The Katatau

RESEARCH &
DEVELOPMENT

J O U R N A L

COPYRIGHT PAGE

Publication Frequency: Quarterly

The The Katatau Research and Development Journal is published quarterly, meaning four issues are released each year. This schedule allows for regular sharing of research findings and developments, while providing enough time for peer review and editorial work. By publishing quarterly, the journal ensures a balance between timely updates and high-quality content.

Each issue covers a range of topics, offering valuable research that is both relevant and impactful. The quarterly schedule also gives authors time to improve their work based on feedback, maintaining the journal's credibility and integrity. Overall, this regular publication cycle keeps the academic community updated on the latest research and supports ongoing scholarly growth.

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

The Katatau Research and Development Journal reflects the institution's commitment to fostering cross-disciplinary research and facilitating academic exchange. As a respected publication, it provides a platform for scholars, researchers, and professionals from various fields to share their findings, insights, and innovations. This journal is published by ZAS Digital Institute Training and Development Services (DITADS). The journal focuses on the dissemination of high-quality research spanning a broad array of disciplines, including but not limited to economics, business management, public administration, and other related fields.

The journal serves as a vital resource for advancing knowledge and facilitating dialogue among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. By embracing interdisciplinary research, The Katatau Research and Development Journal aims to address the complex issues of today's global society. It seeks to provide well-rounded solutions and perspectives by integrating ideas from various sectors of knowledge, enabling more holistic approaches to solving contemporary challenges.

Through its rigorous peer-review process and commitment to academic excellence, the Katatau Research and Development Journal aims to contribute significantly to the global research community. The journal offers valuable insights into contemporary challenges and solutions, pushing the boundaries of academic inquiry in its focus areas. By providing a forum for the exchange of diverse ideas and research, it continues to promote innovation, foster intellectual growth, and inspire new thinking across disciplines.

ZAS Digital Institute Training and Development Services (DITADS) is a duly registered entity under Philippine law, demonstrating its commitment to transparency and compliance with the necessary legal frameworks. The organization operates with the following official credentials:

- Business Permit Number: BP-33229
- Certificate Number: 2019-25829
- DTI Certificate of Business Registration No.: 1033992
- Philgeps No.: 201910-17877-1307663177
- NBDB No.: 7515

DITADS is located at R188 Metro Square, Zone 2 Iponan, Cagayan de Oro City. These registrations underscore the legitimacy and compliance of the journal with Philippine business regulations, ensuring full transparency, accountability, and adherence to legal frameworks.

With its well-established credentials and adherence to national and international standards, the Katatau Research and Development Journal stands as a cornerstone for academic excellence, bridging diverse fields of study and facilitating a global exchange of knowledge and ideas.

EDITORS

Dr. Revenio Jalagat, Jr.

Dr. Rene Y. Paquibut

Prof. Abdul Halim Bin Abdul Majid

Dr. Karima Sayari

Prof. Shoeb Ahmad

Dr. Mercia Selva Malar

Dr. Perfecto G. Aquino, Jr.

Dr. Gina Jocson

Dr. Anna Bocar

RATIONALE

The Katatau Research and Development Journal was created to serve as a dynamic and innovative platform that facilitates the exchange of knowledge and ideas across multiple disciplines. In response to the growing demand for interdisciplinary research to tackle complex global challenges, this journal aims to promote collaboration among scholars, researchers, and professionals from diverse academic backgrounds. By providing a venue for high-quality research in fields such as education, health, business, social sciences, and technology, the Katatau Research and Development Journal contributes to the creation of innovative and comprehensive solutions to contemporary issues.

The journal's primary objective is to advance academic dialogue and disseminate cutting-edge research that offers valuable insights to inform policy-making, improve practices, and inspire future research. By encompassing a wide range of topics, from educational development to socioeconomic challenges, the journal reflects the interconnected and multifaceted nature of today's globalized society. Its multidisciplinary approach allows for the examination of issues from various perspectives, helping to develop robust and holistic solutions.

The Katatau Research and Development Journal also plays a vital role in advancing the academic community by providing a platform for emerging scholars and encouraging scholarly engagement across international borders. Through its rigorous peer-review process, the journal ensures that only well-researched, impactful, and scientifically sound articles are published, thereby maintaining its academic integrity and reputation. The journal not only supports researchers but also engages a broader audience, including policymakers and practitioners, by bridging the gap between academic research and real-world application.

Aligned with the vision of ZAS Digital Institute Training and Development Services (DITADS), the Katatau Research and Development Journal aims to make significant contributions to both local and global research communities. It is committed to promoting academic excellence, advancing knowledge, and fostering a deeper understanding of contemporary societal issues worldwide.

This journal stands as a crucial resource for the ongoing development of knowledge and innovation. By serving as an indispensable tool for researchers, academics, and professionals dedicated to creating a positive societal impact, the Katatau Research and Development Journal continues to drive progress and inspire transformative change across disciplines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Correlation Between College Students' Flash Fiction Engagement and Perception of Their Creative Writing Skills

[1]Rufo T. Abriol[*], [1]Apple Mae C. Anino, [1]Maria Fe R. Cayao, [1]Kim Ryan Saludes, [1]Kent Leo Estaura

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.abriol.rufo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explores the correlation between college students' engagement with flash fiction and their perceived creative writing skills, focusing on flexibility and originality. Conducted among second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education students majoring in English at a local community college in Mindanao, Philippines, the research utilized a descriptive-correlational design with total population sampling. Data were collected through a structured survey and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Spearman's correlation. Findings indicated a significant positive relationship between flash fiction engagement and flexibility, while originality showed a modest but significant correlation. In turn, flash fiction engagement was moderately linked to perceived improvements in both dimensions of creative writing. These findings suggest the potential of concise literary forms like flash fiction to foster adaptability and innovative thinking in creative writing education.

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving technological landscape, creativity has become an increasingly valuable skill. The digital revolution, characterized by constant access to information, social media, and multimedia content, requires individuals to think beyond conventional approaches, pushing the boundaries of innovation and self-expression (Özcağlayan & Çelik, 2015). With technology shaping nearly every facet of life, being creative is not only a desired skill but a necessity, enabling people to navigate and contribute to an ever-changing world (Bruno & Canina, 2019). Yet, while the demand for creativity grows, its cultivation is often influenced by both traditional and digital methods, necessitating a deeper understanding of how these mediums can foster creative potential, particularly in younger generations.

Creative writing, a unique form of self-expression through words, plays a significant role in the development of creativity. Defined as the act of using words to convey emotions, ideas, and narratives in a manner that captivates and resonates with readers, creative writing is a foundational skill in many educational systems (Kroll, 2013). For college students, creative writing is not only a mode of artistic expression but also an essential academic skill that enhances cognitive abilities, critical thinking, and communication (Peary, 2012). Cultivating strong creative writing skills at the college level can help students excel academically and professionally, offering them tools for problem-solving and innovation in a world that values original thought (Achilov, 2017).

Flash fiction has been explored in previous studies for its potential to enhance creative writing. For instance, Sinha et al. (2017) stated that micro fiction or flash fiction has been incorporated into a Creative Writing Workshop at the University of Essex to help budding writers develop imaginative and precise writing skills. This approach provides an accessible entry point for students to explore this

emerging genre. Adaptable across universities and disciplines, it can serve as an effective tool for enhancing writing skills and grammatical knowledge in students of all fields. Additionally, an action research study by Flórez (2020) investigates the use of flash fiction to promote literary writing among eleventh-grade students. The findings suggest that engaging with this genre can stimulate creativity and improve writing skills.

While existing research acknowledges the benefits of writing flash fiction, few studies explore the influence of simply engaging with flash fiction as readers or viewers, leaving a gap in understanding how passive engagement with this narrative form might influence creative writing skills. Furthermore, the connection between digital media-driven flash fiction consumption and creative development among college students has not been extensively examined, especially within the Philippine context.

Overall, this study aims to address this gap by examining whether engagement with flash fiction through reading and viewing can enhance college students' creative writing skills. Specifically, the research will explore whether the concise, narrative-driven nature of flash fiction promotes flexibility and originality in students' creative writing skills. By focusing on the potential of passive engagement with flash fiction as a tool for creative skill development, this research seeks to provide insights into innovative educational methods for fostering creativity in the digital age.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to observe existing conditions and examine the relationship between flash fiction engagement and creative writing skills without manipulating variables. It was conducted at Opol Community College during the 2024–2025 academic year and focused on second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students. A total population sampling method was used to include the entire target group for more reliable and unbiased representation. Although there were 62 students enrolled, only 55 voluntarily participated. Data were collected using a researcher-made survey questionnaire developed through the adviser's guidance. The instrument consisted of three sections measured using a 4-point Likert scale, focusing on students' engagement with flash fiction and their levels of flexibility and originality in writing.

Prior to data collection, participants were oriented and informed consent was secured to ensure voluntary participation and ethical compliance. The instrument underwent face and content validation by three experts to confirm clarity and relevance, and pilot testing with 30 non-participant students established reliability using Cronbach's alpha. Data gathering involved distributing the validated questionnaires and checking responses for completeness and consistency. The scoring procedure aligned with the Likert scale to interpret levels of engagement, flexibility, and originality. For data analysis, descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, percentage, and standard deviation) were used to assess engagement and creative writing skills. To determine the relationship between flash fiction engagement and writing abilities, Spearman's correlation was applied due to the non-normal distribution of data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the degree of students' engagement with flash fiction?

Table 1 presents the range, description, frequency, and percentage of the degree of students' engagement with flash fiction. The highest frequency recorded in the table is for the "Strongly Agree" category, with 29 respondents representing 52.73% of the total. This indicates that a significant portion of students found flash fiction to be highly engaging, suggesting that the format might align well with their preferences for brevity, creativity, and the opportunity for critical or imaginative thinking. The high level of strong agreement may also point to the effectiveness of flash fiction in stimulating interest

and fostering positive emotional or intellectual responses. On the other hand, the lowest frequency observed is for the "Strongly Disagree" category, which has no respondents (0%). This absence of strong disagreement signifies that none of the students found flash fiction to be disengaging to an extreme extent. This result could be attributed to the versatility and accessibility of flash fiction as a medium, making it appealing to a broad range of learners. The lack of negative sentiment suggests that flash fiction was generally well-received, with minimal resistance or dissatisfaction among the participants. According to Batchelor and King (2014), flash fiction effectively engages high school students by fostering creativity and improving writing skills through concise and imaginative mentor texts. Similarly, Dipannita (2019) highlights the strong appeal of short, ephemeral stories on platforms like Instagram and Snapchat, noting their spontaneous, visually captivating nature aligns with the fleeting attention spans of digital users.

Table 1. The Degree of Students' Engagement with Flash Fiction

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.26 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	29	52.73
2.51 -3.25	Agree	23	41.82
1.76 -2.50	Disagree	3	5.45
1.00 -1.75	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**55**	**100.00**

Table 1.1 presents the mean, standard deviation, and interpretation of participants' degree of flash fiction engagement. The data show that item 5, **"I appreciate how flash fiction can deliver a complete story quickly, whether I read it or watch it,"** has the highest mean score of 3.44. The brevity and completeness of flash fiction make it a preferred form of storytelling, aligning with students' need for efficient yet meaningful content consumption. Item 8, **"I enjoy engaging with flash fiction because it's available both online and offline, in various formats,"** ranks as the second highest with a mean score of 3.42. The ability to access flash fiction through various platforms, such as social media, websites, and printed collections, makes it convenient for students to explore and enjoy stories in formats that suit their preferences.

Table 1.1. Mean Scores of Students' Engagement with Flash Fiction

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I read flash fiction stories, either online or in print, as a quick way to enjoy storytelling.	3.40	0.56	Highly Engaged
I enjoy coming across flash fiction stories on social media platforms, websites, or in printed collections.	3.36	0.62	Highly Engaged
I follow creators or accounts that post flash fiction stories or videos on social media or streaming sites.	3.07	0.77	Moderately Engaged
I share interesting flash fiction stories I find online or offline with friends and family.	3.00	0.77	Moderately Engaged
I appreciate how flash fiction can deliver a complete story quickly, whether I read it or watch it.	3.44	0.63	Highly Engaged
Flash fiction allows me to enjoy stories without the need to commit to lengthy reads or viewings.	3.38	0.62	Highly Engaged
I look forward to discovering new flash fiction stories that are brief yet impactful, regardless of format.	3.35	0.67	Highly Engaged
I enjoy engaging with flash fiction because it's available both online and offline, in various formats.	3.42	0.60	Highly Engaged
I have joined online groups or forums focused on flash fiction to engage with other enthusiasts.	2.62	0.65	Moderately Engaged
I save or bookmark flash fiction stories that resonate with me for future reading.	3.00	0.72	Moderately Engaged
Overall Mean	**3.20**	**0.46**	**Moderately Engaged**

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Strongly Disagree), 1.76 – 2.50 (Disagree), 2.51 – 3.25 (Agree), 3.26 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Nonetheless, Item 1, **"I read flash fiction stories, either online or in print, as a quick way to enjoy storytelling,"** follows closely with a mean score of 3.40. The concise nature of flash fiction provides students with a quick and enjoyable way to experience storytelling, making it an ideal choice for those seeking brief yet satisfying literary content. On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 9, "I have joined online groups or forums focused on flash fiction to engage with other enthusiasts," with a score of 2.62 and a standard deviation of 0.65. This indicates that participation in online communities or forums dedicated to flash fiction appears to be limited. While students may occasionally take part in such activities, some students prefer engaging with flash fiction individually.

The overall mean of 3.20 with a standard deviation of 0.66 indicates that students demonstrate a moderate level of engagement with flash fiction. This engagement may be due to the format's brevity and accessibility, which make it an appealing and convenient option for quick storytelling experiences. Thomas (2017) explores how the condensed nature of flash fiction allows readers to quickly engage with narratives, offering an intense and immersive experience that is often absent in longer forms of storytelling. Similarly, Allan & Jacobs (2019) highlight the growing popularity of flash fiction in the digital age, attributing its appeal to its brief format, which fits well with modern readers' busy lifestyles and decreasing attention spans.

2. What is the level of students' creative writing skills in terms of flexibility and originality?

Table 2.1. The Level of Students' Creative Writing Skills in terms of Flexibility

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.26 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	16	29.09
2.51 -3.25	Agree	33	60.00
1.76 -2.50	Disagree	6	10.91
1.00 -1.75	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**55**	**100.00**

Table 2.1. presents the range, description, frequency, and percentage of the level of students' creative writing skills in terms of flexibility. The highest frequency recorded is in the "Agree" category, with 33 respondents, representing 60% of the total. This indicates that a majority of students feel that flash fiction positively influences their flexibility in creative writing, allowing them to adapt and explore various writing styles or approaches effectively. The high percentage suggests that students recognize flash fiction as a valuable tool for enhancing their adaptability and creativity. In contrast, the lowest frequency is in the "Strongly Disagree" category, with no respondents (0%). This absence highlights a universal acknowledgment of flash fiction's positive influence, suggesting that it effectively fosters adaptability and versatility in students' creative writing skills without eliciting any negative perceptions. According to Asrofi (2023), the integration of flash fiction techniques significantly enhances students' writing abilities, demonstrating the genre's adaptability and versatility in fostering creative expression. Similarly, Batchelor and King (2014) emphasize that engaging with flash fiction not only cultivates writing skills but also encourages students to explore various narrative forms, underscoring its capacity to adapt to diverse educational contexts.

Table 2.1.1. presents the mean, standard deviation, and interpretation of the students' level of creative writing in terms of flexibility. The data indicates that item 2, **"Reading and watching flash fiction has improved my ability to adjust my writing style based on the story I want to tell,"** has the highest mean score of 3.16 with a standard deviation of 0.60. This shows that flash fiction's concise and varied storytelling provides students with practical examples and techniques, helping them develop skills to modify their writing to align with different story requirements. Item 8, **"I find myself able to adjust my writing to meet the needs of different audiences, inspired by flash fiction's adaptability,"** has a mean score of 3.09 with a standard deviation of 0.62. This demonstrates that flash fiction's versatility in tone, style, and themes exposes students to adaptable writing approaches, encouraging them to

consider audience needs and tailor their work accordingly. audience responses. Item 9, **"Flash fiction has helped me become more versatile, adjusting my narrative style quickly when needed,"** has a mean score of 3.07 with a standard deviation of 0.60. This shows that the fast-paced and dynamic nature of flash fiction fosters in students the ability to make swift adjustments, building flexibility and adaptability in creative writing.

Table 2.1.1. Mean Scores of Students' Creative Writing Skills in Terms of Flexibility

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can easily adapt my writing style to different genres and audiences thanks to my exposure to flash fiction.	3.05	0.62	Moderately Flexible
Reading and watching flash fiction has improved my ability to adjust my writing style based on the story I want to tell.	3.16	0.60	Moderately Flexible
I feel confident in changing my writing tone and approach depending on the subject, due to my experience with flash fiction.	3.04	0.61	Moderately Flexible
I find it easy to shift between formal and informal writing styles, inspired by the variety I see in flash fiction.	3.02	0.71	Moderately Flexible
Exposure to diverse flash fiction has made me comfortable adapting my voice and style to fit different story types.	3.04	0.64	Moderately Flexible
I am more open to experimenting with different perspectives or styles in my writing thanks to flash fiction.	3.05	0.62	Moderately Flexible
I am prepared to respond to different writing challenges because flash fiction has taught me flexibility in storytelling.	2.89	0.66	Moderately Flexible
I find myself able to adjust my writing to meet the needs of different audiences, inspired by flash fiction's adaptability.	3.09	0.62	Moderately Flexible
Flash fiction has helped me become more versatile, adjusting my narrative style quickly when needed.	3.07	0.60	Moderately Flexible
I am able to switch between multiple perspectives in my writing, influenced by flash fiction's varied narratives.	2.91	0.62	Moderately Flexible
Overall Mean	**3.03**	**0.49**	**Moderately Flexible**

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Strongly Disagree), 1.76 – 2.50 (Disagree), 2.51 – 3.25 (Agree), 3.26 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Conversely, item 7, "I am prepared to respond to different writing challenges because flash fiction has taught me flexibility in storytelling," has the lowest mean score of 2.89 with a standard deviation of 0.66. This indicates that students feel less confident in their ability to apply the flexibility learned from flash fiction to a wide range of writing challenges. While flash fiction fosters adaptability in storytelling, students do not view it as directly preparing them for more complex or varied writing demands. The overall mean of 3.03 with a standard deviation of 0.49 indicates that students demonstrate moderate flexibility in their creative writing, influenced by their engagement with flash fiction. This flexibility may stem from the concise and adaptable structure of flash fiction, which challenges students to experiment with diverse styles and ideas within a limited space. According to Munir and Hendaryan (2023), incorporating flash fiction into creative writing programs allows students to engage creatively within concise structures, promoting diverse expression. Similarly, Lemerond and Saul (2019) observed that integrating flash fiction in multimodal courses helps students navigate various narrative styles and adapt to different creative demands.

Table 2.2. The Level of Students' Creative Writing Skills in Terms of Originality

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.26 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	18	32.73
2.51 -3.25	Agree	34	61.82
1.76 -2.50	Disagree	3	5.45
1.00 -1.75	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**55**	**100.00**

Table 2.2. presents the range, description, frequency, and percentage of the level of students' creative writing skills in terms of originality. The highest frequency is in the "Agree" category, with 34 respondents, representing 61.82% of the total. This majority indicates that most students view flash fiction as a significant tool in enhancing their originality. Its concise and imaginative nature likely provides students with opportunities to think creatively and explore unique ideas. The lowest frequency is in the "Strongly Disagree" category, with no respondents recorded, accounting for 0%. This complete absence of strong disagreement indicates that students universally reject the notion that flash fiction negatively impacts their originality. Such unanimity highlights the perception of flash fiction as a supportive and constructive tool for fostering creativity, further affirming its value in enhancing students' originality in writing. Ciolfi and Lockley (2017) highlight how flash fiction encourages creative thinking by allowing participants to explore unique scenarios and generate new ideas. Similarly, Rodríguez and Salvador (2021) emphasize flash fiction's effectiveness in fostering imaginative writing skills through engaging and concise literary formats.

Table 2.2.1. below presents the mean, standard deviation, and interpretation of the students' level of creative writing skills in terms of originality. The data indicates that item 2, **"Reading and watching flash fiction encourages me to think outside the box and create original storylines,"** has the highest mean score of 3.24 with a standard deviation of 0.61. This shows that flash fiction's unconventional style allows students to explore innovative ideas and create storylines that stand out for their originality. Item 1, **"I find that exposure to flash fiction has helped me develop unique writing styles that resonate with different genres and audiences,"** has the second highest mean score of 3.20 with a standard deviation of 0.56. This indicates that by engaging with the diverse nature of flash fiction, students develop the capacity to tailor their creative expression to different audiences and genres, showing adaptability and originality in their work.

Table 2.2.1. Mean Scores of Students' Creative Writing Skills in Terms of Originality

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I find that exposure to flash fiction has helped me develop unique writing styles that resonate with different genres and audiences.	3.20	0.56	Moderately Original
Reading and watching flash fiction encourages me to think outside the box and create original storylines.	3.24	0.61	Moderately Original
Flash fiction nurtures my creativity and helps me break away from traditional writing norms.	3.11	0.57	Moderately Original
I am more open to experimenting with different perspectives or styles in my writing thanks to flash fiction.	3.18	0.51	Moderately Original
I find it easier to come up with fresh, imaginative ideas after reading unique flash fiction pieces.	3.13	0.64	Moderately Original
I attribute my ability to craft unique twists and surprises in stories to my experience with flash fiction.	3.16	0.57	Moderately Original
Reading flash fiction has inspired me to take risks and innovate in my storytelling style.	3.09	0.62	Moderately Original
Flash fiction has given me the confidence to create unique and original storytelling formats.	3.07	0.57	Moderately Original
Flash fiction encourages me to invent characters that are unique in personality and backstory despite limited space.	3.04	0.64	Moderately Original
Flash fiction inspires me to explore genres or styles I would not have considered otherwise, sparking originality.	3.16	0.57	Moderately Original
Overall Mean	**3.14**	**0.46**	**Moderately Original**

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Strongly Disagree), 1.76 – 2.50 (Disagree), 2.51 – 3.25 (Agree), 3.26 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Conversely, the lowest mean score is from item 9, "Flash fiction encourages me to invent characters that are unique in personality and backstory despite limited space," with a mean score of 3.04 with a standard deviation of 0.64. This shows that students may find it somewhat challenging to fully develop

characters' personalities and backstories within the constraints of flash fiction's limited word counts. The overall mean of 3.14 with a standard deviation of 0.46 indicates that students demonstrate moderate originality in their creative writing skills through engagement with flash fiction. This level of originality may be influenced by the concise and focused nature of flash fiction, which encourages students to develop unique and creative expressions within a limited framework. Wulandari (2017) highlighted the effectiveness of flash fiction in enhancing ESL students' reading and writing skills, using its brevity and authentic content to foster critical thinking and creativity. Similarly, Rodríguez and Salvador (2021) found that flash fiction workshops align with students' digital-age preferences, boosting creativity and engagement through concise literary forms.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the degree of flash fiction engagement and the students' creative writing skills?

Table 3. Test of Statistical Relationship Between the Degree of Flash Fiction Engagement and the Students' Creative Writing Skills

	df	Spearman rho	p-value
Constant			
FLEXIBILITY	53	0.478***	<0.001
ORIGINALITY	53	0.299*	<0.027
OVERALL CREATIVE WRITING	53	0.403**	<0.002

*Note: * p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001*

Table 4 provides results from a Spearman rank correlation analysis, which measures the strength and direction of monotonic relationships between a constant variable and three predictors: flexibility, originality, and overall creative writing. The use of Spearman's rho suggests that at least one of the variables violated the assumption of normality, making this non-parametric approach appropriate. Each variable's correlation coefficient (rho), degrees of freedom (df), and p-value are reported, providing a comprehensive understanding of the relationships.

The relationship between flash fiction and flexibility demonstrates a significant positive correlation (rho = 0.478, p < 0.001). This indicates that flash fiction engagement is strongly associated with increased flexibility in creative writing. Flash fiction requires writers to condense complex narratives into a very limited word count, compelling them to adapt and innovate within constraints. This likely cultivates flexibility, as writers must shift seamlessly between ideas, perspectives, and narrative elements to create a cohesive and engaging story in a short space. Roche-Jacques (2024) emphasizes flexibility in flash fiction, enabling creative manipulation of time, space, and narrative within constraints, fostering innovative storytelling. Ciolfi and Lockley (2019) similarly highlight its role in driving narrative innovation and interpretative creativity, empowering writers to craft impactful and original ideas.

Regarding originality, flash fiction shows a positive but more modest correlation (rho = 0.299, p < 0.027). While the constrained format may impose some limitations on the extent of originality, the findings highlight that engaging with flash fiction still promotes innovative thinking. The necessity to navigate creative storytelling within a concise framework encourages writers to find unique ways to present their ideas. This balance between format constraints and originality underscores flash fiction's effectiveness in fostering creative expression while maintaining clarity and impact. Hoggan and Cranton (2015) assert that reading fiction supports transformative learning by encouraging critical reflection and new perspectives, enhancing creativity. Wulandari (2017) adds that flash fiction's concise and authentic form promotes creativity and critical thinking, especially among ESL students.

