

English Language Level Effect in Undergraduate Saudi Students' Engineering Studies Achievements

Mostafa A-B Ebrahim

Professor at Civil & Environmental Eng. Dept., Faculty of Eng., King AbdulAziz University, KSA

Email: maeali[at]kau.edu.sa

Abstract: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia currently considered education is one of the most important development goals. The government of Saudi Arabia has allocated huge funds for the education of citizens in the kingdom and abroad under the instructions of the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Salman Al-Saud. The number of universities in Saudi Arabia has grown exponentially from 10 universities in 2000 to 42 universities in 2023 (30 Governmental universities and 12 private universities), as well as 13 separate public and private colleges and 7 military colleges. In the engineering schools of Saudi Arabian universities, English language is one of the most important foundations of engineering studies. Students must know this subject to pursue any field of engineering. Although English language is taught to all Saudi students from preparatory school onwards (sometimes from primary), many lecturers and students acknowledge the weakness of students in this subject, especially in higher education. They further acknowledge the impact of this weakness on the learning of most engineering courses. The purpose of this study is to identify the factors that influence the weak English language level of engineering students in Saudi Arabia and their impact on students' studies. Students in College of Engineering - Rabigh Branch - King AbdulAziz University considered as a sample study for this research.

Keywords: English Language Level; Engineering Studies; Student's Achievement; Survey; Skills

1. Introduction

English language proficiency is a crucial aspect of academic success for undergraduate students pursuing engineering studies. According to a study [1] on the influence of English Language Proficiency on college students, the levels of English language proficiency among college students are moderate in nature. This calls for a need for undergraduate students to strive towards improving their English language level to achieve academic success.

The University of Melbourne [2] emphasizes on the importance of having an adequate level of English language proficiency to study undergraduate engineering courses. Students completing a fast-track or accelerated version of their foundation program are required to complete an approved English language proficiency test.

Most of Engineering studies materials are available in English language and. In Kingdom of Saudi Arabia all universities are offering their Engineering Studies in English. So, it is very important for students to have high English language level to fully understand the subjects. Engineering students must master the English language since they must read a lot of material to keep up with their engineering knowledge, and most engineering references and literature are written in English [3]. Previous studies focused on studying the effect of some factors on academic performance such as teaching Style, self-concept, and assessment methods etc. [4-9].

Some other researches considered self-concept, which is personality development to have a strong effect on academic performance [10]. Erdogan et al., [11] tried to find solutions to student problems, the authors concluded that education based on web positively affects the academic achievement improvement.

Loo and Choy [12] studied the relationship between academic performance of students at engineering colleges and sources of self-efficacy. Yi et al., [13] studied the relation between learning behavior and content based academic improvement. The students' academic achievements were found to be highly related with their learning styles.

Therefore, it is important to commit to learning and mastering the English language to reap its full benefits. There are many ways that one can go about developing their skills such as taking classes, reading books and articles, watching videos or movies with, listening to podcasts or radio plays all in English, and engaging in conversations with native speakers [14]. Additionally, there are numerous online tools and resources available today to help individuals become more confident in their English-language abilities.

One important tip when learning English is to be patient with yourself. It is important to understand that it takes time and dedication to acquire the language skills needed for success. Keep in mind that even native speakers make mistakes, so do not be discouraged if you find yourself making errors while speaking or writing in English. Instead, use these experiences as learning opportunities and strive to improve your linguistic abilities over time. Furthermore, by surrounding yourself with other people who are also trying to learn the language, you can create a positive and motivating environment which will help you stay on track with your studies.

Finally, it is also beneficial to use digital technologies such as websites and apps when learning English. There are many different programs and resources that can help you learn the language in an enjoyable and interactive way. These tools are especially useful for practicing pronunciation, expanding your vocabulary, or engaging with other English learners.

With dedication and persistence, you can become fluent in English quickly and confidently [15].

In conclusion, undergraduate students pursuing engineering studies must prioritize their English language proficiency as it is a crucial aspect of their academic success. Developing a strong command of the English language through practice and preparation will help students succeed both academically and professionally.

