

INVESTIGATING THE SAUDI EFL TRAINEE STUDENTS' SATISFACTION WITH THE ENGLISH PRACTICUM PROGRAM

Dr. Mohammad Hussein Hamdan

Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University
College of Languages and Translation
Department of English Language and Literature
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT: *This paper attempts to explore Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University EFL students' satisfaction with the practicum course offered by Department of English Language and Literature at College of Languages and Translation. To address this issue, the researcher developed a questionnaire divided into three domains consisting of thirty-two items to collect data. The first domain included eight items (1-8) aiming at students' evaluation to university supervisor, the other domain consisting of 14 items (9-22) targeted participants' responses towards site school supervisors and principals, while the last 10 items (23-32) aimed at respondents' self-evaluation to their self-performance and professional development. The questionnaire was followed by one open-ended question where participants can add any written quantitative data in their attempt to evaluate the program. The questionnaire was applied to a sample of males EFL Saudi students consisting of all the students registering for the practicum course in the first semester of the academic year 2016-2017. The total number was 25 Male trainee-students majoring in English at College of Languages and Translation. Therefore, there was no sampling procedure was done. The participants were level eight, meaning that all of them were in their fourth year and would be graduating towards the end of this semester or the second semester of the year 2017. The study findings revealed different levels of students' satisfaction of the practicum program experience. The findings were discussed and conclusion along with recommendations were developed based on the study results.*

KEYWORDS: EFL Saudi Trainees, English Practicum Course, Field schools, University Supervisors

INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts to explore Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University EFL students' satisfaction with the practicum course offered by Department of English Language and Literature at College of Languages and Translation. The registering students in this practicum course complete one semester of their teaching experience in primary, middle or secondary schools in Riyadh city of Saudi Arabia. University supervisors from

the English department in cooperation with schools supervisors and principals run this practical course of teaching English in field schools.

In recognition of Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University to the importance of the English language applications in the world of business and workplace, College of Languages and translation has initiated a practicum program for the B.A students of Department English Language and Literature in 2002. The program is offered to Level - Eight students (Fourth-Year students), which is usually the last semester by the time they should be graduating from the college. In an interview (Appendix 2) conducted with a senior chairperson of the Department of English and a founder of the program, professor Othman Alsamari, he indicated that the program has passed through two stages since its establishment fifteen years ago. The first phase involves freeing the students for one day to be available at schools, where they receive their training and do the practical side of the course by teaching English at different school levels from the primary to the secondary grades at Saudi schools in Riyadh city. However, once the department of English realized that freeing the practicum course students for one day was inadequate for them to have sufficient teaching experience, the decision was made by the college senior administration to expand the program to three days where students can practice teaching English as a foreign language to different school areas and levels. In this phase, the practicum course students should deliver English at schools for 12 contact hours a week. Simultaneously, students are permitted to register at the college for not more than eight credit hours during the semester of the practicum course. The specific objectives of the English practicum course as determined by the Quality Assurance Office at College of Languages and Translation can be summarized as follows:

- Enabling students to have real-life experiences of teaching English in Saudi schools upon their graduation.
- Providing graduating students with opportunities to apply the theoretical part they learned at the college in real- life situation where they teach English.
- Giving the opportunity to college staff and trainee students to interact with schools, stakeholders and educators in attempt to build up techniques and processes to rewire the English curriculum in the college and connect it with local schools and workforce demands.
- Improving students' professional level and enhancing their sense of responsibility towards developing their local community and schools.
- Enhancing trainee students' work ethics in a manner of appreciation to the spirit of teamwork with co-teachers in the field and school principals.
- Strengthening the linkage between Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University and various schools, employers and stakeholders.

Educational institutions generally have field-training programs to establish a connection between theory and practice. Jackel, Daniel (2011) states that field training programs not only reinforce students' academic knowkdge they learn in target program at their institutions, but they also establish a connection between what have been learned in the

classrooms and the real world applications of knowledge. Hendriske (2013) emphasizes that teacher preparation programs have no conflict between students' study at a credit-hour program at their academic institutions and spending some time at schools in a process of preparing them to the real-teaching experiences at schools. According to her, on-site students trainees have benefitted from the opportunity of field training by "reflecting on their personal teaching practice and philosophy" (P. IV). Feiman and Parker (2003) maintain that the practicum programs, whose their length varies from an institution to an institution, helps the trainee teachers to have connections between what they have learned in their university theoretical course and what students at schools wants to learn.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study examines students' satisfaction with the practicum program offered at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University by College of Languages and Translation. The investigation of the participants' satisfaction with the program covers three domains, namely; their satisfaction with their with university supervisors, site schools supervisors and principals, and their satisfaction with their self-performance and professional development. This part of paper examines research related practicum courses and internship programs.

Rogers (2015) in his report clarifies the purpose of field training program by stating, "To produce practically oriented graduates that meet the required job-related competences of their future employers. Additionally, it serves as a linkage between the University and various partners who consume services and/or products" (P.1).

(Fletcher, 1990; Beard, 1998; Weible 2010, cited in Amer & Ismail (2014)) stressed out the importance for the practicum programs for both, the trainee students and the employers; students can develop professionally before joining the workforce by reflecting on the theories they learnt at university throughout their applications in the field. Whereas, employment places and stakeholders can benefit by deciding on the best choices of skillful and well-trained teachers needed to fulfill the educational demands of schools or any other academic institutions.

Hendriske (2013) indicates that students attending university full-time course work does not have any conflict in their placements in real-schools teaching experience. Apparently, students benefit from what they have learned at university by applying it in real –life educational experiences. However, we believe that there should be specific guidelines to students doing the field experiences that places some restrictions on the number of credit hours they study at colleges and universities and the number of contact hours done in the field. University administration and supervisors must avoid such a conflict by specifying the number of university credit hours and practicum course contact hours. In the case of Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University Practicum Program, pre-service students-teachers, are not allowed to register for more than eight credit hours at the college, while they have to spend a minimum of 12 teaching contact hours at the site schools during

one semester of the practicum course. In an interview (Appendix B) conducted with Alsmari, Othman in January 2017, a senior chair of English Language and Literature Department at College of Languages and translation-Al-Imam University, stated that students currently spend three days a week at placement schools, which is equivalent to 12 hours of contact teaching hours. He emphasized that such teaching load at schools would give them a sufficient real-life exposure to the teaching field experience.

