

ISSN 0119-5107



**Philippine Normal University
CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION
Manila**



RESEARCH SERIES

No. 111

March 2009

PROFILE OF CLLL UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

Rosarito Tatel-Suatengco
CLLL Research Coordinator

PROFILE OF CLLL UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS*

Introduction

Any academic institution that seeks to open its programs to both the national and international community, should have a comprehensive grasp of its main stakeholders-the students. It is but imperative then for the academic institution to have a strong, solid grounding on their socio-demographics. Moreover, it has to constantly checks itself on how its innovations and programs are perceived by these stakeholders. With this intent in mind, the research anchors on the previous studies about the Profile of PNU College Freshmen conducted by Fetalvero (2008) and Mancao (2006).

Both studies presented a picture of incoming freshmen students of PNU with focus on their socio-demographics and academic standing in high school. Of more than 1,000 students of PNU each year, only about 20 percent are scholars of various foundations and institutions like the Department of Science and Technology (DOST). As in the previous years, the majority consist of females with a little and sporadic increase in male population. The service area of PNU concentrates around Metro Manila and some provinces in Region 3 and IV-A; that is, most students came from these locales. Other findings showed that most were graduates of general public schools and from low income bracket of society, with only one parent earning. The students basically chose PNU for two reasons: low and affordable tuition and high quality and standard of education.

* This is a college-wide research made possible through the Office of the CLLL Dean and the CLLL Research Unit, with the assistance of the department heads of English, Filipino, LIS and LBEL and some faculty members of the College.

In a similar study on the Profile of PNU students who graduated with honors Mancao, et al, (2008) found out that the highest number of academic awardees came from the degree holders of Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Secondary Education. Almost half of the awardees finished high school with honors and their mean score of the awardees was at 105. The majority enjoyed some form of scholarship.

The first attempt to profile the majors of undergraduate programs under the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature (CLLL) was the study on CLLL Majors: A Profile SY 2004-2005 (Espiritu, et al, 2005), done as an offshoot of the verticalization scheme in 2002. CLLL through its Research Unit looked into the profile of majors in the undergraduate programs in terms of age, sex, place of origin, reasons for enrolling at PNU and for choosing the area of majorship.

The data used in the study adapted of the student SES profile instrument developed by the Office of the Vice President for Planning, Research and Extension (OVPPRE). The faculty advisers of each section administered the instrument to their respective advisor classes which filled out survey forms. Later on, they were submitted to the Office of the Research Unit for evaluation and analysis. A total of 322 students responded to the study.

Results of the study showed that the majors are predominately female with a ratio of 3:1. The age range of undergraduates is from 16 to 26 years old. Only 2% of them are married. Like the findings in the first year profile (Mancao, 2006; Fetalvero, 2008), the majority of the respondents come from Metro Manila. Tagalog is their dominant language, however, a few speak other vernacular languages like Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Bicol and Waray.

Notably, the top most reasons in selecting PNU are low tuition and high standard of education. For the choice of majorship, the reasons indicated by the respondents were to enhance one's knowledge or ability, employability, interest, and to share one's learning.

Purpose

This present study is aimed at pursuing the intent of the college to have a strong data bank of undergraduate majors to subsequently support set policies and decisions, that is, to conduct researches that will aid decisions made.

Hopefully, more dimensions of students profile will be explored. Specifically, the study dealt with the following objectives:

1. Determine the socio and linguistic demographics of the majors in terms of :
 - 1.1 Age
 - 1.2 Gender
 - 1.3 Civil Status
 - 1.4 Languages Spoken
 - 1.5 High School Graduate
 - 1.6 Parents's Educational Attainment
 - 1.7 Family Income
 - 1.8 Source of funds for studying
2. Determine the reasons for selecting majorship
3. Identify the benefits gained from the majorship
4. Identify areas in the majorship perceived to be strong or weak
5. Determine the level of satisfaction in the majorship.

Methodology

Using the descriptive survey, the research explored quantitative and qualitative means in data gathering.

Respondents

The respondents of the study were CLLL majors under its undergraduate programs in English, Filipino, Library and Information Science and Literature. In particular the Reading and Literacy Department is excluded in this study, because it lacks majors in its academic program. All the respondents passed the Philippine Normal University Admission Test (PNUAT) and the oral and written examinations given by the English, Filipino, LBEL and LIS departments. A total of 361 students from four different majors across year level were surveyed in this study, all enrolled in the Second Semester of SY 2009-2010.

Instrument

The instrument used a-four component survey questionnaire that looks into the respondents' personal data, majorship, specialization and the general views of the respondents on the programs. For the first component, it deals with the respondents' personal data such as age, gender, major, year and section, civil status, number of brothers and sisters, languages spoken at home, high school graduated from, parents' educational attainment, parents' combined income, and sources of funds for studying.

With the second component, the focus is on the majorship of the respondents, hence, the component reveals the reasons for the choice of majorship, benefits derived from the selection of majorship, rate of satisfaction, and assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the academic programs. The third component explores the specialization of the respondents, while the last

component on the qualitative aspect of the questionnaire explores the respondents' general comments of the academic program and their experiences in the College.

