

Learners' Satisfaction on Language Learning Environment and English Language Proficiency

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17189638

MARCH IVY B. CERIACO

Sagay City, Senior High School, Department of Education, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4419-1353>

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between learners' satisfaction on the language learning environment (LLE) and their English language proficiency among Grade 11 Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) and General Academic Strand (GAS) learners at Sagay City Senior High School during the first semester of school year 2024–2025. Anchored on Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory and Eccles and Wigfield's Expectancy-Value Theory, the research investigated how learners' demographic profiles, satisfaction with LLE, and environmental factors influenced proficiency in grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Using a descriptive correlational-comparative design, data were gathered from 149 respondents through a researcher-made questionnaire and a 50-item proficiency test. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to analyze demographic trends, satisfaction levels, proficiency scores, and potential relationships between variables. Findings showed that most learners were aged 15–16, predominantly female, and enrolled in the HUMSS strand. Learners reported higher satisfaction on classroom environments compared to peer, social, and home contexts. HUMSS learners outperformed GAS learners in vocabulary and reading comprehension, while GAS learners scored higher in grammar. No significant differences were observed in satisfaction and proficiency when grouped by sex or age, though the academic strand yielded notable differences in specific skills. Importantly, no significant correlation was found between learners' satisfaction on the LLE and their English proficiency. The study concluded that while environment and strand influenced certain aspects of performance, learners perceived satisfaction alone did not directly predict proficiency. Recommendations and an Academic Action Plan were developed to enhance English instruction and support for learners.

Keywords: language learning environment, learners' satisfaction, English proficiency, grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, HUMSS, GAS

Introduction

The process of language learning was complex and was influenced by learners' competence levels and their learning environments. In the Philippines, English proficiency remained a national concern. The country ranked last in reading comprehension during the 2018 PISA and performed poorly in mathematics and science. Despite a relatively high placement in EF's global proficiency rankings, persistent gaps were noted, particularly among senior high school and college learners. These weaknesses were linked to systemic challenges such as undertrained teachers, error-laden textbooks, inadequate resources, reliance on code-switching, and limited exposure to English beyond the classroom. Local studies further revealed that Filipino learners struggled with grammar, vocabulary, translation, and reading comprehension, while anxiety in using English often limited participation and confidence.

To address these challenges, Sagay City Senior High School implemented the Intensive Reading Enhancement to Improve Academic Performance (IREAP) program. Results showed that only a small number of learners reached independent proficiency, while most remained at instructional or frustration levels. These outcomes highlighted the need to explore how the language learning environment (LLE)—encompassing classroom settings, peer interaction, teacher support, and access to resources—shaped learners' satisfaction and proficiency. Since HUMSS and GAS learners represented a large group struggling with English, the study focused on examining the relationship between their LLE satisfaction and English proficiency.

Objectives of the Study

The study sought to determine learners' demographic profile, assess their satisfaction on the language learning environment, and measure their English proficiency. It also examined the differences and relationships among these variables and formulated an Academic Action Plan to enhance English instruction and learner support.

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study was anchored on Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory and Eccles and Wigfield's Expectancy-Value Theory, which together explained how learners' internal beliefs and external environments shaped language learning outcomes. Social

Cognitive Theory emphasized the role of self-efficacy, observational learning, and social interactions in developing English proficiency, while Expectancy-Value Theory highlighted the importance of learners' motivation, expectancy for success, and the value they assigned to English learning tasks. Prior studies confirmed that higher self-efficacy and stronger task value were linked to greater satisfaction and achievement in language learning.

Guided by these theories, the study's conceptual framework examined the relationship between learners' demographic profiles (age, sex, and strand), their satisfaction with the language learning environment (classroom, home, peer, and social contexts), and their English proficiency (grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension). The framework assumed that both internal beliefs and external contexts influenced learners' satisfaction, which in turn affected their performance in English.

The framework provided a holistic approach to analyzing how HUMSS and GAS learners at Sagay City Senior High School perceived their learning environments and how these perceptions related to their English proficiency. Ultimately, it aimed to generate evidence-based recommendations to strengthen English instruction and learner support.

Methodology:

This study adopted a quantitative approach using a descriptive correlational-comparative design and the survey method to examine the relationship between learners' satisfaction with the language learning environment (LLE) and their English proficiency. The research described naturally occurring variations without manipulating variables, identified potential relationships, and compared differences between groups, particularly HUMSS and GAS learners. A total of 149 Grade 11 students from Sagay City Senior High School were selected through Slovin's formula and simple random sampling from an overall population of 238 students, ensuring fair and representative participation.

The main instrument consisted of a researcher-made, three-part questionnaire and a 50-item English proficiency test. Part I collected demographic information (age, sex, strand); Part II measured LLE satisfaction across four dimensions (classroom, home, peer, and social environments) using a 40-item Likert scale; and Part III assessed proficiency in grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension, aligned with Grade 11 Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs). The instrument's validity was established through expert evaluation, while reliability testing with 30 Grade 11 students yielded strong internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha of 0.953 for LLE satisfaction and 0.874 for English proficiency).

