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Introduction

In general, the proficiency and achievement level of students in English as a foreign language is unsatisfactory and disproportionately low. The reasons for this low proficiency and achievement levels of students can be attributed to many factors. These factors include Department of English and college environments, students’ level in English when they are registered in the Department of English, the curriculum of the English language, use the language, and motivation and interest of students. In order to improve the proficiency level of students we take into consideration all relevant factors. However, the priority in this respect should be given to the preparation of competent teachers of English. When teachers are highly qualified, they may be able to introduce some supplementary materials into the curriculum, select the methods of teaching and techniques and may create a favorable motivational and attitudinal atmosphere to facilitate learning.

This study will address the issue of authenticity and relevance in the English as a Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Program in College of Education in Al-Nadira in term of its current practice.

THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The English as a Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Program (EFLTPP) in College of Education in Al-Nadira does not provide the students with appropriate and useful skills of teaching English although the program has been implemented since 1993. It is known that any program or curriculum should be developed after at least three or four years trial. Also, there is lack of the facilities of teaching in the department.

Students, college members, department staff, and administrators of the program are aware of some strengths and weaknesses in specific programs. However, the strengths and weaknesses of the entire system of program remain unidentified. No evaluative study has been conducted to bring the program under discussion.

This study will take a closer look at the program that is responsible for preparing and training future teachers of English in the country. It will aim at collecting information about strengths and weaknesses as perceived by advanced students (level four students) who have been enrolled the program, in-service teachers of English who studied the same program in the same department and the staff of the department.

1. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the EFLTPP of Department of English in Al-Nadira College as perceived by staff of the department, advanced students and in-service teachers of English relating to the following areas (axe):
   a) Language proficiency.
   b) The EFL curriculum and methods of teaching courses.
   c) Linguistic courses.
   d) The relevance of the program to the teaching of English in Yemen.
   f) Literature courses.
   g) Administrative and academic policies of the program.
2. To suggest some procedures to reform the weaknesses that were discovered through the results of the study.

The Questions of the Study

In harmony with the above stated purposes, the following research questions were posed:

1. What are the strengths of the EFLTPP which is taught in College of Education, Al-Nadirah according to the point of view the sample of the study?
2. What are the weaknesses of the same program according to the point of view the sample of the study?
3. What are the procedures that help the authority of Ibb University to reform the target program?

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is significant due to the participation of students in program evaluation because in the few cases where evaluation has been conducted, the views of the student was the least considered. His perceived needs and interests have been neglected, and his participation and involvement have been overlooked from the programs development process. In this respect, the study represents a growing trend in Yemeni educational system which emphasizes the students' participation and involvement in program evaluation. This study is the first of its kind to address the question of the viability of the program as perceived by the subjects of the study. Also, the study will reflect the judgments and opinions of subjects about the program particular stage in time, during 2003.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. This study will be confined to the level four students who were studying the target program. The researcher also selected those students because they have a general and comprehensive idea about the program's courses. He also selected English teachers who graduated from the same department and studied the program itself. Those teachers were teaching English language as a foreign language in public schools. Also, the researcher selected the professors who were teaching the target program because they know specific details of the program.
2. The study is limited only to one college of education, Al-Nadirah. It has administered in the first semester, 2003-2004.

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section seeks to present a profile of English as a Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Program offered in the Department of English, College of Education, Al-Nadirah. It would present information related to the professional education of teachers of English as a Foreign Language and introduce some relevant literature related to some aspects of the desired classroom ecology that the staff of the EFLTPP should take care of in order to facilitate more learning.

1. English as a Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Program in College of Education in Al-Nadirah.

There are about twenty-five Departments of English in the country that have undertaken the responsibility of preparing teachers of English for the Basic Education and Secondary schools in Yemen. These are four-year undergraduate programs that exist in colleges of education. Students who graduate from these departments receive a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and education. The graduates usually teach at the
Basic Education level (grades 7-9) After acquiring some experience, some of them are allowed to teach at the secondary school level (grades 10-12). Before graduation, future teachers of English at the college of education, for example in Al-Nadirah college, are required to study 49 semester hours of compulsory basic general education coursework to meet university, college, and professional requirements. In addition, they are required to study 102 semester hours of coursework to meet the requirements of the English Department. (Guide of College of Education, Al-Nadirah, 2000:)

There is only one elective course 2hrs duration.

