

College Preparedness Based on English Proficiency Level: An Instructional Enrichment Manual

Joergen T. Arradaza, Jr., Ph. D.

Eastern Visayas State University – Ormoc Campus
Ormoc City, Leyte

Catalino L. Centillas, Jr., Ph. D.

Palompon Institute of Technology – Tabango Campus
Tabango, Leyte

Abstract

This study investigated the English performance of the Ormoc City Division senior high school students in the National Achievement Test (NAT) SY 2013 in order to design an instructional enrichment so they can be better prepared for college work. The descriptive quantitative method of research was used in this study, using the adapted researcher-made grammar test and questionnaire to gather the data which were then analyzed and interpreted. The findings revealed that teacher-related factors were the most probable causes of the respondents identified deficiency, although a culturally-related cause interference of Cebuano language (L1) got the highest weighted mean. It was concluded that based on English proficiency level, the Ormoc City Division senior high school students are greatly deficient in English. Hence, with the intention to raise their English proficiency level, an instructional enrichment in the form of Instructional Enrichment Manual was developed.

Keywords: English proficiency, English enrichment manual, senior high school, descriptive quantitative method, Philippines.

Introduction

English is the language of commerce and industry- a tool for advancement in the business world. By popular acceptance, it continues to be the “lingua franca” of the Filipinos; by legislation, it is one of the official languages of the Philippines. It provides a gateway to the arts and sciences, to technology and the rest of the world; hence, it has greatly helped lift up the Filipinos to their present state of civilization and culture (Alcantara, et al., 2003).

On the other hand, in the Philippine Educational System, especially in the tertiary level, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) articulates the significance of English all the more by setting the standard of college readiness in its resolution (Technical Panel on General Education 1) and in CHED Memorandum Order No. 59, Series of 1996. The resolution and memorandum order imply CHED’s expectation of a basic education graduates who is equipped with the mastery of the basic communication in English enabling them to tackle academic courses in college.

Likewise, UP Open University (2005) cited that there has been a steadily increasing concern for the communicative competence of language students. Rivers (1972) emphasized that those who work with foreign language teaching in the United States tend to define communicative competence simply as linguistic interaction in the target language: “the ability to function in a truly communicative setting, that is, in a spontaneous transaction involving one or more other persons”. People who work in English as a second language, tend to use communicative competence and to include not only the linguistic forms of the language but also its social roles, the knowledge of when, how, and to whom it is appropriate to use these forms.

According to Savignon (1983) communicative competence is relative, not absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all the participants involved. It is not so much an intrapersonal construct as one saw in Chomsky’s early writings but rather a dynamic, interpersonal construct that can be examined by means of the overt performance of two or more individuals in the process of negotiating meaning. She further explained that sociolinguistic competence as the knowledge of the socio-cultural rules of language and discourse. This type of competence requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction. Only in a full context of this kind can judgment be made on the appropriateness of a particular utterance.

Moreover, Canale and Swain (1980) stressed out that dimensions of communicative competence on grammatical competence encompass knowledge of the rules of grammar. It is the ability of the learners to know the correct usage of the different structures of the language and how they are used in actual communication situations. On the other hand, discourse competence is the ability of the learners to organize oral and written discourse logically; the ability of the learners to use signal words or cohesion devices to come up with meaningful discourse. On the other hand, Murcia (2006) said that discourse competence includes knowledge of and ability to control the ordering of sentences in terms of topic focus given; natural sequencing; cause/effect; the ability to structure and manage discourse in terms of – thematic organization; coherence and cohesion; logical ordering; style and register; rhetorical effectiveness and lastly, text design. These are some of the components in effective writing that the teacher must be cautious of in evaluating. The teacher must make the final evaluation of student writing consistent with the overall approach.

In keeping with current waves of thought, Bachman (1990) adds strategic competence as an entirely separate element of communicative language ability. Strategic competence almost serves as “executive” function of making the final “decision”, among many possible options, on wording, phrasing, and other productive and receptive means in negotiating meaning. The important issue in describing communicative competence is the way interactors use language in different styles depending on the context of a communicative act in terms of subject matter, audience, occasion, shared experience, and purpose of communication.

Krashen (1973) suggest that the distinction between acquisition and learning of a language, being the most fundamental of all hypotheses, as well as the most renowned one among a number of linguists and language practitioners. In his view, subconscious language acquisition bears a great deal of similarity to the way children acquire their first language. However, it is not only the very process of acquisition that is subconscious, but also the final outcome of acquisition, or so to say acquired linguistic competence. The acquisition process itself “requires meaningful interactions in the target language-natural communication- in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding”.

Language teaching practice often assumes that most of the difficulties that learners face in the study of English are consequence of the degree to which their native language differs from English (a constructive analysis approach). A native speaker of Chinese, for example, may face many more difficulties than a native speaker of German, because German is closely related to English, whereas Chinese is not. On the other hand, language learners often produce errors or syntax and pronunciation thought to result from the result of L1, such as mapping its grammatical patterns inappropriately onto the L2, pronouncing certain sounds incorrectly or with difficulty, and confusing items of vocabulary. This is known as L1 transfer or “language interference”. However, these transfer effects are stronger for beginners’ language production and SLA has highlighted many errors which cannot be attributed to the L1, as they are attested in learners of many languages backgrounds.

