

Assessing English Language Knowledge of the Scholarship Students in the Scientific Colleges and the Preparatory Year at the Islamic University of Madinah.

Abdullah Abdul Mohsen Al-Harbi
Islamic University / Madinah

استلام البحث: ٢٠٢٠/٢/١٥ قبول النشر: ٢٠٢٠/٤/٥ تاريخ النشر: ٢٠٢٠/٧/١

Abstract

This research aimed to identify the level of English language knowledge among the students of scientific colleges and the preparatory year (scholarship students) at the Islamic University of Madinah. The research was limited to identifying students at the meanings of vocabulary and grammar of the English language. The researcher used a descriptive approach to achieve study goals. It applied three tools to collect information from the targeted sample; first, a test for determining the level of students in the achievement of vocabulary which applied to (69) students. Second, a test to determine the level of students in the English language grammar, (73) students took part. Third, a survey to get students' opinions about the program of teaching English in the Islamic University. (145) students responded to this. The results of the research revealed that the average score for students of academic colleges in achieving English vocabulary is (57.65%). The results also showed that

there are statistically significant differences in students 'achievement of English language vocabulary due to the college in which the student is studying (Sig. = .000). There are also statistically significant differences in students 'achievement of English vocabulary due to students' nationality (Sig. = 003, Saudi (M) = 42.25, non-Saudi (M) = 84.76). The research also revealed that the average score for students of academic colleges in achieving English grammar is (52.32%), which is less than vocabulary achievement. It was also found that there were statistically significant differences in students 'achievement of English grammar due to the nationality of students (Sig. = .012 Saudi (M) = 42.77, non-Saudi (M) = 67.67). The researcher surveyed (145) students about the English language-learning program offered at the scientific colleges of the Islamic City University. The results of the survey indicated that students are generally satisfied with the program, courses, and materials. it contains are satisfactory to students as well. The researcher recommended more study of English language knowledge for students of the scientific colleges in the Islamic University, considering the student's academic level within the college.

Keywords: Assessment; English, Islamic University, Language Knowledge, Scholarship students

نقيح المعرفة اللغوية الإنجليزية لطلاب المنح الدراسية في الكليات العلمية والسنة التحضيرية في الجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة.

عبد الله عبد المحسن الحربي / الجامعة الإسلامية / بالمدينة المنورة

ملخص البحث

هدف هذا البحث إلى التعرف على مستوى المعرفة اللغوية الإنجليزية لدى طلاب الكليات العلمية والسنة التحضيرية (طلاب المنح الدراسية) في الجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة. واقتصر البحث على التعرف على مستوى الطلاب في معاني المفردات وقواعد اللغة الإنجليزية. استخدم البحث المنهج الوصفي لتحقيق أهدافه، وطبق البحث ثلاث أدوات لجمع المعلومات من المستهدفين: اختبار تحديد مستوى الطلاب في تحصيل المفردات وطبق على (٦٩) طالباً، واختبار تحديد مستوى الطلاب في قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية الذي شارك به (٧٣) طالباً، واستطلاع للتعرف على رأي الطلاب حول برنامج تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعة الإسلامية واستجاب له (١٤٥) طالباً. كشفت نتائج البحث أن متوسط درجات طلاب الكليات العلمية في تحصيل مفردات اللغة الإنجليزية هو (٥٧.٦٥٪). كما أظهرت النتائج أن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في تحصيل الطلاب لمفردات اللغة الإنجليزية يعزى للكلية التي يدرس فيها الطالب (الدلالة = ٠.٠٠٠). و أن هناك أيضاً فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في تحصيل الطلاب لمفردات اللغة الإنجليزية يعزى لجنسية الطلاب (الدلالة = ٠.٠٠٣، سعودي (المتوسط) = ٤٢.٢٥ ، غير سعودي (المتوسط) = ٨٤.٧٦). كما كشف البحث أن متوسط درجات طلاب الكليات العلمية في تحصيل قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية هو (٥٢.٣٢ ٪) وهو أقل من تحصيل المفردات. ووجد أيضاً أن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في تحصيل الطلاب لقواعد اللغة الإنجليزية تعزى لجنسية الطلاب (الدلالة = ٠.٠١٢، سعودي (المتوسط) = ٤٢.٧٧ ، غير سعودي (المتوسط) = ٦٧.٦٧). وأجرى البحث مسحاً لعدد ١٤٥ طالباً حول برنامج تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية المقدم في الكليات العلمية بجامعة المدينة الإسلامية. أشارت نتائج الاستطلاع إلى أن الطلاب راضون بشكل عام عن البرنامج، والمقررات والمواد التي يحتوي عليها مرضية للطلاب أيضاً. وأوصى البحث بمزيد من الدراسة للمعرفة اللغوية الإنجليزية لطلاب الكليات العلمية بالجامعة الإسلامية تأخذ في إعتبارها مستوى الطالب الدراسي داخل الكلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التقييم، اللغة الإنجليزية، الجامعة الإسلامية، المعرفة اللغوية، طلاب المنح.

