

English Proficiency Profile of BSEd Students: Implications for Student Enhancement Activity Material (SEAM)

Alfonso M. Samillano Jr.*, Grace C. Pastolero
University of Antique, Sibalom, Antique, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: alfonso.samillano@antiquespride.edu.ph

Date received: February 28, 2025

Date revised: April 24, 2025

Date accepted: May 19, 2025

Originality: 91%

Grammarly Score: 90%

Similarity: 9%

Recommended citation:

Samillano A., Jr., & Pastolero, G. (2025). English proficiency of BSEd students: Implications for student enhancement activity material (SEAM). *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(6), 268-276.

<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.126>

Abstract. This study examined the English proficiency of Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) students to determine if they meet the expected proficiency level for teachers in the Philippines. With the hope of pinpointing areas where help is needed and exploring what lies behind the rise and fall of a learner's English-language abilities, this research was designed to provide data for targeted actions and reform of BSEd English courses. The aim was to help future teachers improve their English skills, raise the standard of English language teaching, and enable graduates to meet the new demands of twenty-first-century classrooms. The English Proficiency Assessment tool gathered scores in listening comprehension, reading comprehension, grammar knowledge, and writing. The test was a multiple-choice format, including a listening comprehension section where respondents listened to audio clips and then selected their answers. Data were analyzed using frequency, mean, percentage, standard deviation, ANOVA, and Least Significant Difference tests to examine the English proficiency and its relationship with variables such as year level (first to fourth year) and specialization (English, Filipino, Mathematics, Social Science, and Science). The study finds significant variation in the English proficiency of BSEd students in both variables of year level and specialization. In general, the English proficiency of BSEd students is classified as "Developing," which means they can communicate in English. However, vocabulary and grammar hinder their ability to fully express complex ideas. This research contributes to the ongoing discourse on language education reform and enriches empirical information to guide policy and practice of teacher education. Based on the findings, the study proposed the formation of a Student Enhancement Activity Material (SEAM), which consists of worksheets designed to improve reading comprehension, listening comprehension, writing proficiency, and sentence structure where they have been found lacking, and aimed to better equip future educators with the necessary English language skills.

Keywords: Curriculum enhancement; Curriculum development; English language teaching; English proficiency; Pedagogy.

1.0 Introduction

English proficiency is an essential component in the curriculum in the Philippines, particularly in teacher education, Afalla and Fabelico (2020) mentioned, as the proficiency of teachers influences their teaching effectiveness and their ability to communicate with their students. As English serves as both a global lingua franca and the Philippines' second language, Filipino teachers need to be proficient in English not only to become effective in teaching and engaging with students but also to meet the standards of internationalization (Velasco, 2019).

According to Francisco (2019), studies showed that English teachers in the Philippines are highly competent and possess proficiency in speaking, writing, reading, and listening, which are important factors for effective teaching. In fact, the professional identity of Filipino English teachers is prominent, such that they are regarded as on par with teachers who are native speakers of English, as manifested by their pedagogical skills and language proficiency (Jung & Choe, 2024). While the Philippines currently ranks 22nd out of 116 countries in the 2024 EF English Proficiency Index (EPI), according to Business World (2024), this represents a concerning decline. The country has dropped two spots from the previous year, continuing a downward trend since 2013, when it ranked 13th and 20th. This decline is further highlighted by the GMA News (2018) report, citing a TOEIC study. The study revealed that Filipino college graduates possess lower English proficiency than the target proficiency level for Thai high school students.

The principal strength of the Philippines in the global workforce is not only in its diligent workers but more specifically, its majority of educated workers who have fluency in the use of the English language both in speaking and writing (Salomone, 2023). This substantial English-speaking population has made the Philippines a valuable source of labor, both locally and abroad, particularly in the booming business process outsourcing industry (Magno et al., 2024). But the decline in the English proficiency level of Filipinos is alarming despite the schools' trend of focusing on the communicative aspect of teaching English rather than on its linguistic aspect, as emphasis on collaborative and cooperative learning is given importance in the K-12 Basic Education Curriculum (Bautista & Del Valle, 2023). The apparent decline in Filipinos' English reading and listening comprehension skills is even more alarming due to their indifference to reading (Rosales, 2020), making them particularly vulnerable to online misinformation (Rodrigues et al., 2023). This susceptibility is so pronounced that Facebook executive Katie Harbath, as reported by Onn (2024), referred to the Philippines as "patient zero" for disinformation. This term has since become widely recognized as describing the "fake news pandemic" or "infodemic" plaguing democratic nations.

