Evaluation of Business English Competencies in the Light of Job Market Requirements

Mohammad Alqatawna[1] *and Rommel Al-Ali*[2,*]

[1]Preparatory Year Deanship, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
[2]The National Research Center for Giftedness and Creativity, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

Abstract: English is known as the most widely used language in the world in the fields of commerce and marketing, as this flexible and comprehensive language is used in various fields of business and the global market. In general, English was the first undisputed language in the field of modern work. Hence, learning Business English has become one of the most important requirements for international companies and institutions. To ensure the availability of business English language competencies among students of the business administration, this study aims to evaluate the competencies of Business English, by designing a questionnaire to measure the learning outcomes. This study was conducted on a sample of students at business administration departments. The results of the study revealed that the two dimensions of writing and speaking had a high level of estimates, while the holistic, listening, and grammar dimensions obtained an average level of estimates. The results of the study also revealed that there were no statistically significant differences due to gender or student rates. However, there were statistically significant differences due to school type, educational stage, and obtaining an advanced level of courses. The study recommends focus on the communicative approach to convey ideas and improve communication, to focus on building the curriculum on the dimensions: of holistic, listening, and grammar, and to include what supports these dimensions through the development of strategies, tasks, and activities to master and improve understanding of Business English.

Keywords: Business English Competencies- Evaluation- Job Market Needs- Learning Output.

1 Introduction

In light of the scientific, technological and economic development, and that the world has become a small village, it was necessary to have common means of communication, the most important of which is language. Therefore, English language has become the means of communication, it has spread on a large scale, and it became the international language because more than a billion people speak it. It is also used in all fields including science, technology, politics, economics, business, and others. In addition, it has become necessary for workers in the job market. The job market requires proficiency in English language and the ability to communicate due to the difference in language and culture. All this led to the emergence of the English language for specific purposes (ESP), which focuses on the development of communication for individuals in many fields such as business, economics, science, medicine, and others. As a result, Business English (BE) emerged as a branch of English for Specific Purposes, which is concerned with vocabulary and skills in the business environment [Dugosija (2021),Rawat (2021),Rahmi *et al.*(2019),Rao (2017)].

English plays an important role in global business as it is a lingua franca. [Frendo (2005)] defined Business English as a lingua franca used by non-native speakers in business communication that was developed to meet their needs. Thus, the use of English has become demanding for companies trying to compete in international markets [Ojanperä (2014)].

Business English is the professional English used in business life, professional language correspondence, preparing memorandums and reports, discussions, presentations, participation in or management of conferences and meetings, writing formal letters and petitions, using telephone, e-mail, or Face-to-face communication with foreign clients or business partners in the world. In overall, Business English is the language that we use in face-to-face communication and users must be fluent in it [Rao (2017),Pierini (2014)].

* Corresponding author e-mail: ralali@kfu.edu.sa

Since the job market requires many skills to ensure success, in addition to its focus on communication, cooperation, problem-solving skill, critical thinking, teamwork, and others, it is necessary to pay attention to learning Business English to include all of the above [Mercer *et al.*(2019)].

Recently, Business English has received a great deal of attention in higher education. Business colleges, schools or universities, around the world, supply the job markets with millions of graduates in several majoring including business management, accounting, finance, human resources and the like. These graduates apply to many companies or institutions, and the hard working and successful candidates may be entitled to serve to one of the famous world leading companies [Rahmi *et al.*(2019)].

The importance of Business English is certainly indispensable. Business graduates need the necessary language skills to understand, listen, interact with other colleagues, and react to them, accordingly. Indeed, it opens the door for new graduates who hunt for jobs as they enter job markets. Owing Business English skills promotes users to use them in different situation, understand easily, cooperate with fellow employees at any business working environment.

To prepare students for effective and meaningful communication, teamwork skills should be developed through some tasks, such as booking an appointment, ordering goods, so a short conversation must be held, and this is considered real communication in a real work environment. In addition, to prepare them to meet work requirements in terms of communication skills and teamwork, the real work environment should be replicated through simulations so that they feel that they are in reality and a real environment [Dugosija (2021)].

To develop and practice these skills in learning Business English, first, it is necessary to implement Task-Based Language Teaching, which is the use of specific information and a target language for communication to achieve the desired results. For this, the tasks must be real and realistic to reflect work situations. One of its most important methods is role-playing because it reflects work situations in the real world, such as communication in its various forms, business meetings and negotiations, and others. Second, project-based learning requires working collaboratively to plan, organize, and execute prior tasks [Dugosija (2021),Yildiz (2020)].

The outcomes of studying Business English promotes users of Business English to know and use the above-mentioned skills in different situations at their work place. The outcomes are designed in a way to show that users of Business English are expected to show an understanding of essential issues pertaining business environment [Rao (2017)]. There are many ways to define and write learning outcomes, and the approach should reflect the specific purpose and context involved, and identify areas of learning such as knowledge, skills, and competence [Cedefop (2016)].

With regard to the perspective of employers in the labour market, Joseph claims that Business English graduates have poor academic level and specifically in the reading skill. This shows that the Business graduates reading skill need to be developed through a vast amounts of reading tasks and practice. Other studies have highlighted several issues. For example, [Brink & Costigan (2015)] debate that business graduates are weak in listening ad conversing skills. In addition, they discuss that two oral communication skills namely, business meeting skills and conflict resolution, are ignored in in business college curricula. More importantly, [Driscoll (2011)] argues that graduates need to work on three issues; having the ability to produce a straightforward and simple thought, using appropriate tone, and engaging effectively with various audience.