For data collection, the researcher secured the necessary approvals, conducted orientations, and personally administered the instruments under controlled conditions to ensure integrity. Data were encoded and analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation) to summarize profiles, satisfaction, and proficiency. Inferential statistics were applied to test hypotheses: the Mann-Whitney U test compared differences in LLE satisfaction and proficiency across demographic groups, while Spearman's rho determined correlations between satisfaction and proficiency. This systematic process ensured reliable findings to inform an Academic Action Plan for enhancing English instruction and learner support.

Results and Discussion:

SOP1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The results indicated that most learners (143, or 96.0%) were in the 15–16 age range, while 6 (or 4.0%) were in the 17–18 age range. The distribution of learners by sex showed that there were more females (100, or 67.1%) than males (49, or 32.9%). The data revealed that the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand had the highest number of enrolled learners (127, or 85.2%). In contrast, the General Academic Strand (GAS) had the lowest number of learners (22, or 14.8%) among the academic strands.

Demographic Profile of the Grade 11 Learners in Terms of Age, Sex, and Academic Strand

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
15-16 years old	143	96.0
17-18 years old	6	4.0
Sex		
Male	49	32.9
Female	100	67.1
Strand		
GAS	22	14.8
HUMSS	127	85.2
Total	149	100.0

SOP 2 Extent of Language Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment as a whole

The data was structured into four main categories: English Classroom Environment, Home Language Context, Peer Language Interaction, and Social Language Interaction.

English Classroom Environment

The table presented the extent of learners' satisfaction on the English classroom environment. The overall mean score of 3.11 (SD = .329) indicates that learners were generally satisfied on their classroom experiences, although the ratings suggest a moderate level of satisfaction rather than a very high one. Among the indicators, the highest levels of satisfaction were found in the comfort and supportiveness of the classroom environment (M = 3.30, SD = .665), the opportunities to work on group projects in English (M = 3.29, SD = .621), and the support learners received from teachers whenever they encountered difficulties (M = 3.19, SD = .732). These findings suggest that the classroom climate, collaborative opportunities, and teacher support were the strongest contributors to positive learner experiences. This supports Alcantara and dela Cruz (2020), who emphasized that a psychologically safe and physically supportive classroom reduces anxiety and fosters participation. Similarly, Johnson and Johnson (2009) and Manalo (2018) found that collaborative group projects promote peer support, communication, and engagement, which may explain learners' favorable perceptions of group activities. The results also resonate with Chi et al. (2020), who highlighted that autonomy-supportive and approachable teachers significantly enhance learners' confidence and motivation in language learning. On the other hand, the lowest-rated item was the recognition and value of learners' English language skills in their environment (M = 2.99, SD = .678). This indicates that while learners were satisfied on the classroom experiences, they did not consistently feel that their English skills were acknowledged or appreciated beyond the classroom setting. Dörnyei (2001) emphasized that learners' motivation is strengthened when they perceive their English skills as valuable for academic and career opportunities, suggesting a need for schools to highlight the real-world significance of English competence. Satisfactions were also observed for the clarity and helpfulness of feedback (M = 3.03, SD = .609) and the amount of speaking practice in class (M = 3.04, SD = .603). These results suggest that learners were satisfied on the feedback they received and the opportunities to practice English speaking. This finding aligns with Hyland (2003), who stressed that clear, specific, and timely feedback is crucial for learners to refine their language skills. Likewise, Garcia and Salvador (2017) found that Filipino students' fluency and confidence improve when they are frequently engaged in speaking activities, reinforcing the need to strengthen oral communication opportunities in the classroom.

Overall, while learners were satisfied with the classroom environment, these findings affirm Ellis (2016) and Krashen (2018), who argued that classroom strategies alone may not fully lead to proficiency unless complemented by recognition of learners' skills, meaningful practice, and consistent exposure to English beyond the classroom.

Extent of Learners' Satisfaction on the English Classroom Environment

Language Learning Environment	Mean	SD	Int
1. My impressions of the way English is taught in my classroom are.	3.09	.661	
2. The contribution of English language activities in class to my learning is.	3.07	.600	
3. The adequacy of the resources and materials provided in the classroom for my learning needs is.	3.05	.573	
4. The comfort and supportiveness of the classroom environment are.	3.30	.665	
5. The support I receive from my teachers whenever I encounter difficulties with English is.	3.19	.732	
6. The recognition and value of my English language skills in my environment are.	2.99	.678	
7. The amount of practice I get in speaking English during class is.	3.04	.603	
8. The clarity and helpfulness of the feedback I receive on my English assignments are.	3.03	.609	
9. The opportunities to work on group projects in English are.	3.29	.621	
10. The impact of my classroom experiences on my overall proficiency in English is.	3.03	.716	
English Classroom Environment Mean	3.11	.329	

Home Language Context

The table presented the extent of learners' satisfaction on the home language context. The overall mean score of 3.07 (SD = .352) indicates that learners were satisfied on how their home environment supported their English language learning. While the results show that learners received some degree of encouragement and exposure to English

at home, the level of support was not consistent across all indicators. The highest-rated aspect was the encouragement learners received from their family to use English in conversations ($M = 3.20$, $SD = .645$). This indicates that family members played a role in motivating learners to practice English, aligning with Reyes (2019), who emphasized that a supportive family environment fosters motivation and confidence in language learning. Similarly, Rivera (2017) found that parental encouragement enhances learners' persistence in practicing English, showing the importance of active family involvement in shaping language development. Learners were also satisfied with their access to English reading materials at home ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .633$). This suggests that some learners had resources such as books, magazines, or digital content in English, though the availability was not equally experienced by all. This aligns with Pretorius and Klapwijk (2016), who highlighted that exposure to reading materials at home significantly develops learners' comprehension and vocabulary. In the Philippine context, Orbeta et al. (2020) noted that limited access to such resources often restricts reading proficiency, which reflects the level of satisfaction found in this study. On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator was the frequency of using English in everyday conversations at home ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .670$). This result implies that despite encouragement, actual practice of English in family interactions was less frequent. This supports Dörnyei (2001), who stressed that consistent and meaningful use of the target language is essential for developing fluency. In the Philippine setting, Garcia and Salvador (2017) observed that learners often revert to their native language at home, reducing opportunities to build oral proficiency in English.