The preparation of the instrument went through a process. First, a college-wide workshop was conducted among the faculty from all departments to draft their own instrument. The objective was to identify all variables to describe the majors. Second, the instruments produced in the workshop was evaluated and analyzed by the research coordinator to create one general instrument for the entire college. The new instrument was also derived from the Mancao, 2006 and Fetalvero, 2008 studies. Third, the newly created instrument was then presented to the College Dean and Department Heads for further refinement. Finally, the final copy was analyzed and evaluated by the College Dean and the Research Coordinator before distributing to the respondents.

The survey instrument was given to some faculty members for distribution to the respondents. For LBEL, Dr. Cecilia Mendiola administered the instruments to literature majors; for LIS, Dr. Linda Tayona, for Filipino, Prof. Pat. Villafuerte, and for English, Profs Rosarito Suatengco and Connie Raymundo.

Statistical Treatment

To address the objectives of the study, some statistical tools were applied such as frequency, mean, and ranking. The frequency was used to determine the number of times a response occurred. This helped in providing a general picture of the respondents, while the means helped in getting the average of the responses

Results and Discussion

Personal Data

Below are the results, analysis and discussion of the data gathered. The arrangement is based on the objectives presented earlier.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of CLLL Majors Personal Information

Major	Age	Gender				Civil Status			
	Average	Male	%	Female	%	Single	%	Married	%
English	19.25	39	24	123	76	152	94	2	2
Filipino	19.4	16	17	79	83	92	97	3	3
Literature	18.6	13	16	98	84	79	98	2	2
LIS	19.5	4	17	19	83	22	96	1	4

* N =162 for English; N=95 for Filipino; N=81 for Literature; and N=23 for LIS

As expected, the majority of the students are single, however, there are still a few (7 or 4%) among the English majors who did not indicate their civil status. The average age is 19, common to most majors except for the Literature majors with an average of 18.6. This can be accounted by the fact that there are few literature majors in the fourth year compared to the second year and third year. The AB/BSE program in Literature is only on its fourth year of implementation. Furthermore, the fourth year Literature majors are the first batch of majors under the AB/BSE academic program. Similar to the general profile of freshmen of PNU students (Mancao,2006; Fetalvero,2008). Most of the majors are females, although the English program has attracted the most number of male majors with 39 students or 24% of the total number of English majors.

Among the four academic programs under CLLL, it is the English program that has the highest number of majors with 162 compared with 95 for Filipino majors, 81 for Literature and 23 for

Library Science. The popularity or appeal of the majorship may be explained by the ever growing demand of the market for English majors employed in various industries as teachers, language trainers, communication personnel, and call center agents. The least number of majors, however, falls under the LIS program with only 23 majors far less compared with the three other majors. This finding may be attributed to the viability of the program as far as employment is concerned.

Table 2. Mean Scores and Average Siblings in the Family

Major	Brothers	Sisters	Total
English	1.2	1.4	1.2
Filipino	1.0	1.4	1.0
Literature	1.5	1.0	1.5
LIS	1.5	1.4	1.5

** N =162 for English; N=95 for Filipino; N=81 for Literature; and N=23 for LIS*

The table above presents the number of siblings of CLLL undergraduate majors.

It shows that the CLLL majors have more sisters than brothers with 469 brothers and 480 sisters, but on the average, most of the majors have only one or two brothers and one or two sisters. The average number of siblings is at 3.0 which holds true for English, Literature and LIS majors. The lowest average is 2.4 for Filipino majors which means that there are only 2 or 3 children in the family of an English major which is less compared with other majors with four or five siblings. Similarly, the figure is comparative to the PNU average of 3.66 children in a family (Fetalvero, 2008).

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of the Language(s) Spoken at Home by CLLL Majors

Major	Filipino		English		Others	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
English	157	97	100	62	37	22
Filipino	90	95	72	76	17	17
Literature	81	100	65	80	34	41
LIS	22	96	14	60	8	34

From the table presented above it shows that Filipino is still the dominant language spoken at home regardless of majorship, as supported by the fact that most of the students have Filipino as their L1. Notably, English is also a preferred language at home by the majority of the CLLL majors. However, it can be observed that more Literature majors speak English at home than the English majors; 80% for the Literature majors as compared to 62 % for the English majors. However, it was not part of the study to determine the extent of use of these languages at home. Aside from Filipino and English, the CLLL majors also speak other languages at home- Hiligaynon, Bicol, Cebuano, Kapampangan, Ilonggo. This finding reflects the linguistic background as well as regional membership of the CLLL majors. A few spoke Korean at home, due to the fact that some Korean nationals are currently enrolled in the English program of the College.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of the type of High School where CLLL majors graduated

Major	General Public School		Special Public School		Private Non-Sectarian		Private Sectarian	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
English	106	65	12	7	22	13	15	9
Filipino	57	60	23	24	7	7	8	8
Literature	53	65	16	19	5	6	6	7
LIS	13	56	3	13	5	21	2	8

The majority of the English majors graduated from a general public high school (106) or 65% of the total number of majors. This is followed by those who graduated from private non-sectarian school or non-exclusive school. Only 15 or 9 % came from the private sectarian institutions, most of them are Catholic schools.

For the Filipino majors, the same scenario as that of the English majors is evident - 60% of them graduated from a public high school. However, a bigger number came from a special public high school, with a total of 23 or 24 %. For the students who graduated from private non-sectarian and sectarian high schools, their number almost remains equal, 7 and 8 students respectively.

