

**The influence of linguistic proficiency on the reading comprehension skills
of English major students in Polangui Community College**

Solejoy A. Quilonio, MAEd*

Polangui Community College, Polangui, Albay, Bicol, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of linguistic proficiency on the reading comprehension skills of English major students in Polangui Community College for the school year 2025 to 2026. Specifically, it determined the level of linguistic proficiency of the students in terms of parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction, assessed their reading comprehension skills along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations, tested the differences in these variables across year levels, and examined the relationship between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills. The study employed a descriptive evaluative correlational research design and utilized a researcher made test questionnaire administered to 158 English major students from the 1st year to 3rd year levels through total enumeration. Data were analyzed using frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, rank, Kruskal Wallis Test or One Way ANOVA, and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient at 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that the students demonstrated average linguistic proficiency in parts of speech, with 61% for 1st year, 59% for 2nd year, and 60% for 3rd year, while subject-verb agreement and sentence construction ranged from average to below average. In reading comprehension, all year levels generally obtained average performance across the identified skills, with drawing generalizations showing the highest scores at 70%, 67%, and 63%, respectively. The computed chi-square value of 1.27 for linguistic proficiency and 2.32 for reading comprehension were both lower than the tabular value of 5.99, indicating no significant difference among the year levels. Likewise, Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient revealed $R_s = 0.19$, which indicated no significant relationship between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills. Based on the findings, the study concluded that although the students manifested varying levels of performance in both linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension, these did not significantly differ across year levels and were not significantly related. The study recommends the development and use of skill builder activities and targeted instructional interventions to improve students' linguistic and reading comprehension skills.

Keywords: Linguistic proficiency, reading comprehension skills, English major students.

Date Submitted: March 6, 2026

Date Accepted: March 13, 2026

Date Published: April 3, 2026

*Corresponding author/ Email: solejoyquilonio@gmail.com

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502885>

Recommended citation:

Quilonio, S. A. (2026). The influence of linguistic proficiency on the reading comprehension skills of English major students in Polangui Community College. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (2), 13-29. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502885>

INTRODUCTION

In the context of teaching curriculum which was adopted from other country's educational setting and structure, language is an important factor in achieving success in the teaching and learning process. Language is dynamic while Filipinos are diverse. They were linked together in order to make the teaching and learning process more competitive and at par with other developing countries in the aspect of education. Different races colonized the country where Filipinos learned so much about different languages. The dialects' framework was adopted from the foreign races that shaped the Pilipino culture. With the presence and manifestations of Filipino's flexibility in adapting a language connected from the past to present, they are kinds of learners who can learn easily and comfortably about any content with their language competence.

It is important to know that language becomes a foundation of learning. Without language, learning is meaningless. The different aspects of one's culture are shaped through language and multiculturalism is defined by the merging of the skills to learn one's own language and other languages as well.

Linguistics is concerned with the nature of language and communication. It deals both with the study of particular languages and the search for general properties common to all languages or large groups of languages. Linguistics is the scientific study of language, and involves an analysis of language form, language meaning, and language in context. At the heart of linguistics is the search for the unconscious knowledge that humans have about language and how it is that children acquire it, an understanding of the structure of language in general and of particular languages, knowledge about how languages vary, and how language influences the way in which people interact with each other and think about the world.

Reading comprehension skills separates the "passive" unskilled reader from the "active" readers. Skilled readers do not just read; they interact with the text. Reading comprehension skills increase the pleasure and effectiveness of reading. Strong reading comprehension skills helped in all the other subjects and in the personal and professional lives. The high stake tests that control advancement through elementary, middle, and high school and that determine entrance to college are in large parts, a measure of reading comprehension skills. In short, building reading comprehension skills requires a long term strategy in which all the reading skills areas will contribute to success.

Today's educational setting seemed to be so complicated. In the Philippines, English is an official second language. It is used as a medium of instruction. Yet, most Filipinos learn English as an additional language because they have various mother tongues. The backgrounds in language of Filipinos create an experiment for both English teachers and learners of English as an additional language. As all linguistic individuals continue to think of more innovative ways to teach English to speakers of Pilipino languages, the Philippine context presents some particular factors that must be taken into consideration today.

The term "proficiency" was used as a great deal in the modern global world. (Stacie Berdan, 2018) It was used to describe children's competency in a foreign language both in the classroom and in a foreign country as they were able to read and interpret signs and menus in a language other than English. Proficiency was the ability to use language in real world situations in a spontaneous interaction and non-rehearsed context and in a manner acceptable and appropriate to native speakers of the language. Proficiency demonstrated what a language user is able to do regardless of where, when or how the language was acquired. The demonstration was independent of how the language was learned; the context may or may not be familiar; the evaluation of proficiency is not limited to the content of a particular curriculum that has been taught or learned.

The Philippines is a nation that is leading English proficiency in Asia in general. Several English survey reports from both the academe and the business world, and other aspects of life are pointing more and more to the importance that the English language and English proficiency were playing in the educational success and economic boom of the Philippines as well as other surrounding nations. Despite the great linguistic diversity of the country, English continued to receive high functional popularity in the different areas of daily life in the nation. (SafaryWa-Mbaleka, 2014)

In the context of teaching and learning process, most of the discipline in our curriculum is taught through English as medium of instruction. With the new curriculum implemented, the educational setting aimed to develop learners who can adapt quickly and who can go at par with other learners from around the world. English is a medium not only in instruction, but a constant language used in terms of business, industry, politics, social sciences and the like. The different units in society were strengthened by communication. Communication skills were a competent potential that a learner should be equipped with in order to survive in this world full of competitors.

