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Abstract

It is essential that educational institutions prepare students for the workforce especially when they are teaching English. In most Saudi Universities English Departments have been established in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education and Translation. However, recognition of the need for English in the Saudi educational system has not always been matched by acceptable educational outcomes. This is indicated by the inadequate number of well-trained and highly qualified teachers of English. Lack of recognition has hindered progress towards reaching the Kingdom Vision of 2030 that focuses on empowering citizens through reshaping the educational system and turning learners into skillful, educated and independent individuals. Therefore, this study examines the extent to which the KSA Vision 2030, in terms of teaching English as a foreign language in universities, is being implemented. A questionnaire was given to first year students at the Northern Border University, in Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire had two main sections, the first contained six general questions and the second section had 39 items covering very specific elements such as, Content & Teaching Methods, Evaluation & Assignments and Training & Professional Development. Analysing the data from the questionnaire was done using SPSS software.
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1. Introduction

1.1 EFL Teaching in KSA

“Our country is rich in its natural resources. We are not dependent solely on oil for our energy needs. Gold, phosphate, uranium, and many other valuable minerals are found beneath our lands. Our real wealth lies in the ambition of our people and the potential of our younger generation” (Abdulaziz & Mar, 2019).

With these few yet comprehensive sentences, Prince Mohammad bin Salman announced with pride and joy Saudi Arabia’s Vision 2030. He was confident that this vision would by the Will of Allah achieve its target goals in the near future. He regarded the ambitious, highly educated younger generation as one of the most important pillars of this vision. The responsibility of successfully preparing this generation falls not only on schools and universities, but also requires the engagement of parents. Therefore, Prince Mohammad bin Salman announced the launch of the “Irtiqaa” program to measure how effectively schools engage parents in the learning process. He maintained that teachers should receive training to enable them to communicate with parents and should also have access to innovative educational programs to promote their academic achievement.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia can only compete in the global economy by establishing an educated and skilled workforce. Effective communication between different countries and peoples worldwide is of the utmost importance for cultural exchange, and maintaining peace and prosperity. Learning foreign languages, particularly English is essential in order to communicate successfully (Alzahrani & Rajab, 2017) and to cope with state of the art technology which has spread worldwide. Without doubt, it is important to look for new strategies to teach English in Saudi Arabian universities, as this will prove to be a great asset when coping with the huge advances in information and communication technology worldwide. In KSA, English has become a mandatory school subject in public schools from Grade 4 primary school. English is also the language of instruction in scientific
departments such as Faculties of Engineering, Faculties of Medicine and Faculties of Computing.

1.2 Importance of the Study

To cope with the worldwide advances in information and communication technology it is imperative to learn an international foreign language such as English as it is the language of science and technology. Consequently, to prepare university graduates for the workforce, much attention should be paid to teaching and learning English.

One of the pillars of the Saudi Arabia 2030 vision is the determination to become a global investment powerhouse. Empowering individuals through reshaping the educational system is at the heart of the KSA’s vision. This could be achieved by instilling compassion and knowledge in students to enable them to become resilient and independent. Also reinforcing essential values such as initiative, persistence, leadership, social skills, cultural knowledge and self-awareness is an essential part of empowering educational, cultural and entertainment institutions. Saudi Arabia has witnessed the establishment of important projects, the majority of which are from foreign companies. One of these projects is the solar power plan 2030, which is considered of great importance to Saudi Arabia in the field of energy. Another is the Alqedy Entertainment Project that will provide entertainment and recreation. There is also the Neum Project, an international model for all aspects of life. It will deal with the future of energy, water, transportation, biotechnology, digital and technical sciences, media, entertainment and living. In addition, the Red Sea Project is considered to be a giant international tourism project. These projects all add to the importance of teaching and learning English as a foreign language in KSA universities.

This study investigates the current strategies of some higher education institutions and how the modern curriculum and methods equip students with the four English language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking). This is considered the most important trend in the vision of the Kingdom according to the strategic plan for 2030. English is an important factor in achieving this vision. Globalization requires knowledge in various fields as its main focus and the language of communication is English, in terms of technical, digital learning, artificial intelligence and scientific research. This will: 1) contribute to the scholarship of students in prestigious universities. 2) The gap between the graduates and the labor market will be bridged. 3) The number and range of options for graduates is an important requirement of the labor market that requires proficiency in English.

1.3 Literature Review

A review of recent studies examining teaching English in Saudi Arabia reveals the need to improve English teaching methods and increase students’ motivation. These studies highlighted the need for teachers to receive professional development in pedagogies. Students are more motivated when they learn by technology and rather than learning about English, they need to use English in everyday life communications including talking with foreigners, writing reports, and sending emails in English. Teachers should attend professional development programs based on monitoring and micro-teaching. They should be periodically tested and evaluated based on standardized international tests. Further results are revealed in the following studies.

The study of Mitchell and Alfuraih (2017) tracked the development of English Language Education in Saudi Arabia. It emphasized that although there is a partnership between the Tatweer Company for Educational Services and the Ministry of Education, there is still a need to support improvement in the learning and teaching of English as the Kingdom continues to develop as a knowledge-based society. The study also highlighted that investment in pre-university education is complemented by investment in higher education and vocational education to prepare graduates for the workforce. Besides, students are more motivated when teachers use online and digital material to stimulate learning. Teachers reported that they need systematic professional development in a range of areas including textbooks, pedagogies, time management, as well as instruction on how to motivate and engage students.

