

# JOB ENABLING ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (JEEP) PROGRAM: EVALUATION OF STUDENTS' ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

ARBAYA HARON-BOQUIA

Ed.D., Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Cotabato State University

Author email id: barbieboquia@gmail.com

---

**Abstract:** This study aimed to evaluate the English proficiency of the JEEP Program finishers particularly on their speaking and writing skills of Cotabato City State Polytechnic College. The English proficiency of the JEEP finishers was described based on the components of the Speaking and the Writing. Each of the components was rated using the rating scale used in the JEEP accelerate classes. Findings of which served as bases for developing instructional material for EN 121- Writing in the Discipline.

Furthermore, the study sought to answer three specific questions: what was the level of performance of the subjects in Speaking in terms of fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and comprehension; what was the level of performance of the subjects in Writing in terms of content, organization, vocabulary and grammar; and was there a significant relationship between the level of performance of the subjects in speaking and in writing?

This study employed quantitative method utilizing descriptive, evaluative design in describing the level of performance of the subjects in both speaking and writing skills; while correlation analysis in exploring the relationship between the level of performance of the subjects in speaking and writing was used.

The findings revealed that the level of performance of the subjects in speaking per component was good except for the comprehension, which was excellent. But in general, their level of performance in speaking was good; while the level of performance of the subjects in writing per component was also good except for the grammar component where they only get average. But their overall speaking performance was also good. The findings further revealed that there was a significant relationship between the levels of performance of the subjects in speaking and writing. This means that the subjects performed better in speaking, and it follows their writing performance.

The study concluded that the JEEP Program is effective in developing or enhancing the English Proficiency, particularly in speaking and writing skills of the tertiary students in preparation for their future employment so that they can compete locally and even globally with the sectors which require a high level of English Proficiency. This implies that an individual with good speaking skills may also become a good writer too.

**Keywords:** English Proficiency, JEEP Program, JEEP Finishers, Cotabato City, Maguindanao.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized business environment, the English language plays a very important role in social interactions. English being the language of global community because of its functions and uses as the language mainly used in business transaction has found to be very important not only in the lives of the students but also to those professionals who interact with colleagues and customers or clients from all over the world (Tejero, 2010).

In some countries, where English is not their native language, people are still struggling to cope with the international demand of having employees or workers who possess English proficiency or competence which is necessary for the international business transaction. For instance, in Japan, they needed to hire English Language Teachers (ELT) who are

native speakers to teach in Japan. In fact, some of the elementary teachers there spent thousands of Yen for them to learn how to speak English fluently. This was the major initiative that the Japanese Government has launched to improve English language teaching in its educational system.

Unfortunately, even in the United States, public schools have been experiencing problems on English Language Proficiency of the students since the beginning of growing immigration to non-traditional states which changes the country and affecting schools in educating English as Second Language learners. The government has provided a program for public schools which caters the problems on Limited-English Proficient Students. In this program, teachers are trained to handle English as Second Language learners (ASL) to help in addressing this problem (Case, 2005).

In the Philippines, which used to be the top English-speaking country in Asia is facing the dilemma on the performance of the students in national examinations and the International English Proficiency Test. Based on the results released by International English Language Testing System (IELTS), a test that is administered to people wanting to work in the United States and other English speaking countries, the Philippines is no longer the top English speaking country in Asia (Marcelo, 2010). With the deterioration of the English Proficiency of the Filipinos, a lot of programs were designed to help the students acquire the necessary skills to be proficient in the target language (TL), especially in Mindanao. Despite these programs, the students still did not acquire the skills they supposed to have after their basic education. This is evident in the result of the National Achievement Test (NAT) conducted by the Department of Education (DepEd) where ARMM region ranked the lowest performance in 2007 (Inquirer, Jan 17, 2008).

For this reason, the USAID through its Growth Equity in Mindanao (GEM) continued its support up to the tertiary level through its Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP) program. This program was designed to help address the problem that many of the young people graduating from College in Mindanao have lack of English language skills required to gain employment in some of the sectors that tend to offer the most opportunity (GEM, 2010)

In the local setting, specifically at Cotabato City State Polytechnic College, as observed, most of the students did not possess English Language proficiency as what most of the faculty members were saying. In fact, not only the English instructors were facing this problem but also those who handled subjects which English was the medium of instructions. However, these were all speculations; still, nobody verified how poor the students were in English. Thus, this study objectively evaluated the students' English Proficiency, particularly on speaking and writing skills to develop instructional materials that may help in enhancing or developing their English proficiency.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study aimed to determine the level of performances in English proficiency particularly on speaking and writing among the Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP) finishers of Cotabato City State Polytechnic College, Region XII for the second semester 2013-2014. The findings of this study served as bases for a proposed instructional tool.

