International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Linguistic and Translation Competence as Predictors of Writing Skills among Language Education Students

John Mark B. Traña[1], Marbeth G. Aringay [2], Mary Christelle Concepcion C. Bienes[3]

Author Information:
[1]*Don Carlos Polytechnic College, Don Carlos, Bukidnon, Philippines*

[2]*Central Mindanao University, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines*

[3]*Kalilangan National High School, Kalilangan Bukidnon, Philippines*

Correspondence:
jtrana@dcpc.edu.ph

Article History:

Date Received: October 8, 2026
Date Revised: October 14, 2026
Date Accepted: October 16, 2026
Date Published: November 06, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0549

Document ID: *2026IJROMS0549*

Recommended Citation:
Traña, J. M. B., Aringay, M. G. & Bienes, M. C. C. C. (2026). Linguistic and Translation Competence as Predictors of Writing Skills among Language Education Students. International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(10), 143-166. https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0549

Abstract. This study examined the relationship and predictive influence of linguistic competence and translation competence on the writing skills of language education students. Specifically, it determined the levels of linguistic competence in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics; translation competence in terms of textual competence, disposition, and monitoring skills; and writing skills in terms of correct grammar, vocabulary and lexical range, coherence and cohesion, and organization and structure. It also examined the significant relationships between linguistic competence and writing skills and between translation competence and writing skills and identified the dimensions that significantly predicted writing skills. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with a predictive component was employed among 250 BSED Major in Filipino students of Don Carlos Polytechnic College selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using a validated research instrument and analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple regression analysis. The findings revealed that the students demonstrated high levels of linguistic competence (M = 3.70), translation competence (M = 3.73), and writing skills (M = 3.68). Linguistic competence demonstrated a strong positive and significant relationship with writing skills ($r = .789$, $p < .001$), while translation competence demonstrated a very strong positive and significant relationship with writing skills ($r = .869$, $p < .001$). The multiple regression model yielded $R = .886$, $R^2 = .785$, and adjusted $R^2 = .776$, indicating that the predictors collectively explained 78.5% of the variance in writing skills. At the individual predictor level, Morphology ($\beta = 2.28$, $p = .045$) and Semantics ($\beta = 2.33$, $p = .043$) significantly predicted writing skills, whereas the other dimensions did not demonstrate significant individual predictive contributions. The study concludes that linguistic and translation competencies are strongly associated with writing skills, with morphological and semantic competence emerging as significant individual predictors within the specified regression model.

Keywords: Linguistic Competence; Translation Competence; Writing Skills; Morphology; Semantics

Introduction

Writing is a fundamental component of language proficiency because it requires learners to transform ideas into coherent, meaningful, and appropriately structured texts. Effective writing involves more than grammatical accuracy; it requires knowledge of linguistic forms, sensitivity to meaning and context, appropriate lexical choices, and the ability to organize ideas logically. For language education students, these competencies are particularly important because their future professional roles require them not only to communicate effectively but also to model appropriate language use for learners.

Linguistic competence provides an essential foundation for effective written communication. It encompasses knowledge and use of the structural and functional dimensions of language, including phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. These dimensions enable learners to select appropriate forms, construct meaningful sentences, interpret meanings, and adjust language according to context. In writing, such knowledge may be reflected in grammatical accuracy, lexical selection, coherence, cohesion, and organization. The present study therefore considers linguistic competence as a multidimensional construct rather than as grammatical knowledge alone.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Translation competence is likewise relevant to the development of writing skills because translation requires learners to understand, interpret, reorganize, and express meaning across languages. Translation competence extends beyond the substitution of words from one language into another. It involves textual understanding, sensitivity to the intended meaning and style of the source text, willingness to engage with translation problems, and the ability to monitor and revise one's translation decisions. The study's conceptualization of translation competence draws particularly on Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring Skills, consistent with the instrument used in the study.

Existing studies provide evidence of relationships among language proficiency, translation, and writing. The literature reviewed in the present study indicates that vocabulary, grammar awareness, organization, and broader linguistic proficiency contribute to students' writing performance. Research on translation has likewise emphasized the importance of textual analysis, critical thinking, metacognitive awareness, and learner disposition in translation-related performance. At the same time, previous findings suggest that linguistic competence alone may not fully explain writing performance. Differences between learners' self-perceptions and actual language performance, limitations in reading proficiency, the effects of translation strategies under time constraints, and the influence of metacognitive and contextual factors indicate that writing development is multidimensional.