It is of course not feasible for learners to anticipate the socio-cultural aspects for every context. Moreover, English often serves as a language of communication between speakers of different primary languages. Participants in multicultural communications are sensitive not only to the cultural meanings attached to the language itself, but also to social conventions concerning language use, such as *turn-taking*, *appropriacy of content*, *nonverbal language*, and *tone of voice*. These conventions influence how messages are interpreted. *Cultural awareness* rather than cultural knowledge becomes increasingly important. Just knowing something about the culture of an English-speaking country will not suffice. What must be learned is a general empathy and openness towards other cultures. Socio-cultural competence therefore includes a willingness to engage in the active negotiation of meaning along with a willingness to suspend judgment and take into consideration the possibility of cultural differences in conventions or use. Together these features might be subsumed under the term cultural flexibility or cultural awareness (Murcia, 2006).

There is no other theory that permitted radical change in viewing language acquisition and learning through the Communicative Competence Theory which continues up to this day to prove and support the fact that language users can possibly develop several types of language competence other than the grammatical competence. In light of these concerns, the researchers were made to look into the college preparedness based on English proficiency level.

Statement of the Problem 1

The study aimed to investigate the English proficiency level of the senior high students of Ormoc City Division for college preparedness. More specifically, this answers the following sub-problems:

1. What is the level of English proficiency of the respondents, in terms of:
 - 1.1 Lexical,
 - 1.2 Syntactic, and
 - 1.3 Discourse competencies?
2. What are the most probable causes of the respondents’ identified deficiencies?
3. Based on the findings, what instructional enrichment can be proposed?

Significance of the Study

The result of the study will contribute to crafting of Instructional Enrichment Manual on English Grammar that will serve as a guide to teachers. This is designed based on the findings of the study beneficial to the following:

Students: The students who are the most important beneficiary of the study are the end users of the output which is an instructional enrichment that is designed to help them achieve a higher degree of communicative competence. The instructional enrichment serves as their guide or criterion relative to the handling of more complicated problems in English. The built-in strategies in the presentation of the grammar lessons being challenging and novel to a large degree make grammar a pleasant and exciting experience.

English Language Teachers: The results of this investigation help the English teachers determine their priority areas of instruction in English. With the instructional enrichment as guide, they can create instructional materials for both fast and slow learners. Furthermore, they can judge for themselves if they had taught English effectively or not. With this realization, they can select appropriate methods and strategies to improve their teaching skills.

Parents: From the parents' perspective, they can determine the type and intensity of intervention their children need in their homework and private study.

School Administrators: The evaluation results may provide school administrators with a scientific basis for administrative decisions regarding curriculum development. The curriculum is nothing unless there is a concrete measurement of the outcomes of instruction. The results of the evaluation can provide a clear vision and direction as to what is taught and learned within a specified time. It affords the administrators and supervisors a basis for monitoring the progress of instruction. It gives them insights regarding the professional preparation of the teachers assigned to teach English. They know what aspects of English instruction can be given priority and attention in their supervision.

Future Researchers: They are expected to execute related studies in other divisions and regions based on the suggestions of the study and that they may be able to gain knowledge from this investigation.

Methodology

The study used descriptive quantitative method of research. The major areas under consideration were: (1) the level of English proficiency of the respondents in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse competence and; (2) the most probable causes of the respondents' identified deficiencies.

Research Environment

DepEd Ormoc City Division is based in the campus of New Ormoc City National High School located at Barangay Don Felipe Larrazabal, Ormoc City. This city has a population of 188,126 (NSO) under the jurisdiction of the 4th Congressional District of Leyte.

Nine (9) educational supervisors with their fields of specialization are tasked to supervise all the public and private schools in the division, both elementary and secondary levels.

In the elementary level, there are 83 schools, 76 of which are complete schools and seven (7) are incomplete, manned by 65 administrators. These administrators have varied positions, ranging from teacher-in-charge to principal IV. However, in the secondary level, there are 13 national high schools, the research locale. The high schools are likewise supervised by 13 administrators of varying positions from teacher-in-charge to principal IV. These 13 national high schools are situated in the different parts of the city. New Ormoc City National High School is located in the heart of the city and the rest of the 12 schools are based in the different barangays, farthest of which is 35 kilometers away from the city proper. The Ormoc City

government with an enviable local source income of P417 million and P248 million in 2011 and 2008, respectively subsidize all public schools in Ormoc City Division.

The bottom five public secondary schools in the National Achievement Test SY 2012-2013 were Ipil National High School, Linao National High School, Matica-a National High School, Margen National High School and Ormoc Night National High School.

Ipil National High School with an area of one (1) hectare is six (6) kilometers from the Ormoc City proper. It belongs to the Department of Education, Ormoc City Division, and District II. Its barangay residents are mostly professionals and skilled workers. It is headed by Principal IV, a master of arts in education. Sixty-five classroom teachers, four (4) master teachers and eight (8) subject area department heads attend to classroom instruction. To fund the operating expenses of the school such as electric, water and telephone bills including labor services for repairs, the school receives Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) of P102, 000 a month. The total student population is 1, 912.

Linao National High School with an area of one and eight hundredths (1.08) hectare is four (4) kilometers from the heart of the city. It belongs to District III. The barangay residents are businessmen, professionals, skilled workers, construction laborers and fishermen. The school is managed by Principal III, a doctor of education. There are 46 classroom teachers, four (4) master teachers and eight (8) subject area coordinators. Its MOOE is P91, 000 monthly. The total student population is 1, 221.

Matica-a National High School is 16 kilometers from the city proper, the farthest of the bottom five (5) schools. Its area is twenty-five hundredths (.25) hectare. It is run by a Head Teacher, a master of arts in education. There are six (6) classroom teachers. Its total student population is 274. Since the MOOE is based on student population, Maticaa National High School receives only P15, 000 monthly.