Specifically, this study answered the following questions:

1. What was the level of performance of the students in speaking in terms of the

following:

- 1.1. fluency;
- 1.2. accuracy;
- 1.3. pronunciation; and
- 1.4. comprehension?

2. What was the level of performance of the students in writing in terms of the

following:

- 2.1. content;
- 2.2. organization;
- 2.3. vocabulary; and
- 2.4. grammar?

3. Was there a significant relationship between the levels of performance of the students in speaking and writing?
4. What instructional tool can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

### Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are hoped to be of great help to those who are involved in this educational process.

**JEEP FINISHERS.** This study hopes to help them determine their English proficiency in speaking and writing for them to work hard on sustaining and enhancing their skills so that they can compete successfully for jobs that require a high degree of English proficiency.

**Instructors/ Professors.** The result of this study will provide them with an objective picture of how effective they are as an instructor and what they need to do to strengthen the instruction and for possible innovative teaching strategies which may contribute in improving the students' level of English proficiency in speaking and writing. Furthermore, other teachers not teaching JEEP classes may have positive insights on the importance of DynEd software and the task-based with web-based approaches in the JEEP accelerate to facilitate learning.

**Program chairpersons.** They will be guided and informed about the performance of their students, so this study can help them assess how the JEEP Program can contribute on the improvement of the language proficiency level of their students which may lead them to gain confidence.

**Administrators.** The findings of the study can provide them a deeper understanding of the students' needs in developing their language proficiency, particularly speaking and writing skills. This will become the basis for planning measures to correct the weaknesses to strengthen the instruction and setting priorities on any possible effective language program which may help in the improvement of the language performance of the students.

**The Researcher.** It helps her determine the students' English proficiency in speaking and writing after they finished the program. Thus, enable her to set possible innovations in the teaching strategies, techniques, and approaches or language program utilizing DynEd software as a medium to enhance the level of language proficiency of different learners and proposed instructional tool.

**Future Researchers.** The result of the study may serve as their reference when they will conduct a similar study or provide them a basis for comparison for future studies.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a quantitative method utilizing descriptive, evaluative design. Descriptive design is a fact-finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings. It describes what is. It describes with emphasis what exist such as current conditions, practices, situations, or any phenomena (Calderon, 2004). Since the present study was concerned with the evaluation of the JEEP program through determining the students' English proficiency, particularly the speaking and writing performance of the respondents, the descriptive-evaluative research design was the most appropriate method to use. Quantitative and qualitative approaches were used in the collection, processing, and analysis of data.

### Instrument

The research instruments that were used in this study were direct testing for both speaking and writing performance. According to Hughes (2003), if one wanted to determine the real ability of the learners in their productive skills, direct testing was more appropriate. In assessing the speaking performance, the subjects were asked some of the common job interviews used in the JEEP accelerate classes. These job interview questions were extracted from the common job interview questions appended in the Job Hunting book. On the other hand, their writing performance was assessed by asking them to write something about themselves.

Furthermore, in order to get the level of their proficiency, the evaluation scale of Zemach (2009) was adopted for both speaking and writing skills. Zemach (2009) designed the evaluation scale with the following components: fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and comprehension. Each of the components was graded as follows: four (4) being the highest score with verbal description as Excellent, three (3) as Good, two (2) for Average and one (1) which means Below Average. In similar manner, written output was rated based on the following components: Content, Organization, vocabulary, grammar and graded similar to speaking..

Parameter Limits	Interpretation for both Speaking
3.26 - 4.0	Excellent
2.51- 3.25	Good
1.76- 2.5	Average
1.0- 1.75	Below Average

### Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering process started from securing permits from the administrator for the conduct of the speaking test and writing test. Upon approval, the researcher sent letters to those instructors who were chosen to be the raters. There were three raters in this study. Two of them were instructors who were trained in the JEEP Program, and one was from the University of the Visayas' Language and Literature Department.

Then, the researcher talked to the subjects and set the schedule for the data gathering. A day before the scheduled data gathering, both the rater and the subjects were informed through text message. The assessment was done in the JEEP Accelerate room, and they were assessed individually, one at a time for the speaking test. While in the writing test, the subjects were provided blank sheets where they wrote their essay and ballpoint pens. Those who had both the speaking and writing tests were considered subjects of this study.

