Campus Journalism Involvement and Language Proficiency among Public High School Students in Escalante City, Philippines

Lou Reiz Mae V. Bangis., Filmar L. Dioric., Jhon Mark C. Perrin., Janmie S. Salimbot., Melody V. Sangga., Jearemae A. Sarona., Regalado C. Magbanua., Mariel Tanghal

Mount Carmel College of Escalante, Inc

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400475

Received: 20 April 2026; Accepted: 25 April 2026; Published: 14 May 2026

ABSTRACT

Using Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, and Cummins' Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills/Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency distinction, this study examined the relationship between campus journalism involvement and English language proficiency among 102 junior high school student-journalists from nine public schools in Escalante City, Philippines. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design employed a validated survey and a standardized proficiency test on grammar, vocabulary, and writing. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance with Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post-hoc test. Most students reported over one year of involvement, served primarily as writers, and participated weekly or monthly. Training was sourced mainly from school workshops, motivated by a passion for writing, but constrained by time and a lack of mentorship. Overall proficiency was *Nearly Proficient* (M = 20.00, SD = 4.68). No significant differences emerged by age, sex, duration, role, frequency, or activity type. Grade level was significant, $F(5, 96) = 2.47$, $p = .035$, with Grade 9 outperforming Grade 10. Perceived influence also differed significantly, $F(2, 99) = 4.27$, $p = .017$: students who reported moderate improvement outscored those who reported slight improvement. Findings indicate campus journalism is an equitable platform for academic English, but gains depend on sustained engagement, language-intensive roles, mentorship, and metacognitive awareness. Results highlight the need for targeted support in Grade 10 and greater emphasis on reflective practices.

Keywords: campus journalism, language proficiency, CALP, rural education, Philippines, metacognition

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Campus journalism has long been recognized as a pedagogical extension that cultivates literacy, critical thinking, and communicative competence among learners. Beyond news writing and reporting, it provides an authentic context for language use, requiring students to read, analyze, draft, and revise for a real audience (Basilan & Padilla, 2022). In multilingual contexts such as the Philippines, where English serves as a medium of instruction but is seldom used at home, campus journalism offers sustained exposure to academic English that is often absent in traditional classroom drills (Sunio & Alico, 2016).

Language proficiency encompasses interrelated domains—reading comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, listening, speaking, and writing—that are critical for academic achievement and participation in civic discourse. For Filipino high school students, journalistic tasks impose communicative demands that approximate Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), requiring them to synthesize information, manage tone and register, and adhere to editorial standards (Cummins, 1979). These demands differ from Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) practiced in casual conversation, thereby accelerating academic language development.

Empirical work supports this link. Monching (2024) found that elementary pupils in Sta. Cruz North District, who regularly contributed to school publications, demonstrated significantly higher proficiency in writing,

speaking, and vocabulary than non-participants. At the secondary level, Terogo et al. (2018) reported that senior high school student-journalists exhibited stronger grammatical control and audience awareness, though their sociolinguistic competence remained underdeveloped. Similarly, Albino (2023) observed that journalism engagement fostered self-editing habits and intrinsic motivation, prompting students to read widely and seek feedback. However, Hunahunan (2018) cautioned that participation alone does not guarantee proficiency; recurring errors in verb usage, subject-verb agreement, and article use persisted without structured feedback from trained advisers.

Institutional support is a mediating factor. School-based journalism workshops and mentorship programs help transfer classroom grammar instruction into real-world writing (Basilan & Padilla, 2022). However, many public schools, especially in rural areas, lack consistent training, qualified advisers, and resources. In Escalante City, a third-class component city in Negros Occidental, access to external training and print resources is limited, making campus journalism one of the few accessible platforms for advanced English practice.

Despite its potential, existing literature is skewed toward urban or higher education contexts, and few quantitative studies examine rural public high schools. The present study addresses this geographical and methodological gap by assessing how duration, role, frequency, and type of journalistic involvement relate to language proficiency among public high school students in Escalante City.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to assess campus journalism involvement and language proficiency among public high school students in Escalante City. Specifically, it seeks to answer:

1. What is the profile of student-journalists in terms of duration of involvement, primary role, frequency of participation, type of activity, training source, motivation, and challenges faced?