Margen National High School with an area of one and eight hundredth (1.08) hectare is 14 kilometers from the city proper. It belongs to District V. The barangay residents are farmers and skilled workers. The school is administered by a Head Teacher, a master of arts in education. Instruction is managed by 29 classroom teachers and two (2) master teachers. Its MOOE is P51, 200 monthly. The total student population is 834.

Research Respondents

The 274 senior high school students or 30 percent of the 913 population of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools in the National Achievement Test SY 2012-2013 were the respondents of the study. The NAT proficiency level was the main consideration in the choice of samples. The procedure used was the proportional stratified sampling. From Ipil National High School 112 or 41 percent of 274 are taken as samples; Linao National High School 77 or 28 percent; Matica-a National High School 19 or seven (7) percent; Margen National High School 52 or 19 percent; and from Ormoc Night High School 14 or five (5) percent.

Statistical Treatment

On the English Proficiency Level

To find the English proficiency level of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse competencies, the Percentage Score (PS) was computed by dividing the Total Score Obtained (TSO) by the Total Highest Possible Score or the Expected

Perfect Score. The formula for the Total Highest Possible Score is Total Population X Number of Test Items (DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2004).

The computed Percentage Scores were ranked and the General Percentage Score was computed, then interpreted based on levels of proficiency (Adapted from DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2004 as cited in Navarro and Santos, 2012).

On Probable Causes of English Deficiency

To determine the extent of the probable causes of the English deficiency based on the information drawn from the questionnaire, the Likert Scale was used.

Parametric Scale	Description	Likert Scale
4.21 - 5.0	Very Much	5
3.41 - 4.20	Much	4
2.61 - 3.40	Moderate	3
1.81 - 2.60	Little	2
1.0 - 1.80	Very Little	1

The ratings on the probable causes of English deficiency as drawn from the data derived from the questionnaire have been recognized by the researcher as a limitation in this study. The student-respondents might have rated their teachers subjectively for some reasons. These are just their perceptions and perceptions are selective in nature depending on who said what.

Results and Discussion

This part presents and analyzes the data gathered, as well as interprets the results of the survey on the English proficiency level of the 274 senior high students of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools. Likewise, it presents the probable causes of the respondents' English deficiency. The results are presented in table form, textually analyzed, and interpreted sequentially.

The grammar test to determine the English proficiency level of the respondents covered three levels: lexical, syntactic, and discourse competencies. The questionnaire dealt on the probable causes of the English deficiency.

The lexical competence was ascertained through the measure of the respondents' performance in the eight (8) parts of speech: nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and interjections; the syntactic competence, through the run-on sentences, comma splice, fragments, misplaced/dangling modifiers, word order (single-word adjective), word order (single-word adverb) and sentence completion by word order. On the other hand, the discourse competence dealt on paragraph construction.

The questionnaire stipulated 20 probable causes of English deficiency for the senior high students to identify.

English Proficiency Level

The English proficiency level in this study is the performance of the 274 respondents in the

grammar test conducted in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse competencies. This is the equivalent verbal description of the general percentage score computed (Oriondo and Antonio 191; Navarro and Santos 101).

Lexical Competencies: The level of proficiency in lexical competencies is based on the results of the eight (8) parts of speech tested, namely: nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. Lexical competence is a central part of communicative competence (Murcia 2006).

Table 2 presents the summary of the lexical competencies of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools. Appended Tables 2.1 to 2.8 present the detailed information of the respondents' performance in each part of speech. The results reveal that **pronouns** ranked 1st while **prepositions** ranked 8th with the percentage score of 58.03 and 43.68, respectively. It can be deduced that of the eight (8) parts of speech, pronouns proved to be easier to the respondents than the rest of the seven (7) parts of speech while prepositions proved to be the most difficult.

Table 2: Lexical Competencies of the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

Parts of Speech \ Schools	Ipil NHS	Linao NHS	Matica-a NHS	Margen NHS	Ormoc Night NHS	Percentage Score	RANK
Pronouns	57.52	54.76	47.37	56.04	74.48	58.03	1
Adjectives	59.95	33.70	54.89	47.25	64.29	52.02	2
Conjunctions	56.63	39.38	45.11	59.34	54.08	50.91	3.5
Interjections	50.15	45.94	45.61	59.29	53.57	50.91	3.5
Adverbs	56.81	38.78	48.68	50.96	46.43	48.33	5
Nouns	43.30	36.22	44.08	47.84	63.29	46.95	6
Verbs	46.63	44.16	42.69	37.82	50.00	44.26	7
Prepositions	44.08	40.38	38.82	37.98	57.14	43.68	8
General Percentage Score	51.88	41.67	45.91	49.57	57.91	49.39	Needs Improvement

Further scrutiny of the table indicates that four (4) parts of speech, namely: adverbs, verbs, nouns and prepositions with the percentage scores of 48.33, 44.26, 46.95, and 43.68, respectively fall within the range 0-50 percent described as **Needs Improvement** proficiency level. Likewise, four (4) parts of speech, namely: pronouns, adjectives, conjunctions and interjections with 58.03, 52.02, 50.91 and 50.91, respectively fall within the range 51-74 percent described as **Fairly Satisfactory** proficiency level. The conjunctions and interjections are of equal rank which means these two parts of speech are of equal difficulty to the respondents. It is important to note that Ormoc Night National High School whose students are working for others in the daytime with fewer hours for study makes it to the top with its 57.91 percentage performance. Krashen advances the idea that one's desire to land a better job in the future is an instrumental motivation to learn a language. This is an attitudinal factor which relates to language proficiency and could be a powerful predictor of second language acquisition. Dulay and Burt (UP Open University 221) supported Krashen's view when they had suggested that the attitudinal factors may relate to second language acquisition because performers with optimal (positive) attitudes have a lower affective filter. A lower filter means that the performer is more "open" to input, and that the input strikes "deeper", to use Stevick's (221) term. The general percentage scores of **49.39** within 0-50 range points out that the lexical competencies of the respondents **Needs Improvement**, the lowest level of proficiency in the scale. The students at