These observations point to an important issue in language education: while linguistic competence is commonly regarded as a foundation of writing, translation competence may provide additional cognitive, textual, and metacognitive resources that influence how students construct written texts. Translation requires learners to attend to meaning, textual organization, audience, and communicative purpose. These processes overlap with several demands of academic writing, particularly the organization and development of ideas, appropriate word choice, coherence, and revision.

Despite the relevance of these competencies, empirical research examining linguistic competence and translation competence simultaneously as predictors of writing skills remains limited, particularly within the Philippine language education context. The existing literature has often examined language proficiency, grammar, translation, or writing as separate areas of inquiry. Consequently, there remains a need to determine whether linguistic and translation competence are significantly associated with writing performance and which specific dimensions contribute most strongly to students' writing skills.

This study addresses this gap by examining linguistic competence and translation competence as predictors of writing skills among students enrolled in the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Filipino program at Don Carlos Polytechnic College. Specifically, it determiness the levels of students' linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills; examines the relationships between these variables; and identifies the dimensions that significantly predict writing performance. The study was conducted during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026.

By examining these variables within a language education context, the study seeks to provide empirical evidence that may inform the design of integrated instructional activities in language, translation, and writing. The findings may also contribute to understanding how technical linguistic knowledge, textual competence, learner disposition, and metacognitive monitoring work together in supporting students' writing development.

Research Questions

This study sought to determine the relationship and predictive influence of linguistic competence and translation competence on the writing skills of language education students. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of:
   1.1 Phonology;
   1.2 Morphology;
   1.3 Syntax;
   1.4 Semantics; and
   1.5 Pragmatics?
2. What is the level of translation competence of the students in terms of:
   2.1 Textual Competence;
   2.2 Disposition; and
   2.3 Monitoring Skills?
3. What is the level of writing skills of the students in terms of:
   3.1 Correct Grammar;
   3.2 Vocabulary/Lexical Range;
   3.3 Coherence and Cohesion; and
   3.4 Organization/Structure?
4. Is there a significant relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills?

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

5. Is there a significant relationship between translation competence and writing skills?
6. Which dimensions of linguistic competence and translation competence, singly or in combination, significantly predict the students' writing skills?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study focused on examining linguistic and translation competence as predictors of writing skills among language education students at Don Carlos Polytechnic College. Specifically, it covered students enrolled in the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Filipino program during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. The study involved 250 participants selected from a total population of 287 students through purposive sampling. The study examined three major variables. Linguistic competence was assessed in terms of Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics. Translation competence was examined through Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring Skills. Writing skills, as the dependent variable, were assessed in terms of Correct Grammar, Vocabulary/Lexical Range, Coherence and Cohesion, and Organization/Structure. The study was delimited to determining the perceived levels of these variables, examining their relationships, and identifying which dimensions of linguistic and translation competence significantly predict students' writing skills. Data were gathered through structured questionnaires that were adapted and modified from previously developed instruments and subjected to content validation and pilot testing. The study was limited to students enrolled in the specified language education program and institution during the stated academic period. It did not examine students from other academic programs or institutions. Likewise, the study focused specifically on the identified dimensions of linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills and did not investigate other factors that may influence writing performance, such as reading proficiency, motivation, learning environment, instructional practices, socioeconomic factors, or individual differences, unless these were directly measured in the study. The use of purposive sampling also limits the extent to which the findings may be generalized beyond the participants and institutional context of the study. The findings should therefore be interpreted primarily within the context of language education students at Don Carlos Polytechnic College.

Literature Review

Linguistic Competence

Linguistic competence refers to the ability to understand and use language through knowledge of its structural, semantic, and functional systems. In this study, linguistic competence is examined through phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, which collectively contribute to effective written communication.

Phonology

Phonological competence involves awareness and manipulation of the sound system of a language and is associated with the development of written language. Quessep et al. (2024) likewise emphasized the role of phonological awareness in dictated writing. Grigorakis and Manolitsis (2021) further showed that phonological and morphological awareness contribute to the development of accurate spelling. These findings suggest that phonological knowledge provides an important foundation for representing language accurately in writing.

