



## ANALYZING THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMPETENCE OF TEXTILE DESIGN STUDENTS: A CASE OF EAP

Amna Khawar  
[amnakhawar302@gmail.com](mailto:amnakhawar302@gmail.com)

MPhil Student, Department of English, GC Women  
University Sialkot.

Iram Rubab  
[Iram.rubab@gcwus.edu.pk](mailto:Iram.rubab@gcwus.edu.pk)

Assistant Professor, Department of English, GC Women  
University Sialkot.

### Abstract

Recognizing the growing importance of English for academic success and professional engagements in Fine Arts Disciplines. This study investigates the Academic English language needs of Textile Design students through a quantitative study conducted at Government College Women University, Sialkot. The research aims to identify students' existing language competence through questionnaire. It was distributed among 130 students of the concerned Department. Data were analyzed using SPSS to calculate means and standard deviations. The findings reveal noticeable gaps between students' existing English competence and the academic language demands of Textile Design programs, regarding reading, writing, oral communication and listening skills. The study highlights the need for a more targeted English for academic Purposes (EAP) approach that aligns language instruction with the academic needs of Textile Design students.

**Keywords:** *EAP (English for Academic Purposes), Needs Analysis, PSA (Present Situation Analysis), Textile Design Students*

**Corresponding Author:** Iram Rubab (Assistant Professor, Department of English, GC Women University Sialkot)  
**Email:** [Iram.rubab@gcwus.edu.pk](mailto:Iram.rubab@gcwus.edu.pk)

## 1. Introduction

The Textile Design students often struggle to meet the academic English language demands required for success in higher education and for participation in the global Textile industry. In higher education, English functions as a dominant language of academic discourse and professional practice, students are now expected not only to acquire knowledge of their discipline but also to be able to communicate effectively in English through listening, speaking, reading, and writing. While English for academic purpose (EAP) emphasizes needs analysis as a foundation for effective course design (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Hyland, 2016), existing EAP studies remains largely generic and insufficiently aligned with the discipline specific communicative realities of textile realities. As reported by stakeholders, students face persistent difficulties in meeting academic English demands due to the lack of targeted, discipline specific language support, which limits their academic performance and competitiveness in the global textile industry.

Previous researches has highlighted similar challenges in related fields such as Fine Arts and Fashion Design. Studies by Sakurni & Imansyah (2022) and Maulana & Priyana (2023) report persistent weaknesses in academic, reading, writing and oral presentation skills among Art and Fashion Design students, while Mao & Zhou (2024) identified a mismatch between students' needs and teachers' preparedness of ESP oriented instructions. However, despite the increasing internationalization and technological orientation of the textile sector, empirical research focusing specifically on the academic English needs of Textile Design students remains scarce. This represents a clear research gap, as most EAP studies concentrate on disciplines such as engineering, business and medicine, leaving creative and design oriented fields under-explored. The present study is therefore justified in seeking to generate discipline specific evidence that can inform the development of more relevant and effective ESP/ESP curriculum for Textile Design education.

To address this gap, the present study adopts a quantitative research approach grounded in Basturkmen's (2010) Needs Analysis framework, with a specific focus on Present Situation Analysis (PSA). This study seeks to explore students' current level of academic English use, the challenges they face, and the skills they perceive as necessary for their studies. The participants include undergraduate Textile Design students of Government College Women University, Sialkot.

## 2. Literature Review

English functions as a key medium for accessing academic knowledge and participating in global professional communities, making English for Academic Purpose (EAP) essential for university students in particular discipline (Hyland, 2016; Jordan, 1997). EAP is focused around Needs Analysis, which identifies what learners must do with

English, what they currently lack and how instructions can address this gap. Early models such as Munby's (1978) focused on target communicative needs, while later scholars Hutchinson & Waters (1987), Dudley Evans & St. John (1998), and Basturkmen (2010) emphasized learners' perspectives, learning contexts and disciplinary demands. Although EAP research is well developed in fields like medical and engineering, creative disciplines such as Textile design remain unexplored. Yet, Textile Design students require English to read academic literature, report writing and portfolios, and present design concepts in international contexts. Studies in related fields indicate persistent difficulties in academic skills and mismatches between students' needs and existing curricula (Mao & Zhou, 2024). Addressing this gap, the present study applies Basturkmen's framework using questionnaire to identify academic English language needs of Textile Design students.

