

A Comparative Analysis of Literature and Language Competency of Pre-Service Teachers on Integrative Review in English Majorship for Licensure Examination of Teachers

Marko L. Aratea

Gordon College, Olongapo City

Corresponding Author: Marko L. Aratea arateamarko@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Review Session, Tertiary Education, English Majorship, Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), Language Competency, Literature Competency

Received : 18 November

Revised : 21 December

Accepted: 27 January

©2025 Aratea: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

After graduation, an English pre-service teacher will have to take the Licensure Examination for Teachers. Having a review session is helpful to prepare students with all the knowledge taught to them during their tertiary education. This study sought to compare the two majorship review sessions conducted in Gordon College for the integration course of the English pre-service teachers. The study used experimental research design, wherein mean distribution was utilized to identify average scores and paired sample t-test to know the significant difference. The study found that the two review session, both in language and literature competencies, is effective as the pre-service teachers progressed from Developing Proficient to Proficient. This implies sustaining and enhancing the in-house review course of the institution

INTRODUCTION

The proficiency in literature and language competency is crucial for English majors aiming to excel in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). As educational systems evolve, the integration of these competencies within English major programs has become a focal point of academic research and pedagogical reforms (Bunch, 2013). The integration of literature and language competency not only enhances the linguistic and analytical skills of future educators but also equips them with the necessary tools to foster a comprehensive understanding of English among their students (Affendi & Aziz, 2020).

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in comparative analyses of educational programs to determine the most effective methods for integrating literature and language competency (Lasagabaster, 2008). Such analyses provide valuable insights into the best practices and highlight areas requiring improvement. This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of the integrative review sessions of the English major students, both in literature and language courses, and how does the approach and conduct of the integration sessions may affect the students' scores, focusing on their impact on the preparedness of graduates for the LET.

Existing literature suggests that institutions with a well-structured integrative review approach tend to produce graduates with higher pass rates in the LET. However, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that compare these practices across various educational contexts. By filling this gap, this research seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on effective pedagogical strategies for English majors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The efficacy of English majorship in preparing candidates for licensure examinations for teachers is a crucial area of study. This review examines literature on the comparative analysis of literature and language competency, focusing on how these competencies influence the performance of prospective teachers in licensure examinations.

Literature Competency in English Majorship

Literature competency is foundational in the English majorship integration sessions, providing students with critical thinking skills and a deep understanding of cultural and historical contexts. According to Johnson (2020), literature courses enhance students' analytical abilities, which are essential for interpreting complex texts in licensure examinations.

Language Competency in English Majorship

Language competency, encompassing grammar, syntax, linguistics and effective communication, is another vital aspect of the English majorship integration sessions. Research by White (2018) indicates that a strong grasp of language mechanics is directly correlated with higher performance in licensure exams. Effective language instruction prepares candidates to teach complex linguistic concepts to their future students, ensuring they meet educational standards (Smith and Roberts, 2020).

Literature and Language Competency

Studies comparing literature and language competencies suggest a balanced approach is most effective. Jones and Carter (2022) argue that integrating literature and language studies creates well-rounded candidates who excel in both the analytical and practical components of licensure exams. Furthermore, integrated programs have shown higher pass rates in licensure exams compared to those focusing solely on one aspect (Lee & Kim, 2020).

Despite the advantages of a balanced curriculum, several challenges remain. Limited resources and varying quality of instruction can impede the development of these competencies (Roberts, 2019). To address these issues, Roberts (2019) recommends comprehensive teacher training programs and continuous professional development to ensure educators can effectively teach both literature and language.

Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the respondents in the LET literature competency scores of the integrative review session.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the respondents in the LET language competency scores of the integrative review session.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The researcher used a quantitative type of research. Quantitative research involves collecting and analyzing numerical data to identify patterns, determine averages, test causal relationships, and generalize findings to broader populations (Bhandri, 2020).

An experimental research design was used by the researcher. Cherry (2023) stated that experimental research design involves conducting experiments to compare the effectiveness of different strategies under controlled conditions. This method is useful for determining causality.

In each competency, the students were evaluated using the pretest adopted from Lorimar LET English Book 1 before the conduct of the review sessions. After that, the post-test was conducted to evaluate the outcome of the in-house review sessions and compare the competencies of the pre-service teachers in both language and literature courses.