Santos et al. (2022) mentioned in their review article that some specific reasons contributing to Filipinos' decline in English proficiency are the learning environment and teaching strategies, which include the use of instructional materials. A study conducted by Zhang (2023) suggested that in promoting the students' English learning effectiveness, it is necessary to provide a "comfortable, quiet, and clean learning environment." Regidor et al. (2024) agreed that students achieve high levels of learning motivation when placed in a "positive and supportive learning environment." On the other hand, Ng and Ng (2013) found that teaching strategies influence the English proficiency of the learners. A study by Kourieos and Diakou found that many teacher education programs fail to prepare pre-service teachers in pedagogy and English proficiency appropriately. Hadi (2019) revealed that there is an imbalance between practical application and knowledge of theory, and there are inadequate contextualized and integrated learning experiences, while Kim et al. (2024) discovered that existing English medium instruction (EMI) courses do not seem to be doing enough to help students improve their English.

Indeed, various studies conducted in the Philippines tackled English proficiency of teachers focusing on their attitude towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), their teaching competence and the difficulties they experienced in using CLT in the classroom (Banagbanag, 2020); proficiency on reading, writing and listening (Francisco, 2019), and; beliefs of teacher effectiveness in implementing lessons in the macro-skills (Mante-Estacio et al., 2018). However, very few papers have focused on undergraduate or pre-service teachers, and very little has been published in Scopus-indexed journals highlighting the English proficiency of pre-service teachers specifically in their reading and listening comprehension skills, grammar knowledge, and writing skills in relation to their specializations and year level. This study intends to tackle this research gap to broaden the discussions in this aspect. In light of the challenges in English proficiency among BSED students mentioned above, teacher education programs should have enhanced curriculum designs. This study, thus, aimed at determining the English proficiency of BSED student teachers as a basis for curriculum innovation. This study aimed to determine the English proficiency of Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students in the four macro skills, namely, listening comprehension, reading comprehension, grammar knowledge, and writing, as the basis for a curriculum innovation.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study employed the quantitative research design, utilizing descriptive and inferential statistics in order to describe data, discover patterns, predict meanings, and draw conclusions from the data. Descriptive statistics were used in the study to analyze and determine the English proficiency of BSEd students as a whole and when classified according to their year level and specialization. Inferential statistics was used to test the hypothesis and draw conclusions from it.

2.2 Research Participants

The study's respondents are the 245 BSEd students in a teacher education department at a state university in the middle region of the Philippines. The sample population was identified through stratified sampling, classifying the respondents according to year level and specialization or major. Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents based on year level and specialization.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

Variables	f	%
Entire group	245	100
Year Level		
First Year	62	25
Second Year	95	39
Third Year	68	28
Fourth Year	20	8
Specialization		
English	59	24
Filipino	54	22
Mathematics	32	13
Social Science	56	23
Science	44	18

2.3 Data Collection Instrument and Analysis

This study utilized a researcher-made instrument titled “English Proficiency Assessment” to gather data in the form of test scores from the respondents. The instrument was submitted for content validity and reliability testing by a jury of five (5) members who are experts in pedagogy, English language studies, teaching, and learning assessment. This jury validated the items in the questionnaire by writing the options: Accept, Modify, or Reject before each item. The inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha with an 80% agreement ratio.