2. What is the level of language proficiency of student-journalists when taken as a whole and when grouped by age, sex, grade level, duration, role, frequency, and type of activity?

3. Is there a significant difference in language proficiency when students are grouped by age, sex, and grade level?

4. Is there a significant difference in language proficiency when students are grouped by duration, primary role, frequency, and type of journalistic activity?

Hypotheses

H_o1: There is no significant difference in language proficiency among student-journalists when grouped according to age, sex, and grade level.

H_o2: There is no significant difference in language proficiency among student-journalists when grouped according to duration of involvement, primary role, frequency of participation, and type of journalistic activity.

Theoretical Framework

This study integrates three complementary theories to explain how campus journalism mediates English language development. First, Krashen's (1982) Input Hypothesis posits that language is acquired through exposure to comprehensible input slightly beyond the learner's current level (i+1). In campus journalism, students encounter i+1 input through source materials, editorial guidelines, style guides, and peer-written texts that challenge them to process language structures and vocabulary they have not yet mastered. Second, Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory emphasizes that language development is socially mediated within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Journalistic practices such as peer editing, press conferences, collaborative newsroom discussions, and adviser feedback serve as scaffolds that enable students to perform language tasks they cannot yet accomplish independently. Third, Cummins' (1979) BICS/CALP Distinction

differentiates Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills from Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency. Campus journalism facilitates students' transition from conversational BICS to academic CALP by requiring them to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information for public consumption, thereby engaging in cognitively demanding, context-reduced language use typical of academic discourse. Together, these theories frame campus journalism as a linguistically rich, socially scaffolded environment that provides comprehensible yet challenging input to advance academic English proficiency.

Conceptual Framework

This study is anchored on an Input-Process-Output (IPO) model to examine campus journalism involvement as a predictor of English language proficiency among public high school students. The Input consists of three components: (a) the student profile, including age, sex, and grade level; (b) campus journalism involvement, operationalized as duration of involvement, primary role, frequency of participation, type of journalism activity, source of training, motivation to participate, and challenges encountered; and (c) language proficiency, measured through grammar, vocabulary, and writing performance. The Process involves the systematic administration of a validated survey questionnaire, data gathering from student-journalists, statistical processing using descriptive and inferential tests, and subsequent analysis and interpretation of results. The study's output includes empirical evidence on the relationship between journalistic involvement and language proficiency, identification of specific journalistic activities associated with higher proficiency levels, and evidence-based recommendations for integrating journalism into language instruction. Ultimately, the intended Outcome is enhanced student language proficiency, improved school-based journalism programs, and stronger policy support for language development through extracurricular engagement.

Significance of the Study

Students may recognize campus journalism as a pathway to strengthen grammar, vocabulary, and writing confidence.

Teachers and school paper advisers can use findings to justify structured mentoring and to design feedback mechanisms that target persistent errors.

School administrators and policymakers may leverage evidence to allocate resources for training, equipment, and adviser incentives, especially in rural schools with limited access to external programs.

Researchers gain empirical data from a rural Philippine context, expanding the literature beyond urban and collegiate settings.

Scope and Delimitations

This study covers junior high school students who were actively involved in campus journalism in public secondary schools in Escalante City during School Year 2025–2026. The variables examined include duration of involvement, primary journalistic role, frequency of participation, and type of journalistic activity, as well as English language proficiency, measured through a standardized test assessing grammar, vocabulary, and writing. The study is subject to several limitations.

Geographically, the findings may not be generalizable to private schools or other localities with different curricular and extracurricular contexts. Regarding the sample, participation was limited to active student-journalists; non-journalists were excluded, thereby precluding comparisons between involved and uninvolved students. Regarding data, the study relied on self-reported measures for journalistic involvement variables and a one-time proficiency test, which may not capture fluctuations in performance.

