| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

An Integrative Review of Studies on Teaching English for Art Education Purposes to Ph.D. Students

Reima Al-Jarf
Full Professor of English and Translation Studies, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: Reima Al-Jarf, **E-mail**: reima.al.jarf@gmail.com

| **ABSTRACT**

The literature revealed two major gaps: First, no systematic (SR) or integrative reviews (IRs) have examined the teaching of English for Art Education Purposes (EAEP), despite its growing relevance in Saudi higher education. No comprehensive review has synthesized research on reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, research skills, or assessment within art education contexts. Second, no SRs have focused on the longitudinal development of a single scholar's research program, although such an approach can offer valuable insights into the evolution of EAEP pedagogy, materials design, and instructional innovation over time. To fill these gaps, the present study aimed to conduct an IR of the author's research on teaching EAEP between 2003 and 2013. The review synthesizes a decade of work on reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, research skills, instructional strategies, technology integration, and assessment in English for art education contexts. Thus, this study provides a unique longitudinal perspective that is absent from existing ESP systematic reviews. This IR synthesized seven EAEP studies derived from a single teaching of the EAEP course in 2004/2005. The corpus was categorized into 5 thematic clusters: (i) Reading in Art Education, (ii) Translation in Art Education, (iii) Electronic Searching & Research Skills, (iv) Technology Integration in EAEP for Art and (v) Assessment in English for Art Education. Findings of this IR showed that EAEP instruction was grounded in a clear needs analysis that shaped all aspects of EAEP course design. Authentic disciplinary materials from art education scholarship played a central role in developing learners' academic literacy. Reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, and research skills functioned as an integrated system rather than isolated components. Structured scaffolding supported learners' progression from guided engagement to greater autonomy. The technologies used reflected the limited institutional resources of the early 2000s but still facilitated meaningful engagement with specialized texts. Together, these findings position EAEP as a coherent form of disciplinary literacy and highlight the need for future research that explores diverse contexts and leverages contemporary digital and AI enhanced tools. This IR offers the first comprehensive synthesis of EAEP research and establishes a foundational framework for advancing disciplinary literacy in art education contexts.

| **KEYWORDS**

Systematic Review (SR), English for art education purposes (EAEP), EAEP course design, EAEP teaching strategies, EAEP technologies, students' needs analysis, academic needs, professional needs, EAEP assessment, art texts.

| **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

1. Introduction

Colleges of Designs and Arts have expanded significantly across Saudi Arabia, with institutions such as Princess Nourah, Umm Al-Qura, King Abdulaziz, King Saud, Taif, Northern Border, Qassim, Jeddah, Taibah, Tabuk Universities, and others offering specialized undergraduate programs in specialities as Graphic Design and Digital Media, Interior Design, Visual Arts, Product Design, Fashion and Textile Design, and Cinema and Theatre Arts. Before 2008, art education programs in Riyadh were housed within the College of Home Economics, one of the women's colleges which were later incorporated into Princess Nourah University

(PNU), established in 2008. Following the restructuring of PNU in 2008, the college was divided into the College of Home Economics and the College of Design and Arts. The restructuring in 2023–2024 resulted in the college's current form, comprising six academic departments (Graphic Design and Digital Media, Interior Design, Visual Arts, Product Design, Fashion and Textile Design, and Cinema and Theatre Arts) and offering a B.A. degree in nine specialties (Sculpture, Fine Arts Painting, Fashion and Textile Design, Graphic Design and Digital Media, Printmaking, Photography, Performing Arts, Film Production, Animation and Filmmaking, Product Design, and Interior Design).

Although Arabic is the medium of instruction at the former College of Home Economics (CHE) in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, graduate students majoring in art education at CHE needed to be proficient in English to be able to read specialized reference materials in their major area of study, and need to locate information in English resources such as journal articles, reports, dissertations and reference books for their courses, assignments, term papers and theses. For those reasons, graduate students majoring in art education at CHE were required to take an English-for-Specific-Purposes (EAEP) course in the first semester of the doctoral program. In 2004/2005, the author was in charge of designing and teaching this EAEP course to Saudi female doctoral students majoring in art education at CHE for 12 weeks.

Due to its importance academically and professionally, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is taught by many institutions worldwide, and in a wide range of fields. A review of the literature showed a plethora of studies and systematic reviews (SRs) that examined the teaching of ESP in some countries as challenges and innovations of ESP in context in a middle-income country (Bonar & Keary, 2026); ESP research across specialized and underexplored domains in Saudi Arabia (Al-Jarf, 2026l); ESP-based post-graduate research in Turkey (Akbaş, 2021); and the current situation of teaching ESP in Iran (Suzani, Yarmohammadi & Yamini, 2011).

Two studies limited their SRs to some journals as empirical research trends in ESP in SSCI-indexed journal articles (2014–2023) (Yan, 2025) and methods reported in ESP research articles in two leading journals (Gollin-Kies, 2014).

A substantial body of SRs focused on ESP studies in specific domains as the role of ESP in promoting health communication skills among medical students (Fransiska & Sigarete, 2025); a self-review of studies across legal, Islamic, art education, polytechnic, tourism and translation for specific purposes (Al-Jarf, 2026); ESP in business communication (Situmorang, et al., 2023); ESP for police (Waluyo, et al., 2024); AI-enhanced flipped CLIL models for ESP education in tourism and hospitality contexts (Pongpanich, Jantakoon & Laoha, 2025); and need analysis of ESP for engineering students (Musdalifah, Bangsawan & Astika, 2024).

Further SRs addressed the development of ESP research over four decades (1980–2019) (Yang, Xu & Swales, 2023); the potentials and challenges of microlearning in ESP and ESP materials design (Caroline, Sumarni & Darmahusni, 2023); the trajectory of empirical research over four decades of publications in ESP (Ghanbar & Rezvani, 2024); the challenges of teaching ESP (Jande & Ibrahim, 2021); and ESP teachers' current focus, collaboration, and sustainability (Supunya, 2023). Few studies focus on

Additionally, many studies focused on certain aspects of ESP, such as need analysis of ESP for engineering students (Musdalifah, Bangsawan & Astika, 2024); needs analysis in ESP within higher education (Pang & Abd Majid, 2025; Khalid, 2016); the efficacy and implementation of negotiated syllabi in EFL and ESP contexts (Taghipour & Kouhdadht, 2026). Other SRs focused on the integration of AI, technology and M-learning as the use of AI applications in ESP teaching and learning (Liashenko, 2025); AI-enhanced flipped CLIL models for ESP education in tourism and hospitality contexts (Pongpanich, Jantakoon & Laoha, 2025); the integration of technologies into ESP courses (Nguyen, Silalahi & Liu, 2024); and sustaining education with mobile learning for ESP (2012–2021) (Rafiq, Hashim & Yunus, 2021). Two studies focused on teaching specific skills as ESP vocabulary with the application of corpus-based materials at universities (Lacková, 2025) and technology integration in the instruction and retention of ESP vocabulary (Wannas, Altukruni & Naby, 2025).

Despite this extensive body of research, the literature revealed two major gaps. First, no SR or integrative analysis examined the teaching of English for Art Education Purposes (EAEP), an underexplored ESP domain despite its growing importance in Saudi higher education institutions. While some studies have touched on art-related ESP topics, no comprehensive review has synthesized research on reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, research skills, or assessment within art education contexts. Secondly, no SRs focused on the longitudinal development of a single scholar's research program, although such an approach can offer valuable insights into ESP pedagogy, materials design, and instructional innovation.

To address these gaps, the present study aims to conduct an integrative review (IR) of the author's research on teaching ESP between 2003 and 2013. The IR synthesizes a decade of work on reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, research skills, instructional strategies, technology integration, and assessment in EAEP. By examining the trajectory of a single research program, this study provides a unique longitudinal perspective that is absent from existing ESP reviews.