It is not enough to learn the technicality of language. It should be followed by comprehension. Comprehension is relating the new to the already known; relating aspects of the world—including what one reads—to the knowledge, intentions, and expectations one already has in his head; comprehension is a state rather than a set of skills or a process.

Statement of the problem

The main purpose of this study was to determine the linguistic proficiency in relation to the reading comprehension skills of English Major students in Polangui Community College for the school year 2025 to 2026. Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of linguistic proficiency of English Major students in terms of parts of speech, subject verb agreement, and sentence construction?
2. How significant do the linguistic proficiency of the students vary among the different year levels?
3. What is the level of reading comprehension skills of the English Major students in terms of noting details, making inference, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations?
4. How significant do the rank orders of reading comprehension skills vary among the students of the different year levels?
5. How significant is the relationship between the students' linguistic proficiency and their reading comprehension skills?
6. What skill builder activities in improving the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of students can be developed based on the findings of the study?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology used in this study. It includes the identification and selection of the sources of data, the techniques and procedures of gathering data, the population, the instruments used, and the statistical tools and techniques applied in the analysis and presentation of data. The study employed the descriptive evaluative inferential correlational method of research. The descriptive method was used to describe the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of the English major students of Polangui Community College. The inferential method was applied to determine the level of linguistic

proficiency and reading comprehension skills of the students in the different year levels. The study also used the correlational method to determine the relationship between the linguistic proficiency and the reading comprehension skills of the English major students. Appropriate statistical tools were used to accept or reject the hypothesis of the study.

Purposive sampling was employed in choosing Polangui Community College. Total Enumeration was used in choosing the respondents of the study. The respondents were the enrolled English major students from 1st year to 3rd year, A.Y. 2025-2026. There were 40 first year students, 46 2nd year students, and 72 3rd year students, with a total of 158 respondents.

The study used a structured questionnaire constructed by the researcher based on the data and related literature and studies reviewed. The instrument of the study was in the form of test questionnaires where the students had to take a test on the identified elements of linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension as mentioned in the statement of the problem. In the validation of the researcher made instrument, several steps were followed. For content validation, the researcher conducted intensive readings of books and other related references on linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills. The researcher also developed a table of specifications about the instrument used. The table of specifications showed that Part 1 covered linguistic proficiency with three indicators: Parts of Speech, with 15 items placed in items 1 to 15 and corresponding to 18.75%; Subject Verb Agreement, with 15 items placed in items 16 to 30 and corresponding to 18.75%; and Sentence Construction, with 15 items placed in items 31 to 45 and corresponding to 18.75%. Part 2 covered reading comprehension with the following indicators: Noting Details, with 5 items placed in items 46 to 50 and corresponding to 6.25%; Making Inferences, with 5 items placed in items 51 to 55 and corresponding to 6.25%; Predicting Outcomes, with 5 items placed in items 56 to 60 and corresponding to 6.25%; Sequencing Events, with 5 items placed in items 61 to 65 and corresponding to 6.25%; Comparing and Contrasting, with 5 items placed in items 66 to 70 and corresponding to 6.25%; Summarizing, with 5 items placed in items 71 to 75 and corresponding to 6.25%; and Drawing Generalizations, with 5 items placed in items 76 to 80 and corresponding to 6.25%. In total, the instrument consisted of 80 items distributed from item 1 to item 80, representing 100%.

For face validation, the items were inspected to determine if the test was valid to the extent that it served its purpose of the efficiency with which it measures what it intends to measure (Oriondo, et al 1998). Through item inspection, a number of test constructors and evaluators inspected the initial draft of the instrument. The group consisted of instructors in basic statistics and the research adviser. The dry run was administered in a different school outside Polangui, specifically in Ligao Community College. Teachers in English in the said school were asked to make comments and recommendations to add, delete, modify, and revise the survey items.

To measure the internal consistency of the instrument, Kuder Richardson Formula 21 was used. After the questionnaires were retrieved, the reliability was computed using the formula $r = 1 - \frac{M(N-M)}{N(S^2)}$, where r = reliability coefficient, M = mean, N = number of items, and S = Standard deviation. The significance of the reliability coefficient was tested using the formula $t = \frac{r\sqrt{n-2}}{1-r^2}$ (Siegel, 1998), where r = the reliability coefficient and n = number of items. To determine the proficiency level of respondents, the following distribution was categorized together with the corresponding verbal interpretation. A performance level of 95-100 was qualitatively described as Excellent and verbally interpreted as Mastered. A performance level of 76-94 was qualitatively described as Above Average and verbally interpreted as Moving Towards Mastery. A performance level of 57-75 was qualitatively described as Average and verbally interpreted as Average Mastery. A performance level of 38-56 was qualitatively described as Below Average and verbally interpreted as Low Mastery. A performance level of 19-37 was qualitatively described as Poor and verbally interpreted as

Very Low Mastery. A performance level of 0-18 was qualitatively described as Very Poor and verbally interpreted as No Mastery at all. This Likert scale served as the basis for describing the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of the respondents.