Other researchers (Bukaliya, 2012; Mecca 2010; Linn, Howard and Miller 2004; Stretch & Harp 1991) placed an emphasis on the significance of field experience for trainee students as it would give them an ample opportunity to develop their theoretical skills they acquired at the university by applying them in real-schools teaching situations. In addition, practicum courses would build up their professional experiences and open up to them the real world of the workforce by combining the academic universality experiences of course work to practical teaching experiences.

In a study operated by Ganai ,Nicette N. ital.(2016), they found out problems and difficulties encountered the student teachers were mainly classroom management, communication skills with students, low-level instructional skills, inappropriate instructional materials and insufficient evaluation tools suitable to students levels at site schools. The study was conducted on 59 Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) and 41 Bachelor of Secondary singing in Education student teachers program. The participants were practicing teaching in field schools during one semester of school year.

Larissa K. Barber and Sarah F. Bailey (2014) in their review to a psychology interns program at Northern Illinois University indicated that the program should have had a special focus on students' characteristics required by employers for all different types of jobs in the work force.

Amer, Talal S. & Ismail, Omer H (2014) conducted a study on a sample of 29 field supervisors and 65 interns to evaluate the internship program offered by Instructional and Learning Technologies Department (ILT) in the College of Education, Sultan Qaboos University (SQU), Muscat, Sultanate of Oman. Their findings indicated that "distribution of interns to training institutes should be based on their interest, more attention should be given to the development of skills in areas of management and technical report writing, and financial incentives should be paid to supervisors and students as well" (P. 5).

Freidman, Barry (2014) conducted a study on 173 field supervisors to explore the factors that mostly affected the performance of their interns. Among these factors were "skills-self-direction, learning new duties quickly, completing tasks on time and enthusiasm to accomplish work. Accordingly, those factors mirrored those identified interns ' characteristics the employers wanted" (P. 65).

Cummings, Chelsea (2014) conducted a thesis on GLST classes offered in an internship program consisting of 15 credits during spring semester of junior year of the intern

students. The purpose of the thesis was to evaluate the GLST internship classes through interviewing the internship students. The researcher concluded; "Internship classes were refined on a continuous basis to meet the needs of the students before, during, and after the internship. Another conclusion was that the internship become better due to the on-going evaluation process" (P. 33).

Warinda, Togara (2013) found in a study done on The University of Zimbabwe internship accounting B.A students generally benefited from the internship experiences. However, the researcher recommended that certain dimensions of the program should have received special attention during the internship experiences such as communicating to institutions the special requirements of the program that might help intern students to develop professionally.

Hendriske, Jacqueline. V (2013) found in a study performed on a teacher education internship program that there was an expansion of the student-teacher intern's field experiences and knowledge due to their involvement and participation in the school activities. In addition, the mentor teachers and the intern students enjoyed the program as they developed professionally and deepened their understanding of the teaching philosophy.

Bukaliya, Richard (2012) reported in a study done on 50 students from two internship programs at Zimbabwe Open University that a great number of the surveyed students was in preference to internship program. However, the researcher indicated that there were some deficiencies related to the program; the supervisors were too busy to dedicate sufficient time to mentor the trainee students. Besides, they were uncooperative in a manner that they were disclosing some significant information needed by the intern students as those full-time employees looked at the internship students as threats to their positions. The study recommended expanding the period of the practical training for the two target programs.

Larkin, Ingrid K. & Beatson, Amanda. T (2010) reported on internship program in a business faculty where students complete a minimum of 120 hours in workplace for a course of 13 weeks during one semester. They found out Work Placement Preparation Program assisted students in helping them transit successfully to the workplace. It also helped them develop interviewing skills and deal with work environment issues in a more effective professional manner.

The current study comes in accordance with the research reviewed in this section as it focuses on evaluation of an internship program introduced by Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University to College of Languages & Translation students registering in a practicum course. The other studies have given special focus to evaluations of the strengths and weakness of partnership programs from different perspectives; students, supervisors or employers' point of view. Some of these studies intended to examine other issues related to internship programs such as the financial aspect of the program or the workplace

environment. Further, a good deal of these studies gave special attention to training programs related to pre-service student teachers.

However, some of the reviewed studies intended to examine students' internship programs not related to teaching such as accounting or technology applications field experiences. The common dominator among all the research studies in review was that all of them intended to examine the effectiveness of training programs on participants' professional development and the connection between training and the preparation of the trainees to employers market and workplace. Whereas, the current study it is different in a sense that it examines one internship program of EFL students' teaching experience at site schools from their own perspective. More specifically, the study examines students' satisfaction with their practicum program with regard to three domains; their satisfaction with site schools supervisors and principals, their satisfaction with their university supervisors and their satisfaction with their self-performance and professional development. Such development is related to their English communication skills and their abilities to apply knowledge and theory of the English language at field schools through the period of the practicum course.

Research Problem & Significance

The assessment of the practicum program at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University offered through College of Languages and translation will help in the development of the program and its participants for quality assurance purposes. Since the program was initiated fifteen years ago, it has not been evaluated by an individual or an institutional effort. Consequently, neither the university supervisors nor the students are oriented how the program is running or to what extent it is effective within the quality assurance measures. Up to the researcher's knowledge, there are no or scarcity of studies conducted on practicum courses across the country. Therefore, this evaluation will contribute to improve the practical-experience course at the college and other universities in general. It will help the university and other academic institutions determine the extent to which the program intended learning outcomes and objectives are achieved. Therefore, the current study seeks to evaluate the practicum program from the perspective of the B.A English Department students at College of Languages and Translation to view their satisfaction with the program in three domains; university supervisors, school sites supervisors & principals and their own performance & professional development. In addition, this study will reveal to the institution the extent to which the program is successful, or whether it needs improvement to the level it satisfies the trainee students. Therefore, assessing trainee teachers' satisfaction with the practicum program will disclose any deficiencies or weakness pertinent to the field experiences.

Research Questions

In the view of the research problem, the study attempts to answer the following research questions:

- 1- To what extend are the trainees satisfied with their university supervisors?

- 2- To what extend are the trainees satisfied with their site schools supervisors and principals?
- 3- To what extend are the trainees satisfied with their self-performance and professional development?
- 4- Are there any coefficient relations of the trainee-students' satisfaction in the three domains of the program: university supervisors, site schools supervisors& principals, and their self-performance & professional development?