This IR is significant for several reasons. It documents an underexplored ESP domain, provides a comprehensive historical map of ESP development in Saudi Arabia, and highlights neglected learner populations within graduate art education programs. It also offers insights for curriculum design, materials development, and technology integration in ESP. Furthermore, the study contributes to the broader ESP literature by demonstrating how a sustained research program can inform pedagogical innovation and address evolving learner needs. The current review forms part of a broader series of SR/MA projects by the author addressing diverse topics in language learning, translation, digital pedagogy, and specialized ESP domains.

Finally, the current SR is part of a broader series of SR/MA projects by the author, that has so far included the following SRs/MAs of: translation error studies (Al-Jarf 2026a); mobile apps for developing multiple language skills in EFL (Al-Jarf 2026b); studies on pronunciation instruction and practice in L2 (Al-Jarf 2026c); Arabic–English transliteration of personal names and public signages (Al-Jarf 2026d); children's language acquisition and development in Saudi Arabia (Al-Jarf 2026e); classroom practices, writing enhancement and creativity among EFL struggling students (Al-Jarf 2026f); collaborative learning and teaching in digital environments (Al-Jarf 2026g); the effectiveness of mind-mapping on multiple English language skills in the Saudi context (Al-Jarf 2026h); an integrative analysis of inadequate staffing and large class sizes in Saudi EFL and translation programs (Al-Jarf 2026i); innovative word formation and pluralization processes in Arabic (Al-Jarf 2026j); 2024–2025 studies on AI Arabic translation, linguistics and pedagogy (Al-Jarf 2026k); and a self-review of ESP research across specialized and underexplored domains (Al-Jarf, 2026l).

2. Methodology

The current IR includes seven studies derived from a single iteration of an EAEP course taught by the author to ten female Ph.D. students majoring in art education in 2004/2005. The course was fully designed by the author, starting from an assessment of the students' academic and professional needs. Based on the needs analysis, the author identified the skills to be taught (reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching and research), selected the instructional materials, designed the online and offline tasks and assignments, determined the classroom and online teaching strategies, and developed the assessment procedures. In other words, each study focused on one aspect of the EAEP course**.**

Back in 2004/2005, technological resources at the CHE were limited and internet access was not available at the College or in the classrooms. Consequently, the instructional materials, digital tools, and technology-supported strategies documented in the corpus reflect the technological conditions of 2004-2005 rather than those of later years (e.g., 2011 and 2013). The seven studies were later presented at conferences, written and published over different years up to 2013, depending on the author's time available for research and the thematic focus of the conferences in which the EAEP work was presented.

2.1 Study Corpus
Cluster 1: Reading in Art Education
This cluster included 2 studies: (i) Bridging the gap in reading for specific purposes (Al-Jarf, 2013a); and (ii) Developing and testing reading skills through art texts (Al-Jarf, 2011a). The two studies focus on reading comprehension, reading strategies, and reading art texts selected to develop reading skills in the EAEP contexts.

Cluster 2: Translation in Art Education
This cluster included one study: Teaching translation for specific purposes (Al-Jarf, 2006). This study focuses on translation pedagogy and strategies for translating art-related texts.

Cluster 3: Electronic Searching & Research Skills
Studies included in this cluster are: (1) Teaching and assessing graduate students' research skills in ESP (Al-Jarf, 2013), and (2) Training ESP college students in electronic searching (Al-Jarf, 2003). Both studies address research skills, electronic searching, evaluating sources, and using digital tools for academic work in art education.

Cluster 4: Technology Integration in EAEP for Art
Studies included in this cluster are: (i) Using online instruction in English for art education (Al-Jarf, 2009b) and using a small network to teach internet searching skills to ESP graduate students (Al-Jarf, 2005b). The first study shows how the online course was used from home, whereas the second one shows how a small network was created by the author in the classroom to provide the students with hands-on practice.

Cluster 5: Assessment in English for Art Education
This cluster has 2 studies: (i) developing and testing reading skills through art texts (Al-Jarf, 2011a) and (ii) teaching and assessing graduate students' research skills in English for art education purposes (Al-Jarf, 2013b). These studies show how students'

performance in art-related skills (reading, vocabulary, translation, and research skills) was evaluated, and the assessment tools used.

1.2 Eligibility (Inclusion & Exclusion) Criteria

To be included in the corpus, studies had to be authored by Reima Al Jarf, published between 2003 and 2013, and contain extractable data relevant to one or more art-related domains. Eligible topics included online instruction in EAEP and teaching and assessing graduate students' reading, vocabulary, translation and research skills. Because the dataset constitutes a closed, author-bound corpus, all publications were retrieved from the academic platforms listed in Section 2.4, and no external database search was required. Based on these inclusion criteria, several groups of studies by the author were excluded, even though they are about EAEP, as follows:

- Articles that focus on teaching English for other specific purposes as in: Teaching English for legal purposes (Al-Jarf, 2023b); teaching English for polytechnic purposes (Al-Jarf, 2022c; Al-Jarf, 2005a); designing English for Islamic studies (Al-Jarf, 2021a; Al-Jarf, 2021c); an ESP program model for graduate students at King Saud University based on their academic and occupational needs (Al-Jarf, 1994); common names of chemical compounds by AI (Al-Jarf, 2025b); teaching interpreting for tourism purposes (Al-Jarf, 2021d); an integrated, communicative approach to teaching English for polytechnic purposes (Al-Jarf, 2022c).
- Duplicate or elaborated studies in the form of conference presentations for which full journal articles already exist such as: testing reading for specific purposes in an art education course for graduate students in Saudi Arabia (Al-Jarf, 2021e; 2021f); using a small network to teach IT skills to ESP graduate students (Al-Jarf, 2005c); and training ESP college students in electronic searching (Al-Jarf, 2002).
- The author's papers that focus on specialized linguistic components such as: EFL students' difficulties with lexical and syntactic features of news headlines and news stories (Al-Jarf, 2021b); can ESL students identify emphatic features of advertisements (Al-Jarf, 2025a); problems of identifying lexical and syntactic features of legal documents by undergraduate EFL students (Al-Jarf, 2023a); processing of advertisements by EFL Arab college students (Al-Jarf, 2007a); a multiple-associations approach to teaching technical terms in ESP courses (Al-Jarf, 2022a); specialized dictionary mobile apps for students learning English for engineering, business and computer science (Al-Jarf, 2022b); teaching and learning with medical animations and videos (Al-Jarf, 2017); helping medical students with online videos (Al-Jarf, 2011b); teaching Greek and Latin roots to premedical students with mind-mapping software (Al-Jarf, 2011c); teaching medical terminology with mind-mapping software (Al-Jarf, 2010); and teaching grammar for professional purposes (Al-Jarf, 2009a).
- Articles that partially focus on EAEP components, as what students' e-mails tell us about their needs (Al-Jarf, 2009c).

1.3 Corpus Characteristics

The final corpus consisted of 7 studies authored by Reima Al Jarf between 2003 and 2013. Because the dataset represents a closed, author-bounded research program published over a decade, it is both comprehensive and internally coherent, reflecting the author's sustained scholarly trajectory in EAEP. The studies employ diverse methodological approaches, including quantitative counts, qualitative analyses, and descriptive investigations. All articles share a common focus on EAEP. To facilitate synthesis, the 7 studies were organized into 5 thematic clusters, each representing a distinct dimension of the author's research program. Together, these clusters provide an integrated overview of the author's contributions to EAEP. Overall, the corpus reflects a longitudinal, multimodal research agenda that traces the evolution of EAEP technologies, instructional strategies, and practices over time.

1.4 Information Sources

The information sources were limited to platforms that index the author's complete scholarly output. No external database search was required, as the aim was not to identify all studies on ESP but to synthesize all EAEP studies within a single, self-contained research program. All records were retrieved from publicly accessible academic databases in which the author's publications are fully archived. These sources include Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Semantic Scholar, Academia.edu, SSRN, ERIC, EBSCO, ProQuest, Scopus-indexed journals, and institutional repositories such as the King Saud University repository. Collectively, these platforms provide full coverage of the author's publications across journals, conferences, and digital repositories. All included and excluded studies were verified manually to ensure accuracy, remove duplicates, and confirm alignment with the eligibility criteria described in Section 2.2.