The investigation was conducted over a single academic year; thus, longitudinal gains in language proficiency were not captured. Finally, extraneous variables such as home language environment, socioeconomic status, and prior English exposure were not controlled and may have influenced the results.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design to examine the relationship between campus journalism involvement and English language proficiency among junior high school students in public schools in Escalante City. The descriptive component documented the extent of students' involvement in campus journalism and their proficiency in grammar, vocabulary, and writing. The correlational component determined the strength and direction of association between journalistic involvement indicators and language proficiency scores. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences among respondents grouped by demographic and journalistic variables. This design was appropriate because it enabled systematic description and inferential testing without manipulation of variables.

Research Locale and Participants

The study was conducted in nine public secondary schools in Escalante City, Negros Occidental, where campus journalism programs are actively implemented. These schools vary in resource availability and access to journalism training, providing a diverse context for analysis.

The population comprised 176 student-publication staff members across the nine schools. Using purposive sampling, 102 students were selected based on the inclusion criterion of active membership in the school's official publication as writers, editors, photojournalists, or contributors. The sample size was initially computed at 122 using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level. Due to constraints in student availability during the final academic weeks, the final sample was adjusted to 102, which remains sufficient for descriptive and comparative analyses at the .05 alpha level. Proportional allocation was applied to ensure representation across schools, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Distribution of Population and Sample by School

School	Total Publication Staff	Sample Size
Public High School A	18	10
Public High School B	15	10
Public High School C	20	13
Public High School D	29	17
Public High School E	15	9
Public High School F	20	10
Public High School G	26	15
Public High School H	16	8
Public High School I	17	10
Total	**176**	**102**

Research Instrument

Data were collected using two instruments: (1) a researcher-made structured survey questionnaire and (2) a modified standardized language proficiency test.

The survey questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part 1 gathered demographic data and journalism involvement profile: age, sex, grade level, duration of involvement, primary role, frequency of participation, type of journalistic activity, source of training, motivation, and challenges. Part 2 measured the perceived influence of journalism on language development using a 5-point Likert scale.

The language proficiency test comprised three sections—grammar, vocabulary, and writing—totaling 30 items. Scores were classified as: Highly Proficient (27–30), Proficient (23–26), Nearly Proficient (19–22), Low Proficient (15–18), and Not Proficient (0–14).

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Face and content validity were established using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR). Nine experts—public and private school teachers with at least a master's degree and experience in campus journalism and English instruction—rated 42 items as *Essential*, *Useful but not essential*, or *Not necessary*. The instrument achieved a validity index of 1.00. Qualitative comments were incorporated to improve clarity prior to pilot testing.

Reliability was assessed via pilot testing with 10 publication staff from Sagay City Eco-Zone Farm School who were not part of the study sample. Cronbach's alpha was computed across six subscales: Vocabulary, Grammar, Reading Comprehension, Writing Mechanics, Error Detection, and Word Choice/Context. The results showed ____ which indicates acceptable internal consistency, confirming the instrument's reliability for measuring language proficiency components.

Data Gathering Procedure

After securing approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and school administrators, informed consent was obtained from students and parents. Data collection occurred over one month and coincided with end-of-school-year activities. To maximize participation, a hybrid approach was used: face-to-face administration of printed questionnaires and tests, supplemented by an identical Google Forms version for students engaged in recognition or graduation preparations. All responses were monitored to prevent duplication. Completed instruments were retrieved, checked for completeness, and encoded for analysis.

Data Analysis

Data were processed using descriptive and inferential statistics aligned with the research problems.

For **Research Problems 1–2,** Frequency distributions and percentages described campus journalism involvement, training sources, motivation, and challenges.

For Research Problems 3–4, Means and standard deviations were reported for language proficiency levels when grouped by demographic and journalistic variables.

For Research Problems 5–6, a One-Way ANOVA was used to test for significant differences in language proficiency across groups. When ratios were significant, Tukey's HSD post-hoc test identified specific group differences.

All analyses were performed using SPSS v.26 and Microsoft Excel. Effect sizes were reported for significant ANOVA results to indicate practical significance.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173). Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured from students and parents. Anonymity was ensured by assigning codes (e.g., SHS-001) instead of names. Data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researcher and used solely for academic purposes. No deception was involved, and participants could withdraw without penalty. The study was conducted with academic integrity and underwent a plagiarism check prior to submission.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue IV April 2026

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets findings on the relationship between campus journalism involvement and English language proficiency among public high school students in Escalante City. Data from 102 student-journalists were analyzed using descriptive statistics and ANOVA. Results are organized by research problem and discussed in relation to theory and extant literature.