The instrument, a 60-item multiple-choice test, evaluated four key English macro skills, i.e., reading comprehension, listening comprehension, sentence structure, and writing proficiency. The test was set in a multiple-choice format. Respondents were asked to listen to an audio in the listening comprehension test and answer the questions with multiple-choice answers. Before this instrument was administered to the respondents, it was piloted on 30 pre-service secondary education students in a private institution. The result of the pilot test showed that the respondents are classified as developing in terms of English proficiency, with a mean score of 22.13 as a whole. The performance of each item was examined as part of the item analysis. With different levels of the proficiency domain being measured, items that were too easy, too difficult, or did not discriminate well between participants were identified. A Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was used to assess the tool's internal consistency. Based on the quantitative data analysis, the assessment tool was revised in the following ways: rewording questions that lacked clarity and modifying or removing items that did not perform well. To determine the English proficiency level of the respondents, the individual scores in the assessment were categorized as follows based on the 2017 English Language Learning (ELL) Standards:

Table 2. Classification of Respondents as to Scores

Score	Category
46-60	Bridging
31-35	Expanding
16-30	Developing
1-15	Emerging

The respondents classified as “Emerging” can communicate limited information using general academic vocabulary and familiar everyday expressions. At this level, errors in writing are present and often hinder communication. The ones categorized as “Developing” can use English spontaneously but may have difficulty expressing all their thoughts due to restricted vocabulary and limited command of language structure. Proficiency in reading at this level may vary considerably. Those classified as “Expanding” possess language skills adequate for most day-to-day communication needs. They communicate in English in new or unfamiliar settings but occasionally struggle with complex structures and abstract academic concepts. On the other hand, respondents categorized as “Bridging” can express themselves fluently and spontaneously on a wide range of personal, general, academic, or social topics in various contexts. Students in this level have a good command of technical and academic vocabulary as well as idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. Their errors are minimal, difficult to spot, and generally corrected when they occur.

Descriptive and inferential analyses were employed to analyze the data. Specifically, frequency count, percentage distribution, mean, and standard deviation were utilized to analyze the descriptive problems. For the inferential problem, one-way ANOVA and the Least Significant Difference test were used.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 English Proficiency of Pre-service Secondary Education Teachers

The study revealed (see Table 3) that when taken as an entire group, the English proficiency level of BSEd students is Developing ($\bar{x}=26.81$, $SD=7.89$). This suggests that while BSEd students can speak English spontaneously, limited vocabulary and command of language structure may hinder their ability to express their thoughts fully. Indeed, language proficiency acts as a formidable and multifaceted barrier to academic achievement, particularly for students navigating the complexities of higher education. This is not merely about understanding basic grammar or vocabulary; it encompasses a nuanced grasp of academic literacy, a skill set necessary for success in demanding scholarly environments (Du Plessis, 2016). The impact of language proficiency extends far beyond the realm of higher education, casting a long shadow over secondary education as well. Within these formative years, the strength of a student's general language skills is a powerful predictor and, indeed, a critical foundation for their performance across all other academic domains. This is not a mere correlation; it is a deeply intertwined relationship where language acts as both the medium and the tool for learning.

Table 3. *English Proficiency of Pre-service Secondary Education Teachers*

Variables	Mean	SD	Description
Entire group	26.81	7.89	Developing
Year Level			
First Year	27.47	6.94	Developing
Second Year	24.13	6.41	Developing
Third Year	30.89	8.39	Expanding
Fourth Year	25.40	10.97	Developing
Specialization			
English	31.38	6.08	Expanding
Filipino	23.53	6.95	Developing
Mathematics	31.60	10.02	Expanding
Social Science	25.27	7.96	Developing
Science	24.59	6.16	Developing

When the BSED students were classified according to year level, their English proficiency was not homogeneous. The Third-Year students have an English proficiency level described as Expanding ($\bar{x}=30.89$, $SD=10.97$). The First Year ($\bar{x}=27.47$, $SD=6.94$), Second Year ($\bar{x}=24.13$, $SD=6.41$), and Fourth Year ($\bar{x}=25.40$, $SD=10.97$) have a developing English proficiency level. Regarding specialization, the English and Mathematics majors are classified as Expanding, while the rest are classified as Developing. It appears that this is similar to the findings of the study by Ligan (2019), which investigated the communicative competence of BSEd students across different specializations. English majors were found to be “Competent Users of English,” while Mathematics and Physical Science majors were “Fair Users of English”. Filipino majors had the lowest average scores but were still considered “Fair Users of English”.