1.5 *Data Extraction and Synthesis*

Data extraction and synthesis followed an integrated, multi-stage procedure tailored to the descriptive, heterogeneous, and the specific nature of the included studies. For each study, the following information was extracted from the full text: publication year; specific domain (reading, translation, vocabulary, electronic searching & research Skills, assessment and technology integration in art education); participant characteristics (art-education Ph.D. students); methodological approach (qualitative analysis, corpus-based mapping, collaborative instructional interventions); data sources (e.g., test scores, classroom tasks, surveys, learner reflections); and key findings related to learning outcomes, assessment results, or pedagogical implications. These categories were selected to support thematic synthesis and cluster-level comparison rather than effect-size calculation, as the corpus consists primarily of qualitative, descriptive, and intervention-based EAEP studies. All extracted information was entered into a structured matrix to ensure consistency across studies and to enable systematic comparison. Manual coding was used to preserve conceptual accuracy and to classify each study according to the EAEP skill targeted, the technology or instructional tool employed, and the interacting learner groups.

Data synthesis proceeded in three stages: (i) all studies were grouped into 5 thematic clusters based on their focus: EAEP course design, translation for art education purposes, instructional strategies and technology-supported instruction and assessment (see Section 2.3). This clustering enabled synthesis within a conceptually unified domain while preserving the contributions of each study. (ii) Within each cluster, studies were compared according to EAEP course component, teaching methodology, technology used, assessment techniques, data sources, recurring patterns, and pedagogical implications. (iii) Findings were synthesized across clusters to identify broader patterns in EAEP teaching and learning, including cross-skill mechanisms, cognitive processes, recurring challenges, and affordances of the strategies and technologies employed.

Because the corpus represents a single author's research program, the methodological framing and analytical categories were highly consistent across the EAEP studies. This consistency minimized coding discrepancies and enabled a coherent synthesis of EAEP findings covering a decade of research.

1.6 *PRISMA Flow Description*

Because the current IR is based on a closed, predefined corpus consisting of 7 studies published by the author between 2003 and 2013, the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) flow reflects a streamlined identification and screening process. All publications within this time frame were retrieved from the academic platforms listed in Section 2.4 and manually screened for relevance. All records were assessed against the eligibility criteria. Studies were excluded if they were duplicates or constituted only a partial rather than a primary focus on EAEP. Following full-text evaluation, only studies directly addressing the teaching of EAEP (reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, research Skills, teaching techniques, technology-based instruction, and EAEP assessment) were retained. The final set of studies was then organized into 5 thematic clusters for synthesis. Therefore, the PRISMA flow documents the progression from the initial identification of all publications within the author-bounded corpus, through screening and eligibility assessment, to the final inclusion of studies that directly contribute to the analysis of EAEP studies across diverse technologies and skill domains.

3. Results
3.1 *Overview*

The results of this SR synthesize findings from 7 studies examining EAEP course design, EAEP-specific skills, instructional strategies, technologies and assessment techniques used. The analysis is organized around the 5 thematic clusters, allowing the results to highlight both the distinct contributions of the EAEP strand and the cross-cluster patterns that characterize the author's research program. Across the corpus, the studies consistently demonstrate how the specially designed EAEP course addressed the academic and professional needs of Ph.D. students majoring in art education. This overview shows the major trends emerging from the corpus, including the EAEP domains represented in the IR, the skills and instructional strategies employed, the learning outcomes reported, and and the ways in which EAEP instruction facilitated student development. The following subsections present detailed findings for each thematic cluster, followed by a cross-cluster synthesis that identifies shared pedagogical principles, recurring challenges, and broader implications for an EAEP course design and implementation.

3.2   Study Characteristics

Cluster 1: Reading in Art Education

Across the two studies in this cluster (Al-Jarf, 2013a; Al-Jarf, 2011a), a consistent pattern emerges: graduate students in art-related fields began their EAEP courses with very poor reading proficiency, limited vocabulary, and difficulty comprehending specialized art texts. Needs analyses conducted in these studies revealed that students were unable to identify main ideas, identify text organization, recognize key concepts, or infer the meaning of art terminology from context. To address these gaps, each study designed a structured reading program for art purposes based on authentic art texts drawn from encyclopedias, art books, museum websites, book reviews, and online art resources. The reading instruction emphasized macro- and micro-structure analysis, locating main ideas and supporting details, recognizing organizational patterns (classification, comparison–contrast, sequence, cause–effect), and using semantic, syntactic, and morphological clues to infer meaning. Students also practiced identifying art vocabulary in context and connecting reading comprehension with translation of key concepts. The results across the two studies show significant improvement in students' ability to read and comprehend art-related English texts. Students showed better understanding of text structure, accurate identification of details such as artist names, artworks, stylistic features, and thematic elements, and greater confidence in handling longer and more complex art passages. They also showed improved ability to extract information from online art sources and book citations. Overall, the studies provide strong evidence that targeted reading instruction using art-specific materials leads to significant gains in reading comprehension by graduate students in art education.

Cluster 2: Translation in Art Education

The translation study in this cluster (Al-Jarf, 2006) indicates that graduate art-education students began the EAEP course with very poor translation ability, limited vocabulary, and difficulty rendering the meaning of English art texts into Arabic. Pretest results indicated that 90% of the students struggled with reading comprehension, lexical inference, and accurate translation of art terminology. Despite these linguistic limitations, students possessed strong background knowledge in art, names of artists, art schools, materials, techniques, and stylistic concepts, which were a valuable resource during translation practice.

The translation component of the EAEP course emphasized paragraph-level translation, focusing on conveying the overall meaning rather than producing literal, sentence-by-sentence renderings. Students were trained to identify main ideas, rely on content words, avoid literal translation of art terms, and produce cohesive, readable Arabic summaries of English art texts. Instruction also included strategies such as beginning Arabic sentences with verbs, recognizing differences between English and Arabic art discourse, and using background knowledge to support comprehension. Continuous monitoring, individualized feedback, and group correction of common errors further supported skill development.

Results from post-instruction questionnaires and comparisons of pre- and posttest scores showed significant improvement in translation ability. Students demonstrated greater accuracy in conveying the overall meaning of paragraphs, more accurate handling of art terminology, and improved cohesion in their Arabic translations. Statistical results also revealed strong positive correlations between vocabulary and translation scores, and between reading and translation scores, indicating that gains in lexical knowledge and reading comprehension directly supported translation performance. Overall, the study provides clear evidence that targeted EAEP translation instruction, integrated with reading and vocabulary training, effectively enhanced graduate students' ability to translate art-related English texts into Arabic.

Cluster 3: Electronic Searching & Research Skills in Art education

Across the two studies in this cluster (Al-Jarf, 2003; Al-Jarf, 2013), the instructional focus was on developing graduate students' electronic searching and research skills as essential components of EAEP. Both studies revealed that students entered their EAEP courses with extremely limited experience in online searching, minimal familiarity with search engines, and no prior exposure to specialized academic databases. Instruction was therefore designed to build foundational digital research skills step-by-step.

The Al-Jarf (2003) emphasized the need for systematic instruction in electronic searching for graduate students across disciplines. It outlined essential course components, including search-strategy development, database navigation, understanding search commands, and differentiating between types of electronic resources. The study proposed a comprehensive training program that included tutorials, hands-on practice, and structured modules covering major database platforms. The study showed graduate students and instructors how to select relevant databases, construct effective search strategies, interpret database terminology, and document retrieved records.

In Al-Jarf (2013) study, principles outlined in Al-Jarf (2003) study were applied with Ph.D. students at the CHE with a focus on electronic searching in art education, in particular. A structured research-training module was integrated into the EAEP course for doctoral art-education students. Instruction began with identifying research topics and generating appropriate search terms, including narrowing and broadening strategies and using Boolean operators. Students were introduced to major search engines (Google, Yahoo) and guided through locating art-related materials, tools, journals, professional organizations, and conventions.

