

Effectiveness of Project FLIP (Faculty Language Improvement Program) on the Language Proficiency of the Junior High School Faculty

Liza Maquera

English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Kristian Jay Sto. Tomas
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Xyza Moreno
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Jonje Caliste
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Josephine Ancheta
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Nancy Batang
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Mariel Princess Tamaray
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Kristine Mae Auayang
English Area, Junior High School
University of Saint Louis
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

Abstract— Junior High School teachers are expected to be experts in the English Language and should possess high level of proficiency towards language education. With this, it is important that teachers are continuously given professional development activities and training programs to sustain their high-level of English proficiency. This study was conducted to assess the English proficiency levels of teachers of University of Saint Louis – Junior High School. An English Proficiency Test was administered to all teachers with emphasis on the following dimensions: Subject Verb Agreement, Use of Prepositions, Correct Usage of Words, Parts of Speech, and Tenses of Verbs. Results reveal that while some of the teachers have high level of English proficiency, still many of the teachers obtained low scores in the different areas of English. With this result, the intervention program, FLIP, showed that after the implementation of the program, the issues and concerns raised were addressed such that the language competencies of the JHS teachers across all facets specifically Verb consistency and Parts of Speech were significantly improved.

Keywords— *English Proficiency, Junior High School Teachers, Language Education, Faculty Intervention Program*

I. INTRODUCTION

As an essential component of the teaching-learning process, teachers play a significant role in motivating and engaging pupils in the classroom; hence, they are required to be fluent in the language.

They must be able to communicate the required learning, ideas, and concepts to their students. The majority of English language instructors across the world speak English as a second or third language rather than as their first. Many people's English competence may fall short of the standards set by their teachers, coworkers, and pupils (Richards, 2017). English is renowned not just as the language of the English, but also as the language of many other countries. As a result, it is critical for English language learners to notice the distinctions in use of language to that aim, the Philippine government has pushed to modernize the country's educational system in preparation for ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) integration in 2015, as well as the United Nations' demand for Education for All (EFA) by 2015.

Such a transformation necessitates an examination of the efficiency of English in the country's language education (ELE), which can be regarded as a fork in the road, as stakeholders work to resolve challenges of English language development Filipino pupils' abilities on the one hand on the one hand, and the enhancement of academic on the other hand, success This has happened deemed deficient in terms of making a substantial contribution to improve learning outcomes for Filipinos students. ELE policies have been plagued by problems with alignment and coherence in the curriculum and assessment areas, and difficulties in implementing authentic reform. Furthermore, ELE has been adopted at the price of literacy mother languages (Madrunic, Martin, and Plata, 2016).

Researchers discovered that instructors require great and extensive linguistic skills due to the variety of roles they must perform. Teachers, as communicators with pupils from various backgrounds, must recognize that structural disparity across languages and differing cultural practices for language usage may have an impact on their students' conversation. Teachers, in their function as educators, must understand how English competency develops in native speakers and people studying English as a second language. Teachers may pick relevant resources for their pupils if they understand language development and acquisition. Similarly, their function as assessors necessitates a grasp of what linguistic actions to anticipate based on students' performance. Linguistic backgrounds so that typical dialect and language learning characteristics are not mistaken for language deficiency or delay. Teachers are expected to know about language as part of their duty as educated humans and to contribute this knowledge to conversations in schools and beyond. Finally, teachers are key socialization agents who promote children's emerging identities as students who assist children from a range of households and backgrounds. Schools are where communities learn to function comfortably and productively, sometimes in a foreign language and culture. In this line, the Department of Education's (DepEd) National English Proficiency Program (NEPP) prepares proficient teachers across the country to serve as mentors to less experienced teachers in their particular institutions. It was established in response to the need to improve the quality of English proficiency among Filipino teachers, notably Reading/English, Math, and Science instructors, in order to increase their students' skills (PIA, 2009).

Therefore, there is a need to study teachers' grammar proficiency as it is essential to improve teaching practices such as test construction, effective and comprehensible Instruction, and curriculum planning and design. Given the lack of a coherent theoretical underpinning for the place of grammar in the curriculum, the fact that the process of teaching grammar can be affected by factors such as teachers' grammar proficiency, beliefs and practices outlined above, it is now an apt time to study teachers' English Proficiency Levels as basis for In-service Training.

