

INTRODUCTION

Learning and developing proficiency in the English language has become a

assumption that a certain level of language proficiency is necessary for academic

“the interaction of grammatical (formally possible), psycho-linguistic (feasible), sociocultural (contextually appropriate) systems of language”.

Hymes (1972) in Salleh (2000) offers a description of communicative competence as a term that refers to the capabilities of a person that include knowledge about the correct language use. He also elaborates that the role of non-cognitive factors also determines one's competence. It is also dependent on ideas and language use.

These two constructs by Cummins are utilized in the various speaking tasks of the oral proficiency test used to assess the college students' English oral proficiency,

Statement of the Problem

1. What is the English oral proficiency level of the second year students who have taken English 3 in the previous semester in the specific oral sub-component skills: function, content, vocabulary, grammar, comprehensibility and fluency?
2. Is there a significant difference in the English oral proficiency level of the students when grouped according to course / degree program?

Statement of Hypothesis

Below is the hypothesis of the study which was tested at 0.05 level of significance:

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the English oral proficiency level of the students when grouped according to their degree program.

METHODOLOGY

This study set in one of the campuses of the Mindanao State University System employed a Quantitative-

One-way ANOVA test and T-test for Equality were used for the test of significant difference. Also, Tukey B was used for the Post Hoc analysis. Furthermore, it was also used to determine if there was a significant difference in the English oral proficiency of the students when grouped according to course / degree program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Course / Degree Program

Table 1 in the next page shows the distribution of respondents by course or degree program. Students from Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) major in Marketing had the greatest number of respondents with 16.33%. Degree programs such as Bachelor of Science in Secondary education (BSE) major in Biology, BSE Chemistry, BSE Drafting Technology (DT) and Technology and (BSE) Livelihood Education (TLE) all come from the College of Education (CED). It shows that a great bulk of the students who have taken English 3 in the previous semester come from this college.

Table 1: Students' Course or Degree Program

Course	Frequency	Percent
BS Marketing	24	16.33%
BS Accountancy	23	15.65%
DEST	12	8.16%
BSE Bio	19	12.93%

English Oral Proficiency Level

In general, the over-all English oral proficiency level of the sophomore students is 2.9116 as shown in Table 2.

Function has the highest mean, followed by comprehensibility, grammar and content. Moreover, the last two ranks are occupied by vocabulary and fluency, respectively.

Table 2. Mean Distribution of the Oral Proficiency Level
of the Respondents

Based on the scoring scale, the mean proficiency of 2.9116 falls in the range between 2.5 - 3.49 which has a verbal description of Good. It is also evident in Table 2 that all sub-oral component skills fall also in this description.

A speaker who obtains a mark of 3 in a scale of 1-5 based on the Texas Oral

**Significant Difference in the English Oral Proficiency Level of the Students
When Grouped According to Course / Degree Program**

The students with the highest mean oral proficiency level are students enrolled in AB English while the students with the lowest mean oral proficiency level are those

It can be inferred that the students who belong to degree programs with language use (LU) requirement in the System Admission Scholarship Examination (SASE) were able to justify their score since it was also demonstrated in their speaking test or TOPT rating

sub-component skills with BSA and BSBA students. There is a good implication since BSE Bio students are future teachers. Also, a few of them may have enrolled in this

Mamhot, A.M., Martin, H. & Masangya, E. (January 2013). A comparative study on the language anxiety of ESL and EFL learners. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10. Retrieved from <http://philesjournal.com>

Martin, R. (2008). English as a medium of instruction in the Philippines. *UE today*. Volume 17 / no 4 / June-August 2008. Retrieved from <https://www.ue.edu.ph/manila/uetoday/index.php?nav=27.htm&archive=200808>

Oxford, R. (1999). *Anxiety and the language learner: new*

- Savignon, S. (1987). *Communicative language teaching: linguistic theory and classroom practice*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Press.
- Sun, C. and Henrichsen, L. (October 2011). Major university English tests in China: Their importance, nature and development. *TESL Reporter*. Vol. 44 (1 & 2). Retrieved from <https://ojs.lib.byu.edu/spc/index.php/TESL/issue/view/2506>
- Tao, L. (2011). *Investigating English anxiety and proficiency*. Retrieved October 28, 2013 from Luiniabstract.china.edu
- Vecchio, A.D. & Guerrero, M. (1995). *Handbook of English language proficiency tests*. Albuquerque: New Mexico Highlands University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu>
- Xi, X., Bridgeman, B., & Wendler, C. (2014). Tests of English for academic purposes in university admissions. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The Companion to Language Assessment* (Vol. 1, pp. 318–337). Hoboken, NJ: WileyBlackwell Mexico
- Yang, W. & Cheng, L. (2015). *How language proficiency contributes to Chinese students' academic success in Korean universities*. *Language Testing in Asia* 5: 8. doi:10.1186/s40468-015-0016-2