Overall, the findings suggest that while family encouragement and access to resources provided satisfaction, limited practice of English at home hindered stronger language support. These results echo Krashen's (2018) input hypothesis, which argues that meaningful exposure and regular use of language—both inside and outside the classroom—are critical for language acquisition.

Extent of Learners' Satisfaction on the Home Language Context

Language Learning Environment	Mean	SD
1. The frequency of speaking English at home with my family members is.	2.66	.768
2. My level of English communication I have at home is.	2.62	.775
3. The access to English speaking media at home that helps me improve my language skills is.	2.94	.764
4. The comfort level in using English in my daily conversations at home is.	2.75	.779
5. The improvement in my overall language proficiency from speaking English at home is.	2.88	.693
6. The encouragement I receive to read and write in English outside of school hours is.	2.82	.695
7. The enrichment of my potential and understanding from speaking English at home is.	2.86	.622
8. The confidence I have in switching between English and my other home languages is.	2.87	.671
9. The positive contribution of my home environment to my English language learning is.	3.00	.735
10. The support my family provides to practice and improve my English is.	2.96	.829
Home Language Context Mean	2.84	.365

Peer Language Interaction

The table presented the extent of learners' satisfaction on the peer language interaction in the classroom. The overall mean of 2.90 ($SD = .424$) indicates that learners were generally satisfied on the role of peer interaction in their English learning, though their satisfaction did not reach the "very satisfied" level. The highest-rated indicator was the support and encouragement learners received from friends in practicing English ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .729$). This suggests that learners value peer support as a motivating factor in practicing the language. This finding supports Kotz and Verga (2013), who emphasized that sustained peer engagement fosters confidence and participation, while Santos (2021) found that Filipino students who frequently engage in peer-led English conversations improve fluency and willingness to communicate. Other positively rated indicators included peer support during English communication ($M = 2.96$, $SD = .779$) and improvement in English skills due to peer interaction ($M = 2.95$, $SD = .812$). These results affirm Gass and Mackey (2015), who highlighted that interaction provides opportunities for both input and output, and Chairinkam and Yawiloeng (2021), who showed that peer scaffolding through questioning and idea-sharing enhances comprehension and language performance.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated item was the quality of English discussions with classmates ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .728$), followed by learners' confidence in using English during class discussions ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .763$). These relatively lower ratings suggest that while peers encourage language use, the depth and quality of discussions may not always be strong enough to promote sustained confidence and advanced skill-building. This echoes Ellis (2016) who argued that peer interaction sometimes prioritizes successful communication over linguistic accuracy and noted that differences in proficiency or group dynamics can limit weaker learners' chances to benefit fully from collaborative tasks.

Overall, the findings suggest that learners are satisfied with peer interaction as a supportive and motivating element of their language learning, particularly in fostering fluency, confidence, and social use of English. However, the

results also highlight that the effectiveness of peer interaction depends on the quality of discussions, group balance, and opportunities for deeper engagement. This aligns with Bernardo & Gonzales (2019), who observed that structured peer collaboration enhances communicative competence, while Loewen & Sato (2018) cautioned that without proper guidance, peer interactions may sometimes reinforce incorrect forms rather than improve accuracy.

Extent of Learners' Satisfaction on Peer Language Interaction

Language Learning Environment	Mean	SD
1. The level of English communication I have with my classmates is.	2.85	.808
2. The opportunities to practice speaking English with my peers in class are.	2.94	.737
3. The support and encouragement I receive from friends in practicing English are.	3.09	.729
4. The support I receive from my peers when communicating in English during class is.	2.96	.779
5. The improvement in my English language skills due to peer interactions in the classroom is.	2.95	.812
6. The quality of English language discussions I participate in with my classmates is.	2.79	.728
7. The way my peers and I use English to collaborate on classroom projects is.	2.87	.709
8. The role English plays in my social interactions with peers in the classroom is.	2.85	.651
9. The confidence I have in using English during class discussions with my peers is.	2.84	.763
10. The level to which my English activities with peers foster positive interactions is.	2.89	.755
Peer Language Interaction Mean	2.90	.424

Social Language Interaction

The table presented the extent of learners' satisfaction on the social language environment. The overall mean of 2.97 (SD = .384) indicates that learners were generally satisfied on the opportunities and support provided for English practice in social contexts, though satisfaction did not reach the "very satisfied" level. The highest-rated indicator was the variety of social activities available for improving English skills (M = 3.06, SD = .639), followed by sufficient opportunities for social interaction (M = 3.03, SD = .697) and the effectiveness of social events in improving English proficiency (M = 3.03, SD = .766). These findings suggest that learners appreciated the presence of structured social opportunities, which they perceived as useful for developing English competence. This is consistent with Gass and Mackey (2015), who emphasized that structured social interactions enhance learner satisfaction and achievement. Local studies such as De Guzman and Uy (2020), similarly found that school-organized English events foster learners' fluency, vocabulary, and confidence. In contrast, the lowest-rated indicators were the level of engagement and participation of other learners in English activities (M = 2.76, SD = .739) and the support provided by facilitators during social events (M = 2.83, SD = .819). These results imply that while learners recognize the availability of activities, inconsistent peer participation and limited facilitator involvement may have hindered the full effectiveness of the social environment. This echoes the cautions of Saito (2019), who noted that unequal participation, task design, and learner motivation can limit the benefits of collaborative and social tasks.