Furthermore, the data indicate that third-year BSEd students demonstrate greater English proficiency than students at lower year levels. This also suggests their language skills are adequate for most everyday

communication. However, it is surprising that Fourth-Year students performed less well than Third-Year students, with even First-Year students achieving higher scores. However, the matter of third-year students outperforming fourth-year students is curious. However, this can be seen through sample size and statistical power. According to Weber and Hoo (2018), bigger samples yield more precise and significant results, while smaller samples yield less precision and increase the risk of missing significance. As seen in the distribution of respondents (see table 1), the Third-Year students have a larger sample (n=68) compared to a smaller sample (n=20) of Fourth-Year students. The larger sample size for the Third-Year students gives their group result more statistical power. This means that their average score is a reliable estimate of all Third-Year students' true average English proficiency. This also suggests that we cannot accurately represent the true English proficiency of all Fourth-Year students since their smaller sample size means they have less statistical power, thus making it less precise and more susceptible to random variations. It appears that their smaller sample size might be less representative of the whole population despite the stratified sampling method. In short, larger sample sizes outperform smaller sample sizes in assessments such as this study by improving precision (Foody, 2009), reducing variability and errors (Lei & Zhao, 2011), and enhancing the reliability and reproducibility of results (Beca et al., 2021). Aside from sample size, other factors may have intervened, such as teaching methods (Lavy, 2015), which vary from teacher to teacher, and student motivation (Shafaghi & Yousefi, 2023). This, therefore, becomes a limitation of the study as it did not collect qualitative data to capture the reasons for the curious case of Third-Year students outperforming Fourth-Year students in the English proficiency test.

3.2 Differences in English Proficiency when Classified by Year Level and Specialization

Year level

The one-way ANOVA (Table 4) demonstrated a highly significant difference in English proficiency among BSEd students categorized by year level ($F=7.87$, $p=.000$). This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, confirming that language proficiency varies significantly depending on year level.

Table 4. ANOVA Results in English Proficiency by Year Level

Competencies		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-ratio	Two-tailed probability
English Proficiency	Between groups	1303.41	4	434.47	7.87**	<.001
	Within groups	8787.69	241	55.26		
	Total	10091.10	245			

Studies by Qureshi and Waller (2022) and Yau et al. (2024) reveal a clear trend that English proficiency increases with academic progression. First-year students, often transitioning from diverse linguistic backgrounds or encountering higher academic language demands for the first time, tend to experience greater linguistic challenges than their peers in the upper-class level. Recognizing the distinct linguistic challenges that often confront first-year students, particularly those entering with lower English proficiency, Almudibry (2022) emphasized that universities are presented with a compelling opportunity to foster academic equity and enhance student success. It is, therefore, projected that implementing targeted support programs such as comprehensive preparatory English courses could be a strategic and proactive approach to bridge the identified language proficiency gap. A highly significant difference in English proficiency was observed among BSEd students across year levels, so the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was used to identify the specific year-level comparisons contributing to this difference.

Post-hoc analysis (Table 5) revealed statistically significant differences in English proficiency between the following year level pairings: First and Second Year ($MD = 3.35$, $p = .03$), First and Third Year ($MD = 3.42$, $p = .04$), Second and Third Year ($MD = 6.76$, $p < .001$), and Third and Fourth Year ($MD = 5.49$, $p = .04$).

Table 5. LSD Results in the English Proficiency by Year Level

	Position (I)	Position (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
English Proficiency	First Year	Second Year	3.34*	.029
	First Year	Third Year	3.41*	.041
	Second Year	Third Year	6.76**	.000
	Third Year	Fourth Year	5.48*	.036

