



READING COMPREHENSION IN RELATION TO WRITING PROFICIENCY

Mary Grace C. Ramada

Bohol Island State University – Main Campus

Email Address: marygrace.ramada@bisu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Reading and writing are two essential macro-skills in communication. Students do a lot of writing and reading and aim to be adept in writing and to be good readers. That is why this study sought to determine the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students. Find out further, the significant difference of their reading comprehension and writing proficiency. The descriptive design questionnaire was utilized. The reading comprehension was measured in these six (6) sub-skills: finding the main idea, recognizing specific details, recognizing inferences and conclusion, understanding vocabulary from context, recognizing mood and recognizing writing techniques while writing proficiency was measured in these criteria: content, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency and convention. Findings revealed that there is a significant difference between the reading comprehension of the BEED and BSED students while there is no significant difference in terms of their writing proficiency. This means that BSED students tend to read and comprehend better compared to the BEED. Moreover, there is no correlation between their reading comprehension and writing proficiency. Students with good reading comprehension skills may not necessarily be good in writing. Thus, a student may make sense of what is read but may have difficulty in putting his own ideas in well-crafted sentences and logical flow.

Keywords: reading comprehension, writing proficiency, macro-skills, descriptive

INTRODUCTION

The English language can be compared to valuable items found buried and of unknown ownership. It is a treasure-trove of words that anyone can find it valuable. Because it is valuable, anyone also aims to have a piece of it or even own it to be affluent and well-provided in the future. In the same manner, teachers especially English language teachers strive very hard to obtain proficiency and literacy in terms of dealing with the English language. Thus, they want to harness and accumulate skills in terms of using the English language; namely, the four macro-skills of communication speaking, reading and writing. They want to obtain competence, mastery and proficiency of the English language because it would lead to success. That's why, the school plays a vital role in addressing this concern regarding the mastery of language.

According to Alcantara et al., (2003), the mastery of English constructions measured in terms of automatic, error-free production of language items is a major concern in language teaching. The authors further elaborated that a man's communicative competence, which is essentially rooted in his thoughts, feelings and actions, is the by-product of a dynamic process interlocked with his direct experiences. Indeed, man's development in and mastery of language as exemplified in his proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing effectively, are his most important accomplishments and equipment for self-actualization. Villamin et al., (1987), stated the interrelatedness of the macro-skills in communication. The implication is that mastery of one aspect enriches as well as reinforces mastery of the other aspects. Students do a lot of writing in several purposes same as reading. Anyone aims to achieve writing proficiency especially in academic writing; anyone strives to be adept and proficient in their second language composition writing as a manifestation of his/her understanding of the text read or from the input of the speaker. Teachers rate students' output based on a set of criteria to evaluate performance to come up with suggestions and comments for improvement.

Writing is one of the most important ways to ensure that all students master the basic literacy skills, allowing them freedom to express their own concerns and build upon their special interests. Reading experts have become convinced that the full development of literacy skills can occur only when students do a lot of writing as well as a lot of reading.

As stated earlier, one's proficiency in terms of listening, speaking, reading and writing is highly essential and considered as most important accomplishment or achievement of teachers. Therefore, the teachers' role is indeed vital in enabling the learners to be proficient in the four macro-skills in communication. Teaching is a job for people equipped not only with stamina and enthusiasm but also with knowledge in terms of lesson content. That's why, would-be teachers are being polished and trained in the pre-service education to ensure that in their field of work, they will emerge as competent and proficient teachers.

A good knowledge background (academic preparation) gives a sense of confidence and facilitates creative thinking in a teacher. The teacher's ability to conceptualize the structure and function of the language he/she teaches enables him/her to identify the knowledge and skills that students need and to break complex concepts and abilities into "lesson-sized" experiences. This means that the teacher is a good role model.

Good writing begins with careful reading. Students do comprehend text but when it comes to writing, most of the students find it hard to write proficiently. Recent studies would show that literacy does not only limit to reading and writing but includes full comprehension of the text. There is a growing concern at present regarding the fast deterioration of both writing and reading comprehension among students. Students' reading and writing abilities are currently the subjects of much concern for so many educators. A steadily increasing amount of information is transmitted through the medium of written text. As a result, an increase in terms of refined

reading and writing skills at each year level is very necessary for the sustainability of learning in nearly all academic areas. Reading and writing are two inevitable activities a student is engaged in. Teachers require their students to read and reflect something just like a story and let them write a reaction based on their understanding on what they have read. In so doing, teachers must attain effective communication with intelligible use of the English language. In doing so, they will be helped in gaining facility needed in reading and writing before they will have their practice teaching. It is imperative also that education students be good in terms of reading and writing and be helped on how to gain proficiency on these skills.