Morphology

Morphological competence involves understanding the internal structure of words, including roots, affixes, inflections, and derivational patterns. Asaad (2024) found that morphological awareness was significantly related to academic writing and that vocabulary knowledge mediated this relationship. Allen and Lembke (2022) reported positive effects of morphological-awareness instruction on writing outcomes, while Collins et al. (2020) emphasized its contribution to literacy development. Grigorakis and Manolitsis (2021) also demonstrated the importance of morphological awareness in spelling development. More recently, Venoza and Ramos (2026) reported a significant positive relationship between morphological awareness and writing proficiency among Grade 7 students in the Philippines. Collectively, these findings indicate that morphological knowledge supports accurate word formation and written expression.

Syntax

Syntax refers to the organization of words and phrases into grammatically acceptable sentences. Wang et al. (2025) synthesized 109 studies and found positive relationships between syntactic accuracy, syntactic complexity, and writing performance, although the strength of these relationships varied according to learner and task characteristics. Park (2023) identified recurring grammatical errors in the written production of Korean EFL learners. Similarly, Shi et al. (2024) found that grammar and reformulation feedback significantly

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

improved writing accuracy and fluency among EFL college students. These findings indicate that syntactic competence contributes to sentence-level accuracy and overall writing performance.

Semantics

Semantic competence concerns the accurate expression and interpretation of meaning through appropriate linguistic and lexical choices. Asaad (2024) demonstrated that morphological awareness contributes to academic writing partly through vocabulary knowledge. Ait Hammou et al. (2023) found that lexical range and contextually appropriate lexical features were associated with writing proficiency. Raufi et al. (2024) further showed that lexical diversity is related to academic vocabulary use, although lexical diversity alone does not guarantee higher writing quality. Lee (2024) similarly found that lexical density, diversity, and sophistication were associated with stronger argumentative writing. Rambe and Daulay (2025) also reported that semantic-based instruction improved students' sentence construction. These findings suggest that effective writing requires the ability to construct and communicate meaning accurately.

Pragmatics

Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to use language appropriately according to communicative context, purpose, and social relationships. Qin et al. (2024) found that situation, first-language background, and second-language proficiency influenced pragmatic competence in written request emails. Zeng et al. (2022) reported differences in pragmatic competence among Chinese EFL undergraduates' English letter writing. Al-Ibadi (2022) found a positive relationship between pragmatic competence and writing performance among Iraqi EFL university students. Salih and Sahab (2025) further examined pragmatic failure in academic writing, particularly in speech acts, politeness, hedging, and implicature. These studies demonstrate that effective writing requires not only grammatical accuracy but also sensitivity to communicative context.

Translation Competence

Translation competence is a multidimensional ability involving textual processing, strategic decision-making, self-regulation, and evaluation. In the present study, it is operationalized through Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring Skills.

Textual Competence

Textual competence involves the ability to understand, analyze, organize, and reconstruct meaning across source and target texts. Iļinska et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of text analysis and meaning representation in developing textual competence among translation students. Li et al. (2023) likewise demonstrated that translation competence involves multiple cognitive and strategic resources beyond linguistic knowledge. Siregar and Stroupe (2025) emphasized contextual accuracy, idiomatic expression, and cultural meaning in translation learning. These studies suggest that effective translation requires learners to process texts as meaningful and coherent communicative units rather than as isolated words or sentences.

Disposition

Disposition refers to learners' willingness and orientation to engage critically, strategically, and persistently in translation tasks. Li et al. (2023) found that critical thinking, academic self-efficacy, and cultural intelligence were associated with translation technology competence. Siregar and Stroupe (2025) emphasized the importance of metacognitive strategies, self-regulation, and critical reflection in translation learning. Xie and Wang (2025) further established a positive relationship between metacognition and translation competence. These findings suggest that translation competence depends not only on linguistic knowledge but also on learners' cognitive and motivational orientation toward translation tasks.

Monitoring Skills

Monitoring skills involve evaluating translation decisions, identifying problems, and revising the target text. Xie and Wang (2025) found a significant positive relationship between metacognition and translation competence (r = .472) based on a three-level meta-analysis of 23 studies. Dong and Chen (2025) found that professional translators demonstrated more sophisticated metacognitive strategies than graduate translation students. Siregar and Stroupe (2025) likewise emphasized self-regulation and metacognitive awareness in translation learning. Iļinska et al. (2025) also highlighted the importance of continuous text analysis and evaluation in translator training. These findings support monitoring as an important component of translation competence.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Writing Skills

Writing skills involve the ability to produce accurate, meaningful, coherent, and well-organized texts. In this study, writing skills are examined through Correct Grammar, Vocabulary/Lexical Range, Coherence and Cohesion, and Organization/Structure.