Analysis of average scores reveals the following trend in English proficiency: first-year students scored higher than second-year students, but lower than third-year students. This result somehow gains explanation in a case study by Danoch et al. (2023), implying that a clear link emerged between students' initial English proficiency, particularly reading comprehension, and their academic success in the first year of college. This finding also appears to be supported by a survey conducted by Ozawa (2018) on self-assessment of English proficiency among Japanese-English major university students, which revealed a difference in confidence levels in reading between First-Year and Third-Year students. Although the effect size was small, it indicates that upper-year students may feel more confident in their English skills. A similar finding was discovered by a study in Chile, indicating that pre-service teachers' perceived linguistic competence improved as they advanced academically. This suggests that students in the upper-class level felt more confident in their language abilities. Whether they pursue further education, enter the workforce, or engage in public service, they understand that effective communication is essential for success (Vega-Abarzúa et al., 2025). Furthermore, this finding also resonates with a study by Vidal and Jarvis (2018) that focused on the three-year trajectory of English proficiency under English-medium instruction (EMI), which yielded compelling results: marked improvements in L2 skills and essay composition. Lexical diversity, however, did not follow this upward trend. This indicates that year level and continued exposure to English instruction can enhance certain aspects of proficiency.

Specialization

As shown in Table 6, the One-way ANOVA result reveals that a highly significant difference appeared in the English proficiency of BSEd students when they are classified according to specialization ($F=8.806$, $P=.000$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that the English proficiency level of each specialization varies from each other. This finding contradicts a study by Alshehri (2023) at King Khalid University, which found no statistically significant differences in English proficiency levels based on course specialization. This suggests that while English proficiency is linked to academic success, the differences in this relationship across various specializations might not be substantial.

Table 6. ANOVA Results in English Proficiency by Specialization

Competencies		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-ratio	Two-tailed probability
English Proficiency	Between groups	1839.58	4	459.89	8.80**	<.001
	Within groups	8251.51	241	52.22		
	Total	10091.10	245			

With a significant difference in English proficiency found among BSEd students across specializations, the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was used to determine which specific specializations differed significantly.

Table 7 presents the statistically significant differences in English proficiency between specific specializations. These differences include those between English and Filipino majors ($MD = 7.85$, $p < .001$), English and Social Science majors ($MD = 6.11$, $p < .001$), English and Science majors ($MD = 6.78$, $p < .001$), Filipino and Mathematics majors ($MD = 8.08$, $p < .001$), Mathematics and Social Science majors ($MD = 6.33$, $p = .004$), and Mathematics and Science majors ($MD = 7.01$, $p = .003$).

Table 7. LSD Results in English Proficiency as to Specialization

	Position (I)	Position(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
English Proficiency	English	Filipino	7.85**	<.001
	English	Social Science	6.10**	<.001
	English	Science	6.78**	<.001
	Filipino	Mathematics	8.07**	<.001
	Mathematics	Social Science	6.33*	.004
	Mathematics	Science	7.00*	.003

English majors exhibited greater English proficiency than Filipino, Social Science, and Science majors. Similarly, mathematics majors demonstrated higher English proficiency than those in these three specializations. Both English and Mathematics majors outperformed all other specializations. Indeed, the impact of English proficiency on academic performance can vary by specialization (Soruc et al., 2021).

4.0 Conclusion

This study revealed that the level of English proficiency of BSED students, when taken as an entire group and when classified according to year level, specialization, type of device used, type of connectivity, and exposure to online engagements, is developing. Furthermore, there is a significant difference in the level of English proficiency of BSED students when classified according to year level and specialization; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Also, the study revealed significant variations in the English proficiency of BSED students in both variables of year level and specialization. In general, the English proficiency of BSED students is classified as "Developing," indicating that while they can communicate in English, vocabulary and language structure limitations hinder their ability to express complex ideas fully. This finding highlights the crucial role of language proficiency as a foundational skill for academic success in higher education.

When analyzed at the year level, third-year students demonstrated the highest English proficiency level among the group, which is classified as "Expanding." However, First, Second, and Fourth-Year students remained at the "Developing" level. This finding is unexpected and suggests a need for further investigation into factors influencing language skill retention or development in the final year of coursework. The findings align with prior research indicating that language proficiency improves with academic progression. However, targeted interventions such as preparatory English courses could help bridge gaps for students in earlier years. Meanwhile, the study would have been strengthened by specifying the specific areas of English proficiency where scores were lower to inform the development of a targeted curriculum innovation. This limitation in the study could be explored in future research tackling this topic.