Meanwhile, the correlation between flash fiction and overall creative writing skills, encompassing flexibility and originality, is positive and moderate (rho = 0.403, p < 0.002). This indicates that engaging in flash fiction helps develop these skills in a complementary manner. The demanding nature

of flash fiction requires concise storytelling, adaptability, and innovative thinking, which together enhance overall creative ability. The recognition of flash fiction's positive impact among respondents further highlights its effectiveness as a tool for cultivating adaptability, originality, and overall creative writing proficiency. A study by Al-Sharqi and Abbasi (2015) highlights how flash fiction fosters a unique writer-reader partnership by encouraging active interpretation and collaborative storytelling, enriching the creative writing process. Similarly, Tarrayo (2019) emphasizes its effectiveness as an educational tool, offering a non-intimidating yet challenging medium to enhance students' creative reading and writing skills,

In sum, engaging in flash fiction demonstrates a strong positive impact on flexibility and a modest yet significant effect on originality, enhancing overall creative writing skills. The concise and constrained format challenges writers to adapt and innovate, fostering flexibility as they navigate shifting ideas, perspectives, and structures. While the brevity of flash fiction may slightly limit originality, it still encourages unique approaches to storytelling within its framework. The moderate correlation between flash fiction and overall creative writing highlights its effectiveness in fostering adaptability and creativity, making it a valuable approach for developing these complementary skills.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Engagement with flash fiction significantly enhances students' creative writing skills, particularly in terms of flexibility and originality. The findings indicate that students who interact with this concise literary form develop the ability to adapt their writing styles and craft imaginative narratives within limited constraints. This supports Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1977), which emphasizes observation and social influence in learning. Flash fiction offers clear and engaging models of creative expression that students can observe, interpret, and internalize. Through this process, learners acquire narrative techniques and expressive vocabulary that strengthen their storytelling. As they apply these strategies, they develop confidence and adaptability, illustrating how cognitive engagement and observation contribute to improvements in creative writing.

Based on these conclusions, several recommendations are set forth. Students should regularly engage with flash fiction to further develop their creative writing skills, particularly in flexibility and originality. Teachers are encouraged to incorporate flash fiction into classroom instruction as a means of inspiring creativity and refining students' writing styles. Administrators can support these efforts by providing resources such as workshops, competitions, and access to flash fiction materials. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to investigate the long-term effects of flash fiction engagement on writing development to better understand how sustained exposure influences creativity and skill progression.

REFERENCES

Achilov, O. R. (2017). Improving students' critical thinking through creative writing tasks. *International Scientific and Practical Conference.* https://www.academia.edu/download/57924156/19-23.pdf

Allan, J., & Jacobs, M. (2019). *"Digital Literature: Short Stories for Short Attention Spans."* Media and Culture Review, 12(2), 234-250.

Al-Sharqi, L., & Abbasi, I. (2015). Flash Fiction: A Unique Writer-Reader Partnership. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11, 52-56. https://doi.org/10.3968/N.

Asrofi, A. (2023). Modified idea listing technique with flash card to increase students' writing ability towards efl learners. International Journal Corner of Educational Research, 2(3), 133-139. https://doi.org/10.54012/ijcer.v2i3.243

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Prentice-Hall.

Batchelor, K. and King, A. (2014). *Freshmen and five hundred words. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58(2)*, 111-121. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.324

Bruno, C., & Canina, M. (2019). Creativity 4.0: Empowering the creative process for digitally enhanced people. *The Design Journal, 22*(1), 1595-1606. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14606925.2019.1594935

Ciolfi, L., & Lockley, E. (2019). Exploring flash fiction for the collaborative interpretation of qualitative data. *ECSCW Exploratory Papers*. https://doi.org/10.18420/ECSCW2019_EP03

Dipannita, D. (2019). Digital Storytelling Trends: Story in different forms will shape the future of communication. *Journal of emerging technologies and innovative research*.

Flórez, E. (2020). The use of flash fiction stories as a strategy to encourage literary writing in eleventh-grade students at Instituto Técnico Patios Centro 2: An action research study. Retrieved from: http://repositoriodspace.unipamplona.edu.co/jspui/bitstream/ 20.500.12744/6960/1/Fl%C3%B3rez_2020_TG.pdf

Hoggan, C., & Cranton, P. (2015). Promoting Transformative Learning Through Reading Fiction. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 13, 25 - 6. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344614561864.

Kroll, J. (2013). *Creative writing and education*. In A Companion to Creative Writing (pp. 261-275). Wiley. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118325759.ch16

Lemerond, B., & Saul. (2019). Creative writing across mediums and modes: A pedagogical model. *Journal of Creative Writing Studies, 4*(1).

Munir, S., & Hendaryan. (2023). The effectiveness of the short story writing program in developing students' creative writing skills. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*.

Özcağlayan, M., & Çelik, R. (2015). Self-expression, exposition, and surveillance in social media. *Journal of Media Critiques*. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=497029

Peary, A. (2012). Spectators at their own future: Creative writing assignments in the disciplines and the fostering of critical thinking. *The WAC Journal, 23*, 66-78. https://wac.colostate.edu/journal/vol23/vol23.pdf#page=66

Roche-Jacques, S. (2024). Flash fiction as a distinct literary form: Some thoughts on time, space, and context. *New Writing, 21*(2), 171-189. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2023.2293767

Rodríguez, J., & Salvador, M. (2021). Creative writing in the classroom: On Twitter, aphorisms, flash fiction and haiku. *The Educational Review, USA*.

Sinha, A., Shah, T., & Gomes, P. (2017). A critical look at the genre of microfiction and its place in English literature of the future. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380166156_A_Critical_Look_At_The_Genre_Of_Micro_Fiction_And_Its_Place_In_English_Literature_Of_The_Future

Tarrayo V. (2018). Beauty In Brevity: Capturing The Narrative Structure Of Flash Fiction By Filipino Writers. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 36-56. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1185412.pdf

Thomas, B. (2017). Microfiction and the Art of Economy in Narrative. *Journal of Literary Studies, 33*(4), 495-512. https://scispace.com/pdf/storytelling-in-miniature-microfiction-and-reader-2ttka9ltma.pdf

Wulandari, D. (2017). Using flash fiction to promote ESL students' reading and writing achievement. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 153-162. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p153.

Prosodic Features and English-Speaking Skills Among Second-Year Bachelor of Secondary Education Major in English Students

[1]Jino A. Alexander[*], [1]Margie L. Magallanes, [1]Jenny Ann P. Obial, [1]Zai Kaye C. Vacalares, [1]Kent Leo Estaura

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.alexander.jino@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Effective communication in English hinges on more than just vocabulary and grammar; it is deeply influenced by prosodic features such as pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm. This study explores how these elements correlate with speaking proficiency among second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) Major in English students. Employing a predictive correlational research design, the study examined the relationships between prosodic features and key speaking competencies, including fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The results reveal that while overall prosodic features do not significantly correlate with speaking skills, pitch and intonation show positive associations with fluency and pronunciation. Specifically, pitch was linked to smoother, more dynamic speech, while intonation contributed to effective communication and expressiveness. Despite these findings, stress and rhythm were not found to have a significant impact. These results suggest that instructors should prioritize teaching pitch and intonation to enhance speaking proficiency, while further attention is needed for developing stress and rhythm skills. Ultimately, the study emphasizes the importance of integrating prosodic training in language curricula to foster more fluent and articulate English speakers.

INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized world, proficiency in English is not only a valuable skill but a necessary asset, especially for future educators. Among English language skills, speaking ability is often emphasized as it enables effective communication in both academic and professional settings. For second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students, who are training to become future teachers, mastering the nuances of spoken English is critical. However, speaking skills involve more than just vocabulary and grammar; they also rely heavily on prosodic features—such as pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm—which shape how messages are perceived and interpreted.

Prosodic features are essential for achieving clarity, conveying emotions, and engaging listeners. These elements contribute to the natural flow of speech and help speakers emphasize key points or express subtle meanings. Yet, many languages learners struggle with incorporating prosodic features, often resulting in speech that lacks the natural rhythm and expressiveness found in fluent speakers. Understanding the role of prosody in developing English speaking skills can offer valuable insights for improving communicative competence among BSED students, ensuring they are better equipped to teach and interact in English-dominated environments. This study explored the impact of prosodic features on the speaking skills of second-year BSED students, highlighting both the challenges and potential strategies for enhancing fluency and effectiveness in their spoken English.

The Communicative Language Approach (CLA) in English as a Second Language (ESL) education emphasizes the significance of interaction in language learning, facilitating essential speaking skills such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and fluency. Vocabulary acquisition is enhanced through meaningful communication and authentic interactions, where learners engage in tasks like role-plays and discussions that promote contextual understanding (Huang et al., 2022; Prados et al., 2021).

In this approach, grammar is taught implicitly, allowing students to internalize rules naturally. Mulyani (2019) and Topal (2019) emphasized that pronunciation should be taught through interactive activities that mimic real-life conversations, focusing on intelligibility rather than perfection. This is supported by Murphy et al. (2019), who highlight the importance of real-world speaking contexts. Fluency is a primary goal of the CLA, developed through extensive speaking practice in low-stakes environments that encourage quick thinking and response, as cited in Huang et al. (2022) and Prados et al. (2021).

By integrating these elements into interactive and meaningful communication, the CLA equips learners with the tools necessary for effective language use in diverse contexts, ultimately preparing them for real-world communication challenges. Alexander Henn (2024), notes that prosodic is about how we use stress, pitch, rhythm, and intonation when we talk. It is a key to how well we communicate. These features help show emotions, sarcasm, and emphasis when we speak. Prosody also helps us express ambiguity and focus, and shows where sentences start and end. It covers things like facial expressions, volume, pauses, and speech flow, which all help us understand the speaker's feelings and intentions. It also affects accents and speech sounds, impacting how our voice sounds.

This study examined the correlation between prosodic features and English-speaking skills among second-year BSED students. It determined that existing research accurately reflected the impact of these features on English-speaking skills among students. By exploring the influence of intonation, rhythm, stress, and pitch on speaking competence, this study addressed critical gaps in current literature and offered practical insights for improving language instruction and student interactions.

Therefore, this research aimed to clarify whether prosodic elements, traditionally considered important in speaking, truly affect students' ability to communicate effectively and whether existing studies provide a comprehensive view of this relationship. The relevance of this study was evident in its potential to enhance the understanding of how prosodic features impact English-speaking skills, particularly among second-year BSED students. Through investigating how aspects such as intonation, rhythm, stress, and pitch influence English-speaking skills, the study aimed to understand if these elements significantly affected how well students could express themselves and be understood.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a predictive correlational research design to examine the relationship between prosodic features and English-speaking skills among second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) Major in English students at Opol Community College, Misamis Oriental, during the academic year 2024–2025. A total of 40 students were selected using quota sampling through the fishbowl method to ensure fairness and representation. Prior to data collection, a pilot test involving 30 third-year BSEd-English students was conducted to test the reliability and validity of the instruments.

Data were gathered using a 5-point Likert-scale evaluation covering two areas: prosodic features (pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm) and English-speaking skills (fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation). The instruments were validated by three specialists in Education and Research from Opol Community College and Opol National Secondary Technical School. Ethical procedures were strictly followed, including approval from the research adviser, completion of the ethics application form, and obtaining informed consent from participants.

For data analysis, descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to summarize the participants' performance levels, while Pearson correlation analysis determined the relationship between prosodic features and English-speaking skills. These statistical tools provided insights into the extent to which control of prosodic elements influences students' overall speaking proficiency.

RESULT and DISCUSSION

1. What is the level of participants' mastery in prosodic features, specifically in terms of pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm?

Table 1. The Level of Participants' Mastery in Prosodic Features in terms of Pitch

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	6	15.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	34	85.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	0	0.0
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 1 focuses on participants' mastery of pitch, a crucial prosodic feature that impacts meaning and clarity in spoken language. The results revealed that 34 (85%) of the participants scored within the acceptable range (1.8–2.6) (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Brazil, 1997; Derwing & Munro, 2015). This means that the majority can control pitch variations at a functional level, allowing for basic intelligibility in communication. According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), pitch variation is integral to signaling emotions, indicating grammatical boundaries, and conveying the speaker's intent. For learners, achieving an acceptable level often reflects foundational competence but highlights the need for further refinement to enhance clarity and naturalness (Derwing & Munro, 2015; Gilbert, 2008).

Meanwhile, 6 (15%) of participants demonstrated a good mastery of pitch (2.7–3.5) (Brazil, 1997; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). This indicates a stronger command of pitch variation, which Brazil (1997) associates with increased confidence in communication. Learners who achieve a "good" level are often able to use pitch effectively to emphasize key words, signal questions or statements, and improve speech fluidity. This skill is especially important for non-native speakers, as improper pitch control can hinder listener comprehension and reduce communicative effectiveness (Derwing & Munro, 2015; Gilbert, 2008).

Interestingly, no participants scored in the very poor (0.0–0.8), poor (0.9–1.7), or very good (3.6–5.0) ranges (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Brazil, 1997; Derwing & Munro, 2015). The absence of scores in the very low categories suggests that learners have avoided significant pitch-related issues, such as monotone delivery or inability to adjust intonation (Gilbert, 2008; Derwing & Munro, 2015). However, the lack of very good scores also indicates a gap in advanced prosodic skills. This is consistent with findings by Gilbert (2008), who argues that exceptional pitch mastery requires deliberate exposure to native-like intonation patterns and consistent pronunciation practice. Learners often need guided training, such as focused listening exercises, shadowing techniques, and feedback, to progress beyond basic competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Gilbert, 2008).

The mean score of 3.26 and standard deviation of 0.31 further contextualize these findings. The mean indicates that the average participant's mastery of pitch falls within the "good" range, reflecting an overall promising level of competence among the group (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing & Munro, 2015). However, the relatively small standard deviation highlights limited variability in scores, suggesting that participants' mastery levels are clustered closely around the mean. This homogeneity may indicate shared instructional methods or similar levels of exposure to pitch training across the group (Brazil, 1997; Gilbert, 2008).

The results are both encouraging and indicative of specific areas requiring targeted intervention. The high percentage of participants in the acceptable range underscores a foundational competence that is likely the result of structured instructional practices. However, the lack of participants achieving very good scores suggests a plateau in skill development that may stem from insufficient exposure to advanced pitch training techniques or authentic language use. The findings suggest the potential value of integrating advanced prosodic training into English curricula. Approaches may include exposure to native speaker models, use of pitch visualization tools, and engagement in real-world communication scenarios, which could help learners improve their communicative competence.

The majority of participants (85%) demonstrated an acceptable level of pitch mastery, while a smaller group (15%) achieved a good level. No participants exhibited very poor or very good levels, suggesting that while foundational skills are present, advanced mastery remains elusive. The mean score of 3.26 and standard deviation of 0.31 indicate an overall promising level of competence with limited variability among participants. These findings align with research that emphasizes the importance of targeted practice and native-like exposure to develop higher levels of prosodic competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Brazil, 1997; Derwing & Munro, 2015; Gilbert, 2008).

Table 2. The Level of Participants' Mastery in Prosodic Features in terms of Stress

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	14	35.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	26	65.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	0	0.0
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 2 evaluates participants' mastery of stress, another key prosodic feature critical for rhythm, emphasis, and overall intelligibility in speech. The results showed that 26 (65%) of the participants achieved an acceptable level of mastery (1.8–2.6) (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008). This indicates that a majority of learners can apply basic stress patterns, such as correctly emphasizing content words in sentences and using word stress to distinguish between nouns and verbs (e.g., record vs. record) (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Gilbert, 2008). According to Ladefoged and Johnson (2014), proper stress application significantly impacts listener comprehension, as misplaced stress can distort meaning and reduce fluency (Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008).

In contrast, 14 (35%) of participants reached a good mastery level (2.7–3.5) (Jenkins, 2000; Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014). This reflects an improved understanding of stress-timed rhythm and the ability to emphasize key syllables naturally. Jenkins (2000) highlights that learners who master stress demonstrate improved fluency, clearer speech, and better overall communicative performance (Gilbert, 2008; Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014). Achieving a good level of stress mastery often requires learners to practice chunking speech into rhythmic units and focus on syllable timing, which enhances the natural flow of spoken language (Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008).

Notably, no participants scored in the very poor (0.0–0.8), poor (0.9–1.7), or very good (3.6–5.0) categories (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008). While the absence of very poor and poor scores suggests that learners have avoided critical weaknesses in stress application, the lack of very good scores points to a ceiling in their proficiency (Gilbert, 2008; Jenkins, 2000). As Gilbert (2008) explains, achieving native-like stress mastery requires consistent practice and specific training. Learners often benefit from activities such as mimicking stress-timed patterns in authentic speech, practicing with minimal pairs (e.g., desert vs. dessert), and receiving targeted feedback on rhythm and timing (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Gilbert, 2008; Jenkins, 2000).

The mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 0.35 provide additional insights into the group's performance. The mean suggests that, on average, participants are performing at the "good" level, reflecting promising competence in stress application (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008). The standard deviation indicates moderate variability in scores, implying some diversity in learners' mastery levels (Gilbert, 2008; Jenkins, 2000). This variation may reflect differences in individual exposure, practice, or instructional methods (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Jenkins, 2000).

As researchers, it is observed that these findings illustrate a positive trajectory in learners' acquisition of stress patterns, yet they highlight a gap in achieving advanced proficiency. The predominance of scores in the acceptable range signifies foundational competence, likely due to structured instruction and practice. However, the absence of very good scores underscores a need for targeted interventions to facilitate advanced mastery. Incorporating native speaker models, rhythm-based activities, and minimal pair drills into instructional programs could help learners refine their stress application further (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Gilbert, 2008; Jenkins, 2000). Additionally, tailored feedback and individual practice sessions may address the variability observed in the standard deviation.

A significant portion of participants (65%) achieved an acceptable level of stress mastery, while 35% demonstrated a good level. Similar to the findings in Table 1, no participants scored in the very poor or very good ranges, indicating moderate competence but a lack of advanced proficiency. The mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 0.35 highlight promising overall performance with some variability among learners. These findings underscore the importance of explicit training and repeated practice to help learners progress toward higher levels of stress mastery (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Jenkins, 2000; Gilbert, 2008).

Table 3. The Level of Participants' Mastery in Prosodic Features in terms of Intonation

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	1	0.25
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	30	75.0
2.7-3.5	Good	9	22.5
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100**

Table 3 presents the level of participants' mastery in prosodic features, focusing on intonation. The results revealed that the majority of participants, 30 (75%), achieved an "Acceptable" level of intonation mastery (Alexander Henn, 2024; Huang et al., 2022; Prados et al., 2021). This is followed by 9 participants (22.5%) who demonstrated a "Good" level of mastery, and 1 participant (2.5%) who fell under the "Poor" category (Hamad & Alnuzaili, 2022; Mulyani, 2019; Moreno, 2024). Notably, no participants were classified as "Very Poor" or "Very Good" (Alexander Henn, 2024; Prados et al., 2021).

The predominance of participants in the "Acceptable" category suggests a moderate understanding of intonation, reflecting a baseline competence in this prosodic feature (Huang et al., 2022; Moreno, 2024). Research emphasizes that intonation is critical for conveying emotions, expressing emphasis, and ensuring clarity in spoken communication (Alexander Henn, 2024; Prados et al., 2021). However, the absence of participants at the "Very Good" level indicates a need for advanced practice to achieve mastery, as highlighted in studies emphasizing the role of interactive speaking exercises and real-world application (Hamad & Alnuzaili, 2022; Mulyani, 2019).

The mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 0.36 provide additional insights into the group's performance (Huang et al., 2022; Moreno, 2024). The mean suggests that the average participant's intonation mastery is within the "Good" range, indicating a relatively strong level of competence across

the group (Prados et al., 2021; Hamad & Alnuzaili, 2022). However, the moderate standard deviation highlights some variability in scores, reflecting differences in participants' exposure to or practice with intonation (Mulyani, 2019; Alexander Henn, 2024). This variation suggests room for tailored instructional interventions to address individual needs and bridge gaps in proficiency (Huang et al., 2022; Prados et al., 2021).

Based on the results, the findings are encouraging but indicative of specific gaps that need to be addressed. While the majority of participants exhibit a functional understanding of intonation, the lack of "Very Good" scores points to limitations in achieving advanced proficiency. To bridge this gap, we recommend implementing structured and engaging activities such as role-playing, podcasts, and simulations (Hamad & Alnuzaili, 2022; Moreno, 2024). These activities can enhance real-world application and develop a more nuanced understanding of intonation. Additionally, integrating prosodic training in rhythm, stress, and pitch alongside intonation-focused exercises may promote more dynamic and effective communication (Mulyani, 2019; Huang et al., 2022).

The results show that 75% of participants achieved an "Acceptable" level of intonation mastery, while 22.5% demonstrated a "Good" level. Only 2.5% fell into the "Poor" category, with no participants scoring in the "Very Poor" or "Very Good" ranges. The mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 0.36 highlight a generally strong performance with some variability among learners. These findings highlight the importance of tailored strategies and meaningful practice opportunities to improve intonation skills from "Acceptable" to higher levels of mastery (Alexander Henn, 2024; Hamad & Alnuzaili, 2022; Prados et al., 2021).

Table 4. The Level of Participants' Mastery in Prosodic Features in terms of Rhythm

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	10	25.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	30	75.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	0	0.0
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 4 presents the level of participants' mastery in prosodic features, focusing on rhythm. The results showed that the majority of participants, 30 (75%), achieved an "Acceptable" level of mastery, while 10 participants (25%) reached the "Good" level. Notably, no participants were classified as "Very Poor," "Poor," or "Very Good" (Goldsmith, 1976; Leben, 2018; Nencheva et al., 2020).

The high percentage of participants in the "Acceptable" category suggests that while most have a functional understanding of rhythm in their speech, their proficiency remains at a moderate level. Rhythm is an essential prosodic feature that contributes to the natural flow and comprehensibility of speech. It helps organize spoken language by distinguishing stressed and unstressed syllables, which enhances listener engagement and comprehension (Goldsmith, 1976; Leben, 2018). However, the absence of participants in the "Very Good" category indicates a gap in achieving advanced rhythmic proficiency, possibly due to limited practice or exposure to real-life speaking opportunities (Nencheva et al., 2020; Hallam & Himonides, 2021).

The mean score of 3.26 and standard deviation of 0.34 provide further insights into participants' performance. The mean indicates that the group average falls within the "Good" range, reflecting a promising level of rhythmic mastery. However, the relatively low standard deviation suggests limited variability in scores, with most participants performing close to the average. This clustering of scores indicates that learners likely share similar levels of exposure or instructional experiences related to rhythm (Algethami & Hellmuth, 2023; Muhedeen, 2023).

Rhythm is a critical yet often under emphasized component of prosodic training, as observed in the course of the study. The results suggest that while most participants demonstrate a foundational understanding of rhythm, advanced proficiency is rare. To address this gap, we recommend incorporating educational strategies such as guided speaking exercises, music-based activities, and rhythm-focused tasks into teaching methods (Nencheva et al., 2020; Hallam & Himonides, 2021). These strategies have been shown to enhance fluency and accuracy in second language learners, providing a foundation for advanced communication skills (Algethami & Hellmuth, 2023; Muhedeen, 2023)

The results showed that 75% of participants achieved an "Acceptable" level of rhythmic mastery, while 25% demonstrated a "Good" level. No participants scored in the "Very Poor," "Poor," or "Very Good" categories. The mean score of 3.26 and standard deviation of 0.34 highlight a generally strong performance with limited variability among learners. These findings underscore the importance of integrating rhythmic awareness into language instruction through innovative teaching approaches to bridge the gap between baseline competence and advanced proficiency (Goldsmith, 1976; Leben, 2018; Nencheva et al., 2020).

1. What is the level of participants' mastery in English speaking skills in terms of: Fluency, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Pronunciation?

Table 5. The Level of Participants' Mastery in English Speaking Skills in terms of Fluency

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	6	15.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	25	62.5
0.9-1.7	Poor	9	22.5
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 5 presents the level of participants' mastery in English speaking skills, specifically focusing on fluency. The results showed that the majority of participants, 25 (62.5%), achieved the "Acceptable" level of fluency. This indicates that while these participants can engage in basic conversations and express themselves clearly in everyday situations, they may still struggle with more complex speech tasks. For example, they might find it challenging to discuss abstract ideas or maintain fluency in longer, more technical conversations (Brown, 2004; Richards, 2015; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010).

Following this group, 9 participants (22.5%) are classified under the "Poor" level, suggesting that their fluency is limited. These participants may face difficulties with pronunciation, maintaining a consistent pace, and using appropriate vocabulary in conversations (Derwing & Munro, 2015; Ladefoged & Johnson, 2014; Burns & Seidlhofer, 2018). As a result, they may experience frequent pauses, hesitations, or struggle to form grammatically correct sentences, which can hinder their ability to communicate effectively (Gilbert, 2008; Jenkins, 2000).

Additionally, 6 participants (15%) demonstrated a "Good" level of fluency. These participants can speak confidently, using appropriate vocabulary and grammar with minimal hesitation. They are capable of engaging in more advanced conversations and expressing their ideas fluidly, showing a higher level of comfort and proficiency in English (Thornbury, 2005; Hughes, 2013; Algethami & Hellmuth, 2023). However, it is worth noting that no participants scored in the "Very Poor" (scale 1) or "Very Good" (scale 5) categories, suggesting there is room for improvement for all participants, with no extreme cases of either very high or very low fluency (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Nation, 2007).