Such finding is comparable with the general data on PNU freshmen during the past five years indicating that PNU mostly attracts high school students from general public high schools. Only very few came from private schools especially a private-sectarian or exclusive schools. Also such findings resemble those on the first CLLL majors profile in 2002 (Espiritu, 2002) indicating that most of the majors were public high school graduates. However, this study did not determine the academic standing of these majors in high school regardless of the type of high school they came from.

Table 5. Parents' Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	English				Filipino				Literature				LIS			
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Post Graduate	17	10	15	9	5	5	11	11	2	4	3	4	2	8	0	0
Coll Graduate	56	34	43	26	37	38	34	35	32	37	30	37	5	21	9	39
Vocational	16	9	22	1	10	10	15	15	13	8	7	8	3	13	0	0
High School	48	29	50	30	22	23	15	15	17	28	23	28	10	43	10	43
Elementary Graduate	13	8	17	10	5	5	8	8	4	7	6	7	2	8	2	2
Others	7	4	10	6	12	12	8	8	10	13	11	13	2	8	0	0

On the majors' parents' educational attainment, the table above yields that across majorship, very few parents finished a degree in the graduate program. The English majors have more male parents who have a post graduate degree, while the Filipino and Literature majors have more female parents with post graduate degree. The figure further shows that only around 10% of the parents across academic programs have post graduate degrees.

The majority of the students' parents – both father and mother (representing all disciplines) are college graduates; however, the figures still show that these data would not account for at least 40% of the majors; that is, still many of the parents did not complete a bachelors' degree.

Some students noted that their parents reached the tertiary level, but were not able to complete their bachelors' program. Some parents reached only first year, while others the second and third year levels. Not far off are the figures indicating that many of the students' parents are high school graduates. Furthermore, most of these high school graduates are the female parents (30% for English; 15 % for Filipino; 28 % for Literature and 43% for LIS). A number of parents only finished elementary schooling, while some students indicated that their parents only reached the intermediate years (grade four onwards).

Table 6. Distribution of the Respondents' Parents' Combined Income

Major	Income 1		Income 2		Income 3		Mean Income	Rank
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
English	17	10	43	26	64	39	2.3	4
Filipino	18	18	25	26	30	31	2.1	2
Literature	13	16	23	28	31	38	2.2	3
Library Science	4	17	7	30	5	21	2.0	1

The table above shows the combined income of parents of the majors. Income 1 means that the monthly combined income is PhP 30,000 and above, income 2, PhP 20,000 and above, and income 3, PhP 10,000.

For families of English majors, the majority have a combined income of 10,000 monthly (64 or 39%). Only 10 percent of these families have a combined income of PhP 30,000 monthly. Such finding is also observable among the families of other majors to show that most of the families belong to the lower bracket of society based on the monthly income. Less than 20 % of the families across discipline have a monthly income of PhP 30,000 and above. Such is still considered measly since many of the families have seven members with five children. Based on the cost of living and cost of education, the income of families may not be sufficient to send four (4) children to school, more so in tertiary schools. Hence, it was revealed in the students's responses that many of them utilized various means to finance their college education, as shown in table 7.

Table 7. Source of Funds for Studying

Majorship	Scholarship		Parents		Self-Supporting		Others	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
English	9	5	96	61	3	2	47	30
Filipino	6	6	58	63	3	3	25	27
Literature	8	10	45	56	1	1	26	32
Library Science	3	13	11	47	2	8	7	30

In the table above, the majors have varied sources of funds for their studies. Even though the majority get the funds for their studies from their parents (61% for English, 63% for Filipino, 56% for Literature and 47% for Library Science), many are able to utilize other sources such as scholarships, parttime work, and

student assistance. Some also manage to combine various funds sources to finance their schooling, like scholarship and support from parents, support of a sister and parttime work, among others.

This scenario would account for two things: first, most of the parents of majors could not afford to send their children to PNU from their own earnings alone; and second, the students showed a strong drive to finish a bachelors' program. Likewise, it cannot be denied that these students are resourceful enough to be able to identify potential sources of funds. The data also reveal that only a few enjoy a scholarship program and much fewer majors support themselves to finish school.

Table 8.1 Frequency Distribution on the Type of Occupation of Male Parent of the CLLL Majors

Major	Professional		Non-Professional		Others		Not indicated	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
English	29	17	72	44	43	26	18	11
Filipino	36	37	38	40	7	7	14	14
Literature	26	32	32	39	1	1	23	28
Library Science	2	8	14	60	2	8	5	21

The occupation of parents is categorized based on its nature, a white collar or a blue collar job. For those answers that did not fall under in any of the two categories, they were marked under a separate category-others. As shown in table 8.1, most of the occupation of male parents across majorship falls under non-professional, with the English majors accounting for 44 %, 40 % for Filipino majors, 39% for Literature majors and the highest is at 60% for the Library Science majors.

For the occupation under professional category, the highest is posted at 37% for the Filipino majors to show they have more male professional parents, when compared with other majors. Such is followed by Literature majors at 32%, while the lowest is the Library Science majors with only 8%

The occupations under professional category vary – they range from pharmacy, engineering, banking to forestry, shipmate, and business among others. Some mentioned their parents are supervisors or managers of small-scale firms.