The module then proceeded to advanced searching in specialized databases such as ERIC, Wilson Art Abstracts, Wilson Art Index, Dissertation Abstracts, and Google Scholar. Students learned to navigate database interfaces, select fields, interpret search results, save and organize records, and fill online forms. Instruction also included training in reading and analyzing abstracts and research articles, identifying they methodology components, and producing summary translations in Arabic. Teaching followed a gradual release model: instructor demonstration, guided practice, pair work, and independent searching tasks completed at home.

Together, the two studies demonstrate a coherent instructional approach that equips EAEP learners, particularly art-education graduate students, with the practical skills needed to locate, access, and interpret English-language academic resources. The teaching emphasized hands-on practice, explicit strategy instruction, and gradual progression from basic search engines to specialized scholarly databases, enabling students to participate more effectively in academic research within their field.

Cluster 4: Technology Integration in Art Education
The two studies in this cluster (Al-Jarf, 2009b; Al-Jarf, 2005b) demonstrate innovative approaches to integrating technology into EAEP instruction for graduate art-education students, particularly in contexts where technological infrastructure is limited or unavailable. Both studies highlight how carefully designed technological interventions can expand access to English-language art resources, support independent learning, and enhance students' engagement with EAEP course content.

Al-Jarf (2005) study addressed the challenge of teaching EAEP in a classroom with no computers, no internet access, and no technological support. To overcome these constraints, the author built a small network of five laptops using a mini-switch, shared printer, and a single phone-line internet connection. This improvised network allowed students to engage in hands-on internet searching activities during class. Instruction followed a structured weekly sequence, beginning with search-term development and progressing through the use of Google, Yahoo, Amazon, electronic journals, professional organizations, conventions, and specialized art databases such as ERIC, Wilson Art Index, and Dissertation Abstracts. Students practiced navigating websites, saving URLs, identifying components of online pages, and translating selected content. Each session included instructor demonstration, guided practice in pairs, and independent follow-up tasks completed at home. The small-network setup enabled students to experience real-time searching, file sharing, and collaborative learning despite the absence of institutional technological resources.

The Al-Jarf (2009) study focused on the online course (Nicenet) which was used from home. The Nicenet LMS allowed the students to access course materials, art websites, and discussion forums from home. Weekly online tasks complemented in-class instruction and required students to explore art websites, download reading materials, practice vocabulary and translation, and post responses in the conferencing area. The online environment enabled the students to interact with authentic art content, such as museum websites, art encyclopedias, and digital archives, and to engage in extended reading, vocabulary building, and translation activities beyond classroom time. The author facilitated learning by posting links, guiding students through online tools, providing feedback, and encouraging participation through public and private messages. This blended model created a flexible, student-centered learning environment that supported continuous exposure to English art texts and fostered autonomous learning habits.

Together, these studies illustrate how technology, whether through online platforms or improvised classroom networks, can be effectively integrated into English instruction for art-education students. Both technologies expanded the students' access to authentic English art materials, supported the development of reading, vocabulary, translation, and searching skills, and demonstrated that meaningful technology-enhanced learning is possible even in resource-constrained environments.

Cluster 5: Assessment in EAEP
The two studies in this cluster (Al-Jarf, 2011a; 2013b) collectively give a detailed picture of how graduate students' performance reading, vocabulary, translation, and research-skills in EAEP was assessed. Across both studies, assessment was grounded in needs analysis and aligned closely with the instructional components of the EAEP course taught, ensuring coherence between teaching and testing.

The Al-Jarf (2011a) study employed a posttest to measure gains in reading comprehension, vocabulary knowledge, and translation ability after exposure to EAEP reading instruction. The test included tasks such as identifying key concepts, locating specific information in art texts, analyzing the text structure, and translating selected segments. Statistical analyses showed significant improvement, as shown by the posttest, indicating that the assessment effectively captured students' progress in handling art-related English texts.

The Al-Jarf (2013b) study assessed graduate students' research-skills development through a performance-based posttest requiring hands-on electronic searching. Students were evaluated on their ability to select search terms, navigate multiple databases (ERIC, Wilson Art Abstracts, Google Scholar, Dissertation Abstracts), locate relevant records, interpret search-screen components, and complete online forms. Language-related tasks included skimming abstracts and full articles to identify research

components (aim, subjects, instrument, method, results) and producing summary translations in Arabic. The test incorporated screen-shot analysis, database navigation tasks, and bibliographic documentation, offering a comprehensive measure of students' applied research literacy.

Across both studies, the assessments demonstrated strong validity and reliability indicators, including inter-rater reliability, internal consistency, and alignment with course objectives. The results consistently showed significant gains from pretest to posttest, confirming that the assessment tools were sensitive to improvement in reading, vocabulary, translation, and research-skills. Together, both studies contribute a robust model for designing discipline-specific EAEP assessments in art education, emphasizing authentic materials, integrated skills, and performance-based tasks.

A Cross-Cluster Theme Focusing on Vocabulary Development in EAEP

Vocabulary was taught across the seven EAEP studies (2003-2013). The art vocabulary/terminology instruction followed a coherent, systematic approach that aligned with the needs of art-education Ph.D. students. Although each study focused on a different skill area (reading, translation, electronic searching, research skills, technology integration, or assessment), the art vocabulary-teaching methodology remained consistent. The following vocabulary teaching strategies appeared repeatedly across the 7 studies:

(i) Across all seven studies, vocabulary instruction emphasized: art materials, art tools, art schools (cubism, surrealism, etc.), visual elements and principles, names of artists and artworks, stylistic terms, and museum terminology. This discipline-specific focus is one of the strongest contributions of the author's EAEP program.

(ii) Students learned art terminology within authentic art texts (in context), not through isolated lists. They encountered vocabulary in artist biographies, art-movement descriptions, museum websites, book reviews, art encyclopedias, and online art databases. This contextual approach helped the students understand how terms function in real academic discourse.

(iii) In nearly all studies, students were trained to break art terms into prefixes, suffixes and roots. This method helped them infer meaning and identify parts of speech of art terms encountered in art texts. Morphological analysis appears as a main strategy in *Developing and Testing Reading Skills Through Art Texts* (Al-Jarf, 2011a); and *Using Online Instruction in English for Art Education* (Al-Jarf, 2009b).

(iv) The students practiced inferring meaning of art terms from definitions, punctuation marks, synonyms and antonyms, examples, comparison–contrast signals, and classification markers. This strategy appeared in the reading, translation, and online-instruction studies.

(v) the students used monolingual encyclopedic dictionaries, online art dictionaries, museum glossaries, ARTcyclopedia, the Artist's Toolkit Encyclopedia. Dictionary skills were integrated into reading, translation, and online searching tasks.

(vi) In the translation study (Al-Jarf, 2006), vocabulary was taught as part of paragraph-level translation, avoiding literal translation, focusing on content words, and using background knowledge in art. This integration strengthened both lexical and semantic comprehension.

(vii) In the technology-integration studies (Al-Jarf, 2005, Al-Jarf, 2009), students practiced vocabulary by locating terms on art websites, posting vocabulary answers online, identifying terminology in digital museum pages, translating vocabulary found in online texts. Technology expanded exposure to authentic terminology.

(viii) In the research-skills study (Al-Jarf, 2013), vocabulary instruction supported understanding abstracts, identifying research components, interpreting database terminology (descriptor, keyword, citation, etc.), and translating research summaries. This shows how vocabulary supports academic literacy beyond reading.

Vocabulary instruction was a foundational component across all seven studies, regardless of the specific skill focus. This strengthens the argument that the author's ESEP course was Comprehensive, Integrated, skill-based, discipline-specific, and theoretically grounded. It also shows that the author's research program is coherent, not fragmented.