this level struggle with their understanding and have not acquired or developed adequately the prerequisite and fundamental knowledge/skills to aid understanding. This implies that the respondents need more exercises, follow-up activities and a lot of pattern drills like substitution, repetition, transformation and the like to reinforce the correct usage and use of the grammar points taught. Oral practice should be emphasized through dialogues and passages which the teacher provides. These activities are salient features of the Audio Lingual Method in teaching grammar which adheres to the theory of behaviorism conceived by Skinner, Fries and Bloomfield. As posited by these theorists, language is a system of habits, acquired through repetition, conditioning and reinforcement.

Syntactic Competencies: Individual words convey certain types of lexical meaning. However, when words combine with one another to form larger constructions they convey more meaning than the mere aggregate of the independent meanings of the words themselves. These conditions fall into five (5) principal types of syntactic structure which differ in the parts of speech that make them up or in the structural meanings that they convey. The different groups of structures with their corresponding components are the following: structure of predication (subject, predicate); structure of modification (modifier, head); structure of complementation (verbal element, complement); structure of coordination (independent units, coordinator); and structure of subordination (dependent unit, subordinator). All larger structures are simply combinations of the five (5) basic types and no matter how complicated a construction may be, it can always be analyzed in any of these five (Cortez et al. 37).

In this study, the syntactic level of proficiency of the respondents was based on the results of the following structures tested: word order (single-word adjectives), sentence completion by word order, fragments, dangling modifier, run-on sentences, word order (single-word adverbs), and comma splice.

The summary of the syntactic competencies of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools was presented in table 3. The results indicates that word order (single-word adjectives) ranked 1st; while comma splice ranked 7th with the percentage scores of 76.97 and 45.82, respectively. There is a sharp difference between the first and the seventh, being 31.15. The later falls within the range 75-84 described as **Satisfactory** proficiency level while the latter falls within the range 0-50 described as

Table 3: Syntactic Competencies of the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

Schools Skills	Ipil NHS	Linao NHS	Matica-aNHS	Margen NHS	Ormoc Night NHS	Percentage Score	RANK
Word Order (Single-Word Adjectives)	76.79	73.72	65.79	72.12	96.43	76.97	1
Sentence Completion by Word Order	58.84	47.56	53.16	60.19	46.43	53.24	2
Fragments	56.55	53.42	49.12	58.97	40.78	51.77	3
Run-On Sentences	48.21	50.85	36.84	60.90	47.62	48.88	4
Dangling Modifier	40.18	57.69	43.86	69.23	30.95	48.38	5
Word Order (Single-Word Adverbs)	69.64	43.91	43.42	50.96	23.21	46.23	6
Comma Splice	45.54	29.06	35.09	71.79	47.62	45.82	7
General Percentage	56.54	50.89	46.75	63.45	47.58	53.04	Fairly Satisfactory

Needs Improvement proficiency level of the seven (7) syntactic structures tested, the respondents found word order (single-word adjectives) easier than the rest of the six (6) while comma splice was found to be the most difficult. Single-word adjectives highest rank could be attributed to the students' early exposure to this structure in the elementary level (Elementary Level Scope and Sequence, Learning Competencies 25) and reinforced in the secondary level. Further, two (2) structures, namely: sentence completion by word order and fragments with the percentage scores of 53.24 and 51.77, respectively fall within the range 51-74 described as **Fairly Satisfactory**; added to comma splice with **Needs Improvement** proficiency level are dangling modifiers, run-on sentences and word order (single-word adverbs) with the percentage scores of 48.38, 48.88 and 46.23, respectively. The general percentage score of **53.04** falls within the range 51-70 described as **Fairly Satisfactory** proficiency level. This implies that the students at this level possess the minimum knowledge and skills and core understandings, but need help throughout the performance of authentic tasks.

The discourse competence of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools was presented in table 4. As shown in this table, Ipil National High School ranked 1st; Ormoc Night National High School ranked 2nd; Matica-a National High School ranked 3rd; Linao National High School ranked 4th; and Margen National High School ranked 5th with the percentage scores of 51.25, 48.65, 42.11, 40.64 and 36.43, respectively. Of the five (5) schools tested, only Ipil NHS got **Fairly Satisfactory** level of proficiency, its percentage score being 51.25 that falls within the range 51-74. The rest of the four (4) schools, namely: Ormoc Night National High School, Matica-a National High School, Linao National High School and Margen National High School got **Needs Improvement** level of proficiency with their percentage that fall within the range 0-50. The general percentage of **43.82** shows that the level of proficiency of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools in discourse competence is **Needs Improvement**. It falls within the range 0-50.