The 102 semester hours requirements of the English department follow the general sequence of presentation in the target program. The first and second level courses emphasize the development of the main four skills of English language: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They also include introductory courses in English literature. The third and fourth level courses include advanced conversation, advanced grammar, English literature (Poetry, drama, and novel), linguistics (Applied linguistics, phonology, and morphology). (Ibid.)

In order to qualify for admission to the English program in Al-Nadirah, students need to sit a routine exam (not an English proficiency Entrance Examination) usually given before the beginning of the study. All students who pass the examination are admitted to the program.

The Department of English always suffers from the most persistent problem which is the poor English background of students who are enrolled in the department's program. This poor background covers all four basic skills of English language. This can be noticed clearly in grammar, pronunciation, and writing problems of students. Unfortunately, this problem has been persisting with some students even at the time of graduation. As such the quality of training is not up to English Departments' required standards. Most of the graduates are pathetically lacking in their command of English, especially in speech.

2. English as a Foreign Language Teacher Professional Education

Since early sixties the period witnessed the emergence of teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) as fascinating discipline. Experts, in the field, have been concerned with the development and identification of the objectives and required competencies of teaching English as a foreign language. Brooks (1966: 71-78), and Marquardt (1967: 31-35) emphasized on the interdisciplinary nature of the training of second language teachers. Marquardt's paper, "Preparing English Teachers Abroad," (1967) introduced to the National Council of Teachers of English Convention, is a reflection of the basic education objectives for the preparation of beginning teachers, whether native or non-native. He suggested the competencies that should be attained in terms of the attitudes, understandings, skills, and habits that distinguish an effective English as a second language teacher from an ineffective one.

The first professional recommendations for English as a second language (ESL) teacher preparation were made at the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers (TENES) conference in February, 1966. The recommendations emphasized the distinction between teacher training, which seeks to prepare teachers for quite specific roles, and teacher education, which enables teachers to assume leadership roles in research and experimentation. (TESOL GUIDELINES, 1975) The recommendations also require that ESL teacher preparation programs should make a broad spectrum of techniques exist to every teacher.

The most complete document known to the profession is the TESOL GUIDELINES (1975). It represents the consensus of a great number of professionals.
in the field and discusses the required guideline for the preparation of ESL teachers. The document was developed through professional meetings at the Center of Applied Linguistics. The document consists of three sections: the first defines the role of the ESL teacher in American schools, the second describes the personal qualities and professional competencies of ESL teachers, and the third section states the objectives and characterizes important features of an ESL teacher preparation program. In the second section, our concern at this moment, the document focuses on the personal qualities and professional competencies of teachers, which are as follows:

1. He (teacher) has personal qualities which contribute to his success as a classroom teacher, insure understanding and respect for his students and their culture.

2. He demonstrates proficiency in spoken and written English at a level commensurate with his role as a language model.

3. He has experience of learning another language and acquiring knowledge of its structure, as well as has a conscious perception of another cultural system.

4. He understands the nature of language; the fact of language varieties, social, regional, and functional; the structure and development of English language systems, and the culture of English speaking people.

5. He has knowledge of the process of language acquisition as it concerns first and subsequent language learning and as it varies at different age levels.

6. He has an understanding of the principles of language pedagogy and the demonstrated ability, acquired by actual teaching experience, to apply these principles as needed to various classroom situations.

7. He has an understanding of the principles, and ability to apply the techniques and interpret the results of the second language assessment of students' progress and proficiency, and the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching materials, procedures and curricula.

8. He has a sophisticated understanding of the factors which contribute to the life styles of various peoples, and which determine both their uniqueness and interrelationships. (Ibid.)

The purpose of the TESOL Guidelines is to formulate the principles upon which the ideal program of teacher preparation should rest. The guidelines are general rather than specific. Fanselow and Light, (1977: 9) say: “They do not specify behavior nor describe the type of procedures to be followed to produce teachers with the characteristics, knowledge and skills recommended.”

Alatis (1974: 8) provided an organizational paradigm for the kind of courses that should be included in any EFLTPP. He introduced the relevant skills and knowledge referred to in the guidelines in LAPSE. This stands for courses in Linguistics, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociolinguistics, English Education. The idea of the Alatis paradigm is to integrate theory with practice by translating the guidelines into a body of courses.