Recent studies highlight the growing need for discipline specific English instructions in creative fields like Fashion, Textile and Fine Arts etc. Mualana & Priyana (2024) found that tenth grade Fashion Design students struggled mainly with reading and comprehension, particularly when interpreting fashion specific document such as tech packs, and expressed a strong preference for authentic, multimedia-based learning materials. Similarly Belachew (2020) examined the English needs of Ethiopian's Textile industry and reported that speaking, reading and writing skills are essential for professional tasks including email communication, report writing, negotiations, and understanding technical documents, emphasizing the need for needs based courses and stronger collaboration between academia and industry. In the field of Fine Arts, Sukarni & Imansyah (2022) identified speaking and vocabulary development as the most critical skills for students' future careers. Supporting this, a mixed-methods study in Malaysia by Kaur & Khan (2010) showed that over 95% of art and design students rated speaking and listening as essential, highlighting the demand for oral presentation practice and visually contextualized materials.

Rubab (2019) conducted a study on the academic English requirements of social sciences students at Bahauddin Zakariya University. This research employed interviews with instructors and document analysis as her main research tools. The results that she obtained from this research project include low learner proficiency and her proposal of a needs-based EAP course appropriate for discipline-specific tasks (reading, speaking, writing, and academic vocabulary). Although Rubab (2014), (2019), (2020a), she took the same approach of needs analysis to writing, speaking and listening in EAP classroom settings, thereby identifying gaps in reception skills and proposing classroom strategies and materials to facilitate lecture and seminar comprehension for social-sciences learners. And then she also coauthored a profession-focused ESP study in (2020b) entitled with "English for Medical Officers," which performed a needs analysis of medical practitioners and suggested the creation of a purpose-built ESP syllabus that mainly addresses

workplace communication and the use of technical terminology. Another mix-method study with final year art and design college students in Malaysia brought up the same three points. More than 95% of respondents rated the skills of speaking and listening as extremely important, thus oral presentation practice being the most desired, along with specialized vocabulary and materials that align closely with the visual art context (Kaur & Khan, 2010). As well Akhtar & Rubab (2024) conducted a research to explore the writing need of Natural Sciences researchers.

## **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

Basturkmen's model of Needs Analysis (2010) offers a comprehensive framework for conducting needs analysis (NA) in English for specific purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Her model moves beyond earlier, one dimensional approaches by highlighting the needs are multilayered, interdependent, and negotiated among stakeholders. It emphasizes that NA is not only about identifying what students cannot yet do, but also about prioritizing needs, since limited resources means not all needs can be addressed equally.

While Basturkmen's framework is broad, this study narrows its focus to practical and feasible elements due to time limitations and time constraints. Specifically one dimension was applied:

### **2.1.1 Present Situation Analysis (PSA)**

The questionnaire was used to conduct an assessment of students' current English proficiency, challenges, and perceived needs in academic communication.

To bridge the gap, we have been working to explore the language needs of Textile Design students in light of above mentioned framework. In this regard, following major hypothesis and subsidiary hypotheses have been generated:

## **3. Main Hypothesis**

**H<sub>0</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students possess an adequate level of English language proficiency for their academic tasks.

**H<sub>1</sub> (Alternative):** Textile Designing students possess a low level of English language proficiency for their academic tasks.

### **1.2.2 Sub Hypotheses:**

#### **Reading Skills Proficiency**

**H<sub>0a</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students have adequate reading proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1a</sub> (Alternative):** Textile Designing students have low reading proficiency in understanding academic texts.

#### **Listening Skills Proficiency**

**H<sub>0b</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students have adequate listening proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1b</sub> (Alternative):**Textile Designing students have low listening proficiency in understanding academic texts.

#### **Speaking Skills Proficiency**

**H<sub>0c</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students have adequate speaking proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1c</sub> (Alternative):**Textile Designing students have low speaking proficiency in understanding academic texts.

#### **Writing Skills Proficiency**

**H<sub>0d</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students have adequate writing proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1d</sub> (Alternative):**Textile Designing students have low writing proficiency in understanding academic texts.

### **4. Methodology**

This study employed a quantitative approach in order to explore the English language requirements of Textile Design students at Government College Women University, Sialkot. The study included a structured questionnaire, which was adapted from Desta, (2008). The target population was 130 undergraduate students from 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> semesters of Textile Design Department, among which 120 students filled in the questionnaire giving a quiet high response rate. A simple random sampling technique was implemented to ensure fair repetitiveness and minimize sampling error. The data was analyzed by using SPSS, descriptive statistical techniques such as mean scores, frequencies, and percentages to analyze data and identify key trends in students' self-perceived English language needs in the areas of major skills. In this context, reliability of questionnaire was checked first through Cronbach Alpha as shown below:

**Table: 1**  
***Presenting Cronbach Alpha Value***

| Reliability Statistics |             |  |
|------------------------|-------------|--|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | No of Items |  |
| .747                   | 44          |  |

The questionnaire demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach Alpha of .747 across 44 items, indicating that the instrument is sufficiently reliable for educational research purposes.