2. Objectives

This research objective is focusing mainly on:

- Determine the relationship between students' academic achievements and their level in English language.
- Determine to what extent some factors such as high school, province, academic level, and age can explain the variability in students' academic achievements.
- Investigate to what extent the students' academic performance is affected by oral presentations and using the original textbooks.
- Determine to what extent the students' level in English language affect their answer and final grades.
- Reach recommendations to avoid the problems faced by the students and shed light on the means, which can be used to improve the level of students in English language.

3. Methodology

The proficiency of students' English language proficiency significantly impacts the pursuit of engineering studies. Hence, the proficiency of students in the English language is a significant determinant of their academic performance in the field of Engineering. This study will center on the impact of students' English proficiency on their academic performance in Engineering studies at the Faculty of Engineering - Rabigh. This is due to the prevalent utilization

of the English language for both instructional and literary purposes within the Engineering curriculum at said institution. Hence, the proficiency of students in the English language is deemed as a significant determinant of their academic success in various disciplines of engineering studies.

The objective is to investigate the degree to which the proficiency of students in the English language is correlated with their performance in academic pursuits in the field of engineering. It has been observed that there exists a wide disparity among students in terms of the environmental context of their previous academic pursuits, as well as their individual attitudes and levels of motivation towards education. Multiple factors may exert an impact on the English proficiency levels of students during the pre-university phase, including demographic variables such as age, geographic location, and school type. Moreover, various additional factors might exert an impact on their proficiency in the English language, such as the number of credit hours they have accrued throughout their academic tenure and the specific academic department in which they are enrolled.

To substantiate the hypothesis and ascertain the causative factors for the substandard levels of English language proficiency exhibited by students during their academic pursuit, a meticulously fashioned questionnaire was utilized to conduct a survey of students enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering located in Rabigh. The inquisitor has classified the cohorts based on their age bracket, geographical location, educational institution, accumulated academic units, and area of specialization. To enhance precision, the survey underwent a tripartite phase comprising of the pre-university level, the initial year of university preparation, and the academic progression of university studies.

4. The Survey's Questions

| No. | Question | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-university schooling | | | | | | |
| 1 | I had difficulties dealing with the English language at the pre-university level | | | | | |
| 2 | My scores in the English language tests reflect my real level in the language | | | | | |
| 3 | My study of the English language in the early stages helped me in raising the level of language | | | | | |
| Preparatory year phase | | | | | | |
| 1 | I had difficulties dealing with the English language at the undergraduate level. | | | | | |
| 2 | The English language courses that I took in the preparatory year were sufficient to prepare me to join the College of Engineering. | | | | | |
| 3 | The content of the English language courses was appropriate to prepare me to join the College of Engineering. | | | | | |
| 4 | The method of teaching English language courses was appropriate to benefit from the contents of the course | | | | | |
| 5 | I worked hard to improve my level of English to join the Faculty of Engineering | | | | | |
| The study stage at the Faculty of Engineering | | | | | | |
| 1 | The difficulties I face in the English language are mainly due to the difficulty of the linguistic content of the courses. | | | | | |
| 2 | The difficulties I face in the English language are related to the mother tongue of the faculty member. | | | | | |
| 3 | I find that teaching and explaining courses in English is the best benefit in my academic achievement. | | | | | |
| 4 | My level of English has an impact on my participation in the discussions and presentation within the lecture. | | | | | |
| 5 | My level of language has an impact on my academic achievement in laboratories. | | | | | |
| 6 | I use the original references for the courses, which helps in improving my language level. | | | | | |
| 7 | My level of English has an impact on my understanding of the questions in the test | | | | | |
| 8 | My level of English has an impact on communicating the correct answer on the test paper. | | | | | |
| 9 | I am interested in improving my level of English. | | | | | |
| 10 | I find it difficult to communicate in English outside the university. | | | | | |
| 11 | Reading newspapers, books and English improves my language ability. | | | | | |
| 12 | My English improved during my undergraduate studies | | | | | |

5. Results and Data Analysis

5.1 Reliability test

Cutoff points for Cronbach's alpha values as follow:

- $\alpha \geq 0.9$ Excellent
- $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ Good
- $0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$ Acceptable
- $0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$ Poor
- $\alpha < 0.5$ Unacceptable