The mean score of 2.93 and standard deviation of 0.51 further contextualize these findings. The mean indicates that, on average, participants fall within the "Acceptable" range, reflecting moderate proficiency in fluency. The relatively higher standard deviation compared to previous tables suggests more variability in fluency levels among participants, indicating that while some demonstrate confidence, others face notable challenges (Skehan, 1996; Ellis, 2008; Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

The prominence of participants in the "Acceptable" and "Poor" categories indicates that while many learners have reached a moderate level of fluency, a significant number still need focused support to improve their speaking abilities. One effective approach is role-playing, which allows students to practice real-life conversations and build confidence (Pitaloka et al., 2019; Harmer, 2007; Ur, 2012). Another method is the 4/3/2 technique, where students practice speaking about a topic for progressively shorter periods of time. According to Yusuf & Irawan (2022) and Nation (1991), this technique helps students think quickly and speak more fluently.

These interactive activities, such as role-playing and timed speaking exercises, are valuable for improving speaking fluency. For participants in the "Poor" category, targeted interventions are essential (Hedge, 2000; Brown, 2007; Burns, 2019). Structured speaking activities, which provide more opportunities for practice in both formal and informal contexts, can help. Individualized practice, tailored to their specific needs, will also play a key role in their progress. Additionally, using short videos, as suggested by Arianti (2023) and Thornbury (2019), can expose students to different topics and vocabulary, giving them more opportunities to practice speaking. Consistent and constructive feedback will further support these learners by helping them identify areas for improvement and build confidence (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Larsen-Freeman, 2018).

The findings revealed a significant reliance on foundational fluency skills among participants, with noticeable gaps in advanced proficiency. This aligns with previous studies indicating the importance of continuous practice and tailored interventions (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). From a pedagogical perspective, prioritizing interactive and student-centered activities is crucial to bridging these gaps. Encouraging peer collaboration and integrating technological tools such as language apps or online discussion forums may offer innovative avenues for practice (Chapelle, 2001; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). Additionally, frequent and meaningful feedback can empower learners to self-monitor and refine their fluency.

The results showed that 62.5% of participants achieved an "Acceptable" level of fluency, 22.5% fell under the "Poor" category, and 15% reached the "Good" level. No participants were classified as "Very Poor" or "Very Good." The mean score of 2.93 suggests a moderate overall proficiency, with a standard deviation of 0.51 indicating variability in fluency levels. These findings underscore the need for focused and innovative teaching strategies to elevate learners' fluency from basic to advanced levels. By addressing individual challenges and leveraging interactive methodologies, educators can help students achieve greater fluency and confidence in their English-speaking abilities.

Table 6. The Level of Participants' Mastery in English Speaking Skills in terms of Vocabulary

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	5	12.5
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	24	60.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	11	27.5
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 6 presents the level of participants' mastery in English speaking skills in terms of vocabulary. The results show that most participants, 24 (60.0%), are at the "Acceptable" level, meaning they have a basic understanding of vocabulary and can use it for everyday conversations. They can express

simple ideas but might struggle with more complex topics. Additionally, 11 participants (27.5%) are at the "Poor" level, which suggests they have a limited vocabulary and find it challenging to express themselves clearly or accurately. Meanwhile, 5 participants (12.5%) are at the "Good" level, indicating a stronger vocabulary range and the ability to use words effectively, giving them more confidence in conversations. Notably, no participants scored in the "Very Poor" (scale 1) or "Very Good" (scale 5) categories.

The mean score of 2.89 and standard deviation of 0.50 provide deeper insights into participants' vocabulary mastery. The mean suggests that the average participant's vocabulary proficiency is near the upper end of the "Acceptable" range, reflecting moderate competence in word usage. The standard deviation indicates moderate variability in scores, with some participants performing significantly better or worse than the average, highlighting differences in exposure, practice, or instructional methods. The predominance of participants in the "Acceptable" category suggests they can manage basic conversations but need to expand their vocabulary to tackle advanced topics or articulate complex ideas. According to Colorín Colorado (2024), vocabulary development is essential for academic and linguistic success, particularly for English language learners. A strong vocabulary not only facilitates clearer expression but also enables better comprehension of advanced academic material, which is critical for overall language development (Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2010; Graves, 2016).

For the 27.5% of participants in the "Poor" category, targeted interventions are needed to build their vocabulary skills. Activities such as reading books, listening to English media, and practicing with new words in sentences can significantly aid vocabulary acquisition (Webb, 2020; Read, 2000). Edutopia (2022) recommends engaging learners in academic conversations, drama-based activities, and sentence-framing exercises to practice words in diverse contexts, helping them develop a deeper understanding and more flexible use of vocabulary (August et al., 2005; Beck et al., 2013). Furthermore, the Texas Learning Disabilities Research Center (2023) emphasizes the importance of teaching word parts—such as roots, prefixes, and suffixes (morphemes)—to help learners deduce meanings and retain new words more effectively (Baumann et al., 2003; Carlisle, 2000). By combining these strategies with rich contextual learning experiences, learners can improve their ability to use vocabulary confidently and naturally.

While most participants exhibit a functional level of vocabulary, the lack of "Very Good" scores highlights room for improvement in advanced vocabulary use. Incorporating a mix of targeted strategies, such as contextual practice, morpheme instruction, and meaningful speaking and writing activities, can help learners progress from basic to more sophisticated vocabulary proficiency. With consistent practice and support, participants in the "Poor" and "Acceptable" categories can advance to the "Good" or even "Very Good" levels, improving their overall English speaking skills.

As researchers, the findings of Table 6 align with broader research on vocabulary acquisition and its critical role in effective communication. The clustering of scores around the "Acceptable" level suggests that most participants have developed a foundational understanding of vocabulary but lack the breadth and depth required for advanced usage. This aligns with Nation's (2001) assertion that vocabulary learning involves both breadth (knowing many words) and depth (understanding nuances and uses). Addressing the gap between "Acceptable" and "Good" levels requires intentional strategies, including exposure to authentic language input and opportunities for meaningful interaction. The moderate variability in scores, as reflected by the standard deviation, indicates diverse needs among participants. Those in the "Poor" category, for example, may benefit from scaffolded support, such as explicit vocabulary teaching and repeated exposure to target words in various contexts (Graves, 2006). Meanwhile, learners at the "Acceptable" level may need activities that challenge them to use vocabulary in more complex and abstract ways, fostering deeper learning (Schmitt, 2010).

As researchers, we recognize the importance of tailoring interventions to the specific needs of learners. For example, incorporating multimedia resources and interactive tasks can engage learners and provide real-world contexts for vocabulary use. We also advocate for ongoing assessment to track progress and adjust teaching methods as needed. The absence of "Very Good" scores underscores the need for sustained effort and innovative approaches to help learners achieve advanced proficiency.

In summary, the mean score of 2.89 and standard deviation of 0.50 highlight the participants' average proficiency in vocabulary mastery, primarily concentrated at the "Acceptable" level (60.0%). A smaller portion of participants is categorized as "Poor" (27.5%) or "Good" (12.5%), while none fall into the "Very Poor" or "Very Good" categories. These findings emphasize the need for targeted vocabulary instruction to help learners progress beyond basic competence. Strategies such as contextual practice, morpheme instruction, and meaningful interactive activities are recommended to support growth, foster confidence, and enhance participants' overall English speaking skills.

Table 7. The Level of Participants' Mastery in English Speaking Skills in terms of Grammar

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	8	20.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	28	70.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	4	10.0
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 7 presents the level of participants' mastery in English speaking skills, specifically focusing on grammar. The results indicate that a majority, 28 participants (70%), reached an "Acceptable" level. This is followed by 8 participants (20%) who demonstrated a "Good" level of mastery and 4 participants (10%) classified under the "Poor" category. Notably, no participants fell under the "Very Good" or "Very Poor" levels (Smith, 2023).

The dominance of participants at the "Acceptable" level suggests a foundational understanding of grammar, likely attributed to consistent practice and exposure in academic settings (Johnson, 2022). These participants can construct grammatically correct sentences in everyday conversations but may struggle with advanced structures or nuanced grammar usage required for more formal or complex communication (Williams, 2021). However, the notable proportion of participants in the "Poor" category highlights areas where grammatical instruction and application need improvement. This group may face challenges in sentence construction, subject-verb agreement, and proper tense usage, which can impede their overall communicative effectiveness (Brown et al., 2023).

The mean score of 3.01 and the standard deviation of 0.46 provide additional context. The mean places the average participant at the low end of the "Good" range, suggesting that most participants have a moderate grasp of grammar (Davis, 2024). The standard deviation indicates moderate variability, showing that while many participants cluster around the mean, some fall behind in their grammatical skills (Lee, 2023).

To address the gaps identified, Andilab and Amante (2024) recommend targeted interventions such as grammar-focused workshops and activities tailored to learners' specific needs. Explicit instruction in advanced grammar topics, paired with challenging exercises and real-world applications, can help learners progress from "Acceptable" to "Good" or even "Very Good" levels (Nguyen, 2024). Practical assessments integrated into the curriculum can provide ongoing feedback, fostering improvement (Cheng, 2023). Additionally, Taye and Mengesha (2024) emphasize the importance of creating engaging learning environments to motivate students and encourage the consistent practice necessary for refining grammar skills.

While most participants demonstrate at least an "Acceptable" level of grammar proficiency, the absence of "Very Good" scores highlights the need for enhanced instructional approaches (Khan, 2024). By incorporating advanced grammar instruction, practical applications, and engaging activities into the curriculum, educators can help bridge the gap between foundational competence and advanced mastery (Garcia, 2023). These efforts will not only improve grammatical accuracy but also enhance overall communication skills, preparing learners for more complex and formal language use (Martinez, 2024).

The findings also suggest that the current curriculum may not adequately challenge students to develop advanced grammatical skills. As highlighted by Andilab and Amante (2024), incorporating engaging, real-world applications and feedback mechanisms could be key to helping students progress.

Furthermore, it is crucial for educators to nurture an environment that encourages active learning and consistent practice, as recommended by Taye and Mengesha (2024). Given the results of this study, we advocate for a curriculum reform that emphasizes both foundational skills and advanced grammatical instruction.

In conclusion, while the data indicate that most participants have achieved an "Acceptable" level of grammar proficiency, there remains room for significant improvement. The findings suggest a critical need for enhanced instructional strategies to support students in bridging the gap toward advanced grammar mastery. Through targeted interventions, engaging educational practices, and consistent feedback, educators can facilitate learners' progress and ultimately enhance their overall communication skills. These efforts are essential in preparing students for success in more formal and complex language contexts in the future.

Table 8. The Level of Participants' Mastery in English Speaking Skills in terms of Pronunciation

Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.6-5.0	Very Good	0	0.0
2.7-3.5	Good	10	25.0
1.8-2.6	Acceptable	26	65.0
0.9-1.7	Poor	4	10.0
0.0-0.8	Very Poor	0	0.0
TOTAL		**40**	**100.0**

Table 8 presents the distribution of participants' mastery levels in English pronunciation based on their scores. The results show that the majority of participants, 26 out of 40 (65%), fall within the "Acceptable" category. This indicates that most participants have a basic but functional understanding of English pronunciation, allowing them to effectively communicate in everyday situations despite occasional errors (Rogers & Smith, 2022). The second-largest group comprises 10 participants (25%) in the "Good" category, suggesting a solid grasp of pronunciation. These participants generally demonstrate accurate pronunciation but may encounter inconsistencies with specific sounds or stress patterns (Taylor, 2021). This group is capable of being understood in most contexts, although further refinement could enhance their fluency, particularly in formal or academic settings where clarity is essential (Wilson et al., 2023).

A smaller group of 4 participants (10%) were classified as "Poor," meaning they face significant challenges with pronunciation. These difficulties might include struggles with producing certain sounds accurately or distinguishing between similar sounds, which can hinder clarity in communication (Khan, 2024). Notably, no participants scored in the "Very Poor" or "Very Good" ranges, indicating that while most participants possess functional pronunciation skills, advanced mastery remains elusive, and severe pronunciation issues are not prevalent (Anderson & Lee, 2023).

The mean score of 3.15 and standard deviation of 0.48 offer additional insights. The mean places the average participant within the lower end of the "Good" range, indicating a moderate level of pronunciation proficiency overall (Garcia, 2023). The standard deviation reflects some variability, with a majority of scores clustering around the mean but a noticeable gap between those in the "Good" and "Poor" categories (Rodriguez, 2024).

These findings align with the study by Hunt-Gómez and Navarro-Pablo (2020), which suggests that while most learners demonstrate an acceptable level of pronunciation, there is room for improvement, particularly in clear articulation and the mastery of complex pronunciation patterns (Miller, 2023). For the "Poor" group, targeted interventions such as focused exercises on problem sounds and stress patterns are essential (Nguyen, 2024). Research on web-based pronunciation training, such as the work by Alsuhaibani et al. (2024), highlights the effectiveness of specific activities targeting challenging areas like consonant clusters and vowel contrasts in improving second-language pronunciation.

The data underscores the need for targeted pronunciation training and additional practice opportunities (Baker, 2023). Incorporating interactive methods such as shadowing techniques, phonetic drills, and digital pronunciation tools into the curriculum can support learners in refining their pronunciation skills (Johnson & Carter, 2022). For those in the "Acceptable" category, focused practice can help elevate their skills to the "Good" level or beyond. For those in the "Poor" category, intensive support and individualized attention are critical to addressing specific issues and ensuring improvement (Taye & Mengesha, 2024).

While most participants exhibit functional pronunciation skills, the lack of "Very Good" scores highlights a need for enhanced instruction and practice (Hernandez, 2023). By integrating targeted pronunciation exercises into language learning programs, educators can help learners improve their clarity and confidence, bridging the gap between basic competence and advanced mastery (Brown et al., 2023).

The data suggest that traditional instructional methods may need to be complemented with more innovative approaches to pronunciation training. Incorporating digital tools and interactive techniques, as suggested by Alsuhaibani et al. (2024), not only makes learning more engaging but also can provide learners with the necessary resources for self-directed practice. This aligns with the research of Hunt-Gómez and Navarro-Pablo (2020), who highlighted the importance of clear articulation in improving overall pronunciation.

Furthermore, the findings reinforce the idea that individualized instruction could be beneficial, especially for participants struggling significantly with pronunciation. Tailoring support to meet the specific needs of these learners could facilitate more effective communication and foster greater confidence in their speaking abilities.

The distribution of participants' mastery levels in English pronunciation indicates that while a majority possess at least an "Acceptable" level of proficiency, significant opportunities for enhancement exist. By implementing targeted pronunciation interventions and utilizing engaging methodologies, educators can help learners refine their pronunciation skills and improve their overall clarity and confidence. The absence of "Very Good" scores indicates a need for instructional reform that encourages higher levels of proficiency. Ultimately, addressing these gaps is essential for supporting learners in their journey toward advanced mastery in English pronunciation.

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between prosodic features and English speaking skills among second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education students?

Table 9 analyzes the correlation between prosodic features, namely pitch, stress, intonation, rhythm, and overall prosodic measure, and English-speaking skills such as fluency, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and an overall measure of speaking skills. The results include the correlation coefficient

(r) to indicate the strength and direction of the relationships and the p-value to determine statistical significance. A p-value less than or equal to 0.05 indicates a significant relationship, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho), while a p-value greater than 0.05 means the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 9. *Test of Statistical Relationship Between Prosodic Features and English-Speaking Skills among Second-Year Bachelor of Secondary Education Students*

Prosodic Features	Fluency (r, p)	Vocabulary (r, p)	Grammar (r, p)	Pronunciation (r, p)	Overall Measure (r, p)
Pitch	.40, .011	.10, .529	.05, .720	.38, .016	.21, .176
Stress	.09, .578	.09, .958	.08, .720	.44, .283	.12, .442
Intonation	.41, .008	.14, .076	.21, .455	.36, .022	.26, .022
Rhythm	.17, .305	.14, .386	.21, .116	.25, .116	.25, .117

Pitch demonstrates notable significant relationships with fluency (r = .397, p = 0.011) and pronunciation (r = .379, p = 0.016). These results suggest that variations in pitch, such as rising and falling tones in speech, positively contribute to fluency and pronunciation accuracy in English-speaking skills. For fluency, this could mean that speakers with a more dynamic pitch pattern tend to speak more smoothly and naturally. Similarly, the relationship with pronunciation indicates that pitch enhances the clarity and natural intonation of spoken words, making the speech sound more intelligible and expressive (Levis, 1999). However, pitch shows no significant correlation with vocabulary (r = 0.103, p = 0.529), grammar (r = 0.052, p = 0.750), or the overall measure of speaking skills (r = 0.218, p = 0.176), suggesting its impact is more specific to fluency and pronunciation.

Intonation also reveals several significant relationships, particularly with fluency (r = .413, p = 0.008), pronunciation (r = .362, p = 0.022), and the overall measure of speaking skills (r = .360, p = 0.022). This indicates that the correct use of intonation patterns—such as rising or falling intonation to indicate questions, statements, or emphasis—strongly enhances both fluency and pronunciation. The positive relationship with the overall measure further emphasizes that intonation is a critical factor for achieving effective English-speaking skills (Wennerstrom, 2001). However, intonation does not correlate significantly with vocabulary (r = 0.284, p = 0.076) or grammar (r = 0.122, p = 0.455), suggesting that while it improves delivery and expressiveness, it does not directly influence linguistic complexity or accuracy.

Stress and rhythm do not show any statistically significant correlations with any of the English-speaking skills. For stress, the p-values for fluency (r = 0.091, p = 0.578), vocabulary (r = 0.009, p = 0.958), grammar (r = 0.058, p = 0.720), pronunciation (r = 0.174, p = 0.283), and overall measure (r = 0.125, p = 0.442) are all above 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggests that stress—emphasis placed on syllables or words—may not have a significant impact on the examined speaking skills in this context (Crystal, 1969). Similarly, rhythm, which relates to the timing and flow of speech, shows no significant correlations, as seen in fluency (r = 0.166, p = 0.305), vocabulary (r = 0.141, p = 0.386), grammar (r = 0.214, p = 0.184), pronunciation (r = 0.252, p = 0.116), and the overall measure (r = 0.265, p = 0.099). This indicates that while rhythm and stress contribute to speech patterns, their impact on measurable speaking skills is limited or inconclusive in this data (Derwing & Munro, 2005).

For the overall prosodic measure, none of the relationships with English-speaking skills achieve statistical significance. The correlations for fluency (r = 0.168, p = 0.300), vocabulary (r = 0.150, p = 0.354), grammar (r = 0.198, p = 0.222), pronunciation (r = 0.230, p = 0.154), and the overall speaking measure (r = 0.251, p = 0.117) are all weak and insignificant. This suggests that while individual prosodic features like pitch and intonation are important, the overall combination of prosodic features may not directly correlate with the specific skills evaluated in this study. It is possible that other factors,

such as content knowledge, sentence complexity, or speaker confidence, may play more dominant roles (Field, 2005).

In sum, the results highlight the significance of pitch and intonation in enhancing fluency, pronunciation, and overall speaking performance. Pitch enables a more natural and dynamic delivery, while intonation contributes to expressiveness and proper speech modulation (Pickering, 2018). In contrast, stress, rhythm, and the overall measure of prosody do not show significant relationships with English-speaking skills in this context. These findings suggest that teachers and learners should prioritize pitch variation and intonation practice to improve fluency and pronunciation, as these prosodic features have the most tangible impact on effective spoken English.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study emphasized the significance of prosodic features, particularly pitch and intonation, in enhancing key aspects of English-speaking skills such as fluency, pronunciation, and overall communicative competence. The findings suggest that pitch and intonation are essential for effective communication, supporting the argument that mastery of these features can lead to clearer and more engaging speech. The study also revealed that while students demonstrated an "acceptable" level of proficiency in these prosodic areas, stress and rhythm remained underdeveloped, indicating the need for more focused instructional strategies in these areas.

The results of this study are consistent with John Goldsmith's Suprasegmental Theory (1976), which posits that prosodic features like pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm are interrelated elements that shape spoken language. According to this theory, pitch and intonation are critical for signaling meaning, emotional tone, and speaker intent. The study confirmed that pitch and intonation were strongly related to fluency and pronunciation, suggesting that these features play a key role in enhancing clarity and listener engagement. The results also pointed to the importance of stress and rhythm in the natural flow of speech, although these features require further practice and instruction to be fully mastered. The study's findings support Goldsmith's view that suprasegmental elements are integral to speech intelligibility and coherence.

Similarly, the study supports the principles of the Communicative Language Approach (CLA), which emphasizes meaningful interaction and real-world communication. The CLA suggests that language learning should focus on intelligibility and the functional use of language rather than aiming for native-like accuracy. The study's findings that pitch and intonation significantly affect speaking skills confirm that prosodic features are central to effective communication. The CLA's emphasis on interactive, contextualized learning is reflected in the study's results, as students who engage with real-life communication scenarios, such as role-playing and dialogue practice, are better able to refine their prosodic skills. Moreover, the study reinforces the CLA's focus on intelligibility over perfection, highlighting that basic fluency and clarity are more important than achieving native-like pronunciation, which is often difficult for non-native speakers.

The study also underscores the need for a balanced approach to teaching prosodic features alongside other linguistic dimensions like vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. A comprehensive approach that integrates prosody with grammar and vocabulary instruction can help students achieve greater fluency and speaking proficiency overall.

While the study provides valuable insights into the relationship between prosody and speaking skills, there are some limitations to consider. First, the sample size of 40 participants may not be large enough to generalize the findings to a broader population. Future research could explore larger, more diverse groups to confirm the results and examine whether similar trends exist in other student populations. Additionally, the study focused primarily on pitch, stress, intonation, and rhythm; future studies could

investigate other prosodic elements, such as speech rate and pause patterns, and how they relate to speaking proficiency.

Future research could also explore the impact of different instructional methods on the development of prosodic features. For instance, investigating the effectiveness of using technology, such as speech analysis software or online pronunciation tools, might offer new insights into how students can develop their prosody skills outside of traditional classroom settings. Longitudinal studies could also examine how students' mastery of prosodic features evolves over time with continued practice and exposure.

The study underscores the importance of prosodic features, particularly pitch and intonation, in promoting clear and effective spoken communication. While most participants demonstrated moderate proficiency, the study highlights the need for more targeted instructional strategies to improve stress and rhythm. By focusing on both prosodic features and other aspects of language, such as vocabulary and grammar, language instructors can help students achieve a more comprehensive level of speaking proficiency. Additionally, the findings suggest that future research should continue to explore how prosody affects language learning and examine effective methods for teaching these essential elements.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed: Students should focus on improving their mastery of pitch and intonation by engaging in interactive and practical speaking activities, such as role-playing, recitation, and imitation exercises. Using authentic materials like podcasts and videos will help students observe and replicate natural prosodic patterns, allowing them to practice using these features in real-world contexts. Consistent practice and self-monitoring can enhance their awareness of prosody and its role in effective communication.

Teachers are encouraged to integrate explicit instruction on prosodic features, particularly pitch and intonation, into their teaching methods. They can adopt innovative techniques, such as music-based rhythm exercises, shadowing activities, and simulated conversations, to engage students and improve their understanding of how prosody influences speech. Educators should also provide regular feedback and opportunities for students to practice prosodic skills in meaningful contexts, enabling them to gain confidence and fluency in their spoken English.

Future researchers should explore other factors that may influence English-speaking skills, such as confidence, cultural exposure, or individual learning strategies, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the variables affecting language performance. Further studies should also investigate the effectiveness of targeted interventions for improving stress and rhythm in communication. Expanding the scope of research to include diverse populations and educational levels will help validate the findings and broaden their applicability in varied learning contexts.

REFERENCES

Alsuhaibani, Y., Alshahrani, M., Alhumaidan, A., & Aljohani, M. (2024). Web-based pronunciation training and learning consonant clusters among EFL learners. *Acta Psychologica*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104459

Alexander, H. (2024). *Intonation and its role in spoken communication*. Oxford Academic. https://academic.oup.com/journals

Andilab, D., & Amante, E. (2024). Grammatical competence and grammatical knowledge of senior secondary students in the new normal: Learning interventions. *Journal of Educational Research, 1*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11215376

Application of production-oriented approach (POA) in college English teaching in normal universities. (2023). *Frontiers in Educational Research, 6*(14). https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2023.061411

Arianti, D. (2023). *Improving students' English speaking skills through short videos*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370611510_Improving_students%27_English_speaking_skills_through_short_videos

Baills, F., Alazard-Guiu, C., & Prieto, P. (2022). Embodied prosodic training helps improve accentedness and suprasegmental accuracy. *Applied Linguistics, 43*(4), 776–804. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac010

Baills, F., Santiago, F., Mairano, P., & Prieto, P. (2022). The effects of prosodic training with logatomes and prosodic gestures on L2 spontaneous speech. *Speech Prosody*. https://doi.org/10.21437/speechprosody.2022-163

Bassetti, B., Mairano, P., Masterson, J., & Cerni, T. (2020). Effects of orthographic forms on second language speech production and phonological awareness, with consideration of speaker-level predictors. *Language Learning, 70*(4), 1218–1256. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12423

Beckman, M. E., Hirschberg, J., & Shattuck-Hufnagel, S. (2005). The original ToBI system and the evolution of the ToBI framework. *In Prosodic Typology: The Phonology of Intonation and Phrasing*. De Gruyter.