II. METHODS

This study employed document analysis as it described and analyzed the frequent grammar errors observed in the English Proficiency Test. The English Proficiency Test consists of 100 items and is divided into five: Subject-Verb Agreement (20 items), Correct Usage (20 items), Verb Consistency (20 items), Use of Prepositions (20 items), and Parts of Speech (20 items). The participants of the study were the Junior High School Teachers of the University of Saint Louis in the School year 2021-2022. Among the respondents of the study, majority of the respondents were teaching in less than five years and obtained bachelor's degree as their highest educational attainment.

Table 1. Number of Respondents per Area

Subject Area	Number of Respondents
Filipino	7
English	8
Mathematics	8
Science	8
Araling Panlipunan	6
TLE	7
MAPEH	6
Christian Living	7
Computer	4
TOTAL	61

Data were analyzed using the content analysis using the following range and qualitative descriptions:

English Proficiency Test Per Dimension		Overall English Proficiency Level	
Scores	Qualitative Description	Mean Score	Qualitative Description
19-20	Excellent	90 – 100	Excellent
16-18	Very Good	85 - 89	Very Good
14-15	Average	80 – 84	Average
11-13	Fair	75 – 79	Fair
10 and below	Poor	74 and below	Poor

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Mean Scores in Use of Prepositions

Subject Area	Pretest Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	14.80	Average	18.43	Very Good
English	18.50	Very Good	20.00	Excellent
Mathematics	15.125	Average	19.00	Excellent
Science	15.20	Average	18.00	Very Good
Araling Panlipunan	15.50	Average	18.00	Very Good
TLE	16.86	Very Good	17.57	Very Good
MAPEH	16.17	Very Good	18.00	Very Good
Christian Living	16.13	Very Good	19.00	Excellent
Computer	12.25	Fair	17.50	Very Good
AVERAGE	15.615	Average	18.39	Very Good

The table represents the pretest and posttest mean scores of teachers in the facet, Prepositions. It is gleaned from the table that the English, Mathematics, and Christian Living areas got an excellent proficiency on the use of Prepositions. The Filipino, Araling Panlipunan, Science, TLE, MAPEH, and Computer areas showed a Very good proficiency level on the area indicated above. Overall, the proficiency of the Junior High school on the Use of Prepositions is Very Good. This supports the claim of Cabuk (2011), which states that one of the reasons behind low scores in the use of prepositions is because teachers don't comprehend the context when it comes to employing appropriate prepositions and don't know which one to use (Cabuk, 2011).

Table 2. Mean Scores in Correct Usage of Words

Subject Area	Pretest Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	14.80	Average	17.14	Very Good
English	19.33	Excellent	20.00	Excellent
Mathematics	15.00	Average	18.13	Very Good
Science	15.60	Average	19.13	Excellent
Araling Panlipunan	17.17	Very Good	17.50	Very Good
TLE	13.29	Fair	16.43	Very Good
MAPEH	14.67	Average	18.33	Very Good
Christian Living	16.00	Very Good	18.57	Very Good
Computer	15.75	Average	18.25	Very Good
AVERAGE	15.73	Average	18.16	Very Good

The table represents the mean score of teachers in the facet, Correct Usage of Words. It is gleaned from the table that the English and Science area got an excellent description in the facet, Correct Usage of Words. This means the English and Science areas are the most proficient in the facet, correct usage of words among all subject areas in the Junior High

School Department. The rest of the subject areas displayed a very good proficiency level on the area indicated above. Generally, the Junior High school has a very good proficiency on the Correct Usage of Words. The results support the claim of Kim and Krashen (2018) which stipulates that success on an English test was an excellent predictor of performance on an English vocabulary test for high school English language teachers. Furthermore, those who reported more free English reading and instruction performed better on a competency test.

Table 3. Mean Scores in Subject Verb Agreement

Subject Area	Pretest Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	14.80	Average	15.29	Average
English	19.33	Excellent	18.25	Very Good
Mathematics	15.00	Average	15.38	Average
Science	15.60	Average	14.88	Average
Araling Panlipunan	17.17	Very Good	14.83	Average
TLE	13.29	Fair	14.00	Average
MAPEH	14.67	Average	13.67	Fair
Christian Living	16.00	Very Good	16.57	Very Good
Computer	15.75	Average	12.00	Fair
AVERAGE	15.73	Average	14.98	Average