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.708 | 26 |

5.2 Study sample

| Variable | Selection | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Age | 18-20 | 21 | 17.07 |
| | 21-23 | 91 | 73.98 |
| | 23+ | 11 | 8.94 |
| | Total | 123 | 100.00 |
| School | Government | 109 | 86.18 |
| | Private | 17 | 13.82 |
| | Total | 123 | 100.00 |
| Hr. passed | 27 or less | 2 | 1.63 |
| | 28-55 | 9 | 7.32 |
| | 56-88 | 29 | 23.58 |
| | 89-122 | 56 | 43.09 |
| | 123-155 | 30 | 24.39 |
| | Total | 123 | 100.00 |
| Province | Middle | 9 | 7.32 |
| | Western | 95 | 74.80 |
| | Eastern | 10 | 8.13 |
| | Northern | 5 | 4.07 |
| | Southern | 7 | 5.69 |
| | Total | 123 | 100.00 |
| English level | Weak | 16 | 13.01 |
| | Middle | 81 | 63.41 |
| | Excellent | 29 | 23.58 |
| | Total | 123 | 100.00 |
| Major | MEN | 29 | 23.58 |
| | CEN | 22 | 17.89 |
| | EEN | 45 | 34.15 |
| | IEN | 12 | 9.76 |
| | CHEN | 10 | 8.13 |
| | New | 8 | 6.50 |
| | Total | 123 | 100 |

5.3 Descriptive analysis

| Variable | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------|-----|--------|----------------|
| BUQ1 | 123 | 1.9756 | 1.23118 |
| BUQ2 | 123 | 2.5528 | 1.18185 |
| BUQ3 | 123 | 2.4878 | 1.36325 |
| PRPQ1 | 123 | 2.1707 | 1.31016 |
| PRPQ2 | 123 | 3.1707 | 1.40086 |
| PRPQ3 | 123 | 3.1301 | 1.37876 |
| PRPQ4 | 123 | 2.9675 | 1.37861 |
| PRPQ5 | 123 | 1.8699 | .94052 |
| UQ1 | 123 | 2.6504 | 1.19414 |
| UQ2 | 123 | 2.5935 | 1.18624 |
| UQ3 | 123 | 2.4959 | 1.30807 |
| UQ4 | 123 | 2.0081 | 1.03620 |
| UQ5 | 123 | 2.0488 | 1.00697 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|--------|---------|
| UQ6 | 123 | 2.5610 | 1.20889 |
| UQ7 | 123 | 1.8862 | 1.01790 |
| UQ8 | 123 | 1.8211 | .98374 |
| UQ9 | 123 | 1.7724 | .90366 |
| UQ10 | 123 | 2.3496 | 1.19414 |
| UQ11 | 123 | 2.0163 | .92314 |
| UQ12 | 123 | 2.0000 | 1.04803 |

6. One-Way Anova Test

6.1 Age VS Question

| ANOVA | | |
|-------|----------------|------|
| | | Sig. |
| UQ1 | Between Groups | .003 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |

| Post-Hoc (Tukey) | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|------------|------|
| Variable | Age (I) | Age (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
| UQ1 | 18-20 | 21-23 | -.10000 | .28968 | .936 |
| | | 23+ | -.83182 | .44075 | .147 |
| | 21-23 | 18-20 | -.10000 | .28968 | .936 |
| | | 23+ | -.93182 | .37459 | .038 |
| | 23+ | 18-20 | .83182 | .44075 | .147 |
| | | 21-23 | .93182 | .37459 | .038 |

6.2 School VS Question

| ANOVA | | |
|-------|----------------|-------|
| | | Sig. |
| PRPQ1 | Between Groups | |
| | Within Groups | 0.041 |
| | Total | |

Post-Hoc (Tukey)

| PRPQ1 | Government | Private | -.87250 [†] | .36562 | .048 | -1.7402 | |
|-------|------------|------------|----------------------|--------|------|---------|--------|
| | | 3.00 | -.94393 | .91811 | .561 | -3.1227 | |
| | Private | Government | .87250 [†] | .36562 | .048 | .0048 | 1.7402 |
| | | 3.00 | -.07143 | .97246 | .997 | -2.3792 | 2.2364 |
| | 3.00 | Government | .94393 | .91811 | .561 | -1.2349 | 3.1227 |
| | | Private | .07143 | .97246 | .997 | -2.2364 | 2.3792 |

6.3 Hr. Pass VS Question

No significance was found between group variables.