Largely, it is in this light that the researcher, as a teacher in English, is interested to undertake this study on the two modes of communication and to prove the relationship between reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the pre-service teachers given that they will be into the real field of teaching in the near future and will serve as role models in terms of the mastery of the English language to their students. If one obtained the highest level of reading comprehension, would that be also true to one's writing proficiency. Furthermore, the researcher is interested also to prove if there's a significant difference between the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students. Thus, the researcher wants to seek answers on the difference and relationship between reading comprehension and writing proficiency of student's second language composition so that possible actions would be taken into consideration based on the results of the study.

Theoretical Background

It is clearly stated in Executive Order No. 210 of Article XIV, Section 7 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution on the policy to strengthen the use of the English language as a medium of instruction in all public and private institutions of learning in the secondary and tertiary levels. Thus, English shall be used as a medium of instruction. Its objective is to develop competence and proficiency of all students in the use of the English language and to make them better prepared for job opportunities in this age of globalization. Indeed, one has the edge among the others if he/she knows how to communicate.

The study is also supported with the CHED Memorandum Order No. 59, series of 1996 which states "the aim of Language and Literature instruction should be to provide students with effective communication skills in both English and Filipino and to foster critical understanding and appreciation of how people give expressions to their experience in the world." Article III, Section 4 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution emphatically states "the students are given the chance to talk or write on issues that pertain to themselves or the society without abridging their freedom of speech."

Alcantara et al., (2003), strongly recognizes the importance of language as it serves as people's potent tool for effective communication. They further elucidated that by means of language, one

develops himself/herself and helps others develop themselves. Through language, one receives and transmits the great ideals of his/her civilization and those of other people. Therefore, the fulfilment of man's aims and aspirations as an individual and of his role in his immediate and wider community depends greatly upon his ability to communicate. That's why, countless hours are spent in developing one's language specifically the English language which is our universal language. Teachers do require students to be proficient and show competence in the four macro-skills in communication. In this sense, teachers do give ample activities for students to develop one's proficiency in terms of using the language. These are activities that would give students opportunities to work on their own and with others.

This study is anchored on the schema theory which relates with current understanding of cognition derived from the work of Sir Frederick Bartlett (1932) and Swiss epistemologist Jean Piaget (Wadsworth, 1971) as cited by Ruddell (2005). Piaget defined schemata (plural for schema) as "cognitive structures by which individuals intellectually adapt to and organize the environment." Schemata receive, sort, classify and hold information about environmental events and objects; these events and objects comprise our world knowledge and are connected to one another by the logical operations we are capable of performing. Schemata are acquired, extended and refined as a result of both direct and vicarious experience, and they carry with them scripts, or cognitive maps which tell us what to expect and how to behave in specific situations.

With the description of reading, the role of the reader can be pointed out as the central element in the process of reading and the difference between to "make meaning" from text with to "get meaning" from text. It highly emphasizes the individual's construction of meaning. A theory similar to schema proposed mainly to account for learning is constructivism which is generally attributed to Jean Piaget who articulated mechanism by which knowledge is internalized by learners. The theory emphasizes on the individual as creator rather than receiver of meaning. This view of the reading process has clear instructional implications; that is, from this theoretical vantage point, one sees a lot of opportunities for the teachers to improve their strategies in teaching that would increase students' reading abilities.

The author further expounded that during reading, world knowledge serves as both the foundation for and the building blocks for constructing meaning. That is, the amount, type, and kind of prior knowledge a reader has about a given topic and the manner in which the reader links known and new knowledge affects the meaning he/she constructs for the immediate text. In addition to the world knowledge, there's also the text knowledge which contains all that the individual knows about how text is organized, how one processes text, how the language of text functions, what expectations are reasonable when approaching print, what procedures are useful in interacting with text, and countless other conventions of text and print. These two types of prior knowledge which are residing in schemata, namely world knowledge and text knowledge, are critical and essential to the reading process.