Introduction:

The digital era and its characteristics, such as instant connectivity, virtual engagement, and community building (McLoughlin & Lee, 2008), are ensuring the need to improve the essential tool for communication, language. The English language is one of the most languages that spread all over the world. It is an excellent tool to communicate with other people in other countries. So, working hard to elevate the level of the outcomes of English learning programs is demand. This demand can be obtained by helping the student to attain adequate language knowledge in education.

There are broader discussions of the knowledge base for language education (Trojan, Sambainte & King, 2019) and the need for a systematic, principled, and robust theory of language to underpin contextualized world language teaching and learning. According to Mulumba (2016), The knowledgebase in language education is categorized under four dimensions and include; classroom/lecture activities, language teaching laboratory activities, the internship of language student teachers or school practice, and the language teaching resource center and library activities.

Although the grammar is the central area in the foreign or second language acquisition (Pignot-Shahov, 2012), Vocabulary is also a significant factor in teaching and learning language. Vocabulary knowledge is "indispensable to acquire grammar." Language knowledge consists of two main components: vocabulary and grammar. Wen (2014) mentioned that "vocabulary knowledge is a reliable predictor of learners' proficiency in a second or foreign language." For example, even if we knew all the grammatical rules of English, we would never be able to use them without a knowledge of words. Olmos (2009) stated that "measures of vocabulary size –particularly the size of academic vocabulary– are important indicators of the ability of second language learners to achieve academic success."

The Islamic University of Madinah sought and still seeks to improve the level of its students in English language acquisition, where it took advantage of the experiences of some local universities in establishing a program to teach their students the English language in the scientific colleges. Now, after several years have passed since the

founding of this program, the Islamic University sees itself as an urgent need to evaluate its work and know its reality, its advantages, and disadvantages, in order to define a new starting point for marching for the better.

The current research attempts to identify the reality of the level of students of scientific colleges in the English language, in line with the vision of the Islamic University first towards opening up to the world by teaching students an international language like the English language, and secondly, its vision towards adopting quality standards through evaluation research of programs and their outputs. The hope is that this research will contribute to opening a window of development windows that the university seeks in all its colleges and programs and that development will be reflected in the university's outputs from students.

Research statement and questions:

The main question of the research is:

–What is the real level of English language knowledge among the scholarship students of scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah?

The research derived the following questions from the above question:

1. What is the real level of acquiring vocabulary among the scholarship students of scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah?
2. What is the actual level of grammar among the scholarship students of scientific colleges at the Islamic University of Madinah?
3. Are there any statistically significant differences in English language knowledge among scholarship students due to the college to which they belong?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in English language knowledge among scholarship students due to the students' nationality?
5. What are the impressions of students of scientific colleges at the Islamic University of Madinah on the English language program they are studying?

Research items:

English language knowledge: the knowledge that the learners have about English vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension.

Scholarship Students are the non-Saudi students who obtained seats to study in the institutions of higher education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Preparatory year: A study system in which students must complete all courses in one academic year (two semesters + an exceptional summer semester) at a rate of not less than 3.00 from 5.00. The student's grades shall be included in the first-year courses in his academic record in the university.

Limitations of the research:

- This research was applied during the second term in the 2018/2019 academic year.
- The targets of the research were the scholarship and Saudi students who complete the English intensive program in the preparatory year and scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah.
- The research investigated the level of scholarship and Saudi students in English vocabulary and grammar.
- This research investigated scholarship and Saudi students' opinions on the program they learned English from the Islamic University of Madinah.

The objectives of the research:

This research aimed to:

1. assess the English language knowledge among scholarship students of the scientific colleges and preparatory year at the Islamic University of Madinah.
2. Assess the English lexical knowledge among scholarship students of the scientific colleges and preparatory year at the Islamic University of Madinah.
3. Assess the knowledge of English grammar among scholarship students of the scientific colleges and preparatory year at the Islamic University of Madinah.
4. Stand at the level of the English language teaching program in the scientific colleges of the Islamic University.