6.4 Province V.S. Questions

| ANOVA | | |
|-------|----------------|-------|
| | | Sig. |
| PRPQ2 | Between Groups | 0.049 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ1 | Between Groups | 0.037 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ3 | Between Groups | 0.051 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ12 | Between Groups | 0.054 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |

Post-Hoc (Tukey)

| | | Mean | SD | 95% CI | 95% CI | |
|----------|----------|----------|-------|---------|---------|--------|
| PRPQ1 | Middle | Western | 38270 | .876 | -1.4245 | 6960 |
| | | Eastern | 52727 | .851 | -1.9922 | 9293 |
| | | Northern | 73590 | 1.000 | -2.1157 | 1.9618 |
| | | Southern | 57835 | .503 | -6.792 | 2.5253 |
| | Western | Middle | 38270 | .876 | -6.960 | 1.4245 |
| | | Eastern | 41186 | .994 | -1.3082 | 9738 |
| | | Northern | 65815 | .992 | -1.5360 | 2.1107 |
| | | Southern | 47550 | .059 | -0.300 | 2.6047 |
| | Eastern | Middle | 52727 | .851 | -9.293 | 1.9922 |
| | | Western | 41186 | .994 | -9.738 | 1.3082 |
| | | Northern | 75147 | .974 | -1.6273 | 2.5364 |
| | | Southern | 59804 | .114 | -2.023 | 3.1114 |
| | Northern | Middle | 73590 | 1.000 | -1.9618 | 2.1157 |
| | | Western | 65815 | .992 | -2.1107 | 1.5360 |
| | | Eastern | 75147 | .974 | -2.5364 | 1.6273 |
| | | Southern | 78815 | .711 | -1.1835 | 3.1835 |
| Southern | Middle | 57835 | .503 | -2.5253 | 6792 | |
| | Western | 47550 | .059 | -2.6047 | 0.300 | |
| | Eastern | 59804 | .114 | -3.1114 | 2.023 | |
| | Northern | 81000 | .711 | -3.1835 | 1.1835 | |

| | Between Groups | 0.039 |
|------|----------------|-------|
| UQ3 | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| | | |
| UQ9 | Between Groups | 0.014 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ10 | Between Groups | 0 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ11 | Between Groups | 0.018 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |

Post-Hoc (Tukey)