Furthermore, this study utilized direct testing for both speaking and writing, as suggested by Hughes (2003). Direct testing requires the candidate to perform precisely the skills that we wish to measure, and it is easier to carry out when it is intended to measure the productive skills of speaking and writing. These were the reasons why it was considered a more appropriate way of determining the real speaking and writing performance of the students because this was independently done task. The students were asked to answer some of the common job interview questions from Job Hunting Book, which was asked by the rater. During the interview, the subjects were treated as job applicants. The speaking tests were video recorded, and the raters' inference was based on the Speaking test Evaluation scale devised by Zemach (2009).

Likewise, in the writing test, the subjects were asked to write something about themselves. It was believed that the subjects would have a strong opinion because it was their own experiences. The subjects were allotted non-pressured time to write a composition and to write not less than 150 words. The writing output was rated based on the rating scale provided for the JEEP Accelerate class.

Finally, all the video and audio recordings were transcribed for the two raters who were not around during the actual tests.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### *Level of performance of the subjects in Speaking in terms of Fluency*

	n	Percentage (%)
Excellent	19	37.3
Good	22	43.1
Average	10	19.6
Below Average	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, twenty-two (22) or 43.1 percent of them were under the 2.51-3.25 mean score, which was interpreted as Good (3.03). This implies that the majority of the subjects have a good level of fluency in speaking. During the class session, it was observed that the subjects could express their opinions and ideas during the class simulation. This is due to their training in the JEEP start, where they explored different modules of the different study paths. However, the number of study paths and modules that were open for them depends on their entry placement test. Additionally, in the JEEP start, students needed to repeat every audio that they have heard by recording their own voice and comparing it to the native speakers. Otherwise, their score will become low.

Furthermore, nineteen (19) or 37.3 percent of the subjects were under 3.26-4.0 mean score, which was interpreted as Excellent. On the other hand, ten (10) or 19.6 percent of the subjects were under the 1.76-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as Average while none of them was under the 1.00-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

Lastly, the weighted mean for the level of performance in Speaking in terms of fluency was 3.03, which were interpreted as Good. This finding shows that the subjects who took the JEEP program have a good level of fluency in speaking English. According to Brown (2003), a person has complete fluency in the language if his speech is fully accepted by educated native speakers. Similarly, Zemach (2009) stated that a person is fluent in the used of the language if he usually maintains a fairly natural-sounding flow of speech.

#### *Level of performance of the subjects in Speaking in terms of Accuracy*

	n	Percentage (%)
Excellent	12	23.5
Good	27	52.9
Average	12	23.5
Below Average	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>10</b>

*Note:* n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that twenty-seven (27) out of fifty-one (51) subjects were under 2.51-3.25 mean score, which was interpreted as good (2.85). This implies that the majority of the subjects have a good level of accuracy in using words in their sentences or utterances. This is because of the exposure of the JEEP students in the DynEd software where they need to mimic every single word that they have heard. Another thing is that some of the exercises in the DynEd are about the use of appropriate words. The software provided a set of sentences with series of blanks (gap-filling) where the students place their answers from the sets of words provided and once they fill in the wrong word, they will hear “No, that’s not right. Please try again.”

Furthermore, twelve (12) or 23.5 percent of them were under 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as Excellent; also another twelve (12) or 23.5 percent of them were under the 1.76- 2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average whereas none of them was under 1.00-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

Finally, the subjects who took the JEEP Program have Good level of performance in terms of accuracy as revealed by the weighted mean of 2.85.

This finding conformed to the idea that is presented in the British Council website that a person has a high level of accuracy if he speaks accurately. It means that he speaks correctly with very few mistakes. Also, Zemach (2009) pointed out that a person has achieved accuracy if he has a good command of basic structures and function with only occasional errors. However, it contradicted to the statement of some instructors handling the JEEP accelerate class that the students have lesser problems on the other components except for the accuracy of the words they used during the job interview simulation.

*Level of performance of the subjects in Speaking in terms of Pronunciation*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	24	47.1
Good	26	50.9
Average	1	1.9
Below Average	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

It can be gleaned in the table that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, twenty-six (41) or 50.9 percent of them were under the 2.5- 3.25 mean score which was interpreted as good (3.16). While twenty-four (24) or 47.1 percent of them were under 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as Excellent; while only one (1) or two percent of them were under 1.76-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average; and none of them was under the 1.00-1.75 mean score which means that none of them was below average in this component.

Finally, in this component, the subjects got 3.17 weighted mean, which was interpreted as good. In other words, this result implies that the subjects have a good level of performance in pronunciation. In this study, the subjects have a good level of pronunciation because of their experiences in the JEEP start (Phase 1) where they tend to imitate the audio of the native speakers by repeating how the native speakers speak and recording it to compare their pronunciation with that of the audio they have heard. In the Speaking Test, students saw a speech meter in the monitor with four bars, which monitored if they pronounced words correctly in the sentence or not. If they mispronounced a word or a phrase, the student would see one red bar, and if they pronounced words correctly, but not well articulated, they would only see two orange bars. But if they pronounced it correctly, they would see four green bars in the speech meter. This means that they pronounced the word correctly with a good accent.