Respondents

The respondents of the study are the forty-five (45) English Pre-Service Teachers of Gordon College which are the 4th year students of the said program. They were chosen because the researcher is currently teaching them as their Integration Instructor and also to make sure that no student was left behind as the content of the review sessions remains aligned with the learning competency.

Table 1 presented the frequency and percentage distribution of the English Pre-Service Teachers of Gordon College. It presented that the 45 respondents consist of 11 (24.44%) male and 34 (75.56%) female pre-service teachers of English. The table also presents that the greatest number of respondents are female whilst the male had the least.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents according to Sex

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	11	24.44%
Female	34	75.56%
	45	100%

Instrument

This study utilized an assessment form adopted from Lorimar LET English Book 1 as an assessment tool that served as the pretest and posttest questionnaires of the students. The content of the assessment tool was modals, focused in the literature competency including the masterworks and language competency which involves linguistics and grammar competence. The questionnaire was used to measure the proficiency level of the respondents on both areas.

Data Collection Procedure

A step-by-step plan was drawn by the researcher on how to disseminate the assessment tool to be used by the respondents, collect raw data, and transform them into meaningful information. First, the researcher distributed a 50-item multiple choice assessment tool that was given to the respondents as their pretest. After that, the researcher invites a review master who conducts an in-house review session for the literature competency before giving the posttest. On the next integration session, the researcher distributed a 50-item multiple choice assessment for the pretest again. Soon after, the researcher conducts the review session for language competency before giving the posttest to the respondents. The researcher used different questions for the pretest and posttest in both language and literature competencies with the same level of difficulty. Subsequently, the pretest and posttest were analyzed if both show a significant difference and compare it. This indicated the result if there was an improvement in the respondent's language and literature proficiency and what area of competency does the respondents progressed more

Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that NO student was forced to do an activity and answer the assessment if he/she is uncomfortable participating. Second, NO collections were made for the instruments used and for the research study itself. Third, Integration sessions were the only class schedule used for the purpose of research. Lastly, materials and other expenses was shouldered by the researchers alone.

Data Analysis

The data collected were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using Microsoft Excel and Jamovi software with the guidance of a statistics expert. On the other hand, to identify the proficiency level of the respondents in terms of their pretest and post-test, the researcher used mean distribution to know the average score of the English pre-service teachers and was analyzed using a 10-point scale. For the comparative analysis of both area of competency, the researcher used a paired sample t-test using Jamovi software to indicate if there is a significant difference between the proficiency levels of the English pre-service teachers in language and literature LET competencies.

Table 2. Language and Literature Proficiency Level Indicator

Score	Verbal Interpretation
0 – 10	Non-Proficient
11 – 20	Beginner
21 – 30	Developing Proficient
31 – 40	Proficient
41 – 50	Advanced Proficient

RESULT

After obtaining the data, it indicated the following results that shows the comparison of both scores in language competency and literature competency of the in-house LET English majorship review sessions.

Table 3. Pretest Score of the English Pre-Service Teachers in Literature and Language Competency

Test	Mean Score	Verbal Interpretation
Literature	30.4	Developing Proficient
Language	29.91	Developing Proficient

The mean ditribution conducted resulted to indicate the proficiency level of the respondents before the review session. From the table above, it can be concluded that the respondents in both LET competencies, language and literature, are developing proficient with 30.4 and 29.91 mean score, respectively, during the pretest. This demonstrates that the respondents have already the

knowledge and proficiency in both competencies but needs more enhancement to be developed.

Table 4. Post-Test Score of the English Pre-Service Teachers in Literature and Language Competency

Test	Mean Score	Verbal Interpretation
Literature	31.67	Proficient
Language	32.53	Proficient

The mean distribution done indicated the proficiency level of the English pre-service teachers after the review session. It can be concluded in the table 4 that the respondents became proficient after the integrative review session in both literature and language with 31.67 and 32.53 mean score, respectively, during the post-test. This indicates that the respondents scored higher in the language competency than in literature competency.

Table 5. Paired Sample T-Test Results of Pretest and Post-Test Scores of Learners in Literature Competency

Literature Competency	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	df	p	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Pretest	45	30.4	4.24	-	44.0	0.047	Reject the null hypothesis	There is a significant difference
Post-test	45	31.7	3.16	2.04				

Note: *p < .05

The paired sample t-test indicated the progress of the respondents in the literature competency. Table 5 shows that the respondents progressed after the review session from 30.4 to 31.7, with the p-value of 0.047, which means that there is a significant difference between their pretest and posttest scores.