Employers have complained about the language proficiency of candidates for employment in the field of business, and this problem has spread widely, indicating the importance of placing language skills as a priority in university curricula in business administration [Yoke *et al.*(2018),Cambridge (2016)]. This study is a practical and the scientific response to the academic and professional voices calling for the need to develop and improve the skills related to language competence in the field of business. Hence, the current research seeks to evaluate Business English competence in light of the requirements of the job market, by answering the following questions:

1. What are the competencies of Business English?
2. What is the availability of Business English competencies to students of the Department of Business Administration?
3. Are there any differences in the availability of Business English competencies to students of the Department of Business Administration based on their gender or the number of programs they have taken?

2 Literature review

Several studies concerning Business English added significant contribution to the literature in different areas. For instance, [Rahmi *et al.*(2019)] showed students' perceptions of English for specific purposes, and the teaching strategies of Business English teachers were positive and met the learning needs. In another study, [Rao (2017)] concluded that students should enrich their Business English vocabulary for effective communication and for the improvement of professional etiquette in reports, letters, conversations, negotiations, and presentations.

Moreover, the use of Web 2.0 and social media tools motivates, facilitates and distinguishes Business English learning [Laborda, & Litzler (2017)]. Students' motivation and learning achievement have a significant and positive role in learning

Business English [Djàfar *et al.*(2016)]. In addition, e-mail and the design of its tasks also have a great and positive role in learning Business English [Evans (2012)]). In order to maintain business, to grow and thrive in the field of professional life, and to deal with people from different cultures, it is necessary to know Business English and learn the art of business communication [Rawat (2021)].

It is worth noting that cooperative learning also provided opportunities for written interaction via the Internet, improved students' English language skills, and provided a rich context for learning Business English [Carrió-Pastor & Skorczynska (2015)]. Social engagement and academic strategies have also improved Business English learning, but to ensure students acquire professional-level English language skills, institutional awareness and innovation must be increased [Andrade (2018)]. Business English participates in enhancing the job performance of employees. [Tratnik & Jereb(2013)] developed an integrated e-learning model for Business English for Intermediate or Upper Intermediate levels to enable interactive, flexible, and effective online learning, improve language and communication skills, and increase learners' motivation. [Adawiyah (2021)] focused on the importance of the link between communication and work. Increasing the effectiveness of commercial activities depends on communication between producers, distributors, and consumers, and this communication requires proficiency in business-related English. The study by [Ojanperä (2014)] showed that English language skills contribute to improving job performance and promotion in Japanese companies, speed of communication, good understanding, eliminating frustration, and removing obstacles for employees with weak language skills.

Communication is an important aspect of learning English. Thus, some scholars emphasized the significance of it. [Koriche (2019)] emphasized the importance of language for both business and communication, and communication skills determine business success, where business, language, and communication are closely related, and communication is the backbone of the business. [Rashtchi & Ramezani (2020)] emphasized that Business English leads to efficient job performance, increased self-confidence when communicating, willingness to use the language at work, reduced misunderstandings, and enhanced level of language proficiency and communication skills.

3 Theoretical framework

The most significant language skills needed by users of Business English, help in having a better learning environment which definitely promotes professionalism. On the long run, Business English users need the following skills, namely; Business listening, speaking, writing, in addition to acquiring grammar rules and new vocabulary items. Acquiring such skills would ultimately help in cultivating the target for job seekers before joining new working environments [Rahmi *et al.*(2019)]. According to [Hu (2020)], Business English graduates are likely to find a job in trading and logistic services in contrast to other courses or majors that do not study such course. To learn and master the English language for business, it is necessary to master the following competences:

1. Holistic: Holistic in Business English is the professionalism used in commercial life, which is used in correspondence in a professional language, preparing and writing reports and business letters, managing discussions and meetings, and communicating with customers.

2. Business listening: Active listening in English is a flexible skill, like critical thinking skills or problem-solving skills. It is considered one of the skills that receive great attention from employers in various fields. Active listening is the ability to shift your attention to the person speaking to you, rather than what's going on in your head. Where you make a real effort not only to hear what the other party is saying in terms of words but also to understand the full message that this party wants to deliver to you. Listening plays an important role in language learning. Active listening ensures understanding and helps improve accuracy when speaking. In addition, listening is the key to any language that can be difficult to understand and recognize at first, but with practice, listening will improve significantly. To improve listening, students must increase their understanding in meetings and informal discussions with colleagues, and be active listeners who can distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. One of the benefits of active listening is contributing to building strong and good relationships between the speaker and the listener, gaining deeper information about the topic, and achieving better outcomes.

3. Business speaking: Speaking skills are defined as the ability to address a specific audience and deliver the desired message clearly and confidently. It is often the hardest of the language skills. It includes some skills; the ability to express clearly, the skills to manage stress and anxiety associated with speaking in front of others, the skills to prepare presentations, the ability to attract the attention of the audience, and the skills of searching and investigate the latest information and trends. The importance of speaking skills is represented in showing the extent of the speaker's knowledge, showing the speaker's self-confidence.
   – Make effective presentations in work situations.
   – Understand and participate with confidence in formal and informal business contexts.
   – Express your personal opinions in business meetings, and ask and answer questions with confidence.

–Provide suggestions and advice using appropriate language and recording.

–Gain the confidence to ask native speakers or colleagues with strong accents to repeat/slow down/clarify etc. as needed.