For non-professional, the occupations cited are professional driving, clerical jobs, construction works, among others. For others, the respondents stated that their parents are self-employed or tending a sari-sari store. Other also claimed that they their fathers were already deceased, while some did not provide any information at all about this question, as reflected in the non-indicated column.

Table 8.2 Frequency Distribution on the Type of Occupation of Female Parent of the CLLL Majors

Major	Professional		Non-Professional		Others		Not indicated	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
English	30	18	29	17	84	51	19	11
Filipino	36	37	14	14	35	36	10	10
Literature	27	33	16	19	6	7	32	39
Library Science	2	8	4	17	8	34	5	21

The table above indicates the type of occupation that the female parents of CLLL majors are engaged in. As done in table 8.1, the occupations are classified into three categories- professional, non-professional and others.

Except for Literature majors, the majority of CLLL majors have female parents in the *others* category (English with 51%, Filipino with 36%, Library Science with 34%). This means that majority of the female parents are housewives who are not gainfully employed to indicate that there is only one family member working.

For English majors, the number of female parents with professional and non professional occupations is nearly equal (18% and 17 % respectively). With the Filipino majors, more female parents are professionals than non-professionals (37% and 14 % respectively). The same thing is observable with Literature majors with 33% are professionals and only 19% nonprofessionals. The Library Science majors, meanwhile, have more female parents who are non-professional than professional (17% and 8% respectively).

Interestingly, the occupations under the professional category mostly center on teaching. Many of them are either a high school or elementary teachers, others are principals. For the non-professional category, the occupations include factory worker, among others.

Majorship

The second component on the majorship itself focuses on the reasons for the choice, academic program, benefits gained from the program and the perceived assessment of the weak and strong aspects in the program. Equally, the respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction.

Table 9.1 Distribution of Respondents Based on the Influences for the Choice of Majorship according to English Majors

Reasons for the Choice of Majorship	f	%	Rank
Parental Influence	25	15	3
Teacher Influence	64	39	2
Peer Influence	13	8	5
Personal Choice	114	70	1
Others	24	14	4

The table above shows who or what influenced the English majors in selecting the program they are currently into. It appears that an overwhelming majority of the students selected the program based on their own volition (114 responses or 70%). They had not been influenced by anyone. The second is on teacher influence, equivalent to 64 responses or 39%. Very few mentioned peer influence as the reason for selecting the majorship. For others, they cited the influence of a relative like an aunt or sibling in selecting the program. Moreover, some students marked two reasons in selecting the program, e.g. teacher's influences and personal choice.

Table 9.2 Distribution of Respondents according to their Reasons for the Choice of Filipino as their Major

Reasons for the Choice of Majorship	f	%	Rank
Parental Influence	25	26	3
Teacher Influence	16	16	4
Peer Influence	4	4	5
Personal Choice	30	31	2
Others	31	32	1

The table above shows the distribution of reasons for selecting Filipino as a major. The first in the rank falls under the others category which includes housemate's influence, practicality, and siblings accounting for 31 or 32% of the total responses. Not far off is the personal choice that ranked second with 30 responses or 31 %. The third reason points to parental influence with 25 responses or 26%. And the least influence is peer influence with only 4 responses equivalent to 4%.

Table 9.3 Distribution of Respondents according to their Reasons for the Choice of Literature as their Major

Reasons for the Choice of Majorship	f	%	Rank
Parental Influence	7	8	3
Teacher Influence	13	16	2
Peer Influence	4	4	4
Personal Choice	77	95	1

The table 9.3 tells about what influenced the Literature majors in selecting the academic program. Like other majors, personal choice is still the first choice of the respondents with 77 frequency or 95%, followed by teacher's influence with 13% or 16% and third, parental influence with only 8%. The last is peer influence with only 4 responses or 4 %.

Table 9.4 Distribution of Respondents according to their Reasons for the Choice of Library Science as their Major

Reasons for the Choice of Majorship	f	%	Rank
Parental Influence	4	17	2
Teacher Influence	0	0	0
Peer Influence	2	8	3
Personal Choice	13	56	1
Others	6	4	4

Comparable to other majors, personal choice is the number one response of Library Science majors. That is, selecting an academic program was based on their own decision (13 responses or 56%), followed by parental influence which accounts for 4 responses or 17 %. The teachers of the students had not influenced them in selecting of the academic program. There was also a slight influence of the majors' peers as to program choice.

Overall, personal choice is the primary reason of all the majors for opting a program. This only shows that the majority of the students decide on their own regarding their future careers. There is also a remarkable influence of teachers in the students' selecting majorship. For some students, it was the parents' prodding that got them into the program, for others, the choice of the majorship depended on various influences-parents, teachers, peers, relatives, and siblings.

Table 10.1 Distribution of Respondents According Based on the Benefits Gained from their Selected Majorship under the English Program

Benefits Gained from the Majorship	f-Rank 1	%	f-Rank 2	%	f-Rank 3	%	Mean	Rank
Employability	24	14	26	16	24	14	2.0	3.5
Application of Knowledge and Skills	58	35	47	29	28	29	1.9	2
Share talents and Experiences with others	30	18	30	18	44	27	2.1	5
Broadening of Knowledge	55	33	52	32	30	18	1.8	1
Chances of going abroad	3	2	6	37	15	9	2.5	6
Others	2	1	1	1	2	1	2.0	3.5

The respondents were also asked about the benefits derived from the selected majorship, by ranking the first three. The table above presents that the English majors' responses have a wide range, that is, they identified various benefits derived from the program. Interestingly, employability is not the primary benefit that the majors identified, but the application of knowledge and skills gained from the program (58 responses or 35%), which got the most responses for Rank 1. This was followed by broadening of knowledge (55 responses or 33%), and third share talents and experiences with others (30 responses or 18%).

