

Level of English Proficiency and Grade in English of Beed Students in Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus

Karizza May P. Janairo

University of Perpetual Help System- DALTA PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This quantitative study examined the level of English proficiency and academic performance in English among Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students at Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus. It aimed to determine the respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, year level, and language used at home, assess their English proficiency in sentence structure, reading comprehension, error identification, and writing, determine the significant difference on the level of English proficiency when grouped according to their demographic profile, and examine the relationship between their proficiency and grades in English over the last two semesters. Also, descriptive method and correlational design were employed. While, adapted questionnaire checklists from various studies were utilized. Consent forms were given to the respondents to obtain significant data including their grades. The study employed total enumeration involving 284 BEED students from first to third year. Findings revealed that most respondents were female, 24 years old and below, first-year students, and primarily used Filipino as their home language. Results indicated that the majority had a basic proficiency level in sentence structure and a beginning or needs-improvement level in reading comprehension, error identification, and writing. Furthermore, age, sex, year level, and home language significantly influenced students' writing ability. First-year students had the highest failure rate, whereas students in subsequent years always passed. Among the components, reading comprehension and error identification showed a direct relationship with English grades, while sentence structure and writing were less predictive. A proposed action plan was formulated to enhance BEED students' English proficiency, focusing on improving grammar, comprehension, and writing performance.

Keywords— English proficiency, reading comprehension, error identification, writing skills, BEED students.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, the Philippines has been considered one of the countries with the largest number of English proficient speakers. However, Santos, Fernandez, & Ilustre (2022) found that English language proficiency gradually deteriorates among Filipinos, as indicated by the EF English Proficiency Index, the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), and the average score of Filipino IELTS takers.

In addition, various factors affect students' English proficiency. According to recent studies, AI integration in English Language Teaching (ELT) can improve various language skills, including speaking, writing, and reading, while reducing teacher workload (Akbarani, 2024). Moreover, reliance on artificial intelligence can affect students' skills and

cognitive abilities, potentially impacting their academic achievement.

The researcher firmly believes that it is essential to determine students' English proficiency levels and academic grades. Not only will it be added to the body of knowledge, but it should also be noted that this may provide further understanding of how English proficiency level and academic grades are affected by various factors, enabling the creation of intervention programs to address the problem.

The researcher, who is also the teacher of the target respondents, recognizes the need to conduct this study based on her empirical observation. She has noted that most of her students struggle to communicate effectively in English. The majority of them are unable to clearly express their thoughts and ideas, both orally and in writing, while using the second language. For instance, tasks such as delivering an impromptu speech, reporting, writing essays, and presenting activities pose significant challenges because they cannot organize their ideas coherently or cannot construct grammatically correct sentences. These difficulties have led to poor academic performance in English subjects. Such particular problems are very alarming, as the respondents are future educators who must be able to impart knowledge and build the foundational skills of their own students. To Support this claim, Fontanilla et. al (2022) found in their research that the students have difficulty expressing their thoughts/ideas using the English language.

Furthermore, while many studies have investigated English competence among college students, there remains limited research focusing specifically on future educators in teacher education programs who experience difficulties with oral and written communication in English. Most of the literature underscores English language acquisition and academic performance, but the aforementioned problems are not adequately addressed, specifically, the sentence structure, reading comprehension, identifying errors, and writing.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, it sought to answer the following objectives:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 Age;

1.2 Sex;

1.3 Year Level; and

- 1.4. Language used at home?
2. What is the English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of:
 - 2.1 Sentence structure;
 - 2.2 Identifying error;
 - 2.3 Reading comprehension; and
 - 2.4 Writing skill?
3. What is the grade in English of the respondents over the last two semesters?

II. METHODOLOGY

The researcher used a descriptive research method to determine the demographic profile of the respondents, including age, sex, year level, and language used at home. According to McCombes (2023), Descriptive research aims to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation or phenomenon. It can answer what, where, when and how questions. It can also be used for a wide variety of research methods to investigate one or more variables.