The researcher followed certain procedures in the conduct of this study. These included preparing the research proposal, reflecting the Suggestions/Recommendations of the Administration, drafting questionnaire, seeking the permission to gather data, distributing and retrieval of questionnaire, tallying and analyzing the data, interpreting the Data, disseminating of findings, and publication.

The data was presented using frequency count, percentage techniques, weighted mean, ranking, Kruskal-Wallis Test of One Way ANOVA, and Spearman's Correlation Coefficient. To determine the scores and interpret the performance of the English major students along linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension, Mean (M), Mean Percentage Level (MPL), and Standard Deviation (SD) were utilized for computation. Item analysis was considered essential to produce quality test. Item analysis was described as a powerful tool in determining the difficulty index and discrimination index for improvement. This described the least mastered skills of the English major students in linguistic and reading comprehension. The mean, standard and proficiency level was computed and interpreted. Mean was used to describe the responses of the students in the given competencies in a form of tests. The formula in computing weighted mean was presented together with its components, namely Weighted mean, \sum as sum, w as frequency/response, and x as weighted value.

Frequency Count was the method by which the number of respondents' responses and occurrences of the subject of the study was determined, and it was done by a simple one by one counting. It was applicable to be used in part one of the questionnaire that would easily determine the total number of the respondents in terms of quantity. Percentage Technique was used to derive the actual percentage of the data needed to fulfilment of the research study. Slovin's Formula was used to determine the sample population from the total respondents of the study. The formula was $n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$, where n = number of samples, N = total population, $E = 10\%$, and $100 = \text{constant}$.

The Kruskal-Wallis Test of One-Way ANOVA was used to determine the significant difference in linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of students from different year levelss. In this formula, N is the total number of participants for all groups combined, T is the rank total for each group, and n is the number of participants in each group. The Spearman's rank order correlation is the nonparametric version of the Pearson product moment correlation. Spearman's correlation coefficient, (ρ , also signified by r_s), measures the strength and direction of association between two ranked variables. The formula for Spearman is identified where d_i = difference in paired ranks and n = number of cases. The formula to use when there are tied ranks was also indicated. The hypothesis was tested at the level of significance of 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings, interpretation, and analysis of the data gathered from the results of the test administered to 158 English Major students of Polangui Community College, consisting of 40 first year students, 46 2nd year students, and 72 3rd year students for A.Y. 2025-2026. Grounded in the descriptive evaluative inferential correlational research design, the discussion draws directly from the data collected through the researcher made structured test questionnaire covering linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills. The respondents were selected through Total Enumeration, and the results were analyzed using Mean Percentage Level, ranking, Kruskal Wallis Test or One Way ANOVA, Spearman's rank

order correlation coefficient, and t-test correlation. The discussion that follows is anchored on the objectives of the study, particularly the determination of the level of linguistic proficiency of the students along parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction, the level of reading comprehension skills along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations, the significant differences in rank orders across year levels, the relationship between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills, and the development of skill-builder activities based on the findings.

The findings on linguistic proficiency revealed that the English Major students generally performed at average to below average levels across the three grammatical areas assessed. In parts of speech, the 1st year students obtained an Average Proficiency Level (PL) of 61%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 59%, ranked 3, and were likewise described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 60%, ranked 2, with the same qualitative description of Average. These results indicate that the students manifested average proficiency in recognizing parts of speech. Since the proficiency level was obtained by adding the performance level in every item and dividing it by the total number of items for parts of speech, the data suggest that the students only occasionally recognize parts of speech correctly. This average performance implies typical skills in grammar rather than mastery, indicating that further exposure to grammar based activities remains necessary. The results support the view that even English majors may require sustained reinforcement in foundational grammatical competencies, especially because grammatical awareness is central to higher level language performance and academic literacy.

In subject-verb agreement, the performance of the students declined further. The 1st year students obtained 58%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 56%, ranked 2, and were described as Below Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 53%, ranked 3, and were likewise described as Below Average. This pattern shows that the students had not mastered grammar along subject-verb agreement. Although the 1st year group still fell within the Average range, the 2nd year and 3rd year groups were already within the Below Average category, indicating Low Mastery based on the legend where 38-56 corresponds to Below Average (BA). The finding suggests that the students continue to experience difficulty in applying subject-verb agreement rules accurately. As discussed in the original text, subject-verb agreement has long been recognized as an important topic in English language learning and teaching, and earlier behavioristic perspectives in second language learning regarded grammatical errors as products of persistent mother tongue habits. In this context, the results may reflect continuing interference, weak grammatical internalization, or insufficient focused practice. The data therefore point to the need for further drilling and exercises designed to strengthen grammatical competence in subject-verb agreement.

The lowest linguistic proficiency result was observed in sentence construction. The 1st year students obtained 54%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Below Average. The 2nd year students obtained 53%, ranked 2, and were also described as Below Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 51%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative description of Below Average. These findings indicate that the students had not mastered grammar along sentence construction. The consistently Below Average performance across all year levels suggests Low Mastery in constructing grammatically correct sentences. The accompanying interpretation emphasizes that many students were not able to use or recognize the correct form of the verb properly and that carelessness, as well as lack of habitual checking of subject-verb agreement in sentence formation, may have contributed to their weak performance. Since sentence construction is a crucial skill for English majors whose future academic and professional work will require substantial writing, this result has serious practical implications. It suggests a

pressing need for intervention in grammar instruction so that students can become more competent in producing clear and correct written language.