METHOD

Research Design

The research is quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitative in the sense that it used a questionnaire of thirty-two items, which were analyzed quantitatively. However, it is quantitative as there was an open-ended question forwarded to the participants who were asked to provide and additional comments to improve the program.

Participants

The study participants consisted of all the students registering for the practicum course in the first semester of the academic year 2016-2017. The total number was 25 Male student-teachers majoring in English at College of Languages and Translation. Therefore, there was no sampling procedure was done. The participants were level eight, meaning that all of them were in their fourth year and would be graduating towards the end of this semester or the second semester of the year 2017. Students taking this course have to spend three days with a total of twelve hours a week doing the practical experience in public schools. Meanwhile, they can register of course work at the University for a Maximum of eight credit hours. The participants were doing the field experience of teaching English in primary, elementary and secondary public schools as they reported in a questionnaire distributed to them.

Trainee students usually choose their schools under the condition that it must be a public school in accordance with the university regulations. Once the school is chosen, the participants are given an assignment letter signed by the College Dean. The Participants are also oriented about the practicum program through a meeting with the university supervisors prior to joining the site school and through specific written instructions given to them (Appendix 3). The instructions are submitted to the target site schools principals so that they are aware of the program requirements and the manner it should be implemented. According to the university instructions students' Filed Placement is designated in a manner that prompts cooperation between university supervisors and school mentor teachers. Mentor teachers place weekly teaching schedules of a maximum of 12 contact hours. The site schools also provide the university supervisor with these schedules through emails or official mail. Any changes happen to the trainee students' schedules are immediately reported to the university supervision staff.

Material

A questionnaire (Appendix 1) divided into three domains and consisting of thirty-two items was used to collect data. The first domain included eight items (1-8) aiming at students' evaluation to university supervisor, the other domain consisting of 14 items (9-22) targeted participants' responses towards site school supervisors and principals, while the last 10 items (23-32) aimed at respondents' self-evaluation to their own performance and professional development. A Likert five-level scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly disagree) was conducted to gauge the participants' responses to the questionnaire items. An introductory section was developed to the questionnaire to collect some personal data about the participants such as their names, emails, and the name of the school they are performing their field experience. In addition, the questionnaire commenced with a paragraph explaining the purpose of the study along with instructions for the respondents on how to respond to its items. Finally, the questionnaire was followed by one open-ended question where participants can add any written quantitative data in their attempt to evaluate the program.

Three arbitrators of experienced professors supervising the practicum program in the College for several years established the questionnaire validity. Some of the questionnaire items were deleted or adjusted according to the arbitrators' feedback until its final design settled on 32 items distributed across the three domains.

The reliability of the questionnaire items were measured via the utilization of Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. The reliability figures shown in the table below indicated the instrument was appropriate for the study in the three domains.

Table (1) Questionnaire Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient Reliability

The study axes		Items no.	Reliability
First domain (items 1-8)	University supervisor evaluation	8	0.886
second domain (items 9-22)	School/training site evaluation	14	0.956
Third domain (items 23-32)	Student's Self Evaluation	10	0.881
General stability of study pivots		32	0.965

It is evident from Table (1) that the reliability coefficients Alpha Cranach was high, ranging between (0.886, 0.956, and 0.881). The general reliability of the study tool was (0.965) indicating a high level of reliability coefficients. Therefore, the instrument can be relied upon in the application of the study.

Internal consistency of the questionnaire items in the three domains was calculated in Table 2 below:

Table (2) Questionnaire Items Internal Consistency

Item no.	Correlation coefficient	Item no.	Correlation coefficient	Item no.	Correlation coefficient
University supervisor evaluation		School/training site evaluation		Student's Self Evaluation	
1	0.817**	9	0.733**	23	0.663**
2	0.792**	10	0.718**	24	0.797**
3	0.738**	11	0.873**	25	0.738**
4	0.784**	12	0.754**	26	0.705**
5	0.686**	13	0.702**	27	0.789**
6	0.791**	14	0.824**	28	0.679**
7	0.807**	15	0.799**	29	0.748**
8	0.652**	16	0.875**	30	0.668**
-	-	17	0.869**	31	0.712**
-	-	18	0.774**	32	0.692**
-	-	19	0.903**	-	-
-	-	20	0.764**	-	-
-	-	21	0.716**	-	-
-	-	22	0.780**	-	-

Is evident from Table 2 that the correlation coefficients between the degree of freedom values of the total score are functioning at a level of significance 0.01, or 0.05 or less. All values as indicated in the table are positive reflecting a high degree of internal consistency between the questionnaire items for each domain of the study scale.

Procedures and Data Collection

The researcher contacted the university Registrar Main Office to collect the lists for the students registering in the practicum course in the first semester of the current academic year (2016-2017). The lists included students' full names, emails and phone numbers.

Towards the middle of the current semester, the researcher, through emails and phone calls, initiated contacting all the 25 registering students in the program inquiring them if they are willing to participate in the study. The 25 students expressed their enthusiasm to respond to the questionnaire and take part in the study.

The researcher informed the participants through emails and phone calls that they would receive the questionnaire through SurveyMonkey, an on-line program, encouraging them to try their best to complete the survey items. The study respondents were also encouraged to contact the researcher through email or telephone if they experience any problem while completing the survey.

The survey was uploaded to the SurveyMonkey website and the link was sent (<http://www.surveymonkey.net/results/SM-5FDZTP5F/>) to participants' emails during the last two weeks of the current semester. The researcher received only 19 responses as three students dropped the course. Three responses were excluded due to incompleteness of the questionnaire items. The returned complete responses were downloaded from SurveyMonkey website and data was collected for analysis.

Data Analysis

After collecting the data of the study and entering it into SPSS statistical computer program, the researcher used specific figures/numbers to transfer the verbal answers to digital coding, where (strongly agree) was given five degrees, (agree) four degrees, (neutral) three degrees, (Disagree) two degrees, and (Strongly Disagree) was given one degree. The researcher then used the arithmetic mean to represent the questionnaire items on a scale of five-meter cell count used for the study three domains as follows:

- 1 - 1.80 represents (Strongly Disagree).
- 1.81 - 2.60 represents (Disagree).
- 2.61 - 3.40 represents (neutral).
- 3.41 - 4.20 represents (agree).
- 4.21 - 5.00 represents (strongly agree).