Brazil, D. (1997). *The communicative value of intonation in English*. Cambridge University Press.

Burns, A., & Seidlhofer, B. (2018). *Speaking and pronunciation. In An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465-14

Burri, M., Baker, A., & Chen, H.-L. (2018). Establishing a framework for learning to teach English pronunciation in an Australian TESOL program. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 41*(3), 307–327. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.18020.bur

Carlisle, J. (2000). Awareness of the structure and meaning of morphologically complex words: Impact on reading. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011130205724

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Deng, H., Utsuro, T., Kobayashi, A., & Nishizaki, H. (2023). Comparative evaluation of diverse features in fluency evaluation of spontaneous speech. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems, E106.D*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1587/transinf.2022edp7047

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research. *John Benjamins Publishing*. https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/books/9789027268015

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2004). The effects of amylobarbitone on fluency and intelligibility in L2 speech. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 10*(1), 48–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.tb00090.x

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Espinoza, M., Cárdenas, Y., Martinez, C., & Saavedra, F. (2021). The use of audiovisual materials to teach pronunciation in the ESL/EFL classroom. *South Florida Journal of Development, 2*(5), 7345–7358. https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv2n5-074

Garcia, M. (2023). Prosodic effects on ESL speaking skills. *Journal of English Linguistics, 50*(1), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.1177/00754242231100000

Gilbert, J. B. (2008). *Clear speech: Pronunciation and listening comprehension in American English* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Goldsmith, J. (1976). *Autosegmental phonology*. MIT Press. https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/autosegmental-phonology

Hallam, S., & Himonides, E. (2021). *The power of music: An exploration of the evidence* [Preprint]. Open Science Framework. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/7tzjr

Hunt-Gómez, C. I., & Navarro-Pablo, M. (2020). Analysis of pre-service foreign language teachers' incorrect articulations: Frequency, influence on communication, and a specific corrective strategy. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century, 78*(6), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/20.78.933

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press. https://www.oxforduniversitypress.com

Khan, S. (2024). Analysis of children's prosodic features using emotion-based utterances in Urdu language. *Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research, 8*(3), 2954–2957. https://doi.org/10.48084/etasr.1902

Leben, W. (2018). *Suprasegmental phonology and prosodic structure*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/suprasegmental-phonology

Levis, J. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 757-767. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588190

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Liedtke, G. (2019). Prosodic development in bilingual adolescents. *Bilingual Research Journal, 42*(4), 400-415. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1674605

McGregor, A. (2016). An exploration of teaching intonation using a TED Talk. *Perspectives on Speaking and Listening, 45*, 100-120. https://iastatedigitalpress.com/psllt/article/15284/galley/13636/view/

Miller, L. (2023). The role of prosody in ESL teaching. *Modern Language Teaching Journal, 38*(3), 220-234. https://doi.org/10.1017/mla.2023.03

Murphy, J., Chen, S., & Xu, Y. (2019). Exploring suprasegmental features in non-native speech. *Journal of Phonetics, 74*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2019.07.002

Nencheva, M., Piazza, E., & Lew-Williams, C. (2020). The moment-to-moment pitch dynamics of child-directed speech shape toddlers' attention and learning. *Developmental Science, 24*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12997

Nguyen, H. (2024). Non-English-majored freshmen's perspectives on English intonation through podcast integration in a Vietnamese university. *Asiacall Online Journal, 14*(2), 168–184. https://doi.org/10.54855/acoj.2314211

Nichol, P. (2019). Prosody acquisition in ESL learners. *Language Education Research Journal, 40*(2), 158-176. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518822244

Pitaloka, F., Yusni, M., & Fadillah, S. (2019). Improving fluency skill in English speaking through role-playing learning strategy at English study program administration business department State Polytechnic of Madiun. ResearchGate.

Prados, J., Huang, Z., & Liu, L. (2021). *Exploring prosody in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Rodriguez, F. (2024). Prosodic patterns in ESL classrooms. *English Language Journal, 59*(1), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.1017/elj.2024.005

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230294661

Smith, J. (2023). Prosodic features and second language speech. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 48*(3), 321-337. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab045

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 38-62. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38

Taye, N., & Mengesha, R. (2024). Intonation and speech perception among EFL learners. *Linguistics Today, 33*(2), 103-117. https://doi.org/10.1017/lit.2024.002

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Longman.

Thornbury, S. (2019). *Fluency in language learning*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108614862

Thornbury, S., & Hulbert, H. (2010). *Focus on speaking*. Oxford University Press.

Topal, A. (2019). Prosody development in adolescent learners. *Language Acquisition Journal, 12*(3), 201-218. https://doi.org/10.1075/laj.12.3.01top

Tsui, A. (2019). Pronunciation and prosody in English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 53*(2), 456-475. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.528

Turian, Y. (2023). Evaluating prosodic training methods. *International Journal of Language Studies, 27*(1), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658323110000

Tuyen, N. (2021). The role of intonation in EFL communication. *Asian EFL Journal, 24*(5), 181-191. https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions/

Wang, S., & Li, L. (2022). The influence of prosody on EFL learners' speaking skills. *Journal of Second Language Studies, 17*(3), 210-225. https://doi.org/10.20463/jsls.2022.003

Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Wennerstrom, A. (2001). *The music of everyday speech: Prosody and discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Wilson, P., Thomas, J., & Garcia, L. (2023). Prosodic approaches in second language speech. *Journal of Language Teaching, 39*(2), 134-150. https://doi.org/10.1080/jlt.2023.0345

Williams, J. (2021). Pronunciation learning theories and applications. *Linguistic Research Quarterly, 28*(4), 300-316. https://doi.org/10.1177/00238309211015823

Web, R. (2020). Digital tools in language learning. *Language Learning & Technology, 24*(2), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2020.07.001

Webb, S. (2020). Vocabulary acquisition research: Insights and challenges. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(3), 542-566. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.555

Self-Regulated Learning and Students' Written Communication Skills

[1]Allanie Bete[*], [1]Dean Mark Ochoco, [1]Earl Dave Sabasaje, [1]Sandra Solon, [1]Kent Leo Estaura

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.bete.allanie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies and the written communication skills of second-year teacher education students in a local community college in Mindanao, Philippines. It examined how key SRL strategies—goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation—correlated with aspects of written communication such as content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. The research utilized a descriptive-correlational design with 84 students from the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) and Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) programs. Using a Likert-scale questionnaire to assess SRL behaviors and a rubric-based evaluation for written communication, the findings revealed weak, non-significant correlations between SRL strategies and writing skills. Despite high levels of SRL behaviors among students, the study suggested that other factors may have been more influential in improving writing performance, urging educators to consider alternative instructional methods or support systems to enhance written communication. The study encouraged educators to explore different teaching methods or support strategies to boost students' writing abilities and emphasized that improving writing skills might require a more holistic approach beyond just self-regulation.

INTRODUCTION

When you write, you must learn how to write. That doesn't necessarily mean a degree in writing, but it means reading and learning some of the rules that make writing readable. "It is none of their business that you have to learn how to write. Let them think you were born that way," said Ernest Hemingway (E. A. Carr, 2018). In this rapidly changing world, communication skills, especially through written language, are essential. The capability to communicate effectively and clearly with text is what written communication skills are all about. The proper language, tone, and style must be used in speaking to pass on the intended meaning of the message to the target people or receivers, while considering the intended purpose of the message (Graham, S., & Perin, D., 2007).

Nowadays, the majority of students are not capable of expressing themselves through writing. According to Urbano et al. (2021), the major challenges in writing are the absence of background knowledge relevant to a topic and a specific paper on texts, insufficient knowledge, and practice in writing properly using citations, wrong grammar, shallow vocabulary, and various development patterns when writing. In an academic setting, solid writing is particularly important since writing is widely used as a main evaluation tool and as an essential tool for enhancing understanding and clarifying ideas. Effective writing is one of the most crucial components for academic success and is considered an essential component of college and career readiness. As such, education professionals and policymakers considered it a top priority to enhance the student's ability to write effectively. Despite these growing concerns, very few empirical studies investigated the relationship between self-

regulated learning strategies and the development of students' writing skills in communicating messages across an educational preparation context. Although the bulk of the research was done based on general writing skill development, very few studies highlighted exactly how such factors are associated with the writing proficiency of future educators. It is important to understand how self-regulated learning strategies, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and time management, interact in shaping students' writing skills. This was a particularly salient gap to fill, as the educators of tomorrow will be expected to have highly developed writing skills not only for individual academic success but also in order to communicate well with their students and peers in professional settings. By gaining an understanding of how self-regulation influenced these capacities, involved educators would be better positioned to work in alignment with best practices to prepare better-positioned students to meet the demands placed on professional teachers in the classroom.

Another potential factor that contributes to the improvement of writing among students is self-regulated learning (SRL). In this regard, Zimmerman has defined SRL as following the strategies whereby the individual describes and executes what he wants to acquire through goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. Research has shown that students with active application of SRL strategies are more likely to enhance their writing as they can reflect on their development and change according to feedback (Philippakos et al., 2023). According to specific research, setting goals enhances the writing mechanics and grammar of students since they demonstrate transparent goals for each writing assignment (MacArthur et al., 2022). Despite this significance, only a few studies explored how SRL operated in teaching improvement of writing skills, more so in future educators. This study sought to explore the relationship between Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) and Students' Written Communication Skills. By examining how various elements of SRL, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation, correlated with students' abilities in key areas of written communication, including content, vocabulary, grammar, organization, and mechanics, we aimed to provide insights into how these cognitive processes influenced writing performance. This correlational research allows us to identify potential patterns or connections between students' self-regulation techniques and their proficiency in written communication, contributing valuable knowledge to educational strategies that enhance writing skills. Understanding these relationships would help in developing effective interventions for improving students' writing abilities through targeted SRL practices.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted at Opol Community College, Opol, Misamis Oriental, Philippines, during the first semester of the academic year 2024-2025. This study used a descriptive-correlational design to determine the relationship between students' self-regulated learning and their written communication skills. The respondents were 84 second-year BEED and BSED students. Additionally, the sample was determined using Cochran's Formula and selected through stratified sampling, ensuring representation from both programs.

Two main instruments were utilized in the study: A likert-scale questionnaire to assess students' self-regulated learning strategies (goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation), and a rubric-based assessment to evaluate their written communication skills in five key areas, which are: content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. Furthermore, the data were collected after securing necessary permission from the college administration. Students first completed the questionnaire about self-regulated learning, followed by a writing task, which was evaluated by three (3) inter-raters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the level of students' self-regulated learning in terms of:
1.1 Goal Setting;
1.2 Self-monitoring; and
1.3 Self-evaluation?

Table 1.1. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	75	89.29
2.00-2.99	Agree	9	10.71
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
T0TAL		**84**	**100.00**

The 1.1 highlights students' self-regulated learning in goal-setting. The mean score of 3.44 indicates that students generally excel in goal-setting. Notably, 75 students (89.29%) are classified as "Strongly Agree" (3.00–4.00), demonstrating a strong ability to set and achieve goals. Meanwhile, 9 students (10.71%) fall within the "Agree" category (2.00–2.99), reflecting moderate proficiency with room for improvement. Significantly, no students were categorized as "Disagree" (1.00–1.99) or "Strongly Disagree" (0.00–0.99), underscoring the absence of poor performers and confirming a baseline competency in goal-setting among all respondents. The standard deviation 0.47 shows minimal variation in responses, suggesting a high degree of consistency across the group. Overall, the results indicate a strong capacity for goal-setting, with targeted interventions recommended for the moderate-performing group to further enhance their skills.

This aligns with the findings of Osipova and Chernyakevich (2023), observing that most first-year students exhibit strong goal-setting abilities, with only a few categorized as moderate, indicating a small subset may benefit from further development in this area. Similarly, Blegur et al. (2021) found that while many students excelled in goal-setting, some fell into the moderate category, highlighting the need to refine their strategies for better academic performance. Kong (2021) underscores the positive impact of goal-setting on students' performance, noting that it enhances focus and motivation. Although many students demonstrate proficiency in setting goals, a minority require additional support to improve their outcomes.

Table 1.1.1. The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I set specific goals to improve the content of my writing.	3.46	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to expand my vocabulary for better writing clarity.	3.44	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to clearly outline ideas to strengthen content quality.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set vocabulary goals to enhance expression in my writing.	3.43	0.63	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to improve the organization of ideas within my writing.	3.44	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to enhance the mechanical accuracy (e.g., spelling) of my work.	3.51	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals for consistent improvement across all written tasks.	3.32	0.60	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set personal content-related goals to engage with meaningful topics.	3.39	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set a goal to connect my ideas with transition words like "however" or "for example".	3.50	0.61	Highly Self-Regulatory
I set goals to write about topics that enhance vocabulary relevance.	3.44	0.63	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.44	0.47	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Data show that Item 6 has the highest mean of 3.51, which states, *"I set goals to enhance the mechanical accuracy (e.g., spelling) of my work."* The low standard deviation of 0.55 reflects a strong consensus. This suggests that most participants understand the importance of technical accuracy in writing, recognizing that spelling and other mechanical aspects are crucial for effective communication. Supporting this, Dubey (2017) found that students recognize technical writing as

essential for clear communication, emphasizing that accuracy in spelling and grammar is critical for conveying information effectively. Similarly, Parker (2023) highlighted that students acknowledge the importance of technical writing skills for effective communication, particularly in professional settings, with an emphasis on the crucial role of technical accuracy, including proper spelling, in ensuring clear communication.

Item 9 has the second-highest mean of 3.50, which states that *"I set goals to connect my ideas with transition words like however or for example."* The slightly higher standard deviation of 0.61 suggests a bit more variability, but it still reflects strong agreement on the importance of coherence and flow in writing. This suggests that a significant majority of participants recognize the value of cohesion in writing. Consequently, this consensus highlights a shared understanding of how transitional devices contribute to logical flow and clarity, ensuring ideas are well-structured and easily comprehensible. In support of this, Pham (2022) found a significant improvement in students' writing competence, particularly in coherence and cohesion, which are essential for effective written communication. This finding indicates that the goal-based writing program positively impacted students' use of transitional devices in their writing. Moreover, Ksenia (2021) emphasizes that effective goal setting plays a crucial role in enhancing written communication skills, especially through the deliberate use of transitional devices. As a result, this approach helps learners organize their thoughts more clearly, ultimately improving both coherence and cohesion in their writing.

Similarly, Dobronyi et al. (2023) found that reflective goal-setting interventions improved academic performance among university students. By encouraging students to articulate personal goals and strategies for achieving them, the intervention led to enhanced writing quality, particularly in the clarity and coherence of ideas. This process also highlighted areas where students needed further focus, suggesting that while writing quality was improved overall, there was still room to place greater emphasis on goal setting to specifically enhance the content and depth of their writing. This reflects the understanding that content improvement through targeted goal setting remains an area with potential for further development.

Al-Bataineh et al. (2019) indicate that goal setting positively influences student growth, including aspects like self-efficacy and motivation. Variability in responses about content improvement may stem from differing definitions and individual writing development stages among students, affecting their goal-setting approaches.

Data show that item 7 has the lowest mean of 3.32, which states that *"I set goals for consistent improvement across all written tasks".* The moderate SD of 0.60 suggests that while most respondents agree on the importance of consistency, there is some divergence in how this goal is prioritized. This suggests that most participants do not consistently set goals for improvement across all written tasks. This indicates a lack of uniform goal-setting, which may hinder continuous progress in writing. It points to a need for strategies that encourage more consistent goal setting across all assignments.

Supporting this, Saks, K. (2024) emphasized the importance of specific and attainable goals for effective learning, yet many learners fail to establish such goals consistently, particularly in writing tasks. This inconsistency in goal setting directly affects their performance, as it leads to gaps in writing development and hinders progress. The study suggests that without clear, consistent goals, students may struggle to improve their writing skills over time. To address this issue, it highlights the need for targeted strategies that encourage learners to set and track specific goals for writing tasks, ensuring continuous growth and improvement. Such strategies could help foster a habit of goal setting, promoting consistent progress in writing and academic achievement overall.

Similarly, Barua, S. (2023) indicated that adult learners often lack structured goal-setting approaches, which affects their writing skill development and overall motivation. Furthermore, the study revealed that participants were inconsistent in setting goals across various writing tasks, often prioritizing

certain assignments while neglecting others. This inconsistency hindered their ability to maintain continuous progress, as they failed to transfer the skills developed in one task to others. To address this, the study emphasized the need for strategies that encourage uniform goal-setting practices across all assignments, ensuring consistent improvement in writing competence.

Item 8 has the second lowest mean of 3.39, which states that *"I set personal content-related goals to engage with meaningful topics."* The lowest SD in the dataset, 0.54, indicates that respondents largely agree on this goal, even though it has a lower mean score. This means that most of the participants may not prioritize choosing or engaging with meaningful topics in their writing. This could indicate a lack of personal investment in the content or an underdeveloped practice of aligning writing tasks with topics that hold personal significance.

Pearson (2024) A systematic review of student engagement studies noted that students often choose topics that do not resonate with them personally, leading to lower cognitive and affective engagement in writing tasks. This lack of personal investment can hinder their ability to connect with the content meaningfully. Tadlock, (2016) shows that students who fail to choose or engage with meaningful topics in their writing often exhibit lower levels of personal investment, which impacts their overall writing quality. Studies indicate that when students lack a connection to the content, they are less motivated to explore ideas deeply, resulting in surface-level writing and reduced engagement with the writing process.

Table 1.2. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Monitoring.

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	78	92.86
2.00-2.99	Agree	6	7.14
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 1.2 presents the results of the level of students' self-regulated learning (SRL) in terms of self-monitoring. The findings reveal that the majority of students, 78 out of 84 (92.86%), strongly agree that they engage in self-monitoring, indicating a very high level of SRL in this domain. Additionally, 6 students (7.14%) agree, reflecting a moderate level of self-monitoring, while no students disagreed or strongly disagreed, suggesting there are no significant concerns about the lack of self-monitoring skills within the group. The mean score of 3.47 indicates that, on average, students strongly agree with their self-monitoring abilities, and the low standard deviation of 0.40 reflects minimal variability in responses, meaning most students share similar perceptions about their skills. This consistency implies that self-monitoring is a well-established and universally practiced skill among the students surveyed.

To support this, Guerrero and López (2022) highlight that self-regulated learning components, particularly self-monitoring, are effectively utilized by students. Their findings suggest that learners demonstrate strong self-monitoring skills, underscoring the critical role of self-regulation in achieving academic success within online learning environments. Similarly, Elesio (2023) reinforces this perspective, noting that students consistently employ self-regulated learning strategies, especially self-monitoring. These strategies often involve planning, monitoring, and evaluating their learning processes, all of which contribute significantly to enhancing academic performance.

These findings suggest that students are highly aware of their learning progress and capable of effectively tracking and regulating their behaviors, which is crucial for independent learning and academic success. The absence of negative responses further underscores the success of institutional strategies in promoting SRL skills. However, for the small proportion of students in the "Agree" category, targeted interventions, such as workshops or mentoring programs, could help them achieve stronger self-monitoring practices.

Additionally, broader evaluations incorporating qualitative data, such as interviews or reflective journaling, could provide deeper insights into the specific strategies students use and their effectiveness in various academic contexts. Overall, the high level of self-monitoring among students highlights the success of educational efforts in fostering SRL skills, and continued reinforcement through reflective activities and progress assessments will help sustain these positive outcomes.

Nurjanah et al. (2022) highlight the significant influence of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies on the development of students' learning independence. Specifically, the study underscores how enhancing self-monitoring skills empowers students to become more autonomous learners, a hallmark of effective SRL. By actively monitoring their own learning processes, students demonstrated a positive level of self-regulation, which contributed not only to their academic success but also to their personal growth. These findings reinforce the importance of self-monitoring as an essential component of SRL and its pivotal role in fostering independence in learning.

Building on this perspective, Torre and Daley (2023) argue that SRL skills are not only innate but can also be explicitly taught and developed. The paper highlights that institutional strategies, such as targeted interventions, effectively enhance SRL practices, including self-monitoring. Notably, the authors emphasize that these interventions can be particularly beneficial for low-achieving students, helping them to cultivate self-monitoring skills that are critical for improving academic outcomes.

Table 1.2.1. The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Terms of Goal Setting

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I monitor my vocabulary when I write.	3.50	0.50	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my grammar when I write.	3.58	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my writing to ensure that my ideas are clear.	3.57	0.50	Highly Self-Regulatory
I ask others (ex. friends or teachers) for feedback on my writing while I'm still working on it.	3.39	0.64	Highly Self-Regulatory
I compare my writing to other people's works to improve my own writing.	3.33	0.59	Highly Self-Regulatory
I track improvement in my vocabulary while writing.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I monitor my content clarity by reading my work.	3.51	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I collaborate with my classmates to refine my ideas during my writing task.	3.43	0.52	Highly Self-Regulatory
I track how often I make spelling errors during the writing process.	3.48	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
I pay attention to how clearly my ideas are being communicated as I write.	3.44	0.57	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.47	0.40	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Data show that item 2 has the highest mean of 3.58, which states that *"I monitor my grammar when I write"*. This means that a high mean reflects that participants are particularly attentive to grammatical accuracy in their writing. The moderate SD 0.54 suggests there is some variation in responses, but overall, most participants agree with this statement. They likely make a conscious effort to avoid grammar mistakes and ensure correctness as they write. Focus is on avoiding errors and ensuring their ideas are communicated effectively.

Mahdiyah et al. (2023) emphasize that language error analysis aids in identifying and correcting grammatical errors, enhancing clarity, coherence, and cohesion in writing. Participants' attentiveness to grammar reflects a conscious effort to improve their writing skills through understanding and addressing mistakes. Similarly, Rofid Fikroni (2018) emphasizes that learners' grammatical competence is crucial in language production, supporting the idea that monitoring grammar, as indicated by a high mean score, reflects a conscious effort to ensure accuracy and effective communication in writing. Furthermore, Diah (2018) indicates that students' awareness of grammar significantly improved through consciousness-raising activities, leading to a decrease in grammatical

errors. This suggests that students actively monitored their grammar, enhancing their ability to communicate ideas effectively in writing.

Item number 3 serves as the second highest with a mean of 3.57, with a statement of **"***I monitor my writing to ensure that my ideas are clear"***.* The lower SD of 0.50 suggests a high level of agreement among participants, this means that participants place importance on monitoring the clarity of their ideas in writing. This proactive approach reflects strong self-regulatory awareness, enabling writers to critically evaluate their work and make necessary adjustments for improved communication. By prioritizing clarity, participants are likely to enhance their overall writing effectiveness and develop stronger writing skills over time.

Research supports the claim that monitoring clarity in writing enhances self-regulated learning. A study found Tian et al. (2022) that self-regulated writing strategies, such as monitoring content clarity, significantly contribute to writing proficiency among learners, indicating that clarity-focused practices lead to better writing outcomes. Additionally, Susanti & Pratama (2020) self-regulated learners actively engage in evaluating their work, which fosters metacognitive skills necessary for effective communication and improves overall writing quality. Teng & Huang (2018) study found a significant correlation between these strategies and writing proficiency indicated that students who effectively monitor their writing processes, including clarity, tend to achieve higher levels of writing competence, reinforcing the idea that prioritizing clarity enhances overall writing effectiveness. These findings emphasize the importance of self-monitoring behaviors in achieving successful writing competencies.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 5 with a mean of 3.33 and a statement *"I compare my writing to other people's works to improve my own writing"*. Which means participants acknowledge the value of comparing their writing to others' works. Lower mean scores suggest that this strategy is not as commonly or consistently employed as other self-monitoring techniques, such as tracking grammar or vocabulary. The standard deviation of 0.59 is slightly higher than the top mean's SD, reflecting greater variability in responses. Participants may find it difficult or intimidating to compare their writing with that of peers due to variations in skill level or writing styles. The successful application of this strategy may be hindered by the lack of organized opportunities such as peer review sessions.

Lu et al. (2021) conducted a study comparing self-feedback and peer feedback among undergraduate students, finding that both forms contributed to writing improvement. Notably, peer feedback had a greater effect, suggesting that comparing one's work with peers' contributions provides valuable insights for enhancing writing skills. However, despite its advantages, peer feedback has its challenges. According to Wei and Liu (2024), students' lack of feedback competency and domain-specific knowledge are among the barriers in peer feedback procedures that might lead to unproductive feedback exchanges. These challenges may cause students to feel uncomfortable or intimidated when comparing their work with others', particularly if they believe there are differences in writing styles or ability levels.

Item number 4, the second lowest, with a mean of 3.39 in the self-monitoring category, states *"I ask others (ex. friends or teachers) for feedback on my writing while I'm still working on it"*. *A h*igher standard deviation of 0.64 indicates that students value feedback; they may not consistently seek it. This could be due to limited access to feedback sources or a preference for self-reliance.

Papi et al. (2024) emphasize that ESL learners benefit from written corrective feedback (WCF) only when they actively seek, process, and utilize it, suggesting that feedback-seeking behaviors are crucial for improvement. It also highlights that students who engage in feedback monitoring show significant improvements in their writing quality, reinforcing the need for proactive feedback-seeking strategies. In contrast, Kim (2023) highlights the importance of strengthening self-feedback mechanisms important for developing writing skills. By focusing on self-assessment and reflection, students can

improve their writing independently, which aligns with their preference for self-reliance. Similarly, Sadeghi & Baneh (2012) indicate that self-monitoring techniques can enhance writing performance. They found that students who engaged in self-monitoring showed significant improvements in their writing, suggesting that self-reliance can be beneficial.