Correct Grammar

Correct grammar enables writers to construct accurate sentences and communicate relationships among ideas clearly. Wang et al. (2025) found a positive relationship between syntactic accuracy and writing performance. Park (2023) identified recurring grammatical errors in Korean EFL learners' written production. Rustipa et al. (2023) found that mood analysis and self-correction significantly improved students' grammatical accuracy. Shi et al. (2024) likewise reported significant improvements in writing accuracy following grammar and reformulation feedback. These findings confirm that grammatical accuracy is an important component of effective writing.

Vocabulary/Lexical Range

Vocabulary and lexical range refer to the breadth, diversity, sophistication, and appropriateness of words used in writing. Ait Hammou et al. (2023) found that lexical range and phraseological features distinguished different levels of writing proficiency. Raufi et al. (2024) demonstrated that lexical diversity is related to academic vocabulary use but does not automatically indicate higher-quality writing. Lee (2024) found that lexical density, diversity, and sophistication were associated with better argumentative writing quality. Maamuujav et al. (2021) also found that academic vocabulary use predicted writing quality in text-based analytical essays. These findings establish lexical competence as an important contributor to writing quality.

Coherence and Cohesion

Coherence and cohesion enable writers to connect ideas logically and create unified texts. Siekmann et al. (2022) found that less proficient EFL writers experienced difficulties with text structure and coherence and that these features were related to overall text quality. Palacios Briones et al. (2021) emphasized coherence and cohesion as important indicators of effective writing. Osawa (2025) further demonstrated the relevance of genre-based instruction to text organization and cohesion. These findings indicate that effective writing requires not only accurate sentences but also appropriate connections among ideas and textual units.

Organization/Structure

Organization and structure refer to the logical sequencing and development of ideas within a written text. Siekmann et al. (2022) found that EFL students commonly struggled to maintain a clear main idea and provide appropriate conclusions. Osawa (2025) demonstrated that genre-based instruction can improve text organization and cohesion. Lee (2024) found that rhetorical strategies were associated with the quality of university students' argumentative writing. Palacios Briones et al. (2021) likewise emphasized the importance of textual organization in producing coherent written discourse. These findings establish organization as an essential component of clear, purposeful, and effective writing.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with a predictive component to examine the relationships between linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills among language education students and to determine which dimensions of linguistic and translation competence significantly predicted writing skills. The descriptive component was used to determine the levels of students' linguistic competence in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics; translation competence in terms of textual competence, disposition, and monitoring skills; and writing skills in terms of correct grammar, vocabulary and lexical range, coherence and cohesion, and organization and structure. The correlational component was employed to examine the relationships between linguistic competence and writing skills and between translation competence and writing skills. Meanwhile, multiple linear regression analysis was used to identify the dimensions of linguistic and translation competence that significantly predicted students' writing skills. Prior to conducting the inferential analyses, the assumptions underlying the selected statistical procedures were examined. The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to assess the normality of the relevant variables for correlation analysis and the residuals for multiple regression analysis. The linearity of relationships and the homoscedasticity of regression residuals were evaluated using appropriate diagnostic plots. Multicollinearity among the predictor variables was assessed using variance

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

inflation factors (VIF) and tolerance values, while potentially influential observations were examined through appropriate regression diagnostics. These procedures were intended to establish whether the assumptions required for the planned parametric analyses were reasonably satisfied and to guide the interpretation of the statistical results. The use of this research design was appropriate because the study examined naturally occurring relationships among variables without manipulating the learning environment or assigning participants to experimental conditions. Linguistic competence and translation competence were treated as predictor variables, while writing skills served as the dependent variable. The findings were interpreted in terms of statistical relationships and predictive contributions rather than causal effects.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Don Carlos Polytechnic College (DCPC), Don Carlos, Bukidnon, where the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Filipino program is offered. The institution served as the research locale because it provided the appropriate population for examining linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills among students preparing for professional roles in language education. The research was conducted during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026, consistent with the period identified in the scope and delimitation of the study. The selection of the locale was also relevant to the purpose of the investigation because students in the BSED Filipino program are expected to develop competencies in language use, translation, and written communication as part of their academic and professional preparation. Consequently, the institutional setting provided an appropriate context for examining how linguistic and translation-related competencies are associated with students' writing performance.