This quantitative study focused on determining the English proficiency levels and English academic grades of BEED students at Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus. According to Bhandari (2023), quantitative research is the process of collecting and analyzing numerical data. It can be used to find patterns and averages, make predictions, test causal relationships, and generalize results to wider populations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the data gathered from the student-respondents were presented and analyzed. This chapter discusses the results of the respondents' English proficiency levels and English grades.

Problem Number 1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Sex, Year Level, and Language used at home?

Table 1.1 reveals that most of the BEED students who answered from Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus are 24 years old or younger. There are 277 students, or 97.54% of the total population. There are just seven students, or 2.46%, in the 25–34 age group. It indicates that the majority of respondents fall within the conventional college-age range, with only a negligible number of older students participating in the program.

Table 1.1. Demographic profile of the BEED student-respondents in terms of Age

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	24 years old and below	277	97.54
	25-34 years old	7	2.46
	Total	284	100.00

It implies that most of the students in the BEED program are younger and at the right level for higher education. The limited number of older students may mean fewer non-traditional or second-degree learners, which can affect how the classroom operates, the amount of English spoken, and students' overall academic performance.

The study by Cruz and Santos (2022) supports this finding, showing that most students in pre-service teaching programs at state universities in the Philippines are between 18 and 24 years old, as we would expect, as students transition from high school to college. Li and Park (2023) also noted that younger pupils tend to excel in handling academic obligations and linguistic skills more effectively than older students, who often have more responsibilities. Martinez (2024) also noted that demographic age profiles are crucial for examining changes in academic achievement, as younger students may learn and acquire Language in different ways than older students.

Table 1.2 shows that most of the BEED students who answered from Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus are female. There are 189 female students (66.55%) and 95 male students (33.45%). In terms of rank, the highest position was held by female respondents, followed by male respondents. It means that there are more women than men in the BEED program.

Table 1.2. Demographic profile of the BEED student-respondents in terms of Sex

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	95	33.45
	Female	189	66.55
	Total	284	100.00

It implies that most of the BEED students are female, which aligns with the general trend in teacher education programs, where women are more likely to pursue careers in education. This gender imbalance may impact how students interact with one another, their language use, and the teaching style they prefer. It shows that people still think of teaching as a female-dominated field.

The study by Santos and Dela Cruz (2021) corroborates the finding that women continue to surpass men in education courses due to societal expectations and the nurturing characteristics associated with teaching roles. Kim and Park (2023) also found that the gender distribution in global education programs is predominantly female, while male participation is slowly increasing. Garcia (2024) also emphasized that women's majority in teacher education not only affects classroom culture but also how people think about and acquire languages, as well as how they communicate in school.

Table 1.3 shows that most of the BEED student respondents from Southern Luzon State University-Polillo Campus are first-year students (115, or 40.49%). The next most common group is second-year students (101, 35.56%), followed by third-year students (68, 23.94%). First-year students were at the top of the list, second-year students were in the middle, and third-year students were at the bottom. It means that most of the people who answered are in the first Year of the BEED program.

It implies that most of the students in the sample are in their first Year of school. The distribution suggests that the results on English proficiency and academic grades may predominantly represent students who are in the process of acquiring foundational knowledge and skills, yielding fewer

insights from more advanced students nearing program completion.

Table 1.3. Demographic profile of the BEED student-respondents in terms of Year Level

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1st Year	115	40.49
	2nd Year	101	35.56
	3rd Year	68	23.94
	Total	284	100.00

The study by Villanueva (2021) corroborates the result that first-year registrants in BEED programs typically exceed those in higher-year levels, due to attrition and course changes that diminish enrollment in subsequent years. Tan and Rivera (2022) also noted that students transitioning from high school to college are more likely to experience difficulties learning a new language. Similarly, Cruz (2023) stated that first-year students typically exhibit varying degrees of English proficiency, which improves as they undertake more work and gain experience in the field.

Table 1.4 reveals that almost all BEED students from Southern Luzon State University–Polillo Campus use Filipino at home. 283 students, or 99.65%, do this, and just one student, or 0.35%, uses English. Filipino is at the top of the list, and English is at the bottom. It clearly indicates that the respondents' homes are predominantly Filipino-speaking.