The development of the TESOL Guidelines (1975) was made through the contributions of TESOL experts. Gradman (1971: 78), for example, suggested the minimum preparation which an ideal teacher preparation program should provide. It includes a knowledge of language, language acquisition, historical and current methods of language teaching, the experience of practicum, materials and error analysis, measurement and testing, and the prerequisite of competence in English for non-native speakers. Other elements such as culture, literature research techniques and research directions should be provided.
Meanwhile TESOL experts agree in general about the ideal ESL teacher, but there is less agreement on the most effective method for his training. Whereas most of the literature pertaining to the training of ESL teachers is devoted to the pros and cons of competency-based teacher education (Clark, 1979: 26).

This movement is founded on the belief that basic teaching competencies can be identified, isolated, and then introduced to teachers in teacher training programs (Murdoch, 1994: 253-265).

Fanselow (1977: 131) described an approach to competency-based ESL teacher education. According to this approach, the preparation program should include the following characteristics:

1. Presentation of desired competencies of ESL teacher.
2. Description of desired behaviors that represent the competencies.
3. Provision of flexible means of assessment that would provide evidence of the mastery of the important competencies but not specifically the exact number of particular behaviors that must be demonstrated and
4. Being an open-ended program that encourages adding behaviors as long as they meet the objectives of the program.

Lee argued that ESL training programs should be designed according to the abilities and needs of prospective teachers and should take their level of competence as a starting point. This means, “getting down to the details of what they have to teach but not necessarily to the details of any underlying theory” (Lee, 1974: 37). In a later work, Lee provided thirty objectives of ESL teaching specified in behavioral terms. He wrote the conditions under which these behaviors are to be performed, and the criteria by which they are to be evaluated. Two of his objectives are given below:

a) From memory, T(teacher) writes or speaks four lines of dialogue in a non-native language.

b) Within 30 minutes of a new student’s entry into an ESL class, T elicits from at least three other students the correct answer to the question, “What is his name?” (Lee, 1977: 147)

4. The Methods Course

The TESOL Guidelines (1975) mentioned that the methods component of the EFL TPP should contain the following points:

1. Clearly stated objectives.
2. Theoretical approaches to and methods of teaching ESL.
3. Language teaching techniques and procedures.
4. Curricula.
5. Teaching materials and aids.
6. Adaptation of instructional materials to specific situations.
7. Professional information sources, such as journals, research reports.
8. Design, implementation and evaluation of innovative materials and techniques.

The TESOL Guidelines doesn’t distinguish between the component of methods of teaching course and the component of EFL TPP when they discussed the component of methods course.

After teaching an experiment methods course, De Lorenzo recommended that a methods course should:

1. develop a library of video-taped demonstrations for basic performance skills (prepared by students).
2. establish a lab for video-taped teaching methods (prepared by students).
3. create opportunities for relating theory to practice by assigning reading and follow up demonstrations of specific performance skills.
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4. develop individual teaching styles.
5. develop a self-directed instructional manual for completing specified trainee tasks in the course.
6. create opportunities for the trainees’ involvement in the real classroom situation.
7. create opportunities for peer interaction. (De Lorenzo, 1975: 239-245)

On the other hand, some TESOL experts, such as Bowen (1966), Alatis (1974), Lee (1974), Strevens (1974), and Schmieder et al., believe that a methods course which emphasize the practical over the theoretical will be the most effective.

Bose believes (2001: 120-121) evaluation of the methods course experience is of concern to trainers. It is argued that knowledge of teaching techniques can be tested by pencil and paper exams but knowledge of teaching techniques cannot be tested in the same way.

Hok (1964: 55-59) used films (prepared by the Modern Language Association) to evaluate her students’ experience of the methods course. The questions she asked included relating theory to practice, identification of techniques used in the films, and discussion of techniques and their relationship to information presented in class.

In short, one can summarize the most important considerations in the ESL literature pertaining to the methods course in the following sentences: The need for a balance between theory and practice, the need for student involvement in real classroom situations, the need for organized discussions in which students can talk about and evaluate their experiences, and the importance of utilizing innovative instructional approaches.