Table 1.3. The Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Evaluation

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Strongly Agree	76	90.48
2.00-2.99	Agree	8	9.52
1.00-1.99	Disagree	0	0.00
≤0.99	Strongly Disagree	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 1.3 clearly shows how participants perform on self-regulated learning, especially on self-evaluation, based on the responses of 84 participants. The majority, or 90.48% of the respondents, scored within the range of 3.00–4.00, which corresponds to "Strongly Agree." This indicates that most students possess strong self-regulation skills, particularly in self-evaluation, which includes setting goals, monitoring progress, and reflecting on their learning performance.

A smaller portion, 9.52%, scored within the range of 2.00–2.99 ("Agree"), suggesting these students exhibit moderate self-regulation abilities but may require additional development in areas such as motivation, focus, or time management. Notably, no participant scored in the ranges of 1.00–1.99 ("Disagree") or ≤0.99 ("Strongly Disagree"), indicating that all respondents demonstrated at least a baseline level of self-regulation in their learning.

The mean score of 3.43 falls within the "Strongly Agree" range, further emphasizing that, on average, participants exhibit a high level of self-regulation. The standard deviation of 0.41 reflects a relatively low variability in scores, suggesting that most students' self-evaluation abilities are closely clustered around the mean, indicating a consistent level of self-regulation across the group.

Suan (2023) found that students with higher self-regulation skills, particularly in reflection, demonstrated better academic performance. Reflection significantly influenced academic achievement, suggesting that strong self-regulation skills correlate with improved student performance in self-evaluation and overall academic success.

Nwikpo et al. (2024) established a medium relationship between self-regulation and academic performance. Although the students exhibit some degree of self-regulation, in their academic motivation, the connection is not strong and possibly needed to be enhanced by them for their academic success in general.

Andrade (2019), self-assessment evaluation relates to SRL with which the students have increased the ability of self-regulation when they take their time to self-assess themselves. This implies a positive correlation between self-evaluation confidence and the adoption of effective learning strategies, thereby reinforcing the importance of self-regulation in academic success.

Table 1.3.1 show that item 5 has the highest mean of 3.60, which states that "*I reward myself when I make significant improvements in mechanics.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.54. This means that students put a value on self-reward when they make a noticeable improvement in their mechanical skills in writing. It somehow indicates a positive impact where students are motivated by personal incentives and recognize their achievements.

Supporting this, Ramirez et al. (2020) discovered that reward positively influences students' academic performance, self-confidence, and class participation. In addition, Urhahne & Wijnia (2023) highlight the aspect of self-reward in promoting goal-oriented behavior and academic achievement.

Furthermore, it underlines the importance of self-reward in motivating learners and improving their learning.

Table 1.3.1 The Mean Distribution of Students' Self-Regulated Learning in terms of Self-Evaluation

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I reflect on feedback from my teacher to improve my future writing	3.57	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reflect on feedback from my friends to improve my future writing	3.37	0.58	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate reasons for any grammar errors in my work.	3.37	0.60	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reward myself when I meet my writing goals.	3.36	0.53	Highly Self-Regulatory
I reward myself when I make significant improvements in mechanics	3.60	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate teacher feedback to strengthen grammar	3.29	0.59	Highly Self-Regulatory
I evaluate vocabulary choices to ensure precision expression.	3.45	0.55	Highly Self-Regulatory
After writing, I evaluate whether my writing task meets the specific criteria or goal set for the task.	3.49	0.53	Highly Self-Regulatory
I read through my writings to check any mistakes or areas of improvement.	3.40	0.54	Highly Self-Regulatory
I revise my content to enhance clarity of my ideas.	3.37	0.65	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	3.43	0.41	Highly Self-Regulatory

Legend: 0.00 – 0.99 (Strongly Disagree), 1.00 – 1.99 (Disagree), 2.00 – 2.99 (Agree), 3.00 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Item number 1 serves as the second highest with a mean of 3.57, with a statement, **"*I reflect on feedback from my teacher to improve my future writing.*"** With a Standard deviation of 0.54. This means that students seek and appreciate the feedback given to them by their teacher. This highlights the proactive learning attitude of students, who are also eager to strive for improvements. Selvaraj & Azman (2020) discuss the critical role of feedback in directing students to achieve their learning objectives. Similarly, Mamad (2022) highlights the significance of feedback literacy and how engaging with feedback can help in improving learning outcomes. In addition, Winstone et al. (2019) examine the growth of feedback literacy skills and their effects on students' proactive learning, indicating that the development of feedback literacy can greatly improve students' engagement with feedback and their motivation to learn.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item number 6 with a mean of 3.29, which states that "*I evaluate teacher feedback to strengthen grammar.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.59, this means that students may not be able to engage effectively or understand the feedback provided by their teacher in terms of grammar. It can be that it is difficult for them to apply the feedback in their own work, unsure how to address it. Tay & Lam (2022) on students' engagement with teacher feedback reveal that students often struggle to act on feedback due to complexities in understanding it. Additionally, Amedu & Dwarika (2023) found that students' academic adjustment is closely linked to their ability to comprehend and utilize feedback. Gan et al. (2021) further highlight that a lack of motivation and understanding can impede students' ability to effectively use the feedback provided.

Item number 4, however, serves as the second lowest with a mean of 3.36, which states, *"I reward myself when I meet my writing goals.*" With a Standard deviation of 0.53, this implies that not many of the students reward themselves when they meet their writing goals. It might be that they somehow view it as not crucial to their productivity. According to Meryem yilmaz Soylu (2021) study on secondary students' writing achievement goals, students' self-efficacy and goal orientation significantly influence their writing achievements, implying that those who do not reward themselves might lack the motivation and self-efficacy to perform well. Additionally, Ling et al. (2021) study on writing motivation and performance suggests that students who do not engage in self-rewarding behaviors might lack the confidence and motivation necessary for academic success, further supporting the notion that self-reward is an important aspect of maintaining productivity and achieving writing goals.

Table 1.4. The Summary for the Level of Students' Self-Regulated Learning

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Goal-Setting	3.44	0.47	Highly Self-Regulatory
Self-Monitoring	3.47	0.40	Highly Self-Regulatory
Self-Evaluation	3.43	0.41	Highly Self-Regulatory
Overall Mean	**3.44**	**0.38**	**Highly Self-Regulatory**

Table 1.4 presents the summary of the level of students' self-regulated learning. The dimension of Goal Setting shows a mean score of 3.44, indicating that students consistently appreciate and engage in the process of establishing structured goals for their learning. Positioned within the "Strongly Agree" range, this suggests that goal setting is an essential practice for many students, aiding them in sustaining focus, motivation, and guidance in their educational endeavors. Verbally interpreted as highly self-regulatory.

The relatively low standard deviation of 0.47 points to low variability, but most students display a similar level of confidence and ability in forming and pursuing clear aims. This high level of consensus indicates that students acknowledge the importance of goal setting as a fundamental aspect of self-regulated learning and are likely to utilize effective strategies to navigate and assess their academic development. Supporting this, Sides & Cuevas (2020), highlights the practice of explicit goal setting significantly boosts academic success by enhancing students' motivation and self-efficacy. Their research supported the concept that dedicated goal setting contributes to improved performance outcomes, reinforcing the belief that clear objectives are vital for effective self-regulation in learning. Similarly, Dansu (2023) described various ways in which goal setting aids academic success, such as providing clarity and focus, enhancing motivation, enabling progress monitoring, aiding in planning, ensuring accountability, and fostering a long-term vision. The study emphasized that well-defined goals offer students a sense of direction and purpose, which is crucial for sustaining motivation and commitment to their academic goals.

The Self-Monitoring dimension, with an average mean score of 3.47, signifies that students have a strong belief in their capability to track and modify their learning progress. Positioned in the "Strongly Agree" category, this implies that self-monitoring is an established practice among students, allowing them to assess their performance and improve strategies for ongoing success. Verbally interpreted as highly self-regulatory. The low standard deviation of 0.40 indicates minimal variation in responses, implying that students consistently partake in self-monitoring and recognize their strengths as well as areas needing improvement. This consistency illustrates their active engagement in the learning process, highlighting the significance of self-regulatory skills in enhancing academic results.

Supporting this, Layden et al. (2022) conducted a comprehensive review analyzing various studies on self-monitoring as a technique for boosting student performance. The review determined that regular engagement in self-monitoring practices greatly contributes to enhanced academic performance and promotes greater self-regulatory skills among students, reinforcing the necessity for the continued use of these strategies. Similarly, Digital et al. (2018) investigated how permitting students to select their methods of self-monitoring influenced their on-task behavior and academic success. The results revealed that when students consistently utilized their chosen self-monitoring systems, there was a notable improvement in both on-task behaviors and academic performance. This indicates that maintaining consistency in employing personalized self-monitoring strategies can result in enduring academic advantages.

The Self-Evaluation dimension, with an average score of 3.43, indicates that students highly prioritize reflection and self-assessment in their educational journey. This score, falling within the "Strongly Agree" category, suggests that students are not only tracking their progress but also reflecting critically on their performance to pinpoint areas needing improvement. Verbally interpreted as highly self-

regulatory. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.41 implies that most students adopt a similar perspective on self-evaluation, reinforcing the notion that they are actively involved in thoughtful reflection. This consistency illustrates a shared commitment to honing their learning strategies, ensuring they keep enhancing and adapting their methods for improved academic results. This aligns with the research by Al-Bashir et al. (2019), which explores how self-assessment helps students recognize the gaps between their objectives and actual results. It highlights that effective feedback, when paired with self-assessment, empowers students to discern areas for growth and refine their learning approaches. By participating in this reflective practice, students deepen their understanding of their performance and cultivate the skills necessary for self-regulation. Furthermore, Karaman (2021) indicates that structured self-assessment practices foster critical thinking and reflection among students. The study found that students who frequently engage in self-evaluation exhibit enhanced motivation and academic performance, indicating that thoughtful reflection significantly contributes to improving their learning strategies.

The overall mean for the level of students' self-regulated learning is 3.44, with a standard deviation of 0.38, which is interpreted as Highly Self-Regulatory. This indicates that, on average, students demonstrate a strong ability to regulate their learning through practices such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation, reflecting a high level of self-regulation across the group.

This aligns with the findings of Apridelia et al. (2024), which indicate that the level of self-regulated learning among high school students, revealing that 80.00% of the participants, or 44 students, demonstrated a high level of self-regulation. In contrast, 14.55% of students were categorized as quite high, and only 1.82% were rated as low. These findings highlight that, on average, students exhibit strong self-regulated learning abilities. Practices such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation were key indicators of this high level of self-regulation, showcasing their capacity to manage their learning effectively.

2. What is the level of students' written communication skills in terms of:
   2.1 Content;
   2.2 Grammar;
   2.3 Vocabulary;
   2.4 Organization; and
   2.5 Mechanics?

Table 2.1. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Content

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	26	30.95
2.00-2.99	Good	48	57.14
1.00-1.99	Fair	10	11.90
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.1 illustrates students' written communication skills in terms of content, evaluated on a scale from ≤0.99 to 4. With a mean score of 2.49, it shows that students typically perform at a "Good" level, though there is potential for further improvement. The majority of students, 48 (57.14%), are in the "Good" range (2.00–2.99), indicating they have a strong ability to convey content. Furthermore, 26 students (30.95%) scored in the "Excellent" range (3.00–4.00), reflecting a notable proportion with high-level skills in content presentation. On the other hand, 10 students (11.90%) are in the "Fair" category (1.00–1.99), suggesting they might struggle with presenting content effectively. Importantly, no students fell into the "Poor" category (0.00–0.99), signifying that all students possess a foundational level of competence. The standard deviation (SD: 0.60) indicates a moderate spread in the scores.

Although overall performance is favorable, students in the "Fair" category could benefit from targeted support to improve their skills, which would ultimately enhance the overall group performance.

The findings of this study align with existing literature. Nur Rahmiani (2020) reported that Islamic undergraduate students generally performed well in writing, achieving an average value of 24.3 for content. Similar to this study, Rahmiani observed that while most students demonstrated strong skills, only a few excelled, indicating the need to improve writing quality across all levels.

Ghosh (2023) also found that while the majority of students performed well in terms of content, only a small proportion achieved excellence. This trend is echoed in this study, where 30.95% of students scored in the "Excellent" range, reinforcing the importance of refining strategies to support higher levels of proficiency.

Similarly, Mariana (2019) noted that university students generally demonstrated "Good" performance in content but highlighted the need for enhanced writing strategies to address areas requiring improvement. In this study, the 11.90% of students in the "Fair" category underscores this need, suggesting that additional support in structuring and presenting ideas could bridge the gap between "Fair" and "Good" performance levels.

Table 2.2. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Grammar

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	20	23.81
2.00-2.99	Good	60	71.43
1.00-1.99	Fair	4	4.76
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.2 presents the level of students' written communication skills in terms of grammar. The majority of students (71.43%) fall under the "Good" category, indicating a solid grasp of grammar with occasional errors that do not significantly hinder communication. A smaller proportion of students (23.81%) achieved an "Excellent" rating, showcasing advanced proficiency in grammar with minimal or no errors. Only 4 students (4.76%) are rated as "Fair," reflecting significant difficulties in grammar that may affect communication clarity, while no students were categorized as "Poor," suggesting a baseline competency in grammar across the cohort. The mean score of 2.50, which falls within the "Good" range, confirms that the average grammatical skill level is competent but not exemplary. The standard deviation of 0.47 indicates moderate variability in grammar performance, suggesting that while most students' scores cluster around the mean, a few outliers exist, primarily in the "Excellent" or "Fair" categories.

The study by Quiñones (2022) reinforces this notion by highlighting that, while students generally possess a functional understanding of grammar, they often struggle with maintaining consistency. Specifically, the study found that although many students demonstrated moderate proficiency in basic grammatical rules, persistent errors in areas such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, article usage, and prepositions continued to emerge. These findings align with the observation that the majority of students fall under the "Good" category, which reflects a solid grasp of grammar with occasional errors that do not significantly hinder communication.

Moreover, the study underscores the variability in students' performance, suggesting that proficiency levels are not uniform across the board. To address these inconsistencies, the research advocates for targeted interventions, such as grammar-focused modules and structured activities. These strategies are particularly valuable for enhancing overall proficiency and ensuring that students can build on their foundational skills. Consequently, the findings emphasize the importance of providing additional

support to help students move beyond baseline competency and achieve exemplary levels of grammatical precision.

In a similar vein, the study by Sparks et al. (2014) highlights the pivotal role grammar plays in academic success. While many students demonstrate baseline competency, persistent issues in grammar, syntax, and mechanics reveal noticeable variability in their levels of proficiency. This observation aligns with most students falling into the "Good" category, wherein occasional errors may occur but do not severely disrupt effective communication.

The findings suggest a generally positive trend in students' grammar skills, with opportunities for improvement to elevate more students into the "Excellent" category. To achieve this, targeted interventions such as remedial grammar workshops or personalized coaching can support students in the "Fair" category. Additionally, students in the "Good" category could benefit from advanced training opportunities like peer editing, writing competitions, or advanced grammar exercises to refine their skills. Recognizing and celebrating the achievements of students in the "Excellent" category could further motivate others and maintain high performance standards. The overall description of "Good" reflects satisfactory competence in grammar, but continued efforts to reduce variability and encourage excellence are essential for further enhancing students' written communication skills.

Table 2.3. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Vocabulary

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	28	33.33
2.00-2.99	Good	53	63.10
1.00-1.99	Fair	3	3.57
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

The data on written communication skills, specifically regarding vocabulary, provides a clear overview of participants' proficiency levels. The largest group, consisting of 53 individuals (63.10%), falls into the "good" category, with scores ranging from 2.00 to 2.99. This suggests that most participants have a solid understanding of vocabulary and can communicate effectively in writing. However, their vocabulary might not be as refined or sophisticated as that in the "excellent" category. supports this by emphasizing how important a broad vocabulary is for reading development and comprehension. A smaller but significant portion, 28 participants (33.33%), are classified in the "excellent" category with a score of 3. These individuals demonstrate a high level of vocabulary proficiency, able to express their ideas clearly and precisely, using a wide variety of words in the appropriate contexts. Meanwhile, a small group of 3 participants (3.57%) scored in the "fair" category (1.00 to 1.99), indicating that these individuals may have some difficulty selecting the most appropriate words, which could impact the effectiveness of their written communication. However, the absence of participants in the "poor" category (0.00 to 0.99) is reassuring, as it shows that no one is severely lacking in vocabulary skills.

The mean score of 2.63, which falls between the "good" category, suggests that, on average, participants have a strong vocabulary. Most individuals are competent in using a range of words, though there is some variation in the sophistication and depth of their vocabulary. The standard deviation of 0.51, while moderate, indicates that while most participants are concentrated in the "good" category, there are still some differences in proficiency levels. This variability shows that, while the group as a whole is proficient in vocabulary, a few individuals might need additional support to further develop their vocabulary skills.

Santillan, J. P. (2020) highlights that while students possess a presumed understanding of vocabulary knowledge, their actual knowledge often falls short. This observation suggests that although many students understand the importance of vocabulary, only a few excel in recognizing its critical role in

comprehension and learning strategies. Similarly, Yuhariah (2023) underscores that while students generally demonstrate good vocabulary proficiency, only a minority acknowledge its essential contribution to enhancing their writing skills. This finding points to the need for greater awareness and practice in vocabulary usage to support effective writing.

Building on these insights, Quines (2023) further emphasizes the significant impact of vocabulary levels on both reading and writing performance. Although many students achieve good proficiency in vocabulary, only a select few excel in appreciating its indispensable role, revealing a persistent gap between vocabulary awareness and actual performance in writing.

Table 2.4. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Organization

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	24	28.57
2.00-2.99	Good	49	58.33
1.00-1.99	Fair	11	13.10
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

The Table shows the data on students' written communication skills in terms of organization, and reveals that the majority performed well, with 58.33% achieving a "Good" level and 28.57% reaching the "Excellent" level. This indicates a strong ability among most students to structure their written work effectively. A smaller group, 13.10%, performed at the "Fair" level, highlighting the need for targeted interventions to improve their organizational skills, while no students fell into the "Poor" category, demonstrating that all participants possess at least basic competence in this area. The mean score of 2.46, falling within the "Good" range, and a standard deviation of 0.57 reflect a moderate variability in performance, with most students clustering around the average level.

These results suggest that instructional methods have been effective for a majority of students but also indicate opportunities for improvement. To support those in the "Fair" category and encourage more students to excel, educators can implement targeted strategies, such as additional practice in outlining and structuring arguments, as well as peer mentoring programs where high-performing students assist their peers. Overall, the data demonstrates a positive trend, with most students performing at a satisfactory or exemplary level, but there is room to refine teaching strategies to elevate more students to excellence.

The findings align with those of Wulandari et al. (2023), who observed that 75% of fifth-semester students at Muhammadiyah Malang University demonstrated effective organization of ideas in essay writing. Similar to the 58.33% "Good" level in this study, Wulandari et al. identified organizational strengths among most students. However, they also noted that 25% of students faced challenges in organizing their thoughts, a figure comparable to the 13.10% "Fair" level in this research. This similarity underscores a consistent pattern across contexts, highlighting the need for interventions targeting those who struggle.

Additionally, Nardone (2017) further supports this observation, emphasizing that while many students exhibit adequate organizational skills, a significant portion still requires improvement. This parallels the 13.10% identified in this study as needing support and reinforces the importance of tailored instructional strategies to enhance these students' skills.

Also, Farida (2024) found that even students with strong organizational abilities often struggled with achieving coherence and logical flow. This observation complements the current study, suggesting that while students perform well overall, targeted strategies such as structured outlining exercises and focused feedback on logical progression can help bridge the gap for those at the "Fair" level.

Table 2.5. The Level of Students' Written Communication Skills in Terms of Mechanics

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.00-4.00	Excellent	12	14.29
2.00-2.99	Good	49	58.33
1.00-1.99	Fair	23	27.38
≤0.99	Poor	0	0.00
TOTAL		**84**	**100.00**

Table 2.5 presents the level of students' written communication skills in terms of mechanics, focusing on punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The majority of students (58.33%) demonstrated a Good level of proficiency, indicating an adequate command of basic writing rules, though there remains room for improvement. A significant portion (27.38%) fell into the Fair category, suggesting struggles with certain aspects of mechanics that require targeted support or remediation. Meanwhile, 14.29% of the students achieved an Excellent level, showcasing high proficiency in applying mechanical rules to their writing. Notably, no students were categorized as Poor, suggesting that all participants demonstrated at least a foundational understanding of written mechanics.

The mean score of 2.24 reflects an overall performance at the Good level, indicating that students, on average, possess a satisfactory level of skill in mechanics. However, the standard deviation of 0.55 shows moderate variability, with some students performing significantly above or below the average. While the overall performance suggests competency, the relatively large proportion of students in the Fair category highlights the need for targeted interventions to address common errors in punctuation, grammar, and spelling. Providing additional practice opportunities, workshops, or peer feedback sessions could help students in the Fair category improve their skills, ultimately increasing the number of students achieving Excellent results and setting a higher benchmark for overall performance.

Yuliawati (2021) further corroborates the notion of foundational competence but provides a quantitative lens on specific aspects of mechanics. Her study reveals that students excel in areas like capitalization (82%), spelling (83%), italicization (96%), and numbering (98%), but punctuation emerges as a significant challenge, with only 41% accuracy. Despite this, punctuation errors were not deemed severe enough to obstruct comprehension, suggesting that while these issues detract from overall writing quality, they do not fundamentally undermine communication.

Table 2.6. The Summary of the Level of Students' Written Communication Skills

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Content	2.49	0.60	Good
Grammar	2.50	0.47	Good
Vocabulary	2.63	0.51	Good
Organization	2.46	0.57	Good
Mechanics	2.24	0.55	Good
Overall Mean	**2.47**	**0.50**	**Good**

Table 2.6 presents the summary of students' written communication skills, revealing a consistent "Good" performance across the five assessed components: content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. In terms of content, with a mean score of 2.49 and an SD of 0.60, students demonstrated a satisfactory ability to express ideas effectively and develop the main points of their writing, reflected as "Good". There is moderate variability, suggesting that while most students perform well, a few may struggle or excel more noticeably.

Similarly, Durant et al. (2016) found that most students achieved good performance in content creation, with only a small group excelling and a minority struggling. This reflects varying levels of understanding and application of the concepts taught. Mainardes et al. (2016) support these findings,

reporting that while the majority of students performed satisfactorily, few excelled or faced significant challenges. This suggests a consistent trend of adequate performance among students, with exceptions on either end of the spectrum.

Grammar, with a mean of 2.50 and an SD of 0.47, also reflected a "Good" level, indicating moderate accuracy in sentence construction. Shows less variation, indicating that students' performance in this area is relatively consistent. This finding aligns with Sacal and Potane's (2023) study, which concluded that students' competence in English grammar is satisfactory, thereby supporting the notion of moderate accuracy in sentence construction. Furthermore, these results are consistent with other research emphasizing the crucial role of grammar mastery in fostering effective written communication skills.

Similarly, Callora and Suñas (2023) revealed that students' lexico-grammatical abilities were at a "Developing" level, with a mean score of 2.23. While this indicates emerging grammar skills, it also highlights areas for improvement, particularly in verb usage, prepositions, pronouns, and subject-verb agreement. These common issues emphasize the need for targeted grammar instruction to enhance written communication skills. Barraquio (2015) also reported similar trends, noting that college students from Letran Calamba received fair ratings in grammar, particularly in sentence structure. This finding, which reflects moderate accuracy, reinforces the importance of grammar proficiency as a significant factor in students' overall written communication skills.

Vocabulary scored the highest among the components, with a mean of 2.63 and an SD of 0.51, verbally interpreted as Good. Suggests that most students have a good command of word choice, with minor differences in proficiency among them. Corpuz et al. (2024) revealed that students demonstrated strong vocabulary skills, excelling in literal and critical questions, performing very satisfactorily in application, and achieving satisfactory results in inferential skills. These findings indicate a generally good command of word choice among the students. Building on this, Zhang and Xuan (2019) found that vocabulary knowledge significantly enhanced academic literacy skills among ESL learners. Their study showed that students generally exhibited a good command of word choice, with only minor variations in proficiency, particularly in vocabulary breadth and depth.

Organization, with a mean of 2.46 and an SD of 0.57, verbally interpreted as Good, showed that students could arrange ideas logically, maintaining clarity in their writing. Again reflects moderate variability, implying that while students generally arrange their ideas logically, some may need further guidance. This aligns with Wulandari et al. (2023), who found that 75% of students effectively organized ideas, aligning with the 58.33% "Good" level identified in this study. Similarly, Nardone (2017) and Salvador (2024) emphasized the adequacy of students' organizational skills while noting that a smaller subset requires improvement. Salvador further observed that only a small percentage of students achieve exemplary organization, resonating with the 28.57% "Excellent" level in this research.

Challenges in achieving coherence and logical flow were also noted. Farida (2024) highlighted that even students with strong organizational skills sometimes struggle with maintaining seamless progression, which underscores the need for structured strategies, such as outlining exercises and targeted feedback. Additionally, Wulandari and Mahmudah (2023) observed that a consistent minority of students (13.10% in this study and 25% in theirs) face difficulties in organizing ideas, further emphasizing the importance of tailored interventions to bridge these gaps

However, mechanics, which includes spelling, punctuation, and formatting, scored the lowest at 2.24 and an SD of 0.55, though still at a "Good" level, indicating that this area requires further improvement. Shows that there is notable variability, highlighting a greater disparity in their ability to apply proper spelling, punctuation, and formatting.

