into consideration of the needs and interests of the learners (Stoller, 2002). In some cases, learners reach certain levels but they have communication problems in their occupation. Learners need more specific language courses that solve this problem in their workplace while carrying out tasks that are required specific for this job. In most cases, although learners can communicate in their daily life, they have difficulty in their job specific tasks owing to their lack of necessary terminology and vocabulary.

In addition to terminology and vocabulary, communicative needs of the learners are one of the most important of these needs. Learners are seeking for courses which develop their communicative competences, namely their speaking skills because communication is the ultimate goal of the learning a foreign language. For specific areas, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses appeared to meet these needs of the learners. ESP is defined as learning the content of an area through English which is the target language (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). ESP aims at developing both language competencies of the learners and providing opportunities to learn the content of the area in which the learners most probably work in their future career. However, developing a communicative competence of a learners in a foreign language is the most difficult dimension of the learning a foreign language (Nunan, 2006). Speaking skill is the core of developing these communication competencies. To be competent speaker, a learner needs to have varieties of competencies such good level of word knowledge, grammar, fluency, pronunciation and etc. (Zhang, 2009). Fluency and accuracy of a speech is required to convey the message you have to others listening to the speaker.

To fulfill the needs of the learners in terms of their competency in speaking, one needs to understand the sub-skills of the language. Language skills are divided into two as receptive and productive skills. While the former include reading and listening skills, the latter include speaking and writing. Stoller (2002) suggested that speaking is the skill of which development is the hardest. Even learners, who reach higher competencies in reading and listening skills, may have difficulty in their speaking skill. Zhang (2009) deduced that adult learners could develop their speaking competency only after reaching enough competencies in receptive skills and with the help of vocabulary and grammar knowledge, they could express themselves in a prepared and unprepared speech. A number of factors may affect speaking competency such as lack of necessary word knowledge needed for certain topics and contexts, anxiety of performing in front of others, fear of making mistakes and being laughed or embarrassed by others because of mistakes in their speech (Nunan, 2006).

Developing each language competency require working collaboratively and cooperatively with others who is learning the same language. These both provides an environment in which learners feel stress-free for the learners and an environment in which learners get instant feedback and can evaluate them. Collaborative learning is defined as a method of teaching and learning in which students’ team together to explore a significant question or create a meaningful project (Blosser, 1992). In cooperative learning, students work together in small groups. Both individual performance and group performance are taken into account. Collaborative learning provides group opportunities work face-to-face and learn to work as a team. Collaborative learning seems to be appropriate for the development of language competencies of learners while learning a language.

By keeping the entire mentioned in mind, in this study, needs and interests of the learners are analyzed and communication based Aviation English course is designed to meet the needs of the learners and help them in their future career. This design was supported with collaborative learning method to promote the communicative competencies of the learners. The main research questions and sub-questions raised for this study are given as follows:
1. What are the needs of students regarding Communicative Based Aviation English?

2. What is the effectiveness of the Communicative Based Aviation English course which is designed through collaborative learning?

2.1. Is there a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of speaking skills?

2.2. What are the opinions of students and the instructor regarding the instruction in the experimental group?

This study will contribute to the field in different aspects. First of all not many studies and designs were aimed at developing communication competencies through collaborating learning principles in learning a foreign language. Efficiency of this instructional design was evaluated with both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Secondly, designing an instruction in a school where all the learners are candidates of pilots can contribute to the literature on teaching speaking skills especially in the field of aviation.

**Research Design**

In the study, mixed method approach was used. Cresswell (2013, p.18) defined mixed methods approach as an approach "in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g., consequence-oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic)". Concurrent design is thought to be appropriate for the study since focus of the research is providing a comprehensive analysis of the research problem. Researchers collected both qualitative and quantitative data while conducting the research at the same time and overall results were tried to be interpreted in the light of these collected data (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). For, the needs assessment stage of the study, a questionnaire and interview were administered. For the evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction, post-test only experimental research design was used.