For rank 2, it is broadening of knowledge (32%) that got the most responses followed by application of knowledge and skills (47), followed by share talents and experiences with others. For the third most important benefit, or rank 3 the English majors again identified application of knowledge and skills (29%), followed by share talents and experiences with others (27%) and broadening of knowledge (18%).

After computing the mean scores for all the benefits mentioned by the English majors, it reveals that the broadening of knowledge is considered by them as the most important gain or benefit from the majorship with a mean of 1.8, followed by application of knowledge and skills with a mean score of 1.9. Note that employability is not considered a top most benefit that can be gained from the majorship. This finding can be accounted for two things: one, the students are not yet employed and most of them are only at the beginning stages of the majorship; second, they are focusing less on the economic aspect of the majorship. The statements below showed what the students' think they can get from the program:

...I am very satisfied with my majorship, because it really helps me by broadening my knowledge...

[Statement 1: Student 150]

...I am satisfied with my majorship because it has helped me develop skills and potentials...

[Statement 2: Student 151]

Table 10.2 Distribution of Respondents Based on the Benefits Gained from the Majorship according to the Filipino Majors

Benefits Gained from the Majorship	f-Rank 1	%	f-Rank 2	%	f-Rank 3	%	Mean	Rank
Employability	33	34	19	20	1	1	1.3	1
Application of Knowledge and Skills	15	15	22	23	1	1	1.6	3
Share talents and Experiences with others	12	12	9	9	4	4	1.7	4
Broadening of Knowledge	30	31	25	26	4	4	1.5	2
Chances of going abroad	4	4	14	14	9	9	2.1	6
Others	1	1	2	2	1	1	2.0	5

The table above presents the rank given by the Filipino majors on the benefits gained from the program. For Rank 1, the Filipino majors considered employability as their primary benefit from the majorship (34%), followed by broadening of knowledge with 31%. What comes next is application of knowledge and skills (15%); not far behind is share talents and experiences with others (12%).

For the second most important benefit gained from the program or Rank 2, broadening of knowledge topped the answer with 26%, followed by application of knowledge (23%) and then employability with 20%.

Based on the mean scores, the overall primary benefit identified by Filipino majors is employability (mean score of 1.3), next is broadening of knowledge (mean score of 1.5), and not far behind is share talents and experiences (mean score of 1.6) as the third top benefit.

... English majorship is tough but it would teach you a lot of knowledge and skills

[Statement 2: Student 1]

Table10.3 Distribution of Respondents according based on the Benefits Gained from their Selected Majorship under the Literature Program

Benefits Gained from the Majorship	f-Rank 1	%	f-Rank 2	%	f-Rank 3	%	Mean	Rank
Employability	13	16	15	18	23	28	2.1	4
Application of Knowledge and Skills	16	19	30	37	16	19	2.0	2.5
Share talents and Experiences with others	14	17	15	18	14	17	2.0	2.5
Broadening of Knowledge	46	56	15	18	5	6	1.3	1
Chances of going abroad	2	2	5	6	5	18	2.5	5

The table above shows the ranking of benefits gained by the Literature majors from the program. They consider broadening of knowledge as the primary benefit (Number 1 response in Rank 1) they can gain (56%), followed by application of knowledge (19%), then share talents and experiences with others and employability with 17% and 16 % respectively.

For the second important benefit gained from the academic program or Rank 2, 37% selected application of knowledge (37%), followed by employability, share talents and experiences and

broadening of knowledge with 15 responses each or 18%. The highest in Rank 3 went to employability with 23 responses or 28% followed by application of knowledge and skills with 16 responses or 19% and one point shy is chances of going abroad with 15 responses or 18%.

Overall, broadening of knowledge is the principal benefit that the Literature majors believe they gained from the program with a mean score of 1.3. Next is both application of knowledge and skill and share talents and experiences with others with a mean score of 2.0. Comes next is employability with a mean score of 2.1. Notably, it was only in this majorship that chances of going abroad was selected by the majors as a benefit gained from the program.

Table 10.4 Distribution of Respondents according based on the Benefits Gained from their Selected Majorship under the Library Science

Benefits Gained from the Majorship	f-Rank 1	%	f-Rank 2	%	f-Rank 3	%	Mean	Rank
Employability	13	56	3	13	1	4	1.2	1
Application of Knowledge and Skills	3	13	3	13	1	4	1.3	2
Share talents and Experiences with others	3	13	2	8	4	17	2.3	4
Broadening of Knowledge	2	8	12	52	4	17	2.1	5
Chances of going abroad	2	8	6	26	9	39	2.4	3

The table above shows the ranking of the benefits gained by the Library Science majors from their majorship. The top benefit for rank 1 is employability with 13 responses or 56%, followed by application of knowledge and skills and share talents and experiences with others with 3 a piece or 13%. For rank 2,

the highest response goes to broadening of knowledge with 12 responses or 52% followed by changes of going abroad with 6 responses or 26%. For rank 3, the highest response is chances of going abroad with 9 responses or 36%.