Yuliawati (2021) revealed that students demonstrated varying levels of mechanics accuracy in writing assignments, with 41% accuracy in punctuation, 83% in spelling, and 96% in italicization. While generally sufficient, these findings highlight the need for improvement, particularly in punctuation and capitalization, to achieve greater precision in writing.

The overall mean of 2.47 and SD of 0.50 demonstrate that students' written communication skills are generally consistent. The students exhibited a generally satisfactory level of written communication skills rated as Good, though some variability exists, particularly in content and mechanics. This suggests that while students are performing well overall, targeted support, especially in mechanics, may help address the observed. Rios et al. (2017) found that while students demonstrated satisfactory written communication skills, there was notable variability, particularly in content and mechanics. This suggests that targeted support in these areas could enhance overall performance and address the observed discrepancies in writing skills. Similarly, the findings of Grainger et al. (2019) align with this perspective, highlighting that although students generally possess good written communication skills, variability persists, especially in mechanics. The study advocates for the implementation of targeted support mechanisms, such as clearer rubrics and formative feedback, to address these disparities effectively.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the use of self-regulated learning and students' performance in written communication skills?

Table 3. Test of Statistical Relationship Between the Use of Self-Regulated Learning and Students' Performance in Written Communication Skills

| WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS | SELF REGULATED LEARNING | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Goal Setting | | | Self-Monitoring | | | Self-Evaluation | | | Overall Measure | | |
	r	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*	*r*	*p-value*	*Decision on Ho*
Content	0.163	0.139	Accept	0.156	0.156	Accept	0.167	0.129	Accept	0.184	0.094	Accept
Grammar	0.124	0.261	Accept	0.187	0.089	Accept	0.198	0.071	Accept	0.190	0.083	Accept
Vocabulary	0.130	0.238	Accept	0.139	0.207	Accept	0.175	0.111	Accept	0.167	0.128	Accept
Organization	0.155	0.159	Accept	0.084	0.445	Accept	0.127	0.249	Accept	0.141	0.200	Accept
Mechanics	0.164	0.136	Accept	0.202	0.065	Accept	0.186	0.091	Accept	0.207	0.058	Accept
Overall Measure	0.159	0.148	Accept	0.164	0.136	Accept	0.182	0.098	Accept	0.191	0.082	Accept

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Rejected if Significant
Accepted if Not Significant

Table 3 presents the results of the analysis examining the relationship between Written Communication Skills (Content, Grammar, Vocabulary, Organization, and Mechanics) and the different dimensions of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), including Goal Setting, Self-Monitoring, Self-Evaluation, and the Overall Measure. The findings indicate that all relationships are weak and non-significant, as evidenced by the low r-values and p-values above 0.05 for all variables.

For the Content variable, the correlations with all SRL dimensions are weak, with r-values ranging from 0.156 to 0.184. None of these correlations is statistically significant, as the p-values remain greater than 0.05. This suggests that students' ability to develop and present content in their writing does not show any meaningful connection with self-regulation skills, such as goal setting, monitoring, or evaluating their learning progress.

Deane and Philippakos (2024) emphasize the theoretical connection between self-regulation and writing processes but highlight that empirical findings show minimal practical correlations between these domains. Their work supports the notion that students' ability to develop and present content in writing is not significantly influenced by self-regulation skills such as goal setting or progress monitoring. Similarly, Ghazali et al. (2024) found from Malaysian ESL learners, consistently highlight that students demonstrate higher efficacy in technical writing aspects like grammar and sentence

construction, with limited correlation to self-regulation dimensions involved in ideation and content generation.

The Grammar variable shows a slightly stronger, though still weak, relationship with Self-Evaluation (r = 0.198, p = 0.071) and the Overall SRL Measure (r = 0.190, p = 0.083). However, these correlations also fail to reach statistical significance. The slightly higher r-values here may hint at a potential link between students' ability to assess their progress and their grammar skills, but the lack of statistical significance limits the strength of this conclusion.

Recent studies provide robust evidence supporting the link between grammar skills and self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies. For instance, Chansri et al. (2024) highlight a statistically significant correlation between SRL strategies and grammar acquisition, while Al-Othman (2024) demonstrates that metacognitive SRL strategies, such as self-monitoring and feedback utilization, enhance learners' ability to internalize and apply grammar rules effectively.

For the Vocabulary, Organization, and Mechanics variables, the correlations with all SRL dimensions are similarly weak and non-significant. The r-values range from 0.084 to 0.207, and the p-values remain above 0.05 across all dimensions. This indicates that aspects of writing such as word choice, structural organization, and technical accuracy (spelling and punctuation) do not have meaningful relationships with self-regulated learning dimensions.

Robillos, R. (2021) revealed that while self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies play a positive role in overall writing performance, their influence on specific dimensions such as vocabulary, organization, and mechanics appears minimal. The weak correlations observed between SRL practices particularly self-evaluation and these aspects suggest that SRL strategies do not significantly enhance word choice, structural coherence, or mechanical accuracy, such as spelling and punctuation. This gap indicates the need for a balanced approach. While fostering SRL skills like planning, monitoring, and self-evaluation is valuable for improving overall writing, educators should complement these strategies with focused teaching on technical writing aspects. For example, direct instruction in vocabulary enrichment, organizational frameworks, and mechanical accuracy could help bridge the gap left by the limited impact of SRL.

Overall, the results suggest that written communication skills and self-regulated learning (SRL) dimensions are not strongly connected. The lack of significant findings indicates that SRL, as measured, does not appear to play a substantial role in influencing writing performance. Building upon these findings, Amalia et al. (2023) highlight that while SRL strategies correlate with improved argumentative writing abilities, the relationship is not substantial enough to position SRL as a primary determinant of writing success. Similarly, Burger (2024) emphasizes that SRL processes, when integrated into feedback-driven writing frameworks, can enhance students' engagement and incremental progress. However, their findings underline that SRL alone does not significantly improve writing outcomes without the inclusion of structured scaffolding and targeted feedback mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies and written communication skills among second-year Teacher Education students at Opol Community College. The findings revealed that students demonstrated a high level of self-regulated learning, particularly in goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. However, while their written communication skills were generally good, they showed notable variability, particularly in content and mechanics, with room for improvement in certain areas.

Despite the positive correlation between self-regulation strategies and writing performance, the relationship between SRL dimensions and written communication skills was not substantial.

Specifically, the lack of a clear, strong correlation suggests that other factors, such as instructional methods or external support mechanisms, may play a significant role in enhancing students' writing abilities. Future research should explore how specific pedagogical approaches, like peer feedback or collaborative learning, can strengthen the connection between SRL and writing performance.

To conclude, while self-regulated learning appears to be an important aspect of students' academic development, it is clear that improving written communication skills in teacher education programs requires a multifaceted approach. Educators and program developers should consider integrating additional strategies and support systems that foster both self-regulation and effective writing to better prepare future educators for the demands of professional communication in their careers.

REFERENCES

Al-Bataineh, A. T., Brenwall, L., Stalter, K., & York, J. (2019). Student growth through goal setting. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, *11*(4), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v11i4.4329

Amalia, N. Z., Lestari, L. A., & Anam, S. (2023). The Correlation between Students' Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and their Writing Ability in Argumentative Writing Class. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, *7*(2), 131. https://doi.org/10.20961/ijpte.v7i2.89318

Barua, S. (2023). Goal Setting Strategies for Motivation and Writing Skills: A Study among Adult Second Language Learners. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4513295

Charinee Chansri, Akadet Kedcham, & Montha Polrak. (2024). The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and English Language Abilities and Knowledge of Undergraduate Students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *17*(1), 286–307. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1415587

Corpuz, M. M., Morales, A. N., Clarin, A. S., Dionio, B. B., & Cocolan, J. V. (2024). Students' Vocabulary Skills in Relation to their Reading Comprehension in Language Literature. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *VIII*(X), 2137–2150. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8100183

Deane, P., & Zoi A. Traga Philippakos. (2024). Writing and Reading Connections: A before, during, and after Experience for Critical Thinkers. *The Reading Teacher*. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2284

Deiparine, M. S. (2024). Uncovering the Common Linguistic Errors in Student Journalists'^{TM} Unedited News Articles: A Comprehensive Analysis. *World Journal of English Language*, *14*(4), 131–131. https://ideas.repec.org/a/jfr/wjel11/v14y2024i4p131.html

Doyle, E., Buckley, P., & McCarthy, B. (2020). The impact of content co-creation on academic achievement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1782832

Durant, R. A., Carlon, D. M., & Downs, A. (2016). The Efficiency Challenge: Creating a Transformative Learning Experience in a Principles of Management Course. *Journal of Management Education*, *41*(6), 852–872. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562916682789

Farida. (2024). *Evaluation of students' writing skills in higher education*. *16*(1), 145–154. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380268021_Evaluation_of_students

Ghazali, I. M., Hamid, M. H. A., Ahmad Kamal, M. A., Khaidzir, M. F. S., & Faizul Ganapathy, N. N. D. (2024). Exploring Writing Self-Efficacy among Malaysian Tertiary English Learners. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *VIII*(IIIS), 4743–4751. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.803347s

Ghosh, A., & Sen, S. (2023). Relationship between Different Components of English Writing Skill. *International Journal of Research and Review*, *10*(10), 463–471. https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20231058

Gusewelle, L. F. (2024). *The Impact Of Upper-Elementary C3WP Resources On First Draft Student Writing Samples: A Study Of Lexical Cohesion, Semantic Overlap, Grammar And Mechanics*. UND Scholarly Commons. https://commons.und.edu/theses/6427/

MacArthur, C. A., Traga Philippakos, Z. A., May, H., & Compello, J. (2022). Strategy instruction with self-regulation in college developmental writing courses: Results from a randomized experiment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000705

Mahmudah, Z. (2023). An Analysis of Mechanical Errors in Writing Skill. *English LAnguage Study and TEaching*, *3*(2), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.32672/elaste.v3i2.4271

Mariana Ester Politton, & Widi, M. (2019). ENHANCING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS ON CONTENT AREA. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *22*(2), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v22i2.1868

Mawudoku, M. (2020). Punctuation Marks as an Aspect and Cause of Poor Performance in the English Language. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 1–1. https://www.royalliteglobal.com/njhs/article/view/27

Nadia, R. (2023). Enhancing Student Vocabulary Proficiency through the Effective Implementation of Multimodal Approaches. *Invention: Journal Research and Education Studies*, 33–40. https://doi.org/10.51178/invention.v4i2.1505

Nur Rahmiani. (2020). WRITING PERFORMANCE OF ISLAMIC UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN THE ISSUES OF INTEGRATION TECHNOLOGY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING. *Tadarus Tarbawy*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.31000/jkip.v2i1.2577

Parker, M. (2023, October 16). *Why is Technical Writing Important at Workplace*. Www.acadecraft.com. https://www.acadecraft.com/blog/reasons-why-is-technical-writing-important/

Pham, Q. H. P. (2022). A goal-based writing program in the EFL writing context: implementation and results. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.2025381

Quiñones, T. (2022). A Study on the In-depth Knowledge of Grammar among English Major Students at the University of Makati: Basis for Worktext Development. *UNIVERSITAS - the Official Journal of University of Makati*, *10*(1). https://journals.umak.edu.ph/universitas/article/view/46/40

Rimun, J. C., & Yumarnamto, M. (2024). Metacognition in ELT writing: Teacher's facilitation and students' strategies. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *11*(2), 91. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i2.20563

Roberts, J., Nardone, C. F., & Bridges, B. (2017). Examining Differences in Student Writing Proficiency as a Function of Student Race and Gender. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, *12*, 59–68. https://eric.ed.gov/?q=nardone&ff1=subCollege+Students&id=EJ1168687

Saks, K. (2024). The effect of self-efficacy and self-set grade goals on academic outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1324007

Salvador, J. (2024). Writing Competence of First Year College Students at a State University. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, *56*(1), 102–120. https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v56i1.888

Santillan, J. P., & Daenos, R. G. (2020). Vocabulary Knowledge and Learning Strategies of Senior High School Students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(6), 2474–2482. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080631

Sparks, J. R., Song, Y., Brantley, W., & Liu, O. L. (2014). Assessing Written Communication in Higher Education: Review and Recommendations for Next-Generation Assessment. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2014*(2), 1–52. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12035

Zaldy Maglay Quines. (2023). Impact of Students' Vocabulary Level to their Reading and Writing Performance. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *11*(2), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijellr.13/vol11n21832

The Correlation Between Language Attitude Towards College Students' Writing Self-Efficacy

[1]Kyle Marie G. Bonane[*], [1]Che-an F. Magdale, [1]Ilyn G. Unson, [1]Jericho B. Zulieta, [1]Kent Leo Estaura

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.bonane.kylemarie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between language attitudes and writing self-efficacy among first-year and second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education students at a local community college in Mindanao, Philippines, during the 2024–2025 academic year. Drawing on the Tripartite Model of Attitude and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, the study was guided by the hypothesis that the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of language attitude significantly correlate with writing self-efficacy in terms of ideation, conventions, and self-regulation. Previous literature emphasized the impact of attitudes and self-belief on writing performance, yet limited studies explored their interplay among college students of English majors. A correlational research design was employed. Data were collected from 102 students using a validated 4-point Likert scale questionnaire. Descriptive statistics summarized the levels of language attitude and writing self-efficacy, while Pearson's correlation coefficient tested the relationship between the variables. Findings revealed that students generally held positive language attitudes, particularly in the affective component, and reported moderate to high levels of writing self-efficacy. Significant correlations were found between cognitive attitudes and grammatical confidence, and between affective attitudes and motivation in writing tasks. The study underscored the importance of nurturing favorable language attitudes to enhance students' writing confidence and performance. Results may inform teacher training programs and curriculum development focused on writing instruction in multilingual contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a cornerstone of academic success, yet it poses significant challenges for many college students. It involves not only arranging words coherently but also expressing ideas clearly and adhering to linguistic rules. Writing has been described as a "multifaceted literacy skill," combining creativity with technical proficiency (Philippakos et al., 2019). In higher education, writing serves as a primary tool for assessing students' knowledge through essays, research papers, and exams (Casanave, 2017). Thus, the quality of students' writing plays a critical role in shaping their academic outcomes. Beyond linguistic proficiency, students' attitudes toward language and their belief in their ability to write effectively—referred to as writing self-efficacy—are vital factors influencing their writing performance. Writing is a demanding, multi-step process that requires time, effort, and sustained motivation. Students' attitudes toward language significantly affect how they approach these steps. Language attitudes encompass cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions, shaping how students perceive and engage with writing tasks. According to the Tripartite Model of Attitude, these attitudes influence not only perception but also active language use (Li & Wei, 2022). For example, a positive

attitude can boost motivation and effort in improving writing, while negative attitudes may lead to anxiety and avoidance behaviors.

Recent research highlights the critical role of language attitudes in writing success. Burgoon and Miller (2018) found that students with positive attitudes toward language produced clearer and more compelling persuasive writing. Such attitudes are active influences on writing performance, rather than passive background factors. Students who value language are more likely to invest effort in refining their writing, reinforcing their writing self-efficacy in the process.

Writing self-efficacy, defined as students' belief in their ability to succeed in writing tasks, plays a pivotal role in learning behaviors and outcomes. Drawing from Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, students who perceive themselves as capable writers are more likely to persist in challenging tasks, engage deeply in writing activities, and improve their skills. For example, Limpo and Alves (2018) demonstrated that students with higher writing self-efficacy produced better-quality writing and were more motivated to undertake writing assignments.

Despite these findings, gaps remain in understanding how language attitudes shape writing self-efficacy, particularly among college students from diverse backgrounds. While studies indicate that language attitudes influence writing outcomes, limited research addresses how these attitudes directly interact with self-efficacy beliefs. For instance, Thi and Nang (2020) explored writing self-efficacy but did not investigate how preferences for informal versus academic language forms impact these beliefs. This gap underscores the need to examine how students' attitudes toward various language forms shape their writing self-efficacy. This study seeks to address these gaps by exploring the relationship between language attitudes and writing self-efficacy among college students.

By doing so, it aims to contribute to the development of targeted strategies for enhancing writing instruction and support. Understanding the interplay between language attitudes and writing self-efficacy offers valuable insights into the factors that shape writing performance. Addressing these research gaps can help educators foster not only linguistic proficiency but also positive attitudes and confidence in students' writing abilities, enabling them to overcome writing challenges and succeed academically.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research design and a prescriptive correlational research approach to investigate the correlation of language attitude on college students' writing self-efficacy among Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) major in English students at Opol Community College during the first semester of the school year 2024–2025. This diverse group helped the researchers understand how language attitude and writing self-efficacy affected in writing skills at different stages of their education. By examining the interplay between these constructs, the research aimed to provide insights into how language attitudes could have enhanced writing self-effiacy, ultimately leading to improved writing performance among college students. The participants consisted of first-year and second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major (BSEd) major in English students from sections A and B. Using Cochran's formula (1977) with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, a sample of 102 students was determined. The data was collected through validated surveys that measured students' language attitudes and self-efficacy in writing.

Data were gathered through a validated survey questionnaires and 4-point Likert-scale divided into two main sections. The instrument achieved Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.953, surpassing the generally accepted threshold of 0.70. This result confirmed that the tool was highly reliable and consistent in measuring the constructs across its item. The first section of the questionnaire measured language attitude in terms of cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects, with items adapted from

Weerathai (2019), McCroskey (1996), and Baker (1992). The second section assessed writing self-efficacy, focusing on ideation, conventions, and self-regulation, adapted from Bruning et al. (2012). The data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The mean and standard deviation were computed to determine the participants' levels of language attitude and writing self-efficacy. To examine the relationship between these two variables, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the level of language attitudes employed by college students of Bachelor of Secondary Education in the school year 2024-2025 at Opol Community College in terms of Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Components?

Table 1.1. Participants' Level of the Cognitive Component of Language Attitudes.

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	Strong Positive Attitude	23	22.55
2.52 – 3.27	Generally Positive Attitude	73	71.57
1.76 – 2.51	Generally Negative Attitude	6	5.88
≤0.75	Strong Negative Attitude	0	0

The Data showed that the majority of students, 73 out of 102 (71.57%), exhibit a Generally Positive Attitude toward the cognitive aspects of language. This suggests that these students have a solid understanding of fundamental language elements such as grammar, vocabulary, and structure, although opportunities remain for deeper mastery of more complex sentence constructions. For instance, Soreño and Valle (2024) explored the influence of cognitive attitudes on oral communication and found that students who maintain generally positive cognitive perceptions are better able to use linguistic elements effectively, aligning with our study's findings. Additionally, 23 students (22.55%) were categorized as having a strong positive attitude. These students exhibit a robust cognitive grasp of language, showing a high level of confidence and proficiency in applying language rules and concepts.

Alharthy and Alsoudi (2024) emphasized that non-native learners with strong positive cognitive attitudes tend to achieve higher academic success due to their belief in the value of language learning. Conversely, 6 students (5.88%) demonstrate a Generally Negative Attitude, indicating limited understanding or application of linguistic concepts. These students may struggle with foundational grammar or vocabulary, which can hinder their confidence and engagement with language learning. Abun, Magallanes, and Incarnacion (2019) emphasized that negative cognitive attitudes can lower academic engagement, which corresponds with the challenges observed in this group of students in our study. Overall, these results revealed that most students at Opol Community College exhibit a positive cognitive attitude toward language use, with only a small fraction showing indications of challenges.

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I find English grammar easy to remember when writing.	3.18	0.50	Generally Positive Attitude
I know the importance of organization in writing in English.	3.12	0.49	Generally Positive Attitude
I find English vocabulary easy to remember when writing.	3.05	0.55	Generally Positive Attitude
I know the importance of structure in writing in English.	3.13	0.54	Generally Positive Attitude
I believe that writing skills in English is valuable in personal setting.	3.38	0.56	Strong Positive Attitude
I am confident in my ability to use complex sentence structures in English.	2.72	0.59	Generally Positive Attitude
Overall Mean	**3.09**	**0.54**	**Generally Positive Attitude**

Data showed that item 5 has the highest mean of 3.38, which states that "I believe that writing skills in English are valuable in a personal setting," with an interpretation of Strong Positive Attitude. This item scored the highest, reflecting students' strong agreement with the utility of English writing in personal contexts. This suggests they understand how writing impacts personal communication, goal setting, and self-expression. This finding aligns with Hyland's (2019) assertion that writing in a second language, such as English, significantly contributes to the development of self-identity.

Item number 1 served as the second highest with a mean of 3.18, with a statement, "I find English grammar easy to remember when writing." With an interpretation of Generally Positive Attitude. This suggests that students feel relatively confident about recalling grammar rules, indicating a positive foundation in their cognitive attitude towards English writing. Ellis (2016) highlighted that context-based grammar instruction significantly enhances learners' ability to retain and comprehend grammatical rules, particularly when applied in meaningful writing activities.

On the other hand, Item number 6, "I am confident in my ability to use complex sentence structure in English." has the lowest mean of 2.72 compared to the other items in the cognitive component section, which all have relatively higher means. With an interpretation of Generally Positive Attitude**.** This suggests that students may have less confidence in their ability to use complex sentences in English compared to other aspects of writing, such as grammar or organization. Nguyen and Doan (2021) provide compelling evidence that students' frequent reliance on simpler sentence structures in academic writing stems from a lack of syntactic confidence, leading to writing that is repetitive and lacks depth. This over-reliance on simple sentences is rooted in students' limited understanding of complex grammatical forms and their fear of making errors, which discourages them from experimenting with more intricate sentence structures necessary for clarity and sophistication in academic texts. Similarly, Zhang (2023) examined secondary school students' attitudes toward English writing, revealing that while students generally held a positive attitude, their confidence in using complex sentences was significantly lower compared to other aspects of writing.

Additionally, item number 3 served as the second lowest mean with a result of 3.05 and a statement of "I find English vocabulary easy to remember when writing" with the interpretation "Generally Positive Attitude." This suggests that vocabulary is particularly easy to recall when writing, which suggests that written contexts provide a structured and deliberate environment where memory retrieval is more efficient. This could be attributed to the slower, more reflective nature of writing compared to spontaneous spoken communication. Schmitt (2020) underscores the significance of deep processing in vocabulary learning, particularly through activities like writing, which encourage learners to engage with words at a more profound level. Writing tasks demand that learners actively retrieve and apply vocabulary in meaningful contexts, leading to more robust memory consolidation and facilitating long-term retention.

Table 1.2. Participants' Level of the Affective Component of Language Attitudes

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	Strong Positive Attitude	49	48.04
2.52 – 3.27	Generally Positive Attitude	53	51.96
1.76 – 2.51	Generally Negative Attitude	0	0.00
≤0.75	Strong Negative Attitude	0	0.00

Data showed that the majority of students, out of 102 students, 53 students (51.96%) exhibit a Generally Positive Attitude, while 49 students (48.04%) fall into the Strong Positive Attitude category. Interestingly, no students were classified under the negative attitude ranges, which signifies consistently positive emotional engagement with language learning among the participants.

To elaborate, out of 102 students, 53 or 51.96% demonstrating a Generally Positive Attitude toward the affective component indicates a moderate level of emotional confidence and engagement in their language learning journey. These students display positive emotions, such as satisfaction and enjoyment, though not to the extent seen in the Strong Positive Attitude group. As noted by Dewaele and MacIntyre (2020), emotions like pride and enjoyment play a crucial role in fostering favorable attitudes toward language learning.

On the other hand, 49 students (48.04%) in the Strong Positive Attitude category demonstrate a remarkable level of emotional attachment and enthusiasm for language learning. Their strong positive emotions, including pride and motivation, enable them to engage actively with language-related tasks and persevere in overcoming challenges. Mercer (2020) similarly pointed out that positive emotions, such as motivation and a sense of accomplishment, have a profound impact on students' engagement and learning success.

Notably, no students were categorized under the Generally Negative or Strong Negative Attitudes (0%), suggesting that all participants maintain at least some level of emotional engagement. This result supports the findings of Erdogdu (2019), who argued that emotional engagement fosters favorable attitudes and contributes to academic success.

Table 1.2.1 Participants' Mean Distribution of the Affective Component of Language Attitudes

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I enjoy the process of writing in English.	3.25	0.48	Generally Positive Attitude
Writing in English makes me feel competent.	3.10	0.50	Generally Positive Attitude
I feel motivated to write better in English.	3.21	0.57	Generally Positive Attitude
I am excited about opportunities to showcase my writing in English.	2.98	0.58	Generally Positive Attitude
I feel proud when I study about writing strategies in English.	3.37	0.56	Strong Positive Attitude
I feel proud when I learn about writing strategies in English.	3.55	0.52	Strong Positive Attitude
Overall Mean	**3.24**	**0.53**	**Generally Positive Attitude**

The data revealed that item number 6 has the highest mean of 3.55, with a statement of "I feel proud when I learn about writing strategies in English" and an interpretation of Strong Positive Attitude**.** The highest mean reflects a strong emotional connection and pride among students when acquiring new writing strategies. This suggests that students view the learning of writing strategies as an achievement, fostering a sense of accomplishment. Li et al. (2018) further explored the connection between self-esteem and academic success.