4. Business writing (Writing in Business): The writing skill is the art of expressing ideas, feelings, and points of view using language as a mediator to convey and present them to others in the form of a written subject. It is the most advanced English language skill, and it expresses the ability to think in English and then transform these ideas into sentences and words written correctly. The importance of writing skills is represented in providing the opportunity for individuals to express their ideas, opinions, and feelings easily and clearly, it is one of the most important requirements of the formal or personal communication process, enabling the individual to prepare any type of content, and stimulating creativity and excellence in the various written forms. The Effective writing skill helps individual in many areas such as letters, emails, proposals, and reports. In addition, it assists individuals in writing a variety of different types of business documents, such as reports, meeting minutes, emails, etc. Moreover, it helps users in writing reports analyzing charts, graphs, tables, and financial information. Finally, the writing skill guides students to write clear and concise summaries.

5. Business grammar: Grammar is an essential component of any language because it helps to arrange vocabulary and terms understandably. Learning grammar in English enables you to understand different conversations and writings that you encounter academically, at work, or even in your daily life and regular conversations. Correct grammar is important to social life, demonstrating skills in English, showing hardworking individuals, and keeping an eye for detail.

The current study identified a collection of competencies on which the Business English learning outcomes are scale based by reviewing the literature and earlier studies that address some of its competencies. These competencies are the answer to the first study question, which is, "What are the competencies of Business English?"

4 Methodology

4.1 Study procedures

A quantitative descriptive survey methodology is used in this investigation. Because it allows for the validation of the validity and reliability of the instrument. It is also used to offer light on how generalizable the results are.

Five constructs make up the Business English Learning Outcomes instrument, which was developed. King Faisal University granted permission for the study to be conducted ethically. After being applied to pilot research and then the sample, the instrument's nature was described. The results were then subjected to statistical analysis and interpretation.

4.2 Population and Sample

All business students enrolled at Saudi universities during the second semester of the academic year 2022–2023 made up the population of this study. Saudi institutions were spread throughout five regions: the north, south, east, west, and center of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. For this study, 210 students were randomly chosen as a sample.

4.3 Instrument

In this study, a quantitative questionnaire was used as the main instrument for data collection. After reviewing the literature and previous studies, an instrument was developed. The study's goal was set, the instrument's dimensions were established, and finally, the instrument's items were created. It consisted of five dimensions, namely, Holistic (11 items), Business writing (11 items), Business grammar (9 items), Business listening (9 items), and Business speaking (12 items). 52 items made up the instrument's final version.

4.4 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS version 26 in order to provide answers to the study's questions and to assess the construct validity. In addition, the Rasch model was used to analyze and assess them using Winsteps software version 3.68.2. The analysis of the Rasch model was used to check the validity and reliability of the instrument.

The following levels were used to evaluate the study instrument on the five-point Likert scale: very low value lies between 1.0 and 1.8, the low value lies between 1.81 and 2.6, the medium value lies between 2.61 and 3.41, the high value lies between 3.42 and 4.22, and very high value lies between 4.23 and 5.0.

4.5 Verifying the validity and reliability of the instrument

The psychometric properties (validity and reliability) of the instrument were tested. The instrument's items were examined by seven experts from Saudi universities. Based on their opinions, the researchers changed and reformulated some instrument items and also some items were omitted. The instrument was tested on 51 students to ensure its validity and reliability, and the results and suggestions were used to improve the final copy of the instrument. Winsteps software 3.68.2 was used to do a Rasch model analysis. Because Rasch model analysis is an effective tool for determining construct validity, it was applied. Also, it makes educational and psychological measurements objective.

4.6 Construct Validity Based on the Rasch Model

The following assumptions of the Rasch model were evaluated to determine to construct validity: The values of the MNSQ for infit, which should be between 0.4 and 1.5, were used to measure the instrument's validity, the standardized fit statistic (Zstd), whose value should be between -2 and 2, and the polarity analysis of items (PTMEA), whose value should be between 0.2 and 1. dimensionality, calibration scaling analysis, and analyses of which the unexplained variance in the first contrast was less than 15 and the raw variance explained by the measures was greater than 40%. Person and item reliability were used to measure the instrument's reliability [AlAli & Shehab (2020), Boone (2016)]. Table 1 below shows that the value of PTMEA, MNSQ and ZSTD.

Table 1 shows that the values of MNSQ for infit ranged from 0 .58 to 1.49. In addition, the values of PTMEA ranged from .53 to .73. The aforementioned values are adequate and acceptable for construct validity, according to the Rasch model.

Table 2 below provides an overview of the structure of the categories in terms of the gradation of the instruments and the size structure of the intersection. In addition, it displays the timetables for the instrument calibration analysis.

Table 2 demonstrates that the participants' most frequent response was scale 4 with 76 (37%), scale 3 with 66 (33%), and scale 5 with 46 (23%), then scale 2 with 12 (6%). Scale 1 out of 3 (1%) was the last rating scale. The observed averages column reveals that the respondents' pattern shifts from negative to positive (-1.56 to 2.12). This suggests a Rasch model-defined normal pattern.

Table 3 below shows that the raw variance explained by the measures is 43.1%, which is more than 40%. The unexplained variance in the 1st contrast is 11.6%, which is less than 15. Therefore, the result of the dimensionality of the data was appropriate for the Rasch model.

Checking the dependability of the person and items is necessary to assure the Rasch model's reliability. Reliability standards should be 50% or higher. Moreover, to be accepted, item and person separation values must be greater than 2 [AlAli & Al-Barakat (2022), Boone (2016)]. Person reliability was used to measure the instrument's reliability. The instrument's item reliability was also determined. The results of the study show that the instrument has a reasonable level of reliability for the items of the instrument, as shown in Table 4.