This finding was parallel to Kunso (2013), who investigated the use of DyEd as a supplementary tool in enhancing the students' oral communication which she found out that this program (JEEP Start) improved students' pronunciation. Gilakjani (2011) stated that learners with good English pronunciation are likely to be understood even if they made errors in other areas.

This finding was contrary to the idea of Brown in Lasala (2014) that pronunciation is the common issue on why students shy away when asked to answer or participate, fearing that they will pronounce on a single word and sending their classmates to burst into laughter.

This table presents the level of performance of the subjects in speaking in terms of comprehension.

*Level of performance of the subjects in Speaking in terms of Comprehension*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	34	66.7
Good	17	33.3
Average	0	0
Below Average	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, thirty-four (34) of them were under the 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as excellent (3.38); and seventeen (17) of them or 33.3 percent were under 2.51 which was interpreted as good; while none of them was under the 1.76-2.5 mean score which has an interpretation of average; and none of them also was under the 1.0-1.75 mean score which has an interpretation of below average. This result implies that the majority of the subjects had a good level of performance in speaking in terms of comprehension; while others had an excellent level of performance in comprehension.

According to Bashir (2011), it is very important that learners develop their comprehension for them to be able to understand anything at all. He pointed out that through comprehension activities, the learner can internalize some vocabulary and some grammatical structures, which will help the learner to understand more when he knows enough to converse in a simple way. The result of getting through duplicating gestures and movement of the learners to show comprehension is that the learner has acquired enough basic building blocks of the language to begin to function in real communication situation in a halting way.

This table presents the level of performance of the subjects in Speaking. The level of performance in this table covers the four (4) components of speaking skills such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and comprehension.

*Summary of the Level of Performance of the subjects in Speaking*

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Fluency	3.03	Good
Accuracy	2.85	Good
Pronunciation	3.17	Good
Comprehension	3.38	Excellent
<b>Grand mean</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>Good</b>

*Note:* n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

It can be gleaned from the table that the subjects have a good level of performance in speaking based on the average weighted mean of 3.10. Particularly in fluency level shown by the computed mean of 3.03 (good); accuracy has a mean of 2.85 (Good); pronunciation has a mean of 3.17 (Good), and for comprehension has a mean of 3.38 (Excellent). These findings conformed to the notion of Nunan (2011) that spoken language is context-dependent, *i.e.* generally used to communicate with people at the same time and space. It relies on shared knowledge between the interactants and often makes reference to the shared context generally accompanies the action. Secondly, the spoken language is dialogic in nature. Meaning it usually involves two or more speakers creating spoken texts together. While Saymo (2004) discussed that in speaking, the speaker learns quickly from the response, and he can change the direction of his remarks, it also allows the use of informal and formal construction, and there is a higher tolerance for a repetition of a phrase or sentence. That is why it is rapidly acquired and produced.

*Level of Performance of the subjects in Writing in terms of Content*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	11	21.6
Good	33	64.7
Average	7	13.7
Below Average	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

*Note:* n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, thirty-three (33) of them were under 2.51-3.25 mean score, which was interpreted as good (2.93). This result implies that the majority of the subjects have a good level of performance in writing in terms of the content; and eleven (11) of them were under 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as excellent; while the other seven (7) were under 1.76-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average; and none of them was under 1.0-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

Finally, based on the weighted mean, which was 2.93 (good), it revealed that the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of content was good. This finding corroborated to the findings of the study conducted by Cabansag (2013). In his study about the written language proficiency of the Laboratory high school students in a State University in Cagayan Valley, he found out that these students are very proficient in the use of a structure which refers to how the respondents elaborate details, support detail sentences, and the main idea or topic sentences. Though the finding in this study was a bit lower, compared to the result of his study, both studies had desirable results.

This table presents the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of organization.

*Level of Performance of the subjects in Writing in terms of Organization*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	8	15.7
Good	32	62.7
Average	10	19.6
Below Average	1	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

Further, the table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, thirty-two (32) of them were under 2.51-3.25 mean score, which was interpreted as good (2.8). This implies that the majority of the subjects had a good level of writing in terms of organization.

Furthermore, ten (10) of the subjects were under 1.76-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average; while the other eight (8) were under 3.26-4.0 mean score which was interpreted as excellent; and one (1) of them was under 1.0-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

Lastly, the weighted mean for the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of the organization was 2.86, which was interpreted as good. This finding shows that the subjects who took the JEEP program had a good level of performance in this component.