**Administrative Policies:**

The TESOL Guidelines (1975) highlighted some basic EFLTTPPS policy issues related to the evaluation of candidates, staff, and facilities.

In EFLTTPPS a strong relationship should exist between what is taught and the needs and interests of learners. This kind of relationship is justifiable according to the principles of the progressive movement in education.

Rogers (1969: 133) underscored the need of educational experiences which should be effective of and strong relevance to the learner.

Wilga Rivers (1975: 22-23) highlighted the changing relationship between teachers and students. She mentioned that this relationship is changing from the traditional teacher-directed situation to one of teacher–student interaction with shared decision making. The emphasis in the future, she wrote “...should be placed on the individual learner, his needs and interests with a closer rapport between teachers and students in a students-centered program”.

Effective leadership is considered a critical element in the creation and maintenance of a successful institution. Educational institutions such as EFLTTPPS are very complex to lead. College professors are jealous of their independence, proud of their specialized competences, not easily led, and sometimes suspicious of being told what or how they serve. Eble (1978:98) indicated that the head of the program is the overall facilitator of teaching and learning and therefore the outcome of the educational process is affected by the way he exercises his leadership. A thorough job specification and identification of responsibilities of the head of the EFLTTPP includes program organization and management; syllabus design; staff development and the delegation of responsibility within the department; the supervision and assessment of students and staff; the provision of advice and details of sources of information for members of the program, techniques of assessment and examination administration; the acquisition and
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development of teaching materials, resource management, and the planning of visits and exchanges for staff and students (Mojos, 1976: 12).

Classroom Climate of EFLTPP
The discussion in this section will emphasize on the following three main aspects in the classroom climate of EFLTPP:

1. Human Relations:
   The high quality of education that EFLTPP should provide is required because giving only courses will not be sufficient. This kind of education can be achieved through the attitudes and atmosphere which must pervade all of our efforts.

   Available literature about the personal side of the teacher indicates that the teacher should be aware of the moral functions he should provide which includes the building of standards, character and enthusiasm. He should be patient, warm, sensitive, open minded, and flexible (Robinett, 1977: 35-44). The teacher should develop an interest in the language and culture of his students in order that the students will take his example with respect to English (Norris, 1977: 254).

   Puhl (1975: 138) mentioned that human interaction is the key to the development of communicative competence in the ESL learner and stated: “The most decisive element affecting the learning process in the classroom is the teacher; not the teacher as funnel, task master, or puppeteer, but the teacher as facilitator of learning.” The trend of human relations in teaching finds its theoretical support in the theory of humanism in education. This theory is introduced in the work of the humanistic psychologist Carl Rogers. Rogers (1969: 133) identified three qualities that teachers can bring to the learning process which facilitate learning and growth, they are empathy, prizing and realness. Empathy is the ability which helps learner to understand his reactions, and being aware and sensitive to his needs. Prizing means valuing the learner, his feelings, and his opinions. Realness means the attitude of the teacher to be a real person with his students without presenting a front or a facade. The teacher should not limit himself to the role of a faceless embodiment of a curricular requirement. Rogers presented evidence from research that good teachers demonstrate these qualities and poor teachers do not, and students of teachers who have these qualities learn more than students of teachers who do not.

   In conclusion, learners of all ages, regardless of their background, largely seem to feel more positive about learning in a warm, supportive climate than in a depersonalized, cold, rejecting one.

2. Counseling Techniques:
   Several studies have shown that learning to speak a foreign language, there is a period of hesitation which takes some time beyond the time at which a reasonable command of the vocabulary could be expected (Begin, 1971: 26). This hesitation is a type of anxiety which can be overcome by counseling methods in the learning situation.

   Curran (1982: 134-145) has provided the most thorough application of counseling techniques to the issue of language learning. His results have shown that learning is greatly facilitated if the students are provided with sufficient emotional support and help at each stage of language learning until they reach mastery. Begin (1971: 26) showed in his study a positive change in the emotional attitude to the culture of the foreign language.

Study Methodology
The researcher selected the descriptive – analytical method because this study based on description and analysis of the problem and data collected.

Population of the Study:
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The population of the study comprised all students who were studying English in the Department of English Language in the academic year 2003-2004, Faculty of Education, Al-Nadirah, and all English teachers who graduated from the same department and studied the same EFLTPP and were teaching English in the Republic of Yemen. Also the professors who were teaching the target program in the same department.