### **5. Results and Discussion**

The questionnaire was distributed among 130 students enrolled in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> semesters of the Textile Design department. Out of these, 120 students completed and returned the questionnaire, providing a substantial and reliable set of responses for

analysis. The questionnaire was adapted from the thesis Desta (2008) to suit the linguistic and academic needs of Textile design students at GCWUS. For the purpose of this study, the questionnaire was modified to include four major skill-related questions, each containing ten sub-questions, focusing on students' current proficiency in reading, listening, speaking and writing. In addition, it also includes three items related grammar, specialist vocabulary and pronunciation, each with three sub-questions. These adaptations were made to ensure that the instrument aligns closely with the demands of the Textile Design discipline and the aim of this thesis. All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale with the following values: 5 = Very Good, 4 = Good, 3 = Average, 2 = Not Good and 1= Poor. This scale allowed students to rate their own proficiency levels in a way that is simple yet informative for understanding the learning needs. The Data has been analyzed by using SPSS software, and descriptive statistics is applied to obtain the mean scores, standard deviation, maximum and minimum values of the variables involved.

## 5.1 Justification for Hypothesis

### 5.1.1 Main Hypothesis

**H<sub>0</sub> (Null):** Textile designing students possess an adequate level of English language proficiency for their academic tasks.

**H<sub>1</sub> (Alternative):** Textile designing students possess a low level of English language proficiency for their academic tasks.

### English language proficiency

A one-sample t-test has been performed to investigate whether the overall English language proficiency of Textile Design students is significantly different from the benchmark value of 3, which corresponds to an adequate/average proficiency level on the Likert scale. The outcome indicates that students reached an overall proficiency average of  $m = 2.8693$ , which is lower than the benchmark.

**Table 2**

### *One Sample Statistics: English language Proficiency*

#### One-Sample Statistics

|                              | N   | Mean   | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean |
|------------------------------|-----|--------|-------------------|--------------------|
| English Language Proficiency | 120 | 2.8693 | .30399            | .02775             |

The t-test findings with degree of freedom (119),  $T = -4.710$ ,  $p = .000$  reveal that this difference is statistically significant.

**Table 3**

### *One Sample T-Test: English language Proficiency*

#### One-Sample Test

| Test Value = 3             |  |        |     |                        |                    |                                                 |        |
|----------------------------|--|--------|-----|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------|
|                            |  | t      | df  | Sig.<br>(2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | 95%<br>Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |        |
|                            |  |        |     |                        |                    | Lower                                           | Upper  |
| EnglishLanguageProficiency |  | -4.710 | 119 | .000                   | -.13069            | -.1856                                          | -.0757 |

As the p-value is below .05, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) that the students' English language proficiency is significantly below the adequate level.

### 5.2.2 Sub Hypothesis

**$H_{0a}$  (Null):** Textile designing students have adequate reading proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**$H_{1a}$  (Alternative):** Textile designing students have low reading proficiency in understanding academic texts.

#### Reading Skills Proficiency

In this regard, data reveals that the mean reading score for students was  $m = 3.2183$ , which is slightly higher than the standard.

**Table 4**

**One Sample Statistics Regarding Reading Skills**

|         |     | One-Sample Statistics |        |                |
|---------|-----|-----------------------|--------|----------------|
|         |     | N                     | Mean   | Std. Error     |
|         |     |                       | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
| Reading | 120 | 3.2183                | .47774 | .04361         |

The statistical results suggest that this difference is significant at  $df(119) = 5.006$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

**Table 5**

**One Sample Test Regarding Reading Skills**

#### One-Sample Test

| Test Value = 3 |       |     |      |                        |                    |                                              |
|----------------|-------|-----|------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|
|                |       | t   | df   | Sig.<br>(2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |
|                |       |     |      |                        |                    | Lower                                        |
| Reading        | 5.006 | 119 | .000 | .21833                 | .1320              | .3047                                        |

As the p-value is less than .05, we decide that the students' reading proficiency is significantly better than the benchmark of an adequate level. Simply, the statistical evidence supports the idea that students are a little better than the "average/adequate" level

when it comes to reading, and the difference is strong enough to be considered significant thus accepting the null hypothesis  $H_0$ .