| | | Mean | SD | 95% CI | 95% CI | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| UQ1 | Middle | Western | 34592 | .894 | -6.444 | 1.2722 | | |
| | | Eastern | 47659 | .948 | -1.6700 | 9.707 | | |
| | | Northern | 66516 | 1.000 | -1.9197 | 1.7658 | | |
| | | Southern | 52275 | .101 | -1.502 | 2.7463 | | |
| | Western | Middle | 34592 | .894 | -1.2722 | 6.444 | | |
| | | Eastern | 37227 | .389 | -1.6949 | 3.678 | | |
| | | Northern | 59488 | .965 | -2.0389 | 1.2573 | | |
| | | Southern | 42979 | 1.55 | -2.065 | 2.1749 | | |
| | Eastern | Middle | 47659 | .948 | -9.707 | 1.6700 | | |
| | | Western | 37227 | .389 | -3.678 | 1.6949 | | |
| | | Northern | 67524 | .994 | -1.6090 | 2.1545 | | |
| | | Southern | 54055 | .023 | 1.502 | 3.1453 | | |
| | Northern | Middle | 66516 | 1.000 | -1.7658 | 1.9197 | | |
| | | Western | 59488 | .965 | -1.2573 | 2.0389 | | |
| | | Eastern | 67524 | .994 | -2.1545 | 1.6090 | | |
| | | Southern | 71239 | .307 | -5.986 | 3.3486 | | |
| | Southern | Middle | 52275 | .101 | -2.7463 | 1.502 | | |
| | | Western | 42979 | 1.55 | -2.1749 | 2.065 | | |
| | | Eastern | 54055 | .023 | -3.1453 | -1.502 | | |
| | | Northern | 71239 | .307 | -3.3486 | 5.986 | | |
| | UQ3 | Middle | Western | 38014 | 1.000 | -1.0478 | 1.0584 | |
| | | | Eastern | 52374 | 1.000 | -1.4300 | 1.4719 | |
| | | | Northern | 73097 | .340 | -3.3905 | 6.697 | |
| | | | Southern | 57447 | .301 | -2.7069 | 4.7661 | |
| | | Western | Middle | 38014 | 1.000 | -1.0584 | 1.0478 | |
| | | | Eastern | 40910 | 1.000 | -1.1177 | 1.1491 | |
| | | | Northern | 65374 | .228 | -3.1818 | 4.404 | |
| | | | Southern | 47232 | .130 | -2.4292 | 1.878 | |
| | | Eastern | Middle | 52374 | 1.000 | -1.4719 | 1.4300 | |
| | | | Western | 40910 | 1.000 | -1.1491 | 1.1177 | |
| | | | Northern | 74844 | .346 | -3.4543 | 6.616 | |
| | | | Southern | 59403 | .316 | -2.7821 | 5.093 | |
| | | Northern | Middle | 73097 | .340 | -6.697 | 3.3905 | |
| | | | Western | 65374 | .228 | -4.404 | 3.1818 | |
| | | | Eastern | 74844 | .346 | -6.616 | 3.4543 | |
| | | | Southern | 78287 | .998 | -1.9189 | 2.4180 | |
| | | Southern | Middle | 57447 | .301 | -4.7661 | 2.7069 | |
| | | | Western | 47232 | .130 | -1.878 | 2.4292 | |
| | | | Eastern | 59403 | .316 | -5.093 | 2.7821 | |
| | | | Northern | 78287 | .998 | -2.4189 | 1.9180 | |
| | | UQ12 | Middle | Western | 30475 | 1.000 | -8.947 | 7.939 |
| | | | | Eastern | 41986 | .848 | -1.5898 | 7.386 |
| | | | | Northern | 59599 | .999 | -1.7773 | 1.4969 |
| | | | | Southern | 46054 | .086 | -2.4297 | 1.2220 |
| | | | Western | Middle | 30475 | 1.000 | -7.939 | 8.947 |
| | | | | Eastern | 32796 | .781 | -1.2848 | 5.324 |
| | | | | Northern | 52409 | 1.000 | -1.5554 | 1.3485 |
| | | | | Southern | 37864 | .034 | -2.1524 | -0.545 |
| Eastern | | | Middle | 41986 | .848 | -7.386 | 1.5898 | |
| | | | Western | 32796 | .781 | -5.324 | 1.2848 | |
| | | | Northern | 59840 | .991 | -1.3851 | 1.9305 | |
| | | | Southern | 47622 | .547 | -2.0466 | 5.920 | |
| Northern | | | Middle | 59599 | .999 | -1.4696 | 1.7773 | |
| | | | Western | 52409 | 1.000 | -1.3485 | 1.5554 | |
| | | | Eastern | 59840 | .991 | -1.9305 | 1.3851 | |
| | | | Southern | 62760 | .505 | -2.7387 | 7.387 | |
| Southern | | | Middle | 46054 | .086 | -1.2220 | 2.4297 | |
| | | | Western | 37964 | .034 | 0.545 | 2.1524 | |
| | | | Eastern | 47622 | .547 | -5.920 | 2.0466 | |
| | | | Northern | 63760 | .604 | -7.387 | 2.7387 | |