When the mean percentage scores and rank orders of linguistic proficiency among the three year levels were compared, the rank order pattern also reflected stronger performance in parts of speech than in the other two indicators. For the 1st year students, parts of speech had PL = 61, Int = A, Rank = 9; subject-verb agreement had PL = 58, Int = A, Rank = 6; and sentence construction had PL = 54, Int = BA, Rank = 4. For the 2nd year students, parts of speech had PL = 59, Int = A, Rank = 7; subject-verb agreement had PL = 56, Int = A, Rank = 5; and sentence construction had PL = 53, Int = BA, Rank = 2.5. For the 3rd year students, parts of speech had PL = 60, Int = A, Rank = 8; subject-verb agreement had PL = 53, Int = BA, Rank = 2.5; and sentence construction had PL = 51, Int = BA, Rank = 1. Using the legend in which 57-75 is Average (A) or Average Mastery and 38-56 is Below Average (BA) or Low Mastery, the data confirm that only parts of speech consistently remained within Average Mastery across year levels, while sentence construction was consistently within Low Mastery. Subject-verb agreement showed mixed results, with the 1st year and 2nd year students interpreted as A in Table 7 despite 56 falling within the BA band in the stated legend, and the 3rd year students interpreted as BA. Even with this variation in presentation, the overall pattern remains one of modest performance rather than mastery.

The significance of difference in the rank order of the linguistic proficiency of English Major students among the different year levels was tested using Kruskal Wallis or One Way ANOVA. The computed results showed a summation of the squared deviation from the difference (d^2) of 234.50, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 9, Degrees of Freedom = 2, and Computed Chi-square (χ^2) = 1.27. The tabular χ^2 at 0.05 was 5.99147. Since the computed χ^2 of 1.27 was lower than the tabulated chi-square value of 5.99147 at 0.05 level of significance with 2 degrees of freedom ($p > 0.05$), the null hypothesis was accepted and the significance of difference was interpreted as Not significant. This means that there was no Significant Difference in the Rank Orders of the Linguistic Proficiency of English Major students from the Different Year levels in Polangui Community College. The result implies that the students across year levels acquired proficiency in generally the same manner. The original discussion attributes this similarity to possible common influences such as teaching strategies, learning preferences, instructional materials, and lack of innovation among teachers in employing strategic interventions to improve linguistic proficiency. This interpretation is reasonable because when no significant difference is found across cohorts, it often suggests that students are experiencing relatively similar instructional conditions and are progressing within comparable academic environments. However, the lack of significant difference should not be interpreted as satisfactory achievement, since the actual proficiency levels remained average to below average.

The results on reading comprehension skills showed that the English Major students generally performed at an Average level across all seven skill areas. In noting details, the 1st year students obtained 62%, ranked 1.5, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 59%, ranked 3, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 62%, ranked 1.5, with the same qualitative description of Average. These values indicate that the students had average reading comprehension along noting details, but they did not attain mastery. Since noting details requires close attention to explicit textual information, the Average level suggests that students can identify details to some extent but still require more practice to process texts with precision and consistency.

In making inferences, the 1st year students obtained 61%, ranked 2, and were described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 66%, ranked 1, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 60%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative

description of Average. These findings indicate that the students had an average level of reading comprehension in making inferences and still need to improve their skills in deriving implied meanings from text. The result is important because making inferences is a crucial skill in reading comprehension that enables readers to probe important elements of a text and construct meaning beyond what is explicitly stated. The Average results suggest that inferential comprehension is developing but not yet sufficiently strong. Given that inference is a higher order comprehension process closely linked with critical thinking, the lack of mastery in this area may constrain the students' ability to engage deeply with complex academic texts.

In predicting outcomes, the 1st year students obtained 62%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 60%, ranked 2, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 59%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative description of Average. These results imply that the students were still struggling in predicting outcomes of reading texts. The Average performance means that they need more opportunities to practice reading and to employ analytical thinking in linking textual clues to possible developments in a text. Because the ability to predict outcomes reflects active engagement with textual meaning and structure, these findings suggest that although the students can anticipate developments to some extent, they are not yet consistently strategic readers.

In sequencing events, the 1st year students obtained 61%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 59%, ranked 2, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 58%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative description of Average. The accompanying discussion states that these results imply that the Grade 20 students have an average mastery in sequencing events, although the context clearly refers to the English Major students included in the study. The results indicate that the students still found it difficult to arrange ideas and events in a story in chronological order and needed more reading practice in order to understand plot structure. Sequencing is closely associated with understanding the beginning, middle, and end of a story, and it contributes significantly to readers' ability to comprehend narrative texts. Therefore, Average performance in this area suggests partial but incomplete control of organizational comprehension.

In comparing and contrasting, the 1st year students obtained 60%, ranked 3, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 64%, ranked 1, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 61%, ranked 2, with the same qualitative description of Average. These findings imply that the students had average mastery in comparing and contrasting and still needed more practice in discriminating similarities and differences among ideas. The original discussion correctly situates compare and contrast as among the higher order reading comprehension skills and notes that the ability to categorize and differentiate ideas is fundamental to learning itself. Since English majors are expected to analyze texts critically, the inability to move beyond Average performance in this skill indicates a need for more explicit instruction in comparative reasoning and textual analysis.