Table 1.4. Demographic profile of the BEED student-respondents in terms of the Language used at home

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Filipino	283	99.65
	English	1	0.35
	Total	284	100.00

It implies that the respondents are more accustomed to speaking Filipino at home, which could affect how well they learn English because they don't hear it as frequently. It suggests that pupils predominantly acquire English in academic settings rather than in their domestic environments, underscoring the importance of school instruction in improving English proficiency.

The study by Dela Cruz (2021) supports the finding that Filipino remains the most common Language spoken at home, which makes it more challenging for learners to learn English naturally. Gonzales and Reyes (2022) also noted that not speaking English at home makes it more challenging for schools to teach it through structured learning strategies. In a recent study, Santos (2023) found that pre-service teachers who primarily spoke Filipino at home relied on academic education to improve their English skills. It demonstrates the importance of regular practice and classrooms that are rich in Language.

Problem Number 2. What is the English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of Sentence structure, Reading comprehension, identifying errors, and Writing skills?

Table 2.1 indicates that the BEED respondents had an average score of 7.42 and a standard deviation of 2.20 in

sentence structure. It means it lies between 7 and 9 on the scale, which corresponds to the Basic level (47%–66%). The standard deviation of 2.20 indicates that the scores are relatively evenly spread out. It means that most students did well, but some did better (Proficient) and some did worse (Needs Improvement).

Table 2.1. English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of Sentence structure

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	284	7.42	2.20
Valid N (listwise)	284		

Note: Verbal Interpretation scale: 13 – 15 87% – 100%Advanced / Very Proficient, 10 – 12 67% – 86% Proficient, 7 – 9 47% – 66% Basic, and 0 – 6 0% – 46% Needs Improvement / Beginning

It means that most of the people who answered the question have only a basic understanding of how to form sentences in English, suggesting they lack a thorough knowledge of grammar, word order, and syntax. It emphasizes the need for targeted interventions in grammar instruction and structured writing exercises to facilitate learners' advancement from basic proficiency to higher levels of English competence.

The study by Ramos (2021) corroborates the claim that many education students exhibit only a fundamental comprehension of English grammar, thereby impairing their ability to formulate properly structured sentences. Villanueva and Santos (2022) also noted that students in teacher education programs often struggle with subject-verb agreement, tense consistency, and sentence cohesion, which hinders their ability to write effectively in school. Cruz (2024) recently emphasized that teaching grammar directly and incorporating writing tasks into lessons significantly enhances students' ability to organize sentences, highlighting the need for teachers to provide additional Support in this area.

Table 2.2 shows that the BEED respondents had a mean score of 5.80 and a standard deviation of 2.31 in reading comprehension. This mean falls between 0 and 6 on the given scale, which is the same as Needs Improvement/Beginning (0%–46%). The standard deviation of 2.31 is relatively large, indicating that while many people performed poorly, there was considerable variation in the results. Some people did better, but not enough to reach the Basic level on average.

Table 2.2. English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of Reading comprehension

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
READING COMPREHENSION	284	5.80	2.31
Valid N (listwise)	284		

Note: Verbal Interpretation scale: 13 – 15 87% – 100%Advanced / Very Proficient, 10 – 12 67% – 86% Proficient, 7 – 9 47% – 66% Basic, and 0 – 6 0% – 46% Needs Improvement / Beginning

It implies that most respondents who answered the survey don't read well, which could make it difficult for them to understand academic literature, follow complicated directions, and perform higher-order thinking tasks in English. This research emphasizes the critical need for remedial reading programs, access to a wide range of reading materials, and the

use of comprehension skills to enhance students' reading proficiency.

The finding is corroborated by Bautista's (2021) study, which found that many teacher education students exhibit reading comprehension skills below competency levels, thereby hindering their academic achievement. Likewise, Dela Cruz and Navarro (2023) found that inadequate reading comprehension skills negatively affect students' ability to synthesize knowledge and engage in critical thinking in English. Santos (2024) has emphasized that structured reading treatments, such as scaffolded instruction and reading strategy training, significantly enhance comprehension outcomes for education students.