| Dependent Variable | (i) Engl level | (j) Engl level | Mean Difference (i-j) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------|-------------|-------|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | |
| BUQ1 | Weak | Middle | -37597 | 22961 | .234 | -9209 | 1689 | |
| | | Excellent | -18600* | 51577 | .001 | -33740 | 6390 | |
| | | Total | 37597 | 22961 | .234 | -1689 | 9209 | |
| | Middle | Weak | -14740* | 49934 | .011 | -28590 | -2890 | |
| | | Excellent | 18600* | 51577 | .001 | 6390 | 33740 | |
| | | Total | 14740* | 49934 | .011 | 2890 | 28590 | |
| | BUQ2 | Weak | Middle | 23052 | 22789 | .571 | -3103 | 7713 |
| | | | Excellent | 106333 | 51189 | .091 | -1315 | 22981 |
| | | | Total | -23052 | 22789 | .571 | -7713 | 3103 |
| | BUQ3 | Weak | Middle | 85281 | 49559 | .202 | -3233 | 20289 |
| | | | Excellent | -106333 | 51189 | .091 | -22981 | 1315 |
| | | | Total | 85281 | 49559 | .202 | 20289 | 3233 |
| PRPQ1 | Weak | Middle | 23052 | 22789 | .571 | -3103 | 7713 | |
| | | Excellent | 106333 | 51189 | .091 | -1315 | 22981 | |
| | | Total | -23052 | 22789 | .571 | -7713 | 3103 | |
| PRPQ4 | Weak | Middle | 23192 | 18204 | .413 | -2002 | 8638 | |
| | | Excellent | 71667 | 40891 | .190 | -4547 | 1.6871 | |
| | | Total | -23192 | 18204 | .413 | -8638 | 2002 | |
| UQ1 | Weak | Middle | 48485 | 39589 | .441 | -14244 | 2537 | |
| | | Excellent | -71667 | 40891 | .190 | -1.6871 | 4547 | |
| | | Total | 48485 | 39589 | .441 | 2537 | 14244 | |
| UQ2 | Weak | Middle | 33831 | 22255 | .285 | -8664 | 1898 | |
| | | Excellent | -181607 | 49899 | .001 | -3.0930 | 6304 | |
| | | Total | 33831 | 22255 | .285 | 1898 | 8664 | |
| UQ3 | Weak | Middle | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | -4547 | 1.6871 | |
| | | Excellent | -181607 | 49899 | .001 | -3.0930 | 6304 | |
| | | Total | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | 1.6871 | 4547 | |
| UQ9 | Weak | Middle | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | -4547 | 1.6871 | |
| | | Excellent | -181607 | 49899 | .001 | -3.0930 | 6304 | |
| | | Total | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | 1.6871 | 4547 | |
| UQ10 | Weak | Middle | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | -4547 | 1.6871 | |
| | | Excellent | -181607 | 49899 | .001 | -3.0930 | 6304 | |
| | | Total | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | 1.6871 | 4547 | |
| UQ11 | Weak | Middle | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | -4547 | 1.6871 | |
| | | Excellent | -181607 | 49899 | .001 | -3.0930 | 6304 | |
| | | Total | 48397 | 40891 | .190 | 1.6871 | 4547 | |

6.5 English level VS Question

ANOVA

| | | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|-------|
| BUQ1 | Between Groups | 0.002 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| BUQ3 | Between Groups | 0.028 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| PRPQ1 | Between Groups | 0 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| PRPQ4 | Between Groups | 0.028 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| UQ1 | Between Groups | 0.002 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |

6.6 Major VS Question

No significance was found between group variables.

7. Conclusion

English Language level of the students has a major effect on the students' achievements in Engineering studies. The students' weakness in the English language due to, mainly, the weak achievements in the pre-university stage which lead to unfollow the level of the preparatory studies for the university consequently in the university stage. Also, the

English courses in the University stage do not consider such weakness to make the students ready for his engineering studies. The Major field of study has no significant effect on their English level which shows that the same materials and teaching strategies are applied. The hours passed has no significant effect. Private schools have the lead in English level over the governmental schools, which is natural, because of the strict rolls in the private sectors. Major field of study also has no effect in the English language level for studies achievements. English language level has major effect in understanding the subjects due to the natural of teaching environmental and the references books which are in English languages. It is recommended to rise the students' achievements in English language for better understanding the study materials, and consequently in the engineering studies, better teaching strategies in the pre-university stage must be applied. Also, the admission rolls of the engineering students must include a certain English language level to be accepted.