5 Results

To answer of the second question: What is the availability of Business English competencies to students of the Department of Business Administration? The mean, standard deviation, rank, and level of availability of competencies in Business English for students in the business administration department were calculated. Table 5 shows the mean, standard deviation, rank, and degree of availability of competencies in Business English for Business Administration students on the overall scale.

Business speaking and writing item scores are shown in Table 5 with respective means of (3.5064) and (3.5463) and standard deviations of (0.84721) and (0.60272), respectively. In general, the business writing and business speaking mean scores for both categories showed a high level (degree) of availability. As opposed to the holistic, business listening, and business grammar items, which had mean scores of 3.2439, 3.3898, and 3.4056 with standard deviations of (0.77405), (0.79279), and (0.68920), respectively, for the three dimensions. The three domains' mean scores generally indicated a middle degree of availability: holistic, business listening, and business grammar. First place went to the business speaking dimension, then came the business writing dimension, the business grammar dimension, the business listening dimension, and the business reading dimension. Generally speaking, the items on the entire instrument had mean scores of (3.4184) and standard deviations of (0.60272). The mean of the overall Business English instrument indicated a medium level of availability.

The third question was addressed using the T-test and one-way analysis of variance. Table 6 below shows the results of the T-test for the degree of availability of Business English skills for students in the dimensions of the instrument due to gender and school type.

Table 1: Item Fit Analysis for Business English instrument

Items	Measure	Model S.E	Infit		Outfit		Pt-measure
			MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR
H1	.17	.09	1 .43	1 .9	1 .47	1.9	.56
H2	.32	.09	1.40	1.9	1.49	1.9	.54
H4	.65	.10	1.30	1.7	1.46	1.8	.53
G2	. 21	.09	1.42	1.8	1.30	1.7	.59
H3	. 28	.09	1.46	1.9	1.10	1.8	.54
H6	. 33	.09	1.41	1.7	1.42	1.8	.55
H10	.10	.09	1.49	1.7	1.02	1.9	.58
H11	. 22	.09	1.48	1.4	1.39	1.8	.57
H9	.02	.09	1.48	1.2	1.36	1.8	.58
H8	. 23	.09	1.41	1.8	1.11	1.4	.58
H5	.06	.10	1.40	1.7	1.34	1.8	.57
H7	.17	.09	1.47	1.4	1.30	1.1	.60
L4	.14	.10	.85	1.6	.82	1.5	.59
L6	.29	.10	.80	1.2	.79	1.9	.63
W11	.26	.09	.83	1.8	1.00	.0	.63
S10	.28	.10	.80	1.2	.77	1.1	.63
W1	.14	.09	.81	1.9	.78	1.0	.64
W2	.05	.09	.82	1.9	.80	1.9	.64
L1	.30	.09	.75	1.8	.73	1.5	.64
L9	.07	.10	.75	1.5	.74	1.5	.65
S6	.48	.09	.74	1.0	.71	1.7	.65
W8	.18	.09	.82	1.9	.80	1.9	.65
W3	.12	.09	.80	1.2	.77	1.1	.65
G5	.65	.10	.79	1.5	.77	1.2	.65
L3	.43	.10	.73	1.1	.72	1.8	.66
S1	.05	.10	.69	1.2	.67	1.1	.66
W4	.06	.09	.76	1.6	.74	1.5	.66
S2	.01	.10	.76	1.6	.76	1.3	.67
S9	.05	.09	.73	2.0	.71	1.8	.67
W9	.08	.09	.73	2.0	.71	1.9	.67
L8	.37	.10	.71	1.3	.69	1.2	.68
G7	.65	.10	.76	1.8	.74	1.6	.68
S7	.34	.10	.74	1.0	.71	1.8	.68
W10	.38	.09	.79	1.3	.77	1.3	.68
G1	.38	.09	.79	1.3	.77	1.3	.68
L7	.47	.10	.68	1.9	.66	1.4	.68
G4	.51	.10	.67	1.1	.65	1.6	.69
W7	.59	.09	.76	1.6	.74	1.6	.69
S12	.00	.09	.66	1.8	.66	1.4	.69
L5	.19	.10	.68	1.7	.65	1.3	.69
G3	.08	.10	.69	1.4	.67	1.3	.69
L2	.05	.09	.66	1.9	.66	1.5	.69
G9	.09	.10	.65	1.9	.64	1.7	.69
S5	.42	.10	.64	1.3	.62	1.8	.69
S3	.17	.10	.61	1.5	.58	1.1	.69
G8	.11	.10	.69	1.6	.67	1.4	.70
G6	.12	.10	.67	1.8	.66	1.6	.70
S8	.16	.09	.67	1.7	.65	1.5	.70
W6	.19	.09	.68	1.7	.66	1.5	.71
W5	.28	.09	.64	1.2	.62	1.8	.71
S11	.03	.09	.57	1.2	.55	1.5	.72
S4	.13	.10	.58	1.1	.57	1.3	.73

Table 2: Calibration Scaling Analysis of Business English instrument

Category Lable	Observed Count %	Observed Average	Sample Expect	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Structure Calibration	Category Measure
1	3 1	2.19	. 62	3.41	5.56	Non	3.20
2	12 6	1.00	. 07	2.23	3.26	-1.56	1.71
3	66 33	.84	. 46	1.85	2.68	1.33	.34
4	76 37	. 87	1.03	1.65	1.32	.77	1.33
5	46 23	. 1.33	2.07	1.96	1.83	2.12	3.21