In a similar vein, the study of Al Mukhallafi (2019) examined how university students reacted to and used smartphones to learn English as an EFL subject. It showed that students were optimistic about using mobiles phones and that they were very open to using technology to learn English. They welcomed using mobile phones to communicate with professors in the learning community, receiving grades on assignments and feedback on projects. Students showed positive attitudes towards studying and doing quizzes on their mobile phones. They were aware of applications to install that could make courses easier to study. In general, students were intensely interested in learning English using mobile phones.

Al-Hazmi (2017) pointed out that there have been numerous inadequacies in university English, noting that many students were not proficient in using English for further academic or real-life purposes after leaving
They also lacked competency in writing effective workplace documents such as reports and engaging in meaningful communication in English. Moreover, most first year undergraduate students at universities needed intensive or remedial English courses and programs before starting standard English academic study because of their poor proficiency levels. There was also evidence that many EFL teachers, especially at the pre-university level experience difficulty in using English effectively in classroom tasks such as lecturing, giving instructions, and explanations. Alshammari (2016) highlighted the fact that a monolingual approach to English teaching has been the predominant method in most Saudi Arabian Universities.

Teaching methods that encourage creativity and motivate learners were cited as one of the most important characteristics to deliver quality education (Aremu & Sokan, 2003).

Al-Nasser (2015) focused on the major barriers and problems that Saudi students faced when learning English. The study also highlighted the challenges faced by EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia. These included:

- The dissonance between English and Arabic sounds which makes it difficult for most Saudi students to distinguish between them. The EFL teachers are not adequately trained in linguistics and in using technology in their teaching.
- The teaching approach is outdated and most teachers rely on the grammar translation method.
- Teachers do not pay attention to developing the four basic language skills; they focus more on writing and reading and neglect listening and speaking.
- Activities employed are more teacher-centered.

The study (Al-Nasser, 2015) also suggested that modern teaching methods and electronic devices should be used for teaching English language to achieve better understanding and to promote interest in the language.

Al-Seghayer’s study (2015) surveyed teaching English in Saudi schools. The results revealed that traditional language teaching methods dominated the English teaching practices in Saudi. EFL classrooms divided English into subdivisions of disconnected skills and areas of knowledge. Consequently, there was an enormous gap between the recommended pedagogic approaches and actual practices in Saudi English education. The study suggested that a state licensing system should be developed to accredit novice English language teachers, instructors should attend professional development programs based on monitoring other experienced individuals, recruiting teachers should be based on criteria of good English communication skills, and prospective English language teachers should undergo periodic testing and achieve certain scores in standardized proficiency examinations such as TOEFL, IELTS and TOEIC to ensure that they continue to maintain the required English levels.

The study of ur Rahman and Alhaisoni (2013) investigated the present status of education and ELT in Saudi Arabia, exploring the challenges of teaching English, and providing recommendations to tackle those challenges. The study confirmed that teachers need to be trained in conversation and communication teaching skills which is reflected in the performance of secondary school students. The study further emphasized a university qualification is not sufficient; a proper knowledge of English language is required, including how to teach, and how students learn. The study also highlighted that teachers should apply new teaching methods that enable students to be self-learners.

Fageeh’s study (2011) examined the use of blogging technology at an intermediate level EFL college writing class and its effect on developing positive attitudes towards writing compared with the traditional oral presentation of writing instruction. The study employed an experimental research method and a descriptive research design to examine these effects of blogging on writing proficiency and attitudes. The results showed that the students perceived Weblog as a viable tool to improve their English, in terms of their writing proficiency and attitudes towards writing. The students also regarded Weblog as a tool that gave them the opportunity and freedom to express themselves in English, writing for both a native and global audience, creating active, interactive social connections in blogs, and establishing an interactive relationship with a real-time readership. Students showed positive attitudes towards Weblog use.

Fareh’s study (2010) investigated the challenges encountered in teaching English in Arab countries. The study attempted to explore the challenges facing some Arabian countries (including Saudi Arabia) in teaching EFL and how to meet these challenges. The findings of the study revealed that insufficient preparation of teachers, learners’ lack of motivation, teacher-centered methods and inadequate assessment techniques were among the major problems that led to EFL programs being unable to achieve the desired outcomes. The study suggested that teaching methods needed to be learner-centered rather than teacher-centered. Teaching of language skills should be integrated, not taught separately. Also, assessment should be utilized as a learning tool and not as a
final testing device.

Khan’s (2011) study highlighted that teachers are responsible for updating their knowledge and equipping themselves with the advancement of the society and use of technology in general and educational environment in particular. To justify their employment teachers must attend training that is regarded as essential in this fast-changing society. It is desirable for teachers to attend in-service training or professional development programs and preferable that they be research oriented. Professional development is always required for every teacher. Even if a teacher is highly educated, experienced and trained, it is important that they continue their professional development.

1.4 Research Questions

This study examines the current status of EFL teaching methods in Saudi universities and whether or not these teaching methods prepare students to be future leaders who can participate in achieving the KSA Vision 2030. The study also explores the possible challenges that might hinder achieving the kingdom’s vision. Thus, the study seeks to answer the following two main questions:

- What is the current status of teaching English as a foreign language in universities in Saudi Arabia?
- What are the challenges of English as a foreign language in KSA universities in the light of the Saudi Vision 2030?