The statistical measures used in the study were frequencies and percentages to identify participants' responses to the questionnaire items in the three main domains contained in the study. The arithmetic mean (weighted mean) and the arithmetic average (mean) were also applied to find out how high or low the responses of the participants were presented to each item of the questionnaire in the three domains. Simultaneously, the researcher intended to conduct Standard Deviation analysis to identify the dispersion in the responses to each item of the questionnaire in the three variables or domains. Pearson correlation coefficient was also conducted to know the degree of correlation between the items in each domain and the total correlation score of all items in the three domains of the survey. Finally, Alpha Cronbach's coefficient was used to test the reliability of the study tool.

RESULTS

The researcher of the current study posted four questions whose total answers constructed the main body of the study findings. Table 3 below reflected the findings related to the first question that covered the first domain of the questionnaire, "*To what extent are the trainees satisfied with their university supervisors?*"

Table (3) Trainees' Satisfaction with University Supervisors

Table (5) - Practices Satisfaction with University Supervisors										
Item No.	statement		Strong ly	Agree	Neutra l	Disagr ee	Strong ly	mean	Std. Deviat i	Rank
1	I received good orientations sessions about my field teaching experience from my university professor/supervisor before starting my field teaching.	Fre q.	6	6	4	2	1	3.74	1.195	6
		%	31.6	31.6	21.1	10.5	5.3			
2	I have regular meetings& visits with my university supervisors at the training site to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.	Fre q.	4	7	5	2	0	3.63	1.012	7
		%	21.1	36.8	26.3	15.8	0			
3	My university supervisor provided me with a training manual about the practicum course before joining my field school	Fre q.	7	3	4	3	2	3.53	1.429	8
		%	36.8	15.8	21.1	15.8	10.5			
4	My University supervisor was available and accessible during his/her office hours at the university when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.	Fre q.	12	3	4	0	0	4.42	.838	1
		%	63.2	15.8	21.1	0	0			
5	My communication with my University supervisor through email or other social media tools was appropriate.	Fre q.	10	6	3	0	0	4.37	.761	3
		%	52.6	31.6	15.8	0	0			
6	My University supervisor used to respond promptly and without delays to my messages through email and social media networks	Fre q.	10	3	6	0	0	4.21	.918	4
		%	52.6	15.8	31.6	0	0			
7	My university supervisor has explained to me my grading and evaluation process during the field experience.	Fre q.	10	3	3	2	1	4.00	1.291	5
		%	52.6	15.8	15.8	10.5	5.3			
8	My university has given me appropriate credit hours to teach English at field schools.	Fre q.	13	2	3	0	1	4.37	1.116	2
		%	68.4	10.5	15.8	0	5.3			
Overall Mean								4.03	.813	

The statistical data shown in Table 3 indicated that the arithmetic average of students' responses to the dimension related to their satisfaction with the university supervisors was equal to (4.03 out of 5). This average falls within the fourth category of the quintet

progressive scale, ranging between (3.41 to 4.20), which indicates a high- degree level of the participants' satisfaction with their university supervisors.

We also find that the arithmetic mean of the detailed points of this particular domain ranged between (3.53 to 4.42), and these averages fall within the fourth and fifth category of the gradient Pentagon scale, which refers to two- degree scale levels (satisfied=agree, very satisfied=strongly agree). The results shown in the table above also indicated that the English language students at the College of Languages and Translation enrolled in the practicum program were very satisfied with the four items no. (4-8-5-6), whose averages were ranging between (4.21 to 4.42) on the fifth category of the gradient Pentagon scale.

However, the results shown in the table above for items no. (1 -2-3-7) indicated the study participants were dissatisfied with these items as their averages ranged between (3.53 to 4.00). We can conclude from discrepancy of averages for the items no. (4-8-5-6) and the other items no. (7-1 -2-3) that there is varying degree of students' satisfaction with their university supervisors.

The item no. 4 "My University supervisor was available and accessible during his/her office hours at the university when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experience" received the highest mean score (4.42). Whereas, the item no. 8 "My university has given me appropriate credit hours to teach English at field schools" scored the highest second mean score (4.37). Simultaneously, the item no. 5 "My communication with my University supervisor through email or other social media tools was appropriate" scored the highest third mean score (4.37).

On the other hand, the lowest two items were item no.3 "*My university supervisor provided me with a training manual about the practicum course before joining my field school*", and item no. 2 "*I have regular meetings& visits with my university supervisors at the training site to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices*", which both received the lowest two mean scores of this domain (3.53 and 5.63) successively.

Table 4 below shows the findings of the second research question related to the second domain of the questionnaire, which was "*To what extend are the trainees satisfied with their site schools supervisors and principals?*"

Table (4) Trainees' Satisfaction with University Site Schools Supervisors& Principals

Item No.	statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
9	My field schools has assigned to me additional responsibilities as my experience increased	Fre q.	11	2	5	0	1	4.16	1.167	4
		%	57.9	10.5	26.3	0	5.3			
10	This experience at school gave me a realistic view of my field experience in teaching English.	Fre q.	14	2	2	1	0	4.53	.905	1
		%	37.7	10.5	10.5	5.3	0			
11	My field school has explained to me how they will evaluate my field experience in general.	Fre q.	6	6	4	2	1	3.74	1.195	13
		%	31.6	31.6	21.1	10.5	5.3			
12	My field school has given me the opportunity to evaluate students' works during my field experience.	Fre q.	10	5	3	0	1	4.21	1.084	3
		%	52.6	26.3	15.8	0	5.3			
13	My field school/supervisors/ co-teachers gave me an orientations session about my teaching responsibilities before starting the field training.	Fre q.	8	5	2	3	1	3.84	1.302	9
		%	42.1	26.3	10.5	15.8	5.3			
14	My field schools have given me adequate training and teaching load to enhance my teaching skills of English.	Fre q.	6	6	5	1	1	3.79	1.134	11
		%	31.6	31.6	26.3	5.3	5.3			
15	My school supervisor/co-teacher was available and accessible when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.	Fre q.	11	5	2	0	1	4.32	1.057	2
		%	57.9	26.3	10.5	0	5.3			
16	I have regular meetings with my schools supervisors to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.	Fre q.	7	5	2	4	1	3.68	1.336	14
		%	36.8	26.3	10.5	21.1	5.3			
17	My filed schools have given me students levels/grade levels appropriate to my teaching abilities of teaching English	Fre q.	8	5	3	3	0	3.95	1.129	7
		%	42.1	26.3	15.8	15.8	0			
18	My field school has explained to me how they will evaluate my teaching experience.	Fre q.	9	4	4	2	0	4.05	1.079	5
		%	47.4	21.1	21.1	10.5	0			