Lasala (2014) pointed out that the writing exercise requires comprehension of the learner that covers not only the grammatical competence but the skills in organizing ideas, creating a coherent and cohesive paragraph. It also on many different registers depending on the function of the written word.

Similarly, Nik, Hamzah, & Rafidee (2010) emphasize that writing is not just putting pen to paper or writing down ideas, but it is how these ideas are presented or expressed effectively. This highly demanding process of writing requires several skills and conventions like organization in the development of ideas and information.



*Level of Performance of the subjects in Writing in terms of Vocabulary*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	11	21.6
Good	22	43.1
Average	15	29.4
Below Average	3	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subjects, twenty-two (22) of them were under 2.51-3.25 mean score, which was interpreted as good (2.67). This further shows that the majority of the subjects have a good level of performance in vocabulary, while the other fifteen (15) were under 1.76-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average; and eleven (11) of them were under 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as excellent; and only three (3) of them was under 1.00-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

Finally, the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of vocabulary was good based on the weighted mean of 2.67, which was interpreted as good. This finding was parallel to the findings of the study conducted by Ma (2007), she investigated the learning outcomes of the vocabulary program using computer-assisted, and the result was satisfactory. Also in the study conducted by Nik, Hamzah, & Rafidee (2010), they emphasized that a highly demanding process of writing requires a number skills and convention like a high degree of accuracy in choosing right words so that there is no ambiguity of the meaning. Besides, writing demands the writer to have a careful choice of vocabulary.

*Level of Performance of the subjects in Writing in terms of Grammar*

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Excellent	3	5.9
Good	21	41.2
Average	25	49.0
Below Average	2	3.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average; 1.0-1.75 Below Average.

The table revealed that out of fifty-one (51) subject, twenty-five (25) of them were under 1.75-2.5 mean score which was interpreted as average (2.39); and twenty-one (21) of them were under 2.51-3.25 mean score which was interpreted as good; while the other three (3) were under 3.26-4.00 mean score which was interpreted as excellent; and the remaining two (2) were under 1.0-1.75 mean score which was interpreted as below average.

The result shows that based on the weighted mean of 2.39, the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of grammar was only average or acceptable. This finding conformed to the idea of Szynalski (2014) that grammar is difficult to learn because it is difficult to memorize all the grammar rules. One needs a lot of time to use a grammar rule. One needs to recall it, and see if it can be used in his sentence, then he has to build the sentence according to rule.

According to Lasala (2014), writing is perceived to be difficult by most students due to the different grammar rule, which most of the second language learners of English failed to learn with understanding. Similarly, the right use of grammatical devices to focus and emphasize ideas and understanding grammatical patterns and be able to write sentence structures that are appropriate to the subject matter is a highly demanding process of writing (Nik, Hamzah & Rafidee, 2010).

Further, Cabansag (2013) stated that the role of grammar in writing is akin to the role of listening and speaking, where the two are mutually synergistic. In other words, writing and grammar are inextricably intertwined as much of good writing derives its excellence from faultless grammar. This is emphasized by Frodesen and Eyring (2000) in Cabansag (2013) who believe that "a focus on form (grammar) in a composition can help writers develop rich linguistic resources needed to express ideas effectively." Thus, he deduced that Second Language writers need to pay attention to form in developing writing proficiency.

This table presents the level of performance of the subjects in writing. The level of performance in this table covers the four components of writing skills such as content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar.

*Summary of the Level of Performance of the subjects in Writing*

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Content	2.93	Good
Organization	2.8	Good
Vocabulary	2.67	Good
Grammar	2.39	Average
<b>Grand mean</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>Good</b>

*Note:* n=51. Parameters: 3.26-4.00 Excellent; 2.51-3.25 Good; 1.76-2.5 Average;

1.0-1.75 Below Average.

Further, the table shows that the subjects had a good level of performance in writing based on the average weighted mean of 2.70. Specifically, for their level of performance in content, it has a mean of 2.93 (Good); the organization has a mean of 2.8 (Good); vocabulary has a mean of 2.67 (Good), and grammar has a mean of 2.39 (average). Writing requires a more complex and difficult discourse (Saymo, 2004).

In her study, Lasala (2014) also cited that many English learners learning to write fluently in English is much more challenging than learning to speak fluently. Even for advanced level learners, written communications can come much more slowly in English than spoken communications. Writing is perceived to be difficult by most students due to the different grammar rules, which most of the second learners of the English language failed to learn with understanding.