4. Discussion

4.1 *Meta-Conclusion*

Across the 5 thematic clusters, the research studies conducted between 2003 and 2013 revealed a coherent instructional program that consistently considered EAEP as a discipline grounded in needs-based course design, art-education-specific tasks and innovative teaching approaches. The studies collectively demonstrate that effective EAEP instruction must be anchored in a clear understanding of learners' academic and professional needs, and their language proficiency level. The 7 studies consistently highlight gaps in learners' proficiency and the inadequacy of generic instructional materials. This reinforces the premise that the EAEP course must be tailored to the communicative purposes of each discipline rather than relying on general language instruction. Additionally, this IR demonstrates that EAEP is inherently multimodal and multidimensional, requiring the integration of linguistic, cognitive, and art education domain knowledge and the growing role of technology in EAEP instruction. Whether through online learning environments or a small classroom-based internet network created by the author, the studies show that technology can expand learners' access to authentic materials, enhance engagement, and support the development of specialized vocabulary,

reading, electronic searching and research skills. At the same time, the findings emphasize that technology must be guided by clear pedagogical objectives, as digital tools alone cannot replace informed instructional design. Together, the studies reveal a unified research trajectory that advances EAEP as a field committed to discipline-specific relevance, learner-centered design, integration of reading, vocabulary, translation and research skills. The emerging conclusion is that EAEP instruction must be responsive, contextualized, and empirically grounded. This 20-year research program not only fills gaps in the under-represented EAEP domain but also offers a comprehensive framework for designing, and delivering EAEP courses in higher education.

4.2   Meta-Interpretation

The meta-interpretation of the seven EAEP studies conducted between 2003 and 2013 reveals a coherent pedagogical logic that extends beyond the individual findings of each cluster. Collectively, the studies illustrate how EAEP functions not merely as a language course, but as a framework that integrates linguistic, cognitive, and field-specific competencies. The consistent emphasis on needs-based design suggests that EAEP instruction is most effective when it emerges from an understanding of the communicative demands of the discipline rather than from generic language teaching models. This interpretation aligns with broader trends in ESP, where domain authenticity and learner relevance are central to successful instruction.

Across the corpus, the studies demonstrate that EAEP learning is shaped by the interaction of three core dimensions: (i) the linguistic demands of art-education texts, (ii) the cognitive processes required for comprehending, translating, and researching within the discipline, and (iii) the pedagogical structures that scaffold learners' engagement with these demands. The integration of reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, and research skills across the clusters indicates that EAEP literacy develops as an interconnected system rather than as isolated skills. This interconnectedness explains why instructional interventions that combine multiple modalities—textual, visual, digital, and collaborative—yield stronger learning outcomes.

The interpretation of the technology-supported studies further suggests that technological tools function not as external add-ons but as mediating instruments that reshape how learners access, process, and apply their domain knowledge. Even within the technological constraints of the 2003–2013 period, the studies show that digital environments expanded learners' exposure to authentic materials and supported more autonomous engagement with research tasks. This pattern reinforces the idea that EAEP pedagogy evolves in response to available technologies and that instructional design must continually adapt to new digital affordances.

Taken together, the studies reveal that EAEP development is a dynamic process shaped by disciplinary relevance, multimodal engagement, and iterative instructional refinement. The meta-interpretation therefore positions EAEP not as a static curriculum but as an evolving pedagogical approach that responds to learners' needs, disciplinary expectations, and technological contexts. This perspective provides a conceptual foundation for understanding how EAEP courses can be designed, adapted, and expanded in future instructional settings.

4.3   Cross-Cutting Insights

A cross-cluster analysis of the 7 EAEP studies conducted between 2003 and 2013 reveals several recurring pedagogical patterns that go beyond the individual skill areas. First, the studies consistently demonstrate that EAEP learning is most effective when authentic domain content is used. Whether the focus is reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, or research skills, the use of art-education texts and tasks acts as a unifying principle that enhances relevance, motivation, and transfer of learning. Second, the studies highlight the central role of scaffolding in supporting learners' engagement with complex art materials. Across clusters, instructional interventions rely on structured guidance, step-by-step modelling, and gradual release of responsibility. Third, the findings reveal a consistent emphasis on multiple skills integration within a single instructional event. Reading activities incorporate vocabulary development; translation tasks reinforce comprehension; research assignments require electronic searching, summarizing, and synthesizing. This interconnectedness indicates that EAEP develops as a holistic system rather than as discrete competencies, and that instructional designs that combine modalities tend to yield stronger learning outcomes. Fourth, the studies collectively emphasize the importance of learner-centered design. Needs analysis, diagnostic assessment, and continuous feedback appear across clusters as mechanisms for aligning instruction with learners' academic and professional needs and objectives. Finally, although the technological tools available during the 2003–2013 period were limited compared to current digital environments, the studies demonstrate that even modest technologies could expand access to authentic materials and support more autonomous learning. This cross-cutting insight suggests that technology functions as a mediating resource that amplifies engagement with the students' area of specialization when guided by clear isntructional objectives.

Together, these insights reveal a coherent set of multimodal integration, authenticity, learner-centered design, guidance, and purposeful use of technology that shape the EAEP instructional landscape across all clusters. These principles form the conceptual backbone of the author's EAEP research program and provide a foundation for future course design and instructional innovation.

4.4 *Implications*

The findings of this IR yield several implications for EAEP course design, instructional practice, and future curriculum development. First, the consistent emphasis on needs-based design across all studies indicates that EAEP instruction must begin with a systematic analysis of learners' academic and professional needs and assessing their pre-instruction proficiency level. Courses that rely on generic language materials are unlikely to meet the specialized demands of art-education students, whereas discipline-specific texts and tasks enhance relevance, engagement, and learning outcomes.

Second, the cross-cluster patterns highlight the importance of integrating multiple skills within a single instructional framework. Reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, and research skills function as interconnected competencies rather than isolated domains. This suggests that EAEP instructors should adopt multimodal and task-based approaches that allow learners to practice several skills simultaneously while engaging with authentic disciplinary content.

Third, the studies underscore the value of structured scaffolding in supporting learners' progression from guided practice to independent performance. Effective EAEP instruction requires clear modeling, step-by-step guidance, and opportunities for learners to apply strategies autonomously. This has practical implications for lesson planning, assessment design, and the sequencing of instructional activities.

Fourth, although the technological tools available during the 2003–2013 period were limited compared to contemporary digital environments, the studies demonstrate that even modest technologies can expand access to authentic materials and support more autonomous learning. For current and future EAEP instruction, this implies that instructors can leverage more advanced digital tools, including online databases, multimodal platforms, and AI-supported applications, to enhance learners' engagement with specialized texts and research tasks. The pedagogical principles identified in this review remain applicable, but the technological affordances available today offer expanded opportunities for implementation.

Finally, the review highlights the need for ongoing evaluation and refinement of EAEP courses. Because disciplinary demands evolve and learners' needs shift over time, EAEP curricula must remain flexible, responsive, and empirically grounded. Continuous feedback, iterative course design, and alignment with disciplinary developments are essential for sustaining the effectiveness of EAEP instruction in higher education.

4.5 *Positioning This IR Within the Global ESP SR/MA Research*

Within the global ESP SRs and MAs in the literature, this **IR** occupies a distinct position by focusing on a highly specialized and under-represented subfield which is EAEP. While existing ESP SR/MA studies in the literature have examined areas such as ESP, English for Medical Purposes, English for Engineering, and English for Business, very few reviews address discipline-specific ESP programs in the arts or humanities. This positions the present IR as a unique contribution that expands the scope of ESP scholarship beyond its traditionally examined domains. Methodologically, this IR aligns with global ESP SR/MA practices through its use of transparent inclusion criteria, thematic clustering, and cross-study synthesis. However, it diverges from large-scale ESP reviews that typically draw on multi-institutional or multi-author datasets. Instead, this IR synthesizes a coherent author-bounded corpus, offering a longitudinal perspective on EAEP course design and instructional innovation across a decade of research. Such author-bounded reviews, while less common in ESP studies, provide valuable insights into how a sustained research program evolves in response to disciplinary needs, pedagogical challenges, and technological developments. The review also contributes to global ESP scholarship by highlighting the role of multimodal and technology-supported instruction during a period (2003–2013) that predates the widespread adoption of contemporary digital and AI-enhanced tools. This historical perspective enriches current ESP discussions by illustrating how foundational principles—needs-based design, disciplinary authenticity, integrated skills instruction, and strategic scaffolding—remain relevant even as technological affordances evolve.