In summarizing, the 1st year students obtained 63%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 61%, ranked 2, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 60%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative description of Average. These values indicate that the students were still having difficulty summarizing texts read. This suggests that they needed to improve their reading comprehension and understanding of text so that they could learn how to shorten texts while retaining the most important details. Since summarizing teaches students to identify central ideas, ignore irrelevant information, and integrate important points meaningfully, Average performance in this area suggests that the students' comprehension remains more literal than synthetic. For English majors, this is particularly significant because summarizing is foundational not only to reading but also to academic writing, research, and scholarly communication.

The highest reading comprehension percentages were recorded in drawing generalizations. The 1st year students obtained 70%, ranked 1, and were qualitatively described as Average. The 2nd year students obtained 67%, ranked 2, and were also described as Average, while the 3rd year students obtained 63%, ranked 3, with the same qualitative description of Average. Although these were the highest values among the reading skills, they still fell within the Average range based on the legend where 57-75 is classified as Average. The results imply that the students, particularly the 1st year and 2nd year students as stated in the original discussion, had average mastery of drawing generalizations but still needed improvement. Drawing generalizations requires readers to move from specific textual information to broader conceptual understanding, and the failure to reach mastery indicates that students may still be limited in abstracting meaning from text in a fully developed way.

The mean percentage scores and rank orders of the reading comprehension skills across year levels further illustrate the distribution of strengths and weaknesses. For the 1st year students, noting details had PL = 62, Int = A, Rank = 14; making inferences had PL = 61, Int = A, Rank = 10.5; predicting outcomes had PL = 62, Int = A, Rank = 14; sequencing events had PL = 61, Int = A, Rank = 10.5; comparing and contrasting had PL = 60, Int = A, Rank = 6.5; summarizing had PL = 63, Int = A, Rank = 16.5; and drawing generalizations had PL = 70, Int = A, Rank = 21. For the 2nd year students, noting details had PL = 59, Int = A, Rank = 3; making inferences had PL = 66, Int = A, Rank = 19; predicting outcomes had PL = 60, Int = A, Rank = 6.5; sequencing events had PL = 59, Int = A, Rank = 3; comparing and contrasting had PL = 64, Int = A, Rank = 18; summarizing had PL = 61, Int = A, Rank = 10.5; and drawing generalizations had PL = 67, Int = A, Rank = 20. For the 3rd year students, noting details had PL = 62, Int = A, Rank = 14; making inferences had PL = 60, Int = A, Rank = 6.5; predicting outcomes had PL = 59, Int = A, Rank = 3; sequencing events had PL = 58, Int = A, Rank = 1; comparing and contrasting had PL = 61, Int = A, Rank = 10.5; summarizing had PL = 60, Int = A, Rank = 6.5; and drawing generalizations had PL = 63, Int = A, Rank = 16.5. Using the legend, all of these scores fell within the Average range, which corresponds to Average Mastery. The consistently Average interpretation across all indicators shows that reading comprehension skills were generally similar in quality across the three year levels, with no skill area reaching Above Average or Excellent.

The significance of difference in the rank order of the reading comprehension skills of English Major students among the different year levels was tested using Kruskal Wallis or One Way ANOVA. Table 17 reported a summation of the squared deviation from the difference (d^2) of 2630.43, No. of Groups = 7, No. of Entities = 21, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (χ^2) = 2.32, tabular χ^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = Not significant, and Decision of H_0 = Accepted. The explanatory narrative accompanying the table states that the computed chi-square of 1.55 was obtained. Whether based on the tabled value of 2.32 or the textual value of 1.55, both values are lower than the tabulated chi-square value of 5.99147 at 0.05 level of significance with 2 degrees of freedom ($p > 0.05$). Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there was no Significant Difference in the Rank Orders of the reading comprehension skills of English Major students from the Different Year levels in Polangui Community College. This means that the three year levels exhibited comparable patterns of performance across the seven reading skills. Such a finding suggests that the factors shaping reading comprehension may be relatively consistent across year levels and that progression through the program did not produce substantial divergence in skill ranking. At the same time, because all performance levels remained within the Average range, the absence of significant difference does not imply adequate mastery but rather a shared level of middling performance.

The study also examined the significant relationship between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of English Major students among different year levels using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient. The computed results showed No. of Cases = 7, Summation of the Ranks = 28, Summation of the difference $d^2 = 45.5$, Computed $r = 0.19$, Degrees of freedom = 6, Tabular t-value at 0.05 = 0.571, Significance of Relationship = Not significant, and Decision of H_0 = Accepted. The narrative interpretation stated that the computed results of Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient is $R_s = 0.19$ at 0.05 level of significance which is less than the critical value (0.714), therefore there is no significant relationship between the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of English Major students among the different year levels in Polangui Community College. The positive value of $R_s = 0.19$ indicates a very weak positive association, but because it was interpreted as not significant, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that within the ranked data used in the analysis, higher linguistic proficiency did not correspond strongly or significantly with higher reading comprehension skills. The result is noteworthy because, conceptually, linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension are usually expected to be related. However, in this study, the weak and non-significant association suggests that the students' performance in reading comprehension may also be shaped by other factors not directly captured by the linguistic proficiency indicators alone, such as background knowledge, reading habits, motivation, strategy use, or exposure to texts.