2. Method

This study has adopted a quantitative approach which uses variables to describe what is actually happening. The variable could be a concept or property with which the researcher is involved (Cohen, Manion, Morrison, & Morrison, 2007). It is possible there may be some change in the volume or degree of the variable. A questionnaire was designed to be distributed among university students. As defined by Kumar (2011), a questionnaire is a written list of questions to be answered by the respondents. It is intended to accurately represent the participants so that results are based on the data provided. The advantages of questionnaires are that the researcher does not need to personally collect data (Wilson & Mclean, 1994) and they are easy to manage and analyze. When planning each question, the researcher must anticipate the possible responses. This process entails explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and detailing topics in the research.

2.1 Participants

The participants in the study were 247 students in the first year of the English Department at Northern Border University in Saudi Arabia. The participants were divided into 147 males and 100 females aged between 21 years and 27 years.

2.2 Sampling Procedures

A probability sampling method was implemented to select the participants for the study. This method is useful, simple and designed to relax the reader (Abu Saleh & Avaz, 1988). The sample of the study consisted of 147 males and 100 females EFL university students. The questionnaire used a systematic sampling approach and participants were provided with the questionnaire form and a pencil, allowing them to either answer all the questions or withdraw at any time.

Both names and numbers were documented on a main sheet. A number was given to each survey envelope. This number was linked to a name on the main sheet. This technique has been successfully used for other purposes where necessary. This process made it easy to ascertain those who answered the questionnaire and those who ignored it. However, to ensure confidentiality, only numbers were shown on the survey envelopes and not names. The names were withheld and only the researcher had access to them.

2.3 Data Collection

The questionnaire used in this present study contained multiple-choice questions. The participants chose answers that supplied basic personal information and were questioned on two main issues: the present status of education and ELT in Saudi Arabia, and exploring the challenges of teaching English in the light of KSA’s vision 2030. The questionnaire consisted of two main sections, the first contained six more general questions and the second section had 39 items covering very specific essential elements, for example, Content & Teaching Methods, Evaluation & Assignments and Training & Professional Development.

The questionnaire was conducted from 6 January 2018 to the 26 January 2018. Prior to this, ethics approval was required from the University. This ensured confidence was established between the researcher and the participants of the study in order to gain results that were trustworthy and conclusive (Gay et al., 2009).
of the participants was essential in regard to the questionnaires. This ensured that participants chose to participate willingly and were not under threat of being punished.

3. Results

This section presents and discusses the results of the interview. To analyze the data, the SPSS program was conducted as shown in the tables and diagrams below to process the data yield including chi-squared analyses. In the following table, the Observed N. is the number of students who answered the questions, the Expected N. is the expected number of students answering the questions which is calculated by the data analysis program, the Residual or the remaining is Observed N. minus Expected N., DF is the degree of freedom, and the Asymp. Sig. is the asymptotic significance indicating that the potential error value is approaching zero. The following are the results of the participants’ responses to the administered questionnaire.

Table 1. Did you study required and compulsory courses?

|                | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Yes            | 210        | 123.5      | 86.5     |
| No             | 37         | 123.5      | -86.5    |
| Total          | 247        |            |          |

Test statistics

|                | Did you study required and compulsory courses |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square     | 121.170                                     |
| Df             | 1                                           |
| Asymp. Sig.    | .000                                        |

Table 1 shows that 120 of the respondents in the study area had studied both the required and compulsory courses. The table indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the observed frequencies. The chi-squared test table shows a statistically significant difference with the value of 26.167, the degree of freedom is one and the asymptotic significance is less than 0.05. This means that the majority of the students had studied the required and compulsory courses.

Table 2. What is the period of time prescribed for English per week

|                | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------|
| 1Hour          | 80         | 82.3       | -2.3     |
| 5hours         | 36         | 82.3       | -46.3    |
| More than 5 hours | 131       | 82.3       | 48.7     |
| Total          | 247        |            |          |

Test statistics

|                | What is the period of time prescribed for English per week |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square     | 54.907                                                    |
| Df             | 2                                                         |
| Asymp. Sig.    | .000                                                      |

The table indicates that there is a significant difference between the observed frequency distribution and the random distribution of the results. One hundred and thirty-one of the observed samples agreed that the time they allocated to English per week is more than five hours. The table reveals that the difference is statistically significant because the value of the chi-squared is 26.167, the number of degrees of freedom is four and the asymptotic significance is less than 0.05. This means that the period of time allocated to English per week is more than 5 hours.
Table 3. How many hours of study on English are usually spend daily

|            | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| 1 Hour     | 77         | 82.3       | -5.3     |
| 2 Hours    | 150        | 82.3       | 67.7     |
| More than 3 hours | 20      | 82.3       | -62.3    |
| Total      | 247        |            |          |

Test statistics

| How many hours of study for English usually spend daily |
|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 103.150* |
| Df         | 2        |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000    |

Table 3 presents that 150 of the students spent more than three hours studying English daily. The chi-square value is 103.150, the degree of freedom is two; and the significance is .000. That means that the students in this area of study spent more than three hours studying English every day.

Table 4. English language courses are helpful in daily life

|            | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Usually    | 100        | 49.0       | 51.0     |
| Sometimes  | 41         | 49.0       | -8.0     |
| Not helpful| 6          | 49.0       | -43.0    |
| Total      | 147        |            |          |

Test statistics

| English language courses are helpful in daily life |
|---------------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 92.122    |
| Df         | 2         |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000    |

From Table 4, it is clear that 100 respondents usually benefit from English language courses in daily life with significant differences between the observed number and the expected number in the sample’s responses. The chi-squared test table shows that the difference from the random distribution is statistically significant meaning that English Language courses are helpful in daily life.