Table 6. Paired Sample T-Test Results of Pretest and Post-Test Scores of Learners in Language Competency

Language Competency	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	df	p	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Pretest	45	29.9	5.37	-	44.0	<.001	Reject the null hypothesis	There is a significant difference
Post-test	45	32.5	4.84	4.80				

Note: *p < .05

The paired sample t-test highlighted the respondents' improvement in language competency. As shown in Table 6, their scores increased from 30.4 to 31.7 after the review session, with a p-value of 0.047, indicating a significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores.

Table 7. Comparative Paired Sample T-Test Results of Pretest and Posttest Scores of Learners in Literature and Language LET competencies

Competency	N	Mean	SD	statistic	df	p	Decision
Literature							
Pretest	45	30.4	4.24	-2.04	44.0	0.047	Reject Ho
Posttest	45	31.7	3.16	-2.04	44.0	0.047	Reject Ho
Language							
Pretest	45	29.9	5.37	-4.80	44.0	<.001	Reject Ho
Posttest	45	32.5	4.84	-4.80	44.0	<.001	Reject Ho

The comparative paired sample t-test was conducted in order to show which competency does the respondents progressed more. It can be inferred that the respondents improved higher in the language competency from 29.9 to 32.5 than in literature competency which is from 30.4 to 31.7. Thus, the review session for language competency is more effective than in the literature competency.

DISCUSSION

The Proficiency Level of the English Pre-Service Teachers before the Integrative Review Session

The findings from Table 3 indicate that English pre-service teachers have an average score of 30.4 in literature competency and 29.91 in language competency, placing them at the developing proficient level in both areas. The slightly higher score in literature competency, with a 0.49 difference, suggests a modestly better performance in this area compared to language competency. This observation aligns with recent studies that have explored similar trends in pre-service teacher competencies.

For instance, Miller (2022) found that pre-service teachers often exhibit higher proficiency in literature due to more extensive exposure to literary analysis in their coursework compared to language mechanics. Similarly, a study by Lee and Kim (2019) demonstrated that literature courses tend to engage students in deeper critical thinking and analytical skills, which may explain the higher scores in literature competency.

Moreover, Johnson (2020) reported that while language proficiency is crucial, it often requires more targeted pedagogical strategies to improve, given its complex nature involving grammar, syntax, and usage. This finding is supported by Rodriguez and Thompson (2021), who emphasized the need for more focused language instruction in teacher education programs to bridge this gap.

In a more recent study, Nguyen and Tran (2022) highlighted that pre-service teachers' literature competency benefits from a variety of instructional methods that promote interpretative skills and cultural understanding. Additionally, research by Martinez and Sanchez (2023) underscored the importance of balanced instruction in both literature and language to ensure comprehensive competency development.

These findings suggest that while English pre-service teachers demonstrate a slightly higher competency in literature, there is a clear need for enhanced instructional strategies in language proficiency to ensure well-rounded development.

The Proficiency Level of the English Pre-Service Teachers

Table 4 presents that the English pre-service teachers obtained a mean score of 31.67 in literature competency, while they achieved 32.53 in language competency in LET majorship. This means that the respondents became proficient in both competencies in LET. It can be observed that the respondents got a higher score in language than in literature competency, with a difference of 0.86.

Miller (2022) found that targeted instructional strategies and practice in language competency significantly enhance language proficiency, leading to higher competency scores. Lee and Kim (2019) noted that pre-service teachers who engage in intensive language training tend to perform better in language-related assessments due to the structured and practical nature of language courses.

Martinez and Sanchez (2020) emphasized that comprehensive language instruction, including grammar, syntax, and usage, plays a crucial role in achieving proficiency, which aligns with the observed higher scores in language competency. Additionally, Rodriguez and Thompson (2021) highlighted the importance of integrating language practice with teaching methodologies to strengthen overall language skills.

Nguyen and Tran (2022) found that a balanced approach to teaching both literature and language is essential for developing well-rounded competencies. Their study showed that when pre-service teachers receive equal emphasis on interpretative skills in literature and practical language use, their proficiency in both areas improves significantly.

Martinez and Sanchez (2023) pointed out that while literature competency is crucial for developing critical thinking and cultural understanding, language competency often requires more direct and structured teaching approaches to achieve higher proficiency levels.

These studies collectively suggest that English pre-service teachers' higher scores in language competency reflect the effectiveness of targeted language instruction and practice, while their proficiency in literature remains strong due to the prior knowledge that they have gained from their program.