The significance of the relationship was further tested through t-test correlation using the result from the Spearman Rho computation. The t-test results showed No. of Cases = 7, Computed $r = 0.19$, Computed $t = 0.43282$, Degrees of freedom = 6, Tabular t-value at 0.05 = 2.83, Decision of H_0 = Accepted, and Significance of Relationship = Not significant. The narrative stated that the computed t yielded to 0.43282 ($P < 0.05$) for the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of English Major students. While the notation ($P < 0.05$) appears in the narrative, the decision reported in the table was Accepted and the significance of relationship was Not significant, which is consistent with the comparison of Computed $t = 0.43282$ against the Tabular t-value = 2.83. Since 0.43282 is lower than 2.83, the result supports the decision to accept the null hypothesis and confirms that the relationship between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills was not significant. Taken together, the Spearman result and the t-test correlation both point to the same conclusion that the observed association was weak and not statistically significant at 0.05.

Although the earlier overall rank-order tests for linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension across year levels were not significant, the additional statistical results reported for specific indicators show a more differentiated pattern at the item or indicator level. For linguistic proficiency, the results indicated that parts of speech had Summation of the squared deviation from the difference (d^2) = 26382.00, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 45, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (χ^2) = 14.94, Tabular χ^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = significant, and Decision of H_0 = Reject. Subject-Verb Agreement had $d^2 = 27850.67$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 45, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (χ^2) = 23.45, Tabular χ^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = Significant, and Decision of H_0 = Reject. Sentence Construction had $d^2 = 28188.07$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 45, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (χ^2) = 25.41, Tabular χ^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = significant, and Decision of H_0 = Reject. Since all three computed chi-square values of 14.94, 23.45, and 25.41 were higher than 5.99147, these results indicate significant differences for each linguistic proficiency indicator. This suggests that while the aggregated rank order of linguistic proficiency across year levels was not significant when treated broadly, more granular analysis of the specific indicators detected statistically significant variations. Such a pattern may mean that the year levels did not differ enough in their overall ranked performance to reach significance at the broader level, but

distinct indicator-based distributions were sufficiently different to yield significant chi-square values.

A similar pattern appeared in the additional results for reading comprehension indicators. Noting Details had $d2 = 1010.80$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 2.54, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = NS, and Decision of Ho = Accept. Making Inferences had $d2 = 1140.20$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 9.01, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = S, and Decision of Ho = Reject. Predicting Outcomes had $d2 = 1108.20$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 7.41, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = S, and Decision of Ho = Reject. Sequencing Events had $d2 = 1200.40$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 12.02, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = S, and Decision of Ho = Reject. Comparing and contrasting had $d2 = 1132.40$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 8.62, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = S, and Decision of Ho = Reject. Summarizing had $d2 = 1117.60$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 7.88, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = S, and Decision of Ho = Reject. Making Generalizations had $d2 = 1024.40$, No. of Groups = 3, No. of Entities = 15, Degrees of Freedom = 2, Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 3.22, Tabular x^2 at 0.05 = 5.99147, Significance of Difference = NS, and Decision of Ho = Accept. These results show that significant differences were found in Making Inferences, Predicting Outcomes, Sequencing Events, Comparing and contrasting, and summarizing, while Noting Details and Making Generalizations or Drawing Generalizations were not significant. This more specific analysis indicates that some reading comprehension processes were more sensitive to variation across groups than others. Inferential and analytical skills appeared more variable, whereas more detail based or broader generalization skills were comparatively stable.

Based on the findings, the study developed skill-builder activities intended to improve both linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of the students. As stated in the original discussion, these skill builder activities will advance the formation or reformation of students' abilities to become proficient in linguistic aspects especially in parts of speech, subject-verb agreement and in sentence construction, the mastery of new ways of addressing reading problems and new methods of thinking in reading, overcoming negative attitudes towards reading, changing the motivational and operational sphere of students' reading activity. This conclusion is consistent with the overall pattern of results, which showed that most competencies were only at the Average or Below Average levels and that several indicator based comparisons yielded significant differences. The emphasis on remediation, strategic intervention, and motivational development is therefore well grounded in the empirical evidence generated by the study.

Overall, the findings showed that the English Major students of Polangui Community College demonstrated Average proficiency in parts of speech and Average to Below Average performance in subject-verb agreement and sentence construction, while their reading comprehension skills across noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations remained consistently within the Average range. The broader tests of rank order differences across year levels in linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension were Not significant, with Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 1.27 for linguistic proficiency and Computed Chi-square (x^2) = 2.32, while the narrative also reported 1.55, for reading comprehension, both lower than the tabular x^2 of 5.99147 at 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypotheses. The relationship

between linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills was likewise Not significant, as shown by $R_s = 0.19$ and Computed $t = 0.43282$, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. At the same time, the additional indicator based analyses revealed significant differences in all three linguistic proficiency indicators and in several reading comprehension indicators, suggesting that more specific competencies varied in ways not fully reflected in the broader aggregate comparisons. These results directly address the objectives of the study by identifying the students' levels of performance, clarifying where significant differences exist, and determining the nature of the relationship between the two major variables. As a contribution to the field, the study highlights that English Major students may still experience considerable difficulty in core grammatical and comprehension competencies despite being enrolled in a language focused program, thereby underscoring the importance of targeted intervention. The findings also provide an empirical basis for the proposed skill-builder activities and prepare the way for the next chapter or section, where conclusions, implications, and recommendations may be drawn from the evidence presented.