Research Participants

The participants of the study were 250 students enrolled in the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Filipino program at Don Carlos Polytechnic College during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. They were selected from a total population of 287 students through purposive sampling. The participants were considered appropriate for the study because their academic program requires sustained engagement with Filipino language, linguistic analysis, translation, and written communication. Their academic experiences therefore provided a relevant context for examining the relationships between linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills. Participation was limited to students belonging to the specified program and academic period. Consistent with the study's delimitation, students from other academic programs and institutions were not included. The restricted participant group also ensured that the study maintained a clearly defined population corresponding to its research objectives.

Research Instrument

Data were collected through structured questionnaires adapted and modified from previously developed instruments. The instruments were subjected to content validation and pilot testing before their administration to the participants to ensure their appropriateness, clarity, and suitability for the study. The research instrument consisted of measures corresponding to the three major variables of the study, namely, linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills. Linguistic competence was assessed across five dimensions: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics. Phonology focused on the participants' knowledge and appropriate use of the sound system and phonological features of language. Morphology concerned the formation and use of words and other meaningful linguistic units, while Syntax focused on the organization of words and phrases into grammatically appropriate structures. Semantics addressed the interpretation and appropriate expression of meaning, whereas Pragmatics concerned the appropriate use and interpretation of language according to context, communicative purpose, and intended meaning. These dimensions reflect the multidimensional conceptualization of linguistic competence adopted in the study, recognizing that linguistic competence extends beyond grammatical knowledge and encompasses structural and functional aspects of language that may be manifested through grammatical accuracy, lexical selection, coherence, cohesion, and organization in written communication. Translation competence was assessed in terms of Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring Skills. Textual Competence referred to the ability to understand, analyze, organize, and appropriately express meaning within and across texts. Disposition referred to the learner's willingness and orientation toward engaging in translation tasks and addressing translation-related problems, while Monitoring Skills referred to the ability to examine, evaluate, and revise translation decisions throughout the translation process. These dimensions were adopted because translation competence extends beyond the direct substitution of words from one language to another. It requires an understanding of source meaning, sensitivity to textual organization and style, appropriate linguistic decision-making, and continuous monitoring and revision of translation choices. Writing skills were assessed in terms of Correct Grammar, Vocabulary/Lexical Range, Coherence and Cohesion, and Organization/Structure. Correct Grammar referred to the appropriate application of grammatical rules and

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

structures in written communication. Vocabulary/Lexical Range focused on the breadth, appropriateness, and effectiveness of word choice. Coherence and Cohesion concerned the logical connection and continuity of ideas and the use of linguistic devices that establish meaningful relationships among parts of a text. Organization/Structure referred to the logical arrangement, development, and overall structuring of ideas in written compositions. These dimensions correspond to the operationalization of writing skills specified in the study's research questions. The internal consistency of the instruments was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. The results yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.895 for Linguistic Competence, 0.879 for Translation Competence, and 0.789 for Writing Skills, indicating high internal consistency among the items within each instrument. These reliability coefficients demonstrate that the instruments provided sufficiently consistent measures of the constructs under investigation and were therefore considered appropriate for use in the actual data collection and subsequent statistical analysis.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researchers first secured the necessary permission to conduct the study among students enrolled in the BSED Filipino program of Don Carlos Polytechnic College. After obtaining the appropriate institutional authorization, the researchers coordinated with the concerned academic personnel and identified the students who met the inclusion criteria. Prior to the actual administration, the research instruments were reviewed through content validation and pilot testing. The purpose of these procedures was to establish the appropriateness, clarity, and relevance of the questionnaire items before they were administered to the actual participants. The manuscript indicates that the instruments were adapted and modified from previously developed measures and underwent content validation and pilot testing. Following the validation process, the finalized instruments were administered to the qualified participants. The researchers provided the participants with appropriate instructions regarding the purpose of the study and the manner of answering the questionnaire. Participants were given sufficient time to complete the instruments, and the researchers ensured that the responses were collected systematically. After retrieval, the accomplished questionnaires were examined for completeness. The responses were then organized, coded, and prepared for statistical analysis. The resulting dataset was analyzed according to the research questions, particularly the determination of the levels of linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills; the examination of relationships among the variables; and the identification of significant predictors of writing skills.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics; and pragmatics?