19	My field school principal and co-teachers treated on the same level as other teachers.	Fre q.	10	6	1	0	1	3.79	1.437	12
		%	52.6	31.6	5.3	0	10.5			
20	The field school has given me the opportunity to improve my oral & written communication skills, Interpersonal/human relations skills and my creativity and problem Solving abilities skills	Fre q.	8	6	3	1	1	4.00	1.155	6
		%	42.1	61.6	15.8	5.3	5.3			
21	My field school granted me a wide variance of opportunities to teach the English language skills.	Fre q.	5	7	6	1	0	3.84	.898	8
		%	26.3	36.8	31.6	5.3	0			
22	My field school has provided me with levels of responsibility consistent with my ability as a trainee.	Fre q.	5	8	4	2	0	3.84	.958	10
		%	26.3	42.1	21.1	10.5	0			
Overall Mean								3.98	.908	

The statistical data shown in Table 4 indicated that the arithmetic average of students' responses to the dimension related to their satisfaction with their site schools supervisors and principals was equal to (3.98 out of 5). This average falls within the fourth category of the quintet progressive scale, ranging between (3.41 to 4.20) which indicates a high- degree level of the participants' satisfaction with their site schools supervisors and principals.

As seen from the results shown in the table above, we can conclude that the English language students at College of Languages and Translation enrolled in this practical English course were very satisfied with the three items given the numbers (10-12-15), whose arithmetic averages ranged between (3.68 to 4.53) indicating a high degree of satisfaction (very satisfied).

Furthermore, the results shown in table 4 for items no. (9-11 -13-14-16-17-18-19-20-21-22) indicated the study participants were satisfied (agree) with these items as their averages ranged between (3.68 to 4.16). We can conclude from discrepancy of the averages for the items given the numbers (10-12-15) and the other items given numbers (9-11 -13-14-16-17-18-19-20-21-22) that there is varying degree of students' satisfaction (satisfied to very satisfied) with their site schools supervisors and principals.

Item number 10 " *This experience at school gave me a realistic view of my field experience in teaching English*" received the highest mean score (4.53). Whereas, Item number 15 " *My school supervisor/co-teacher was available and accessible when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences*" scored the highest second mean score (4.32). Simultaneously, Item number 12 " *My field school has given me the opportunity to evaluate students' works during my field experience*" scored the highest third mean score (4.21).

On the other hand, the lowest two items were item number 11 *"My field school has explained to me how they will evaluate my field experience in general"*, which received a mean score of (3.74), and item number 16 *"I have regular meetings with my schools supervisors to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices"*, which received a mean score of (3.68).

Table 5 below shows the findings of the third research question related to third domain of the questionnaire, which was *"To what extend are the trainees satisfied with their self-performance and professional development?"*

Table (5) Trainees' Satisfaction with their Self-Performance and Professional Development

Item No.	Statement		Strong ly	Agree	Neutr al	Disagr ee	Strong ly	mean	Std. Deviat	Rank
23	I feel that I am better prepared to enter the world of work of teaching English after this experience.	Freq %	7 36.8	4 21.1	7 36.8	1 5.3	0 0	3.8 9	.994	10
24	I feel that I am better prepared to evaluate my students' works during this experience.	Freq %	8 42.1	6 31.6	3 15.8	1 5.3	1 5.3	4.0 0	1.15 5	6
25	I feel that my oral & written communication/presentation skills have improved during this field experience.	Freq %	12 63.2	2 10.5	4 21.1	0 0	1 5.3	4.2 6	1.14 7	1
26	I feel that my creativity and problem Solving abilities skills have improved during this field experience.	Freq %	5 26.3	7 36.8	7 36.8	0 0	0 0	3.8 9	.809	9
27	I feel that the work I performed was challenging and stimulating in a way to improve my English knowledge and skills.	Freq %	9 47.4	5 26.3	4 21.1	1 5.3	0 0	4.1 6	.958	3
28	Because of my field experience, I have a better understanding of concepts, theories, and skills of teaching English.	Freq %	11 57.9	4 21.1	2 10.5	1 5.3	1 5.3	4.2 1	1.18 2	2
29	I had a good working relationship with my co-workers.	Freq %	7 36.8	6 31.6	5 26.3	0 0	1 5.3	3.9 5	1.07 9	8
30	Overall, I would rate this training experience as excellent	Freq %	9 47.4	5 26.3	3 15.8	1 5.3	1 5.3	4.0 5	1.17 7	5

31	Finally, I would recommend this training experience to other students.	Freq	10	3	3	1	2	3.9	1.39	7
		%	52.6	15.8	15.8	5.3	10.5	5	3	
32	Additional Comments: Please write below if you have any additional information to help improve this course.	Freq	11	3	2	1	2	4.0	1.39	4
		%	57.9	15.8	10.5	5.3	10.5	5	3	
Overall Mean								4.0	.809	
								5		

The statistical data shown in Table 5 indicated that the arithmetic average of students' responses to the domain related to their satisfaction with their self-performance and professional development were equal to (3.98 out of 5). This average has fallen within the fourth category of the quintet progressive scale, ranging between (3.41 to 4.20) which indicated a high- degree level of the participants' satisfaction (agree) with their self-performance and professional development.

We also could find that the arithmetic mean of the detailed points of this particular domain ranged between (3.98 to 4.426), and these averages have fallen within the fourth and fifth of the Gradient Pentagon Scale which referred to two- degree scale levels (satisfied=agree and very satisfied=strongly agree). As seen from the results shown in this table that the English language students at the College of Languages and Translation enrolled in the practical education program were very satisfied with the two items no. (25, 28), whose mean scores were (4.21 to 4.26).