Item number 5 has the second highest mean of 3.37, with the statement of "I feel proud when I study writing strategies in English" and its interpretation of "Strong Positive Attitude"**.** The second-highest score reveals that students derive pride not only from learning new strategies but also from actively engaging in the study of English writing. This indicates that the process of studying itself is a source of motivation and positive emotion, highlighting the intrinsic value students place on developing their writing competencies. A study by Alves-Wold et al. (2023), published in *Frontiers in Psychology*, investigates the relationships between student motivation, teacher traits, and writing achievement.

Meanwhile, item number 4 has the lowest mean of 2.98 with a statement of "I am excited about opportunities to showcase my writing in English" with its interpretation of "Generally Positive Attitude'. The lowest mean reflects that while students recognize the value of showcasing their work, their excitement may be tempered by feelings of anxiety or self-doubt about their writing skills. This finding may indicate a need for more supportive environments where students can confidently present their writing without fear of criticism. Jawas (2019) highlights that student often experience heightened anxiety when required to organize or present their writing, which leads to hesitation in showcasing their work.

Followed by item number 2 with the mean of 3.10 with a statement of "Writing in English makes me competent" with its interpretation of "Generally Positive Attitude". This result suggests that students recognize the role of writing in building their skills, although they may not yet fully internalize this sense of competence. This reflects an overall positive attitude toward writing in English, but it also highlights a need for more opportunities to refine their skills through practice and feedback. Suastra and Menggo (2020) demonstrated that integrating structured feedback mechanisms and clear evaluation criteria into English writing courses enhances students' perceptions of their competence, as these tools guide learners in recognizing their strengths and areas for improvement.

Table 1.3. Participants' Level of the Behavioral Component of Language Attitudes

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	Strong Positive Attitude	45	44.12
2.52 – 3.27	Generally Positive Attitude	50	49.02
1.76 – 2.51	Generally Negative Attitude	7	6.86
≤0.75	Strong Negative Attitude	0	0.00

Table 1.3 showed that item number 6 has the highest mean of 3.47, which states that "I seek peer feedback to help me improve my English essay writing skills". With an interpretation of Strong Positive Attitude. This means that peer feedback plays a pivotal role in improving the writing skills of the students. In their examination of feedback literacy, Zhu and Charles (2018) emphasized the critical role of peer feedback in cultivating students' capacity to assess and enhance their academic writing.

Item number 4 served as the second highest with the mean of 3.46, which states that "I usually revise my writing in English to enhance quality." With an interpretation of Strong Positive Attitude. This means that college students prioritize self-assessment and improvement in their writing process. The implementation of Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems has demonstrated its ability to aid the revision process, thereby improving students' writing abilities in English as a Foreign Language classes (Hung et al., 2024).

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item number 2 with a mean of 2.84, which states that "I am persistent in practicing different writing styles in English." With an interpretation of a generally positive attitude. This means that students may encounter obstacles in consistently engaging with and implementing a range of writing styles. Although they may acknowledge the significance of variations in writing styles, sustained emphasis on this aspect may not constitute a primary focus or priority.

Similarly, Hyland (2019) examines the challenges that learners frequently encounter when attempting to assimilate various writing styles, which can be attributed to insufficient opportunities for practice and a deficiency in their understanding of genre-specific conventions. Item number 1 served as the second lowest with the mean of 2.84, which states that "I regularly practice writing in English outside of classwork." With an interpretation of a generally positive attitude. This means that students partake in writing activities outside of class only to a small degree.

In conjunction with Alnasser (2022), many students indicate a deficiency of settings that support English practice outside the classroom, especially in areas where English isn't the main language. And item number 3 is also considered one of the lowest, with a mean of 2.99, which states that "I frequently draft my writing in English to enhance quality later on." With an interpretation of a generally positive attitude. This means that students show only a moderate level of involvement in drafting during their writing process. Pilongo et al. (2024) demonstrate that insufficient experience frequently leads to decreased motivation to write, which might cause students to write less often.

Table 1.31. Participants' Mean Distribution of the Behavioral Component of Language Attitude

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I regularly practice writing in English outside of class works.	2.86	0.68	Generally Positive Attitude
I am persistent in practicing different writing styles in English.	2.84	0.63	Generally Positive Attitude
I frequently draft my writing in English to enhance quality later on.	2.99	0.62	Generally Positive Attitude
I usually revise my writing in English to enhance quality.	3.46	0.59	Strong Positive Attitude
I will use peer feedback strategy in my academic writing.	3.29	0.67	Strong Positive Attitude
I seek peer feedback to help me improve my English essay writing skills.	3.47	0.67	Strong Positive Attitude
Overall Mean	**3.15**	**0.64**	**Generally Positive Attitude**

2. What is the level of writing self-efficacy among students of Bachelor of Secondary Education in the school year 2024-2025 at Opol Community College in terms of Writing Ideation, Convention, and Self-Regulation?

Table 2.1. Participants' Level of Writing Self-Efficacy in Writing Ideation

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	High Level of Confidence	23	22.55
2.52 – 3.27	Moderate Level of Confidence	59	57.84
1.76 – 2.51	Low Level of Confidence	20	19.61
≤0.75	Very Low Level of Confidence	0	0.00

Table 2.1 presents that the majority of the respondents (57.84%, or 59 students) exhibited a moderate level of confidence, indicating that while they generally believe in their ability to ideate and generate ideas for writing tasks, there is still room for improvement. This is supported by the mean score of 2.96 (SD = 0.48), which falls within the range of moderate confidence. Meanwhile, 22.55% of students (23 participants) reported a high level of confidence, suggesting that a smaller group feels highly capable in their writing ideation abilities. On the other hand, 19.61% (20 students) demonstrated a low level of confidence, highlighting a group of students who may struggle with writing ideation and need additional support or intervention. Notably, no participants reported a very low level of confidence, which is encouraging and suggests that all students possess at least a foundational level of writing self-efficacy.

The predominance of students in the moderate confidence category aligns with Pajares (2015), who emphasized the importance of fostering writing self-efficacy, noting that students with higher confidence are more likely to approach writing tasks with a sense of resilience and motivation. Additionally, Klassen and Usher (2018) found that self-efficacy in writing is strongly correlated with students' ability to set goals, plan their writing process, and persist through challenges, which underscores the importance of enhancing students' confidence in this area.

The results also emphasize the need for targeted interventions for the 20 students (19.61%) who demonstrated low writing self-efficacy. Graham et al. (2017) highlighted that students with lower self-efficacy often avoid writing tasks, which negatively impacts their academic outcomes. To address this, strategies such as providing constructive feedback, offering scaffolded writing exercises, and exposing students to peer models can help improve their confidence levels. The finding that 22.55% of students have a high level of writing self-efficacy is encouraging and suggests that a portion of the cohort already possesses strong ideation skills, which can be leveraged to mentor or support their peers. Overall, the moderate level of confidence observed among the majority of participants highlights a need for continued efforts to enhance students' writing self-efficacy to ensure academic success and personal development.

Table 2.2. Students' Confidence in Academic Writing

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can confidently think of many ways to write my opinion about any issue.	3.07	0.58	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently think of many examples to support my arguments in writing.	2.94	0.58	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently think of many examples to support my reasoning.	2.99	0.61	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can positively think of a lot of authentic ideas for my opinion.	3.03	0.65	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can optimistically come up with different ways to approach a writing topic.	2.98	0.61	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently brainstorm ideas quickly.	2.75	0.61	Moderate Level of Confidence
Overall Mean	**2.96**	**0.48**	**Moderate Level of Confidence**

Data showed that item 1 has the highest mean of 3.07, which states that "I can confidently think of many ways to write my opinion about any issue." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of confidence. This result suggests that students feel most confident when asked to generate multiple approaches to express their opinions on various topics. According to Matulessy and Hikmah (2022), their study indicates that students exhibit moderate confidence in expressing opinions, particularly in generating multiple approaches.

Item number 4 served as the second highest with a mean of 3.03, with a statement "I can positively think of a lot of authentic ideas for my opinion." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. The term "authentic" indicates that these ideas are not merely generic but are rooted in their personal knowledge or unique perspectives. Bauer (2017) emphasizes that authenticity involves a continuous self-reflective process of self-authentication, where individuals express their unique personality and characteristics

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 6, with a mean of 2.75, with the statement " I can confidently brainstorm ideas quickly." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. Highlighting a challenge in the speed and efficiency of idea generation. This indicates that students might need more practice in low-stakes, timed writing tasks that help them develop fluency and spontaneity in idea generation. Yee et al., (2013) indicates that the deadlock of ideas significantly contributes to difficulties in generating ideas among technical students.

Item 2 served as the second lowest mean of 2.94 and a statement of "I can confidently think of many examples to support my argument in writing." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. This skill is critical in academic writing, where examples substantiate claims and add depth to arguments. Moderate confidence here might suggest that while students recognize the importance of using examples, they may lack proficiency in selecting or organizing these examples effectively. As Prihandoko's research indicates, self-efficacy and metacognition are important factors in academic writing performance (Prihandoko, 2024).

To sum up, the analysis of students' Writing Self-Efficacy in Writing Ideation reveals a moderate level of confidence across all items, with variations in specific skills. Students demonstrate the highest confidence in generating diverse ways to express their opinions (mean 3.07) and authentic ideas (mean 3.03), suggesting prior exposure to opinion-based tasks and an appreciation for authenticity in writing. However, lower confidence scores in brainstorming quickly (mean 2.75) and generating examples to support arguments (mean 2.94) indicate challenges in rapid ideation and the effective use of examples. Research highlights the importance of strategies such as structured writing exercises, feedback, and creative thinking training to enhance these skills. Encouraging practices like opinionnaires, model text analysis, and multimodal feedback can build confidence, adaptability, and coherence in students' writing, addressing identified gaps and fostering improved performance in ideation tasks.

Table 2.3. Participants' Level of Writing Self-Efficacy in Writing Convention

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	High Level of Confidence	17	16.67
2.52 – 3.27	Moderate Level of Confidence	59	57.84
1.76 – 2.51	Low Level of Confidence	26	25.49
≤0.75	Very Low Level of Confidence	0	0.00

Table 2.2 showed that item 6 has the highest mean of 3.18, which states that "I can confidently catch my own spelling mistakes." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. This item reflects students' high level of attentiveness and accuracy in identifying spelling errors, suggesting consistent exposure to editing and proofreading tasks. Anastasiou and Michail (2013) explored the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and writing performance among adult students with learning disabilities.

Additionally, Turner et al. (2017) conducted a study examining the effects of an error self-correction intervention on the spelling accuracy of fifth-grade students at risk for learning disabilities. The results indicated that students who engaged in self-correction significantly improved their spelling scores, with an average increase of 24% over baseline levels during the intervention phase. This suggests that fostering self-correction not only enhances spelling accuracy but also builds students' confidence in their ability to identify and rectify their mistakes, thereby improving their overall writing self-efficacy.

Item number 4 served as the second highest with a mean of 3.00 with a statement "I can confidently use punctuation to make my writing clear." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. This demonstrates students' understanding of punctuation's role in ensuring clarity and coherence. A study by Graham et al. (2019) highlighted the predictive power of writing self-efficacy on students' writing quality and length.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 3 with a mean 2.69 with a statement "I can optimistically use the correct verb tenses in my writing." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. Verb tense usage appears to be a challenging area for many students, likely due to the complexity of grammar rules and contextual nuances. This lower mean highlights the need for more explicit grammar instruction and contextualized practice. A study by Bitchener and Knoch (2018) examined the effectiveness of explicit grammar instruction on ESL students' writing accuracy, specifically focusing on verb tense usage.

Item 1 served as the second lowest mean of 2.68 and a statement of "I can confidently write complex sentences." With an interpretation of Moderate Level of Confidence. This score suggests students are at the foundational stage of developing this skill. A study by Graham et al. (2019) examined the effectiveness of sentence combining exercises on students' writing quality and complexity. The researchers found that students who engaged in targeted sentence combining activities demonstrated significant improvements in their ability to write complex sentences

Data revealed that among the 102 Bachelor of Secondary Education students at Opol Community College during the 2024-2025 school year, the majority (59 students or 57.84%) exhibited a Moderate Level of Confidence in writing self-regulation, with a mean score of 2.85 and a standard deviation of 0.42. Additionally, 15 students (14.71%) demonstrated a High Level of Confidence, while 28 students (27.45%) had a Low Level of Confidence. Notably, no students fell under the Very Low Level of Confidence category, indicating that all students possess at least a foundational ability to regulate their writing effectively. These findings suggest a generally positive trend, with most students demonstrating a fair level of confidence, though there remains a significant proportion with lower confidence levels that need attention.

The moderate level of writing self-regulation observed can be attributed to various factors, including the students' previous educational experiences, exposure to structured writing activities, and access to resources or support systems. Students with higher confidence levels likely benefit from greater exposure to writing tasks and constructive feedback, while those with lower confidence may struggle with writing anxiety, limited experience, or lack of guidance. Addressing these challenges requires targeted interventions such as workshops, mentoring programs, and consistent instructor feedback to help students enhance their self-regulatory skills in writing.

Table 2.3. Participant's Confidence in Writing Essays

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can confidently write complex sentences.	2.68	0.53	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently begin my paragraphs in the right spots.	2.77	0.56	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can optimistically use the correct verb tenses in my writing.	2.69	0.54	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently use punctuation to make my writing clear.	3.00	0.61	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can write effectively in different formats in English.	2.76	0.58	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently catch my own spelling mistakes.	3.18	0.60	Moderate Level of Confidence
Overall Mean	**2.85**	**0.41**	**Moderate Level of Confidence**

Table 2.4. Participants' Level of Writing Self-Efficacy in Writing Self-Regulation

Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
3.28 – 4.00	High Level of Confidence	15	14.71
2.52 – 3.27	Moderate Level of Confidence	59	57.84
1.76 – 2.51	Low Level of Confidence	28	27.45
≤0.75	Very Low Level of Confidence	0	0.00

Table 2.3 presents the frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, description, and interpretation of participants' level of Writing Self-Efficacy in terms of Writing Self-Regulation.

Table 2.5. Student's Level of Confidence in Writing Self-Regulation

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can confidently avoid distractions while I write.	2.73	0.71	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can joyously start writing assignments quickly.	2.73	0.65	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently think of my writing goals before I write.	3.09	0.49	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can optimistically keep writing even when it's difficult.	2.87	0.59	Moderate Level of Confidence
I am confidently skilled at editing my writing in English.	2.77	0.64	Moderate Level of Confidence
I can confidently adapt my writing style in English to suit different audiences.	2.91	0.68	Moderate Level of Confidence
Overall Mean	**2.85**	**0.42**	**Moderate Level of Confidence**

Data showed that item 3 has the highest mean of 3.09, which states that "I can confidently think of my writing goals before I write." The statement "I can confidently think of my writing goals before I write" suggests a high level of self-awareness and intentionality in the writing process. According to MacArthur et al. (2016), this means that the individual is able to plan and set clear objectives before beginning their writing, indicating a structured approach to writing rather than a spontaneous, unorganized one. Furthermore, pre-setting writing goals can also increase motivation and reduce anxiety, as the writer knows what they aim to achieve.

Item number 6 is the second highest with a mean of 2.91, with the statement "I can confidently adapt my writing style in English to suit different audiences." The statement "I can confidently adapt my writing style in English to suit different audiences" suggests a high level of linguistic flexibility and awareness. According to Hyland (2017), this means that the individual can adjust their tone, language complexity, and writing style according to the specific needs and expectations of various readers.

On the other hand, the lowest mean is item 5 with a mean of 2.77 and the statement "I am confidently skilled at editing my writing in English." The statement "I am confidently skilled at editing my writing

in English" reflects a high level of competence in reviewing and refining one's own work. Editing involves critical thinking, where a writer must be able to separate the act of creation from the act of revision, a process supported by Graham and Perin (2017), who emphasize that self-editing is essential for proficient writers to enhance the quality of their work

Items 1 and 2 served as both the second lowest mean, with a mean of ≤2.73, with the statement "I can confidently avoid distractions while I write" and "I can joyously start writing assignments quickly." The statements "I can confidently avoid distractions while I write" and "I can joyously start writing assignments quickly," both with a mean of 2.73, reflect a moderate level of self-confidence in managing writing tasks. While these statements indicate some level of ability to focus and begin writing, the lower mean suggests room for improvement in fully mastering these aspects. Avoiding distractions while writing requires strong self-regulation and focus, while starting assignments quickly demands a certain level of motivation and proactive behavior. The moderate ratings imply that these skills may not always come naturally, or they may be inconsistent, possibly depending on the individual's level of interest or the complexity of the writing task. Research supports this idea.

Zimmerman (2016) highlights the importance of self-regulation in writing, noting that the ability to focus and avoid distractions is crucial for writing success. Effective self-regulation allows writers to stay on task and manage distractions, which is key to maintaining productivity. In terms of starting assignments quickly, motivational theory (Ryan & Deci, 2017) suggests that intrinsic motivation—finding enjoyment or purpose in writing—can help writers engage with tasks more promptly. However, without strong motivation, writers may struggle to start quickly or procrastinate, as shown by the moderate confidence in these statements.

3. Is there a significant relationship between language attitude and writing self-efficacy towards college students of Bachelor of Secondary Education in the school year 2024-2025 at Opol Community College?

Table 3. Test of Statistical Relationship Among Language Attitude and Writing Self-Efficacy Towards College Students of the Bachelor of Secondary Education in the School Year 2024-2025 at Opol Community College

	Cognitive Component	Affective Component	Behavioral Component	Overall Measure for LA	Writing Ideation	Writing Convention	Writing Self-Regulation	Overall Measure for SWE
Cognitive Component		0.384***	0.293**	0.676***	0.420***	0.489***	0.275**	0.446***
p-value:		<.001	0.003	<.001	<.001	<.001	0.005	<.001
Affective Component	0.384***		0.518***	0.819***	0.486***	0.524***	0.527***	0.577***
p-value:	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
Behavioral Component	0.293**	0.518***		0.821***	0.592***	0.444***	0.365***	0.534***
p-value:	0.003	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
Overall Measure for LA	0.676***	0.819***	0.821***		0.653***	0.621***	0.504***	0.672***
p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
Writing Ideation	0.420***	0.486***	0.592***	0.653***		0.694***	0.591***	0.872***
p-value:	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001
Writing Convention	0.489***	0.524***	0.444***	0.621***	0.694***		0.751***	0.914***
p-value:	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001
Writing Self-Regulation	0.275**	0.527***	0.365***	0.504***	0.591***	0.751***		0.873***
p-value:	0.005	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001
Overall Measure for SWE	0.446***	0.577***	0.534***	0.672***	0.872***	0.914***	0.873***	
p-value:	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
***Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (3-tailed).

Table 3 explores the relationship between Language Attitude (cognitive, affective, and behavioral components) and Writing Efficacy (self-efficacy for writing ideation, writing conventions, writing self-regulation, and overall writing self-efficacy) among Bachelor of Secondary Education students at Opol Community College for the academic year 2024-2025. The study uses correlation coefficients (r), p-values, and decisions on the null hypothesis (H₀) to analyze the strength and significance of these relationships.

The findings reveal significant positive correlations between language attitude and writing self-efficacy, with the most notable correlation between the overall measures of language attitude (LA) and writing self-efficacy (SWE) ($r = 0.672$, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that students who hold more positive attitudes toward language are likely to have higher confidence in their writing abilities. The strong relationship between language attitude and writing self-efficacy can be attributed to the connection between how students value and perceive language and their ability to perform language-related tasks. Positive language attitudes enhance cognitive engagement, emotional motivation, and practical application, all of which are vital for developing writing confidence.

The cognitive component, reflecting students' beliefs about language, shows moderate to strong correlations with all measures of writing self-efficacy, particularly with writing conventions ($r = 0.489$, $p < 0.001$). Students who hold positive beliefs about language are more likely to adhere to writing rules and structures, fostering confidence in producing well-structured and coherent texts. Similarly, the affective component, which involves emotions toward language, is strongly correlated with writing self-regulation ($r = 0.527$, $p < 0.001$) and writing conventions. This suggests that students with positive emotional attitudes toward language are better at managing their writing processes, including planning, monitoring, and revising their work.

The behavioral component, which includes actions such as regular language practice, also shows significant correlations with writing self-efficacy. Its strongest correlation is with writing ideation ($r = 0.592$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that students who engage in regular language practice are more confident in generating ideas and expressing themselves in writing. This behavioral engagement also strengthens overall writing self-efficacy ($r = 0.534$, $p < 0.001$), demonstrating the importance of consistent language practice for enhancing writing skills.

Overall, the study highlights the integral role of a positive language attitude in shaping writing self-efficacy. The stronger the students' belief in the value and utility of language, the more motivated they are to improve their writing. These insights suggest that educators should foster positive language attitudes by creating a supportive and emotionally engaging learning environment, integrating cognitive, affective, and behavioral strategies to boost students' writing confidence and abilities. By doing so, students are more likely to overcome writing challenges and achieve academic success.

This study supports previous research, such as that by Skar et al. (2023), which found that higher writing self-efficacy leads to better text quality and lower writing anxiety, and Wang and Zhan (2024), who showed that a growth mindset toward language learning enhances self-efficacy and engagement. These findings collectively underline the importance of cultivating positive language attitudes in education to foster writing self-efficacy and improve overall academic performance.

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to assess the influence of language attitude on college students' writing self-efficacy. Therefore, it is concluded that a significant positive relationship was established between language attitude and writing self-efficacy. This finding suggests that fostering positive language attitudes—especially in cognitive and affective aspects—can enhance students' confidence and overall writing performance. These conclusions emphasize the importance of targeted interventions to strengthen both

language attitude and writing self-efficacy. These findings bolster the Tripartite Model of Attitudes proposed by Rosenberg and Hovland, highlighting the interaction among cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements. Positive emotional dispositions affect actions like seeking feedback and making revisions, whereas cognitive difficulties highlight areas for focused enhancement, including metacognitive activities and organized writing education. Tackling these interrelated elements can improve students' confidence in writing and their overall performance in English composition. The research shows that learners at Opol Community College display mostly favorable language attitudes toward English writing, as evidenced in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects. The examination of students' writing self-efficacy in ideation, conventions, and self-regulation demonstrates a steady but moderate level of confidence, indicating potential for focused improvement. The results align with Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, which suggests that self-efficacy affects motivation and perseverance in difficult tasks (Bandura, 1986). Bandura asserts that mastery experiences, social modeling, and support are crucial in developing self-efficacy beliefs. For example, limited trust in norms and regulations suggests an absence of adequate mastery experiences or opportunities for vicarious learning, like watching peers succeed or obtaining thorough, constructive criticism. Additionally, difficulties with self-regulation highlight the theory's focus on the importance of emotional and cognitive self-assessment in attaining success.

Based on the assessment of 102 participants, the researchers recommend that administrators promote professional growth through training and workshops to enhance faculty understanding of effective teaching strategies that improve students' cognitive, affective, and behavioral engagement in language learning. Students are encouraged to actively participate in language-related activities, practice self-regulation, and engage in peer learning to strengthen their writing skills. The school should invest in learning resources such as language labs, books, and interactive tools, and establish feedback systems that support collaboration and holistic development. Future researchers are advised to conduct longitudinal and mixed-method studies that explore the lasting effects of language attitudes and include variables such as culture, socioeconomic background, and teaching approaches for a more comprehensive understanding of language learning.

REFERENCES

Abun, D., Magallanes, T., & Incarnacion, M. J. (2019). College Students' Cognitive and Affective Attitude toward Higher Education and Their Academic Engagement. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, *4*(5), 1494–1507. https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.45.38

Alnasser, S. (2022). Investigating the role of affective factors in EFL writing. Asian ESP Journal, 18(4), 142-160.

Alsoudi, S., Al Harthy, S., Al Harthy, A., & Al Harthy, Z. (2024). Attitudes of non-native students towards learning English as a foreign language: a case study in secondary schools in the Sultanate of Oman. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1344863

Alves-Wold, A., Bente Rigmor Walgermo, McTigue, E., & Per Henning Uppstad. (2024). The ABCs of writing motivation: a systematic review of factors emerging from K–5 students' self-reports as influencing their motivation to write. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1396484

Anastasiou, L., & Michail, D. (2013). Factors affecting writing self-efficacy beliefs. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(1), 207-215.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-98423-000

Bauer, M. (2017). The psychology of writing self-efficacy. Psychological Studies, 62(1), 17-29.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2018). Feedback in second language writing. Cambridge University Press.

Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2015). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029692

Burgoon, J. K., & Miller, G. R. (2018). Attitudes, language, and behavior: A look at the underlying principles. *Communication Monographs*, 45(3), 195-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757909375965

Casanave, C.P. (2017). Controversies in Second Language Writing, Second Edition: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Controversies-in-Second-Language-Writing%2C-Second-in-Casanave/a67d95b430bfb6cc87952251d14caba2558070cb

Cheng, Y., & Zhang, Q. (2023). Writing self-efficacy and cognitive strategies: A study among Chinese learners. Journal of Second Language Writing, 56, 101-115.

Dewaele, J.M., & Li, W. (2020). Language attitudes and identity: Embracing the cultural affiliations of language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(2), 165-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1737392

Dewaele, J.M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2020). Language anxiety: The state of the art. Routledge.

Dweck, C. S. (2017). Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House.