The Progress in the Literature Competency of the English Pre-Service Teachers

Table 5 indicates the paired sample t-test results from the adopted assessment tool used by the researcher to observe if there will be differences in the English LET competency of the respondents, particularly in the literature competency. The results revealed that the scores before the integration review session ($M = 30.4$, $SD = 4.24$) were significantly higher compared to the scores obtained after ($M = 31.7$, $SD = 3.16$), $t(45) = -2.04$, $p = 0.047$. In addition, the computed p-value (0.047) of the study is lower than the alpha level of significance set at .05; thus, there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores based on the assessment tool used to measure the level of proficiency of the respondents in Literature. This suggests that the integration review session

was deemed to be helpful for the English pre-service teachers and effective in improving their competency in literature.

These results align with previous research suggesting that targeted review sessions can enhance pre-service teachers' subject matter knowledge and competencies (Brown, 2019).

The observed improvement in literature competency may be attributed to several factors. First, structured review sessions provide focused and intensive reinforcement of key concepts, which can help pre-service teachers consolidate their knowledge and address any gaps in understanding. Second, the collaborative and interactive nature of these sessions can enhance engagement and motivation, leading to better learning outcomes (Sharma et al., 2020). Finally, the review sessions likely offered opportunities for feedback and reflection, which are critical components of effective learning and professional development (Cordingley, 2015).

The Progress in the Language Competency of the English Pre-Service Teachers

Table 6 presents the outcomes of a paired sample t-test conducted using the adopted assessment tool to examine potential difference in English LET competency among respondents, specifically focusing on language proficiency. Findings indicated that initial scores ($M = 29.9$, $SD = 5.37$) were notably higher compared to those obtained post-integration review session ($M = 32.5$, $SD = 4.84$), $t(45) = -4.80$, $p < .001$. Moreover, the computed p-value ($< .001$) was lower than the predefined alpha level of .05, signifying a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores based on the assessment tool employed to gauge language proficiency. These results underscore the beneficial impact of the integration review session on enhancing language competency among English pre-service educators.

Several studies have reported similar findings, reinforcing the positive impact of structured review sessions on language competency. For instance, Huang (2019) demonstrated that targeted review sessions significantly enhanced students' language skills, aligning with the current study's findings. Additionally, they found that review sessions contributed to improved test scores in language assessments, corroborating the observed increase in post-test scores in this study.

Moreover, the significant p-value ($< .001$) confirms the efficacy of the intervention, consistent with previous research by Johnson (2020), which emphasized the importance of intervention-based learning strategies in boosting language proficiency. Furthermore, Miller (2022) highlighted the role of review sessions in solidifying language skills, thereby supporting the conclusion that integration review sessions can significantly improve English language competency among pre-service educators.

The Comparative Analysis of Language and Literature Competency Scores of the English Pre-Service Teachers

Table 7 displays the comparative paired sample t-test results of pretest and post-test scores from the assessment tool for English pre-service teachers in both the experimental and control groups. It shows that the p-value for literature competency is 0.047, while for language competency, it is $<.001$, both of which are below the significance threshold of .05. Hence, there is a substantial difference between pretest and post-test scores. Notably, respondents scored lower in language competency (mean score 29.9) than in literature competency (mean score 30.4) during the pretest. However, in the post-test, they scored higher in language competency (mean score 32.5) compared to literature competency (mean score 31.7). This indicates a greater improvement in language competency, with a score increase from 29.9 to 32.5 (difference of 0.86), compared to literature competency, which increased from 30.4 to 31.7 (difference of 0.49). Consequently, English pre-service teachers showed more significant progress in language competency than in literature competency during the LET review session.

These findings suggest that the review sessions were particularly effective in enhancing language competency among English pre-service teachers. This is consistent with previous research which has highlighted the benefits of targeted interventions and review sessions in improving specific academic competencies (Jones & Carter, 2022).

Moreover, the greater improvement in language competency might be attributed to the structure and content of the review sessions, which potentially emphasized language skills more intensively.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the result and discussion of the study, the following were concluded:

1. The English pre-service teachers were at the developing proficient level in both areas, with a slightly higher score in literature competency. The English Pre-Service Teacher have a good foundation of knowledge in literature.
2. Respondents became proficient in both competencies, with a higher score in language competency. The integrative review session was deemed to be effective, especially in honing their language competency.
3. The English pre-service teachers progressed from developing proficient to proficient level in both competencies. This means that the review session was helpful and effective in aiding knowledge in both areas which is needed in the Licensure Examination for Teachers.
4. Review sessions were particularly effective in enhancing language competency, potentially due to the intensive emphasis on language skills during the sessions.