A total of 130 participants were selected by Simple random sampling technique, out of which 120 participants filled and returned the questionnaire from 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> semester students of Textile Design Department. The analysis of reading skills contains a description of reading skills one by one and then overall reading scores of mean, standard deviation, maximum and minimum values have been discussed to give a comprehensive picture of current proficiency of Textile Design students regarding reading.

**Table 6**

***Descriptive statistics Regarding Reading skills***

**Descriptive Statistics**

|                                         | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Reading carefully to understand a text  | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.4833 | 1.01239        |
| Identify key ideas                      | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.1417 | .87251         |
| Understanding organization of text      | 120 | 2.00    | 5.00    | 3.5167 | .79898         |
| Identifying supporting ideas/ examples  | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.1500 | 1.43574        |
| Taking Brief                            | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.3750 | 1.39062        |
| Understanding specialist vocabulary     | 120 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.3667 | 1.00363        |
| Reading quickly to get overall meaning  | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.6083 | 1.06350        |
| Reading quickly to find information     | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.3083 | 1.22848        |
| Evaluating an academic journal          | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.0417 | 1.29249        |
| Working out meanings of difficult words | 120 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.1917 | 1.33659        |
| Reading                                 | 120 | 2.00    | 4.40    | 3.2183 | .47774         |
| Valid N (listwise)                      | 120 |         |         |        |                |

Among the comprehension tasks, the students seem to be relatively more at ease with identifying supporting ideas and examples ( $m = 3.15$ ) with standard deviation of 1.43, taking brief notes while reading ( $m = 3.37$ ) with standard deviation ( $sd = 1.39$ ), and reading quickly to get the overall meaning ( $m = 3.60$ ) with standard deviation ( $sd = 1.06$ ). In effect,

the students demonstrate their competence in general information retrieval and surface-level understanding of academic texts.

Conversely, several important academic reading skills are dropping into a low average range which is indicative of significant difficulties. Examples to this point are identification of main ideas ( $m = 3.14$ ) with standard deviation 0.87, evaluation of an academic journal ( $m = 3.04$ ,  $sd = 1.29$ ), and working out the meanings of difficult words ( $m = 3.19$ ) with standard deviation ( $SD = 1.33$ ) which were presented as receiving moderate only ratings. In fact, these proficiency demand higher cognitive processes and boldness in handling intricate language—two aspects that ESL learners are known to have difficulty with.

The lowest figure in the chart, understanding specialist vocabulary ( $m = 2.36$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ), is an indicator of a substantial problem. As reported by stake holders that Textile Design is a field that is highly dependent on the use of technical terms, the students' insufficient knowledge of the subject-specific vocabulary has become a major obstacle in reading and comprehending the contents of the research articles as well as descriptions of the designs.

The reading skills by Textile Design students through the descriptive statistics portray their overall reading proficiency as medium with an overall mean of 3.21 with standard deviation 0.47, which is considered the "average" level according to the scale. The Minimum and maximum values for overall reading are 2.00 and 4.40 respectively. This finding shows that the students are able to carry out elementary reading tasks but they lack the required utmost confidence and proficiency in the advanced academic reading skills that their field entails.

Overall, the results reveals that students encounter persistent problems with deeper comprehension, academic vocabulary, and critical reading skills.

#### Listening Skills Proficiency

**H<sub>0b</sub> (Null):** Textile designing students have adequate listening proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1b</sub> (Alternative):** Textile designing students have low listening proficiency in understanding academic texts.

The mean listening score of the students was  $m = 2.9083$ , that is a bit lower than the standard.

**Table 6**

#### *One Sample Statistics Regarding Listening Skills*

##### One-Sample Statistics

|  | N | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation | Std.<br>Mean | Error |
|--|---|------|-------------------|--------------|-------|
|--|---|------|-------------------|--------------|-------|

|           |     |        |        |        |
|-----------|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| Listening | 120 | 2.9083 | .68103 | .06217 |
|-----------|-----|--------|--------|--------|

However, the test outcomes show that this difference is not statistically significant ( $t(119) = -1.474$ ,  $p = .143$ ).

**Table 7**

***One Sample T-Test Regarding Listening Skills***

**One-Sample Test**

Test Value = 3

|           | t      | df  | Sig.<br>tailed) | (2-<br>Mean<br>Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |       |
|-----------|--------|-----|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------|
|           |        |     |                 |                           | Lower                                        | Upper |
| Listening | -1.474 | 119 | .143            | -.09167                   | -.2148                                       | .0314 |

The p-value is higher than 0.05, which indicates that the difference between the mean of the sample and the test value is not significant enough to infer a real deviation from the level of adequacy. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis  $H_{0b}$  that Textile students have adequate level of listening proficiency for understanding academic text.