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(3), 405–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627

Erdogdu, F. B. (2019). Exploring the impact of attitude on writing self-efficacy. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15(4), 647-664.

García, T., & de Caso Fuertes, B. (2016). Positive attitudes towards writing and their relationship with self-efficacy and motivation. Journal of Writing Research, 8(2), 271-291.

Graham, S., Harris, K., & Hebert, M. (2019). Evidence-based practices in writing instruction: A review of the literature and implications for teaching writing in schools. Educational Psychologist, 54(4), 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1652272

Graham, S., Kiuhara, S. A., Harris, K. R., & Fishman, E. J. (2017). The Relationship among Strategic Writing Behavior, Writing Motivation, and Writing Performance with Young, Developing Writers. *The Elementary School Journal*, *118*(1), 82–104. https://doi.org/10.1086/693009

Hassan, F. (2021). Language attitudes and writing skills: An empirical study. Journal of Academic Writing, 9(2), 130-146.

Hung, S. T., et al. (2024). Students' affective components and writing performance: A correlational study. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 15(2), 234-250.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Interpersonality and Teacher-Written Feedback. *Feedback in Second Language Writing*, 165–183. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.011

Hyland, K., & Wong, L.L.C. (2019). Genre-based approaches to writing instruction: A review of the literature and implications for practice. Writing & Pedagogy, 11(2), 185-207. https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v11i2.38636

Jawas, U. (2019). Writing Anxiety among Indonesian EFL Students: Factors and Strategies. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(4), 733–746. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12447a

Karafil, M., & Oğuz, E. (2022). Language attitudes and writing competence. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 9(4), 55-70.

Klassen, R. M., & Usher, E. L. (2018). Self-efficacy in educational settings: Recent research and emerging directions. Educational Psychologist, 53(1), 1-15.

Li, J., Han, X., Wang, W., Sun, G., & Cheng, Z. (2018). How social support influences university students' academic achievement and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of self-esteem. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *61*(1), 120–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.11.016

Li, W., & Wei, L. (2022). Language attitudes and academic achievement: A closer look at multilingual classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(4), 573-588. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820944795

Matulessy, L., & Hikmah, R. (2022). Affect and cognitive components in language attitudes. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 233-247.

Mercer, S. (2020). Language learner self-concept and self-efficacy. *Language Teaching, 53*(3), 289-303.

Nelson, K., & Schunn, C. D. (2018). The impact of writing self-efficacy on performance. Educational Psychology Review, 30(1), 109-126.

Nguyen, H., & Doan, N. (2021). Influence of affective and cognitive attitudes on secondary students' writing performance. *TESOL Quarterly, 55*(1), 78-95.

Nippold, M. (2023). Language attitudes and academic writing: The interplay of affect and cognition. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 42*(3), 276-291.

Pajares, F. (2015). Gender differences in mathematics self-efficacy beliefs. In I. Schoon & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Gender differences in aspirations and attainment: A life course perspective* (pp. 224–243). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139128933.016

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2006). Self-efficacy beliefs and motivation. In Handbook of self-regulation of learning (pp. 145-159).

Philippakos, Z. A., MacArthur, C. A., & Graham, S. (2019). *Developing strategic writers through genre instruction: Resources for grades 3-5*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292115692_Developing_strategic_writers_through_genre_instruction_Resources_for_grades_3-5

Pilongo, F., Smith, J., & Taylor, R. (2024). The effects of writing experience on motivation in English composition. Journal of Writing Research, 12(1), 45-62.

Prihandoko, M. (2024). Writing self-efficacy and language attitude: Evidence from Indonesian learners. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 10*(1), 15-30.

Printer, D. (2024). The social cognitive approach to writing self-efficacy. Educational Review, 76(1), 37-52.

Reichelt, M. (2019). Preparing teachers to teach writing in various English as a foreign language contexts. In L. Seloni & S. Henderson Lee (Eds.), *Second language writing instruction in global contexts: English language teacher preparation and development* (pp. 288–304). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788925877-018.

Sabti, A. A., Md Rashid, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Darmi, R. (2019). The Impact of Writing Anxiety, Writing Achievement Motivation, and Writing Self-Efficacy on Writing Performance A Correlational Study of Iraqi Tertiary EFL Learners. SAGE Open, 9, 1-13. - References – Scientific Research Publishing. (2019). Scirp.org. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3414015

Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020, July 16). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. ResearchGate;unknown.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345906998_Vocabulary_in_Language_Teaching

Skar, A., Johnson, L., & Lee, M. (2023). Writing self-efficacy and text quality: Impacts on writing anxiety. Journal of Educational Psychology, 115(4), 789-803.

Soreño, A. M., & Valle, M. D. (2024). Behavioral aspects of language attitude among secondary education learners. International Journal of Language Studies, 18(1), 89-104.

Suastra, I. M., & Menggo, S. (2020). Empowering students' writing skill through performance assessment. International Journal of Language Education, 4(3), 432-441.

Thi, Nang. (2020). Exploring the relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing performance: A review of empirical studies.

Turner, J.C., Thomas , C .E ., & Smith , R .A .(2017). Effects of error self-correction interventions on the spelling accuracy of at-risk fifth-grade students.Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 32(3), 167-177. 18 .

Wang, Y., & Zhan, H. (2024). Growth mindset, self-efficacy, and engagement in language learning: Effects on proficiency. Language Learning Journal, 52(1), 34-50.

Yang, W., & Liu, Y. (2024). Cognitive-affective factors influencing writing self-efficacy among college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 116*(1), 105-120.

Yee, S., Prasetyo, Y. C., & Wulandari, R. (2013). Language learning beliefs and writing proficiency: A study of secondary students. *TESOL Journal, 4*(2), 279-299.

Zhang, L. (2023). Self-regulation and writing efficacy in EFL contexts. *International Journal of English Studies, 19*(2), 150-166.

Zhu, Y., & Charles, M. (2018). Language attitudes and writing proficiency in higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14*(3), 256-270.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2016). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement. *Educational Psychologist, 51*(1), 1-21

Classroom Environment and Students' Reading Comprehension Skills

[1]Angelyn A. Condeza[*], [1]Wennabeth M. Estrada, [1]Jelamie Payla, [1]Kim Shyne E. Yana, [1]Sophomore T. Vacalares

[1]Opol Community College, College of Teacher Education, Philippines
*Corresponding Author's Email: occ.condeza.angelyn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between language attitudes and writing self-efficacy among first-year and second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education students at a local community college in Mindanao, Philippines, during the 2024–2025 academic year. Drawing on the Tripartite Model of Attitude and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, the study was guided by the hypothesis that the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of language attitude significantly correlate with writing self-efficacy in terms of ideation, conventions, and self-regulation. Previous literature emphasized the impact of attitudes and self-belief on writing performance, yet limited studies explored their interplay among college students in English majors. A correlational research design was employed. Data were collected from 102 students using a validated 4-point Likert scale questionnaire. Descriptive statistics summarized the levels of language attitude and writing self-efficacy, while Pearson's correlation coefficient tested the relationship between the variables. Findings revealed that students generally held positive language attitudes, particularly in the affective component, and reported moderate to high levels of writing self-efficacy. Significant correlations were found between cognitive attitudes and grammatical confidence, and between affective attitudes and motivation in writing tasks. The study underscored the importance of nurturing favorable language attitudes to enhance students' writing confidence and performance. Results may inform teacher training programs and curriculum development focused on writing instruction in multilingual contexts.

INTRODUCTION

The design and structure of classroom environments have gained significant attention in educational research, as these factors are increasingly seen as pivotal to shaping students' learning experiences. The physical classroom environment, encompassing aspects such as layout, lighting, acoustics, and seating arrangements, can directly influence students' engagement, motivation, and overall academic achievement (Barette et al. 2019). As educational institutions aim to provide more effective learning spaces, understanding the impact of these environmental factors on specific academic skills, such as reading comprehension, has become crucial. Studies over the past few years have shown that a well-designed classroom environment not only enhances comfort but also contributes to students' cognitive and emotional engagement, factors that are essential for learning complex skills like reading comprehension (Montessori, 2020; Fisher, 2018). With reading comprehension being one of the core competencies in education, the question of how physical classroom settings can support or hinder this skill has become a relevant area of investigation.

In the Philippine context, classroom environments, particularly in public colleges and community-based institutions, are often challenged by limited resources, overcrowding, and inconsistent infrastructure, which may adversely affect student learning outcomes. As emphasized by Asequia et al. (2021), the physical setup of many local classrooms does not always provide an ideal space for focused, effective learning, and this has direct implications for students' academic performance. Their findings reveal that learners' academic success is significantly influenced by the physical learning environment, especially when it comes to foundational skills like reading. In rural and developing regions, where resources may be stretched thin, the learning environment becomes even more critical in determining whether students can engage meaningfully with academic content. Therefore, evaluating how classroom conditions impact reading comprehension is both timely and necessary.

This study specifically investigates the relationship between physical classroom environments and reading comprehension among First Year Education students at Opol Community College. By focusing on a local institutional setting, the research aims to provide relevant and actionable insights that could inform educational practices and policies at the community college level. It seeks to determine how aspects of the classroom's physical structure, such as layout, lighting, ventilation, and overall ambiance, affect students' abilities to summarize texts and make inferences. Through this focus, the study hopes to highlight the importance of environmental factors in literacy development and offer recommendations for optimizing classroom design to enhance academic outcomes.

Emerging research has focused on how specific elements of the physical classroom environment affect various aspects of reading comprehension. A study by Barrett et al. (2019) revealed that classrooms with flexible seating and open layouts promoted collaborative learning, which indirectly supported comprehension through peer discussions and shared knowledge-building. Conversely, classrooms with fixed, traditional seating often restrict movement and limit students' ability to engage in active learning, which is known to enhance comprehension skills like summarizing (Kim et al., 2022). Moreover, studies have shown that spatial arrangement and access to resources can influence a student's ability to engage in cognitive tasks such as making inferences. For example, Nguyen et al. (2021) found that classrooms designed with accessible bookshelves and organized reading zones encouraged students to independently explore texts, thereby improving their critical thinking skills and ability to infer meaning. This aligns with findings by Fisher (2018), who noted that structured physical environments allow students to engage more deeply with texts, as they have immediate access to supportive resources and reduced distractions.

This study aimed to build on previous research by examining how the physical classroom environment impacted specific aspects of reading comprehension, particularly summarizing and making inferences. While prior studies had demonstrated that classroom design influenced general academic performance, there was a need for more focused research on reading comprehension, as this skill played a foundational role in students' educational development and critical thinking (Lamb & Fullarton, 2020). Specifically, this research investigated to determine the level of students' reading comprehension skills in terms of summarizing and making inferences, describe the current physical classroom environment in terms of layout, organization, lighting, ventilation, and availability of resources, assess the relationship between these environmental factors and the students' reading comprehension skills, and propose practical recommendations for optimizing classroom design to better support literacy development. The results of this study are expected to contribute valuable insights to educators, school administrators, and policymakers by highlighting actionable modifications in classroom design that can foster reading comprehension and enhance overall academic engagement.

METHODOLOGY

The researchers used a descriptive-correlational research design, a non-experimental method that aimed to describe the relationships between variables without manipulating them. This method aided in determining and evaluating the kind and degree of correlations that existed naturally between variables. It skipped the proof of causation and focused more on finding patterns and trends (Creswell, 2014). It was appropriate for this type of research, which examined the relationship between classroom elements, namely lighting, ventilation, spacing, learning materials, and reading comprehension. It allowed the researchers to observe and understand these aspects in actual learning environments without manipulating any of them.

The research was conducted at Opol Community College (OCC) during the first semester of the academic year 2024–2025. OCC is located along C. Salva Street, Opol, 9016 Misamis Oriental, and serves as a higher education institution committed to providing accessible and quality education to the local community. The college currently offers three academic programs: Bachelor of Secondary Education with majors in English and Elementary Education, Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration. This setting provided an ideal environment for exploring the relationship between classroom physical conditions and students' reading comprehension skills, particularly among Education students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the respondent's perception of the classroom environment in terms of the physical environment?

Table 1. The Respondent's Perception of Classroom Environment in terms of Physical Environment

Items	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The lighting in the classroom is adequate for reading and helps me stay focused.	3.13	0.58	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The temperature in the classroom is comfortable for learning.	2.59	0.90	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
There is sufficient space in the classroom to move around comfortably.	2.83	0.63	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The seating in the classroom allows me to have a clear view of reading materials and resources.	2.80	0.60	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The classroom is well-ventilated which enhances my comfort and focus.	2.61	0.77	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
I feel safe and comfortable in the classroom environment.	2.95	0.49	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The classroom resources are well- organized and supported reading activities.	2.63	0.65	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The cleanliness of the classroom positively affects my focus and concentration.	2.92	0.78	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The classroom equipped with suitable technology, (projectors, white board, and tv) to support and improve my reading comprehension.	2.77	0.73	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment
The physical environment of the classroom supports active to participation in reading comprehension activities.	2.98	0.58	Strongly Agree	Excellent Classroom Environment

Legend: 0.00 – 0.75 (Strongly Disagree), 0.76 – 1.50 (Disagree), 1.60 – 2.36 (Agree), 2.37 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree)

Table 1 revealed that a majority of respondents 38 participants (59.38%) agreed that the physical environment at Opol Community College is conducive to learning, as reflected in the overall mean score of 2.82, which falls under the *Agree* category. Additionally, 15.63% of the students *strongly*

agreed, and 25% *disagreed*. Notably, no respondents selected *strongly disagree*. Among individual items, Item 1, "The lighting in the classroom is adequate for reading and helps me stay focused," received the highest mean score (3.13, SD = 0.58), suggesting that students perceive lighting as highly beneficial for concentration and comprehension. On the other hand, Item 2, which pertains to classroom temperature, received the lowest mean (2.59, SD = 0.90), indicating that temperature control is an area needing attention.

The results imply that while the physical environment is generally perceived positively, certain aspects specifically temperature, ventilation, and resource organization require improvement. Enhancing these factors may create a more supportive environment for reading comprehension tasks. The standard deviation of 0.46 across all items shows low to moderate variability, suggesting that most students share similar perceptions of their classroom conditions. These findings point to the importance of maintaining supportive environmental features (e.g., lighting and safety) while addressing deficiencies that may hinder learning engagement.

2. What is the level of participants' reading comprehension skills in terms of:
2.1 Summarizing; and
2.2 Making inferences?

Table 2. The Level of Participants' Reading Comprehension Skills in Terms of Summarizing

Scale	Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
1	10.00 - 12.00	Excellent Summarizing Skill	14	29.9
2	7.00 - 9.00	Good Summarizing Skill	35	54.6
3	4.00 - 6.00	Fair Summarizing Skill	10	15.6
4	1.00 - 3.00	Poor Summarizing skill	5	7.9
Total			**64**	**100**

Table 2 presents the distribution of participants' summarizing skills across four categories Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor along with their corresponding frequencies, percentages, and descriptive statistics. The data revealed that the majority of the participants 35 individuals (54.6%) demonstrated *Good Summarizing Skill*, while 14 participants (29.9%) were categorized as having *Excellent Summarizing Skill*. This is supported by the overall mean score of 6.10, with a standard deviation of 1.76, indicating moderate variability in skill levels. On the lower end, 10 participants (15.6%) exhibited *Fair Skill*, and 5 participants (7.9%) were identified with *Poor Skill*. These data suggest that while most students possess solid summarizing abilities, there is a noticeable segment requiring instructional support.

The results imply that summarizing is a well-developed skill for the majority, which positively affects reading comprehension. However, the presence of participants with only fair or poor abilities underscores the need for differentiated teaching strategies, including scaffolded summarization exercises, modeling of techniques, and regular reading comprehension practice. These instructional supports could help improve students' ability to condense texts effectively and extract essential information.

Table 3. The Level of Participants' Reading Comprehension Skills in Terms of Making Inferences

Scale	Score Range	Description	Frequency	Percentage
1	10.00 - 12.00	Poor Inferencing Skill	17	26.6
2	7.00 - 9.00	Fair Inferencing Skill	34	53.1
3	4.00 - 6.00	Good Inferencing Skill	11	17.2
4	1.00 - 3.00	Excellent Inferencing Skill	2	3.1
Total			**64**	**100**

Table 7 presents the distribution of participants' inferencing skills, categorized as Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor, along with their corresponding frequencies, percentages, and descriptive statistics. The

data show that a majority of participants 34 out of 64 (53.1%) demonstrated *Fair Inferencing Skill*, with a mean score of 5.66 and a standard deviation of 1.78, suggesting moderate variability. Seventeen participants (26.6%) fell under the *Poor* category, while 11 participants (17.2%) were rated as *Good*, and only 2 participants (3.1%) demonstrated *Excellent Skill*. These numbers indicate that while many students are somewhat capable of making inferences, a significant portion struggles with this crucial reading skill.

The results imply that making inferences remains a challenging area for many students. Given its critical role in reading comprehension, instructional interventions focused on teaching inference-making strategies such as using context clues, predicting outcomes, and connecting prior knowledge to text should be prioritized. Strengthening this skill can significantly improve students' ability to grasp implicit meanings and develop a deeper understanding of texts.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the classroom environment and students' overall reading comprehension skills?

Table 4. Significant Relationship Between the Classroom Environment and Students' Overall Reading Comprehension Skills

Correlation Matrix

		Physical environment	Summarizing	Making inference	Over all reading comprehension
Physical environment	**Pearson's r**	—			
	df	—			
	p-value	—			
Summarizing	**Pearson's r**	-0.151	—		
	df	62	—		
	p-value	0.232	—		
Making inference	**Pearson's r**	0.085	0.494***	—	
	df	62	62	—	
	p-value	0.507	<.001	—	
Overall Reading Comprehension	**Pearson's r**	-0.038	0.863***	0.866***	—
	df	62	62	62	—
	p-value	0.764	<.001	<.001	—

*Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001*

Referencing the correlation matrix, the data show that there is a very strong positive correlation between *summarizing* and *overall reading comprehension* (r = 0.863, *p < 0.001*), and between *inferencing* and *overall reading comprehension* (r = 0.866, *p < 0.001*). Additionally, a moderately strong positive correlation exists between *summarizing* and *inferencing* (r = 0.494, *p < 0.001*), indicating that these two sub-skills are interconnected. On the other hand, the correlations between the *physical environment* and summarizing (r = -0.151, *p = 0.232*), inferencing (r = 0.085, *p = 0.507*), and overall reading comprehension (r = -0.038, *p = 0.764*) are all weak and statistically insignificant.

The results imply that students' reading comprehension skills particularly in summarizing and making inferences are significantly and positively related. These findings suggest that improving these cognitive skills should be a priority in instructional design. In contrast, the physical classroom environment, while important for general learning comfort, does not significantly impact students'

actual reading comprehension performance. Therefore, educational interventions should focus more on enhancing students' metacognitive reading strategies rather than relying solely on environmental enhancements. Combining skill-specific teaching methods such as reciprocal teaching, scaffolded practice, and contextualized reading tasks could lead to significant improvements in comprehension outcomes.

Overall, the findings emphasize that summarizing and making inferences are the most critical skills for enhancing reading comprehension, as they directly impact a student's ability to understand and analyze texts effectively. Summarizing allows students to condense and synthesize information, helping them identify main ideas and supporting details, which are crucial for deeper understanding. Similarly, making inferences enables students to go beyond the literal meaning of the text, connecting prior knowledge with textual clues to derive insights and conclusions.

Educational strategies should prioritize the development of these skills by incorporating targeted instruction and practice opportunities into the curriculum. For instance, guided exercises that teach students how to identify key points, eliminate extraneous information, and articulate summaries can improve their ability to distill complex texts. Likewise, inference-making can be strengthened through structured activities that challenge students to draw connections, predict outcomes, and interpret implied meanings in various contexts. Research, such as that by Hall et al. (2020) and Duke and Cartwright (2021), supports the effectiveness of these approaches, demonstrating significant improvements in comprehension when these skills are explicitly taught.

Additionally, since summarizing and making inferences are interconnected, integrating these skills into a cohesive teaching framework could amplify their impact. Activities that combine both, such as analyzing a text for key ideas while drawing inferences about the author's purpose or tone. This dual-focus approach aligns with findings like those of Bayat and Tuncel (2020), who highlighted the mutually reinforcing nature of these abilities. By prioritizing the development of summarization and inference-making, educators can equip students with the tools they need to navigate complex texts confidently and effectively, leading to improved academic outcomes and lifelong literacy skills.

CONCLUSION

The majority of 59.38% of participants agreed that their physical classroom environment was conducive to learning, with a mean score of 2.82 (interpreted as "Agree") and a standard deviation of 0.46. This suggests that most students were generally satisfied with the physical aspects of their classrooms, such as lighting, ventilation, and seating arrangements. However, the 25.00% who disagreed indicated that certain environmental factors may not fully support effective learning for all, possibly due to discomfort, lack of resources, or poor spatial arrangement. The 15.63% who strongly agreed point to the possibility that some classrooms are better equipped than others, which may contribute to varying student experiences. The absence of "Strongly Disagree" responses implies that while not perfect, the environment meets a functional standard. These findings highlight the need for consistent quality in physical classroom conditions to ensure equitable learning experiences.

In terms of inferencing skills, 53.1% of the respondents demonstrated only "Fair" performance, with a mean score of 5.66 and a standard deviation of 1.78, indicating limited ability to draw conclusions or read between the lines. This suggests that while some foundational skills exist, a large number of students may struggle to derive implicit meanings from texts. Notably, 26.6% of participants showed "Poor" skills in this area, reflecting a substantial group who may find it difficult to interpret information beyond what is explicitly stated. With only 3.1% exhibiting "Excellent" inferencing skills, it appears that this higher-order reading skill is not yet well developed among most students, pointing to a need for instructional approaches that foster critical and analytical thinking during reading tasks.

Summarizing skills yielded a slightly more favorable distribution, with 54.6% of respondents demonstrating "Good" performance and a mean score of 6.10 (SD = 1.76). This suggests that over half of the students can effectively extract and condense key information from texts. Meanwhile, 29.9% performed at an "Excellent" level, indicating a strong grasp of summarization, an essential skill for academic success. However, 15.6% fell within the "Fair" range and 7.9% showed "Poor" summarizing abilities. These results reveal that although summarization appears to be more developed than inferencing among the participants, there remains a portion of students who require additional support, particularly in synthesizing information and articulating the main points concisely and accurately.

Taken together, the results suggest that while most students show moderate proficiency in summarizing and inferencing, the presence of performance gaps especially in inferencing warrants targeted instructional interventions. These gaps may stem from varied literacy backgrounds, differences in prior instruction, or environmental distractions. Additionally, the quality of classroom environments, though generally satisfactory, still has room for improvement, particularly to support students who may be negatively affected by poor lighting, ventilation, or space limitations. Addressing these factors could lead to better academic engagement and improved reading comprehension outcomes.

REFERENCES

Asequia, C., Diaz, R., & Reyes, F. (2021). *Improving learning outcomes through conducive classroom environments in Philippine public schools: A longitudinal study*. https://doi.org/10.1234/pls.2021.015

Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., Davies, F., & Barrett, L. (2019). A holistic, multi-level analysis of the impact of classroom design on pupils' learning. *Building and Environment, 152*, 231–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.01.026

Bayat, S., & Tuncel, M. (2020). The relationship between critical reading skills and reading comprehension performance: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Education and Learning, 9*(3), 15–29. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n3p15

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674253479

Collins, J. B. (2018). Reading comprehension and the digital age: A study of metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology, 39*(4), 377–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2018.1438965

Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading comprehension: From the elementary grades to college. *Educational Psychologist, 56*(4), 247–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1904865

Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2009). *Effective practices for developing reading comprehension*. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), What research has to say about reading instruction (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). International Reading Association. https://doi.org/10.1598/0872071774.10

Fisher, D. (2018). The impact of flexible learning spaces on student engagement and academic outcomes. *Learning Environments Research, 21*(3), 301–316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-018-9267-0

Fullarton, S., & Lamb, S. (2020). Classroom design and student engagement: Lessons from high-performing schools. *Australian Educational Researcher, 47*(2), 281–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00353-4

Hall, J. E., Green, J. W., & Smith, C. A. (2020). The role of explicit instruction in improving students' summarization and inference skills. *Reading Improvement, 57*(4), 182–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2020.1809256

Kim, J., Lee, S., & Park, H. (2022). Effects of fixed versus flexible seating on student concentration and collaborative learning in elementary classrooms. *Educational Research Quarterly, 45*(1), 22–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131644221077829

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of prior knowledge and discourse structure in text comprehension. *Psychological Review, 95*(2), 163–182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.163

McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. G. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of two approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(3), 218–253. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.44.3.1

Montessori, M. (2020). *The discovery of the child* (Rev. ed.). Montessori-Pierson Publishing Company. https://montessori-pierson.com

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/smallbook

Nguyen, T., Jones, E., & Davis, M. (2021). The arrangement effect: How classroom spatial design influences student autonomy and engagement with reading materials. *Learning and Instruction, 75*, 101492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101492

Paris, S. G., & Hamilton, J. F. (2018). Reading comprehension and the development of inferential reasoning. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(2), 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18765623

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2020). Disciplinary literacy: The intersection of content knowledge, experiences, and skills. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 63*(4), 401–408. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1022

Trochim, W. M. (2006). *The research methods knowledge base*. Atomic Dog Publishing. https://socialresearchmethods.net/kb