The Importance of the research:

Since assessment is a useful tool for determining the students' progress, the current research may clarify the real situation about the level in the English language among scholarship students of the scientific colleges and preparatory year at the Islamic University of Madinah. This clarification may contribute to developing teaching English methods in the scientific colleges of an Islamic university. Improving the English language is one of the priorities in the vision of Islamic universities, especially in scientific colleges, to raise the scientific level of the scholarship students to have the university the desired position among the universities of the world.

Literature review:**Language deficiency:**

Researchers (Moll, 1999) suggested a language deficiency analysis for university students by comparing their target level with their actual level to help in the selection of the content to be taught. It also suggested using standardized tests to assess students' linguistic competence, their language knowledge in university EFL classes. A study conducted by (Lin, 2014) ensured that assessment is an important issue. It proposed some strategies that can be adapted to assessing learners' progress in the English language. The study of (Olmos, 2009) clarified that "Several research studies have proven a direct relationship between the number of words known by a foreign language student and his language proficiency." It indicated that the number of words acquainted by the learners could help in predicting their general ability in the foreign language. Another study conducted by (Al Khanji, 1999) that aimed at assessing the knowledge of the English language among Jordanian university students who were studying in the English department. The findings of the study indicated that the learners of English are incompetent in both their perception and production of English language knowledge. Almi (2017) conducted a study that aimed at evaluating EFL Students' lexical knowledge in the master stage. It compared learners' receptive and productive written word knowledge as two prominent dimensions of a person's vocabulary knowledge recognized in many

lexical types of research. The result of the study revealed an imperfect mastery of the participants' abilities to use words productively in diverse contexts. Clark–Gareca (2013) conducted a study that aimed at contributing to further the understanding of how English Language Learners' content knowledge is assessed and evaluated in elementary classrooms. The results of this study indicated that the decisions based on the classroom test scores, if they are interpreted as an accurate measure of student content knowledge will be misguided. It proposed to try other ways than classroom test scores in assessing the English language knowledge among students. A study conducted by (Qian, 1998) and aimed at exploring the relationships among vocabulary size, depth of vocabulary knowledge, and reading comprehension in English as a second language (ESL). The findings of the study indicated that: (a). scores on vocabulary size, depth of vocabulary knowledge, and reading comprehension were positively, and firmly, related; (b).depth of vocabulary knowledge made a unique contribution to the prediction of reading comprehension scores, over and above the prediction afforded by vocabulary size; (c).depth of vocabulary knowledge played a fundamental role in these ESL learners' reading comprehension processes. The results of this research also point to the importance and necessity of improving the depth of learners' vocabulary knowledge in their ESL learning. Pappamihel & Mihai (2006) conducted a study that aimed at highlighting ways in which middle school content area teachers can more effectively assess ELLs in their classrooms. The study suggested encouraging content area teachers to use multiple assessment points when working with ELLs. It also recommended that teachers use not only formal tests but also informal assessments such as running records and journals to assess the content mastery of their ELLs. A study conducted by (Tang& Treffers–Daller, 2016) and aimed at investigating the effects of different tasks on incidental vocabulary acquisition. It was an experimental study conducted on Chinese students in a secondary vocational school. The results showed that the students learned more words in reading tasks with a higher involvement load than in tasks with a lower involvement load. The study

recommended that future research should address the effects of involvement load on the learning of other aspects of vocabulary knowledge. Another study conducted in Bahrain by Hayes and Mansour (2017), it aimed to examine English language proficiency and knowledge of science students from Bahraini public schools. The results of the study revealed that despite the lack of adequate linguistic attributes, the students are still able to learn science in the context of language change successfully.

Vocabulary size:

According to Adolphs and Schmitt (2003), learners need 2000–3000 of the most frequent English word families to be able to take part in everyday conversations, while they need 5000–word families to begin to read authentic texts (Schmitt, 2007). This research assesses students on the basis that the vocabulary size is 3,000 words. Another study conducted by Alsager and Milton (2016) suggested that a vocabulary knowledge threshold of 5000 and above is necessary for L2 learners to undertake international education. A study conducted by Tan & Goh (2017) to investigate the level of Malaysian Tertiary Students, indicated that the mean vocabulary size of the students in the study was 6484.91. Schmitt and Schmitt (2014) ensured that the high–frequency vocabulary of English has traditionally been thought to consist of the 2,000 most frequent word families, and low–frequency vocabulary as that beyond the 10,000–frequency level. They argued that these boundaries should be reassessed on pedagogic grounds. A study conducted in Spain by Alonso, Garcia & La Rioja (2014) revealed that the target students' productive vocabulary size is below 1,000 words.