Sample of the Study:

The sample of the study was confined to 98 level four students who attended the lectures regularly in the Department of English as mentioned above. The researcher selected those level four students because they were in the final level of the EFLTPP. At the same time, they had good experience in the English language more than that of the other level students.

The second group consisted of the graduates who studied the target program and were in-service teachers teaching English in public schools. Since the number of these English teachers is large, the researcher selected a lot of 17 English teachers who were teaching in Al-Nadirah and Saddah schools.

The third group consisted of the professors who were teaching the target program. They were 3 assistant professors.

Study Instrument

The development of the questionnaire items were written after a careful examination of the literature in EFL teacher education. The questionnaire consisted of 57 items. Sixty-eight of these items were close-ended, meanwhile ten items were open-ended. The questionnaire items represent 6 areas (axes) of EFL teacher education. These areas are as follows:

1. Language proficiency;
2. Required EFL curriculum and methods of teaching courses;
3. Required linguistic courses;
4. Relevance of the program to the teaching English in Yemen;
5. Literature courses;
6. Academic and administrative policies of the program.

The Reliability and Validity

The questionnaire should be reliable and valid. In order to achieve this, the researcher followed the following procedures:

The Validity of the Questionnaire

The first draft of the questionnaires was submitted to some faculty members who are specialized in curricula and methods of teaching and linguistics, for further refinement.

Based upon the comments, suggestions, and recommendations of those specialists, the final drafts were written.

The Reliability of the Questionnaire

The final drafts of the questionnaire were administered to ten students of level four who were studying the target EFLTPP in the Department of English language, faculty of Education in Al-Nadirah. After fifteen days, the researcher administered it again, to the same group of students. Then, he counted the correlation between two tests responses of the pilot study. The correlation coefficient was 0.91 which meant the questionnaire was a reliable one.

The same drafts were administered to five English teachers, two of them teaching in Al-Nadirah schools and the other three teaching in Saddah schools. The
researcher used the same procedures which were used with students. The correlation coefficient was 0.88.

There were four scale values for every item; strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. The mean value of the responses to every item was based on this scale from 4 to 1 which considers all responses individually.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

This section deals with analysis of data that was collected from sample of the study which consisted of three groups, group (a) was the professors who were teaching the target program in the Department of English, Al-Nadirah. Group (b) was the English teachers who studied the same program and were then teaching English in Al-Nadirah and Saddah schools, and group (c) was English students of level four who were studying the same program.

Depending on the samples’ responses to the distributed questionnaires, the researcher presented their reactions regarding each category of the questionnaire in the forms of frequencies, percentages, mean and std. deviation. The responses to each statement were inserted on a scale ranging from 1 to 4. In order to make this section easier to read and understand, the researcher combined response number 1 (strongly disagree) and response number 2 (disagree) into one as a negative category. Also, response number 4 (strongly agree) and response number 3 (agree) were combined into one as a positive category.

**Table No.(1): Shows Distribution of Sample According to Independent Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gro.</th>
<th>Variables F.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table No.(2): Shows the Responses to Language Proficiency.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Understand dialogues</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Understand lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Speak English fluently</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Speak with good pronunciation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read and understand with ease original materials on subjects with a familiar context</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations Used in the Tables:**

Table No. 2, shows that the subjects felt positively that the language courses enable students to master English, in speaking English with good pronunciation, understanding dialogues, and understanding lectures easily, whereas the target items got highest percentages, mean, and std. deviation scores( 79.7 %, 3.22 M, and .93 SD ), ( 74.6 %, 3.00 M, and .98 SD ), and ( 71.2 %, 2.90 M, and .92 SD ) respectively.

On the other hand, the subjects indicated only slight agreement with item No. 2a, “Speaking English fluently”, since it got ( 56 %, 2.65 M and .96 SD ). The last item, “Read and understand with ease original materials on subjects with a familiar context” got high disagreement ( 44.1 %). Also, item No. 2a, got high disagreement (43.2 %). This means, the program does not provide students with required skills of language which concern items (2a and 3).