Table 4: Discourse Competence of the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

School	Percentage Score	RANK
Ipil National High School	51.25	1
Ormoc Night National High School	48.65	2
Matica-a National High School	42.11	3
Linao National High School	40.64	4
Margen National High School	36.43	5
General Percentage Score	43.82	Needs Improvement

This means that the findings underscore the need for teachers to change their views about writing, identify the distinctive features of these views and eventually match their approaches to teaching writing that match the views about composing. It further implies that the correct thinking about the nature of writing and the teaching of writing, one is beginning to see that writing is not a straightforward activity. In fact, it is a process with a lot of twists and turns and the teacher should help the student with the process. Writing requires a great amount of thinking beforehand, and the teacher should be around to help students prepare for the writing task with several pre-writing activities. Also writing is now viewed as a recursive and spiraling process, with the writer constantly stopping, going back, reviewing, revising, thinking ahead and all the while, clarifying and refining his/her thoughts. In other words, writing is a thinking process, with emphasis on **thinking** and **process**. In the thinking, drafting and revising phases, the teacher and the writer's peers should give as much input as they possibly can.

Summary of the English Proficiency Level in Terms of Lexical, Syntactic and Discourse Competencies of the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

The English proficiency level of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools, **Table 5** presents the summary of the English proficiency level in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse competencies. Findings reveals that syntactic competence ranked 1st; lexical competence ranked 2nd; and discourse competence ranked 3rd with the percentage scores of 53.04, 49.39 and 43.82, respectively. This means the syntactic competence got the highest proficiency level but described only as **Fairly Satisfactory** since its percentage falls within the range 51-74. The lexical competence got the second highest proficiency level described as **Needs Improvement**, since its percentage falls within the range 0-50. Although both the lexical and the discourse competencies are described as **Needs Improvement** proficiency level, there is a difference of 5.99 percentage score between them. This points out that of the three (3) competencies, discourse competence proved to be the most difficult.

Table 5: Summary of the English Proficiency Level in Terms of Lexical, Syntactic and Discourse Competencies of the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

Schools Competencies	Ipil NHS	Lina o NHS	Matica- aNHS	Margen NHS	Ormoc Night NHS	Percentag e Score	Rank
Syntactic	56.54	50.89	46.75	63.45	47.58	53.04	1
Lexical	51.88	41.67	45.91	49.57	57.91	49.39	2
Discourse	51.25	40.64	42.11	36.43	48.65	43.82	3
General Percentage Score	53.22	44.4	44.92	49.82	51.38	48.75	Needs Improveme nt

Further scrutiny of Table 5 shows that generally the proficiency level of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools in English in term of lexical, syntactic and discourse competencies is described as **Needs Improvement** with its percentage score of **48.89**, a numerical value within the range 0-50. This means the respondents struggle with their understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding. The results entail employment of oral communication strategies that get students to interact orally in the classroom to compensate the absence of the opportunity for natural communicative activity. This performance in English far from **satisfactory** implies knowing the causes of the deficiency so that an intervention can be designed to enhance the English proficiency level of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools.

Probable Causes of English Deficiency of the Senior High Students in the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

Table 6 presents the probable causes of English deficiency and to what extent they have caused such deficiency as perceived by the 274 senior high students of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools. Data were drawn from the questionnaire accomplished by the respondents of the study.

Table 6: Probable Causes of English Deficiency as Perceived by the Senior High Students in the Bottom Five (5) Public Secondary Schools

RATINGS CAUSES	1 Very Little	2 Little	3 Modera te	4 Much	5 Very Much	Weighte d Mean	Interpre- tation
1. Interference of Cebuano language (L1)	5	10	15	350	875	4.56	Very much
2. Inavailability of reading materials	7	10	18	360	850	4.53	Very much
3. Ineffective teaching techniques	4	14	15	340	870	4.52	Very much
4. Classroom not conducive to learning	7	16	45	300	875	4.52	Very much
5. Inadequate/uninteresting instructional materials/media	20	60	90	132	810	4.04	Very much
6. Poor study habits	32	56	210	300	425	3.72	Very Much
7. Poor teacher classroom management	40	62	84	280	530	3.62	Much
8. Lacks interest in English	41	60	84	312	490	3.59	Much
9. Learning disabilities/diseases	39	74	90	280	495	3.56	Much
10. Teacher's incompetence in teaching English	40	36	28	71	100	3.56	Much
11. Low student motivation	42	62	87	280	505	3.55	Much
12. Negative attitude toward the teacher, peers	36	44	207	244	435	3.51	Much
13. Lacks readiness to learn the subject	43	74	87	280	480	3.51	Much
14. Inadequacies of food, clothing and shelter	44	72	90	280	475	3.49	Much
15. Parents' negative attitude toward their child's educational upliftment	60	120	60	148	470	3.12	Moderate
16. Parents' low level education	11	130	69	152	400	2.95	Moderate
17. Low intelligence level	62	130	225	268	100	2.85	Moderate
18. Inadequate administrator's support	64	144	90	316	100	2.60	Little
19. Lack of teacher-student contact due to absences	78	156	90	276	100	2.55	Little
20. Personal/emotional problems	75	178	78	280	75	2.49	Little
GENERAL WEIGHTED MEAN						3.54	MUCH

Table 6 shows **interference of Cebuano language (L1)** recorded a weighted mean 4.56, having a **very much** impact on the English deficiency of the senior high students. This means of the 20 probable causes its impact was the greatest. **Unavailability of reading materials** had a **very much** effect on the deficiency with the weighted mean 4.53. It was second highest. This finding is in consonance with Daulta's (4) in her study "Impact of Home Environment on the Scholastic Achievement of Children." She found that as the quality of home environment which includes books the children own and the daily newspaper the family gets deteriorated, the level of scholastic achievement also comparatively declines. **Ineffective teaching techniques and classroom not conducive to learning** got similar weighted mean of 4.52. Their effects on the deficiency was likewise **very much**. Further, it indicates their impact was equal. **Inadequate/uninteresting instructional materials/media** obtained a weighted mean of 4.04.