Overall, the findings highlight that learners were satisfied with the social language environment, particularly valuing structured social activities and opportunities to practice English outside regular classroom instruction. However, weaker areas such as peer participation and facilitator support indicate the need to improve the quality, inclusivity, and guidance within social learning contexts. These results support Krashen's (1985) Affective Filter Hypothesis, which stresses the importance of low-stress, supportive environments for maximizing language acquisition, and align with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which underscores the role of social mediation in language learning.

Extent of Learners' Satisfaction on the Social Language Environment

Language Learning Environment	Mean	SD	Int
1. The opportunities provided for practicing English with classmates during social activities are.	2.98	.749	
2. The variety of social activities available for improving my English skills is.	3.06	.639	
3. The sufficient opportunities for social interaction to practice the English language are.	3.03	.697	
4. The support provided by facilitators or organizers (e.g., guidance during group activities, feedback on conversations) in facilitating English language interactions during social events is.	3.02	.739	
5. The effectiveness of social events or gatherings in helping me improve my English proficiency is.	3.03	.766	
6. The accessibility of resources and materials for enhancing my English language learning in social environments is.	2.93	.741	
7. The frequency of social interactions	3.01	.735	

8. The level of engagement and participation of other learners in English language activities is.	2.76	.739
9. The overall atmosphere and ambience of our social language environment for practicing English is.	3.02	.784
10. The support provided by facilitators or organizers (e.g., guidance during group activities, feedback on conversations) in facilitating English language interactions during social events is.	2.83	.819
Social Language Interaction Mean	2.97	.384

Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment

The results revealed that learners were "Satisfied" with the overall language learning environment ($M = 2.95$). This indicates that while learners recognized positive aspects of their environment, satisfaction did not reach the "Very Satisfied" level, suggesting areas for further development. Strengths were found in the variety of activities and interaction opportunities, which encouraged participation and engagement in language learning. Similar findings were highlighted by Cambridge (2018), who emphasized that diverse classroom strategies promote learner motivation, and by Bernardo and Gonzales (2019), who noted that interactive activities enhance satisfaction and language outcomes. In contrast, the lowest ratings were observed in peer engagement and facilitator support, showing that learners perceived limited collaboration with classmates and insufficient scaffolding from teachers. Philp (2016) pointed out that meaningful peer interaction is crucial in language acquisition, while King (2018) stressed that teacher guidance strongly influences learners' perceptions of the classroom environment.

Overall, learners' satisfaction leaned positively but revealed gaps in fostering stronger peer relationships and more consistent facilitator involvement. This aligns with Krashen's (1982) Affective Filter Hypothesis suggest that effective learning occurs when learners feel supported, motivated, and engaged within their environment.

Overall Extent of Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment

Language Learning Environment	Mean	SD	Int
1. The opportunities provided for practicing English with classmates during social activities are.	2.98	.749	
2. The variety of social activities available for improving my English skills is.	3.06	.639	
3. The sufficient opportunities for social interaction to practice the English language are.	3.03	.697	
4. The support provided by facilitators or organizers (e.g., guidance during group activities, feedback on conversations) in facilitating English language interactions during social events is.	3.02	.739	
5. The effectiveness of social events or gatherings in helping me improve my English proficiency is.	3.03	.766	
6. The accessibility of resources and materials for enhancing my English language learning in social environments is.	2.93	.741	
7. The frequency of social interactions	3.01	.735	
8. The level of engagement and participation of other learners in English language activities is.	2.76	.739	
9. The overall atmosphere and ambience of our social language environment for practicing English is.	3.02	.784	
10. The support provided by facilitators or organizers (e.g., guidance during group activities, feedback on conversations) in facilitating English language interactions during social events is.	2.83	.819	
Social Language Interaction Mean	2.97	.384	
Overall Mean	2.95	.303	

Scaling:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Satisfied (VS) 1.75 – 2.49 Dissatisfied (D)
2.50 – 3.24 Satisfied (S) 1.00 – 1.74 Very Dissatisfied (VD)

SOP 3 Level of English Language Proficiency of the learners as a whole

The GAS learners obtained a mean score of 8.04, which falls within the Proficiency level (7–8). This indicates that GAS students generally have a good understanding of grammar rules, with only small mistakes that do not significantly hinder communication. On the other hand, HUMSS learners had a mean of 6.72, which corresponds to the Approaching Proficiency level (5–6). This suggests that while HUMSS students have some understanding of grammar, they still commit regular errors that may affect the clarity of their expression. This result shows that GAS learners are more proficient in grammar compared to HUMSS learners, possibly due to the broader subject scope of their strand,

which often includes rule-based assessments (Garcia & Dela Cruz, 2021). This aligns with Cameron and Larsen-Freeman (2019), who emphasized the role of grammatical competence in navigating academic texts, and with Enriquez et al. (2024), who found that grammar mastery strongly supports success in academic performance.