**Setting and Participants**

University learners and their teachers at a university in Istanbul-Turkey were admitted as the target population for the study. In this four-year university, there are four major engineering departments; aerospace, electronic, industrial, and computer engineering and learners are trained to be pilots at the same time. The academic language of the school is not English; however, it is given special attention and quite an important amount of time in the curriculum owing to the necessity of the prospective career of the learners.

Purposive sampling method was chosen for the study since the chosen learners is thought to be more appropriate for the purpose. Learners were above intermediate proficiency level. The proficiency level of learners was determined by Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and institutional exam called ALCPT of whose Cronbacha Alpha level was found to be .98. The total number of learners was 60 and 30 of whom were in experimental group and while 30 of them were in control group. All the participants of the study were male. All the participants from learners were between 18 and 20 years old and from four majors of the university. Since the participants were not assigned to the groups randomly, the groups were compared in terms of English proficiency before the application of the design, students’ achievement levels were analyzed by independent sample t-test and there was no significant difference at α=.05 level.

The teachers in the study hold this profession for seven years and both of the instructors were PhD students at that time. The instruction in the experimental group and the instructor were observed by an expert. And for the internal validity of the instructors’ performances were ensured by an expert colleague who holds master degree in English language teaching with the certificate of
DELTA (Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) using an “evaluation form” (Danielson, 1996) based on planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction and occupational responsibilities. The instruction was evaluated by an expert. For ethical considerations, all the participants from the teachers and learners are informed about the purpose of the study.

Before the implementation of the new English program, researchers carried out a needs assessment procedures. Data for the needs analyses were collected through a semi-structured interview and survey. All of the 60 learners supposed to take the survey at the beginning of the study however 52 of them were present on the day of survey. For the semi-structured part of the needs assessment 12 learners and six teachers were volunteered. To create more informal and comfortable atmosphere to get more valid and reliable data, semi-structured interview sections were held in their native language in this case Turkish.

In the evaluation stage of the developed program, advanced class freshmen students were chosen and since there were only two classes of advanced learners, one of them was chosen as experimental and the other as the control group.

**Procedure**

In the control group, teacher went on his general English course following a commercial course book named Northstar produced by Pearson Publishing. In the experimental group, the course was designed by the institution’s staff with collaborative learning principles and implemented for eight weeks. In the design of course instruction with collaborative learning, ASSURE instructional design model was followed. ASSURE is an instructional model aiming at increasing the efficiency of teaching and learning process. ASSURE is an acronym which stands for; Analyze learner characteristics, State objectives, Select, modify or design materials, utilize materials, require learner participation, and evaluation. Each item of the instructional design process is explained below.

**Analyze learner (needs assessment)**

First step of the design was need assessment process to analyze learners. After a comprehensive need analysis process, a needs assessment report was formed. It shows the perception of learners’ self-efficacy, their readiness and expectations towards communication based aviation English. It also shows in which areas learners have difficulties such as mastering basic aviation corpus, mastering vocabulary used in concrete subjects. With this need analysis process, needs and preferences of the learners were examined and identified. Necessary suggestions were put forward.

**State objectives**

In the light of need assessment results, specific objectives were identified. The identified objectives were checked by the instructors. While setting objectives, cognitive and affective skills were taken into consideration.

**Select methods, media and materials**

In accordance with the learner preferences and teachers’ suggestions, collaborative group activities were conducted. Educational games were used. The board and board markers, handouts including listening questions and activities, model aircraft, laptop, speakers and projector, blank papers to draw an aircraft on them, tack-it were utilized. To better explain the items videos were used. The teachers who were also the researchers decided to prepare their own material which they think best fit their students’ needs and were authentic as well. The materials can be listed as: audio-visuals, visual, text and posters.
Using the selected media and materials

After analysis and preparation process, selected media and materials were utilized in the class.