Table 5. Where do you spend most time studying English language

|            | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Home       | 102        | 82.3       | 19.7     |
| University’s library | 87      | 82.3       | 4.7      |
| Others     | 58         | 82.3       | -24.3    |
| Total      | 247        |            |          |

Test statistics

| where do you spend most time to studying English language? |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 12.154    |
| Df         | 2         |
| Asymp. Sig. | .002    |

From Table 5, above, the following information is evident. One hundred and two of the respondents spent most of their time studying English language at home. The chi-squared shows that the difference from the random distribution is statistically significant (sig less than 0.05) meaning university students in this area of study spend most of their time studying English language at home.
Table 6. Who will help you with your English

|                     | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|---------------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Self-reliance       | 149        | 61.8       | 87.3     |
| Family member       | 57         | 61.8       | -4.8     |
| Private lessons classes | 26       | 61.8       | -35.8    |
| Tutorials-educational sites on the internet | 15 | 61.8 | -46.8 |
| Total               | 247        |            |          |

Test statistics

|                     | Chi-Square | Df | Asymp. Sig. |
|---------------------|------------|----|-------------|
| who will help you with your English | 179.737* | 3  | .000        |

Table 6 presents the attitudes of the sample to studying English language. One hundred and forty-eight of the participants depended on themselves. The chi-squared test table shows that there is a statistically significant difference as the chi-squared value is 26.167, the number of degrees of freedom is four and the asymptotic significance is less than 0.05. This means that university students in this area of study depend on themselves to study the English language Course Content and teaching methods.

Table 7. Courses goals

| Questions                                      | Response  | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df | Chi-value | Sig   |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----|-----------|-------|
| Programs and activities associated with the curriculum are directly related to professional goals? | Strongly agree | 41         | 49.4       | 8.4-     | 4  | 142.291   | 0.00  |
|                                                 | Agree     | 50         | 49.4       | 6        |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Neutral   | 120        | 49.4       | 70.6     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Disagree  | 19         | 49.4       | -30.4    |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Strongly disagree | 17 | 49.4 | -32.4 |    |           |       |
| Do you have clear educational goals activities supported by homework assignments? | Strongly agree | 20         | 55         | -29.4    | 4  | 277.1905  | 0.00  |
|                                                 | Agree     | 55         | 49.4       | 5.6-     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Neutral   | 149        | 49.4       | 99.6     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Disagree  | 13         | 49.4       | 36.4     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Strongly disagree | 10 | 49.4 | -39.4 |    |           |       |
| Are the objectives of the course achieved       | Strongly agree | 115       | 61.5       | 53.5     | 4  | 59.659    | 0.00  |
|                                                 | Agree     | 67         | 61.5       | 5.5      |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Neutral   | 58         | 61.5       | 3.5-     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Disagree  | 7          | 61.5       | 54.5-    |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Strongly disagree | - | - | - |    |           |       |
| The special goals of the English courses are clearly stated | Strongly agree | 56       | 49.4       | 6.6      | 4  | 143.870   | 0.00  |
|                                                 | Agree     | 117        | 49.4       | 67.6     |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Neutral   | 38         | 49.4       | 11.4-    |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Disagree  | 32         | 49.4       | 17.4-    |    |           |       |
|                                                 | Strongly disagree | 4 | 49.4 | 45.4- |    |           |       |

Table 7 shows that most of the respondents tend to agree with the items. One hundred and fifteen in the sample strongly agree that the objectives of the course were achieved. One hundred and seventeen of them agreed that the special goals of the English courses are clearly stated. One hundred and twenty in the sample have neutral opinions as to whether programs and activities associated with the curriculum are directly related to professional goals. One hundred and forty-nine of them are neutral in regard to having clear educational goals’ activities supported by homework assignments. With a high level of statistical significance (sig less than 0.05), it appears that the goals of the program’s activities are unclear to them.
Table 8. Courses content

| Questions                                                                 | Response          | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|------|
| Does the program improve your abilities to work in different cultures?    | Strongly agree    | 24         | 49.4       | 25.4-    | 4   | 143.142   | 0.00 |
|                                                                           | Agree             | 63         | 49.4       | 12.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Neutral           | 118        | 49.4       | 68.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 23         | 49.4       | 26.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | 20         | 49.4       | 29.4-    |     |           |      |
| The program helps to develop your professional competencies in the        | Strongly agree    | 50         | 49.4       | 6        | 4   | 261.158   | 0.00 |
| field of your specification?                                              | Agree             | 147        | 49.4       | 69.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Neutral           | 27         | 49.4       | 22.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 11         | 49.4       | 38.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | 12         | 49.4       | 37.4-    |     |           |      |
| Does the curriculum increase your motivation to study English Language    | Strongly agree    | 60         | 49.4       | 10.6     | 4   | 162.534   | 0.00 |
| and foreign cultures?                                                    | Agree             | 111        | 49.4       | 61.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Neutral           | 65         | 49.4       | 15.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 2          | 49.4       | 47.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | 9          | 49.4       | 40.4-    |     |           |      |

Table 8 shows that there is a very considerable trend to agree to the items, with a considerable level of statistical significance. One hundred and forty-seven agreed that the program helped to develop their professional competencies in their specified field. One hundred and eleven agreed that the curriculum increased their motivation to study English Language and foreign cultures. One hundred and eighteen of the participants were neutral as to whether the program improved their abilities to work in different cultures.