This means its effect on English deficiency was **very much**. The senior high students perceived **poor study habits** to have **much effect** on their English deficiency having obtained a weighted mean of 3.72. It is triggered by meaningless, non-functional speaking and writing assignments and unorganized, unchallenging language tasks dousing water to the students' enthusiasm to learn. **Poor teacher classroom management** got a weighted mean of 3.62. Its effect on English deficiency was perceived to be much. **Lacks interest in English** was perceived to have caused **much** effect on deficiency, its weighted mean being 3.59. This calls for varied learning activities, exercises and pattern drills before one can rightfully claim that the mastery of skills taught shall have been achieved. **Teacher's incompetence in teaching English and learning disabilities and diseases** got equal percentage of 3.56. Senior high students perceived these variables to have much equal impact on their English deficiency. **Low student motivation** with a weighted mean of 3.55 was perceived to affect **much** English deficiency. **Negative attitude toward the teacher and peers** was perceived by the senior high students to have **much** impact on their English deficiency having obtained 3.51 weighted mean. Students' attitudes in learning determine their ability and willingness to learn. Positive attitudes toward classroom teacher and peers are manifestations of self- confidence and of integrated motivation. **Lacks readiness to learn the subject** with a weighted mean of 3.51 was perceived to have caused **much** impact on English deficiency. **Inadequacies of food, clothing and shelter** were perceived to have **much** effect on English deficiency having a weighted mean of 3.49. The teacher should understand the children's needs as they grow and develop. Perceived by senior high students among the probable causes to have a **moderate** impact on their English deficiency were **parents' negative attitude toward their child's educational upliftment, parents' low level education, and low intelligence level** with the weighted means of 3.12, 2.95 and 2.85, respectively. **Inadequate administrator's support, lack of student- teacher contact due to absences and personal/emotional problems** with weighted means of 2.60, 2.55 and 2.49, respectively were perceived by the senior high students to have **little** effect on their English deficiency. Although *lack of administrator's support* was found to affect English deficiency **little** among the senior high students, it is worthwhile to accent the key role of the administrator in the improvement of instruction. Table 6 indicates a **general weighted mean of 3.54**, which falls within the 3.54-4.20 parametric scale, described as **much**. It is therefore safe to say that the twenty probable causes taken as one have caused much English deficiency on the 275 senior high students of the bottom five (5) public secondary schools. Varied causes of English deficiency are interacting with each other, complementing, and overlapping, hence, they are influencing one another.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The level of English proficiency of the senior high students of Ormoc City Division in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse competencies **Needs Improvement**. The most probable causes of the respondents' identified deficiencies are **teacher related factors**, although a culturally-

related cause **interference of Cebuano language (L1)** got the highest weighted mean. **Instructional Enrichment Manual** as instructional enrichment is proposed based on the results that the senior high students of Ormoc City Division which are greatly deficient in English, which necessitates instructional enrichment.

It is therefore recommended that students be exposed to various communicative and interactive activities that incessantly boost their confidence and efficiency in expressing their ideas in English; and that school administrators design modules for instructional management for strict implementation since there were many factors that could have rendered English proficiency, such modules comprise student development, curriculum development, staff development and physical facilities development. Hence, the teacher trainings based on sound language theories be conducted with intensified monitoring of implementation;; that teachers encourage students to use English in their reporting and discussion specially in subjects using English as medium of instruction like English, Science and Math; and that teachers themselves avoid code switching in discussion and interaction with the students; and that output in this study be used by the teachers in their English classes to enhance the communicative competence of the senior high students.

Instructional Enrichment Manual

This Instructional Enrichment Manual on English Grammar is intended as practical guide to teachers. This is designed based on the findings of the study. Focused on the communicative competence and critical literacy of the Filipino learner, this is in consonance with the K to 12 Integrated Language Arts Program based on the theories of language teaching, language learning and acquisition (K to 12 Toolkit 37). Its relevance is further stressed in the underlying provisions of the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 20, s. 2013 which stipulates the framework and rationale of the revised General Education as a paradigm shift and in the context of the K to 12 curriculum based on college readiness standards. Article 1 Section 2 of the said memorandum provides the development of intellectual competencies specifically higher levels of comprehension (textual, visual, etc) and proficient and effective communication (writing, speaking and use of new technologies). In a similar vein, Article 1 Section 3 provides the development of purposive communication, specifically in writing, speaking and presenting to different audiences and for various programs. To meet the demands of purposive communication, contextualized communication through conversational English is the thrust of this material. Cooperative learning through dyadic and group speaking activities abound throughout this material to give the students opportunities to express their views in creative ways.

There are three (3) parts in this manual. Part 1 deals on Parts of Speech; Part 2, Correcting Sentence Faults, and Part 3, Writing Paragraphs. As guide to English teachers, he or she can turn to it for notes on the content of a chapter, on how to approach the exercises, and for suggestions in classroom activities. The bulleted step-by-step instructions contain detailed plans for conducting the lesson patterned after the Grade 9 Teachers' Edition for English of the K to 12 Education Program. The information found in this manual can assist teachers and administrators in their planning, programming and assessment of curriculum goals.

Part 1

Parts of Speech

Introduce Part 1 by bringing the attention of the students to the overview of the eight (8) parts of speech. Let them reflect on the implication of the different positions of the parts of

speech in the diagram; why noun comes first, followed by pronoun and then, verb; why noun, pronoun and verb occupy the first level in the diagram; why adjective and adverbs come next on the second level followed by preposition, conjunction and interjection on the third level, the last. For further activation or recall of prior knowledge ask the students why the eight (8) parts of speech are called the “**building blocks**” of language and why they are likened to the parts of a house. Stress on this analogy to bring out the point that the parts of speech have varied functions.