The table represents the mean score of teachers in the facet, Subject Verb Agreement. It is shown in the table that the English and Christian Living area obtained a very good qualitative description. This means the English and Christian Living area are the most proficient in subject verb agreement among all subject areas in the Junior High School Department. The Filipino, Mathematics, Science, TLE, and Araling Panlipunan areas have an average proficiency on subject-verb agreement. On the contrary, MAPEH and Computer areas exhibited a fair proficiency on subject-verb agreement. Overall, the Junior High school exhibited an average proficiency on subject verb agreement. The result supports the claim of Ellis (2012) which states that errors in subject verb agreement arise because the individual does not know what is correct; they represent inadequacies in a teacher's knowledge (Ellis 2012). Moreover, the findings validated Escamilla, et al. (2013) hypothesis that, given the linguistic and instructional diversity among instructors in most schools, teacher-educators can do more to model a variety of bilingual pedagogies, even in predominantly English-language situations.

Table 4. Mean Scores in Verb Consistency

Subject Area	Pretest Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	13.29	Fair	15.40	Average
English	18.88	Very Good	19.00	Excellent
Mathematics	14.38	Average	16.375	Very Good
Science	14.38	Average	16.40	Very Good
Araling Panlipunan	13.67	Fair	17.00	Very Good
TLE	12.29	Fair	14.14	Average
MAPEH	13.00	Fair	14.83	Average
Christian Living	14.00	Average	17.80	Very Good
Computer	14.00	Average	14.25	Average
AVERAGE	14.21	Average	16.13	Very Good

The table represents the mean score of teachers in the area, Verb Consistency. It is shown in the table that the English area got an excellent proficiency in Verb Consistency. This means the English area is the most proficient in verb consistency among all subject areas in the Junior High School Department. The Christian Living, Araling Panlipunan, Science, and Mathematics areas displayed a very good proficiency level on the area indicated above. On the contrary, Computer, MAPEH, Filipino, and TLE areas showed an average proficiency level on Verb Consistency. On the whole, the Junior High school displayed a very good proficiency on Verb Consistency. The result support the claim of Cowan (2014) which explains that most teachers have difficulty grasping tense and aspect because of L1 interference. Furthermore, it appears that many teachers lack a thorough understanding of tense and aspect since training materials frequently overlook lexical aspect and its consequences.

Table 5. Mean Scores in Parts of Speech

Subject Area	Pretest Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	10.40	Poor	14.43	Average
English	14.20	Average	19.13	Excellent
Mathematics	9.50	Poor	14.63	Average
Science	12.20	Fair	13.50	Fair
Araling Panlipunan	13.17	Fair	14.17	Average
TLE	9.710	Poor	13.57	Fair
MAPEH	8.00	Poor	14.00	Average
Christian Living	8.90	Poor	15.00	Average
Computer	9.50	Poor	13.25	Fair
AVERAGE	10.62	Poor	14.63	Average

The table represents the mean score of teachers in the area, Parts of Speech. It is presented in the table that the English area got the highest mean and obtained an excellent

proficiency on the facet, Parts of Speech. Moreover, the Filipino, Mathematics, Araling Panlipunan, MAPEH, and Christian Living areas got an average proficiency level in the area indicated above, while the Science, TLE, and Computer areas obtained a fair proficiency in the facet, Parts of Speech. As a whole, the Junior High school displayed a fair proficiency in the facet, Parts of Speech. Teachers, according to Ackley (2014), have limited vocabularies and are unfamiliar with grammar, punctuation, and capitalization. Most people can't distinguish the difference between a "noun" and a "verb." Their English is so splintered that they commit grammatical faults that grammarians have yet to identify.

Table 6. Summary of Overall Facets in Grammar

Subject Area	Pretest Overall Mean Score	Qualitative Description	Posttest Overall Mean Score	Qualitative Description
Filipino	70.00	Poor	78.57	Fair
English	89.67	Very Good	96.25	Excellent
Mathematics	71.00	Poor	81.50	Average
Science	75.40	Fair	79.88	Fair
Araling Panlipunan	75.33	Fair	78.17	Fair
TLE	66.86	Poor	73.86	Poor
MAPEH	67.67	Poor	77.00	Fair
Christian Living	73.13	Poor	83.14	Average
Computer	67.50	Poor	75.00	Fair
AVERAGE	72.95	Poor	80.37	Average

The table shows the overall mean score of teachers in all facets of the Proficiency Test conducted during the FLIP Intervention Program. It is presented in the table that the English area obtained an excellent proficiency in the Proficiency Test. Both Math and Christian Living areas got an average proficiency level in the test, while Filipino, Science, Araling Panlipunan, MAPEH, and Computer areas obtained a fair proficiency in the test conducted. Overall, the Junior High school obtained an average proficiency in the facets indicated in the test. The result supports the claim of PIA (2011) which indicates that the National English Proficiency Program, a nationwide program implemented by the DepEd which aims to raise the quality of English Proficiency among Filipino teachers, particularly reading/English, Math and Science teachers; thus, to improve the competencies of their students.