Overall, the top most benefit that the majors gained from the program is employability with a mean score of 1.2, next is application of knowledge and skills with 1.3 mean score, and third is chances of going abroad with 2.4 mean score.

In comparing the four groups of majors, one notes that the library science majors focused more on the economic benefits that they can derive from the program with employability and chances of going abroad receiving a higher places in the overall ranking. Filipino majors come second, since employability ranked 1 based on the overall mean.

With the English and Literature majors, they focused more on the cognitive benefits derived from the programs. Both majors consider broadening of knowledge as the top most benefit they can obtain from their respective academic programs.

Table 11. Level of Satisfaction in the Academic Program according to Majorship

MAJORSHIP	Weighted Mean	Rank
English	3.39	2
Filipino	3.0	4
Literature	3.44	1
Library Science	3.1	3

The table above shows that satisfaction rating of the majors on the programs did not reach the very satisfactory level of 4.0. This finding holds true to all the CLLL majors. Nevertheless, the satisfaction rating for the academic programs all reached the 3.0 mark which is equivalent to satisfactory. The highest is at 3.44 for the literature majors to show that a higher percentage of literature majors appears very satisfied with their program, as compared with other majors. This is followed by English program with 3.39 level of satisfaction; next is Library Science with a weighted mean of 3.1, and not far behind is the Filipino program with 3.0.

Table 12.1. Distribution of Respondents based on their perceived Assessment of the Strong in the Majorship according to English Majors

Areas Strong in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	113	69	1
Facilities	35	21	6
Instruction	38	23	5
Instructional Materials	42	25	4
Scheduling	55	33	3
Library Resource	30	18	7
Department Assistance	68	41	2
Others	5	3	8

The table above presents the assessment of the English majors on the strong areas in the majorship. The highest goes to faculty with 69% indicating that the strongest component in the majorship; appearing as poor second is the department assistance with only 41% of the respondents indicating it as a strong area in the program. Third goes to scheduling (33%)

followed by instructional materials (25%). At the bottom lie facilities and library resource with 21% and 18 % respectively.

Although, the students considered the faculty the strongest in the program, instruction ranked only 5th with 23% approval. The reasons for this may be found in the statements of some majors indicating that some faculty members are considered to be strong in instruction, while others weak, as shown in the statements below:

...My majorship really helps me a lot in learning and appreciating literature. I salute my professors for being the best and for motivating us with regard to our majorship. Maybe some physical facilities (rooms and equipment) are scarce, but then the method of instruction itself is excellent

[Statement 5: Student 316]

Table 12.2 Distribution of Respondents based on their Assessment of the Strong in the Majorship according to Filipino Majors

Areas Strong in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	78	82	1
Facilities	18	18	5.5
Instruction	66	69	2
Instructional Materials	26	27	4
Scheduling	7	7	7
Library Resource	18	18	5.5
Department Assistance	30	31	3
Others	1	1	8

For the Filipino majors, the majority consider the faculty to be the strongest area (78 responses or 82%), followed by instruction with 66 responses or 69 %. This assessment is

supported by the majors' statements on the quality of faculty and instruction that the department has:

....Karamihan sa mga propesor na nakilala ko na ay pawang kaaya-aya naman ang mga pagtuturo; mayroon lamang iba na nangangailangan pa ng kaunting improvement.

[Statement 6: Student 49]

...Mas magiging maganda ang pagtuturo ng mga propesor kung kumpleto sa kagamitan at pasilidad. Ito rin ang magbibigay daan upang maging mahusay ang mga mag-aaral.

[Statement 7: Student 96]

Next to faculty and instruction is the assistance of the department given to the students (30 responses or 31 %). Instructional materials is ranked fifth, while library resource and facilities tied at 5.5 rank.

Table 12.3. Distribution of Respondents based on their perceived Assessment of the Strong in the Majorship according to Literature Majors

Areas Strong in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	77	95	1
Facilities	66	81	2
Instruction	44	54	3
Instructional Materials	35	43	4
Scheduling	13	16	7
Library Resource	32	39	5
Department Assistance	31	38	6

For Literature majors, a great majority considered the faculty as the strongest component of the program with 77 out of 81 taking a nod, or an equivalent of 95%. Unlike in the other majors where facilities component is at the bottom, the literature majors considered this as the second strongest component in the program. This assessment can be proven by the fact that among all departments, it is the LBEL department that has a complete array of instructional tools and facilities readily available to the students such as TV, DVD, OHP, among others, not to mention fully air-conditioned rooms.

The third strongest component is the instruction posting at 54%, followed by instructional materials at 43%. The least strong areas ranked are department assistance and scheduling with 38% and 16 % respectively, as evidenced in their general comments:

*...Our teacher/professor in literature is very very good!
She's my idol when it comes to literature...*

[Statement : Student 21]

...The efforts of the LBEL department are paying off well. Maintenance of the facilities including rest rooms can be further improved...

[Statement : Student 304]

...I am grateful to belong in a department that I wanted so much ever since I stepped on the threshold of PNU. The faculty members of LBEL department – a home to me – do their job much better than any professors I hope to met. I just want to have a larger "Literature family" in the next year...