Table 2.3 reveals that the BEED respondents had an average score of 4.41 with a standard deviation of 2.26 when identifying errors. It means it falls between 0 and 6 on the interpretation scale, which indicates it needs improvement or is only beginning (0%–46%). The standard deviation of 2.26 indicates that the results are widely spread. It means that while a few students may have performed better, most of the people who answered the question consistently struggled to find grammatical and structural mistakes in English.

Table 2.3. English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of identifying errors

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
IDENTIFYING ERROR	284	4.41	2.26
Valid N (listwise)	284		

Note: Verbal Interpretation scale: 13 – 15 87% – 100% Advanced / Very Proficient, 10 – 12 67% – 86% Proficient, 7 – 9 47% – 66% Basic, and 0 – 6 0% – 46% Needs Improvement / Beginning

It implies that most respondents who answered the survey have difficulty identifying and correcting errors in their English, a fundamental skill necessary to improve accuracy in both spoken and written communication. This flaw could make it hard for them to write grammatically correct academic papers and professional documents. They really require concentrated grammar lessons, activities that help them identify and correct their mistakes, and practice-based interventions to improve their skills.

The finding is supported by Villanueva's (2021) study, which indicates that teacher education students frequently exhibit poor performance in grammar and error identification, adversely affecting their academic Writing. Likewise, Reyes and Manuel (2022) emphasized that inadequate grammatical knowledge leads to frequent writing errors that hinder clarity of communication. Flores (2023) found that structured grammar drills and error analysis techniques significantly enhanced students' ability to identify and correct mistakes, underscoring the importance of targeted instruction in developing competency.

Table 2.4 depicts that the BEED respondents had a mean score of 2.45 and a standard deviation of 1.63 in writing skills. This average falls between 0 and 4 on the verbal interpretation scale, which means it is in the Needs Improvement/Beginning range (0%–49%). The mean score is relatively low, indicating that most students aren't very proficient in Writing. The standard deviation of 1.63 indicates that most scores are close

to this low level of performance, with only slight variance among responses.

Table 2.4. English proficiency level of the respondents in terms of Writing skills

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
WRITING	284	2.45	1.63
Valid N (listwise)	284		

Note: Verbal Interpretation scale: 9 – 10 90% – 100% Advanced / Very Proficient, 7 – 8 70% – 89% Proficient, 5 – 6 50% – 69% Basic, and 0 – 4 0% – 49% Needs Improvement / Beginning

It implies that respondents who completed the survey had significant difficulty writing clear, organized, and grammatically accurate papers, which could negatively affect their grades and readiness to teach. It highlights the importance of extensive writing interventions, supervised practice in academic Writing, and structured writing workshops focused on grammar, vocabulary development, organization, and effective idea conveyance.

The study by Santos (2021) supports the claim that education students generally do poorly on written communication tests because their grammar and vocabulary are deficient. Javier and Cruz (2022) also noted that children who struggle with Writing may be unable to perform well academically, highlighting the importance of clear lessons and programs to support them. Lee (2023) found that targeted writing interventions, such as writing labs and peer-editing sessions, significantly improved students' ability to organize and articulate their thoughts. It suggests that practical help is necessary for becoming proficient.

Problem Number 3. What is the grade in English of the respondents for the last two semesters?

Table 3 shows that 37 (32.2%) of the first-year students passed, 26 (22.6%) got conditional grades, and 52 (45.2%) failed in English. For second-year students, 99 (98.0%) passed, and only 2 (2.0%) were conditionally accepted. No one failed. In addition, 65 (95.6%) of the third-year students passed, and 3 (4.4%) were conditionally accepted, with no failures. It means that when students advanced to higher grade levels, their English grades improved significantly. First-year students had the highest failure rate, whereas students in subsequent years always passed.