Require learner participation

To ensure learner participation, collaborative group work activities were held and learners were given tasks during the lesson which they carried out cooperatively and collaboratively with the other classroom members by responding and getting feedback from their friends, which created a stress-free environment lowering the classroom anxiety. Learners were given group work presentations and the presenter was chosen randomly among the group members by the instructors. Moreover, to increase the learner participation, games were used by the instructors and at the end of the activity the winners were awarded. Learners also evaluated the performances of the presenters by filling the online form which was prepared by the instructors for each group.

Evaluation and revise

During this stage of the instruction, instructors evaluated the entire instructional process to check whether stated objectives were met, lesson plan were applied accurately and revision was needed.

Data Collection Tools

The current study implemented a new instructional design to the ongoing program of the institution and to realize this change, a set of analysis were conducted. In the first part need for change was revealed and for the second phase the effect of this change was investigated. Under mentioned first two tools were used during need assessment stage and the other were for the evaluation stage.

At the needs assessment stage

Need assessment questionnaire

In needs assessment stage, to get the learners’ demographic info and English learning activity preferences a questionnaire named “Communication Based Aviation English” was created in Google Docs - a web based application- and administered to the participants. The questionnaire is composed of three different sections; demographic info of the participants, Likert Scale questions on how students perceive their Aviation English proficiency and Likert Scale questions on the preferences of activities in learning English. Prior to administration of the questionnaire to our target population, it was applied to a sample group to see whether the questions were working. After pilot study, it was administered to the participants. Cronbacha Alpha values for the questionnaires were found to be .86 and .82.

Semi-structured interview with the instructors and the learners

Semi-structured interview with the instructors and the learners: Semi-structured interview questions were taken from ICAO (International Civilian Aviation Organization) language standards. There were 14 semi-structured interview questions related to competency level of language skills such as vocabulary, grammar and speaking, etc. For the reliability and validity of the questionnaires expert view were taken.
At the evaluation stage of the effectiveness of the instruction

Speaking examination

Both experimental and control groups were administered a speaking examination at the end of the instructions. This exam was evaluated by using rubric which was adapted from University of Michigan English Language Test - Speaking Assessment Rubric. Learners were provided ten topics about the aviation and they were expected to talk about the topic for three minutes after two-minute preparations. Two raters evaluated the speech of the learners based on criteria accordingly to the objectives of the course such as vocabulary, fluency, accuracy and the content. Cronbacha Alpha level of the inter-rater reliability was found to be .78 which means reliability of the speaking scores reliable enough.

Peer evaluation of the presentations of the learners

In the experimental group, to make the learners dive into the lesson and to see the results of collaborative learning, five presentation groups were formed and prepared presentations. One learner per group was randomly chosen and he presented and the other classroom members evaluated the learner’s performance. An oral presentation evaluation form, which was (www.unlv.edu) adapted to this course, used in terms of the stated course objectives after getting two expert opinions. This form basically consisted of four major fields i.e. content, organization, delivery, overall impression and 15 sub-fields detailing the aforementioned items.

Course evaluation form for learners and instructors

Learners in the experimental group were given course evaluation form after the instruction. Form was designed to check whether objectives of the instruction were reached or not and to learn the views of the learners on classroom environment. Two experts checked the form and necessary changes were made.

Instructors of the experimental group filled the course evaluation form about how the plan goes during the instruction and about the overall design of the instruction in free format.

Analysis of Data

After getting data from both qualitative and quantitative tools, researchers examined all the data. Researchers analyzed qualitative data from interviews, performance evaluation of the instructors by an expert colleague, self-assessment of learners and reflection of the Instructors and focused on the important statements and comments of learners and teachers. Descriptive analysis was applied. After the analysis procedure, results were shared with the participants to ensure that results were reflecting their intended purposes in the study.

For the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire, peer evaluation of the presentations of the learners and speaking exam, descriptive statistics such as arithmetic means and standard deviation were calculated. For the speaking exam, these statistics were calculated for vocabulary, grammar, fluency, pronunciation, content separately and totally. Independent samples t-test was applied to data to calculate the significance level of the difference between experimental and control groups in terms of exam scores.
Findings

After a carefully analyzed needs assessment procedure, this study conducted an experimental research design and findings in the light of research questions were stated below.