The HUMSS learners obtained a mean score of 12.50, interpreted as Approaching Proficiency (9–12), while GAS learners scored 11.14, also under Approaching Proficiency. This means that both groups demonstrate only basic vocabulary knowledge, relying mostly on common words and struggling with more sophisticated terms. However, HUMSS learners scored slightly higher, likely because their strand requires frequent engagement with reading and writing tasks. This supports Nation and Webb (2017), who highlighted that vocabulary breadth and depth are key predictors of comprehension and language achievement. while Llamas & Dela Peña (2022) reported that self-rated English fluency among Visayan students was closely tied to confidence in academic discussions.

The GAS learners scored 10.68, while HUMSS learners scored 10.71, both of which fall under the Approaching Proficiency level (9–12). This indicates that learners from both strands show basic comprehension skills but may miss key details or struggle with more complex texts. The minimal difference between the two strands suggests that their reading ability is fairly similar, with neither group showing advanced comprehension skills. This is consistent with Zhang and Beckmann (2021), who affirmed that comprehension depends heavily on grammar and vocabulary mastery, and with Bernardo and Mante-Estacio (2023), who stressed the importance of metacognitive strategies in improving Filipino learners' reading comprehension.

The GAS learners had an overall mean score of 29.86, while HUMSS learners scored 29.93. Both scores fall within the Proficiency level (30–39) on the English Proficiency scale. This means that while learners are generally capable of handling most English tasks effectively, they still need occasional support, especially in more complex academic situations. The strand differences tend to balance each other: GAS learners are stronger in grammar, while HUMSS learners slightly outperform in vocabulary and reading comprehension. This reflects the multidimensional nature of proficiency, as argued by Hulstijn (2015), who emphasized that grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension are interdependent.

Level of English Language Proficiency of the Learners (Grammar, Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension)

English Language Proficiency	Strand	Mean	SD	Int
Grammar	GAS	8.04	1.914	
	HUMSS	6.72	2.181	
Vocabulary	GAS	11.14	2.210	
	HUMSS	12.50	3.79	
Reading Comprehension	GAS	10.68	3.39	
	HUMSS	10.71	4.62	
Overall Score	GAS	29.86	5.574	
	HUMSS	29.93	8.444	

SOP 4 The significant Difference in the Learners' Satisfaction on Language Learning Environment (LLE) among Grade 11 learners When Group According to Their Demographic Profile.

The data presented the learners' satisfaction with the Language Learning Environment (LLE) of Grade 11 learners, analyzed by age across four areas: English Language Environment, Home Language Context, Peer Language Interaction, and Social Language Interaction, along with their overall satisfaction scores.

English Classroom Environment

The mean rank of learners aged 15–16 was 74.65, while those aged 17–18 had a mean rank of 83.33. The computed p-value was 0.627, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This means there was no significant difference in satisfaction with the English classroom environment when grouped according to age. Thus, learners' satisfaction with the classroom environment was generally comparable across age groups.

Home Language Context

Learners aged 15–16 obtained a mean rank of 73.61, while those aged 17–18 recorded a higher mean rank of 108.17. Despite the difference in mean ranks, the computed p-value of 0.053 was still slightly higher than the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there was no significant difference in learners' satisfaction with the home language context based on age. This indicates that both younger and older learners shared similar perceptions of home-related language support.

Peer Language Interaction

The mean rank for 15–16-year-old learners was 74.16, compared to 95.00 for the 17–18-year-old group. The p-value of 0.245 exceeded the 0.05 significance threshold, showing that there was no significant difference in satisfaction with peer language interaction across age groups. Thus, learners' engagement with peers in language-related activities did not vary substantially by age.

Social Language Environment.

Learners aged 15–16 registered a mean rank of 75.09, while those aged 17–18 had a slightly lower mean rank of 72.75. The p-value of 0.896 was far above 0.05, indicating that there was no significant difference in satisfaction with the social language environment by age. This suggests that learners, regardless of age, had parallel experiences in terms of social support for language learning.

Overall Mean

The overall mean rank of learners aged 15–16 was 74.12, while those aged 17–18 scored 96.00. However, the p-value of 0.224 indicated that the difference was not statistically significant. This finding confirms that age did not play a significant role in shaping learners' overall satisfaction with the language learning environment.

Significant Difference in Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment (LLE) by Age

Language Environment	Learning Environment	Age	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
English Environment	Language	15-16 years old	74.65	.627	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		17-18 years old	83.33			
Home Context	Language	15-16 years old	73.61	.053	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		17-18 years old	108.17			
Peer Interaction	Language	15-16 years old	74.16	.245	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		17-18 years old	95.00			
Social Interaction	Language	15-16 years old	75.09	.896	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		17-18 years old	72.75			
Overall Mean		15-16 years old	74.12	.224	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		17-18 years old	96.00			

The table indicated that there was no significant difference in learners' satisfaction with the language learning environment when grouped according to sex. For the English classroom environment, male learners obtained a mean rank of 73.37 while females had 75.80, with a p-value of .745. Since the value exceeded the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis was not rejected, indicating no significant difference between groups. A similar outcome was observed in the home language context, where males scored a mean rank of 72.66 and females 76.15, with a p-value of .642, also showing no significant difference. In peer language interaction, males recorded 69.78 and females 77.56, with a p-value of .299, which likewise revealed no significant difference. For social language interaction, males scored 75.71 while females had 74.65, with a p-value of .887, again indicating no significant difference. When taken together, the overall mean rank of 73.94 for males and 75.52 for females, with a p-value of .834, further confirmed that sex did not significantly influence learners' satisfaction on the language learning environment.