The constructivist theory and the schema theory explain how prior knowledge affect the reading process in the second language. These two theories were further affirmed by Krashen's model - the Input Hypothesis. The Input Hypothesis states that people learn a second language by understanding language containing linguistic structures that are just beyond the structures they already know. Krashen calls this comprehensible input and symbolizes it as $i(\text{input}) + 1$. It is that place just a little bit beyond their current level of competence within which they are able to construct new meaning. People construct this new meaning (in this instance, understand the content of the communication and acquire more of the second language) using what they already know about the language, world knowledge, contextual information and extra-lingual information. Krashen emphasizes that people acquire new structures in a second language (new words, new grammar rules, etc.) not by focusing on the structures themselves but by understanding the meaning of a communication containing those new structures (Ruddell, 2005).

The understanding of meaning that Ruddell (2005) pointed out, relates with the main goal of communication specifically in the reading process known as comprehension in which according to Alcantara et al., (2003), effective reading is reading with speed and comprehension. Speed in reading is relatively easy to achieve but developing comprehension, which is a constellation of skills or abilities, is difficult. Whatever the motivation and the purpose, reading implies comprehension. An individual must understand what he reads if he is to accomplish any purpose except to waste time.

The aforementioned strongly support that meaning of comprehension is combining the reader's background experience or prior knowledge with the new text information within the context of the reading situation. Thus, without prior knowledge or familiarity with a topic, it will be difficult to understand a new idea, make guesses, inferences and draw conclusions.

Ornos et al., (2004), states about reading that it is the interpretation of the written symbols that the writer wants to convey. Through these symbols, the writer reveals his message to the readers. A person who knows how to read, learns fast. The authors further elucidated that a fast reader easily interprets what he reads, thus, he communicates well.

Effective reading is reading with comprehension which, according to Alcantara et al., (2003), is a constellation of skills or abilities and is the most complex of all human attributes and functions. Because of its internal nature, it is most difficult to explain as a process although it is easy to observe. To comprehend means to understand the meanings not only of single words and sentences but also of the interrelationships among sentences in a discourse. Reading specialists believe that a reader can comprehend selections if he can pick out or infer the main idea, note supporting details or proof statements, arrange incidents in proper sequence, see cause and effect relationships, do some characterization, predict outcomes of given events, or draw conclusions.

Reading as an act of constructing meaning implies comprehension and the most important goal in every reading task is comprehension. Reading comprehension refers to the ability to understand information presented in written form. While the process usually entails understanding textbook assignments, reading comprehension skills also may affect one's interpretation of directions on exams, labs, and homework assignments and completion of job applications or questionnaires (Learning Strategies Database, 2012). Villamin et al., (1987), clearly stated in the book, "Innovative Strategies in Communication Arts" that comprehension has been called the teacher's bugbear. Many students achieve accuracy in recognition and pronunciation, but very few succeed in comprehension. To comprehend means to understand the meanings not only of single words and sentences but also of the interrelationships among sentences in a discourse. It implies the ability to summarize, outline, and organize concepts. It also involves a full grasp of the author's style and purpose and the features of the local setting against which a story unfolds.

The authors further identified reading comprehension skills such as getting the main ideas, effect, and relationships; determining sequence; predicting outcomes; making judgment; drawing conclusions; and following directions to fully grasp the message.

That's why, reading tests mostly measure how much one has read in the past by how well they read in the present when asked to perform adult reading tasks. In general, the more one reads, the more he/she reads, the easier reading tasks are to perform. Commonly, reading comprehension tests ask to: find the main idea or central thought of a selection; recognize specific detail in the selection; recognize valid inferences and conclusions drawn from the selection; derive the meaning of unfamiliar words from their usage in the selection; recognize the mood of the writer and the selection; and recognize techniques writers use to convey the message of the selection (Reading Review: Test of Reading Comprehension, 2012).

The functionalist approach explains proficiency in its relationship to communication in specific contexts. In this respect, it is "the outcome of social interaction with a linguistic environment." In written discourse, common knowledge cannot be assumed; therefore, the writer may need to provide more background information in order to communicate clearly (Myles, 2012). Thus, it relates with what the schema theory which states how background knowledge influence one's communicative skills. Furthermore, the abovementioned website stated, "for L2 writers, the greater the language proficiency, the better the writing quality." As a rejoinder, Alcantara et al., (2003) states that to write well, one must understand the experiences he has and one must also be able to manipulate words and English patterns to give the reader a clear sense both of the experiences which are transformed of the ideas about attitudes towards these experiences.