The methodology of the research

The methodology of the study was descriptive. "descriptive research primarily concentrates on describing the nature of a demographic segment, without focusing on "why" a specific phenomenon occurs."

The community of the research:

They are all registered students in the preparatory year and scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah during the academic year 2018/2019.

Table 1: the number of students in PYP and scientific colleges.

No.	College	Saudi	Non- Saudi	Total
1	Engineering	65	134	199
2	IT	54	97	151
3	PYP	108	92	200
4	Sciences	99	46	145
Total	4	326	369	695

Sample of the research:

A random sample of the students was chosen from all scientific colleges and the preparatory year like the following:

a. Vocabulary test sample:

Here are the students who answered the vocabulary test from scientific colleges and preparatory year (PYP).

Table 2: vocabulary test sample

	Frequenc		
college	y	Percent	Cumulative Percent
PYP	19	27.5	27.5
Engineering	22	31.9	59.4
Sciences	14	20.3	79.7
IT	14	20.3	100.0
Total	69	100.0	

a. Grammar Test sample:

The following table showed the number of students who answered the grammar test:

Table 3: grammar test sample

College	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
			Percent
PYP	30	41.1	41.1
Engineering	23	31.5	72.6
Sciences	10	13.7	86.3
IT	10	13.7	100.0
Total	73	100.0	

b. Survey sample:

The following table showed the number of students who responded to the research survey about the English language program presented at the scientific colleges and PYP:

Table 4: the survey sample

College	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
			Percent
PYP	80	55.2	55.2
Science College	26	17.9	73.1
Engineering College	27	18.6	91.7
IT	12	8.3	100.0
Total	145	100.0	

The instruments of the research:

The tools of this research were as the following:

1. Achievement test: on English vocabulary and grammar

c. Vocabulary Level Test (VLT):

"The Vocabulary Levels Tests have been widely used to delimit the vocabulary size of students of very different levels" (Olmos, 2009, 82). This research utilized a ready Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) that measures the gained vocabulary by the learners. The amount of the gained vocabulary estimated according to this test is 3000 words. The (VLT) test was taken from:

<https://www.lexutor.ca/>. Students were allowed 60 minutes to complete the 3000 words test. It was calculated that a minute per item was enough to perform the task in addition to the two variables about (College) and (Nationality). However, it is notable that most students finished the test before this time ended.

d. Grammar Test:

It consisted of 20 questions. Students were allowed 25 minutes to complete the grammar test. The questions of this test were derived from the following link:

<https://www.tefl.net/quizzes/>

1. A survey designed to provide reliable data on students' opinions on the program they learned English in. The survey consisted of 16 items with a five-scale response. The reliability of the survey by The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients measurement. The reliability was acceptable (89.5) to

Table 5. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients of the survey on the English Program

The English program survey scale	Items	Alpha
Overall Satisfaction of the English Program	(1,2, 3 ,4, 5, 6, 7, 8)	91.8
Courses and materials in the English Program	(9,10, 11 ,12, 13, 14, 15, 16)	73.5
Total	1-16	89.5

Discussion of the results:

The research depended on some statistical styles, with the help of (SPSS) program including percentages, frequencies, means, and standard deviations to answer the questions of the research as the following:

Q1: What is the real level of acquiring vocabulary among the scholarship students of scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah?

Table 6: the results of vocabulary level test (VLT)

College	N	Percent	Mean	SD	Ranking of the colleges
PYP	19	27.5	26.6842	21.84555	4
Engineering	22	31.9	70.5000	20.20549	2
Sciences	14	20.3	46.7857	31.48670	3
IT	14	20.3	90.3571	8.67008	1
Total	69	100.0	57.6522	31.97187	

Table 6 shows the mean of the students' scores in the vocabulary test. The total estimated mark for this test was 100 marks. As the table showed us, the results of the students according to their colleges, had overwhelming differences in the level of students in English vocabulary acquisition. The best result in the vocabulary achievement test came from the students of IT college (N= 14, M=90.3, SD= 8.67). The second college in the level of vocabulary achievement test was the Engineering college (N=22, M=70.5, SD= 20.2). The third college was the college of sciences (N= 14, M= 46.78, SD= 31.48). The last in achievement ranking among scientific colleges was PYP (N= 19, M= 26.68, SD= 21.84). The complete vocabulary level result of all students in all scientific colleges in the Islamic University of Madinah, was N= 69, M= 57.65, SD= 31.97. This total result was less than expected and Less than what the Islamic University aspires to obtain high-quality educational outputs, especially if we know that the percentage (57.65%) means that students of scientific colleges possess only (1710) of the meanings of the English language words. The success percentage of (VLT) that the research applied is (%76). This indicated the real level of the students

in English vocabulary. It also indicated that only IT college students who passed the vocabulary test success degree (% 90.35). The result of PYP students in (VLT) was disappointing, 26.68, which means that they have only (1126) of English words. To answer the third question of the research,