**Significant Correlation between the levels of Performance of the subjects in Speaking and Writing**

This table presents the significant correlation between the levels of performance of the subjects in speaking and writing.

*Significant Correlation between the Levels of Performance of the Subjects in Speaking and Writing*

Variables	Pearson r	P-value	Interpretation
Speaking and Writing	.484	.000	Significant

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The table further revealed the correlational analysis between the level of performance of the subjects in speaking and writing. This shows that the hypothesis there is no significant relationship between the speaking and writing performance of the subjects was rejected. It appears, therefore that there is a moderate relationship between the speaking and writing

performance of the subjects with Pearson value of .484 and significant at both .01 and .05 level of significance. This implies that the better is the performance of the subjects in speaking; it follows better performance also in writing.

Furthermore, the extent of the relationship between speaking and writing was .23 or 23 percent. This means that 23 percent of the performance of the subjects in speaking was attributed by their performance in writing, while the remaining 77 percent was attributed by other variable other than writing.

Speaking and writing are skills that have similarities. Both require the use of language symbols to express needs and feelings, and they are both governed by rules of semantics and syntax. Both are also expected to achieve a communicative purpose- a degree of understanding, common knowledge, and shared expectations (Saymo, 2004).

Additionally, writing and speaking have a close relationship within languages as they are both about the person going them creating language. Many beginners shy away from creating languages preferring instead to concentrate on listening and reading, those aspects which are centered on understanding other people's language. But writing and speaking help everyone to get better at the language and understanding how it works. Not until you have put the skills into practice in speaking and writing yourself can truly appreciate how the language works (Walker, 2012).

Walker (2012) further added that making the person first foray into speaking a foreign language and holding a full conversation with a fluent or native speaker are two different things. But there is only one way to get from one to another, and that is to practice. Speaking will be most people's first proper chance to create a language of their own—whether are babies learning their first language or adults learning a brand new foreign language.

This result contradicted the notion of Vygotsky, e.f. Hughey in Saymo (2004) that composing a written discourse is a "separate linguistic function differing from oral speech in both structure and mode of functioning. Writing is significantly different from speaking because writing requires a more complex and difficult discourse (Saymo, 2004).

The findings also corroborated to the concepts of Nunan (2011) which he explained that in terms of skills, producing a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing is probably the most difficult thing there is to do in the language. It is something even the native speakers never master. For the second language, learners are enormous, particularly for those who go on to a university and study in a language that is not their own. There are differences between spoken and written language. Firstly, spoken language is context-dependent, *i.e.* generally used to communicate with people at the same time and space. It relies on shared knowledge between the interactants and often makes reference to the shared context generally accompanies action; while written language is context independent, *i.e.* it is used to communicate across time and distance and must recreate for readers the context. Secondly, the spoken language is dialogic in nature. Meaning it usually involves two or more speakers creating spoken texts together. But the written language is monologic in nature. This means that it is usually written by one person and removed from the audience (Nunan, 2011).

Nevertheless, Saymo (2004) affirmed that writing is more difficult because it is a solitary act which means that the communication is formed in isolation that is why chances of giving meaning to a piece of written work are slim; it also requires a sustained act of imagination. It also employs longer structure and formal construction; whereas in speaking, it has situational context which requires direct contact with the audience. In speaking, the speaker learns quickly from the response, and he can change the direction of his remarks. It also allows the use of informal and formal construction, and there is a higher tolerance for a repetition of a phrase or sentence. That is why it is rapidly acquired and produced.

With the different presentation of results in the oral and written competencies of the subjects, it manifests that students got no reservations in terms of speaking. They can communicate, expound, they are even confident and good manipulators of the English language.

In spoken communication between two people who are in proximity to each other, usually fewer words need to be used than would be necessary in writing, because people in a conversation can point or gesture, use facial expressions, tonal inflections, body language to convey part of their meaning without spelling everything out in words alone.

Many language learners regard speaking ability as the measure of knowing a language. These learners define fluency as the ability to converse with others, much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. They regard speaking as the most important skill they can acquire, and they assess their progress in terms of their accomplishments in spoken communication.

#### 4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the analyzed data, the following are the salient findings:

The level of performance of the subjects in speaking in terms of fluency was good; in terms of accuracy, their level of performance was also good. For their level of performance in terms of pronunciation, they were good; and in terms of comprehension, their level of performance was excellent. Generally, the level of performance of the subjects in speaking was good.

Furthermore, the level of performance of the subjects in writing in terms of content was good; and their level of performance in writing in terms of the organization was also good. In terms of vocabulary, their level of performance was also good with, while in terms of grammar, their level of performance was only average. In general, the level of performance of the subjects in writing was good.