The study is also anchored on the mathemagenic theory which states that criterion-referenced measurement is among the areas of knowledge in which writing is integrated. With the participant's consciousness of the criteria in writing, he/she will be more stimulated to write.

Hence, it helps teachers in judging student's writing task and to clarify the teacher's goal and role as judge.

In this connection, Strong (2006) popularized this one such set of criteria that is widely used as standard with validity which is the 6-trait analytical model developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory which are: content, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency and convention.

Content means that the paper is clear and focused. It holds the reader's attention. Relevant anecdotes and details enrich the central theme or storyline (Six Trait Analytical Model, 2009). Furthermore, Langan (2004) states that the first concern in good writing should be content- what one has to say. The ideas and feelings are what matters most.

The organization enhances the central idea or storyline. The order, structure or presentation of information is compelling and moves the reader through the text (Six Trait Analytical Model, 2009).

Voice refers to the trait that the writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individualistic, expressive and engaging. Clearly, the writer is involved in the text, is sensitive to the needs of an audience, and is writing to be read.

Word choice means that the words used convey the intended message in a precise, interesting and natural way. Sentence fluency means that the writing has an easy flow and rhythm when read aloud. Sentences that are well-built, with strong and varied structures invite expressive oral reading.

Convention refers to the characteristic of the writer being able to demonstrate a good grasp of standard writing conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors in spelling, punctuation, usage and grammar, capitalization, and/or paragraphing tend to be so few and so minor that the reader can easily overlook them unless hunting for them specifically.

With those related studies mentioned, indeed, the school has the direct contact to the students in terms of the development of language. It is in this light that teachers must be adept in terms of disseminating and teaching the intelligible use of the English language so that quality graduates would be produced. And so, through this study, teachers and would be teachers will be helped in order to gain facility in teaching the mastery of the English language especially in terms of reading and writing.

This study adopted the 6-trait analytical model developed by Strong (2006) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in measuring the writing proficiency wherein it is composed of six areas namely: content/ideas, organization, voice, sentence fluency, word choice and convention (grammar and mechanics). This serves as a guide for teachers in measuring and evaluating the written output of the students.

The proposition that reading and writing are integrally linked as skills and as makers of knowledge has been the focus of researchers. Such investigation has been further informed by research that reading is an active, not a passive experience. In addition, research has shown that correlations exist between effective readers and effective writers. Reading and writing are forms of learning and that they have common cognitive processes. That is, the writer discovers and constructs meaning, interprets and re-interprets the information through the text for a reader and in turn, a reader reconstructs and rediscovers that meaning by actively bringing one's world knowledge and experience to the written text.

Thus, this study aimed to prove the relationship between reading and writing as what other researches revealed to have a link by measuring reading comprehension and writing proficiency. If one achieves the highest level in one's reading comprehension, would that be also true in terms of one's writing proficiency. Furthermore, it aimed to determine the significant difference between the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students of Bohol Island State University – Main Campus.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the participants' reading comprehension skills categorized into areas such as:
 - 1.1 finding the main idea;
 - 1.2 recognizing specific details;
 - 1.3 recognizing inferences and conclusion;
 - 1.4 understanding vocabulary from context;
 - 1.5 recognizing mood; and
 - 1.6 recognizing writing techniques?
2. What is the writing proficiency profile of the participants in terms of:
 - 2.1 content;
 - 2.2 organization;
 - 2.3 voice;
 - 2.4 word choice;
 - 2.5 sentence fluency; and
 - 2.6 convention (grammar and mechanics)?
3. Is there a significant difference between the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students?
4. Is there a significant relationship between reading comprehension and writing proficiency?

5. What enrichment program can be proposed to enhance reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the students?

Methodology

Research Design

The descriptive-correlational method was used in the study. Such method is deemed most appropriate because there was no manipulation of variables or controls. The main tools in data gathering were structured and unstructured questionnaires. Structured questionnaire was used in measuring the reading comprehension through the areas or skills namely: finding the main idea, recognizing specific details, recognizing inferences and conclusion, understanding vocabulary from context, recognizing mood and recognizing writing techniques. The unstructured questionnaire was used for writing proficiency, wherein the 6-trait analytical model was used through this set of criteria: content, organization, word choice, sentence fluency, convention (spelling, punctuation and grammar) and voice.