Finally, by documenting the development of EAEP as a specialized ESP strand, the review broadens the conceptual boundaries of ESP research and underscores the importance of examining less-studied disciplines. In doing so, it invites future ESP SR/MA studies to explore similarly specialized contexts, thereby contributing to a more inclusive and diversified understanding of English for Specific Purposes in global higher education.

4.6 *Comparison of Current findings with Prior SR Results*

A comparison of the current findings with prior SRs and MAs in the broader ESP field reveals that this IR confirms the centrality of needs analysis as a foundational principle in designing effective discipline-specific language instruction. Previous ESP reviews consistently emphasized that courses grounded in learners' academic and professional needs yield higher engagement and more

meaningful learning outcomes, a pattern strongly reflected in the EAEP studies synthesized here. The current findings also align with prior ESP SRs in highlighting the importance of authentic disciplinary materials, integrated-skills instruction, and scaffolded pedagogical support. Reviews of English for Medical, Engineering, and Business Purposes similarly report that learners benefit most when instruction mirrors the communicative practices of their fields and when multiple skills—reading, vocabulary, writing, and research—are developed in interconnected ways. The cross-cutting insights identified in this review therefore reinforce established ESP principles while demonstrating their applicability within the under-represented domain of art education.

However, the current IR is inconsistent with prior ESP SRs in that most global ESP reviews synthesize large, multi-institutional datasets, whereas this review examines a coherent author-bounded corpus developed within a single instructional context. This difference allows for a longitudinal perspective on EAEP course design that is rarely captured in broader ESP reviews.
Moreover, while prior ESP SRs often focus on high-stakes professional fields with well-defined communicative demands, the EAEP studies address a discipline where language needs are more diverse, multimodal, and intertwined with visual and conceptual analysis. This highlights the unique literacy demands of art-education contexts and expands the scope of ESP research beyond its traditional domains.

Finally, the technological dimension of the EAEP studies reflects the tools available during the 2004/2005 period (when the course was taught), which differ substantially from the digital and AI-enhanced environments discussed in recent ESP SRs. This temporal distinction provides a historical lens that complements contemporary ESP research by illustrating how foundational pedagogical principles remain stable even as technological affordances evolve.

Taken together, the comparison shows that while the current review aligns with global ESP findings in its emphasis on needs-based, authentic, and integrated instruction, it also contributes new insights by documenting the development of EAEP as a specialized ESP strand and by offering a longitudinal perspective rarely present in prior SR/MA studies.

4.7   *Limitations of This IR*
Although this IR provides a coherent synthesis of an author-bounded EAEP research program conducted between 2003 and 2013, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the corpus is intentionally restricted to 7 studies produced within a single instructional context. While this closed design ensures conceptual coherence and methodological consistency, it limits the diversity of perspectives typically found in multi-author or multi-institutional ESP reviews. Second, all studies were conducted with the same sample of ten Ph.D. students in art education. This small and fixed sample size reflects the structural reality of doctoral programs, yet it constrains the generalizability of the findings to larger or more heterogeneous populations.
Third, although several studies include quantitative elements, such as descriptive statistics, pre-/post-test comparisons, and correlation analyses, the corpus as a whole is mainly qualitative and descriptive. Consequently, the review could not support statistical meta-analysis or effect-size aggregation, and synthesis relied on thematic and conceptual integration. Finally, the pedagogical and technological contexts represented in the 2003–2013 studies differ substantially from contemporary digital and AI-enhanced learning environments. As a result, some instructional practices documented in the corpus may not fully reflect the possibilities afforded by current technologies, even though the underlying pedagogical principles remain relevant.

Despite these limitations, this IR offers a comprehensive and coherent account of EAEP course design, with specific skills, teaching strategies, and technology-enhanced instruction and assessment procedures. The limitations mentioned here provide a foundation for refining future research and expanding the evidence base in the under-explored EAEP domain.

4.8   *Future Research Directions*
The findings of this IR point to several directions for future EAEP research. First, there is a need for studies that examine EAEP instruction in more diverse institutional contexts and with larger student populations, since many Saudi universities now have Colleges of Designs and Arts. Because the current corpus is based on a single cohort of ten Ph.D. students, future research could explore how EAEP principles transfer to undergraduate programs, master's-level students, or art-education professionals in continuing-education settings.

Second, future studies could investigate how contemporary digital and AI-enhanced tools reshape EAEP literacy practices. The instructional technologies available in 2004/2005 were limited, and the corpus reflects the technological conditions of that period. With the expansion of online databases, multimodal platforms, and AI-supported applications, new research is needed to examine how these tools influence reading, vocabulary development, translation, electronic searching, and research-skills instruction within art-education contexts.

Third, longitudinal studies could explore how EAEP competencies develop over time and how learners transfer these skills to their academic writing, thesis work, and professional practice. Such research would provide deeper insight into the long-term impact of EAEP instruction and its role in shaping disciplinary identity and scholarly engagement.

Fourth, comparative studies could examine EAEP alongside other specialized ESP strands—such as English for Design, Architecture, or Humanities—to identify shared literacy demands and discipline-specific divergences. This would broaden the conceptual boundaries of ESP research and situate EAEP within a wider network of arts-related language instruction.

Finally, future research could adopt mixed-methods or experimental designs to complement the predominantly qualitative nature of the existing corpus. Studies incorporating controlled interventions, learning-analytics data, or multimodal analysis could provide more robust evidence of instructional effectiveness and deepen our understanding of how learners engage with specialized texts and tasks.

Together, these directions highlight the potential for expanding EAEP research beyond a single instructional context and for leveraging contemporary technologies and methodologies to advance the field.

5. Recommendations

Based on the synthesis of the seven EAEP studies and the cross-cutting insights identified in this IR, this study proposes several recommendations for enhancing EAEP course design, instructional practice, and program development.

EAEP instruction should begin with a clear and systematic needs analysis that identifies the academic, professional, and domain requirements of art-education Ph.D. students. Instruction should rely on authentic texts, tasks, and visual-verbal materials drawn directly from the field of art education. Authenticity enhances relevance, supports disciplinary literacy, and helps learners transfer EAEP skills to their thesis work, research activities, and professional practice. Reading, vocabulary development, translation, electronic searching, and research skills should not be taught in isolation. Multimodal, task-based activities that combine these skills reflect the interconnected nature of art education literacy and lead to stronger learning outcomes.

EAEP learners benefit from explicit modelling, guided practice, and gradual independent learning. Instructors should design instructional sequences that move from supported engagement with texts to more independent performance, ensuring that learners develop confidence and autonomy.

Although the original EAEP course was taught in 2004/2005 under limited technological conditions, current instructional environments offer far more advanced tools. Instructors are encouraged to integrate online databases, multimodal platforms, and AI-supported applications to enrich learners' engagement with specialized texts and research tasks.

Given that the existing corpus is based on a single sample of Ph.D. students, institutions may consider adapting the EAEP principles herein for undergraduate, master's-level, and continuing-education contexts. Tailoring EAEP instruction to different learner groups can broaden its impact and strengthen disciplinary literacy across academic levels.

EAEP courses should be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect evolving disciplinary demands, technological developments, and learner needs. Continuous feedback from students and instructors can guide improvements in materials, tasks, and assessment practices.

Interdisciplinary collaboration can enhance the relevance and accuracy of EAEP instruction. Joint efforts in material development, task design, and assessment can ensure that EAEP courses remain aligned with the conceptual and communicative practices of the discipline.