Table 9. Materials and teaching methods

| Questions                                                                 | Response          | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|------|
| There are different teaching methods used.                                | Strongly agree    | 161        | 49.4       | 111.6    | 4   | 335.247   | 0.00 |
|                                                                           | Agree             | 37         | 49.4       | 12.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Neutral           | 37         | 49.4       | 12.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 10         | 49.4       | 39.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | 2          | 49.4       | 47.4     |     |           |      |
| Have the additional materials;                                            | Strongly agree    | 65         | 61.8       | 3.3      | 4   |           |      |
| worksheets, video and slides                                              | Agree             | 117        | 61.8       | 55.3     |     |           |      |
| helped you better understand the course?                                  | Neutral           | 56         | 61.8       | 4.8-     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 8          | 61.8       | 53.8     |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | -          | -          | -        |     |           |      |
| The teaching methods used are modern and updated                           | Strongly agree    | 25         | 49.4       | 24.4-    | 4   | 586.74    | 0.00 |
|                                                                           | Agree             | 201        | 49.4       | 151.6    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Neutral           | 10         | 49.4       | 39.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Disagree          | 5          | 49.4       | 44.4-    |     |           |      |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree | 6          | 49.4       | 43.4-    |     |           |      |

Table 9 shows that most of the respondents tend to agree with the items. One hundred and sixty-one of the sample strongly agreed that different teaching methods were used. One hundred and seventeen agreed that they had additional materials, worksheets, videos and slides, which helped them better understand the course. One hundred and twenty of the sample agreed that the teaching methods used were modern and updated with a high level of statistical significance (sig less than 0.05).
Table 10. Shows the teaching process

| Questions                                                                 | Response            | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| English courses are suitable for undergraduate level                      | Strongly agree      | 114        | 49.4       | 64.6     | 4   | 161.401   | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 59         | 49.4       | 9.6      |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 60         | 49.4       | 10.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 7          | 49.4       | 42.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 7          | 49.4       | 42.4-    |     |           |     |
| Is the time allotted for English Language lectures in the College          | Strongly agree      | 39         | 49.4       | 10.4-    | 4   | 266.826   | 0.00|
| enough                                                                    | Agree               | 150        | 49.4       | 10.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 23         | 49.4       | 26.4     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 25         | 49.4       | 21.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 7          | 49.4       | 24.4-    |     |           |     |
| Are you able to receive some lessons whenever and however you want        | Strongly agree      | 56         | 49.4       | 6.6      | 4   | 175.166   | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 63         | 49.4       | 13.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 6          | 49.4       | -43.4    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 117        | 49.4       | 67.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 5          | 49.4       | 44.4-    |     |           |     |
| Curriculum gives you the means and motivation to continue learning        | Strongly agree      | 40         | 49.4       | -9.4     | 4   | 143.020   | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 123        | 49.4       | 73.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 32         | 49.4       | -17.4    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 35         | 49.4       | 14.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 17         | 49.4       | 32.4-    |     |           |     |

The above Table 10 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the observed frequency distribution and the random distribution of the results. One hundred and fourteen of the observed sample strongly agreed that the English courses were suitable for undergraduate level. Also, 150 agreed that the time allotted for English Language lectures in the college was sufficient. One hundred and twenty-three agreed that curriculum gave them the means and motivation to continue learning but 117 did not agree as to receiving some lessons whenever and however they wished. The chi-squared test table shows that the difference is statistically significant because the asymptotic significance of .000 is less than 0.05.

Table 11. Evaluation

| Questions                                                                 | Response            | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| Is the assessment criteria clearly stated at the beginning of your study  | Strongly agree      | 111        | 49.4       | 61.6     | 4   | 272.628   | 0.00|
| of your course                                                            | Agree               | 115        | 49.4       | 65.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 10         | 49.4       | 39.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 8          | 49.4       | 41.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 3          | 49.4       | 46.4-    |     |           |     |
| Do you get feedback of assessment within appropriate time periods          | Strongly agree      | 36.        | 49.4       | 13.4-    | 4   | 121.198   | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 116        | 49.4       | 66.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 16         | 49.4       | 33.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 34         | 49.4       | 15.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 45         | 49.4       | 4.4-     |     |           |     |
| Is self-evaluation allowed                                                 | Strongly agree      | 29         | 49.4       | 20.4-    | 4   | 275       | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 17         | 49.4       | 32.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 31         | 49.4       | 18.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 153        | 49.4       | 103.6    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 17         | 49.4       | 32.4-    |     |           |     |
| If you are given an assignment; are you given enough time to submit it?    | Strongly agree      | 113        | 49.4       | 63.6     | 4   | 161.563   | 0.00|
|                                                                            | Agree               | 59         | 49.4       | 9.6      |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Neutral             | 62         | 49.4       | 12.6     |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Disagree            | 5          | 49.4       | 44.4-    |     |           |     |
|                                                                            | Strongly disagree   | 8          | 49.4       | 41.4     |     |           |     |

Table 11 shows that most of the respondents’ responses tended to agree with the items. One hundred and fifteen of the sample agreed that the assessment criteria were clearly stated at the beginning of their study of the course. One hundred and sixteen agreed that they received feedback on their assessment within appropriate time periods.
Additionally, 113 of the sample strongly agreed that when they were given an assignment they had sufficient time to submit it. However, 153 disagreed that self-evaluation was allowed with a high level of statistical significance (sig less than 0.05).