The students of Textile design discipline filled the questionnaire regarding listening skills. As their descriptive statistics has been given below:

**Table 8**

***Descriptive statistics Regarding Listening skills***

**Descriptive Statistics**

|                                            | N   | Minimu<br>m | Maximu<br>m | Mean   | Std.<br>Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Understanding classmates accents           | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 3.4083 | 1.39324           |
| Understanding questions                    | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 2.9333 | 1.10563           |
| Understanding the main ideas of lectures   | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 2.5250 | 1.18082           |
| Understanding the organization of lectures | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 2.6667 | 1.26580           |
| Taking briefs, clear notes                 | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 3.4417 | 1.35222           |
| Class Discussions                          | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 3.1500 | 1.30706           |
| Understanding lecturer's accents           | 120 | 1.00        | 5.00        | 3.0583 | 1.30478           |

|                                     |     |      |      |        |         |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|--------|---------|
| Identifying different views/ ideas  | 120 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.5167 | 1.25010 |
| Recognizing supporting ideas/ Views | 120 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.6417 | 1.12119 |
| Understanding key vocabulary        | 120 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.7417 | 1.14125 |
| Listening                           | 120 | 1.50 | 4.10 | 2.9083 | .68103  |
| Valid N (listwise)                  | 120 |      |      |        |         |

The mean scores for several listening sub-skills are very low that show misunderstandings. Taking one which is the biggest cause, we have the understanding of lecturing that has a very low main idea mean of 2.52 (sd = 1.18) which reflects the fact that students not only have problems in engagement with lectures but have very low proficiency in information extraction. Also, identifying different views/ ideas (m = 2.51, sd = 1.25) as well as understanding the organization of lectures (m = 2.66, sd = 1.26) are among the bottom scores presented here that point to the involvement of students in comprehension, logical sequencing, and academic listening strategies.

Students also report weaknesses in understanding questions (m = 2.93, sd = 1.10) and recognizing supporting ideas / views (m = 2.64, sd = 1.12). These tasks typically require both linguistic competence and the quick processing, which many students seem to find difficult. The relatively high standard deviations for these items indicates that proficiency varies widely among students; some students manage these skills better, but many face consistent challenges.

On the other hand few listening tasks show slightly improved performance. The mean for understanding the accent of the classmates is 3.4 with standard deviation (sd = 1.39), and the mean for taking clear notes is 3.44(sd = 1.35)—both are in the “average” category. These results indicate that students can handle informal listening situations or note-taking when content is familiar. However, the large value of standard deviation suggest inconsistent ability across the group.

Similarly, class discussions mean 3.15 with standard deviation 1.30 and understanding lecturers’ accents (m=3.05) , sd=1.30) shows average proficiency but again with high variation. This suggest some students cope better with interactive listening than others, possibly depending on prior exposure to English.

Overall, the listening results demonstrate that students have uneven and generally low listening proficiency, particularly in understanding lectures, extracting main ideas and following academic discourse. Their better performance in familiar or informal settings shows that the difficulty lies mainly in processing academic English, not everyday conversational English.

### Speaking

**H<sub>0c</sub> (Null):** Textile Designing students have adequate speaking proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1c</sub> (Alternative):** Textile Designing students have low speaking proficiency in understanding academic texts.

It was found that the average speaking score was 2.4639 (m), indicating a substantial drop from the standard.

**Table 9**

#### *One Sample Statistics: Speaking Skills*

##### One-Sample Statistics

|          | N   | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|-----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| Speaking | 120 | 2.4639 | .36059         | .03292          |

According to the t-test findings ( $t(119) = -16.287$ ,  $p = .000$ ), this difference is statistically highly significant.

**Table 10**

#### *One Sample T-Test Regarding Speaking Skills*

##### One-Sample Test

Test Value = 3

|          | t       | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |
|----------|---------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|
|          |         |     |                 |                 | Lower                                     | Upper  |
| Speaking | -16.287 | 119 | .000            | -.53611         | -.6013                                    | -.4709 |

Because the p-value is smaller than .05, the findings indicate that the speaking proficiency of students is considerably below the level of adequately. No doubt, the statistical evidence is so strong that we may confidently reject the null hypothesis and, thereby, accept the Alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>1c</sub>).

As mentioned earlier, out of 130 participants, 120 students filled and returned the questionnaire from Textile design department. The data is analyzed by using SPSS and interpretation are discussed below to portray the clear picture of the competence that Textile Design students show in speaking skills.