Table 3: Item Dimensionality of Business English instrument

		Empirical		Modeled
Total raw variance in observations	84.0	100%		100%
Raw variance explained by measures	32.0	43.1%		38.5%
Raw variance explained by persons	14.5	17.2%		17.4%
Raw Variance explained by items	17.5	20.2%		21.4%
Raw unexplained variance (total)	52.0	61.9%	100%	61.5%
Unexplained var.in 1st contrast	13.2	11.6%	29.9%	
Unexplained var.in 2nd contrast	4.8	5.7%	9.3%	
Unexplained var.in 3rd contrast	3.0	3.6%	5.8%	
Unexplained variance in 4th contrast	2.5	3.0%	4.8%	
Unexplained variance in 5th contrast	2.1	2.5%	4.1%	

Table 4: Person Separation and Reliability for Business English instrument

	Raw Score	Count	Measure	Error	Infit		Outfit	
					MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD
Mean	189	52.0	.99	.20	1.04	.7	1.05	.7
S.D.	29.5	.0	1.16	.10	.74	1.8	.78	1.9
Real Rmse	.25							
ADJ.SD	1.14							
Separation	4.52							
Person Reliability	.95							
Mean	763.0	208.0	.00	.09	.99	.8	1.05	.5
S.D.	26.5	.0	.27	.00	.50	1.6	.64	1.8
Real Rmse	.09							
ADJ.SD	.28							
Separation	2.92							
Person Reliability	.92							

Table 6 shows that the value of (t =0.286) for whole dimensions indicated that there were statistical significant difference for the differences between the means, where the significant level was less than (0.05). In other words, there were statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample on the degree of availability of Business English competencies in the dimensions of the instrument according to the type of school. While, the value of (t =1.670) for whole dimensions indicated that there were no statistical significant difference for the differences between the means, where the significant level was greater than (0.05). In other words, there were no statistically significant differences

Table 5: The means, standard deviation, rank, and degree of availability of competencies in Business English instrument

Rank	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	degree of availability
1	H4	208	3.5712	.89504	High
2	H2	208	3.5135	.95917	High
3	H3	208	3.4750	.95490	High
4	H6	208	3.4317	.93538	High
5	H1	208	3.3400	.93489	Medium
6	H5	208	3.3133	.92850	Medium
7	H11	208	3.2867	.96085	Medium
8	H9	208	3.0333	.96919	Medium
9	H10	208	3.0120	.96996	Medium
10	H8	208	2.9733	1.05967	Medium
11	H7	208	2.7333	1.05862	Medium
Holistic Dimension (H)		208	3.2439	.77405	Medium
1	W1	208	3.6279	1.01062	High
2	W2	208	3.6490	.95649	High
3	W4	208	3.6010	.97772	High
4	W11	208	3.5513	1.01264	High
5	W9	208	3.5465	.99380	High
6	W3	208	3.5265	1.00828	High
7	W8	208	3.5085	.99198	High
8	W6	208	3.4144	.95795	Medium
9	W5	208	3.4004	1.03555	Medium
10	W10	208	3.3894	1.01548	Medium
11	W7	208	3.3558	1.06248	Medium
Business writing Dimension (W)		208	3.5064	.84721	High
1	L4	208	3.5231	.88675	High
2	L1	208	3.4885	.94968	High
3	L6	208	3.4485	.91338	High
4	L9	208	3.425	.90724	High
5	L3	208	3.3596	.90618	Medium
6	L8	208	3.3308	.87621	Medium
7	L7	208	3.3212	.90577	Medium
8	L5	208	3.3183	.93279	Medium
9	L2	208	3.2938	.94556	Medium
Business listening Dimension (L)		208	3.3898	.79279	Medium
1	G4	208	3.4752	.89953	High
2	G9	208	3.4363	.91225	High
3	G5	208	3.4335	.91272	High
4	G6	208	3.4242	.90536	High
5	G7	208	3.4213	.86876	High
6	G8	208	3.3598	.89684	Medium
7	G3	208	3.3291	.92338	Medium
8	G2	208	3.3817	.97458	Medium
9	G1	208	3.3894	1.01548	Medium
Business grammar Dimension (G)		208	3.4056	.68920	Medium
1	S1	208	3.6837	.93060	High
2	S6	208	3.6288	.93723	High
3	S10	208	3.6192	.90336	High
4	S3	208	3.6086	.93245	High
5	S5	208	3.6058	.92450	High
6	S12	208	3.6015	.95917	High
7	S7	208	3.5935	.88039	High
8	S9	208	3.5646	.96367	High
9	S2	208	3.5250	.91881	High
10	S11	208	3.4010	1.00212	Medium
11	S4	208	3.3710	.94761	Medium
12	S8	208	3.3529	.98643	Medium
Business speaking Dimension (S)		208	3.5463	.81577	High
Overall Business English Instrument		208	3.4184	.60272	Medium

Table 6: T-test results for differences in means by gender and school type.