Research Environment

The study was conducted at the Bohol Island State University (BISU) – Main Campus specifically at the College of Teacher Education of BISU-Main Campus which offers the following programs: Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEED), Bachelor in Technology Education (BTE) and Bachelor in Secondary Education (BSED) with specializations in Mathematics, Social Studies, Technology and Livelihood Education, Filipino and English.

Research Participants

The participants of the study were the third year BEED and BSED students from the College of Teacher Education of Bohol Island State University – Main Campus. There was no sampling technique used in choosing the research participants for the third year BEED while purposive sampling was employed by the researcher in choosing the BSED participants. The third year Mathematics and English majors were chosen because they have more or less equal IQ with the BEED students. Thus, it would be reliable in determining the significant difference of the variables in the study between the two curricular programs.

Research Instrument

The unstructured questionnaire was used in determining the writing proficiency and structured questionnaire measured the reading comprehension of the third year BEED and BSED students. The researcher adopted reading passages which was pilot tested and was subjected for

item analysis wherein some items were rejected and retained in order to come up with the final questionnaire

The participants read carefully the passages and questions in the six areas of reading comprehension skills (finding the main idea, recognizing specific detail, recognizing inferences and conclusion, understanding vocabulary from context, recognizing mood and recognizing writing techniques) followed wherein the participants answered. The participants' writing proficiency was measured through their written output. A title was given and the participants were instructed to develop a good written composition which was rated by the English instructors of the Bohol Island State University based on the given rubrics of the 6-trait analytical model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 2. Profile of BEED Students' Reading Comprehension Skills

| Category | Mean | Description |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Finding the Main Idea | 3.63 | Very Good |
| Recognizing Specific Details | 2.63 | Good |
| Recognizing Inferences and Conclusions | 3.56 | Very Good |
| Understanding Vocabulary from Context | 2.82 | Good |
| Recognizing Mood | 2.88 | Good |
| Recognizing Writing Techniques | 2.22 | Good |
| Grand Mean | 2.96 | Good |

Table 2 presents the profile of the BEED students' reading comprehension skills categorized into six (6) areas namely finding the main idea, recognizing specific details, recognizing inference and conclusion, understanding vocabulary from context, recognizing mood and recognizing writing techniques. Each skill is composed of five items. The table shows the average number of items answered correctly by the participants. In general, the BEED students were good in reading comprehension skills as revealed in the grand mean.

The table further shows that the participants were very good in terms of finding the main idea and in recognizing inference and conclusion. The participants obtained a grand mean of 3.63 and 3.56 respectively of the 5 items. In the rest of the items, the participants were good in terms of recognizing specific details, understanding vocabulary from context, and in recognizing mood wherein the participants got the mean of 2.88, 2.82 and 2.63 respectively of the five items. Considered as the relatively weakest skill of the BEED students, with the lowest mean of 2.22 of the five items is recognizing writing techniques though still can be described as good. Of the

reading comprehension skills measured, the participants got the lowest in the aforementioned skill.

Table 2 also reflects that the participants could easily find the main idea and recognize inference and conclusion rather than recognize writing techniques which is the ability of the participants to recognize how writers select and structure their material in specific ways to achieve specific purposes. The participants were very good in finding what the writer wants to communicate that inspires the title or that is illustrated by the rest of the writing, and conveys the author’s purpose for writing the passage. In similar way, the participants were also very good in recognizing facts and premises based on the passage that would lead to arrive at a conclusion or consequence as how it appears on the participants’ skill to recognize inference and conclusion. Furthermore, this would mean that the participants were very good in deducing, judging or surmising evidences from the passage that would lead to the conclusion of the evidences gathered.

It is noteworthy also to look into the participants’ profile on the three reading comprehension skills namely to recognize specific details, to understand vocabulary from context and to recognize mood because the participants got the close grand mean which means that they are good in terms of these skills mentioned. This further means that the participants were good in recognizing proof and other detail that support the main idea or that proves a point, understanding the information in surrounding words and sentences that can give clues to the meaning of word, and in recognizing a writer’s choice of words guided by the writer’s purpose and attitude about a topic. However, the BEED students got the lowest mean in recognizing writing techniques which means that among those reading comprehension skills mentioned, they find it difficult to recognize writer’s styles in writing.