Q 3: Are there any statistically significant differences in English language knowledge among scholarship students due to the college to which they belong?

The research used the ANOVA one-way test to get the right answer.

The research used the ANOVA one-way test to get the right answer.

Table 7: Sig. of differences according to college

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	38480.475	3	12826.825	26.870	.000
Within Groups	31029.177	65	477.372		
Total	69509.652	68			

Table 7 showed that there are statistically significant differences in English language knowledge among scholarship students due to the college to which they belong (sig.= .000).

Also, in order to answer the question of the research,

Q 4: Are there statistically significant differences in English language knowledge among scholarship students due to the students' nationality?

we must look at Tables (8) and (9):

Table 8: results according to nationality

Nationality	N	M	SD	Ranking
Saudi	44	43.9091	30.11591	12
Sudan	2	98.5000	2.12132	1
Malawi	1	94.0000	.	4
Djibouti	2	60.5000	23.33452	11
Yemen	2	76.5000	13.43503	9

Syria	6	78.0000	16.11211	7
Kenya	1	94.0000	.	4
Algeria	1	32.0000	.	13
Burma	1	73.0000	.	10
Mauritania	1	77.0000	.	8
Somalia	1	87.0000	.	5
Bangladesh	3	94.0000	.00000	4
Nigeria	1	95.0000	.	3
Ghana	1	98.0000	.	2
Guinea Bissau	1	81.0000	.	6
AFG	1	94.0000	.	4
Total	69	57.6522	31.97187	

Table (8) showed that there are differences in the level of the students in the familiarity of English vocabulary related to their nationality. The table also showed that the best students in the results of (VLT) were the Sudanese (%98.5), and the least level student was from Algeria(%32).

Table 9: results differences

Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	df	t	Sig.
Saudi	44	42.2500	27.93691	9.224	67	-6.887-	
Non-Saudi	25	84.7600	17.24886		66.457	-7.808-	.003

Because of the considerable variation in the numbers of students regarding their nationalities, the students were divided into Saudis and non-Saudis to verify the presence of statistically significant differences between them in the level of their English language meanings mastery. Therefore, the researcher used a T-test for two independent samples, and the results showed a statistically significant differences (Sig.= .003) as shown in Table No. (9), where we find that the mean score for Saudi

students is ($M= 42.25$), while the mean score for non-Saudi students is ($M= 84.76$). This result means that there is no problem for non-Saudi students in acquiring the English vocabulary. Also, we conclude from this table (9) that the low mean of the Saudi students 'scores in possession of the English vocabulary is the reason for the results that we observed in answering the first question of the research. Generally, the results included in tables (8) and (9) demonstrated that there statistically significant differences in English language knowledge (vocabulary) among scholarship students due to the students' nationality.

Grammar Level Test:

To answer the 2nd research question,

Q 2: What is the actual level of grammar among the scholarship students of scientific colleges at the Islamic University of Madinah?

The researcher analyzed the results of grammar achievement test as the following:

Table 10: the results of the grammar level test.

College	N	Percent	Mean	SD	Ranking of the colleges
PYP	30	41.1	45.0000	21.93250	3
Engineering	23	31.5	65.6522	17.98385	1
Sciences	10	13.7	32.5000	20.98280	4
IT	10	13.7	63.5000	14.15195	2
Total	73	100.0	52.3288	22.88380	

Table (10) indicated that 73 students performed the grammar level test. In general, the results came less than the results of students in (VLT). The ranking of colleges differed from that of (VLT). The engineering college came in the first level ($N= 23$, $M= 65.65$, $SD= 1798$), in contrast to IT college, which came first in (VLT). It came here as the 2nd college in the ranking ($N= 10$, $M= 63.50$, $SD= 14.15$).

The preparatory year (PYP) ranked higher than the vocabulary test results, as it ranked third instead of fourth ($N=30$, $M= 45$, $SD=21.93$). While the College of Sciences

rankings fell in the rankings, to become the fourth instead of the third that obtained it in the vocabulary test (N= 10, M= 32.50, SD= 30.98).