Table 1. Level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of phonology

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I can relate the sounds of language to correct spelling and writing.	3.79	High	Highly Evident
2. I use intonation to make my message clear.	3.77	High	Highly Evident
3. I can convey the meaning of a word through correct pronunciation.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
4. I can recognize differences in the sounds of similar words.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
5. I understand the role of phonology in effective communication.	3.69	High	Highly Evident
6. I can identify sounds that change the meaning of a word.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
7. I can relate correct pronunciation to the appropriate meaning of a word.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
8. I can correct my pronunciation of borrowed or foreign words.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
9. I apply phonological rules when writing words.	3.59	High	Highly Evident
10. I avoid incorrect pronunciation that may cause confusion.	3.55	High	Highly Evident
11. I know the correct stress placement in each syllable of a word.	3.58	High	Highly Evident
12. I can identify minimal pairs that demonstrate phonemic differences.	3.50	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.65**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

Based on the result, the respondents demonstrated a high level of phonological competence, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.65. This suggests that the students generally possess a good level of awareness and ability in recognizing and applying phonological features in language use, particularly in pronunciation, sound–meaning relationships, intonation, and the connection between spoken and written forms. The high overall rating indicates that phonological competence is generally well-developed among the respondents.

The three highest-rated indicators were “I can relate the sounds of language to correct spelling and writing” (M = 3.79), “I use intonation to make my message clear” (M = 3.77), and “I can convey the meaning

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

of a word through correct pronunciation" (M = 3.74). The highest mean for the relationship between sounds and spelling suggests that the respondents are particularly confident in connecting phonological knowledge with written language. This is important because writing requires learners to represent linguistic forms accurately through written symbols. Meanwhile, the high rating for intonation indicates that the students recognize the role of prosodic features in making messages understandable and meaningful. The third-highest result further indicates that respondents perceive correct pronunciation as important in conveying meaning, suggesting that they are aware of the communicative function of phonological accuracy.

In contrast, the three lowest-rated indicators, although still classified as high, were "I can identify minimal pairs that demonstrate phonemic differences" (M = 3.50), "I avoid incorrect pronunciation that may cause confusion" (M = 3.55), and "I know the correct stress placement in each syllable of a word" (M = 3.58). The comparatively lower mean for identifying minimal pairs may indicate that respondents are less confident in performing more specific phonemic analysis than in applying phonological knowledge in everyday communication. Similarly, the lower rating for avoiding pronunciation errors and identifying stress placement may suggest that these more technical aspects of phonology require continued practice. Thus, while the respondents generally demonstrate strong phonological competence, phonemic discrimination, stress placement, and pronunciation accuracy may represent areas that could benefit from more focused instructional activities.

The finding is consistent with the studies cited in the review of related literature. Quessep et al. (2024) emphasized the role of phonological awareness in dictated writing, suggesting that awareness of the sound system supports learners' ability to represent language accurately in written form. Similarly, Grigorakis and Manolitsis (2021) demonstrated that phonological and morphological awareness contribute to the development of accurate spelling. These findings support the present result, particularly the respondents' high rating on their ability to relate the sounds of language to correct spelling and writing (M = 3.79). The consistency between the present finding and these studies suggests that phonological knowledge provides an important foundation for connecting sound patterns with written representation and for developing accurate written language.

Table 2. Level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of morphology

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I can identify different types of affixes, such as prefixes, infixes, suffixes, and circumfixes.	3.93	High	Highly evident
2. I can identify how the meaning of a word changes when an affix is added.	3.81	High	Highly evident
3. I can identify the root word within a sentence.	3.80	High	Highly evident
4. I understand the difference between root words and affixes.	3.79	High	Highly evident
5. I understand differences in word formation across different parts of speech, such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives.	3.78	High	Highly evident
6. I correctly use affixes to form new words.	3.66	High	Highly evident
7. I use the appropriate form of a word based on the context of the sentence.	3.64	High	Highly evident
8. I can relate my knowledge of morphology to the expansion of my vocabulary.	3.66	High	Highly evident
9. I apply my knowledge of morphology in analyzing literary works.	3.59	High	Highly evident
10. I understand the process of reduplication or repetition of syllables in word formation.	3.58	High	Highly evident
11. I can form new words using appropriate morphological rules.	3.54	High	Highly evident
12. I can identify words involving phonemic changes in morphology, such as assimilation and phoneme substitution.	3.50	High	Highly evident
Overall Mean	**3.69**	**High**	**Highly evident**

The results show that the students' level of linguistic competence in terms of morphology was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.69, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that morphological competence was highly evident among the students. The finding suggests that the students generally demonstrated a strong understanding of word structure, affixation, word formation, and the relationship between morphological elements and meaning.