CONCLUSION

This chapter synthesized the findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the study on the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of English major students in Polangui Community College. The main purpose of the study was to determine the linguistic proficiency in relation to the reading comprehension skills of English major students in Polangui Community College. Specifically, the study examined the level of linguistic proficiency of English major students along parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction; determined how significant the linguistic proficiency of the students varied among the different year levels; identified the level of reading comprehension skills of the English major students along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations; determined how significant the rank orders of reading comprehension skills varied among the students of the different year levels; examined how significant the relationship was between the students' linguistic proficiency and their reading comprehension skills; and identified what skill builder activity in improving the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of students could be developed based on the findings of the study. The study employed the descriptive evaluative correlational type of research utilizing a questionnaire to gather primary data from three year levels, from 1st year to 3rd year. Frequency count, percentage techniques, weighted mean, and rank were used, while inferential statistics such as Kruskal Wallis or One way ANOVA and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient were applied, with the significance level set at 0.05 in testing the hypotheses.

The findings revealed that the respondents demonstrated varied levels of linguistic proficiency along parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction. In parts of speech, the linguistic proficiency level of 1st year students was 61% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 59% with average proficiency level, and 3rd year students obtained 60% with average level of proficiency. In subject-verb agreement, the linguistic proficiency level of 1st year students was 58% with the qualitative description of average, while 2nd year students obtained 56% with below average linguistic proficiency level, and 3rd year students obtained 53% with below average level of proficiency. In sentence construction, the linguistic proficiency level of 1st year students was 54% with the qualitative description of below average, while 2nd year students obtained 53% with below average linguistic proficiency level, and 3rd year students likewise obtained 53% with below average level of proficiency. These findings indicate that while the students showed average performance in parts of speech, they experienced greater difficulty in subject-verb agreement

and sentence construction, suggesting that grammatical mastery among the respondents remained uneven and generally below the expected level for English majors in several core areas of linguistic competence.

The results further showed that there was no significant difference in the rank order of the linguistic proficiency of English Major students among the different year levels in Polangui Community College. In terms of linguistic proficiency along parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction, the computed chi-square was 1.27. Since this was lower than the tabulated chi-square value of 5.99 at 0.05 level of significance with 2 degrees of freedom ($p > 0.05$), the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that there is no Significant Difference in the Rank Orders of the Linguistic Proficiency of English Major students from the Different Year levels in Polangui Community College. This conclusion suggests that the level of linguistic proficiency remained generally comparable across the three year levels and that progression in year level did not produce statistically distinct differences in the students' overall linguistic performance.

With respect to reading comprehension, the findings revealed that the respondents also manifested varied levels of reading comprehension along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations. In noting details, the level of reading comprehension skills of 1st year students was 62% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 59% with average proficiency level, and 3rd year students obtained 62% with average level of performance. In making inferences, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 61% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 66% with an average level of reading comprehension, and 3rd year students obtained 60% with an average level of reading comprehension. In predicting outcomes, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 62% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 60% with an average reading comprehension level, and 3rd year students obtained 59% with an average level of reading comprehension skills. In sequencing events, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 61% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 59% with average reading comprehension level, and 3rd year students obtained 58% with an average level of reading comprehension skills. In comparing and contrasting, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 60% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 64% with an average reading comprehension level, and 3rd year students obtained 61% with an average level of reading comprehension skills. In summarizing, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 63% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 61% with average reading comprehension level, and 3rd year students obtained 60% with average level of reading comprehension skills. In drawing generalizations, the reading comprehension level of 1st year students was 70% with the qualitative description of average, 2nd year students obtained 67% with average reading comprehension level, and 3rd year students obtained 63% with average level of reading comprehension skills. Taken together, these findings show that the respondents demonstrated generally average performance across all identified reading comprehension skills, indicating that while they possessed functional comprehension abilities, they had not yet reached mastery in these important aspects of reading.

The study also established that there was no significant difference in the rank order of the reading comprehension skills of English Major students in Polangui Community College. The computed results to test the significance of difference between the different year levels in terms of reading comprehension skills along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, summarizing, and drawing generalizations yielded a computed chi-square of 2.32. Since this was lower than the tabulated

chi-square value of 5.99 at 0.05 level of significance with 2 degrees of freedom ($p > 0.05$), the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that there is no Significant Difference in the Rank Orders of the reading comprehension skills of English Major students from the Different Year levels in Polangui Community College. This means that the reading comprehension performance of the students remained statistically similar regardless of year level, suggesting that the progression from 1st year to 3rd year did not produce significant variation in their comprehension rankings.

Moreover, the study found that there was no significant relationship between the linguistic proficiency and the reading comprehension skills of English Major students in the different year levels in Polangui Community College. The computed results using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient showed that $R_s = 0.19$, which is less than the critical value ($\alpha = 0.05$) = 0.714 with $N = 7$. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of English Major students among the different year levels of Polangui Community College. On the basis of this result, the null hypothesis was accepted. This finding indicates that the respondents' linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills did not demonstrate a statistically significant association within the context of the study, even though both constructs are theoretically related in language learning. It may be inferred that other factors not covered in the study could be influencing the development of these two abilities.