Table 12. Assignment

| Questions                                                                 | Response         | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df    | Chi-value | Sig    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|----------|-------|-----------|--------|
| The required references are available for assigned assignments at the University Library | Strongly agree   | 59         | 49.4       | 9.6      | 4     | 203.466   | 0.00   |
|                                                                           | Agree            | 133        | 49.4       | 83.6     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Neutral          | 25         | 49.4       | 24.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Disagree         | 13         | 49.4       | 36.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree| 17         | 49.4       | 32.4     |       |           |        |
| Were there any instructions from the lecturer                             | Strongly agree   | 155        | 49.4       | 105.6    | 4     | 203.304   | 0.00   |
|                                                                           | Agree            | 50         | 49.4       | 6        |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Neutral          | 20         | 49.4       | 29.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Disagree         | 14         | 49.4       | 35.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree| 8          | 49.4       | 41.4     |       |           |        |
| The lecturer’s comments were useful and detailed                          | Strongly agree   | 114        | 49.4       | 64.6     | 4     | 120.146   | 0.00   |
|                                                                           | Agree            | 54         | 49.4       | 4.6      |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Neutral          | 35         | 49.4       | 14.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Disagree         | 26         | 49.4       | 23.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree| 8          | 49.4       | 31.4     |       |           |        |
| You have been given an opportunity to improve and re-submit the work      | Strongly agree   | 51         | 49.4       | 1.6      | 4     | 134.316   | 0.00   |
|                                                                           | Agree            | 19         | 49.4       | 30.4     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Neutral          | 113        | 49.4       | 63.6     |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Disagree         | 55         | 49.4       | 5.6      |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree| 9          | 49.4       | 40.4     |       |           |        |
| Did this assignment help you better understand the subject matter of the study | Strongly agree   | 119        | 61.8       | 57.3     | 3     | 109.194   | 0.00   |
|                                                                           | Agree            | 65         | 61.8       | 3.3      |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Neutral          | -          | -          | -        |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Disagree         | 60         | 61.8       | 1.8      |       |           |        |
|                                                                           | Strongly disagree| 3          | 61.8       | 58.8     |       |           |        |

Table 12 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the observed frequency distribution and the random distribution of the results. One hundred and thirty-three of the observed samples agreed that the required references are available for assigned assignments at the University Library. Also, 155 of them strongly agreed that there are instructions from the lecturer. One hundred and fourteen strongly agreed that the lecturer’s comments were useful and detailed. One hundred and nineteen strongly agreed that assignment help them better understand the subject matter of the study. However, 117 gave neutral opinions that they have been given an opportunity to improve and re-submit the work. The chi-squared test table shows that the difference is statistically significant because the asymptotic significance of .000 is less than 0.05.
Table 13. Lecturer performance

| Questions                                           | Response       | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|------|
| Is the lecturer committed to the curriculum and the course? | Strongly agree | 118        | 49.4       | 68.6     | 4   | 183.749   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 61         | 49.4       | 11.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 60         | 49.4       | 10.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 5          | 49.4       | 44.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 3     | 49.4       | 46.4     |     |           |      |
| Has the lecturer encouraged you to participate in discussions to help you develop your knowledge and abilities | Strongly agree | 114        | 49.4       | 64.6     | 4   | 172.575   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 63         | 49.4       | 13.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 61         | 49.4       | 11.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 4          | 49.4       | 45.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 5    | 49.4       | 44.4     |     |           |      |
| The lecturer accepts different opinions and views   | Strongly agree | 52         | 49.4       | 1.4      | 4   | 276.111   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 152        | 49.4       | 101.4    |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 23         | 49.4       | 27.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 20         | 49.4       | 30.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 6    | 49.4       | 44.6     |     |           |      |
| Is the lecturer obliged to work hours               | Strongly agree | 169        | 49.4       | 119.6    | 4   | 364.802   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 25         | 49.4       | 24.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 19         | 49.4       | 30.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 24         | 49.4       | 25.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 10  | 49.4       | 39.4     |     |           |      |

Table 13 shows that most of the responses tend to agree with the items. One hundred and eighteen strongly agreed that the lecturer was committed to the curriculum and the course. One hundred and fourteen strongly agreed that the lecturer encouraged them to participate in discussions to help them develop their knowledge and abilities. Also, 152 of the sample agreed that the lecturer accepted different opinions and views, and 169 strongly agreed that the lecturer was obliged to work hours with a high level of statistical significance (sig less than 0.05). not sure of your meaning here. Do you mean teachers worked the hours they were supposed to?