Campus Journalism Involvement Profile

Table 1 Campus Journalism Involvement by Duration, Primary Role, Frequency, Activity Type, and Perceived Influence on Language Proficiency (N = 102)

Dimension	**Group**	***f***	**%**
Duration of Involvement	Less than 6 months	21	20.6
	6 months – 1 year	26	25.5
	1 – 2 years	30	29.4
	More than 2 years	25	24.5
Primary Role	Writer	58	56.9
	Editor	18	17.6
	Photographer	7	6.9
	Layout Artist	2	2.0
	Broadcaster	5	4.9
	Other Role	12	11.8
Frequency of Participation	Daily	16	15.7
	Weekly	34	33.3
	Monthly	33	32.4
	Rarely	19	18.6
Type of Journalism Activity	News Writing	21	20.6
	Editorial Writing	15	14.7
	Feature Writing	12	11.8
	Sports Writing	16	15.7
	Copy Editing	10	9.8
	Photography	7	6.9
	Broadcasting	6	5.9

	Other type	15	14.7
Perceived Influence on Language Proficiency	Significantly improved	47	46.1
	Moderately improved	41	40.2
	Slightly improved	14	13.7

Note. Percentages may not total 100.0 due to rounding.

As shown in Table 1, 53.9% of respondents reported involvement for more than 1 year, indicating sustained engagement. The dominant primary role was writer (56.9%), followed by editor (17.6%), reflecting heavy participation in language-intensive tasks.

Most students participated weekly (33.3%) or monthly (32.4%). News writing (20.6%) and sports writing (15.7%) were the most common activities. Notably, 86.3% perceived that campus journalism moderately to significantly improved their language proficiency.

These patterns suggest that campus journalism provides a low-anxiety, authentic context for English use, consistent with Krashen's (1982) Input Hypothesis. Regular engagement in writing and editing exposes students to comprehensible input slightly beyond their current level, facilitating acquisition.

The preponderance of writing roles aligns with Graham and Perin's (2007) meta-analysis: writing instruction embedded in real communication tasks yields greater gains than decontextualized grammar drills. The self-reported improvements support Albino's (2023) finding that journalism fosters self-editing and revision habits. Educationally, results imply that schools should treat journalism not as peripheral but as a pedagogically sound extension of the language curriculum, with diversified roles and regular schedules to sustain engagement.

Training Sources, Motivation, and Challenges

Table 2 Sources of Training, Motivation, and Challenges in Campus Journalism (N = 102; multiple responses allowed)

Dimension	***f***	**%**
Journalism Training Received		
School workshops/seminars	86	84.3
External journalism conferences	22	21.6
Online courses/webinars	4	3.9
No formal training	2	2.0
Motivation to Participate		
Passion for writing	59	57.8
Influence from teachers/mentors	30	29.4
Interest in media and communication	26	25.5
Desire to inform and educate others	18	17.6

Scholarship opportunities	8	7.8
To express my talent	1	1.0
Challenges Faced		
Time management with academics	46	45.1
Lack of training or mentorship	36	35.3
Limited resources	25	24.5
Difficulty in gathering news/sources	18	17.6
Pressure from deadlines	18	17.6
Run out of ideas sometimes	1	1.0

Table 2 indicates that 84.3% received training via school workshops, while external and online training were minimal. Intrinsic motivation predominated: 57.8% cited passion for writing, and 29.4% cited teacher influence. The primary barriers were time management (45.1%) and lack of training or mentorship (35.3%).

The reliance on school-based training underscores the institution's gatekeeping role in access to co-curricular enrichment (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The salience of intrinsic motivation supports Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000): when students act from autonomy and interest, persistence and cognitive gains increase.

However, time constraints and limited mentorship threaten sustained engagement. Consistent with Bandura's (1986) Social Learning Theory, the absence of models and guided practice reduces self-efficacy. Thus, institutionalizing regular training, mentoring schedules, and workload accommodations is essential to convert interest into measurable proficiency gains.