When grouped by specialization, English and Mathematics majors manifested higher English proficiency than Filipino, Social Science, and Science majors. This disparity emphasizes the varying linguistic demands and exposure across specializations and the potential influence of subject-specific language use on proficiency development. The results resonate with previous studies showing that English majors tend to achieve higher language competence due to their focused engagement with the language. Lastly, the statistically significant differences in English proficiency across year levels and specializations revealed by ANOVA and post-hoc analyses indicate the need for tailored language support activities in the BSED program. Such activities should address students' unique challenges in different year levels and specializations, ensuring equitable opportunities for academic and professional success. Ultimately, enhancing English proficiency among pre-service teachers is vital for their academic achievement and future roles as educators for secondary schools, where effective communication is essential for fostering student learning and engagement.

As most students demonstrate "Developing" English proficiency, which indicates a low level, the courses should aim to cultivate advanced language proficiency across the four macro skills. The instructional development committee should utilize this proficiency goal as a key criterion in designing syllabi and learning materials for targeted language support programs, especially for First and Second-year students. Given the unexpected decline in English proficiency among Fourth-Year students as found in this study, it is also recommended that the students be introduced to advanced language courses or refresher modules in the final year before their deployment for an internship. These materials could emphasize professional communication skills, such as lesson delivery and lesson plan writing, to prepare them for an internship.

Although students exhibit some variation in language proficiency scores, potentially influenced by specialization and year level, the scores remain relatively close. Consequently, a comprehensive investigation into the effects of these factors is necessary to inform the development of an effective language development program integrated into General English courses. Additional studies focusing on qualitative data should be conducted to explore the factors contributing to the decline in English proficiency among Fourth-Year students and to investigate the long-term impact of language support programs. This will help the college refine its strategies and ensure sustained improvements in English proficiency.

The researcher proposed a set of curriculum enhancement activities, Student Enhancement Activity Materials (SEAM), to address the knowledge gap among BSED students regarding English proficiency. This material is a tailored language training program for students in specializations with lower proficiency levels, such as Filipino, Social Science, and Science majors. This includes discipline-specific vocabulary building and communication

exercises that will be integrated into their coursework in Purposive Communication. The proposed material intends to enhance the students' English proficiency in the four components: reading comprehension, listening comprehension, writing proficiency, and sentence structure.

Recognizing the critical need to improve English proficiency among BSEd students, this study introduces a curriculum innovation. This innovation consists of worksheets, structured progressively from basic to advanced, targeting the four key areas of reading comprehension, listening comprehension, writing proficiency, and grammar (sentence structure). This covers foundations of academic English, intermediate communication skills, advanced academic and professional English, and English for teaching and classroom communication. The Student Enhancement Activity Material (SEAM) will be integrated into the Purposive Communication course for BSEd students at the University of Antique during the first semester. This five-month program features a structured approach: each month, a component skill will be developed through weekly worksheets, followed by a macro-skill test to measure student progress and the effectiveness of SEAM in enhancing English proficiency.

The proposed program seeks to improve the overall English proficiency of BSED students to at least an "Expanding" level, address the specific language needs of students in different year levels and specializations, foster confidence in using English for academic, professional, and everyday communication, and prepare students to effectively use English as a medium of instruction in their future teaching careers.

The first phase of the implementation will focus on curriculum design, where syllabi are modified and materials are developed accordingly for the integrated English proficiency learning activities, which are specialization-specific. This will be done in two months, specifically at the end of the second semester. The pilot testing will occur in the second phase, which will happen in the first semester, in five months. The integrated course activities will be implemented with a small group of students to gather feedback from them and the faculty to refine the curriculum. The third phase will cover the full implementation of the curriculum innovation across all year levels and specializations while monitoring the progress through regular assessments to adjust the program as necessary. The final phase will see continuous improvement through annual evaluation to assess the impact of the curriculum innovation on students' English proficiency. Regarding financial requirements, the proposed curriculum innovation will require funding to develop course materials and resources, faculty training and workshops, and technology tools and platforms.