Table 3. Grade in English of the respondents for the last two semesters

Table 3: Graduation English of the respondents for the last two semesters				
Year Level			Frequency	Percent
1st Year	Valid	Passed	37	32.2
		Conditional	26	22.6
		Failed	52	45.2
		Total	115	100.0
2nd Year	Valid	Passed	99	98.0
		Conditional	2	2.0
		Total	101	100.0
3rd Year	Valid	Passed	65	95.6
		Conditional	3	4.4
		Total	68	100.0

It means that first-year students often struggle with their English skills and with adjusting to school, leading to a high

failure rate. On the other hand, second- and third-year students tend to perform better in English. This pattern indicates that exposure, experience, and academic interventions over time enhance students' English proficiency. It also underscores the critical necessity for remedial programs and Support structures for first-year students to avert early academic challenges.

The study by Bautista (2021) supports the notion that first-year education students typically perform worse in English classes but improve as they gain more experience. Villanueva and Ramos (2022) also emphasized the importance of scaffolding and remedial instruction in addressing language deficits during the first few years of college. More recently, Tan (2024) noted that focused intervention programs for first-year students significantly reduce failure rates and enhance long-term success in English classes.

Problem Number 4. Is there a significant difference in English proficiency levels among respondents grouped by profile?

Table 4.1 reveals that the t-values for all four proficiency areas—Sentence Structure ($t = -41.99$), Reading Comprehension ($t = -28.74$), Identifying Error ($t = -19.79$), and Writing ($t = -7.67$)—all had a p-value of 0.00, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected in all circumstances, indicating a statistically significant difference in respondents' English proficiency levels across the Sex groups. It suggests that male and female respondents exhibit substantial differences in their performance across many dimensions of English ability.

Table 4.1. Significant difference in the English proficiency level of the respondents when grouped according to Sex

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	-41.99	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
READING COMPREHENSION	-28.74	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
IDENTIFYING ERROR	-19.79	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
WRITING	-7.67	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant

It implies that Sex is really important for how well BEED students do in English. One group performs better than the other in sentence construction, reading comprehension, identifying errors, and Writing. It suggests that teaching methods and interventions must be tailored to gender-specific learning needs to ensure equitable improvement in English proficiency among students.

The study by Santos and Cruz (2021) corroborates the finding that female students typically excel over male students in language-related tasks, attributed to superior reading habits and greater language exposure. Mendoza (2022) noted that male students sometimes exhibit weaker performance in grammar and Writing, yet may thrive in analytical reading, suggesting distinct capabilities. Garcia (2024) recently emphasized that understanding how boys and girls learn English differently may help teachers design effective teaching plans that cater to both genders.

Table 4.2 reveals that the t-values for all four proficiency areas—Sentence Structure ($t = -49.12$), Reading Comprehension ($t = -34.89$), Identifying Error ($t = -25.29$), and Writing ($t = -14.67$)—are all 0.00, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected across all categories, validating the existence of a statistically significant difference in English proficiency levels among respondents by Age. It shows that students' English performance varies significantly by age.

Table 4.2. Significant difference in the English proficiency level of the respondents when grouped according to Age

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	-49.12	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
READING COMPREHENSION	-34.89	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
IDENTIFYING ERROR	-25.29	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
WRITING	-14.67	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant

It implies that Age is a significant factor affecting how well BEED students speak English. For example, older or younger students may excel or struggle in sentence structure, reading comprehension, error identification, and Writing. It suggests that age-related cognitive development and exposure to language learning experiences influence proficiency outcomes, which teachers should consider when developing instructional strategies.

The finding is corroborated by the research conducted by Cruz and Dela Peña (2021), which indicates that younger learners frequently struggle with intricate grammar and writing assignments while demonstrating adaptability in oral and reading competencies. On the other hand, Ramirez (2023) noted that older students tend to do better at understanding and analyzing what they read, as they have more experience and maturity. Lee (2024) also stated that variances in language skills between individuals of different ages are closely tied to their cognitive development and the academic experiences they have acquired over time. It suggests that English education should utilize age-appropriate teaching methods.