Table 14. The lecturer’s contributions to developing educational process

| Questions                                           | Response       | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | df  | Chi-value | Sig  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|----------|-----|-----------|------|
| Does the lecturer use the available materials and resources, including books, to effectively support the teaching process | Strongly agree | 110        | 49.4       | 60.6     | 4   | 115.895   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 61         | 49.4       | 11.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 35         | 49.4       | 14.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 61         | 49.4       | 11.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 25  | 49.4       | 24.4     |     |           |      |
| Have you had the opportunity to give feedback to the lecturers about the program, course or teaching methods | Strongly agree | 9          | 49.4       | 40.4     | 4   | 157.271   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 6          | 49.4       | 43.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | 61         | 49.4       | 11.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 113        | 49.4       | 63.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 58  | 49.4       | 8.6      |     |           |      |
| Do you receive appropriate academic support for the course | Strongly agree | 57         | 49.4       | 7.4      | 4   | 178.048   | 0.00 |
|                                                     | Agree          | 11         | 49.4       | 38.6     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Neutral        | -          | -          | -        |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Disagree       | 119        | 49.4       | 69.4     |     |           |      |
|                                                     | Strongly disagree | 60  | 49.4       | 10.4     |     |           |      |

Table 14 shows that the differences between the observed and expected results of the sample are significant. One hundred and ten of the respondents agreed that the lecturer used the available materials and resources, including books, to effectively support the teaching process. One hundred and thirteen disagreed that they had the opportunity to give feedback to the lecturers about the program, course or teaching methods. One hundred and nineteen disagreed that they received appropriate academic support for the course. The chi-squared test table shows that the difference is statistically significant as the asymptotic significance is approaching zero.
Table 15. Training and professional development

| Questions                                      | Response     | Observed | Expected N | Residual | df | Chi-value | Sig |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|----------|----|-----------|-----|
| Have you received practical training during the study | Strongly agree | 149      | 49.4       | 99.6     | 4  | 235.004   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 80       | 49.4       | 30.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 10       | 49.4       | 39.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 7        | 49.4       | 42.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 1   | 49.4       | 48.4     |    |           |     |
| Were modern and effective training methods used for practical training | Strongly agree | 60       | 49.4       | 10.6     | 4  | 129.093   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 115      | 49.4       | 65.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 25       | 49.4       | 24.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 27       | 49.4       | 22.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 20  | 49.4       | 29.4     |    |           |     |
| Is the duration of activities and training adequate for professional practice after graduation | Strongly agree | 57       | 49.4       | 7.6      | 4  | 155.328   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 59       | 49.4       | 9.6      |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 114      | 49.4       | 64.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 10       | 49.4       | 39.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 7   | 49.4       | 32.4     |    |           |     |
| Are the practical activities and training done in school and classrooms | Strongly agree | 124      | 61.8       | 62.3     | 3  | 115.445   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 62       | 61.8       | 3        |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 56       | 61.8       | 5.8      |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 5        | 61.8       | 56.8     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | -  | -         | -        |    |           |     |

Table 15 displays the differences between the observed and expected results for the sample distribution. One hundred and forty-nine of the respondents strongly agreed that they received practical training during the study. One hundred and fifteen agreed that there were modern and effective training methods used for practical training and 154 agreed that the practical activities and training took place in school and classrooms. However, 114 of the sample were neutral as to whether the duration of activities and training was adequate for professional practice after graduation. The chi-squared test table shows that the differences are statistically significant because of the asymptotic significance level of 0.00.

Table 16. The ability to Evaluate the contents of the English language and the requirements of the job market

| Questions                                      | Response     | Observed | Expected N | Residual | df | Chi-value | Sig |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|----------|----|-----------|-----|
| Have you been given follow up and evaluations of your performance during the training period | Strongly agree | 64       | 49.4       | 14.6     | 4  | 156.583   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 40       | 49.4       | 14.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 14       | 49.4       | 9.4      |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 114      | 49.4       | 68.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 11  | 49.4       | 38.4     |    |           |     |
| Did the training achieve the desired objectives | Strongly agree | 114      | 49.4       | 67.6     | 4  | 168.44    | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 64       | 49.4       | 14.6     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 51       | 49.4       | 1.6      |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 4        | 49.4       | 45.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 11  | 49.4       | 38.4     |    |           |     |
| Can you evaluate the contents of the English language course and how appropriate it is for you and the requirements of the job market after graduation | Strongly agree | 142      | 49.4       | 92.6     | 4  | 237.919   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 51       | 49.4       | 1.6      |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 30       | 49.4       | 19.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | 11       | 49.4       | 38.4     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | 13  | 49.4       | 36.4     |    |           |     |
| Do you think English language materials provide you with the basic skills for the job market after graduation | Strongly agree | 203      | 82.3       | 120.7    | 2  | 265.368   | 0.00|
|                                                | Agree        | 24       | 82.3       | 58.3     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Neutral      | 20       | 82.3       | 62.3     |    |           |     |
|                                                | Disagree     | -        | -          | -        |    |           |     |
|                                                | Strongly disagree | -  | -         | -        |    |           |     |

Table 16 shows that the majority of the responses tended to agree with the items. One hundred and fourteen of the sample strongly agreed that their training achieved the desired objectives. One hundred and forty-two strongly agreed that they could evaluate the contents of the English language course and the appropriateness of
the training for them and the requirements of the job market after graduation. Also, 203 of the sample strongly agreed that they thought the English language materials provided them with basic skills for the job market after graduation, with a high level of statistical significance (sig less than 0.05).

4. Conclusion

From the above results, the study produced the following concluding points:

- Most of the university students in the area of the study had studied required and compulsory courses.
- Most of the students in area of study spent two hours daily studying English language at home.

With regard to the content of the curriculum and methods of teaching, the research concluded:

- Activities and programs associated with the curriculum did not have clear educational objectives supported by assignments and homework, which reflected the performance of the respondents.
- University students in the study area were unable to receive some lessons whenever and however they wanted.
- The curriculum gave students the motivation to continue learning and to study English and foreign cultures.
- The program improved the capacity of respondents to work in different environmental cultures.
- The program helped to develop professional competencies in certain fields.
- Teaching methods used in teaching English in universities in the study area were varied, modern and up-to-date. Additional materials used (worksheets, video, slides, etc.) aided understanding.
- English language courses were suitable for university level and had clear objectives that had been adequately achieved.
- The time allocated for English language courses at the University was appropriate.