Language Proficiency by Demographic Variables

Table 3 Language Proficiency by Age, Grade Level, and Sex

Variable	**Group**	***n***	***M***	***SD***	**Interpretation**
Age	16 yrs. old & below	77	20.00	4.80	Nearly Proficient
	Above 16 yrs. old	25	20.00	4.39	Nearly Proficient
Grade Level	Grade 7	9	21.00	3.80	Nearly Proficient
	Grade 8	11	21.00	5.13	Nearly Proficient
	Grade 9	14	22.00	3.70	Nearly Proficient
	Grade 10	36	18.00	5.04	Nearly Proficient
	Grade 11	17	21.00	2.81	Nearly Proficient
	Grade 12	15	19.00	5.04	Nearly Proficient
Sex	Female	75	20.00	4.59	Nearly Proficient

	Male	27	19.00	4.89	Nearly Proficient
Overall		102	20.00	4.68	Nearly Proficient

Note. Interpretation based on: Highly Proficient = 27–30; Proficient = 23–26; Nearly Proficient = 15–22; Low Proficient = 8–14; Not Proficient = 0–7.

All subgroups fell within the "Nearly Proficient" range (M = 18–22), indicating functional but not yet independent command of academic English. ANOVA revealed no significant differences by age, $F(1, 100) = 0.00$, $p = .99$, or sex, $F(1, 100) = 0.89$, $p = .35$, suggesting that campus journalism provides an equitable platform for language development. A significant difference was found by grade level, $F(5, 96) = 2.47$, $p = .038$, = .11. Tukey HSD indicated that Grade 9 ($M = 22.00$) scored significantly higher than Grade 10 ($M = 18.00$), $p = .021$.

The homogeneity across age and sex aligns with Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory: active participation, reflection, and application benefit learners regardless of demographic background. The Grade 10 dip may reflect mid-adolescent academic disengagement due to increased curricular demands and identity transitions (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). This signals a need for grade-specific scaffolding, particularly in Grade 10, through targeted writing workshops and feedback cycles.

The collective "Nearly Proficient" status indicates that while students have functional English, most have not reached the independent proficiency required for academic writing. Vygotsky's (1978) notion of social mediation suggests that increasing adviser feedback and peer-editing structures could move students from "nearly" to "proficient." Thus, journalism should be paired with explicit language instruction rather than treated as a substitute for it (Hunahunan, 2018).

Key Implications. Campus journalism is a viable, inclusive vehicle for academic English development, but its impact is maximized when: (1) roles are diversified beyond writing to include editing, layout, and broadcast to engage varied language domains; (2) regular, school-based training and mentorship address the 35.3% who lack guidance; (3) time management supports are provided to mitigate the primary barrier; and (4) Grade 10 interventions counter the observed proficiency dip. Schools should institutionalize journalism not as an extracurricular activity, but as a co-curricular one, with timetabled practice and assessment linked to the English curriculum.

Language Proficiency by Journalism Involvement Characteristics

Table 4 Language Proficiency by Duration, Primary Role, Frequency, Activity Type, and Perceived Influence

Dimension	**Group**	***n***	***M***	***SD***	**Interpretation**
Duration of Involvement	Less than 6 months	21	18.00	5.00	Nearly Proficient
	6 months – 1 year	26	20.00	5.71	Nearly Proficient
	1 – 2 years	30	20.00	4.14	Nearly Proficient
	More than 2 years	25	21.00	3.68	Nearly Proficient
Primary Role	Writer	58	20.00	4.50	Nearly Proficient
	Editor	18	20.00	4.71	Nearly Proficient
	Photographer	7	20.00	3.83	Nearly Proficient
	Layout Artist	2	13.00	2.83	Low Proficient