Table 7. Test of Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Means

Facet	t	P value	Decision
Preposition	4.4388	0.0004	Extremely significant
Correct Usage	3.4318	0.0034	Very significant
Subject-Verb Agreement	0.3290	0.7464	Not significant
Verb Consistency	2.3102	0.00345	Significant
Parts of Speech	4.3807	0.0005	Extremely significant
Overall Facets in Grammar	2.2993	0.00353	Significant

As gleaned from the table, there is an extremely significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores in the facet, preposition and parts of speech. This means that the Junior High School faculty are extremely proficient in facets, preposition and parts of speech. On the other hand, Junior High School faculty are very proficient in the facet, correct usage of words. Conversely, the Junior High School faculty obtained are significantly proficient in the facet, verb-tense consistency. However, in the facet, Subject-Verb Agreement, the pretest and posttest results show an insignificant difference.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, it is concluded that the Junior High School has an average grammar proficiency specifically in the areas included in the Proficiency Test. After the implementation of the FLIP, there is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest conducted. Therefore, the FLIP is significantly effective on the facets, Use of Preposition, Correct Usage, Verb-Tense Consistency, and the Parts of Speech. Conversely, on the facet, Subject-Verb Agreement, a slight decrease in the posttest mean was observed. This facet obtained an insignificant difference between the pretest and posttest means.

Overall, there is a need for a more intensive and continuous language intervention course for the Junior High School Teachers most especially on the facet, Subject-Verb

Agreement in order to improve their test construction, effective and comprehensible instruction-making and curriculum planning and design.

REFERENCES

- Adger, C.T., Snow, C.E., Christian, D. (2018). What teachers need to know about language CAL Series on Language Education (2 ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- ASEAN.org. (2015). ASEAN economic community.<http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-economic-community>
- Brookfield, S. (2012). Radical aesthetics. Learning and Education for a Better World, 113-124. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-979-4_8
- Cowan, R. (2014). The Teacher's Grammar of English. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- EFA. (2015). National review report: Philippines. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280131738_Education_for_All_2000-2015_Review_and_Perspectives
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Butvilofsky, S. (2013). Bilingual literacy from the start: Literacy squared in action. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
- Han, L. (2019). A review of the major varieties of English language. International Education Studies, 12(2), 93-99. doi:EJ1204368
- Kleiman, J. (2020). Teaching Grammar in an ESL setting: Teachers' beliefs and practices. (Thesis). Malmö University. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:mau:diva-32552>
- Madrunio M.R., Martin I.P., & Plata, S.M. (2016). English language education in the Philippines: Policies, problems, and prospects. Language Policy, 245-264. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_11
- PIA. (2009). Philippine Information Agency. <https://www.loc.gov/item/lcwaN0003734>
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. RELC Journal, 48(1), 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059>
- Nurusus, E., Samad, A. A., Rahman, S. Z. S. A., Noordin, N., & Rashid, J. M. (2017). Exploring teachers' beliefs in teaching grammar. The English Teacher, 44(1), 10.
- Önal, O. (2018). Non-Native English Teachers' Beliefs on Grammar Instruction. English Language Teaching, 11(5), 1-13.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. RELC Journal, 48(1), 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059>
- Sitorus, D. (2012). Teaching grammar to young learners. Academia Database. http://www.academia.edu/7694429/TEACHING_GRAMMAR_TO_YOUNG_LEARNER_S_A_Chapter_Report
- Toprak, T. E. (2019). "Teaching grammar is not my main responsibility": Exploring EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 6(1), 205-221. <http://www.iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/398>
- Van Vooren, V., Casteleyn, J., & Mottart, A. (2012). The impact of teachers' beliefs on grammar instruction and students' grammar competences. Procedia-Social and behavioral sciences, 69, 641-648

The author/s retain the copyright to this article, with IJAESSI granted first publication rights. This article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), allowing for open access.