To answer the research question,

Q 3: Are there any statistically significant differences in English language knowledge (grammar) among scholarship students due to the college to which they belong?

The research used the ANOVA one-way test to confirm the differences between college students in the results grammar level test.

Table 11: Sig. of differences according to college

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Between Groups	(Combined)	10873.892	3	3624.631	9.322	.000	
	Linear Term	Unweighted	371.741	1	371.741	.956	.332
		Weighted	750.313	1	750.313	1.930	.169
		Deviation	10123.580	2	5061.790	13.018	.000
Within Groups		26830.217	69	388.844			
Total		37704.110	72				

Table 11, in general, demonstrated that there are statistically significant differences in English language knowledge (grammar) among scholarship students due to the students' Colleges. However, table 11 also showed (Sig.= .332, and Sig.=.169) that there are no statistically significant differences in English language knowledge (grammar) among scholarship students due to the students' Colleges in case of Engineering, and IT colleges.

To answer the research question,

Q 4: Are there statistically significant differences in English language knowledge (grammar) among scholarship students due to the students' nationality?

the researcher analyzed the data at it appears in table (12), and (13):

Table 12: results of grammar test according to nationality

Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rankings
Saudi	45	44.3333	21.86217	12
Sudan	1	85.0000	.	3
Malawi	1	75.0000	.	5
Jebuti	1	35.0000	.	13
Yemeni	5	47.0000	22.80351	11
Syrian	3	70.0000	5.00000	6
Kenyan	1	90.0000	.	2
Algerian	1	50.0000	.	10
Mauritanian	1	75.0000	.	5
Somali	2	60.0000	28.28427	8
Bangladeshi	2	75.0000	.00000	5
Nigerian	1	85.0000	.	3
Togo	3	68.3333	10.40833	7
Indonesian	1	95.0000	.	1
Myanmar	1	60.0000	.	6
Ghanaian	1	80.0000	.	4
guinea Bissau	1	60.0000	.	8
Afghani	1	60.0000	.	8
Jordanian	1	55.0000	.	9
Total	73	52.3288	22.88380	

Table (12) indicated that there are differences in the level of the students in the familiarity of English grammar related to their nationality. The table also showed that the best students in the results of (grammar level test) were the Indonesian (%95), and the least level student was from Algeria (%35). Generally, there are statistically significant differences between Saudi students and non-Saudi students in the

achievement test of grammar for the benefit of non-Saudi students (Sig.= .012). Table (13) showed that the mean scores of Saudi students Saudi in the grammar level test are (M= 42.78), while the mean scores of non-Saudis in the grammar level test is (M= 67.68).

Table 13: Differences in the results of the grammar level test

Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	df	t	Sig.
Saudi	45	42.7778	22.14507	6.610	71	-5.305-	
Non-Saudi	28	67.6786	14.17367		70.916	-5.857-	.012

Table (12) indicated that there are differences in the level of the students in the familiarity of English grammar related to their nationality. The table also showed that the best students in the results of (grammar level test) were the Indonesian (%95), and the least level student was from Algeria (%35). Generally, there are statistically significant differences between Saudi students and non-Saudi students in the achievement test of grammar for the benefit of non-Saudi students (Sig.= .012). Table (13) showed that the mean scores of Saudi students Saudi in the grammar level test are (M= 42.78), while the mean scores of non-Saudis in the grammar level test is (M= 67.68).

Table 14: responses on Satisfaction of the program

Items	N	Mean	SD
1. In general, I am satisfied with the English language Program in the scientific colleges at Islamic University.	145	3.4414	1.37374
2. I think the subjects of the English language Program are well coordinated	145	3.4000	1.34578
3. Learning contents, in English Program in the scientific colleges, is suitable for us	145	3.6207	1.34407

4. The organization of the textbooks of the English Program is appropriate.	145	3.7034	1.21977
5. I realize I have learned as many contents as the students in the Arabic language program.	145	3.3379	1.32403
6. I need to make stronger efforts in the classes taught in English.	145	3.6759	1.23537
7. I would recommend other students to take the English Learning Program in the scientific colleges at the Islamic University of Madinah.	145	3.4621	1.40446
Total	145		

Table 14 showed that the students, whether they are Saudi or non-Saudi, satisfied the program, on the whole, is good. The organization the textbooks had the best responses (Item 4, $M= 3.70$, $SD= 1.21$). The least mean of responses was that of subjects' coordination (Item =2, $M= 3.40$, $SD= 1.34$). This response means that the topic or subjects inside the textbooks of the program need more coordination to be more effective than the current situation.