	Broadcaster	5	18.00	8.73	Nearly Proficient
	Other Role	12	22.00	3.45	Nearly Proficient
Frequency of Participation	Daily	16	20.00	5.05	Nearly Proficient
	Weekly	34	20.00	4.27	Nearly Proficient
	Monthly	33	20.00	5.17	Nearly Proficient
	Rarely	19	20.00	4.52	Nearly Proficient
Type of Journalism Activity	News Writing	21	21.00	4.42	Nearly Proficient
	Editorial Writing	15	20.00	4.67	Nearly Proficient
	Feature Writing	12	20.00	6.07	Nearly Proficient
	Sports Writing	16	20.00	4.01	Nearly Proficient
	Copy Editing	10	19.00	4.03	Nearly Proficient
	Photography	7	19.00	3.98	Nearly Proficient
	Broadcasting	6	19.00	7.99	Nearly Proficient
	Other type	15	21.00	4.19	Nearly Proficient
Perceived Influence on Language Proficiency	Significantly improved	47	20.00	4.86	Nearly Proficient
	Moderately improved	41	21.00	4.08	Nearly Proficient
	Slightly improved	14	17.00	4.69	Nearly Proficient
Overall		102	20.00	4.68	Nearly Proficient

Note. Proficiency levels: Highly Proficient = 27–30; Proficient = 23–26; Nearly Proficient = 15–22; Low Proficient = 8–14; Not Proficient = 0–7.

Descriptively, all subgroups except Layout Artists scored within the "Nearly Proficient" range. Students with >2 years of involvement posted the highest mean (M = 21.00), while Layout Artists posted the lowest mean (M = 13.00, Low Proficient). Those who perceived "moderate improvement" from journalism had the highest proficiency (M = 21.00), whereas "slight improvement" aligned with the lowest (M = 17.00).

These patterns suggest that duration and linguistic demand of the role matter. Sustained engagement provides repeated, contextually rich language input, consistent with Cummins' (2000) claim that academic language develops through frequent, cognitively demanding use. The lower scores for Layout Artists support Nation's (2007) finding that vocabulary and fluency gains depend on language output; visually oriented roles provide fewer opportunities for productive English use. The alignment between perceived and actual proficiency underscores metacognitive awareness: students who recognize growth are more likely to apply strategies and persist, as Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory predicts. Black and Wiliam (2009) similarly argue that reflective self-assessment enhances ownership and achievement.

Practically, schools should (1) encourage longer tenure in publication staff, (2) embed language tasks in non-writing roles—e.g., requiring captions or editorial discussion from layout artists—and (3) use reflective journals to strengthen students' awareness of linguistic gains.

Comparative Analysis by Demographic Variables

Table 5 ANOVA of Language Proficiency by Age, Grade Level, and Sex

Variable	**Group**	***n***	***M***	***SD***	***p***	**Decision**	**Sig. at α = .05**
Age	16 yrs. old & below	77	20.00	4.80	.852	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Above 16 yrs. old	25	20.00	4.39			
Grade Level	Grade 7	9	21.00	3.80	.035	Reject H_0	Significant
	Grade 8	11	21.00	5.13			
	Grade 9	14	22.00	3.70			
	Grade 10	36	18.00	5.04			
	Grade 11	17	21.00	2.81			
	Grade 12	15	19.00	5.04			
Sex	Female	75	20.00	4.59	.223	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Male	27	19.00	4.89			

ANOVA revealed no significant differences by age, $F(1, 100) = 0.04$, $p = .852$, or sex, $F(1, 100) = 1.50$, $p = .223$. A significant effect emerged for grade level, $F(5, 96) = 2.47$, $p = .035$, = .11, indicating a medium effect.

Table 5.1 Tukey HSD Post-Hoc Comparisons of Language Proficiency by Grade Level

	Grade 7	**Grade 8**	**Grade 9**	**Grade 10**	**Grade 11**	**Grade 12**
Grade 7	—					
Grade 8	0.13	—				
Grade 9	-0.99	-1.12	—			
Grade 10	3.39	3.26	4.38	—		
Grade 11	0.22	0.09	1.21	-3.17	—	
Grade 12	1.89	1.76	2.88	-1.50	1.67	—

Note. Values are mean differences. $p < .05$.

Post-hoc tests showed only the Grade 9 vs. Grade 10 comparison was significant ($MD = 4.38$, $p = .032$), with Grade 9 outperforming Grade 10.