Table 3. Profile of BSED Students’ Reading Comprehension

| Category | Mean | Description |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Finding the Main Idea | 4.02 | Very Good |
| Recognizing Specific Details | 2.75 | Good |
| Recognizing Inferences and Conclusions | 3.67 | Very Good |
| Understanding Vocabulary from Context | 2.93 | Good |
| Recognizing Mood | 3.53 | Very Good |
| Recognizing Writing Techniques | 2.67 | Good |
| Grand Mean | 3.26 | Good |

Table 3 presents the reading comprehension profile of the BSED students categorized into six areas namely, finding the main idea, recognizing specific details, recognizing inference and conclusion, understanding vocabulary from context, recognizing mood and recognizing writing techniques. There were five items in each category. As a whole, the BSED students were good in their reading comprehension in which in average, they got a grand mean of 3.26.

From the table above, it is very evident that the BSED students were very good in these three skills namely: finding the main idea, recognizing inference and conclusion and in recognizing mood as shown by the mean of 4.02, 3.67 and 3.53 respectively. The finding means that BSED students find it easier to determine the author’s purpose in writing the passage and to identify what the writer wants to communicate to the readers as expressed in the topic sentence. Not only that, BSED students were very good at reading “between the lines” by applying reasoning to what is said in order to understand more completely what is meant as revealed in their skill to recognize inferences and conclusion. Their interpretation is based on the facts presented in arriving at a conclusion. Moreover, they were also very good in determining the attitude as an outcome of the writer’s feelings which is primarily set by the writer’s choice of words as revealed in their skill of recognizing the author’s mood. Thus, it is very evident that BSED students were very good in finding the topic sentence and the main idea of the passage.

The table also shows that the BSED students were good in these skills such as recognizing specific details, understanding vocabulary from context and recognizing writing techniques as shown by the mean of 2.93, 2.75 and 2.67 respectively. This further means that they were good in identifying details that support the main idea of the passage and in recognizing the writer’s techniques and styles in achieving a purpose. They were also good in identifying and finding the meanings of words by how these words were used in the sentence. And thus, they could understand vocabulary from the context or situation presented in the sentence or passage. The BSED students got the lowest grand mean in recognizing the author’s styles in writing in order to achieve a specific purpose.

Table 4. Profile of BEED Students’ Writing Proficiency

| Category | Mean | Description |
|------------------|------|-------------|
| Content/Ideas | 3.55 | Capable |
| Organization | 3.21 | Developing |
| Voice | 3.45 | Developing |
| Word Choice | 3.00 | Developing |
| Sentence fluency | 3.06 | Developing |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Convention(mechanics) | 3.39 | Developing |
| Grand Mean | 3.28 | Developing |

Table 4 presents the profile of participants’ writing skills categorized into six indicators: content/ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and convention (mechanics). After the participants wrote their written composition, the evaluators adjudged it based on the six criteria mentioned. It is evident in Table 4 that the participants were in developing level with regards to their proficiency in writing wherein they got the grand mean of 3.28. The grand mean obtained by the participants further means that they were not proficient in their written composition and were still developing because those skills were already present yet still lacking.

The table also shows that the participants were capable of writing the main idea or content and that they were proficient in terms of identifying the topic or theme as main idea. In this respect, they obtained an average score of 3.55. It further means that the supporting details for topic sentence is starting to work but still, it does not quite tackle key issues. The participants also employed some details which begin to define the main idea or topic, yet are limited in number or clarity.

Among those criteria mentioned, students got the lowest grand mean of 3 of the six points in choosing the correct words to be used in the written composition. It further means that the words they used were adequate and correct in a general sense and that vocabulary is very basic; simple words rule; variety starts to “show” rather than “tell”; yet, mental images are still missing.

The table also shows that the participants were developing in organization. It means that they were not yet proficient in terms of using transitions and of sequencing events. Pacing is dominated by one part of piece and is not controlled in remainder. As a result, lead or conclusion may be present but are clichés or leave reader wanting more.

Table 4 also presents that the participants were developing in terms of voice and seemed aware of the reader yet discarded personal insights as revealed by the mean of 3.45. They were also developing in sentence fluency which means that the sentences they used were technically correct but did not explain more and sentence structure was usually correct, yet sentences do not flow naturally as revealed in the mean for sentence fluency. The participants also were developing with regards to convention as revealed in the mean of 3.39 which means that inappropriate grammar/usage results from heavy reliance on conversational oral language and that results in confusion.