Table No. (3): Shows the Responses to the EFL Curriculum and Methods Courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teaching listening.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teaching grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teaching dialogues and conversations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Preparing tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evaluating students’ performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Using various methods and techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Preparing and organize lessons plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distinguishing between aims and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Understanding the components of the content of English curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Analyzing the elements of curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Participating in development of English curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Participating in school English curriculum evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 3, reveals that the subjects generally expressed their agreement with all items of second axis. They claimed positively that the curricula and methods of teaching courses enabled students to teach English language skills and areas. The target courses also enabled the English teachers to analyze the elements of curriculum and participate in developing English curricula. Close inspection of subjects responses, however, reveals additional insights. Responses to item No.
“Teaching listening” with the agreement rate of only 58.5% suggests that this area is less emphasized in the program.

Table No. (4) : Shows the Responses to Linguistic Courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sc F. %</th>
<th>sc F. %</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Understanding the English sound system.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Explaning and identifying students’ pronunciation problems.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Linguistic courses provide students with knowledge about a foreign language acquisition.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>They provide students with knowledge about first language acquisition.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They help students to identify the linguistics problems of learning English as a foreign language</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>They enable students to understand English syntax</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>They enable teachers to explain English syntax to their students</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>They enable students to understand English phonology.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>They enable teachers to explain phonology to their students.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>They enable students to understand morphology.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>They enable teachers to explain morphology to their students.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 4, shows mean, std deviation scores and percentages of subjects responses to individual items in the axis of linguistics , which clearly indicate only slight agreement. This means, the subjects evaluated their experience positively in the linguistic courses.

On other hand, only four items, the items, 4d, “They enable students to explain English phonology to their students in future”, 4e, Linguistic courses enable students to understand English morphology”, 4f “Linguistic courses enable students to explain English morphology to their students in future”, and item 2b “Linguistic courses provide students with knowledge about first language acquisition” the negative
responses of subjects to target items were high. This means, the linguistic courses do not provide students with necessary skills of morphology, phonology, and knowledge of the acquisition the first language which help students to explain them to their students in future. (please, see their means, S. deviations and percentages in table No. 4).

Table No. (5) : Shows the Responses to the Relevance of the Program to the Teaching English in Yemen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The British and / or the American literature courses are relevant to the aims and requirements of teaching English in Yemen.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The program provides students with the opportunity to become familiar with the curricula used in teaching English in Yemeni schools.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The program, in general, meets the needs of individuals preparing to teach English in Yemeni schools.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The program has adequately prepared teachers to teach English in Yemeni schools.</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As revealed in table No.5, the mean and S. deviation scores of responses of the subjects to this axis (M =2.33, SD=.99, M= 2.85, SD=.94, M= 2.50, SD=.86, M= 2.74, SD=.82) respectively and (45.8%, 68.6%, 52.5% and 67.8%)percentages of responses to individual items indicate low general tendency towards agreement except item No. one, subjects reacted negatively to it.

In item No. one, which deals with the literature courses, the responses suggest the lack of relevance of these courses to the teaching English in Yemen.

On the contrary, item No. one (54.2 %) and item No. 3 (47.5%) got high negative responses which indicate that great number of the students did not satisfy with the target program because it did not equip them with necessary language skills that can be used in teaching English in Yemeni schools. This negative reaction against items one and 3 ,raises some questions relating to the preparation of future teachers of English.
Table No. (6): Shows the Responses to Literature Courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>Understanding the Western European literature.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>Knowing the English culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.</td>
<td>Distinguishing between the Arabic literature and English literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>Analyzing the English poem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e.</td>
<td>Teaching the English literature to their students in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f.</td>
<td>Knowing the English literature poets and writers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 6, reveals the percentages, mean and std. deviation scores (52.6%, M=2.52, SD=1.03, 71.1%, M=2.81, SD=.88, and 51.7%, M=2.56, SD=1.03) of responses of subjects to items 1a, 1b, and 1f respectively. They indicate a slight tendency towards agreement.

While the responses of the subjects to items, 1c, 1d and 1e,(50.9%, M=2.55, SD=.96, 57%, M=2.36, SD=.94 and 63.6%, M=2.19, SD=.85) respectively were disagreement.

Thus, we find that teaching literature in the EFLTPP of College of Education, Al-Nadirah is less important than other knowledge, skills, and understandings necessary for preparing competent EFL teachers.