Variables and Dimensions			No.	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-Value	Sig.
The type of school	Holistic Dimension	Public	193	3.6983	.75538	.262	.279
		International	15	3.8194	.80474		
	Business writing	Public	193	3.4043	.84323	.510	.002
		International	15	3.7859	.80340		
	Business listening	Public	193	3.7045	.77417	.036	.215
		International	15	3.8465	.82151		
	Business grammar	Public	193	3.5118	.65393	.065	.001
		International	15	3.8246	.70792		
	Business speaking	Public	193	3.6282	.80337	1.137	.225
		International	15	3.7708	.83446		
	Overall average	Public	193	3.5894	.57781	.286	.011
		International	15	3.8094	.62318		
Gender	Holistic Dimension	Male	132	3.7287	.76767	.344	.609
		Female	76	3.9212	.86029		
	Business writing	Male	132	3.5398	.85621	.144	.576
		Female	76	3.5939	.74560		
	Business listening	Male	132	3.7519	.79586	1.421	.850
		Female	76	3.8148	.77626		
	Business grammar	Male	132	3.6258	.69245	2.406	.799
		Female	76	3.6296	.66887		
	Business speaking	Male	132	3.6805	.82646	.788	1.37
		Female	76	3.6778	.68709		
	Overall average	Male	132	3.6653	.60891	1.670	.286
		Female	76	3.7275	.53147		

between the responses of the sample on the degree of availability of Business English competencies in the dimensions of the instrument according to gender.

Table 7 below shows the results of one-way analysis of variance for the degree of availability of Business English competencies in the dimensions of the instrument due to the student rate, educational stage and training courses

Table 7 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competences based on rate, where the significant level exceeded 0.05. While there were statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competences based on educational stage and training courses, where the significant level was less than 0.05.

The three periods of educational stages and three periods of training courses were determined using the Tukey test of the post-comparisons, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8 shows that there were statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competences on whole instrument based on educational stage and obtaining training courses.

6 Discussion

The goal of the current study was to determine whether there were any Business English Competencies in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia given the demands of the labor market. The results of the study revealed that the Business-writing construct received a high rating after the instrument was applied to participants. This can be explained by the fact that there are fixed and well-known models and that changing them can be difficult because the global business community uniformly relies on these models. Furthermore, most writings in the field of business consist of short words or simple and short sentences that refer to specific clues and concepts related to business.

The study's findings also revealed that the business speaking dimension received highly rating. This can be explained by the fact that most of the correspondence does not need to be spoken at length, and the vocabulary and synonyms used in business are also short and specific, making pronunciation easier. As well as the number of repetitions of the same practices continuously.

The study's findings also revealed that the holistic dimension received an average rating. Deficiency in vocabulary knowledge causes serious problems to learners which consequently negatively affects in the understanding of various Business situations. One of the reasons behind low knowledge of vocabulary is that teaching vocabulary is commonly informed by traditional teaching methods; that is students receive the knowledge and meanings of vocabulary items

Table 7: Analysis of variance results for differences in sample response means.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rate	Holistic	Between Groups	6.007	3	2.002	3.461	.870
		Within Groups	118.018	204	.579		
		Total	124.026	207			
	Writing	Between Groups	.519	3	.173	.238	.805
		Within Groups	148.059	204	.726		
		Total	148.578	207			
	Listening	Between Groups	.625	3	.208	.328	.969
		Within Groups	129.477	204	.635		
		Total	130.103	207			
	Grammar	Between Groups	.119	3	.040	.083	.807
		Within Groups	98.204	204	.481		
		Total	98.324	207			
	Speaking	Between Groups	1.094	3	.365	.544	.990
		Within Groups	136.660	204	.670		
		Total	137.753	207			
	Overall Dimensions	Between Groups	.461	3	.154	.419	.924
		Within Groups	74.736	204	.366		
		Total	75.197	207			
Stage	AvH	Between Groups	.450	2	.225	.373	.019
		Within Groups	123.576	205	.603		
		Total	124.026	207			
	AvW	Between Groups	.216	2	.108	.149	.041
		Within Groups	148.362	205	.724		
		Total	148.578	207			
	AvL	Between Groups	.488	2	.244	.386	.030
		Within Groups	129.614	205	.632		
		Total	130.103	207			
	AvG	Between Groups	.206	2	.103	.215	.027
		Within Groups	98.118	205	.479		
		Total	98.324	207			
	AvS	Between Groups	.013	2	.007	.010	.018
		Within Groups	137.740	205	.672		
		Total	137.753	207			
	AvToT	Between Groups	.058	2	.029	.079	.024
		Within Groups	75.139	205	.367		
		Total	75.197	207			
Courses	AvH	Between Groups	.708	2	.354	.588	.017
		Within Groups	123.318	205	.602		
		Total	124.026	207			
	AvW	Between Groups	1.504	2	.752	1.049	.040
		Within Groups	147.073	205	.717		
		Total	148.578	207			
	AvL	Between Groups	3.619	2	1.809	2.933	.045
		Within Groups	126.484	205	.617		
		Total	130.103	207			
	AvG	Between Groups	1.382	2	.691	1.462	.039
		Within Groups	96.941	205	.473		
		Total	98.324	207			
	AvS	Between Groups	2.172	2	1.086	1.642	.050
		Within Groups	135.581	205	.661		
		Total	137.753	207			
	AvToT	Between Groups	1.184	2	.592	1.640	.021
		Within Groups	74.013	205	.361		
		Total	75.197	207			

Table 8: Tukey test results for Differences between Students obtaining training courses and between educational stages.