Since the “**overview**” is synonymous to motivation, end this portion by asking the students’ insight as to the importance of recognizing the parts of speech.

LESSON 1 - NOUNS

Get started on **LESSON 1 Nouns** by drawing the students’ attention to the pictures in the illustration. Ask them to name the things/objects shown in the pictures. Let them conceptualize that the things/objects are naming words called *nouns*.

Move the students’ attention to the entries in the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase like:

1. share prior knowledge about the topic;
2. process information mentioned in the text listened to;
3. perform tasks by following instructions;
4. distinguish naming words from one another;
5. use nouns for effective interaction and negotiation of meaning.

Assess the performance of the students and allow independent correction for review and mastery of the structure. Provide key answers to double check independent correction. For those students who perform very low, conduct remedial teaching. Let them go over the learning experiences again.

LESSON 2 - PRONOUNS

Get started on **LESSON 2 Pronouns** by asking the students some questions about the exchanges in the illustration like: Who is tired and weary? What does the man ask the woman? What is the response of the woman? Tell the students to take note of the boldfaced words **you, me, I, and my**. Further ask: What are those words representing? What parts of speech are they?

Lead the students to the entries in the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase:

1. demonstrate competence in adjusting listening strategies in relation to the main purpose of listening;
2. sharpen thinking skills and reasoning ability through the listening process;
3. appreciate beauty in message and song;
4. classify the different kinds of pronouns and their functions;
5. identify the antecedent to be able to use the appropriate pronouns;
6. use the correct pronouns in both oral and written communications.

Assess the performance of the students after practice and production. Allow independent correction to lower affective filter .Double check independent correction by providing key

answers. For those students who perform very poorly, conduct remedial teaching. Encourage them to go over the learning experiences to improve their performance.

LESSON 3 - VERBS

Get started on **LESSON 3 Verbs** by directing the students' attention to the pictures that show actions. Ask them questions such as: What is the first boy doing? What is the second boy doing? How about the third, etc.? Ask them what the pictures suggest.

Move them to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and emphasize to them the importance of the entries like:

1. guess the meaning of words and expressions through structural analysis and context clues;
2. infer the persona in the poem read;
3. answer directly stated details;
4. justify answers given;
5. react to statements made;
6. differentiate the kinds of verbs;
7. use verbs correctly in communicative tasks.

Assess the performance of the students using the test. Let them check their own test papers for review and mastery of *verbs*. To double check independent correction, provide key answers to the students. For those students who perform very poorly, conduct remedial teaching by letting them go over the learning experiences in the

Development Phase

LESSON 4 – SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT

Get started on **LESSON 4 Subject-Verb Agreement** by bringing the students' attention to the exchanges in the illustration. Ask them what the exchanges mean.

Direct them to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and point out the importance of the entries:

1. analyze subject-verb agreement based on examples given;
2. internalize the rules in subject-verb agreement;
3. apply rules in subject-verb agreement in communicative tasks.

Wind up by assessing the students' performance. Let them correct their answers independently. To double check the independent correction, provide key answers to the students. Conduct remedial teaching to those who perform very poorly. Let them do the learning experiences over again.

LESSON 5 – ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

Get started on **LESSON 5 Adjectives and Adverbs** by directing the students' attention to the illustration. Ask them the difference between *good or well*.

Lead them to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and underscore the importance of the entries:

1. get meaning of words through context clues and use them in sentences;
2. express reactions to situations in a selection read;
3. compare and contrast character traits;
4. transcode information from non-linear to linear;
5. act out roles to show understanding of what is read;
6. identify adjectives and adverbs and classify them;
7. use adjectives and adverbs in sentences.

Assess the students' performance through a test. This will lower their affective filter in learning the language. Double check independent correction by providing key answers. Conduct remedial teaching to those who perform very poorly. Invite them to go over the learning experiences.

LESSON 6 – PREPOSITIONS

Get started on **LESSON 6** *Prepositions* by asking the students where the blue ball is positioned in relation to the red box; the position of the yellow moon, the tire, the black cat, the boy, the flowers and the green grass. These questions serve as advance organizers to facilitate the students' comprehension of the poem that follows.

Lead the students to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase.

By the end of the lesson you will have been able to:

1. infer based on the information found around the text;
2. reason based on significant details;
3. identify and classify prepositional phrases;
4. construct sentences using prepositions;
5. use prepositions in communicative tasks.

Assess the students' performance. To double check independent correction, provide key answers to the students. Conduct remedial teaching for the students who perform very poorly. Let them do the learning experiences over again.

LESSON 7 – CONJUNCTIONS

Get started on **LESSON 7** *Conjunctions* by bringing the students' attention to the illustration. Ask them the implication of the statement "I like big conjunctions and I cannot lie."

Direct the students to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and discuss with them the importance of the entries:

1. compare and contrast characters in poem read;
2. interpret idiomatic expressions and metaphors;
3. interpret messages and images;
4. evaluate values and ideas;
5. identify the kinds of conjunctions and their functions;
6. use conjunctions in communicative tasks.

Assess the students' performance by answering the test and allow independent correction for review and mastery of the structure. To double check the independent correction,

provide key answers to the students. Conduct remedial teaching for those who perform very low. Let them go over again the learning experiences.

LESSON 8 – INTERJECTIONS

Get started on **LESSON 8 *Interjections*** by bringing the students' attention to the illustration. Have them describe what the children feel at the moment. Ask them to mention the expressions on the words that go with that feeling.