Table 15: Sig. differences

Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	F	Sig.
Saudi	82	3.5784	1.06926	.747	.001	.978
Non-Saudi	63	3.4444	1.07031	.747		

Table (15) showed that there are no statistically significant differences in students' responses in their overall Satisfaction of the English program presented in the scientific colleges at Islamic University of Madinah ($M= 3.57$, $M= 3.44$, $Sig.= .978$).

1. Courses and materials in the English Program:

This domain of the questionnaire included nine Items in the survey(:8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16):

Table 16: targets' responses about courses and materials

Items	N	Mean	SD
8. In general, lecturers have the right level of English.	145	4.0897	1.18390
9. Lecturers show involvement and commitment in the courses	145	4.0966	1.14458
10. Lecturers in this Program teach mostly in English	145	4.4069	.96822
11. I do not understand some of the lecturers when they explain in English.	145	2.6345	1.39848
12. Class materials, resources, and bibliography are suitable and updated.	145	3.2345	1.11812
13. There are available materials in English for most subjects.	145	3.8759	1.04671
14. Students' participation in the courses taught in English is similar to the one in the courses taught in Arabic.	145	3.0621	1.29754
15. I find the evaluation more difficult in the English language Program.	145	3.0345	1.18095
16. The overall quality of lessons in English is better than the ones in Arabic.	145	3.1793	1.42726
Total	145		

Table (17) showed that the students agreed that the program has excellent English language lecturers because they use the English language more than the Arabic language during English language lectures (item 8, Item 9, Item 10, M= 4.08, M= 4.09, M= 4.40). They undecided to determine that the lecturers explain English lessons clearly or not (Item 11, M= 2.63). They also undecided to determine that the material, resources, and bibliography is suitable and updated (item 12, M= 3.23).

They were also undecided about the overall quality of English lessons (Item 16), the difficulty of evaluation (Item 15), Participation in taught courses (Item 14). However, they ensured the availability of materials in English for most subjects (Item 13, M= 3.87).

Table 17: Sig. differences

Nationality	N	Mean	SD	F	t	Sig.
Saudi	82	3.5176	.66443	.041	.105	.839
Non-Saudi	63	3.5062	.63289		.106	

Table (17) showed that there are no statistically significant differences in students' responses upon the courses and materials in the English program presented in the scientific colleges at Islamic University of Madinah (M= 3.51, M= 3.50, Sig.= .839).

Conclusion:

The current research answered all its questions about the linguistic knowledge of the targeted, as it found that the mean scores of students of scientific colleges in achieving English vocabulary are (%57.65). It also found that there are statistically significant differences in students' achievement of English language vocabulary due to their college (Sig. = .000). There are also statistically significant differences in students' achievement of English language vocabulary due to students' nationality (Sig. = .003, M (Saudi) = 42.25, M (Non-Saudi) = 84.76). The vocabulary level test (VLT) was prepared to measure the extent of students' possession of (3000) words from the English vocabulary. By analogy with this, the research found that Saudi students possess only (1260) words, while scholarship students own (2542) words of the English vocabulary. These results for Saudi and Non-Saudi students are less than the results of (Tan & Goh, 2017), and more than the study results of (Alonso, Garcia & La Rioja, 2014). The differences in results among students may have a link to the place of students' study of the English language before entering the Islamic University of Medina.

The results of the research revealed that the mean scores of scientific college students in achieving English grammar are (%52.32), which is less than the achievement of vocabulary. It also found that there are also statistically significant differences in students' achievement of English language grammar due to students' nationality (Sig. = .012, M (Saudi) = 42.77, M (Non-Saudi) = 67.67).

The research surveyed 145 students about the English learning program presented in the scientific colleges at the Islamic University of Madinah. The results of the survey indicated that the students are generally satisfied with the program, and the courses and materials it contains are satisfied.

Finally, the research recommended, in the light of results, to further studies about the English language knowledge of scientific colleges students at Islamic universities consider the student's academic level. It also recommended creating a program to teach the English language or to amend the current program so that it can differentiate between scholarship students and Saudi students, as the research revealed that Saudi students entered the university with a lower English language level than scholarship students. Therefore, Saudi students need to study the English language with a higher intensity and concentration and perhaps a more extended period than scholarship students.