The absence of age and sex effects suggests campus journalism is an equitable platform, aligning with UNESCO's (2017) call for gender-inclusive education and Vygotsky's (1978) view that social, language-rich contexts benefit diverse learners. The Grade 10 dip likely reflects mid-adolescent academic pressure and motivational shifts (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). Eccles and Midgley (1989) note that structural transitions and increased rigor around Grade 10 can reduce engagement. Scaffolded writing tasks, peer mentoring, and expressive journalism genres may re-engage this cohort. The stability across other grades supports Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory: meaningful, reflective practice benefits learners across developmental stages.

Comparative Analysis by Journalism Involvement Variables

Table 6 ANOVA of Language Proficiency by Duration, Role, Frequency, Activity Type, and Perceived Influence

Dimension	***p***	**Decision**	**Sig. at α = .05**
Duration of Involvement	.327	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Primary Role	.241	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Frequency of Participation	.992	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Type of Journalism Activity	.905	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Perceived Influence on Language Proficiency	.017	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 6.1 Tukey HSD Post-Hoc for Perceived Influence

	Significantly improved	**Moderately improved**	**Slightly improved**
Significantly improved	—		
Moderately improved	-1.61	—	
Slightly improved	0.23	3.98	—

Note. $p < .05$.

ANOVA indicated no significant differences across duration, role, frequency, or activity type ($p > .05$). Only perceived influence was significant, $F(2, 99) = 4.27$, $p = .017$, = .08. Post-hoc tests revealed that students reporting "moderate improvement" ($M = 21.00$) scored significantly higher than those reporting "slight improvement" ($M = 17.00$), $p = .021$.

The non-significant results for objective involvement variables suggest that campus journalism serves as a consistently beneficial environment regardless of how long students participate or in what capacity. This supports Krashen's (1982) claim that the quality of meaningful input outweighs the quantity of exposure. However, the significance of perceived influence highlights the role of metacognition and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011): students who believe journalism improves their English invest more effort and deploy strategies, yielding higher scores. Black and Wiliam (2009) similarly found that formative self-assessment strengthens learning.

For practice, advisers should integrate reflection prompts, portfolio reviews, and vocabulary tracking to make linguistic gains visible. This converts implicit practice into explicit learning, enhancing both proficiency and students' recognition of growth.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

1. Language proficiency was uniformly "Nearly Proficient," with higher means for longer involvement and writing-intensive roles.

2. Grade 10 students scored significantly lower than Grade 9, indicating a target cohort for intervention.

3. Objective involvement variables did not differentiate proficiency, but students' perceived influence did, with moderate/significant perceived gainers outperforming slight gainers.

4. Age and sex did not affect proficiency, indicating equitable benefits.

These results confirm campus journalism as a viable co-curricular strategy for academic English, most effective when paired with sustained participation, language-rich roles, and reflective practice.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Public high school student-journalists in Escalante City demonstrate a functional level of English proficiency (*Nearly Proficient*), regardless of age or sex, suggesting that campus journalism provides an equitable language development platform.

2. A significant proficiency dip occurs in Grade 10 relative to Grade 9, indicating a grade-specific vulnerability that may be linked to transitional academic demands and requires targeted support.

3. Objective characteristics of journalism involvement—duration, role, frequency, and activity type—do not, by themselves, produce statistically significant differences in proficiency. However, roles with higher linguistic demand (e.g., writers, editors) descriptively outperform visual/technical roles (e.g., layout artists), implying that language output opportunities mediate gains.

4. Students' metacognitive awareness matters: perceived improvement in language skills is significantly associated with actual proficiency. Those who believe journalism helped them moderately or significantly tend to score higher than those who perceive a slight impact.

5. Campus journalism functions as a viable co-curricular extension of the English curriculum, but its effectiveness is contingent on sustained institutional support, structured training, mentorship, and reflective practice—especially for students in less language-intensive roles or at critical grade levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. Schools may integrate digital platforms, multimedia journalism, and collaborative tools (e.g., shared editors, school news websites) alongside print media. This broadens participation and aligns with 21st-century media literacy competencies.