[Statement : Student 306]

...We need a fixed schedule of class, we don't want to have a schedule wherein we will go home as late as 7pm...

[Statement : Student 320]

Table 12.4. Distribution of Respondents based on their perceived Assessment of the Strong in the Majorship according to Library Science

Strong Areas in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	22	95	1
Facilities	4	17	7
Instruction	15	65	3
Instructional Materials	11	47	5
Scheduling	12	52	4
Library Resource	5	21	6
Department Assistance	17	73	2

The assessment of the Library Science majors on the strong areas of the majorship showed that the faculty is considered to be the strength of the program with 95% frequency, followed by department assistance at 73% and instruction at 65%. The least strong is the facilities and library resource.

Overall, the strongest component in all the CLLL undergraduate academic programs lies in the faculty. For the second strongest up to the least strong, the responses of the majors varied. Although the faculty is the top most answer, it does not follow that instruction is viewed as the second strongest. For example, despite the faculty appearing as the strongest area considered by the English majors, instruction was a far cry fifth in the ranking. Nevertheless, faculty and instruction took the top first and second position in the ranking for other majorships. It can be inferred that such ranking is strongly influenced by the majors' experience in their own respective program. For example, the area on facilities is second considered in Literature program, but considered as the least strong in other academic program; the same holds true to department assistance and scheduling. This finding shows a need for uniformity as to undertaking innovations

and improvements which need to cut across all the undergraduate programs of CLLL.

...Our College has very good professors, they just need to improve on some areas for the betterment of the whole College.

[Statement 12: Student 26]

...Faculty...are very much competent and even excel in their field. They really are great in terms of instruction. I just hope that the facilities and scheduling will be improved so that the students will benefit so much from the majorship.

[Statement 13: Student 186]

Table 13.1 Distribution of Respondents Based on their Perceived Weak Areas in the Majorship According to English Majors

Weak Areas in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	49	30	5
Facilities	97	59	1
Instruction	7	4	7
Instructional Materials	65	40	4
Scheduling	76	46	2.5
Library Resource	75	46	2.5
Department Assistance	22	13	6

For the English majors, the three weakest areas in the program are: facilities (95 responses or 59 %), scheduling, and library resource. Scheduling and library resource both tied at 2.5 ranking (75 and 76 responses respectively or 46%). It is noteworthy that notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the students consider the faculty as a strong component in the program, many still viewed this area as weak with 49 responses or

30%. Such assessment was further strengthened by the comments made by some majors:

...The English Department needs more facilities that will allow students to use computers and LCD projectors in class which I think is very important for future students of today. ...

[Statement 14: Student 40]

...The English Department needs more teachers and professors and in that case, I hope that the department hires competitive teachers/ professors who can teach or apply their knowledge that they have learned.

[Statement 15: Student 28]

Table 13.2. Distribution of Respondents Based on their perceived Weak Areas in the Majorship according to Filipino Majors

Weak Areas in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	3	3	7
Facilities	9	9	4
Instruction	4	4	5.5
Instructional Materials	11	11	3
Scheduling	38	4	5.5
Library Resource	44	46	1
Department Assistance	14	14	2

The table above reveals the Filipino majors' assessment of what is considered as weak areas in their program. The three weakest areas in the program based on the majors' responses are: library resource (44 responses or 46%), department assistance (14 responses or 14%), and instructional materials (11 responses or 11%). Faculty and instruction are two areas considered as less weak, a finding which only validates the data that identified faculty and instruction as two strong areas

considered by the Filipino majors. These perceptions are further proven by the statements below made by the majors:

...Isang masayang karanasan ang pagiging dalubhasa sa Filipino, mababait at mahuhusay ang mga guro.

[Statement 16: Student 44]

...Sa pangkalahatan, masasabi kong masaya at makabuluhan ang pagmemedyor ng Filipino ngunit nangangailangan pa talaga ito ng mga pagbabago.

[Statement 17: Student 47]

...Masaya ang pagiging Filipino major. Natutulungan kaming maibahagi ang aming kaalaman, talento at kasanayan...

[Statement 18: Student 48]

...Karamihan sa mga propesor na nakilala ko na ay pawang kaaya-aya naman ang mga pagtuturo – mayroon lamang iba na nangangailangan pa ng kaunting improvement...

[Statement 19: Student 49]

...May mga propesor na hindi talaga nagtuturo, maigi puro pagrereport. Ngunit sa pagkalahatan ay masaya ako sa napili kong medyor. Sana mapagbuti pa ang pagtuturo at magkaroon ng sapat na aklat na makakatulong sa pag-aaral ng amga medyor...

[Statement 20: Student 63]

...May ilang propesor sa kolehiyo na hindi mahusay magturo, walang epektibong estratehiya upang makamtan ng bawat mag-aaral, hindi lamang ng ilan ang ganap na pagtuto. Malaking kasiyahan at karangalan na mapabilang sa medyorship na ito. Nakatutuwa dahil gumagawa ang kagawaran lalo na ang Kadipan ng mga programa na makakatulong upang mapaunlad ang pang-akademikong aspekto ng mga medyor. Sa kabuuan masayang maging medyor ng Filipino. ..