Upon the conclusion, the following were recommended:

1. The program may give emphasis on the language competency apart from the literature competency when it comes to the grammar and linguistic knowledge. By demonstrating a significant improvement in literature competency, this study underscores the importance of incorporating structured review sessions into the curriculum for pre-service teachers.
2. Focus in both competencies are highly encouraged, specifically in literature, during the review sessions. Different strategies may be explored in order to enhance this competency even more.
3. Integration review sessions in English may further be enhanced to progress the English pre-service teachers to advanced proficient level.
4. The integrative review sessions may be sustained in order to help the English pre-service teachers in their preparation for the board examination.

FURTHER STUDY

Future research could explore the long-term impact of such sessions on teaching practice and student outcomes, as well as investigate the effectiveness of similar interventions in other subject areas. The future researchers may also do a qualitative study to know the perceptions of the pre-service teachers about their review sessions in English majorship, focusing on both competencies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher would like to acknowledge and extend their profound gratitude, with heartfelt appreciation, to the following who had supported them in the fulfillment of this study:

To the assessment developer who created the assessment tool that was adopted and used for this study;

To the 45 English pre-service teachers of academic year 2023-2024, for being our respondents, for participating during the review sessions, and for answering the assessment tool with all their knowledge;

To my family, relatives, friends, colleagues, English program coordinator, and other people who, in one way or another, shared their support – morally, financially, and physically. Thank you!;

And above all, to the Great Almighty – the author of knowledge and wisdom – for His countless love and blessings and for giving the researchers strength, guidance, and wisdom every day.

REFERENCES

- Affendi, F. R., & Aziz, A. A. (2020). Systematic review: The challenges and approaches in the teaching of English Literature in enhancing English proficiency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education & Development*, 10(4), 318-336.
- Bhandri, P. (2020). What Is Quantitative Research? Definition, Uses and Methods. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quantitative-research/>
- Brown, A. (2019). Enhancing teacher education through targeted review sessions: Evidence from a pre-service program. *Journal of Educational Research*, 112(3), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1491457>
- Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of research in education*, 37(1), 298-341.
- Cherry, K. (2023). How the Experimental Method Works in Psychology. Verywellmind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-experimental-method-2795175>
- Cordingley, P., Higgins, S., Greany, T., Buckler, N., Coles-Jordan, D., Crisp, B., & Coe, R. (2015). *Developing great teaching: Lessons from the international reviews into effective professional development*.

- Huang, X. (2019). The impact of structured review sessions on language proficiency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(4), 635-645. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000387>
- Johnson, P. (2020). Enhancing language proficiency in teacher education: Strategies and outcomes. *Journal of Educational Development*, 45(3), 234-250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedudev.2020.03.005>
- Jones, M., & Carter, L. (2022). Integrated approaches to literature and language in English majorship. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 29-45.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1(1).
- Lee, J., & Kim, H. (2019). The impact of literary analysis on pre-service teachers' competencies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(4), 356-370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119836653>
- Martinez, J., & Sanchez, P. (2023). Balancing literature and language instruction for comprehensive competency development. *International Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(3), 212-230. <https://doi.org/10.7890/ijte.2023.1834>
- Miller, R. (2022). Enhancing language skills through review sessions: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 72(1), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12411>
- Nguyen, A., & Tran, H. (2022). Developing interpretative skills in pre-service teacher education. *Literature and Language Education Journal*, 51(2), 178-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2022.2037104>
- Roberts, J. (2019). Addressing challenges in teaching literature and language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35, 158-170.
- Rodriguez, S., & Thompson, D. (2021). Bridging the gap in language competency: A pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1874765>
- Sharma, K., Leftheriotis, I., & Giannakos, M. (2020). Utilizing interactive surfaces to enhance learning, collaboration and engagement: Insights from learners' gaze and speech. *Sensors*, 20(7), 1964.

Smith, A., & Roberts, J. (2020). Preparing English majors for teaching: A competency-based approach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(1), 36-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119861662>

White, R. (2018). Correlation between language competency and exam performance. *Journal of Linguistic Education*, 19(2), 89-104.