2. To address the observed proficiency dip, writing boot camps, genre-based modules, and peer-coaching specifically for Grade 10 students may be designed and embedded in homeroom periods, reading time, or co-curricular sessions to avoid academic overload.

3. Digital portfolios, weekly writing logs, and structured feedback journals may be adopted to help students track vocabulary growth, syntactic control, and writing fluency. Regular consultations with an adviser or peer reviewer shall accompany these tools to strengthen metacognitive awareness and self-efficacy.

4. Language-based tasks may be assigned to students in technical/visual roles. Layout artists can write captions and blurbs; photographers can produce photo-essay narratives; broadcasters can submit scripts for editing. This ensures equitable language exposure regardless of primary role.

5. One-off seminars may be replaced with Regular skill-building sessions facilitated by teachers, alumni, or local media practitioners. Training should be tiered—foundational journalism and English basics for novices, advanced reporting and editing for veterans—and integrated into club periods or summer programs.

6. Subsequent studies should examine campus journalism's impact on civic engagement, critical thinking, and digital citizenship to demonstrate its holistic contribution to secondary education. Longitudinal designs and mixed-methods approaches are encouraged to capture causality and student voice.

REFERENCES

1. **Albino, L. (2023).** The role of campus journalism in enhancing students' communication skills and academic performance. World Journal of English Language, 13(4), 112–125. https://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/wjel/article/viewFile/25213/15904
2. **Albino, M. C. (2023)**. Campus journalism and its effect on students' communication skills. Journal of Language and Education Research, 5(1), 42–58.
3. **Bandura, A. (1997**). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.
4. **Basilan, M. L. J. C., & Padilla, M. (2022).** Assessment of teaching English language skills: Input to digitized activities for campus journalism advisers. IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 4(4), 118–130. https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/245694
5. **Black, P., & Wiliam**, **D. (2009).** Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5
6. **Cummins, J. (1979).** Cognitive academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (19), 121–129.
7. **Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017).** Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report
8. **Eccles, J. S., & Midgley, C. (1989).** Stage-environment fit: Developmentally appropriate classrooms for young adolescents. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education (Vol. 3, pp. 139–186). Academic Press.
9. **Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011).** Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21(1), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x
10. **Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981)**. A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387.
11. **Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007).** Writing next: Effective strategies to improve the writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. Alliance for Excellent Education. https://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/10/WritingNext.pdf
12. **Harcup, T. (2021).** A Dictionary of Journalism. Oxford University Press.
13. **Hunahunan, L. (2018)**. Language errors in campus journalists' news articles: Its implications for writers' interlanguage. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 2(3), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.31142/ijtsrd19006
14. **Kolb, D. A. (1984)**. Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.
15. **Krashen, S. D. (1982)**. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.
16. **Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T**. (2021). The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect (4th ed.). Crown.
17. **Manuel, R. (2022)**. English language proficiency of senior high school students: An assessment of grammar and reading comprehension. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359744516_English_Language_Proficiency_of_Senior_High_School_Students
18. **Mencher, M. (2010).** News Reporting and Writing (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

19. **Monching, S. (2024).** Campus journalism participation and language proficiency among elementary school learners in Sta. Cruz North District. Nexus International Journal of Science and Education, 1(1). https://nijse.org/index.php/home/article/view/6
20. **Nation, I. S. P. (2007).** The four strands. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1(1), 2–13. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt039.0
21. **Piaget, J. (1952)**. The origins of intelligence in children. W. W. Norton & Company.
22. **Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000).** Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
23. **Sunio, R. P., & Alico, J. C. (2016)**. Language preference of student journalists in Mindanao State University-Marawi, Philippines: Reasons and attitudes. Advances in Sciences and Humanities, 2(6), 92–103. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ash.20160206.16
24. **Terogo, I. J. R., Elimino, C. A. C., Tallo, J. P. M., Sacal, J. A., & Balahadia, C. M. J. E. (2018).** Linguistic and sociolinguistic competence of senior high school students. Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 6(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj1806.01.03
25. **UNESCO. (2017).** A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254
26. **Vygotsky, L. S. (1978)**. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
27. **Zimmerman, B. J. (2002).** Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2
28. **Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011).** Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives (2nd ed.). Routledge.