In light of these findings, it can be concluded that the respondents had varied levels of linguistic proficiency along parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and sentence construction, and likewise had varied levels of reading comprehension along noting details, making inferences, predicting outcomes, sequencing events, comparing and contrasting, drawing generalizations, and summarizing. However, despite these variations in actual scores and qualitative descriptions, there was no significant difference in the linguistic proficiency of English Major students among the different year levels in Polangui Community College, and the null hypothesis was accepted. Similarly, there was no significant difference in the reading comprehension skills of English Major students among the different year levels in Polangui Community College, and the null hypothesis was likewise accepted. Furthermore, there was no significant relationship between the linguistic proficiency and the reading comprehension skills of English Major students in the different year levels in Polangui Community College, and the null hypothesis was accepted. Nevertheless, the findings support the conclusion that skill builder activities in improving the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension level of students can be developed as an appropriate and necessary output of the study.

Given these conclusions, it is recommended that English teachers innovate teaching strategies in teaching language and reading comprehension in order to enhance the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of students. It is also recommended that teachers of language conduct classroom based action research according to the least mastered skills of junior high school students in order to determine the most effective teaching strategy that will enhance linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of students. In addition, language teachers in public schools should exert effort in helping learners, particularly the English Major students, master linguistic proficiency that will enhance their writing skills and prepare them for their future careers. It is further recommended that teachers design a lesson plan appropriate to the students' needs in order to enhance, reinforce, or remediate the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills identified in the study. Teachers should also implement different reading intervention programs to enhance the reading comprehension skills of students so that learners will move towards mastery in reading comprehension. Finally, skill builder activities in the form of a module are recommended as the output of this study so that language teachers can use and integrate them in teaching English and thereby help learners master language and reading comprehension skills.

For future research, it is suggested that subsequent studies determine and find out the factors that affect the linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension skills of the students of Polangui Community College. Future researchers may also determine the level of comprehension skills of the students along other reading comprehension skills not mentioned in this study. Moreover, there is a need to formulate a program for the improvement of the students' linguistic and reading comprehension skills and to determine the effectiveness of these skill builder activities and evaluate their effects on the students and teachers. Overall, the present study underscores the continuing need for responsive instructional interventions, targeted language support, and further scholarly inquiry in order to strengthen both linguistic proficiency and reading comprehension among English major students.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J. C., & Urquhart, A. H. (Eds.). (1984). *Reading in a foreign language*. Longman.
- An, S. (2013). Schema theory in reading. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.1.130-134>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Benson, K. (2014). Preparing learners for extensive reading through reciprocal teaching strategies. *English Australia Journal*, 30(1), 40–56.
- Calderón, M. (2011). *Teaching reading and comprehension to English learners, K-5*. Solution Tree Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Chang, A. C.-S., & Millett, S. (2013). Improving reading rates and comprehension through timed repeated reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 25(2), 126–148.
- Chang, A. C.-S., & Millett, S. (2015). Improving reading rates and comprehension through audio-assisted extensive reading for beginner learners. *System*, 52, 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.05.003>
- Crossley, S. A., Allen, D., & McNamara, D. S. (2012). Text simplification and comprehensible input: A case for an intuitive approach. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(1), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811423456>
- Duffy, G. G. (2009). *Explaining reading: A resource for teaching concepts, skills, and strategies* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Graham, S., & Golan, S. (1991). Motivational influences on cognition: Task involvement, ego involvement, and depth of information processing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(2), 187–194.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Pearson Education.

- Gunning, T. G. (2018). *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Hawkins, M. R. (2004). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 14–25.
- Hedge, T. (1985). *Using readers in language teaching*. Macmillan.
- Jacobs, G. M. (2014). Selecting extensive reading materials. *Beyond Words*, 2(1), 116–131.
- Jacobs, G. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2016). Using positive education to enliven the teaching of reading. *RELC Journal*, 47(2), 256–263.
- Kruskal, W. H. (1952). A nonparametric test for the several sample problem. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(4), 525–540.
- Lado, R. (1961). *Language testing*. McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, J., Schallert, D. L., & Kim, E. (2015). Effects of extensive reading and translation activities on grammar knowledge and attitudes for EFL adolescents. *System*, 52, 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.04.016>
- Oller, J. W. (1976). Language testing. In R. W. Wardhaugh & H. D. Brown (Eds.), *A survey of applied linguistics* (pp. 275–300). University of Michigan Press.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 33–40.
- Rasinski, T. V. (2003). *The fluent reader: Oral reading strategies for building word recognition, fluency, and comprehension*. Scholastic Professional Books.
- Roehling, J. V., Hebert, M., Nelson, J. R., & Bohaty, J. J. (2017). Text structure strategies for improving expository reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(1), 71–82.
- Schunk, D. H. (1981). Modeling and attributional effects of children's achievement: A self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(1), 93–105.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Texas Education Agency. (2002). *Research-based content area reading instruction*. Texas Education Agency.
- Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford University Press.

Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2014). Teaching English to speakers of other languages: The case of the Philippines. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3(3), 64–78.

Wardani, S. (2015). Using speed reading and extensive reading activities to improve students' reading fluency. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 2(3), 219–227.

Watson, J. B. (1924). *Behaviorism*. W. W. Norton & Company.