Together, these recommendations provide a roadmap for strengthening EAEP instruction and for extending the insights of this IR into future pedagogical and ESP innovations.

6. Conclusion

This IR synthesized seven EAEP studies conducted between 2003 and 2013, all derived from a single teaching of an EAEP course delivered in 2004/2005. By examining the studies through thematic clustering and cross-study analysis, the review revealed a coherent pedagogical logic that positions EAEP as a specialized form of domain literacy rather than a traditional language course. Across the corpus, the studies consistently emphasized needs-based design, authentic disciplinary materials, integrated-skills instruction, structured scaffolding, and purposeful use of the technologies available at the time. The review also demonstrated how EAEP literacy develops as an interconnected system in which reading, vocabulary, translation, electronic searching, and

research skills reinforce one another. Despite the technological limitations of the early 2000s, the studies showed that even modest digital tools can promote learners' engagement with specialized texts and support more autonomous learning. The longitudinal nature of the corpus further highlighted how a sustained research program can evolve in response to disciplinary demands, pedagogical challenges, and emerging opportunities. By situating the findings within global ESP SR/MA scholarship, the review contributes to expanding the scope of ESP research into under-represented fields such as art education. It also underscores the need for future studies that explore EAEP instruction in diverse contexts, leverage contemporary digital and AI-enhanced tools, and employ more varied methodological designs.

Overall, this IR provides a comprehensive account of the development of EAEP as a specialized ESP strand and offers a conceptual and pedagogical foundations for future course design, research, and innovation in the field.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6255-1305
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References
[1] Akbaş, R. (2021). A systematic review of the ESP (English for Specific Purposes)-based post-graduate research in Turkey. *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *11*(22), 369-387.
[2] Al-Jarf, R. (2026a). A self systematic review of translation error studies (2000–2025): The Case of students' errors in English–Arabic and Arabic–English translation. *International Journal of Translation and Interpretation Studies*, *6*(1), 16-32. DOI: 10.32996/ijtis.2026.6.1.2. Google Scholar
[3] Al-Jarf, R. (2026b). A Self-Systematic Review of Mobile Apps for Developing Multiple Language Skills in EFL. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, *8*(3), 14-29. DOI: 10.32996/jcsts.2026.8.3.2. Google Scholar
[4] Al-Jarf, R. (2026c). A systematic review of studies on pronunciation instruction and practice in L2 (2005-2025). *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *8*(1), 10-26. DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2026.8.1.2. Google Scholar
[5] Al-Jarf, R. (2026d). Arabic–English transliteration of personal names and public signages: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *British Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 01-14. DOI: 10.32996/bjal.2025.6.1.1. Google Scholar
[6] Al-Jarf, R. (2026e). Children's language acquisition and development in Saudi Arabia: A Systematic review and meta analysis. *Journal of Learning and Development Studies*, *6*(1), 18-37. DOI: 10.32996/jlds.2026.6.1.3. Google Scholar
[7] Al-Jarf, R. (2026f). Classroom practices, writing enhancement and creativity among EFL struggling students: A systematic review. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, *8*(1), 20-38. DOI: 10.32996/jweep.2026.8.1.3. Google Scholar
[8] Al-Jarf, R. (2026g). Collaborative learning and teaching in digital environments: A systematic review of two decades of research. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, *8*(4), 25-40. https://doi.org/10.32996/jcsts.2026.8.4.2 Google Scholar
[9] Al-Jarf, R. (2026h). Effectiveness of mind-mapping on multiple English language skills in the Saudi Context: A systematic review. *Frontiers in English Language and Linguistics*, *3*(1), 01-10. DOI: 10.32996/fell.2026.3.1.1. Google Scholar
[10] Al-Jarf, R. (2026i). Inadequate staffing and large class sizes in Saudi EFL and translation programs: An integrative analysis of empirical studies. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, *5*(1), 19-27. DOI: 10.32996/bjtep.2026.5.1.3. Google Scholar
[11] Al-Jarf, R. (2026j). Innovative word formation and pluralization processes in Arabic: A systematic review. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, *8*(1), 44-60. DOI: 10.32996/jhsss.2026.8.1.6. Google Scholar
[12] Al-Jarf, R. (2026k). Systematic review and meta-analysis of 2024–2025 studies on AI Arabic translation, linguistics and pedagogy. *Frontiers in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence*, *5*(1), 07-27. DOI: 10.32996/jcsts.2026.5.1.2. Google Scholar
[13] Al-Jarf, R. (2026l). Three decades of ESP Innovation: A review of research across specialized and underexplored domains. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, *5*(2), 19-31. DOI: 10.32996/bjtep.2026.5.2.3. Google Scholar
[14] Al-Jarf, R. (2025a). Can ESL students identify emphatic features of advertisements? *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices* , *7*(2), 01-11. DOI: 10.32996/jweep.2025.7.2.1. Google Scholar
[12] Al-Jarf, R. (2025b). *Can ESP students use artificial intelligence for translating common names of chemical compounds*. 6th INNO-LSP International Conference titled: Innovative Trends In Teaching Languages For Specific Purposes in the Context of the Current Social Instability. Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania. September 18- 19. Google Scholar
[13] Al-Jarf, R. (2023a). Problems of identifying lexical and syntactic features of legal documents by undergraduate efl students. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis 1*(1), 31-39. DOI: 10.32996/jpda.2023.2.1.3. ERIC ED627248. Goolge Scholar
[14] Al-Jarf, R. (2023b). Teaching English for legal purposes to undergraduate translation majors. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices, 5*(2), 1-10. DOI: 10.32996/jweep.2023.5.2.1. ERIC ED628486. Google Scholar

[15] Al-Jarf, R. (2022a). A multiple-associations approach to teaching technical terms in English for specific purposes courses. *International Journal of English Language Studies, 4*(2), 56-66. DOI: 10.32996/ijels.2022.4.2.5.   ERIC ED621773. Google Scholar

[16] Al-Jarf, R. (2022b). Specialized dictionary mobile apps for students learning English for engineering, business and computer science. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED), 4*(1), 1-10. DOI: 10.22161/jhed.4.1.1. ERIC ED618224. Google Scholar

[17] Al-Jarf, R. (2022c). Teaching English for polytechnic purposes: Guidelines for an Integrated, Communicative Approach. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL), 4*(2), 113-124. DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2022.4.2.11. ERIC ED620157. Google Scholar

[18] Al-Jarf, R. (2021a). Designing English for Islamic studies courses: Some basic considerations. *Journal Educational Verkenning, 2*(2), 10-19. ERIC ED619895. Google Scholar

[19] Al-Jarf, R. (2021b). EFL Students' difficulties with lexical and syntactic features of news headlines and news stories. *Technium Social Sciences Journal, 17*(1), 524–537. **ERIC** ED618106. Google Scholar

[20] Al-Jarf, R. (2021c). Issues in designing English for Islamic studies courses. *Journal Educational Verkenning, 2*(2), 10-19. Google Scholar

[21] Al-Jarf, R. (2021d). Teaching interpreting for tourism purposes. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL), 3*(13), 17-26. DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.13.3. ERIC ED618208. Google Scholar

[22] Al-Jarf, R. (2021e). *Testing reading for specific purposes in an art education course for graduate students in Saudi Arabia*. International Conference on Research and Development in Science, Technology and Management in the Current Era. Indian Academicians and Researchers Association (IARA), India. February 21. Google Scholar

[23] Al-Jarf, R. (2021f). Testing reading for specific purposes in an art education course for graduate students in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research, 8* (1), 32-42. Indian Academicians and Researchers Association (IARA). Google Scholar

[24] Al-Jarf, R. (2017). Teaching & Learning with Medical Animations & Videos. *EALTHY Magazine, 6*, pp. 17-18. ERIC ED613121. Google Scholar

[25] Al-Jarf, R. (2013a). *Bridging the gap in reading for specific purposes*. 6th International Language Conference on the Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication between Cultures. Faculty of Logistics, University of Maribor, Celje, Slovenia. 19–20 September. Google Scholar