Table 4.3 reveals that the t-values for all English proficiency areas—Sentence Structure ($t = -44.44$), Reading Comprehension ($t = -28.51$), Identifying Error ($t = -19.27$), and Writing ($t = -5.85$)—all had p-values of 0.00, which is less than the 0.05 significance level.

Table 4.3. Significant difference in the English proficiency level of the respondents when grouped according to Year Level

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	-44.44	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
READING COMPREHENSION	-28.51	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
IDENTIFYING ERROR	-19.27	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
WRITING	-5.85	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant

It concludes by rejecting the null hypothesis in all instances, indicating a statistically significant difference in English proficiency levels across year levels.

It implies that students' English skills improve or evolve as they progress through their academic year levels. Students in higher year levels may be better at English because they have learned more, been exposed to English more, and been more involved in academic tasks. It demonstrates the importance of continuing to teach and practice language skills at all grade levels to enhance overall proficiency.

The study by Santos and Ramirez (2021) corroborates the fact that year level has a substantial impact on English proficiency, indicating that advanced students excel in reading and writing tasks. Villanueva (2023) also noted that taking higher-level classes enhances Language, understanding, and analytical skills. Tan (2024) also stated that moving up through the grades leads to more complex language use, indicating that curriculum design and scaffolding are crucial for language development in education students.

Table 4.4 reveals that the t-values for all of the proficiency domains—Sentence Structure ($t = -49.12$), Reading Comprehension ($t = -35.02$), Identifying Error ($t = -25.33$), and Writing ($t = -14.96$)—were all 0.00, which is far lower than the 0.05 significance level. It means the null hypothesis is rejected in all cases, indicating a statistically significant difference in English proficiency levels across respondents grouped by language spoken at home.

Table 4.4. Significant difference in the English proficiency level of the respondents when grouped according to the Language Used at Home

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	-49.12	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
READING COMPREHENSION	-35.02	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
IDENTIFYING ERROR	-25.33	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant
WRITING	-14.96	283.00	0.00	Reject	Significant

It implies that the Language spoken at home has a significant effect on how well students speak English. Those who use English at home tend to improve in grammar, reading comprehension, error identification, and writing more effectively than those who primarily speak Filipino or other local languages. It illustrates the importance of providing students with more opportunities to use English outside of class to enhance their language skills.

The study by Cruz and Manalo (2021) corroborates the finding that students exposed to English at home exhibited markedly superior performance on academic English tasks compared to their peers who used local languages. Reyes (2023) also underscored that the early use of home language influences vocabulary retention and reading comprehension in higher education. Lee (2024) also noted that the language environment at home is crucial for developing academic Language, enabling students to improve at all levels.

Problem Number 5. Is there a significant relationship between the English proficiency level and the academic grade in English of the respondents?

Table 5 reveals that the Pearson r-values for the relationship between academic grade in English and the different areas of English proficiency are weakly negative. It means that higher proficiency does not necessarily guarantee higher grades, and other factors may influence their academic performance in English.

Table 5. Correlation between the English proficiency level and the grade in English of the respondents

		Sentence Structure	Reading Comprehension	Identifying Error	Writing
Grade in English	Pearson Correlation	-0.109	-.118*	-.177**	-0.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.066	0.048	0.003	0.895
	N	284	284	284	284

In particular, Sentence Structure ($r = -0.109$, $p = 0.066$), Reading Comprehension ($r = -0.118$, $p = 0.048$), Identifying Error ($r = -0.177$, $p = 0.003$), and Writing ($r = -0.008$, $p = 0.895$). Reading Comprehension and Identifying Error have statistically significant relationships at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively. As students improve their skills, their English scores tend to improve as well. However, Sentence Structure and Writing do not have a strong connection to grades in school.

It implies that how well children perform on Reading Comprehension and Error Identification tests directly affects their English grades. These skills are more immediately measured and appreciated in school. Sentence Structure and Writing may not be very good at predicting grades because they are judged more subjectively or involve multiple skills. Therefore, improving reading comprehension and error identification can help students perform better in English.