References

- [1] Emilda Josephine, 2015, "The Influence of English Language Proficiency on College Students", International Journal of Innovative Research and Development 4(8):411-414.
- [2] Melbourne University, 2022, "Undergraduate English language requirements", <https://study.unimelb.edu.au/how-to-apply/english-language-requirements/undergraduate-english-language-requirements#navigation-bridgingprogram>.
- [3] R.S. Hutomo, 2021 "The Importance of English for Engineering Students", ENGLISH Conference 1 (1), 1-3.
- [4] Ralf Engler, 2010, "Are particular school subjects associated with better performance at university?", Tertiary Sector Performance Analysis and Report [Ministry of Education], New Zealand. , <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/80898/79296/4.-effect-of-school-subject-on-university-performance>
- [5] Liudmila Tarabashkina and Petra Lietz, 2011, "The impact of values and learning approaches on student achievement: Gender and academic discipline influences", Educational Research, 21(2).
- [6] Mohammad Salehi and Sogol Gerami , 2012, "On the relationship between multiple intelligences and achievement among Engineering students", English for Specific Purposes World, ISSN 1682-3257, Issue 35, vol. 12, <http://www.esp-world.info>.
- [7] Abdirahman M. Addow, , Abdullahi Hussein Abubakar, and , Mohamed Said Abukar, 2013, "English Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement for Undergraduate Students in Somalia", Educational Research International, SAVAP International, ISSN-L: 2307-3713, ISSN: 2307-3721, Vol. 2 No. 2, www.erint.savap.org.
- [8] Loo, C.W., and J.L.F. Choy, 2013, "Sources of Self-Efficacy Influencing Academic Performance of Engineering Students", American Journal of Educational Research 1.3, 86-92.
- [9] Wei C.Y, Hoo Y.H and See J., 2011," Relationship between Learning Styles and Content Based Academic Achievement among Tertiary Level Students", Teaching and Learning Conference.
- [10] M. Addow, A. H. Abubakar, M. S. Abukar, 2013. "English language proficiency and academic achievement for undergraduate students in Somalia", Educational Research International, Vol. 2, 59 – 66.
- [11] Y. Erdogan, S. Bayram, L. Deniz, 2008. "Factors that Influence Academic Achievement and Attitudes in Web Based Education", International Journal of Instruction, Vol.1, No.1, 31 – 47.
- [12] C.W. Loo, J.L.F.Choy, 2013. "Sources of Self-Efficacy Influencing Academic Performance of Engineering Students", American Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 1, 86 – 92.
- [13] W. C. Yi, H. Y. Hui, S. Jasmine, 2011. "Relationship between Learning Styles and Content Based Academic Achievement among Tertiary Level Students", Teaching and Learning Conference.
- [14] American English Skills Development Center, 2022, "10 Ways To Improve Your English Language Skills",
- [15] <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/10-ways-improve-your-english-language/>
- [16] Gary Motteram, 2013, "The benefits of new technology in language learning", British council,
- [17] <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/the-benefits-new-technology-language-learning>
- [18] Yavuz ERDOGAN, Servet BAYRAM, and Levent DENİZ, 2008, "Factors that Influence Academic Achievement and Attitudes in Web Based Education", International Journal of Instruction, Vol.1, No.1.
- [19] Richardm. Felder and Rebecca Brent, 2005, "Understanding Student Differences", Journal of Engineering Education, 94 (1), 57-72.
- [20] Alf Lizzio, Keithia Wilson and Roland Simons, 2002, "University Students' Perceptions of the Learning Environment and Academic Outcomes: implications for theory and practice", Carfax Publishing, Studies in Higher Education Volume 27, No. 1.
- [21] Guilizhang, et al, 2004, "Identifying Factors Influencing Engineering Student Graduation: A Longitudinal and Cross-Institutional Study", Journal of Engineering Education, 313-320.
- [22] Mussie T. Tessema, Kathryn Ready , and Wei-Choun "William" Yu, 2012, "Factors Affecting College Students' Satisfaction with Major Curriculum: Evidence from Nine Years of Data", International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 2 No. 2 [Special Issue]
- [23] Dubey Pushkar, Sharma Sudhir Kumar, and Surethiran N., 2013, "Factors affecting choice of Engineering Colleges in Odisha, India", Research Journal of Management Sciences, Vol. 2(4), 14-20, Res. J. Management Sci, ISSN 2319–1171.

Author Profile



Prof. Mostafa A-B Ebrahim received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in Civil Engineering from Faculty of Engineering, Assuit University in 1986 and 1992, respectively. During 1995-1998, he stayed in Institute of Geodesy, Innsbruck University, Austria to study the evaluation and application of digital close-range photogrammetry for Ph.D. He has been awarded his Ph.D. degree in 1998. He now working as full professor at King Abdul Aziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.