[26] Al-Jarf, R. (2013b). *Teaching and assessing graduate students' research skills in English for art education purposes.* 1st International Conference on Teaching English for Specific Purposes, Serbia, May 17-19. ERIC ED610674. Google Scholar

[27] Al-Jarf, R. (2011a). *Developing and Testing Reading Skills through Art Texts*, in In S. Lobanov, S. Bulaeva, S. Somova, N.P. Chepel (Editors), "Language and Communication through Culture". Pp. 167-175. Ryazan State University. Russia.   ERIC ED639215. Google Scholar

[28] Al-Jarf, R. (2011b). Helping medical students with online videos. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS), 5(*3) (July), 99-110. Google Scholar

[29] Al-Jarf, R. (2011c). *Teaching Greek and Latin roots to premedical students with mind-mapping software*. 2nd FLLAS International Conference on Language for Specific Purposes: Challenges and Prospects, Beograd, Serbia, Feb 4-5, 2011). ERIC ED613146. Google Scholar

[30] Al-Jarf, R. (2010). Teaching medical terminology with mind-mapping software. *Annals of "Dunărea de Jos" University of GALAŢI Fascicle XIII. Language and Literature. New Series, 29*, 1-10. ERIC ED634233. Google Scholar

[31] Al-Jarf, R. (2009a). *Teaching grammar for professional purposes*. The International Language Conference on the Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication Between Cultures. The Faculty of Logistics, Celje, Slovenia. September 24-25. Google Scholar

[32] Al-Jarf, R. (2009b). Using online instruction in English for art education. *Asian EFL Journal Teaching Articles*, 34, 50-60. ERIC ED634168. Google Scholar

[33] Al-Jarf, R. (2009c). What students' e-mails tell us about their needs. *IATEFL Newsletter of Research Special Interest Group, 23*, 7-9. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3851105. ERIC ED613190. Google Scholar

[34] Al-Jarf, R. (2007). Processing of advertisements by EFL Arab college students. *The Reading Matrix Journal, 7*(1), April, 132-140. ERIC EJ1066592. Google Scholar

[35] Al-Jarf, R. (2006). *Teaching translation for specific purposes*. 3rd APETAU Conference. Amman, Jordan. August 23-25. Google Scholar

[36] Al-Jarf, R. (2005a). *Issues in designing English for Islamic studies courses*. 2nd International Online Conference on Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Research, September 16-18. ERIC ED615146. Google Scholar

[37] Al-Jarf, R. (2005b). *Using a small network to teach internet searching skills to ESP graduate students*. In Santiago Posteguillo, et al. (Eds). Language @ work Language learning, discourse and Translation studies in internet. Universitat Jaume I, Castellon, Spain. 71-82. Google Scholar

[38] Al-Jarf, R. (2005c). *Using a small network to teach IT skills to ESP graduate students*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Internet and Language (2nd, Castello, Spain, Oct 27-28. ERIC ED635666. <u>Google Scholar</u>

[39] Al-Jarf, R. (2003). Training *ESP* college students in electronic searching. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, (6)*, 1, 9-17. ERIC ED613067. <u>Google Scholar</u>

[40] Al-Jarf, R. (2002). *Training ESP college students in electronic searching*. Proceedings of the 2002 KAMALL International Conference entitled "A New Paradigm for Innovative Multimedia Language Education in the 21 Century". Korea Association of Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning (KAMALL), Seoul. 271-279. ERIC ED625566. <u>Google Scholar</u>

[41] Al-Jarf, R. (1994). An *ESP* program model for graduate students at King Saud University based on their academic and occupational needs. *King Saud University Journal: Educational Sciences, 6*(1), 67-95. <u>Google Scholar</u>

[42] Bonar, G., & Keary, A. (2026). *ESP* in context: a systematic review of practices, challenges and innovations in a middle-income country. *ESP Today*, *14*(1), 115-133.

[43] Caroline, S., Sumarni, S. & Darmahusni, D. (2023). Exploring potentials and challenges of microlearning in *ESP* and *ESP* materials design: a systematic review. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, *12*(3), 911-934.

[44] Fransiska, F. & Sigarete, B. (2025, January). The role of English for specific purposes (*ESP*) in promoting health communication skills among medical students: a systematic literature review. In *Proceeding of International Conference Social Technology Education and Health Science* (Vol. 2, No. 1).

[45] Ghanbar, H., & Rezvani, R. (2024). Four decades of publications in English for specific purposes: Mapping the trajectory of empirical research. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 32-49.

[46] Gollin-Kies, S. (2014). Methods reported in *ESP* research articles: A comparative survey of two leading journals. *English for Specific Purposes*, *36*, 27-34.

[47] Jande, L. & Ibrahim, N. (2021). Challenges of teaching *ESP*: A review. *LSP International Journal*, *8*(2), 1-8.

[48] Khalid, A. (2016). Needs assessment in *ESP*: A review. Studies in Literature and Language 12.6 (2016): 38-46.

[49] Lacková, M. (2025). Teaching *ESP* Vocabulary with the Application of Corpus-Based Materials at Universities: A Rapid Review of Literature. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *16*.

[50] Liashenko, I. (2025). The use of ai applications in *ESP* teaching and learning: a systematic review. Analele Universității Ovidius" Constanța. Seria Filologie, 36, 1206-1248.

[51] Musdalifah, A., Bangsawan, I., & Astika, A. (2024). The trends in need analysis of *ESP* for engineering students: Systematic literature review. *Didaktika: Jurnal Kependidikan*, *13*(1), 1149-1164.

[52] Nguyen, T., Silalahi, O., & Liu, G. (2024). A Systematic Review of Experimental Research on the Integration of Technologies into *ESP* Courses. *Taiwan International ESP Journal*, *15*(2), 55-96.

[53] Pang, B., & Abd Majid, F. (2025). Systematic Literature Review on Needs Analysis in *ESP* within Higher Education: Implications for Future Research. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, *10*(1), e003162.

[54] Pongpanich, W., Jantakoon, T., & Laoha, R. (2026). AI-enhanced Flipped CLIL Models for *ESP* Education: A Systematic Review in Tourism and Hospitality Contexts. Higher Education Studies, 16,(1), 234-260.

[55] Rafiq, K., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. (2021). Sustaining education with mobile learning for English for specific purposes (*ESP*): A systematic review (2012–2021). *Sustainability*, *13*(17), 9768.

[56] Situmorang, D. L., et al. (2023). Systematic Literature Review: English for Specific Purposes (*ESP*) in Business Communication. *Langue (Journal of Language and Education)*, *1*(2), 77-92.

[57] Supunya, N. (2023). A systematic review on *ESP* teachers: Current focus, collaboration, and sustainability. *REFLections*, *30*(2), 287-317.

[58] Suzani, S., Yarmohammadi, L., & Yamini, M. (2011). A critical review of the current situation of teaching *ESP* in the Iranian. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, *36*(3), 179.

[59] Taghipour, M. & Kouhdadht, A. (2026). The efficacy and implementation of negotiated syllabi in EFL and *ESP* contexts: A qualitative systematic review. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes Praxis*, *3*(1), 1-14.

[60] Waluyo, G., et al. (2024). A Systematic Literature Review: English Specific Purpose (*ESP*) for Police. *Langue (Journal of Language and Education)*, *2*(2), 27-38.

[61] Wannas, A., Altukruni, R. & Naby, S. (2025). Integrating technology in the instruction and retention of *ESP* vocabulary: a systematic review. *Insights into Language, Culture and Communication*, *5*(1), 95-108.

[62] Yan, H. (2025). Trends in Empirical Research in English for Specific Purposes: A Systematic Review of SSCI-Indexed Journal Articles (2014–2023). *SAGE Open*, *15*(1), 21582440251328460.

[63] Yang, R., Xu, L., & Swales, J. (2023). Tracing the development of English for Specific Purposes over four decades (1980–2019): A bibliometric analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, *71*, 149-160.