Significant Difference in Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment (LLE) by Sex

Language Environment	Learning Environment	Sex	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
English Environment	Language	Male	73.37	.745	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		Female	75.80			

Home Context	Language	Male	72.66	.642	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		Female	76.15			
Peer Interaction	Language	Male	69.78	.299	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		Female	77.56			
Social Interaction	Language	Male	75.71	.887	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		Female	74.65			
Overall Mean		Male	73.94	.834	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		Female	75.52			

The table revealed that there was no significant difference in learners' satisfaction with the language learning environment when grouped according to academic strand. For the English Language Environment, learners from the General Academic Strand (GAS) obtained a mean rank of 81.68, while those from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand obtained a mean rank of 73.84, with a p-value of .428, leading to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Similarly, in the Home Language Context, GAS learners had a mean rank of 75.84 compared to 74.85 for HUMSS learners, with a p-value of .921, also indicating no significant difference. In terms of Peer Language Interaction, GAS learners had a mean rank of 68.68, whereas HUMSS learners obtained 76.09, with a p-value of .455, which was not significant. The same trend was observed in the Social Language Interaction, where GAS learners had a mean rank of 71.27 compared to 75.65 for HUMSS learners, with a p-value of .659, resulting in a non-significant difference. When taken as a whole, the overall mean ranks were 73.36 for GAS and 75.28 for HUMSS, with a p-value of .847, confirming that there was no significant difference in learners' satisfaction with the language learning environment across academic strands.

Significant Difference in Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment (LLE) by Academic Strand

Language Environment	Learning Environment	Strand	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
English Environment	Language	GAS	81.68	.428	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		HUMSS	73.84			
Home Context	Language	GAS	75.84	.921	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		HUMSS	74.85			
Peer Interaction	Language	GAS	68.68	.455	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		HUMSS	76.09			
Social Interaction	Language	GAS	71.27	.659	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		HUMSS	75.65			
Overall Mean		GAS	73.36	.847	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
		HUMSS	75.28			

SOP 5 Significant Difference in the Level of English Language Proficiency of the Grade 11 Learners When Grouped According to Their Demographic Profile

The table revealed that there was no significant difference in the level of English language proficiency among Grade 11 learners when grouped according to age. For Grammar, learners aged 15–16 obtained a mean rank of 74.94, while those aged 17–18 had a mean rank of 76.50, with a p-value of .930, resulting in the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. In Vocabulary, learners aged 15–16 had a mean rank of 74.81, compared to 79.58 for learners aged 17–18, with a p-value of .790, indicating no significant difference. Reading Comprehension followed the same trend, with 15–16-year-old learners obtaining a mean rank of 74.43 and 17–18-year-old learners obtaining 88.50, with a p-value of .432. The overall level of English language proficiency, as reflected in the total score, showed mean ranks of 74.32 for 15–16-year-olds and 91.25 for 17–18-year-olds, with a p-value of .346, confirming that the differences across age groups were not statistically significant. This implies that age did not influence the learners' English language proficiency, as both younger and older learners demonstrated comparable levels in grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and overall proficiency.

Significant Difference in the Level of English Proficiency of the Learners by Age

Level Of English Proficiency	Age	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
Grammar	15-16 years old	74.94	.930	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	17-18 years old	76.50			
Vocabulary	15-16 years old	74.81	.790	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	17-18 years old	79.58			
Reading Comprehension	15-16 years old	74.43	.432	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	17-18 years old	88.50			
Level Of English Proficiency Total Score	15-16 years old	74.32	.346	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	17-18 years old	91.25			

The table showed that there was no significant difference in the level of English language proficiency among Grade 11 learners when grouped according to sex. In Grammar, male learners obtained a mean rank of 74.99, while female learners had a mean rank of 75.01, with a p-value of .998, indicating that the difference was not statistically significant. In Vocabulary, male learners had a mean rank of 67.96 compared to 78.45 for female learners, with a p-value of .162, also showing no significant difference. For Reading Comprehension, males obtained a mean rank of 73.13, while females scored 75.92, with a p-value of .710, again indicating non-significance. The overall English proficiency total scores revealed mean ranks of 70.98 for males and 76.97 for females, with a p-value of .425, confirming that sex did not significantly influence learners' English language proficiency. These results suggest that male and female learners demonstrated comparable levels of grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and overall English proficiency, indicating that sex was not a determining factor in their English performance.