**Table 11**

#### *Descriptive statistics Regarding Speaking skills*

##### Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|---|---------|---------|------|----------------|
|--|---|---------|---------|------|----------------|

|                                      |       |      |      |        |         |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------|------|--------|---------|
| Speaking from notes                  | 120   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.6750 | 1.16794 |
| Presenting information/ ideas        | 120   | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.2333 | .88625  |
| Asking questions                     | 120   | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.3083 | .86768  |
| Participating actively in discussion | 120   | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.2917 | .72640  |
| Answering Questions                  | 120   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.6750 | 1.12394 |
| Communicating ideas fluently         | 120   | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.2583 | .82499  |
| Speaking clearly                     | 120   | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.3667 | 1.00363 |
| Communicating with instructors       | 120   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.8333 | .99860  |
| correct pronunciation                | 120   | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.5333 | .99523  |
| Speaking                             | 120   | 1.56 | 3.44 | 2.4639 | .36059  |
| Valid (listwise)                     | N 120 |      |      |        |         |

For majority of the speaking items, students rated their proficiency levels between 2.3 and 2.8, which implies that they have difficulties with spoken communication in English in almost all its facets.

The lowest mean score is observed for presenting information or ideas ( $m = 2.23$ ,  $sd = 0.88$ ), indicating that students feel highly insecure when required to speak formally in front of peers or teachers. The relatively high standard deviation shows considerable variation among learners, suggesting that while a few may perform better, the majority struggle significantly with presentations.

Skills related to communicating ideas fluently ( $m = 2.25$ ,  $sd = 0.82$ ), participating in discussions ( $m = 2.29$ ,  $sd = 0.72$ ), also show low means, highlighting difficulty with spontaneous communication. The lower standard deviation for these items suggest that most students consistently weak themselves in these areas.

Students also struggle with asking questions with mean 2.30 and standard deviation 0.86 and speaking clearly ( $m = 2.36$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ), reflecting challenges in confidence, vocabulary and pronunciation. The higher standard deviations indicated that some students may occasionally manage clarity, but may face persistent difficulties.

A slightly better score appears in communicating with instructors ( $m=2.83$ ,  $sd=.99$ ), which remains with the “average” range. This suggests that students may feel somewhat more comfortable in structured interactions, although high standard deviation shows mixed confidence level across students.

Speaking from notes and answering questions both have mean value 2.67 with standard deviation above 1.10, suggesting that students perform somewhat better when supported by written material, but their performance remains inconsistent and below the desired academic level.

Finally, correct pronunciation shows a low mean of 2.53 with standard deviation .99, indicating that pronunciation difficulties contribute significantly to their lack of fluency and confidence during oral communication.

Overall, the means and standard deviations shows that students lack the necessary proficiency, accuracy and confidence required for effective spoken communication in academic contexts.

### Writing

**H<sub>0d</sub> (Null):** Textile designing students have adequate writing proficiency for understanding academic texts.

**H<sub>1d</sub> (Alternative):** Textile designing students have low writing proficiency in understanding academic texts.

The average writing score achieved was  $m = 2.8867$ , which is a bit lower than the adequate level.

**Table 12**

#### *One Sample Statistics: Writing Skills*

##### One-Sample Statistics

|         | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|---------|----|--------|----------------|------------|
| Writing | 20 | 2.8867 | .3806          | .0347      |

The t-test outcome is significant ( $t(119) = -3.262$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

**Table 13**

#### *One Sample T-Test Regarding Writing Skills*

##### One-Sample Test

Test Value = 3

|         | t      | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |
|---------|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|
|         |        |     |                 |                 | Lower                                     | Upper  |
| Writing | -3.262 | 119 | .001            | -.11333         | -.1821                                    | -.0445 |

Because the p-value is smaller than .05, the decision is that students' writing skills are markedly below the level of those that are adequate. Hence we accept the alternative hypothesis ( $H_{1d}$ ) i.e. Textile designing students have low writing proficiency in understanding academic texts.

As it is previously mentioned, that 130 participants were part of this quantitative study but 120 take part and filled out the questionnaire. Here the description of writing skills is given. The data is interpreted by evaluating the mean scores, standard deviation and minimum and maximum values of all the sub items regarding writing skills. At the end, the overall values for writing skills are discussed to understand the current proficiency of Textile design students in writing skills.