Direct the students to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and discuss with them the entries:

1. get meaning of words through context clue and use these words in sentences;
2. justify answers by citing evidences;
3. make decisions based on analysis;
4. demonstrate comprehension through a graphic organizer;
5. summarize the story read;
6. define interjections and give their functions;
7. use interjections in free communicative tasks.

Wind up with a test in the ***Let's Answer*** section. Allow independent correction. To double check independent correction, provide key answers found in the ***Let's Check*** section. For those students performing very poorly, conduct remedial teaching by letting them go over the learning experiences again.

Part 2

Correcting Sentence Faults

Introduce Part 2 by directing the students' attention to the overview which deals with sentence faults like misplaced/dangling modifiers, run-on sentences, comma splice and sentence fragments. Underscore to the students the significance of learning to express thoughts clearly in writing by establishing its direct relationship to formal speaking.

Move the students to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and discuss with them its entries like:

1. get meaning of words through clustering and clining;
2. single out the technique used in the presentation of information in the text;
3. note significant details;
4. give title to text read;
5. identify misplaced or dangling modifiers.

Assess the students' performance using the test in the ***Let's Answer*** section. Encourage independent correction to lower affective filter and to review for mastery. To double check independent correction provide key answers found in the ***Let's Check*** section to the students. Conduct remedial teaching for those performing very poorly by going over the learning experience again.

Part 3

The Paragraph

Introduce Part 3 by discussing with the students that writing is a difficult activity because it demands much mental discipline coupled with creativity and know-how in putting thoughts together. Gradually, have them realize that with intensified practice one can own the skill. Stress to them that to write good paragraphs one must be equipped with the knowledge and skill on the topic sentence, transition within a paragraph and methods of developing a paragraph.

Direct the attention of the students to the **YOUR OBJECTIVES** phase and take up with them its entries:

1. define a paragraph;
2. differentiate implied topic sentence from expressed topic sentence;
3. analyze the features of a good paragraph in terms of the topic sentence transition within a paragraph and methods of its development;
4. write good paragraph with unity, coherence and emphasis.

Assess the students' performance by letting them answer a test in the **Let's Answer** section. Provide the students a rubric for them to check their own work and thus lower the affective filter. The total point is ten (10). For students performing very poorly, conduct remedial teaching by letting them go over again the learning experiences.

References

- Alcantara, R. D., et al. (2003). *Teaching Strategies 1 For the Teaching of the Communication Arts: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing*. Makati City, Philippines: Katha Publishing Co., Inc., 2003.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baraceros, E. L., & Lintao, R. B. (2010). *English 4: Oral Communication in Context*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
- Bondoc, J. (2010). *English, Math, Science Focus of New Curriculum*. The Philippine Star.
- Calhoun, R. (1994). *Autonomy and Language Learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Compt, D., & Schrch, L. (2010). *The Little Book of Dialogue and General Conversation for Difficult Subject*. San Francisco: Imagine Press.
- CONSTEL English: A Telecourse for English for Teachers of English. (1999). Testing. Quezon City: People's Television Network, Inc.
- Meena, S. D. (2008). Impact of home environment on the scholastic achievement of children. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 23(1), 75-77.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations on Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kapunan, R. R. (1974). *Educational Psychology*. Manila, Rex Printing Company, Inc.
- Krashen, S. (1973). *Language Learning*. UP Open University, Quezon City.
- Magister Training Center TEST. (2008). *Total English Skills Training, English Plus Textbook*: Manila, Philippines.

- Mayer, S. E. (2002). *The Influence of Parental Income on Children's Outcomes*. New Zealand: Knowledge Management Group, Ministry of Social Development, Te Manatu Whakahiato Ora.
- Murcia, M. (2006). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, Third Edition*. Heinle and Heinle Singapore.
- Navarro, R. L., & Santos, R. G. (2012). *Assessment of Learning Outcomes (Assessment 1)*. (2nd Ed.), Aurora Blvd: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
- Newman, D. (2009). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. USA: ESP Printers, Inc.
- Oriundo, L. L., & Dallo, E. M. (1989). *Evaluating Educational Outcomes (Test, Measurement and Evaluation)*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
- Parkhurst, C. C. (1965). *English for Business*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Peters, H. E., & Mullis, N. C. (1997). *The Role of Family Income and Sources of Income in Adolescent Achievement*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Reeves, T. C. (1998). *The Impact of Media Technology in Schools*. The University of Georgia, a, Athens, GA, USA.
- Rionda, C. S. (1996). *A Handbook of Readings in Language Education*. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.
- Rivers, W. M. (1972). Talking off the tops of their heads. *TESOL Quarterly*, 6(1), 71-81.
- Roldan, A. H. (1997). *Remediation in a Developmental Reading Program*. Ortigas Center, Pasig City: Reading Dynamic Center, Inc.
- Salvaleon, R. (1985). *Teaching English as Second Language*. Manila: Oriental Book Store.
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Addison- Wesley Publishing Company
- Smith, A. N. (1972). The Importance of Attitude in Foreign Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, LV, 2, 82-88.
- Source book in English IV. (1991). *Department of Education, Culture and Sports and the School of Languages and Linguistics*. Quezon City.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Condition for Second Language Learning*. London: Oxford University Press.
- UP Open University. (2005). *Language Acquisition, Theories, Principles and Research in Education*. UP Diliman, Quezon City.
- Villamen, A. M. (1985). *Remedial Reading a Handbook for Teachers and Students*. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House.
- Warriner, J. E., & Griffith F. (1963). *English Grammar and Composition*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.