Level of English Language Proficiency of the Significant Difference in the Level of English Proficiency of the Learners by Sex

Level Of English Proficiency	Sex	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
Grammar	Male	74.99	.998	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	Female	75.01			
Vocabulary	Male	67.96	.162	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	Female	78.45			
Reading Comprehension	Male	73.13	.710	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	Female	75.92			

Level Of English Proficiency	Total Score	Male	Female	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
		70.98	76.97	.425	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant

The table showed the significant difference in the level of English proficiency of the learners when grouped according to their academic strand. For grammar, GAS learners obtained a mean score of 99.80, while HUMSS learners scored 70.70, and the p-value of .003 indicates a significant difference. This suggests that GAS learners were significantly more proficient in grammar compared to HUMSS learners, which may be attributed to the broader, rule-based curriculum of the GAS strand that emphasizes grammatical accuracy.

In vocabulary, the GAS learners scored 70.82, while HUMSS learners scored 75.72, with a p-value of .621, indicating no significant difference between the strands. This means that both GAS and HUMSS learners showed comparable vocabulary proficiency, reflecting similar exposure to word learning and context usage across strands.

For reading comprehension, HUMSS learners scored 78.25, surpassing GAS learners' score of 56.23, and the p-value of .026 shows a significant difference. This indicates that HUMSS learners were better at comprehending texts, likely because their strand emphasizes critical reading, interpretation, and discussion activities.

Finally, the overall English proficiency total scores revealed no significant difference between GAS (66.93) and HUMSS (76.40) learners, with a p-value of .341. This implies that while there are strand-specific strengths—GAS in grammar and HUMSS in reading comprehension—the learners' overall English proficiency did not differ significantly.

Significant Difference in the Level of English Proficiency of the Learners by Academic Strand

Level Of English Proficiency	Strand	Mean Rank	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
Grammar	GAS	99.80	.003	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
	HUMSS	70.70			
Vocabulary	GAS	70.82	.621	Failed to Reject the HO	Not Significant
	HUMSS	75.72			
Reading Comprehension	GAS	56.23	.026	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
	HUMSS	78.25			
Level Of English Proficiency Total Score	GAS	66.93	.341	Failed to Reject the Ho	Not Significant
	HUMSS	76.40			

Legend:

Significant if p-value is lesser than 0.05

Not Significant is greater than 0.05

SOP 6 Significant Correlation Between the Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment and English Level of Proficiency.

The table showed the correlation between learners' satisfaction with the Language Learning Environment (LLE) and their English language proficiency. The results revealed that the relationship between learners' satisfaction and grammar was very weak or negligible ($r = .019$, $p = .822$), indicating that the correlation was not significant. Similarly, the correlation between satisfaction and vocabulary was also very weak or negligible ($r = .030$, $p = .717$), and satisfaction with reading comprehension showed a very weak or negligible relationship as well ($r = .011$, $p = .897$). Overall, the relationship between satisfaction on the LLE and total English proficiency was also very weak or negligible ($r = .035$, $p = .671$).

These results suggested that learners' perceptions of their language learning environment did not significantly influence their English language proficiency. This aligned with findings by Dizon (2018), who reported that Filipino students' English proficiency was often more influenced by out-of-school factors, such as reading habits, digital media exposure, and familial language use, than by classroom satisfaction. Furthermore, it supported the view of Santos (2020) that engagement with the learning environment alone does not guarantee measurable gains in grammar, vocabulary, or reading comprehension without targeted instructional support and practice.

Significant Correlation Between Learners' Satisfaction on the Language Learning Environment and English Language Proficiency

Language Environment vs	Learning	R	p-value	Strength	DECISION FOR H ₀	CONCLUSION
Grammar		.019	.822	Very Weak or Negligible Relationship	Refuse to reject the null hypothesis	The relationship between the variables is not significant
Vocabulary		.030	.717	Very Weak or Negligible Relationship	Refuse to reject the null hypothesis	The relationship between the variables is not significant
Reading Comprehension		.011	.897	Very Weak or Negligible Relationship	Refuse to reject the null hypothesis	The relationship between the variables is not significant
Level Of English Proficiency		.035	.671	Very Weak or Negligible Relationship	Refuse to reject the null hypothesis	The relationship between the variables is not significant

Conclusion:

The study revealed that students perceived their language learning environments— including the classroom, home, peer, and social contexts—as moderately supportive, providing opportunities for group work, collaboration, and social English activities. However, areas such as peer engagement, facilitator support, and access to learning resources needed improvement. The findings also revealed variations in students' English proficiency levels: GAS students performed significantly better in grammar ($p = 0.003$), while HUMSS students excelled in reading comprehension ($p = 0.026$). Vocabulary scores were slightly higher for HUMSS students, but the difference was not significant, and overall proficiency levels were comparable between strands. In terms of demographics, age and sex showed no significant effects on proficiency, although female students slightly outperformed males, and older students scored marginally higher. The correlation analysis further showed very weak and negligible relationships between the language learning environment and English proficiency across all components, with all p -values > 0.05 , indicating that the learning environment did not significantly predict students' proficiency outcomes. The results suggested that while students benefited from moderately supportive environments, their English proficiency depended more on individual effort, study habits, and instructional quality rather than environmental factors alone.

Recommendation:

The study's findings suggested a collaborative effort among students, teachers, school administrators, and future researchers to improve English proficiency. For students, it was advised to enhance self-learning through regular reading, writing, and speaking activities, actively participate in group projects and social English activities, and utilize available learning resources to strengthen vocabulary and comprehension. For teachers, the study suggested diversifying teaching strategies, balancing grammar and vocabulary instruction, providing consistent feedback, and encouraging peer collaboration to create a more engaging learning experience. For school administrators, it was recommended to develop English enrichment programs, improve access to updated learning resources, enhance facilitator support, and monitor student performance through regular assessments. Finally, future researchers were encouraged to explore other factors affecting English proficiency, apply qualitative approaches to gain deeper insights, and conduct longitudinal studies to track language development over time.