**Table 14**

***Descriptive statistics Regarding Writing skills***

**Descriptive Statistics**

|                                               | N     | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Summarizing /Paraphrasing                     | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.7833 | .99734         |
| Expressing ideas clearly/ logically           | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.6750 | 1.08591        |
| Course assignment                             | 120   | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.1083 | 1.17248        |
| Artist description                            | 120   | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.0250 | 1.01636        |
| Papers                                        | 120   | 1.00    | 5.00    | 2.7417 | 1.07294        |
| Expressing ideas with correct English Grammar | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.5583 | 1.06744        |
| Writing coherant paragraphs                   | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.0000 | .85011         |
| Linking sentences smoothly                    | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.8667 | 1.04466        |
| Reports                                       | 120   | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.4917 | 1.01249        |
| Notes                                         | 120   | 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.6167 | 1.16809        |
| Writing                                       | 120   | 1.90    | 4.00    | 2.8867 | .38061         |
| Valid (listwise)                              | N 120 |         |         |        |                |

The descriptive statistics of writing skills indicates that Textile design students at GCWUS generally perceive their writing proficiency as low to moderate, with the overall writing mean of 2.88 with standard deviation 0.38, placing them between “Not good” and “average”. this suggests that while students can manage basic writing tasks, they struggle with more complex academic writing required in their discipline.

Several writing skills fall below the average level. For example, expressing ideas clearly and logically shows a low mean of 2.67 with standard deviation 1.08, indicating that students find it difficult to organize their thoughts and produce coherent, well structured writing. The high standard deviation suggests diverse proficiency levels, indicating that some students struggle significantly more than others. Similarly, expressing ideas using correct English grammar ( $m=2.56$ ,  $sd= 1.06$ ) highlights grammatical weaknesses that affect clarity and accuracy, which are essential for academic communication.

Writing tasks that demand higher-order skills demonstrate consistently low mean scores. Summarizing/paraphrasing ( $m = 2.78$ ,  $sd = .99$ ) and writing papers ( $m = 2.74$ ,  $sd = 1.07$ ) reveal that students have difficulty with information processing, rephrasing, and text skills crucial for academic success. Similarly, writing reports ( $m = 2.49$ ,  $sd = 1.01$ ) emerges as weakest skill in the list, indicating a major gap in producing formal, structured writing that is expected in most university courses, including Textile Design.

On the other hand, some items fall within the average range. Students report moderately better proficiency in artist description ( $m = 3.02$ ,  $sd = 1.01$ ), course assignments ( $m = 3.10$ ,  $sd = 1.17$ ), and writing coherent paragraphs ( $m = 3.00$ ,  $sd = .85$ ). These means indicates that the students can manage simpler writing tasks, especially those that are shorter and more familiar. The relatively lower standard deviation for paragraph writing indicates more consistent performance among learners. Writing notes has the highest mean 3.61 with standard deviation 1.16), which shows that note-taking is the skill students feel more comfortable with.

Overall, the mean scores and standard deviations reveal that students' writing skills are underdeveloped, particularly in areas requiring organization, grammar accuracy, and extended academic writing. Their better performance in elementary tasks such as note-taking is in a stark contrast to their lower performance in more formal writing tasks like reports and papers. This imbalance points to the fact that students lack exposure to the conventions of academic writing and may require explicit instruction and guided practice.

## 6. Conclusion

Together, the descriptive statistics offer a comprehensive view of the GCWUS Textile Design students' English language proficiency level. The findings uncover the differences in language skills performance, to which skills students in the receptive category perform at higher levels than those in the productive category.

**Table 15**

*Descriptive statistics: Overall Results presenting Language Proficiency*

**Descriptive Statistics**

|                    | N   | Minimu<br>m | Maximu<br>m | Mean   | Std.<br>Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Reading            | 120 | 2.00        | 4.40        | 3.2183 | .47774            |
| Listening          | 120 | 1.50        | 4.10        | 2.9083 | .68103            |
| Speaking           | 120 | 1.56        | 3.44        | 2.4639 | .36059            |
| Writing            | 120 | 1.90        | 4.00        | 2.8867 | .38061            |
| Valid N (listwise) | 120 |             |             |        |                   |

Overall, the results shows a consistent proficiency pattern across the four skills, with students performing better in receptive skills than in productive ones. Reading emerges as their strongest area, with a mean score 3.21 and standard deviation .47 that is slightly above the average level, indicating that students can understand written text reasonably well, particularly when the content is familiar or not too complex. However, listening falls just below adequacy ( $m=2.88$ ,  $sd= .68$ ), suggesting that understanding spoken English in academic contexts remains challenging, and the wide variation in scores shows uneven listening abilities among students. Writing ( $m= 2.88$ ,  $sd= .38$ ) is notably weak, reflecting difficulties with organizing ideas, applying correct grammar, and producing structured academic text. Speaking is the lowest rated skill ( $m=2.46$ ,  $sd =.36$ ), indicating clear struggles with fluency, confidence, pronunciation and spontaneous oral communication. Taken together, these findings demonstrates that students manage basic comprehension tasks, they face significant challenges in expressing ideas clearly and accurately. This imbalance underscores the need for an EAP course that prioritizes the development of productive skills particularly speaking and writing while also strengthening academic listening and advance reading strategies.