In the field of evaluation and assignments, the respondents stressed the following:

- The evaluation criteria were clarified at the beginning of the course study.
- Students received the results of assessments within appropriate time periods.
- University students in the study area were not allowed to self-assess.
- The respondents believed that assignments helped to better understand the subject of the study and the research material required for assignments was available at the university library. However, when the assignment was given, there was no guidance from the lecturer nor was there sufficient time provided to submit the assignment.
- University students in the study area were given an opportunity to improve and re-submit the work.
- The lecturer was committed to the curriculum and the decision and the comments of the lecturer were useful and detailed and encouraged the lecturer to participate in the discussions in a manner that helped to develop students’ knowledge and ability.
- Most of the respondents believe that the lecturer was committed to working hours as the lecturer accepted different points of view.
- Universities in the study area considered that lecturers integrated the theoretical side with the applied side in the courses.
- University students in the study area received appropriate academic support for the course.
- Respondents confirmed that the lecturer used the materials and resources available, including books, to effectively support the teaching process.
- Most university students in the study area did not have the opportunity to give feedback to the lecturers about the program, course or teaching methods.
- Most of the university students in the study area received practical training during the study.
- Respondents emphasized that the training methods used were modern and effective for practical training.
- Respondents confirmed that activities and training were conducted on the ground inside the schools and educational halls.
- The respondents’ performance was monitored during the training period.
- The respondents agreed that the training achieved the desired goals.
- University students in the study area considered that activities and training were sufficient for professional
practice after graduation.
- Students can evaluate the content of the English language and its suitability for them and the requirements of the labor market after graduation.

Respondents believed that English subjects provided them with the basic skills of the labor market after graduation.

In light of the results of the study, the recommendations are:
- There is a need to develop the performance of the university professors and their use of technology in the teaching of English.
- There is a need to encourage the employment of modern teaching methods to teach English in universities to attract the attention of students and motivate them to learn English.

Educational software and websites should be used to guide and obtain scientific material and assignments.
- Development of the English language curriculum in universities need to contain topics that keep up with the times and advanced methods.

References
Abdulaziz, M. b. S. (2019, March). *Our vision: Saudi Arabia. The heart of the Arab and Islamic worlds*. Retrieved from https://vision2030.gov.sa/en/foreword

Abu Saleh, M. S., & Avaz, A. M. (1985). *Introduction to statistics*. Irbid, Jordan: AYarmouk University.

Al Mukhallafi, T. R. (2019). *Attitudes and Usage of MALL Among Saudi University EFL Students*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 407–420. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p407

Al-Arabai, F. (2016). *Facts Underlying Low Achievers of Saudi EFL Learners*. http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n3p21

Al-Nasser, A. S. (2015). Problems of English language acquisition in Saudi Arabia: An exploratory-cum-remedial study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1612–1619. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpsls.0508.10

Al-Seghayer, K. (2015). *Salient Key Features of Actual English Instructional Practices in Saudi Arabia*. *English Language Teaching*, 8(6), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p89

Alshammari, A. K. (2016). *Developing the English curriculum in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Possibilities and challenges*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2847465

Al-Sulaimi A. (2016). The first international conference on English language concludes its sessions in Jeddah. *Sabq Electronic Journal*.

Al-Zahrani, N. O. A., & Rajab, H. (2017). *Attitudes and Perceptions of Saudi EFL Teachers in Implementing Kingdom of Saudi Arabia’s Vision 2030*. *World*, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.5296/ijeje.v5i1.10733

Aremu, A. O., & Sokan, B. O. (2003). *A multi-causal evaluation of academic performance of Nigerian learners: Issues and implications for national development*. Department of Guidance and counseling, University of Ibadan.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K., & Morrison, R. B. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Fageeh, A. I. (2011). *EFL learners’ use of blogging for developing writing skills and enhancing attitudes towards English learning: An exploratory study*. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 2(1), 31–48.

Fareh, S. (2010). Challenges of teaching English in the Arab world: Why can’t EFL programs deliver as expected? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3600–3604. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.559

Fatani, S. A. (2016). *Reflections: 10 Challenges to address in order to improve the teaching of English to fulfill the 2030 Vision*.

Graddol, D. (2006). *Why global English may mean the end of English as a foreign language*. The British council. http://www.researchgate.net

Khan, I. A. (2011). Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Research*, 2(7), 1248–1257.

Khan, I. A. (2011a). An analysis of learning barriers: The Saudi Arabia Context. *International Studies*, 4(1), 242.
Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Sage.

Mitchell, B., & Alfuraih, A. (2017). English language teaching in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Past, present and beyond. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(2), 317. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2017.v8n2p317

Ur Rahman, M. M., & Alhaisoni, E. (2013). Teaching English in Saudi Arabia: prospects and challenges. *Academic Research International, 4*(1), 112.

Wilson, G. R., McLean, N. R., Chippindale, A., Campbell, R. S. D., Soames, J. V., & Reed, M. F. (1994). The role of MRI scanning in the diagnosis of cervical lymphadenopathy. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery, 47*(3), 175–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-1226(94)90050-7

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).