There is a significant relationship between the levels of Performance of the subjects in speaking and writing. This means that the subjects performed better in Speaking, and it follows their writing performance.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

In the light of the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the JEEP Program is effective in developing or enhancing English Proficiency. Particularly in speaking and writing skills of the tertiary students in preparation for their future employment so that they can compete locally and even globally with the sectors which require a high degree of English Proficiency. It implies that an individual with good speaking skills may also become a good writer too.

#### 6. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the summary of findings and conclusions, the following are the recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the proposed instructional material be used in writing in the Discipline classes since it was developed based on the findings of the study.
2. In lieu of the increasing number of enrollees, the additional subsidy should be given to sustain the program.
3. More training for faculty in charge should be conducted to enhance their capability further.
4. Integration of the JEEP Program in the curriculum as regular courses is needed.
5. There is still a need to develop more instructional materials that can support the program to improve the performance of the students to become better or excellent in English proficiency.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Ambayon, C. (2012). Reading skills and English Language course performance of College Freshmen students of Sultan Kudarat State University. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Visayas. Cebu City
- [2] Almansour, NS. And Al-Shorman, RA. (2012). The Effect of Computer-Assisted instruction on Saudi University students' learning of English. Journal of King Saud University-Language and Translation.
- [3] Al-Menei, A.M.O. (2008). An Investigation of Computer-assisted Writing Instruction on EFL Saudi Learners' Ability. (Published master thesis). King Saud University. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Retrieved from repository.ksu.edu.sa/jspui/bitstream/123456789/19275/1/Thesis%20byAhmed%20M.%20A-Menei.pdf.
- [4] Bagarić, V. (2007). Defining Communicative Competence. Metodika Vol.8.
- [5] Bashir, M. & Azeem, M. (2011). Factors Affecting Students' English Skills. British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences. ISSN:2046-9578, Vol.2 No.1 (2011). British Journal Publishing Inc. 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.bjournal.co.uk/BJASS.aspx>
- [6] Bovitch, S., Cullimore, Z., Bramwell-Jones, T., & Massas, E. (2013). Theory of Learning: What is learning? How are skills and knowledge acquired? Retrieved from <http://www.newfoundation.com/GALLERY.html>
- [7] Brown, H.D. (2003). Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices. PEARSON Longman.

- [8] Cabansag, J.N.(2013). Written Language Proficiency of Laboratory High School Students in a State University in Cagayan Valley Philippines. *ResearchersWorld-Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce*. E-ISSN 2229-4686. ISSN 2231-4172. Retrieved from [www.researchersworld.com/vol4/issue2/paper\\_12.pdf](http://www.researchersworld.com/vol4/issue2/paper_12.pdf)
- [9] Calderon, J.F. (2004). *Curriculum and Curriculum Development*. Educational Publishing House. Manila, Philippines
- [10] Case, E. (2005). *Issues and Challenges Facing Limited-English Proficient Students and the US Public Schools*. Retrieved from [www.macaletes.edu/educationreform/publicintellealessay/EmmaC.pdf](http://www.macaletes.edu/educationreform/publicintellealessay/EmmaC.pdf)
- [11] Celce-Murcia, M (2006). *Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language*. 3rd Edition. Thomson Learning Asia. Singapore
- [12] Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (2008). *The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*, 2nd Edition. Thomson Learning Asia. Singapore.
- [13] Celce-Murcia, M. and Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language teaching: A guide for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- [14] Crystal, D. (2001) *Language and Internet*. Cambridge UK. Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Cummins, J. (2000). *Language Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [16] Denham, K. & Lobeck, A. (2010). *Linguistics for Everyone*. Wadsworth. Retrieved from <http://grammar.about.com/od/il/g/Linguistic-Competence.htm>
- [17] Downes, C. (2009). *Cambridge English for Job-Hunting*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK
- [18] Farhady, H. (1994). *Measures of Language Proficiency*. Retrieved from <http://www.mpazhou.ir/wp-content/uploads/2011/11Measures-of-language-proficiency.pdf> on February 2, 2014
- [19] Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. (2011). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Cengage Learning Asia Pte.Ltd.
- [20] Gilakjani, A.P.(2011). *The significance of Pronunciation in English Language Teaching*. *English Language Teaching* Vol. 5 No.4. Retrieved from [www.Ccset.org/elt](http://www.Ccset.org/elt).
- [21] Go, M.B. & Posecion, O.T. (2010). *Language and Literature Assessment: A Comprehensive Guide*. ALIMAR Publishing Inc. Quezon City.
- [22] Hinkel, E. (2005). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- [23] Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press. London England.
- [24] Jannedy, S., Poletto, R., Weldon, T. (1994). *Language Files*. 6th Edition. Ohio State University Press. Columbus
- [25] Kamiya, M. (2014). *The Role of Communicative Competence in L2 Learning*. Retrieved from [www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki26/kamiya.pdf](http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki26/kamiya.pdf). February 2, 2014.
- [26] Kunso, F. (2013). *Using Dynamic Education As A Supplementary Tool in Enhancing The Students' Oral Communication*. (Unpublished master thesis). Notre Dame University. Cotabato City.
- [27] Landon, M.M. and Tanner, M.W. (2009). *The Effects of Computer-Assisted Pronunciation Readings on ESL Learners' use of Pausing, Stress, Intonation, and Overall Comprehensibility*. *Language Learning Technology*. <http://llt.msu.edu/vol13num3/tannerlandon.pdf>
- [28] Lasala, C.B. (2014). *Communicative Competence of Secondary Senior Students: Language Instructional Pocket*. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Retrieved from [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187704281403153X](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187704281403153X)
- [29] Llorda, E. (2000). *On Competence, proficiency, and communicative language ability*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol.10, No. 1.