## 7. Recommendations or Future Implications

Universities should develop English for Specific purpose (ESP) courses specifically design for Textile Designs students the courses should focus on discipline related to task such as describing Textile Designs writing project and understanding technical vocabulary used in textile and fashion industries. English language learning should be integrated with practical textile design activities. For example students can practice writing design description, presenting portfolios and describe discussing textile concepts in English during Studio sessions. This integration will make language learning for meaningful and relevant to their field. Teachers should emphasize academic reading

and writing skills such as summarizing research articles, understanding technical text, writing reports and preparing course assignments. These skills are essential for students to successfully complete their academic tasks.

Future studies can extend this research to other design related fields such as fashion Design Graphic Design, and Architecture, to compare their specific English language needs. Researchers may conduct longitudinal studies to evaluate the effectiveness of newly developed ESP courses overtime and determine how they influence students' academic performance and fashion readiness. Future studies can also investigate how digital tools Artificial Intelligence and online learning platform can support the development of English skills for designs students.

### References

- Akhtar, J. & Rubab, I. (2024). Analyzing Academic English Writing Needs of Natural Sciences Researchers. *Annals Of Humans and social sciences Review*, 5(2), 284-294. [http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-II\)27](http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-II)27)
- Basturkmen, H. (n.d.). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. SpringerLink. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230290518>
- Belachew, M. (2020, June). *ESP needs in Ethiopian Textile Engineering*. Scribd. <https://www.scribd.com/document/959727823/A-Needs-Analysis-of-ESP-in-Textile-Engineering>
- Desta, H. (2008, July). *English needs analysis for Fine Arts Students*. Scribd. <https://www.scribd.com/document/959727764/English-Language-Needs-Analysis-of-Theol>
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998, September 10). *(PDF) developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach; Tony Dudley-Evans and Maggie-Jo St John*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, 301 pp. Cambridge.
- Ghani, M. & Rubab, I. (2014). English Writing Competence: A Study on Social Sciences Students of Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan. *EFL Annual Research Journal*, 16(16), 119-136.
- Huchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes*. Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes a learner-centered approach*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press. - references - scientific research publishing. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1164865>
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (. (2019). *Academic Discourse and Global Publishing: Disciplinary Persuasion in Changing Times* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429433962>

- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaur, S., & Khan, M. A. (2010). Language Needs Analysis of Art and Design Students: Considerations for ESP Course Design Introduction. *ESP World*. 9.
- Mao, F., & Zhou, J. (2024). *A needs analysis of ESP courses in colleges of Art and Design: Consensus and divergence*. PLOS ONE. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0305210>
- Maulana, H. F., & Priyana, J. (2024, November 30). *Needs analysis on English reading and viewing materials for tenth grade fashion design students*. *Academic Journal Perspective : Education, Language, and Literature*. <https://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Perspective/article/view/9934>
- Munby, J. (2004). *Communicative syllabus design: A sociolinguistic model for defining the content of purpose-specific language programmes*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Rubab, I. (n.d.). English for medical officers: A case of ESP. <https://jdss.org.pk/issues/v1/3/english-for-medical-officers-a-case-of-esp.pdf>
- Rubab, I., Khan, M., & Masood, F. (2019). Academic English Language for Social Sciences Learners: A Case of Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 3(1) 180-193.
- Rubab, I., Masood, F. & Butt, A. M. (2017). Exploring the Academic English Speaking Competence of Social Sciences Students at Higher Level: A Case of Southern Punjab. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*. 1(2) 67-81.
- Rubab, I. & Masood, F. (2020). English for Medical Officers: A Case of ESP. *Journal of Develoment & Social Sciences*, 1(3), 21-31.
- Rubab, I., Butt, M.A. & Masood, F. (2020). Investigating the Social Sciences Students' Listening Skills in EAP Clasroom Settings. *Journal of Develoment & Social Sciences*, 1(4), 44-57.
- Sukarni, S., & Imansyah, I. (2022). Needs Analysis of English for Fine Arts Study Program Students as a Basis to Design English Teaching Materials. *Linguistics and English Language Teaching Journal*. 10(1), 43-47.