Table No. (7): Shows the Responses to Administrative and Academic Policies of the Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>sc</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The objectives of the program were available in writing for all concerned.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>The program maintained up-to-date curriculum materials that include aids and equipment used in teaching English as a foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>The program maintained up-to-date professional books and journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The program made proper use of the language laboratory to develop my communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>The students were involved in the evaluation of courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>The students were involved in the evaluation of faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>The evaluation of the student's work in the program was primarily based on subjective tests.</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.</td>
<td>The evaluation of the student's work in the program was primarily based on objective tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c.</td>
<td>The evaluation of the student's work in the program was primarily based on classroom participation and presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d.</td>
<td>The evaluation of the student's work in the program was primarily based on research papers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table No. 7, shows responses of subjects to this axis, the percentages, mean and std. deviation scores of responses to individual which items indicate a low tendency towards agreement with eight items; but the subjects reacted to the remaining six items negatively.

The reactions to item 1, availability of written objectives, and item 2a, maintenance of up-to-date curriculum materials, were low positive. Even we assume for the sake of argument that there were written objectives, and up-to-date curriculum materials, the fact remains that the program did not communicate this information to students.

Responses to the item 2b, maintenance of up-to-date professional books and journals, item 3, suggest shortcomings in the program. This means, the program failed to provide such services might negatively influence the quality of education program provide.

Responses to item 3, “The program made proper use of the language laboratory to develop my communication skills”, indicate a lack of perceived proper use of an already available facility in the program.

Responses to 4a and 4b, involvement of students in the evaluation of courses and faculty members, reflect a traditional practice of EFLTPP where students are not usually involved in evaluating courses and faculty members.

Items 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d, deal with the evaluation of students’ work. 56.8% of the subjects indicated that the evaluation of students’ work was primarily based on subjective tests and 57.6% of subjects indicated that it was based on objective tests. These reactions asserted that the evaluation of students’ work included subjective and objective tests together. With respect to whether evaluation was based on (1) class participation and presentation, and (2) research papers, the responses of subjects to the items confirmed the disagreement.

This suggests the kind of focus the program places on subjective and objective tests only. In item 6, “The purpose of evaluating the students in the program was understood as a way to facilitate learning” the subjects expressed agreement with the item.

With respect to item 7, “The policy of course offerings was flexible and convenient” the subjects’ responses to item were divided into two halves. 50% of the subjects showed a tendency towards agreement while the other 50% of the subjects revealed disagreement. This division reveals that the subjects have not adequate experience in this field.

Responses to the item 8, “The hall size of most of my courses was more than 100 students’ the agreement of subjects was at the rate of 50.8%. This suggests that the hall size in the program seems to be crowded because most of the halls in College of Education, Al-Nadirah, are very small.

In the last item of this axis, “I am generally satisfied with the administration of the program” the subjects’ responses revealed an acceptable agreement with administration.
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of the program. However, whatever the reasons for this agreement, it should be an area of concern for the program in the future.

Finally, in the last of each axis of the questionnaire the subjects were asked to provide comments and suggestions that were important to present a good quality of teaching and to make the program more responsive to the needs and interests of students.

Results

The questionnaire items of the study were designed to reflect a standard of what might ideally be provided in EFL teacher preparation. For this reason, the agreement and disagreement tendencies of the subjects to the items suggest strengths and weaknesses in the practices of the EFTPP which is taught in Department of English in Al-Nadirah.

When the subjects generally agreed it is an indication of strength; and when they disagreed, it is more or less an indication of weakness. In so far as this study tried to elicit information directly from subjects, one has to assume that the subjects' responses reflected their true beliefs. The following inferences can be drawn about the EFTPP of Department of English in Al-Nadirah area:

1. With respect to language proficiency, it seems that the program is doing well in preparing students to master in areas of listening, speaking English with good pronunciation. The presentation of reading and writing was good as well. But we notice all the areas above-mentioned got less than 75% of subjects' responses.

2. In the EFL curricula and methods of teaching, the program seems to provide good experience that was positively evaluated by a majority of the subjects. It is felt that the program generally enabled students to teach the basic skills of the English language.