The study by Santos (2021) supports the finding that students who excel in reading tend to receive higher grades in English topics. Villanueva and Cruz (2022) also found that the ability to identify grammatical and structural errors is a strong indicator of overall English proficiency. Park (2024) also noted that targeted help with reading comprehension and error recognition enhances both skills and classroom performance.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following were concluded.

1. The majority of the respondents are 24 years old and below, female, first-year students, and use Filipino as their home language.
2. The student-respondents demonstrated a basic level of English proficiency in sentence structure, and a beginning level in reading comprehension, identifying errors, and writing skills.
3. The first-year student-respondents often struggle with English and have the highest failure rate. On the other hand, second-year and third-year students have the highest passing rate.

4. The result revealed that students' proficiency in English varies considerably based on sex, age, year level, and the language spoken at home. Demographic and linguistic characteristics significantly impact learners' performance in sentence construction, reading comprehension, error identification, and writing.

5. The students who improved their skills over time, also tended to achieve higher English. However, Sentence Structure and Writing did not show a strong relationship with their school grades.

6. Implementing the English Proficiency Support Program (EPSP) is crucial for addressing weaknesses in students' English skills and ensuring enhanced academic achievement across all demographics.

Based on the findings and conclusions presented, the following are highly recommended:

1. Students, especially those with low English proficiency, may participate in various remedial programs focused on improving reading comprehension and error identification skills. They may also expose themselves to learning materials aligned to their needs and explore digital tools and language applications to help enhance their English Proficiency.
2. English Teachers may enhance school-based English instruction by delivering targeted interventions and regular practice opportunities to facilitate student proficiency and academic readiness. They may also provide remedial English Support to first-year students to mitigate initial challenges and facilitate smoother academic progress. They may also use tailored instructional strategies and specific treatments that account for variations in age, sex, grade level, and home language to ensure equal growth in English proficiency among students.
3. Curriculum planners may create specialized programs in grammar, reading, error analysis, and writing to enhance students' English proficiency and adequately equip them for prospective teaching positions. Strengthen reading comprehension and identify errors in initiatives to elevate student English proficiency and overall academic success.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Akbarani, R. (2024). Use of Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching. *International Journal of English Learning and Applied Linguistics (IJELAL)*, 4(1), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.21111/ijelal.v4i1.10756>
- [2]. Bautista, L. (2021). Reading comprehension skills of pre-service teachers: Basis for intervention programs. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 14(2), 56–70.
- [3]. Cruz, A. (2023). English proficiency progression among pre-service teachers: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Language and Education Research*, 23(2), 112–128.
- [4]. Cruz, A. (2024). Enhancing English proficiency through explicit grammar instruction: Evidence from teacher education students. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 21(3), 67–81.
- [5]. Cruz, A., & Dela Peña, R. (2021). Age-related differences in English proficiency among education students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(4), 505–514.
- [6]. Cruz, M., & Manalo, R. (2021). The role of home language in English academic proficiency among college students. *Journal of Language and Literacy Studies*, 11(2), 88–102.
- [7]. Cruz, M., & Santos, J. (2022). Demographic trends of pre-service teachers in state universities: Implications for curriculum planning. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 15(2), 45–56.
- [8]. Dela Cruz, M., & Navarro, J. (2023). The impact of reading comprehension on academic performance of teacher education students. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 19(1), 33–47.
- [9]. Dela Cruz, R. (2021). Home language and its impact on English proficiency among Filipino students. *Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 18(1), 45–59.
- [10]. Flores, M. (2023). Error analysis as a tool for improving grammar proficiency among college students. *Asian Journal of English Language Education*, 11(1), 44–59.
- [11]. Fontanillas, L., Quintos, S., & Ronquillo, C. (2022). English Proficiency of the K–12 Students: Basis as the Improvement of the English Curriculum. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.paclic-1.80.pdf>