References:

1. Adolphs, S., & Schmitt, N. (2003). Lexical coverage of spoken discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 425–438.
2. Al Khanji, R. R. (1999). Assessing English collocational knowledge among advanced language learners. *Mu'tah Lil-Buhuth wad-Dirasat*, 14(6), 129–159.
3. Almi, Y. (2017). A Word–frequency Based Assessment of English as a Foreign Language Master One Students' Written Receptive and Productive Lexical Knowledge. *Human Sciences Journal*, 48(1), 25–40.
4. Alonso, A., Garcia, M. & La Rioja, U. (2014). Productive Vocabulary Knowledge of Spanish EFL Learners, *AESLA*, Vol. 13(1), 39–56.
5. Alsager, R. & Milton, J. (2016). Investigating the Relationship between Vocabulary Knowledge and Academic Success of Arabic Undergraduate Learners at Swansea University, *Language in Focus Journal*, Volume 2, 2016, DOI: 10.1515/lifjjsal-2016-0010.
6. Clark–Gareca, B. (2013). Assessing English Language Learner Content Knowledge inThe Mainstream Classroom.
7. Cobb, T. Range for texts v.3 (2018. [computer program]. Accessed 15 Sept at <https://www.lex Tutor.ca/cgi-bin/range/texts/index.pl>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1196233>
8. Hayes, A. & Mansour, N. (2017). Confidence in the Knowledge Base of English Language Learners Studying Science: Using Agency to Compensate for the Lack of Adequate Linguistic Identity, *Res Sci Educ*, 47:353–371, DOI 10.1007/s11165-015-9504-8.

9. Lin, Y. (2014). Designing assessment tasks with language awareness: Balancing cognitive and linguistic demands. *Assessment and Learning*, 3, 97–119.
10. McLoughlin, C., and M. J. W. Lee. 2008. "Mapping the Digital Terrain: New Media and Social Software as Catalysts for Pedagogical Change." In *Hello! Where Are You in the Landscape of Educational Technology?* Proceedings Ascilite Melbourne 2008. Melbourne, Australia. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/mcloughlin.html>.
11. Moll, T. (1999). A linguistic Need Analysis for EFL at University Level. *Alicante Journal of English Studies*, 12, 117–125.
12. Mulumba, M. (2016). Improving student teachers' knowledge-base in language education through critical reading, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, VOL. 24, NO. 4, 571–586
13. Olmos, C. (2009). An Assessment of the Vocabulary Knowledge of Students in the Final Year of Secondary Education. Is Their Vocabulary Extensive Enough? *IJES*, Special Issue, 2009, pp. 73–90.
14. Pappamihel N. & Mihai, F. (2006) Assessing English Language Learners' Content Knowledge in Middle School Classrooms, *Middle School Journal*, 38(1), 34–43.
15. Pignot-Shahov, V. (2012). Measuring L2 Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Knowledge, *Language Studies Working Papers*, Vol.4, 37–45.
16. Qian, D. (1998). Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge: Assessing its Role in Adults' Reading Comprehension in English as a Second Language. (Ph.D. Dissertation), Canada: University of Toronto.

- 17.Schmitt, N. (2007). Current perspectives on vocabulary teaching and learning. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (eds.). International handbook of English language teaching: Part II (pp. 827–841). New York: Springer.
- 18.Schmitt, N. & Schmitt, D. (2014). A reassessment of frequency and vocabulary size in L2 vocabulary teaching, Lang. Teach. 47.4, 484–503, DOI:10.1017/S0261444812000018.
- 19.Tang, C., and Treffers–Daller, J. (2016). Assessing Incidental Vocabulary by Chinese EFL Learners: a test of the Involvement Load Hypothesis. In Yu, G. and Jin, Y. (eds.) Assessing Chinese Learners of English: Language Constructs, Consequences, and conundrums. Palgrave, London, pp. 121–149.
- TEFL.net (2018). Retrieved 15 Sept: <https://www.tefl.net/quizzes/>.٢٠
- 21.Tan, A. & Goh, L. H. (2017). Relationship between Vocabulary Size and Reading Comprehension Levels of Malaysian Tertiary Students. International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies. 5(4). 149–155.
- 22.Troyan FJ, Sembiante SF, King N. (2019). A case for a functional linguistic knowledge base in world language teacher education. Foreign Language Annals. 52:644–669. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12410>
- 23.Wen, W. (2014). Assessing the Roles of Breadth and Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge in Chinese EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 37(3), pp. 358–372. Retrieved 30 Dec. 2019, from DOI:10.1515/cjal-2014-0022