Table 5. Profile of BSED Students’ Writing Proficiency

| Category | Mean | Description |
|----------|------|-------------|
|----------|------|-------------|

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Content/Ideas | 3.56 | Capable |
| Organization | 3.42 | Developing |
| Voice | 3.44 | Developing |
| Word Choice | 3.20 | Developing |
| Sentence fluency | 3.26 | Developing |
| Convention(mechanics) | 3.27 | Developing |
| Grand Mean | 3.36 | Developing |

Table 5 shows the writing proficiency profile of the BSED students wherein their written composition was rated and judged in terms of these six criteria mentioned in the rubrics namely, contents/ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency and convention (mechanics and grammar). The highest possible score in each criterion is 6 and the lowest possible score is 1 as how it is explained thoroughly in the writing rubrics. It is clearly shown in Table 5 that the BSED students were at developing level in terms of their writing proficiency wherein they got an average mean of 3.36 which could be interpreted as they were not yet proficient in terms of their writing.

It is noteworthy that among the above-mentioned criteria, the BSED students were capable in writing the content/ideas where, they got the mean of 3.56. This means that the BSED students could stay on the topic and had the ability to connect the readers through self, text, world, or other resources. Through this, the reader is led to generally understand the content because the writer’s direction is clear.

On other hand, they were only at developing level in the rest of the criteria mentioned based on their written composition which means that they were not yet proficient in these criteria. Among those criteria, the students emerged to be mostly capable yet still at developing level in terms of writing the voice which means that the readers could sustain to read the composition that was starting to support purpose/mode though remains weak as shown by the mean of 3.44. In terms of organization, they were still developing which means that organization was still problematic though structure begins to emerge; the ability to follow text was slowed. The participants got the lowest mean in terms of using appropriate words that fit the message they wanted to convey. The result means that there were overused nouns and the composition lacked modifiers and it resulted to fuzzy message. The words and phrases they used did not create a vivid picture on the message they wanted to say.

Table 6. Significant Difference between the Reading Comprehension and Writing Proficiency of third year BEED and BSED Students

| Variable | Group | Mean | SD | Computed t | Critical value of t | Decision |
|-----------------------|-------|------|------|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Reading Comprehension | BEED | 2.96 | 0.44 | 3.83 | 1.96 | Reject Ho |
| | BSED | 3.26 | 0.46 | | | |
| Writing Proficiency | BEED | 3.28 | 0.62 | 0.52 | 1.96 | Accept Ho |
| | BSED | 3.36 | 1.12 | | | |

Table 6 presents the significant difference between the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the two groups or programs mentioned: the BEED and BSED. It is revealed that there is a significant difference between the reading comprehension of the third year BEED and BSED students where the computed t which is 3.83 is greater than the tabular or the critical value of t. This calls for the rejection of the hypothesis because there is a significant difference of their scores in terms of reading comprehension. This also means that the BSED students have higher comprehension skills compared to BEED students. This implies that BSED which is composed of two majors, the English and Math were better readers compared to those BEED students who are composed of GCC majors.

This study has a similar finding in the study of Chua, et al., (2010), regarding the significant difference of the reading comprehension between the fourth year BEED and BSED students of Holy Name University where BSED students got high scores compared to BEED students in terms of reading.

On the other hand, in terms of writing proficiency, the BEED and BSED students have no significant difference since the computed t which is 0.52 is less than the tabular or critical value of t. This calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Yet, still, it is noteworthy to look at that the BSED students got higher grand mean compared to the BEED students in terms of writing. But the BSED students got higher standard deviation compared to BEED students which means that the scores of the BSED students had a big difference in terms of the highest and lowest scores obtained by the students.

For reading comprehension, the respective mean and SD of the BEED and BSED give the idea that that their scores were just close to one another and that shows that the performance of the two groups was more or less homogenous.