Mean	(I) Courses	(J) Courses	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
3.5125	never	get primary level	-.16659	.09252	.007
		get progress level	-.00057	.25043	.018
3.6223	get primary level	never	.16659	.09252	.037
		get progress level	.16602	.25727	.021
3.7883	get progress level	never	.00057	.25043	.021
		get primary level	-.16602	.25727	.027
Mean	(I) Stage	(J) Stage	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
3.8409	kindergarten	primary	-.03763	.15430	.034
		Secondary	.00461	.18615	.001
3.6785	primary	kindergarten	.03763	.15430	.010
		Secondary	.04224	.12385	.003
3.2463	Secondary	kindergarten	-.00461	.18615	.029
		primary	-.04224	.12385	.018

from their lecturers, rather than being autonomous learners. Students at the university level of education are weak in word pronunciation, spelling, and using new word correctly [Afzal (2019)]. Indeed, such problem greatly affects the students understanding in dealing with Business related tasks. Thus, it is critical to highlight this issue, first, by urging the students towards the needs of new vocabulary items, and then by enforcing their motivation to find meaning of vocabulary autonomously.

The results of the study also showed that Business listening got an average rating. One explanation for this is due to that the fact that the linguistic outputs in the Arab region lack adequate training in the listening skill. Another explanation is that students might have faced a variety of difficulties in comprehending listening texts which are due to anxiety, pronunciation, speed of speech, their own poor vocabulary and mastery of grammar, speakers' accents, lack of concentration, and poor-quality recordings [Hamouda (2013)].

The study's findings also revealed that the Business grammar dimension received an average rating. This can be explained by the fact that the rules of grammar are not taught in these faculties as required, or they are taught inadequately because in the field of business, more importance is attached to access to information than to its linguistic accuracy. Another explanation is that teaching lacks the use of communicative grammar [Leech, (2013)], rather than deductive methods of instructions. In addition, traditional grammar-translation method of teaching, which is based on learning grammatical rules and then applying them by translating sentences, might be a valid reason for average knowledge of grammar [Elyas & Picard (2010)].

According to the study's findings, there were no statistically significant gender differences in any of the business English competencies dimensions. This can be explained by the fact that both males and females study the same courses and have the same cultures and customs. In addition, they have the same motives and incentives to join the job market. In addition, the job market deals with individuals according to their performance level, regardless of their gender.

The study's findings also revealed that there were statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competencies according to school type in favor of international schooling. This can be explained by the fact that international schools pay attention to the English language in all subjects and design their courses and programs according to international standards. It also selects its teachers who have international professional certificates in teaching and in the English language.

According to the study's findings, there were no statistically significant differences in any of the business English competency constructs according to the rates of the students. This is attributed to the particular competencies that depend on the individual's linguistic and skill performance, and to the fact that achievement tests are not important in the performance itself because they often measure achievement more than performance. The study's findings revealed statistically significant differences between educational stages in all constructs of business English proficiency, favoring kindergarten. This is attributed to the fact that learning English during childhood stage helps to increase the vocabulary of the learner's achievement. In addition, language learning is faster in early stages in contrast to later stages.

According to the study's findings, there were statistically significant differences in all constructs of business English competencies in favor of those who had taken advanced-level training courses. This is attributed to the fact that those who have taken advanced training courses are more motivated and have the desire to reach the jobs and positions in the job market and distinguish themselves from others in the performance of their duties and the performance of the business. Moreover, the levels and programs of these advanced courses are also designed to help learners to be qualified for the labor market. In addition, the advanced programs are in precise sub-fields that take into account the needs of the job market in their contents.

7 Conclusions and Future directions

With regard to what is imposed by the needs of the job market, and in response to the academics and professionals calling for the need to develop and improve the skills related to language competence in the field of business, this study sought to evaluate the competencies of the Business English, by developing a list of the most important competencies. To ensure the availability of Business English competencies among business administration students, a questionnaire was designed to measure Business English learning outcomes. The study's findings revealed that the two dimensions of writing and speaking were available with a high level of estimates, which indicates that the program to prepare students for Business English is characterized by an appropriate and acceptable limit for writing and speaking skills. While the dimensions: holistic, listening and grammar got a medium level of estimates, which indicates the program's urgent need to pay attention to the different skills of these dimensions and focus on translating vocabulary and concepts into a set of applicable practical practices and the transfer of the impact of other situations.

The results of the study also confirmed that there were no statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competency due to gender or student rates. At a time when the study's findings confirmed that there were statistically significant differences in all dimensions of Business English competency due to: the type of school in favor of international education, the educational stage in favor of kindergarten, and obtaining training courses in favor of those who have an advanced level of courses. This indicates the impact of learning English at the early childhood stage and ensuring the continuity of learning it at different stages on the outcomes of the Business English Learning Program.

In light of the findings, the study recommends focusing on the approach based on communication to communicate ideas and improve the English language, the necessity of practical application for a semester in companies to train on many tasks, and the employment of role-playing strategy in classrooms and simulation work so that students play their roles in real life. The study suggests moving forward towards future directions and studies in this regard, such as: focusing on building the curriculum on the holistic dimension, listening, and grammar, and including what supports these dimensions through developing strategies, tasks, and activities to master and improve understanding of Business English. In addition, this study suggest to develop an integrated e-learning model for Business English that enables interactive, flexible, and effective learning via Internet.

Acknowledgment

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[Adawiyah (2021)]Adawiyah, D. (2021). The Importance of English in Business Communication. *Adminika*, **7**, 178-186.

[Afzal (2019)]Afzal, N. (2019). A Study on Vocabulary-Learning Problems Encountered by BA English Majors at the University Level of Education. *Arab World English Journal*, **10**, 81-98.

[AlAli & Al-Barakat (2022)]AlAli, R. & Al-Barakat, A. (2022). Using Structural Equation Modeling to Assess a Model for Measuring Creative Teaching Perceptions and Practices in Higher Education. *Educational Sciences*, **12**, 690.