This curriculum innovation proposal addresses the critical need to enhance the English proficiency of BSEd students at the University of Antique to ensure that they are well-prepared for the linguistic demands of higher education and their future roles as educators in secondary schools. By implementing targeted language support programs, specialization-specific modules, and technology-enhanced learning, this initiative will empower students to achieve their full potential and contribute effectively to the field of education.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

The first author designed, analyzed, interpreted, and prepared the manuscript. The second author, as research adviser, provided guidance and direction to the first author in conducting the study and preparing the manuscript.

6.0 Funding

This paper did not receive a financial grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The authors of this paper have neither a personal nor financial relationship with any person or organization that may have or could be perceived to have influenced this study nor a conflict of interest in the publication of this paper. Prior to the conduct of an investigation, approval from key officials of the institution where the study was conducted and consent from respondents were obtained.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The authors extend their gratitude to the people who directly and indirectly contributed to the success of this study. Sincere appreciation is given to the expert jury - Associate Professors Charisse Joting-Quiman, Sammy Militante, and Marvin Casalan, along with Dr. Albert Enopiques and Ms. Asle Joyce Flores - for their critical review of the research instrument. The authors also acknowledge Dr. Runato A. Basañes for helping in the computation of data and Dr. Joel Bual for his initial review of the paper to refine its content and improve its quality for publication.

9.0 References

Afalla, B., & Fabelico, F. (2020). Pre-service teachers' pedagogical competence and teaching efficiency. *Journal of Critical Reviews* 2020. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3655150>
Almudibry, K. (2022). Students' attitudes towards using English as a medium of instruction in scientific disciplines: Challenges and solutions. *Kıbrıslı Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(8), 2760-2770. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i8.7522>