Among the indicators, the three highest-rated statements were "I can identify different types of affixes, such as prefixes, infixes, suffixes, and circumfixes" (M = 3.93), "I can identify how the meaning of a word changes when an affix is added" (M = 3.81), and "I can identify the root word within a sentence" (M = 3.80). These results indicate that the students were particularly confident in recognizing basic morphological structures and understanding how affixation influences word meaning. The highest mean of 3.93 suggests that identifying different types of affixes was the most evident aspect of their morphological competence.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Meanwhile, the relatively high ratings for identifying changes in meaning and recognizing root words indicate that students were also able to connect the structural components of words with their meanings and functions.

In contrast, the three lowest-rated indicators, although still within the high category, were "I can identify words involving phonemic changes in morphology, such as assimilation and phoneme substitution" (M = 3.50), "I can form new words using appropriate morphological rules" (M = 3.54), and "I understand the process of reduplication or repetition of syllables in word formation" (M = 3.58). These findings suggest that students were comparatively less confident when morphological knowledge required them to recognize or apply more complex processes. In particular, the lowest mean of 3.50 for identifying phonemic changes in morphology may indicate that processes such as assimilation and phoneme substitution are less readily recognized than basic morphological elements such as roots and affixes. Similarly, the lower ratings for applying morphological rules and understanding reduplication suggest areas where students may benefit from greater practice and contextual application.

Overall, the overall mean of 3.69 indicates that the students possessed a high level of morphological competence, with all twelve indicators receiving means within the high category. The results demonstrate that students generally understood the structure and formation of words and could recognize the functions of morphological elements. However, the pattern of means also suggests a distinction between recognizing morphological structures and applying more complex morphological processes. The higher ratings were concentrated on identifying affixes, root words, and changes in meaning, while comparatively lower ratings were observed in applying morphological rules and analyzing phonemic changes.

The present finding is supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Asaad (2024) found that morphological awareness was significantly related to academic writing, while Allen and Lembke (2022) reported positive effects of morphological-awareness instruction on writing outcomes. Collins et al. (2020) likewise emphasized the contribution of morphological awareness to literacy development, and Grigorakis and Manolitsis (2021) demonstrated its importance in spelling development. More recently, Venoza and Ramos (2026) reported a significant positive relationship between morphological awareness and writing proficiency among Grade 7 students in the Philippines. These findings support the present result by emphasizing that knowledge of word structure, affixation, and morphological processes is an important component of language and literacy development.

Table 3. Level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of syntax

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I arrange sentence elements to ensure a smooth flow of ideas.	3.76	High	Highly Evident
2. I use different types of sentences in my writing.	3.75	High	Highly Evident
3. I can identify the correct use of pronouns and verbs in sentences.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
4. I use conjunctions to maintain the connection between ideas.	3.71	High	Highly Evident
5. I apply my knowledge of syntax when writing academic texts.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
6. I can construct sentences with correct structures.	3.65	High	Highly Evident
7. I know when to use simple or compound sentences.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
8. I can connect clauses to form clear ideas.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
9. I avoid incorrect word order within sentences.	3.62	High	Highly Evident
10. I can identify grammatical errors before submitting my written work.	3.60	High	Highly Evident
11. I can express ideas using complex sentences.	3.60	High	Highly Evident
12. I avoid run-on sentences and sentence fragments.	3.42	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.65**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of linguistic competence in terms of syntax was high, as reflected by the overall mean of 3.65, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that syntactic competence was highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to organize words and sentence elements appropriately, construct meaningful sentences, and apply syntactic knowledge in their written communication.