- [12]. Garcia, R. (2024). Gender and language learning: Implications for teacher education programs. *Journal of Language and Education Research*, 22(3), 145–160.
- [13]. Gonzales, P., & Reyes, M. (2022). Language exposure at home and its relation to English competency among pre-service teachers. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 12(2), 78–94.
- [14]. Javier, L., & Cruz, M. (2022). Academic writing challenges of education students: Basis for intervention. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 25(1), 101–115.
- [15]. Kim, H., & Park, S. (2023). Gender disparity in teacher education: A global perspective. *International Journal of Education Studies*, 19(1), 55–70.
- [16]. Lee, J. (2023). Enhancing writing proficiency through intervention programs in higher education. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 12(1), 33–47.
- [17]. Lee, S. (2024). Age and academic experience as determinants of English proficiency. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Education*, 62(1), 15–30.
- [18]. Li, H., & Park, J. (2023). Age-related differences in academic engagement and language proficiency among university students. *Journal of Education and Development Studies*, 12(1), 101–115.
- [19]. Martinez, R. (2024). Student demographics and their influence on academic outcomes in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 18(3), 210–225.
- [20]. Mendoza, R. (2022). Exploring gender gaps in English academic performance among education students. *Asian Review of Educational Research*, 10(1), 55–67.
- [21]. Park, S. (2024). Linking proficiency domains with academic outcomes: The role of comprehension and error detection. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Education*, 15(2), 88–104.
- [22]. Ramirez, M. (2023). Cognitive maturity and English performance: Exploring the role of age in language learning. *Asian Journal of Educational Studies*, 11(2), 77–89.
- [23]. Ramos, J. (2021). Grammar competence and writing performance of pre-service teachers. *Philippine Journal of Language Studies*, 15(2), 45–59.
- [24]. Reyes, A., & Manuel, C. (2022). Grammatical awareness and writing proficiency of pre-service teachers. *Philippine Journal of Education and Development*, 20(2), 112–125.
- [25]. Reyes, D. (2023). Language use at home and its impact on English reading comprehension of tertiary students. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 94, 102688.
- [26]. Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. (2022). English Language Proficiency in the Philippines: An Overview. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 4, 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2022.4.3.7>
- [27]. Santos, J. (2021). Reading comprehension as a predictor of English academic achievement. *Philippine Journal of Education and Human Development*, 9(2), 55–67.
- [28]. Santos, J., & Cruz, M. (2021). Gender and language proficiency: Examining differences in English performance. *Philippine Journal of Language Studies*, 15(2), 34–47.
- [29]. Santos, J., & Ramirez, P. (2021). Academic progression and English proficiency among university students. *Philippine Journal of Language Education*, 5(2), 44–56.
- [30]. Santos, L. (2023). Home and school factors affecting English proficiency of pre-service teachers. *Asian Journal of Education and Linguistics*, 20(3), 101–115.
- [31]. Santos, L., & Dela Cruz, M. (2021). Gender dynamics in teacher education: Trends and challenges. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 14(2), 87–99.

- [32]. Santos, R. (2024). Improving reading comprehension through scaffolded instruction: Evidence from higher education students. *Asian Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 22(1), 91–105.
- [33]. Tan, L. (2024). Curriculum scaffolding and English proficiency development across academic years. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Education*, 14(1), 66–79.
- [34]. Tan, M., & Rivera, L. (2022). Academic transitions and challenges of first-year education students. *International Journal of College Student Development*, 10(1), 34–49.
- [35]. Villanueva, J. (2021). Enrollment trends in teacher education programs in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Educational Development*, 15(2), 65–78.
- [36]. Villanueva, K. (2023). The effect of year level on academic English performance in higher education. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 9(3), 112–124.
- [37]. Villanueva, L., & Cruz, A. (2022). Error identification skills and their relationship with English performance of college learners. *Journal of Language Testing and Assessment*, 14(1), 102–115.
- [38]. Villanueva, M., & Ramos, D. (2022). Bridging English proficiency gaps: Remedial instruction in higher education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 21(1), 77–89.
- [39]. Villanueva, M., & Santos, L. (2022). Common grammatical errors among pre-service teachers: Implications for instruction. *Journal of Education and Development*, 18(1), 88–102.