- Alshehri, A. (2023). Correspondence between the textbooks of the Intensive English program and students' language proficiency at King Khalid University. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(9), 2323-2330. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1309.19>
- Banagbanag, R. A. (2020). ESL teachers' attitudes and competence on communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(7), 2883-2889. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080715>
- Bautista, R.A. & Del Valle, J.M. (2023). Communicative competence and oral language usage of Filipino learners in English. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.53378/352957>
- Beca, J. M., Chan, K. K. W., Naimark, D. M. J., & Pechlivanoglou, P. (2021). Impact of limited sample size and follow-up on single event survival extrapolation for health technology assessment: a simulation study. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01468-7>
- Business World. (2024, November 17). Filipinos still 'highly proficient' in English language. *Business World Online*. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/BusinessWorldOnline2024>
- Danoch, A., Michaelan, R., Danoch, R., & Kela-madar, N. (2023). Investigating the relationship between the initial English reading skills of newly enrolled engineering undergraduates and their academic success-a case study. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 39(2), 488-496. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhes.2021.0903.0156>
- Du Plessis, C. (2016). Inferences from the test of academic literacy for postgraduate students (TALPS). *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2015.1108206>
- Footy, G. M. (2009). Sample size determination for image classification accuracy assessment and comparison. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 30(20), 5273-5291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431160903130937>
- Francisco, A. (2019). Read and spell: The communicative competence of the English language teachers and the teaching of English as a second language. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*, 23(3.4), 277-292. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/Francisco2019A>
- GMA News. (2018, February 20). English proficiency of Pinoy students, teachers lagging – survey. *GMA News Online*. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/GMANews2018>
- Hadi, A. (2019). Exploring preparation of pre-service teachers' English proficiency and pedagogy: Stories from an EFL teacher education program. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(8), 1946-1966. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3771>
- Jung, C., & Choe, H. (2024). Professional identity of Filipino English teachers teaching international students in a global city in the Philippines. *English Teaching*, 79(2), 3-31. <http://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.79.2.202406.3>
- Kim, S., Brutt-Griffler, J., & Park, M. K. (2024). Enhancing EMI pedagogical curricula to prepare pre-service English teachers for socioculturally diverse classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 728-745. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12529>
- Kourieos, S., & Diakou, M. (2019). Pre-service English language teacher education and the first years of teaching: Perspectives from Cyprus. *The New Educator*, 15(3), 208-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2019.1628558>
- Lavy, V. (2015). What makes an effective teacher? Quasi-Experimental evidence. *CESifo Economic Studies*, 62(1), 88-125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cesifo/iftv001>
- Lei, P., & Zhao, Y. (2011). Effects of vertical scaling methods on linear growth estimation. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 36(1), 21-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621611425171>
- Lingan, L. (2019). Prospective teachers' level of communicative competence as basis for English program enhancement. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21 (2), pp. 306 - 314. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/Scopus85065076702>
- Magno, J. M., Indal, R. S., Chavez, J. V., Garil, B. A., & Reyes, R. B. D. (2024). Alternative teaching strategies in learning Filipino language among dominant English speakers. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(4), 404-419. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i4.6742>
- Mante-Estacio, M. J., Valdez, P. N., & Pulido, D. (2018). Effective teaching of the macro-skills: Reflections from Filipino teachers of English. *Reflective Practice*, 19(6), 844-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1539662>
- Ng, C.F. & Ng, P.K. (2013). Teaching strategies and their impacts on the English proficiency of young Malaysian learners. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 4, 186-195. <https://tinyurl.com/NgAndNg>
- Onn, L. P. (2024, July 16). Digital autocratisation and electoral disinformation in the Philippines. *ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute*. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/YusofII>
- Ozawa, S. (2018). A cross-sectional survey on Japanese English-major university students' confidence in the TOEIC can-do list. *TESL-EJ*, 21(4), n4. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1172548>
- Qureshi, S. F., & Waller, S. K. (2022). An examination of factors predicting the academic success of undergraduate second-language learners in the United Arab Emirates. *Athens Journal of Education*, 9(4), 711-724. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.9.4-10>
- Regidor, A., Vesmanos, A., & Deguito, P. 2024. The impact of supportive learning environment on student learning motivation of senior high school students. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies* 50 (7):558-71. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71487>
- Rodrigues, B., Cadime, I., & Ribeiro, I. (2023). Cognitive and metacognitive strategy use in poor comprehenders: An exploratory study. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 28(2), 139-153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19404158.2023.2287611>
- Salomone, R. (2023). In pursuit of sustainable educational development: The Philippines and the English dilemma. In: McEntee-Atalianis, L.J., Tonkin, H. (eds) *Language and Sustainable Development*. *Language Policy*, vol 32. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24918-1_7
- Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. (2022). English language proficiency in the Philippines: An overview. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 4(3), 46-51. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2022.4.3.7>
- Shafaghi, M., & Yousefi, S. H. (2023). The effect of university students' motivation and attitude on test performance: Construction and validation of an instrument on English Proficiency Test. *International Journal of Educational Reform*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879231205263>
- Soruc, A., Altay, M., Curle, S., & Yuksel, D. (2021). Students' academic language-related challenges in English medium instruction: The role of English proficiency and language gain. *System*, 103, 102651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102651>
- Vidal, K., & Jarvis, S. (2018). Effects of English-medium instruction on Spanish students' proficiency and lexical diversity in English. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(5), 568-587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818817945>
- Vega-Abarzua, J., Morales, M., Olivo, C., Rubilar, F., & Gutiérrez-Turner, E. (2025). Preservice teachers' perceptions of C1 English proficiency in a Chilean teacher education program. *Profile: Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 27(1), 133-150. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v27n1.115643>
- Velasco, Y. P. (2019). The Kachruvian Connection and English Language Teaching in the Philippines. *World Englishes*, 38(1-2), 294-302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12374>
- Weber, E. J., & Hoo, Z. H. (2018). Why sample size estimates? *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 35(12), 755-756. <https://doi.org/10.1136/emjmed-2018-207763>
- Yau, A. H. Y., Fung, D., & Tsang, A. (2024). Effects of supplementary and mainstream education on the secondary-tertiary transitional challenges in English medium higher education. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 23(2), 289-311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-024-09368-5>
- Zhang, J. (2023). The impact of the learning environment on English language learning. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23, 69-72. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v23i.12737>