[AlAli & Shehab (2020)]AlAli, R. A. & Shehab, R. T. (2020). Psychometric Properties of Social Perception of Mathematics: Rasch Model Analysis. *International Education Studies*, **13**, 102-110.

[Andrade (2018)]Andrade, M. S. (2018). English Language Development: Preparing for a Business Career. *e-Journal of Business Education and Scholarship of Teaching*, **12**, 107-126.

[Boone (2016)]Boone, W. J. (2016). Rasch analysis for instrument development: Why, when, and how?. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, **15**, rm4.

[Brink & Costigan (2015)]Brink K. E., Costigan R. D. (2015). Oral communication skills: Are the priorities of the workplace and AACSB-accredited business programs aligned? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **14**, 205-221.

[Cambridge (2016)]Cambridge English (2016). Exams and tests, ICFE discontinued from December 2016. https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams-and-tests/icfe-discontinued/

[Carrió-Pastor & Skorczynska (2015)]Carrió-Pastor, M. L., & Skorczynska, H. (2015). Collaborative learning and communication technologies in teaching business English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, **178**, 32-37.

[Cedefop (2016)]Cedefop (2016). Annual Report 2016. Luxembourg: Publications Office. Cedefop information series. http://dx.doi.org/10.2801/474919

[Djàfar *et al.*(2016)]Djàfar, V. H., Cahyono, B. Y., & Bashtomi, Y. (2016). EFL Teachers' Perception of University Students' Motivation and ESP Learning Achievement. *Journal of Education and Practice*, **7**, 28-37.

[Driscoll (2011)]Driscoll E. (2011). Um, like, whatever: College grads lack verbal skills. Fox Business. Retrieved from http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2011/03/03/um-like-college-grads-lack-verbal-skills/

[Dugosija (2021)]Dugosija, Tatjana (2021). *Integrating the 21st Century Skills into the Business English Classroom*. 7th International Scientific Conference - ERAZ 2021, 282-291.

[Elyas & Picard (2010)]Elyas, T., & Picard, M. (2010). Saudi Arabian educational history: Impacts on English language teaching. Education, Business and Society: *Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, **3**, 136-145.

[Evans (2012)]Evans, S. (2012). Designing email tasks for the Business English classroom: Implications from a study of Hong Kong's key industries. *English for Specific Purposes*, **31**, 202-212.

[Frendo (2005)]Frendo, E. (2005). How to teach Business English (p. 162). Harlow, UK: Longman.

[Laborda, & Litzler (2017)]Garcìa Laborda, J., & Litzler, M. F. (2017). English for business: Student responses to language learning through social networking tools. *Online Submission*, **5**, 91-107.

[Hamouda (2013)]Hamouda, A. (2013). An investigation of listening comprehension problems encountered by Saudi students in the EL listening classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, **2**, 113-155.

[Hu (2020)]Hu, J. (2020) Business Graduates Job Survey and Analysis of local University. *Journal of Shengli College China University of Petroleum*, **1**, 57-60.

[Joseph (2017)]Joseph, A. (2017). University Graduates English Language Abilities: Impressions from the Labor Sector. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, **4**, 45-60.

[Koriche (2019)]Koriche, H. (2019, November). *Language and Business Two Meeting Roads: The Case of Business E-mails as a New Emerging Discourse*. In RSEP CONFERENCES (p. 1).

[Leech, (2013)]Leech, G. (2013). Language in literature: Style and foregrounding. Routledge, New York, USA.

[Mercer *et al.*(2019)]Mercer, S., Hockly, N., Stobart, G.,& Galés, N. (2019). *Creating Empowered 21st Century Citizens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Ojanperä (2014)]Ojanperä, Miina (2014). *Effects of Using English in Business Communication in Japanese-based Multinational Corporations*. Master's Thesis, University of OULU, Finland.

[Pierini (2014)]Pierini, F. (2014). Definition and main features of business English with a special regard to differences with the language of economics. *ESP across Cultures*, **11**, 109-119.

[Rahmi *et al.*(2019)]Rahmi, R., Abduh, A., & Sofyan, M. (2019). Student Perception of ESP Business English Teaching Implementation in Makassar National Informatics Polytechnic. *Jurnal Administrare: Jurnal Pemikiran Ilmiah Dan Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran*, **6**, 167-76.

[Rao (2017)]Rao, V. C. S. (2017). English for business and management. *Journal for research scholars and professional of English language teaching*, **1**, 1-10.

[Rashtchi & Ramezani (2020)]Rashtchi, M., & Ramezani, R. J. (2020). BELF Courses and Iranian Learners' Perception Regarding Success in Business Communication. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, **11**, 83-94.

[Rawat (2021)]Rawat, Anjana (2021). ROLE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS BUSINESS LANGUAGE. *International Journal of Education, Modern Management, Applied Science & Social Science*, **3**, 281-284.

[Tratnik & Jereb(2013)]Tratnik, A., & Jereb, E. (2013). *E-learning model for Business English*. Bled eConference, 49-57.

[Yildiz (2020)]Yildiz, Y. (2020). Task-Based language teaching: An approach in the spotlight to propel language learning forward. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, **7**, 72-77.

[Yoke *et al.*(2018)]Yoke, S. K., Zainon, S., Rajendran, C. B., & Kamaludin, P. N. H. (2018). Business Graduate Language Skills for Future Employment: A Case Study. *Global Business & Management Research*, **10**, 455.