As can be also seen from the results shown in the table 5 that the study sample were satisfied (agree) with eight phrases given the numbers (27-32-30-24-31-29-26-23), where their averages have fallen within the fourth category (agree) of the gradient Pentagon scale ranging from (3.41 to 4.20), indicating the participants were satisfied (agree) with their self-assessment and professional development.

Furthermore, we can find item no. (25), which was (*I feel that my oral & written communication / presentation skills have improved during this field experience*) received the highest average arithmetic (4.26 out of 5), followed by items (28), (*Because of my field experience, I have a better understanding of concepts, theories, and skills of teaching English*) with a mean of (4.21 out of 5). The item no. (27), which was (*I feel that the work I performed was challenging and stimulating in a way to improve my English knowledge and skills*) received a high mean of (4.16 out of 5), which comes next to item no. (28).

However items No (23, 26), which were (*I feel that I am better prepared to enter the world of work of teaching English after this experience*) and (*I feel that my creativity and problem Solving abilities skills have improved during this field experience*) received the lowest two arithmetic averages of (3.89 out of 5). The two items (23, 26) indicated the participants' dissatisfaction with their self-assessment and professional development.

One further general comment can be concluded on the three domains results shown tables (3, 4 &5). We can conclude that the domain of self-assessment and professional development of students came in the first place in terms of the overall participants' satisfaction of the practical education program, with a mean score of (4.05 out of 5), followed by the domain of students' satisfaction with their University supervisors, with a mean score of (4.03 out of 5). Finally, the domain related to the participants' satisfaction with their site schools supervisors and principals came in last place with a mean score of (3.98 out of 5).

Table 6 below shows the findings of the fourth research question related to coefficient relationships of the three domains of the questionnaire, which was *"Are there any coefficient relations of the trainee-students' satisfaction in the three domains of the program: university supervisors, site schools supervisors & principals, and their self-performance & professional development?"*

Table (6) Correlational Relationships of Trainees' Satisfaction on the Three Domains

Correlations				
		University supervisor evaluation	School/training site evaluation	Student's Self Evaluation
University supervisor evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	.653**	.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002	.003
	N	19	19	19
School/training site evaluation	Pearson Correlation	.653**	1	.816**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002		.000
	N	19	19	19
Student's Self Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	.652**	.816**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	
	N	19	19	19
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

A review of statistical indicators outlined in the table 6 shows that there is a strong positive correlation between the three study domains, where the relationship between the domain (University supervisor evaluation), and the domain (School / training site evaluation) was (0.653) at the level of significance (0.002), indicating a statistically significant relationship at the level of significance 0.01. As we can also see from table 6 results that there is a strong positive correlation between the domain (University supervisor evaluation) and the domain (Student's Self Evaluation), reaching the value of the relationship of (0.652) at the level of significance (0.003), indicating a statistically significant value at the level of significance 0.01. Finally, it is seen from the results that there is a strong relationship between the domain (School / training site evaluation) and the domain (Student's Self Evaluation), reaching the value of the relationship (0.816), at the level of significance

(0.00). Finally, there is a statistically significant relationship at the level of significance 0.01 or less, that is, whenever the students' satisfaction has increased in one domain, it has increased in the other remaining domains, as well.

With regard to the qualitative data analysis for the open –ended statement "Add *any additional comments to improve the practicum course*", four students out of the nineteen responded to it. Their responses came in one direction and all of them stated that university should give them more time to choose the school so that students can search for better schools that can give them better opportunities to apply their teaching experiences.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results showed that English language students at College of Languages and Translation enrolled in the education practicum program were satisfied with their university supervisors with a mean score of (4.03 out of 5). The most prominent items that reflected this satisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- My University supervisor was available and accessible during his/her office hours at the university when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.
- My university has given me appropriate credit hours to teach English at field schools
- My communication with my University supervisor through email or other social media tools was appropriate.
- My University supervisor used to respond promptly and without delays to my messages through email and social media networks.

However, the results showed the participants' dissatisfaction for items no. (1 -2-3-7) as their averages ranged between (3.53 to 4.00). The most prominent items that reflected this level of dissatisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- I received good orientations sessions about my field teaching experience from my university professor/supervisor before starting my field teaching.
- I have regular meetings& visits with my university supervisors at the training site to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.
- My university supervisor provided me with a training manual about the practicum course before joining my field school.
- My university supervisor has explained to me my grading and evaluation process during the field experience.

This finding of students' dissatisfaction suggests that university supervisors should give sufficient orientations to the students of the practicum course, explaining to them through a clear manual the requirements of the training, and how they will grade and evaluate them in this field experience. The supervisors should be encouraged to pay sufficient visits to the trainees in site schools. Supervisors, thus, should provide the university with schedules

of visits and write reports about each visit to the administration staff at the university. This finding is consistent with Warinda, Togara (2013) who recommended that special requirements of the program should be communicated by institutions to the participants.

Furthermore, the results indicated that English language students at College of Languages and Translation enrolled in the education practicum program were satisfied with site schools supervisors and principals with a mean score of (3.98 out of 5). The most prominent items that reflected this satisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- This experience at school gave me a realistic view of my field experience in teaching English.
- My school supervisor/co-teacher was available and accessible when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.
- My field school has given me the opportunity to evaluate students' works during my field experience.
- My field schools has assigned to me additional responsibilities as my experience increased.

However, the results showed participants' dissatisfaction for items no. (11 and 16) as their averages came as (3.74 for item 11 and 3.68 for item 16). The most prominent items that reflected this level of dissatisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- My field school has given me the opportunity to evaluate students' works during my field experience.
- I have regular meetings with my schools supervisors to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.

The finding of students' dissatisfaction in this particular domain suggests that site schools supervisors and principals should give the participants opportunities to grade and evaluate students in the field schools. Site schools supervisors should devote more time to pay regular visits to the trainees in site schools. Supervisors, thus, should provide both the site school and the university with schedules of visits and write reports concerning these visits. This finding is harmony with Bukaliya, Richard (2012) who reported that the supervisors were too busy to dedicate sufficient time to mentor the trainee students.

The results showed also that English language students at College of Languages and Translation enrolled in the education practicum program were satisfied with their self-performance and professional development with a mean score of (3.98 out of 5). The most prominent items that reflected this satisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- I feel that my oral & written communication/presentation skills have improved during this field experience.
- Because of my field experience, I have a better understanding of concepts, theories, and skills of teaching English.