Findings Regarding Needs Assessment

**What are the needs of students who will work in aviation sector in their future career?**

As for the first main research question of the study, research was focused on the language skills needs of the students who are supposed work in aviation sector. To diagnose the current program’s problems learner and learning environment analysis were conducted through learner questionnaire, learner and instructor interviews. The findings obtained from the questionnaire regarding the perceptions of the learners regarding their proficiency in Aviation English were given in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

*Learners’ Perceptions Regarding Their Proficiency in Aviation English.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Arithmetic Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explaining emergency vocabulary with different words</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering basic aviation corpus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering vocabulary used in concrete subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering informative pilot-tower communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the message in aviation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking fluently</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using complex sentence structures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing misunderstandings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressing/emphasizing understandably</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the null points in the communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using basic grammar rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking correctly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting quickly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking English in an understandable accent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouncing the words correctly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using basic sentence structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having adequate vocabulary for communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, the highest arithmetic means were realized in “having adequate vocabulary for comprehension” and “using basic sentence structures”, however the lowest arithmetic means were observed in “explaining emergency vocabulary with different words” and aviation corpus related items which the research based upon these findings.
Most of the students identified themselves on the range of “very good” and “good”. “Explaining emergency vocabulary with different words”, “ mastering basic aviation corpus”, “ mastering vocabulary used in concrete subjects”, and “delivering informative pilot-tower communication” items were considered to be most problematic areas of the target group according to learners’ perceptions regarding their proficiency in aviation English.

Learners were asked to rank their preferences for instructional methods, techniques and activities. The items which perceived most effective relate to the receptive skills of the language such as reading, watching, and listening.

The results of the interview on objectives of communication based Aviation English showed that throughout aviation terminology learners wanted to no barriers in communication both to motivate themselves and to do their duties effectively. It can be deduced from learners’ comments that assessment and evaluation should be administered through speaking exam, peer assessment, scenario based exam, no exam, teacher observation, presentation, no paper based evaluation, learners can be given ready made situations and they analyze it and listening exam.

Findings Regarding the Evaluation of the Design

What is the effectiveness of the course which is designed as Communicative Based Aviation English course designed through collaborative learning?

Due to the nature of the study both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered and evaluated to give a comprehensive answer to this question. Research questions stated below are categorized in terms of quantitative and qualitative data.

Is there a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of speaking skills?

To identify the effect of new design on students achievement scores compared to the traditional teaching methods, speaking exam results were compared. According to Table 2, there is a meaningful difference between the posttest scores of experimental and control group at p<.05. At the beginning of the experimental design both groups were chosen from the same achievement levels however following the course based on collaborative learning activities resulted in observable increase in experimental group’s achievement scores (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>-9.33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>79.05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
Results of Independent T-test on Posttest Scores of Both Experimental and Control Groups.

The arithmetic means of experimental and control group for each language skill in Table 3 also shows the difference that the treatment did. As it is clear from the table, experimental group’s scores in each part of the speaking exam are realized higher than the control group’s scores. Looking at the five sections of achievement exam and differences between the groups; differences in vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency sections are higher than grammar and content sections. This also shows that this course with collaborative learning made noteworthy difference especially in vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency skills.
Table 3. Results of Descriptive Statistics of Both Experimental and Control Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vocabulary (20)</th>
<th>Grammar (10)</th>
<th>Pronunciation (20)</th>
<th>Fluency (20)</th>
<th>Content (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>18. 70</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the opinions of students and the instructor regarding the instruction in the experimental group?

The answer of this research question was obtained from four data tools namely; course evaluation and peer evaluation form for learners/instructors.