Table 7. Relationship Between Reading Comprehension and Writing Proficiency of BEED and BSED Students

| Programs | Variables | Computed r | Critical value of r | Decision @ 0.05 |
|----------|---------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| BEED | Reading Comprehension & Writing Proficiency | 0.05 | 0.23 | Accept Ho |
| BSED | Reading Comprehension & Writing Proficiency | 0.02 | 0.27 | Accept Ho |

Table 7 presents the relationship between reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the third year BEED and BSED students of Bohol Island State University – Main Campus. The computed r for both BEED and BSED students, showed a negligible relationship between the two variables considered in the study. Testing the given value if there is really a significant relationship between the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the BEED and BSED students revealed that the computed value is less than the tabular value. This result calls for acceptance of the null hypothesis. The finding implies that students with good comprehension skills may not necessarily be good in writing or vice versa. A student may make sense of what is read but may have difficulty in putting his own ideas in well-crafted sentences and logical flow.

Having a wide stock of vocabulary is one aspect needed to obtain proficiency in writing. In this study, word choice is one of the areas measured for writing proficiency. This study relates with the finding of the study of Chua, et al., regarding the relationship between reading comprehension and vocabulary competence. The study revealed that there is only a slight correlation between reading comprehension and vocabulary competence. Thus, if one student achieves high level of vocabulary competence, it does not guarantee that he/she achieves good reading comprehension skills.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings of the study, the study concludes that good readers are not actually good writers. Many could read well but could not assure proficiency in terms of writing. Good reading comprehension skills do not necessarily assure writing proficiency. Comprehension skills do not necessarily translate into skills that produce impressive write-ups. The third year BEED and BSED students performed likely in terms of writing proficiency. It doesn't matter whether you are a BEED or BSED student in writing impressive write up. On the other hand, BSED students could comprehend better to BEED students. This implies that BSED students were more exposed in reading compared to BEED students.

The researcher offers the following recommendations:

1. Instructors, especially those handling English courses should devote into giving the students opportunities to develop their writing skills such as giving them activities to write reaction papers based on a movie being watched, to write journal entries on a given topic or even to write a diary. These things would help the students develop their writing skills because the law of practice is being employed.
2. Lessons on stylistics may be integrated in English classes to enhance students' skills in identifying writing strategies.
3. The administrators of the university may plan to put up a reading center so as to cater to the needs of the students and at the same time to inculcate in the hearts and minds of the students the importance of reading.
4. A follow-up study may be conducted on the reading comprehension and writing proficiency of the students in relation to their attitude towards reading and writing.

References

Alcantara, et.al. **Teaching Strategies 1 for the Teaching of the Communication Arts: Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing**. Katha Publishing Co., Inc. Makati City. 2003.

Byrnes, Heide and Michalle Canale (ed). **Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations and Concepts**. USA. National Textbook Company, 1987.

Definitions of the criteria of the 6-trait analytical model. From www.nwrel.org/com/catalog/, retrieved on 2021.

De Leon, Hector S. **Textbook on the 1987 Philippine Constitution**. Rex Bookstore, Inc., Manila, Philippines. 2008.

Delos Santos, Rogelio L. and Villanueva, Aida S. **Developmental Reading 1**. Lorimar Publishing, Inc. Quezon City, Metro Manila. 2008.

Haddley (1993), "Composing is best viewed as a continuum of activities that range from the more complex act of composing on the other end. From <http://www.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej22//al.html>, retrieved on 2022.

- Kitao, Kathleen S. **Textual Schemata and English Language Learning**. Cross Currents, Issue 3, 147-155.
- Krashen, Stephen D. **Writing: Research, Theory and Applications. Language Teaching Methodology**. Pergamon Institute of English. Oxford. 1984.
- Langan, John. **A Workbook for Writers (7th Edition)**. Allyn and Bacon, New York. 2004.
- McCuen, Jo Ray and Winkler, Anthony C. **Readings for Writers (12th Edition)**. Thomson Wadsworth, USA. 2007.
- Myles, Johanne. Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts. <http://www.cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp/information/tesl-ej/ej22/a1.html>). retrieved on 2021.
- Reading passages. http://englishforeveryone.org/PDFs/Level_12_Passages.pdf. retrieved on 2021.
- Reid, Joy M. **Teaching ESL Writing**. Prentice Hall Regents, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 1993.
- Ruddell, Martha Rapp. **Teaching Content Reading and Writing**. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. USA. 2005.
- Six-Point Writer's Rubric. http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/773, retrieved on 2021.
- Strong, William. **Write for Insight**. Pearson Education Inc., United States of America. 2006.