- I feel that the work I performed was challenging and stimulating in a way to improve my English knowledge and skills.

However, the results showed participants' dissatisfaction for items no. (23 and 26) as their averages came as (3.89 for both of them). The most prominent items that reflected this level of dissatisfaction in this domain were as follows:

- I feel that I am better prepared to enter the world of work of teaching English after this experience.
- I feel that my creativity and problem solving abilities skills have improved during this field experience.

The finding of students' dissatisfaction in this particular domain suggests that site schools supervisors and principals did not give the participants sufficient opportunities to practice the training requirements in the site schools, for example, the participants indicated that school principals did not give them chances to evaluate their students' works. Therefore, the trainees did feel that they were completely involved in the practical training process during their field experience. Besides, the trainee students emphasized in the domain related to site schools that the schools supervisors did not devote much time to pay regular visits to the trainees in classrooms. The assumption underlying this finding is that if school supervisors were able to devote sufficient time of classroom visits, the trainees would gain better teaching skills. This finding comes in contrast with the findings of a study done by Larkin, Ingrid K. & Beatson, Amanda. T (2010) who reported that work Placement Preparation Program assisted students transit successfully to the workplace in a way that helps them develop the skills related to work environment issues.

The overall study findings revealed that there was a strong positive correlation of trainee students' satisfactions in the three domains of the study. Whenever the students' satisfaction has increased in one domain, it has increased in the other remaining domains, as well. These findings drew a general conclusion that the participants reflected varied levels of satisfaction toward the practicum program, but generally positive in most of the questionnaire items in the three domains. Such a conclusion comes in accordance with other studies findings that reflected positive attitudes of the trainees' attitudes towards the practical training programs (Bukaliya, 2012; Mecca 2010; Linn, Howard and Miller 2004; Stretch & Harp 1991).

Although the data analysis indicated a positive field experience reflecting trainee students' varying levels of satisfaction with the practicum program offered by Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University, there are existing some natives sides of the program prompting the researcher to initiate some recommendations geared towards the improvement of the this particular field experience. Among these recommendations based on the findings of the study can be listed as follows:

- 1- Mentor teachers at site schools should pay special attention to time devoted to supervise trainee students.

- 2- Mentor teachers and principals at field schools should provide better opportunities to trainee students to be more involved in evaluating and grading students' works.
- 3- University supervisors should pay more visits to field schools in their attempt to supervise their students. Such visits should be included in written schedules submitted to the university administration.
- 4- University supervisors should get trainee students well –oriented of how they are going to be evaluated by the university and site schools. Such evaluation issues should be included a very well- developed manual given to the trainees prior to the period of field experience.
- 5- The qualitative analysis of the open-ended question indicated that trainee students were not given sufficient time to choose their schools. Consequently, it is recommended that the university should improve their techniques of students' section of their site schools. Trainees should be allowed to shop around and find field schools that better meet their interests and teaching skills.

Other recommendations for future research were initiated based on the limitations of the study. The study sample was limited to male students as a matter of fact the university has two separate sections for male and female students. Other studies may be needed to evaluate the practicum program from the perspective of EFL Saudi female students. More generally, other researchers may conduct studies on both male and female students to compare their levels of satisfaction of the field experience, and to ensure quality assurance measures are followed with regard to unification of the practicum program procedures to male and female students in the university.

REFERENCES

- Amer, Talal S. & Ismail, Omer H (2014). An Evaluation of the Internship Program at the College of Education, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*. 1 (10), pp. 5-10.
- Beard, D.F., (1998). The status of internship / cooperative education experiences in accounting education. *Journal of Accounting Education*, (16), 507-516.
- Bukaliya, Richard. (2012). the Potential Benefits and Challenges Internship Programs in an ODL Institution: a Case for the Zimbabwe Open University. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*. 3 (1), pp. 118-133.
- Cummings, Chelsea (2014). *Global Studies Internship Experience and Evaluation*. Master's thesis. Liberty University. Retrieved 30th January 2017 from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1470&context=honors>
- Feiman, Nemser, S., and Parker, M.B. (2003). What New Teachers Need to Learn: Keeping good teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (8) pp.25-29.
- Fletcher, J. (1990). Self Esteem and Cooperative Education: A Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 26 (3), pp.41-55.

- Freidman, Barry (2014). Site Supervisors' Assessment of Student Interns. *The BRC Academy Journal of Education*. Retrieved 30th January 2017 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2514483.
- Ganal, Nicette. N, Andaya, Olive Joy F. & Guiab, Marissa R. (2016). Problems& Difficulties Encountered by Student Teachers of Philippine Normal University Isabela Campus. *International Journal of Science and Engineering ISSN: 2454 - 2016 -*, PP 63-74. Retrieved 30th January 2017 from <http://ephjournal.com/EPH-Pdf/International-Journal-of-Science-and-Engineering/September-2015/International-Journal-of-Science-and-Engineering-6.pdf>.
- Hendriske, Jacqueline. V (2013). *Teacher Education by Means of Internship: A Case Study*. Master's thesis. Retrieved 28th January 2017 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/16387282.pdf>.
- Jackel, Daniel (2011). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Internship Program*. Master's thesis. Western Kentucky University. Retrieved 28th January 2017 from <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1117/>.
- Larissa K. Barber and Sarah F. Bailey (2014). Internship Supervision Resources for Developing Student Employability. *Society for the teaching of psychology Instructional Research Award 2014*. Northern Illinois University. Retrieved 30th January 2017 from <http://teachpsych.org/Resources/Documents/otrp/resources/barber14.pdf>.
- Larkin, Ingrid K. & Beatson, Amanda T. (2010). Assessing and learning in internships: Reflecting on pedagogy and progress. *International Conference on Work Related Learning: "University-Industry Collaboration for Real Life Education"* 2010 World Association of Collaborative Education (WACE) Conference, 3 - 5 February 2010, Hong Kong.
- Linn, P.L., Howard, A. and Miller, E (2004). *Handbook for Research in Cooperative Education and Internships*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Mecca, J. (2010). *Case study of supervising a student teacher: Its impact on the cooperating teacher's professional development*. Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Rogers, Mukalee (2015). *Report on Field Attachment/ Internship IT Plus Solutions Limited, Kampala*. Makerere University. College of Computing and Information Sciences. Retrieved 28th January 2017 from https://www.academia.edu/15551409/Internship_Report?auto=download.
- Stretch, S. and Harp, S. (1991). Retail internships: an experiential learning challenge. *Marketing Education Review*, (1) pp. 66-75.
- Warinda,Togara (2013). Accounting students' Evaluation of Internship Experiences from a Skills Perspective. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2013, 3(3), PP.783-799.
- Weible, R. 2010. Are universities reaping the available benefits internship programs offer? *Journal of Education for Business* (85), pp. 59-63.