Course Evaluation Form for Learners and Instructors

In addition to the peer evaluation, students’ comments made on the course evaluation form regarding their friend’s presentation and the classroom atmosphere were also noteworthy. The most important impact mentioned by nearly all students is that they enjoyed and motivated by the activities. One student wrote “evaluating my friends’ presentation was really exciting for me. It helped me build my confidence”. Another student wrote “I think this lesson broadened my vision. Actually, I was bored in the English lessons but in this lesson, I was really interested and motivated”. Both instructors were also agreed on the motivation factor in the new instruction based on collaborative learning and one of them said “After realizing that they would use these words in their future career, they were really eager and motivated to go further”.

The second benefit referred by students and instructors was giving the chance of evaluating their friends. One student wrote that “Evaluating a performance of my friends helped me in that I realized my own mistakes and reinforced what I did accurately” and one of the instructor wrote “Learners enjoyed a lot because they had never found a chance to evaluate themselves or their friends”. The reasons for these expressions are likely to be found in traditional way of teaching learning process. In a classical classroom environment students are in the role of receiver even if they collaborate with their peers they are not supposed to evaluate their friends officially. One student wrote “evaluating my friends’ Presentation was really exciting for me. It helped me build my confidence” which also indicates that being an evaluator made them felt themselves more dominant in the lesson.

The most significant finding identified by the students and instructors is the joy of working together actually collaborating. One student wrote “we were together with our friends. We always corrected each other mistakes. I felt myself like we were in a team” and one instructor added “especially the Team-tournament Activity made it possible for the learners to enjoy what they were doing”. Due to the nature of military academies, discipline is the key factor no matter where you are even in class. Such an activity made it possible for students to act more flexible.

Regarding the design of the instruction, the instructor wrote “learner analysis, learning environment analysis, materials, classroom readiness, and assessment tools have been prepared and this situation gave me a great deal of relaxation because everything was set and ready.” And this shows that the program had a positive effect on the instructor. The instructor also indicated “The main aim was to teach basic aircraft elements and it was achieved successfully. Especially the Team-tournament Activity made it possible for the learners to enjoy what they were doing.” He also added “I can say that the lesson served the purpose in general and everything done was had an aim to contribute to the general aim of the lesson.” All these reflections show that the study succeeded what it is supposed to do.
**Peer evaluations**

Peer evaluations were done through a form basically consisted of four major fields i.e. content, organization, delivery, overall impression and 15 sub-fields detailing the aforementioned items. Additionally learners’ comments were gathered through the comments of the learners. One of the students’ evaluation results were given in Table 4. Out of 30 students 26 of the students (absentees: one presenter, three on duty) evaluated their friend. As is seen in the table learners were evaluated “excellent or good”, except for the “professional posture and relations with the audience” items.

**Table 4.**
Peer Evaluation for One of the Presenter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and complexity of project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support main points</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate use of media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth transitions between topics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical flow of sections/ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear thesis and supporting data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative and clear project summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and confident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged with audience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear voice with good pace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command of language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions and Discussions**

This study is conducted to see the effectiveness of the Communicative based Aviation English course which was designed through ASSURE model and on collaborative learning. Keeping in mind what the literature remarks such as difficulties of developing communicative competence (Nunan, 2006), developing materials on the light of collaborative activities helped the instructors to realize this ultimate goal.

As well as developing competence in a language what is to be included in this process also important (Zhang, 2009) and facilitate such a holistic process learners were exposed to a great deal of specific terminology which also took the attention of the learners.

Furthermore, along with the definition of Blosser (1992) about collaborative learning, this study applied the basics of this teaching activity that all the students involved in the activities to reach one aim. They had the chance to teach each other and feel like team members.

Stump et al. (2011) discussed the achievements of university level students in accordance with the collaborative learning activity use and with the current study it can also be regarded similar results.

This study demonstrated that an instructional design which hired ASSURE model and collaborative learning activities improved university students’ achievement scores and their social motivations. The positive results of the study added weight to the implementation of this model to ongoing general English teaching program.
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