[Statement 21 Student 64]

Table 13.3. Distribution of Respondents Based on their Perceived Weak Areas in the Majorship According to Literature Majors

Weak Areas in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	3	3	6.5
Facilities	9	11	5
Instruction	4	4	6.5
Instructional Materials	11	13	4
Scheduling	38	46	2
Library Resource	44	54	1
Department Assistance	14	17	3

The table above shows that that Literature majors consider library resource and scheduling as the two weakest areas in the majorship with 44 responses or 54% and 38 responses or 46% respectively. Although the third weakest component is department assistance, it only posted 14 responses or 17% which means only a few of the majors consider this area weak. Similar to other majors, faculty is considered least weak posting only 3 responses or 3%.

...We need a fixed schedule of class, we don't want to have a schedule wherein we will go home as late as 7pm...

[Statement 22: Student 320]

Table 13.4 Distribution of Respondents Based on their Perceived Weak Areas in the Majorship According to Library Science Majors

Weak Areas in the Majorship	f	%	Rank
Faculty	3	13	5.5
Facilities	18	78	1
Instruction	4	17	4
Instructional Materials	9	39	3
Scheduling	3	13	5.5
Library Resource	16	69	2
Department Assistance	3	13	5.5

For the Library Science majors, facilities were considered as the weakest component of the program with 18 responses or 78%, followed by library resource with 16 responses or 69%, then instructional materials with 9 responses or 39%. Although the identified three weakest areas in the program resemble those identified by other majors, it is notable that LIS majors have given primary concern to these three integral areas in their own program, being involved in library work.

...The faculty provides good instructional materials to the students. They are very kind and supportive.

[Statement 23: Student 257]

Overall, the area on facilities is still considered as the weakest component. In the study of Fetalvero (2008), and Mancao (2006) these identified areas need the most innovation and improvements. Let some majors speak for themselves:

...The College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature must help our department in terms of additional resources, like books and other materials, some equipment and facilities for conducive learning...

[Statement 24: Student 4]

...May the Lord bless CLLL with more instructional materials and library resources...

[Statement 26: Student 5]

Table 14. Frequency Distribution of Respondents according to their Choice of Majorship

Majorship	First		Second	
	f	%	f	%
English	100	61	62	38
Filipino	84	88	11	11
Literature	59	72	22	27
LIS	11	47	12	52

The table above indicates whether the academic program that the majors are enrolled in is their first choice or second choice. Except for the LIS majors, it appears that an overwhelming number of the majors have their academic program as their first choice, with Filipino majors posting highest at 84 responses or 88 %, 59 responses or 72% for Literature majors and 100 responses or 61% for English majors. Not far behind is the LIS with 11 responses or 47% of the majors saying that the program they are currently enrolled in their first choice.

The majority of the LIS majors indicated that the program they are enrolled in is their second choice. Only 11% of Filipino majors consider their program as their second choice, 27% for Literature majors and 38 % for English majors. Other choices of CLLL majors included Psychology, History, Biology, Journalism and other programs in the college.

Table 15. Frequency Distribution of Respondents Based on the Number enrolled in a Specialization

Majorship	f	%	Rank
English	65	40	1
Filipino	19	20	2
Literature	7	8	3.5
LIS	2	8	3.5

The table above indicates the number of majors who are enrolled in a specialization program. English gets the lion share of student enrollees (65 or 40%). The rest are enrolled in Reading Specialization, while others in CWA, SPED, Early Childhood, and Mathematics. Asked why they decided to enroll in the chosen specializations, many said that these served as reinforcement of their current program, if not help them get a better work or advance their future career.

Implications

Empirically, the findings of the study inform the CLLL management on the aspects of the program that need to be revisited to ensure guaranteed client satisfaction. The study also strengthens the notion that the faculty is still the greatest academic strength of the College; however, the realities presented through the study challenge the CLLL community, especially the faculty, to constantly innovate and upgrade themselves. Undeniably, based on the findings, the students remain critical of the academic environment as well as their experiences; therefore, the research provides an opportunity for the CLLL management to constantly reexamine its goals, values and priorities to ensure that all areas necessary to achieve excellence are dealt with properly.

Be that as it may, the study reinforces the notion that constant, intensive and extensive research undertakings are necessary to ensure continuous development of the students as well as the College in all areas of academic undertakings. Hence, studies that deal with the language development of students are most welcome for that matter.

References

- Fetalvero, Lucilla (2008). Profile of PNU College Freshmen, School Year 2007-2008. Research Series Vol. 96, CREDE, PNU
- Mancao, Maria Carmela, Zulieta, Noemi and Barribal, Ma. Allen (2008) Profile of Academic Awardees Sy 2007-2008. Research Series No. 100. CREDE, PNU
- Mancao (2006)). Profile of PNU College Freshmen, School Year 2006-2007. Research Series Vol. 96, CREDE, PNU

Research Project Staff

Chief Researcher/Writer:	Rosarito Tatel-Suatengco, <i>CLLL Research Coordinator</i>
Technical Experts:	Dr. Ma. Antoinette Montealegre Dr. Linda Tayona Prof. Patrocinio Villafuerte Prof. Alice Karaan Dr. Mila Arias
Data Gathering and Instrument Preparation Team	Dr. Cecilia Mendiola Prof. Connie Raymundo Faculty members of LBEL, English
Consultant	Dr. Lydia Liwanag <i>CLLL Dean</i>
Editor	Dr. Venancio L. Mendiola