3. As far as in the relevance of the program to the teaching of English in Yemen is concerned, it can be concluded that:
   a. The literature courses in the program are not considered relevant to the teaching of English in Yemen.
   b. The program gives students the opportunity to become familiar with the curricula used in the teaching of English in Yemeni schools.
   c. The program adequately prepares teachers to teach English in Yemeni schools.
   d. It does not meet all needs of individuals preparing to teach English in Yemeni schools.

Here, we should notice that the program does not take care of individual needs while preparing students for teaching English in schools.

4. With respects to literature, it seems that the program is doing no bad in making students understand the Western literature, know the English culture and know English poets and writers. Yet it could not enable students to distinguish between the Arabic literature and English literature, analyze the English poem, and teach the English literature to their students in future.

5. The present atmosphere of the program, as indicated in the responses of subjects, seems to provide for good personal relationships between the students and the faculty members, high motivation for learning, and an opportunity to pursue personal interests related to the English major.

6. The subjects felt that the fear of making mistakes in the classroom acted as a psychological barrier that hindered the students' ability to communicate in English. They reflected a belief that there was no lack of opportunity to participate in classroom discussions provided by teachers.
7. The program, as indicated by subjects' responses, seems that the students could not easily communicate their problems and concerns with the faculty members, English program administrators, students' affairs and deanship of the college.

8. Concerning the most important components in the education of English as a Foreign Language, teachers demonstrated good English language proficiency, knowledge of linguistics, curriculum and methods of teaching, literature, teaching aids, and other educational courses. The subjects claimed that the students have not had any additional work in areas mentioned above.

9. The students of the program were usually not involved in evaluation of course and of faculty members. Furthermore, the evaluation of student's work was heavily based on subjective and objective tests. Other means of evaluation, such as class participation, presentations and research papers are less emphasized in the program.

10. The subjects indicated in their comments that the handouts of literature and linguistics were not clear.

11. The subjects also indicated in their comments that there are few professional books in the library of college.

**Suggested Procedures of Reforming the weaknesses of EFLTPP.**

Based on the results of the study, the suggestions and comments provided by the subjects and information collected about the program, the researcher suggests the following procedures to overcome the weaknesses of the program and to reform and facilitate better quality of education in the English as a Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Program:

1. The program should provide students with better preparation in main skills of English language. More time and effort should be expended in this direction. Also, the program should emphasize teaching morphology, phonology, and pronunciation.

2. The program should provide more training to prepare students to teach listening and writing skills in the schools.

3. The program should provide students -teachers with more opportunities to observe the schools teachers teaching and students -teachers should teach more than one period in both practicum courses, in the college and schools.

4. The program should provide students with the opportunity to acquire a basic knowledge of first language acquisition.

5. The literature courses should be offered in a way that facilitates discussion and more practice in speaking English.

6. Most of the Department of English members in the program are not Yemenis. However, the expatriate teachers should make the effort to be more sensitive to the interests and needs of students. They should also familiarize themselves with the Yemeni educational system and the objectives and practices of teaching English in Yemeni schools.

7. The faculty members of the program should provide students with more opportunities to participate in classroom discussions and encourage students to freely communicate in English.

8. The program seems to reflect a traditional teaching atmosphere where the lecture method is the most frequent method of teaching. This kind of atmosphere may not be the best for meeting the future demands of teaching English. So, the program should provide different modern teaching methods and strategies that are aimed at increasing the students' professional skills and creating opportunities for them to
listen, speak, read, and write in English. Such chances can be created in group
discussions, term papers, oral and written reports.
9. The program should maintain a strong and efficient communication link between
administrators and faculty members on the one hand and students on the other. This
communication network can be maintained through periodic meetings among
administrators, faculty members, and students together to discuss relevant problems
and suggest solutions to achieve the objectives of the program.
10. The handouts required for the different courses and levels of the program should be
selected in a way that takes the levels of students into consideration. They should
reflect a continuum of language skill levels.
11. The program should maintain up-to-date curricular materials to be used in EFL
Teaching at all levels. Also, professional books, research papers, journals and other
sources of supportive professional information should be made available and kept
current.
12. The program should focus on different means and strategies to evaluate students’
work. The present practices which seem to emphasize two forms of evaluation
strategy, namely subjective and objective tests should be changed in favor of a wide
range of evaluation strategies. The evaluation should also include other strategies
such as regular assignments, class participation, presentations and research papers.
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