The findings highlighted that while the language learning environment was moderately supportive, improving English proficiency requires personal engagement, effective teaching strategies, and strong institutional support.

References:

- Alcantara, J., & dela Cruz, M. (2020). *Classroom environment and Filipino students' performance in English*. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 22(1), 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjer.2020.221033>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., & Gonzales, D. (2019). Collaborative learning and English proficiency: A Philippine study. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 28(4), 313–324.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., & Gonzales, D. (2019). Collaborative learning and English proficiency: A Philippine study. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 28(4), 313–324.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., & Mante-Estacio, M. J. (2023). Metacognitive reading strategies and Filipino high school students' reading proficiency: Insights from the PISA 2018 data. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01886-6> openurl.ebsco.com

- Cambridge Assessment English. (2018). Learning English through peer interaction: *Effective strategies for communicative competence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L., & LarsenFreeman, D. (2019). Grammar. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 19–34). Routledge.
- Chairinkam, N., & Yawiloeng, S. (2021). *Peer scaffolding behaviors in Thai EFL classrooms*. TESOL Journal, 12(1), e5678. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.5678>
- Chi, M., Chen, X., & Lin, Y. (2020). *Autonomy-supportive teaching and student motivation in language learning*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 112(5), 987–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000392>
- De Guzman, A. B., & Uy, M. S. (2020). Learners' active participation in English clubs and school-organized social events: Impact on spoken fluency and confidence. *Journal of Language and Education*, 6(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jle.2020.06204>
- Department of Education. (2013). *K to 12 curriculum guide: Senior high school – Academic track*. Department of Education. <http://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 109–132.
- EF Education First. (2023). *EF English proficiency index: A ranking of 113 countries and regions by English skills*.
- Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816641670Cambridge University Press & Assessment>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2021). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Enriquez, J. M., Bautista, R. P., & Lazo, K. A. (2024). Grammar competence and academic performance of Grade 11 HUMSS students. *Philippine Journal of Language and Education Research*, 6(1), 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjler.v6i1.2024>
- Garcia, M. R., & Dela Cruz, J. P. (2021). Grammar performance among senior high school students: A strand-based comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Language Studies*, 7(2), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjls.v7i2.321>
- Garcia, M., & Salvador, R. (2017). *Frequent speaking activities and learner fluency in Philippine classrooms*. Philippine Journal of Applied Linguistics, 41(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12345678.2017.0123456>
- Garcia, M., & Salvador, R. (2017). *Speaking activities and student confidence in Philippine English classrooms*. Philippine Journal of Language Education, 13(2), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjle.2017.132050>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2015). *Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779590>
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2015). *Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition*. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 180–206). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203628942>
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2015). Explaining phenomena of first and second language acquisition with the constructs of implicit and explicit learning. In *Implicit and explicit learning of languages (Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 48, pp. 25–51)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2009). *An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning*. Educational Researcher, 38(5), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
- King, J. (2018). Unequal participation and task design challenges in group-based activities: Implications for language learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(5), 567–585. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818773192>
- Kotz, S. A., & Verga, L. (2013). Social interaction in second language acquisition: The neurocognition of language learning. *Cortex*, 49(2), 278–279.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (2018). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (Revised ed.). Routledge.
- Krashen, S. D. (2018). *The power of reading: Insights from the research* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.
- Llamas, C. J., & Dela Peña, M. R. (2022). English language proficiency and classroom performance of senior high school students in Negros Occidental. *Visayas Journal of Education Research*, 14(1), 77–92.
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285–329. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000046eric.ed.gov+1>
- Manalo, E. (2018). *Enhancing communication and collaboration skills through English group activities in Philippine classrooms*. Philippine Journal of Education, 17(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pje.2018.172078>
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Orbeta, A. C. Jr., Melad, K. A. M., & Potestad, M. V. (2020, Desember 30). *Correlates of test performance of 15-year-old students in the Philippines: Evidence from PISA* (PIDS Discussion Paper No. DP 2020-57). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2020.57>



- Philp, J. (2016). Peer interaction and second language learning: The role of individual differences. In J. Philp, R. Adams, & N. Iwashita (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning* (pp. 1–15). Routledge.
- Pretorius, E. J., & Klapwijk, N. M. (2016). Reading comprehension in South African schools: Are we making progress? *Per Linguam*, 32(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5785/32-1-627>
- Saito, K. (2019). Motivation, prior knowledge, and peer interaction: Their influence on language outcomes. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(2), 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818773193>
- Santos, J. P. (2021). Peer-led discussions and learner satisfaction among Filipino ESL students. *Philippine Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 17(2), 87–101.
- Santos, K. G. (2020). Classroom engagement and English achievement: Mediating effects of instructional strategies in Philippine secondary schools. *International Journal of Education Research*, 99, 101518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101518>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Zhang, L., & Beckmann, N. (2021). Reading comprehension and grammar knowledge as predictors of academic performance in English-medium universities. *System*, 97, 102448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102448>