Appendixes

Appendix I

Satisfaction Questionnaire of the Trainees

Dear Student registered College of Languages and Translation Practicum course,

There *are three parts* of this questionnaire designated for your evaluation to the field experience:

Part 1 is information about you. Part 2 is a questionnaire that has three sub-components (your evaluation to the university supervisor, your evaluation to school/training site, and your self-evaluation). The main of the questionnaire is to evaluate the effectiveness of practicum course on your practical experiences, knowledge, and teaching skills based on the field experience course you are currently enrolled in.

Finally, *part three* is mainly about any additional comments you would like to add in attempt to improve the quality of the field experience program.

1. Part one: Please fill the form below and then move to answer the questionnaire items:

- Trainee's/ students' Name:
- School Name where you are practicing the English teaching: -----

- School level (Primary, Middle or Secondary): -----

- School Location/address: -----

2. Part Two: Rate the following statements on scale of five points (Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly disagree) about your practicum course by checking (✓) the box that represents your answer.

3. Part three: Please write below if you have any additional information to help improve this course.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Evaluation scope	No	Items	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Neutral	4. Disagree	5. Strongly Disagree
University supervisor evaluation	1.	I received good orientations sessions about my field teaching experience from my university professor/supervisor before starting my field teaching.					
	2.	I have regular meetings& visits with my university supervisors at the training site to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.					
	3.	My university supervisor provided me with a training manual about the practicum course before joining my field school.					
	4.	My University supervisor was available and accessible during his/her office hours at the university when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.					
	5.	My communication with my University supervisor through email or other social media tools was appropriate.					
	6.	My University supervisor used to respond promptly and without delays to my messages through email and social media networks.					
	7.	My university supervisor has explained to me my grading and evaluation process during the field experience.					
	8.	My university has given me appropriate credit hours to teach English at field schools.					
School/training site evaluation	9.	Field schools has assigned to me additional responsibilities as my experience increased					
	10.	This experience at school gave me a realistic view of my field experience in English.					
	11.	My Field school has explained to me how they will evaluate my field experience in general.					
	12.	Field school has given me the opportunity to evaluate students' works during my field experience.					
	13.	My field school/supervisors/ co-teachers gave me an orientations session about my teaching responsibilities before starting the field training.					
	14.	Field schools have given me adequate training and teaching load to enhance my teaching skills of English.					
	15.	My school supervisor/co-teacher was available and accessible when I had questions/concerns related to my teaching experiences.					

	16.	I have regular meetings with my schools supervisors to give me appropriate feedback on my teaching practices.					
	17.	Field schools have given me students' levels/grade levels appropriate to my teaching abilities of teaching English.					
	18.	My field school has explained to me how they will evaluate my teaching experience.					
	19.	The field school has given me the opportunity to improve my oral & written communication skills, Interpersonal/human relations skills and my creativity and problem Solving abilities skills.					
	20.	Field school principal and co-teachers treated on the same level as other teachers.					
	21.	My field school granted me a wide variance of opportunities to teach the English language skills.					
	22.	Field school has provided me with levels of responsibility consistent with my ability as a trainee.					
Student's Self Evaluation	23.	I feel that I am better prepared to enter the world of work of teaching English after this experience.					
	24.	I feel that I am better prepared to evaluate my students' works during this experience.					
	25.	I feel that my Interpersonal/human relations skills have improved during this field experience.					
	26.	I feel that my oral & written communication/presentation skills have improved during this field experience.					
	27.	I feel that my creativity and problem Solving abilities skills have improved during this field experience.					
	28.	I feel that the work I performed was challenging and stimulating in a way to improve my English knowledge and skills.					
	29.	Because of my field experience, I have a better understanding of concepts, theories, and skills of teaching English.					
	30.	I had a good working relationship with my coworkers.					
	31.	Overall, I would rate this training experience as excellent.					
	32.	Finally, I would recommend this training experience to other students.					

Appendix II

Interview

Dear Dr. Othman Al-Smari

As a senior Chair of the English Department and a founder to the practicum program, could you please give us an idea about this program? Kindly elaborate on the need of its introduction, and the different phases of its structure.

Interviewee Response:

In recognition of Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University to the importance of the English language needs in schools and workplace, we initiated a practicum program for the B.A students majoring in English in 2002. The program was offered towards the pre or final semester of their graduation. The program started with a first stage where students can be freed for one day to teach at schools and do the practical side of teaching English at field schools. However, once we realized that freeing the students for one day was not enough to give them proper teaching experience; we decided to expand the program to three days. Thus, students can practice teaching English for 12 contact hours a week, and they can register for a maximum of eight credit hours during the semester of the practicum course.

Appendix III

Training Instructions:

Field Training Instructions

Dearest students of Practicum course,

This is your course instructor and practicum program supervisor. You are kindly requested to provide the department with a name of a school you are choosing to do your teaching for the practicum course no later than the 2nd week on **of the current semester**. We need to draft a letter to the school principle to accept you. Make sure you provide us with the school address, telephone number, name of the school principle so that we can send your assignment letter promptly.

Kindly follow the indicated guidelines:

- 1-** Please be advised that the school should be a government school and very close to the university.
- 2-** You are supposed to teach two different class levels or more; two class sessions or more daily. Your teaching hours should be 12 contact hours and distributed on 4 days per week.
- 3-** Once you are settled in a school, you need to provide us with your teaching schedules which include the class level, room number and the time of your classes.
- 4-** If your schedules are changed, inform us directly of the new change.

5- Attend on time to your classes at school and precisely follow the school policies with regard to attendance and leave time.

6- Portfolio (30-40 marks): make a collection of all your works and combine them in a folder to be discussed with you towards the end of the semester.

7- Stay on weekly or biweekly touch with your supervisor from the university so that you keep him/her posted of your progress.

8- Your grade will be out of 100 based on your university supervisor report and your school report.