- [30] Ma, Q. & Kelly, P. (2006). Computer Assisted Vocabulary Learning: Design & Evaluation. Computer Assisted Language Learning Vol.19, No.1. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from [people.csail.mit.edu/uncgnaw/links/research/pubs/VocabularyQuizMa.pdf](http://people.csail.mit.edu/uncgnaw/links/research/pubs/VocabularyQuizMa.pdf)
- [31] Marcelo, P. (2010). English Proficiency is key to Landing a job. Retrieved from <http://planetphilippines.com/current-affairs/english-proficiency-is-key-to-landing-a-job/> on February 2, 2014
- [32] McCawley, P.F. (2001). The Logic Model for Program Planning and Evaluation. University of Idaho Extension.
- [33] McGuire, M. (2002). Canadian Evaluation Society-Project in Support of Advocacy of Professional Development. Literature Review.
- [34] Nik, Y.A., Hamzah, A. & Rafidee, H. (2010). A Comparative Study on the Factors Affecting the Writing Performance Among Bachelor Students. International Journal of Educational Research and Technology, Vol1 June 2010: 54-59. Retrieved from [www.soeagra.com/ijert/vol1/ijert7.pdf](http://www.soeagra.com/ijert/vol1/ijert7.pdf)
- [35] Nunan, D. (2011). Second Language Teaching & Learning. Cengage Learning Asia Pte Ltd (Philippine Branch).
- [36] Palma, J.C. (1992). Curriculum Development System: A Handbook for school practitioner in Basic Education. National Bookstore. Metro Manila, Philippines.
- [37] Robinson, B. (2002) The CIPP Approach to Evaluation: COLLIT project: A Background
- [38] Saymo, A. S. (2004). Effective Writing. Trinitas Publishing, Inc. Meycauyan, Bulacan.
- [39] Singhal, V., & Gromisch, E.S. (Ed.). (2012). Chomsky's Theories on Language. Retrieved from <http://www.brighthubeducation.com/language-learning-tips/71728-noam-chomsky-language-acquisition-theories/>
- [40] Schütz, R. (2014). Stephen Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>
- [41] Szynalski, T. (2014). Why you shouldn't rely on grammar rules. Retrieved from <http://www.antimoon.com/how/input-gramrules.htm>
- [42] Talebi, F. & Teimoury, N. (2013). The Effect of Computer-assisted Language Learning on Improving EFL Learner's Pronunciation Ability. World Journal of English. Vol. 3, No.3. Retrieved from [www.sciedu.ca/wjel](http://www.sciedu.ca/wjel)
- [43] Tejero, E.G. (2010). Doorways to English Language Proficiency. National Bookstore. Mandaluyong City.
- [44] Valdman, A. (1985) AILA REVIEW. Association International de Linguistique Appliquées.
- [45] Walker, J. BA. (2012). Writing and Speaking—the Relationship. Retrieved from <http://www.languagetutoring.co.uk/writing-and-speaking-the-relationship.html>
- [46] Wong, M. (2011). Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory in Practice. Edinburgh University Press Ltd. Edinburgh
- [47] Zemach, D. (2009). Business Venture. Teacher's Guide. Oxford University press. Oxford New York. <http://eka1.wordpress.com/2007/04/18/competence-versus-performance-in-language/>. April 18, 2007 [learnenglishteens.britishcouncil.org/exams/speaking-exams/accuracy-and-fluency](http://learnenglishteens.britishcouncil.org/exams/speaking-exams/accuracy-and-fluency)