Among the indicators, the three highest-rated statements were "I arrange sentence elements to ensure a smooth flow of ideas" (M = 3.76), "I use different types of sentences in my writing" (M = 3.75), and "I can identify the correct use of pronouns and verbs in sentences" (M = 3.74). These results indicate that the students were particularly confident in organizing sentence elements, varying sentence structures, and recognizing the appropriate use of grammatical elements. The highest mean of 3.76 suggests that arranging sentence elements for a smooth flow of ideas was the most evident aspect of their syntactic competence. The high rating for using different types of sentences also suggests that students perceived themselves as capable of employing varied sentence structures in writing, while the rating for pronoun and verb usage indicates relatively strong awareness of grammatical relationships within sentences.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

The three lowest-rated indicators, although still classified as high, were "I avoid run-on sentences and sentence fragments" (M = 3.42), "I can identify grammatical errors before submitting my written work" (M = 3.60), and "I can express ideas using complex sentences" (M = 3.60). These results suggest that the students were comparatively less confident in detecting and avoiding sentence-level problems and in producing more complex syntactic structures. The lowest mean of 3.42 for avoiding run-on sentences and sentence fragments is particularly noteworthy because it indicates that, while the competency remains highly evident, this area may require greater attention. Likewise, the relatively lower rating for expressing ideas using complex sentences may suggest that students are more comfortable with recognizing and organizing sentence structures than with consistently producing more sophisticated syntactic constructions.

Overall, the overall mean of 3.65 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of syntactic competence. All twelve indicators obtained means within the high category, showing generally consistent confidence in sentence construction, grammatical relationships, clause connection, sentence organization, and the application of syntax in academic writing. However, the results also reveal a slight difference between students' perceived ability to organize and recognize sentence structures and their ability to identify and avoid more specific sentence-level errors or produce complex structures. This suggests that further practice in sentence revision, error detection, and complex sentence construction may help strengthen the students' syntactic competence.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Wang et al. (2025) synthesized 109 studies and found positive relationships between syntactic accuracy, syntactic complexity, and writing performance, indicating the relevance of sentence construction and grammatical accuracy to writing. Park (2023) identified recurring grammatical errors in the written production of EFL learners, highlighting the importance of syntactic accuracy in written language. Similarly, Shi et al. (2024) found that grammar and reformulation feedback significantly improved writing accuracy and fluency among EFL college students. These findings support the present result by emphasizing that syntactic knowledge is important not only for constructing grammatically acceptable sentences but also for developing accurate and effective written communication.

Table 4. Level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of semantics

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I understand the meaning of a word based on context.	3.76	High	Highly Evident
2. I avoid words that may cause confusion to the reader.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
3. I can correct inappropriate word usage.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
4. I can correct an incorrect interpretation of a word in reading or writing.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
5. I use words with implied meanings to deepen an idea.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
6. I can select words with meanings appropriate to the context.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
7. I relate semantic knowledge to the development of meaningful paragraphs.	3.65	High	Highly Evident
8. I use advanced vocabulary to express my ideas effectively.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
9. I can identify words with double or idiomatic meanings.	3.61	High	Highly Evident
10. I use figures of speech to enrich meaning.	3.60	High	Highly Evident
11. I can identify denotative and connotative meanings.	3.57	High	Highly Evident
12. I understand the relationships between words, such as synonymy and antonymy.	3.55	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.65**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of linguistic competence in terms of semantics was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.65, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that semantic competence was highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to understand and express meaning through appropriate word choices, contextual interpretation, and effective use of language in written communication.

Among the indicators, the three highest-rated areas were "I understand the meaning of a word based on context" (M = 3.76), "I avoid words that may cause confusion to the reader" (M = 3.72), and the two indicators tied at 3.70, namely "I can correct inappropriate word usage" and "I can correct an incorrect interpretation of a word in reading or writing." These results indicate that the students were particularly confident in interpreting word meaning according to context and in ensuring that their word choices communicated their intended meanings clearly. The highest mean of 3.76 suggests that contextual understanding of meaning was the most evident aspect of the students' semantic competence. The ratings of 3.72 and 3.70 further indicate that students were able to monitor word usage and correct inappropriate or inaccurate interpretations.

The three lowest-rated indicators were "I understand the relationships between words, such as synonymy and antonymy" (M = 3.55), "I can identify denotative and connotative meanings" (M = 3.57), and "I

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

use figures of speech to enrich meaning" (M = 3.60). Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means suggest that students were less confident in dealing with more specific or nuanced aspects of semantic knowledge. In particular, the lowest mean of 3.55 for understanding synonymy and antonymy may indicate that recognizing relationships among words was comparatively less evident than interpreting word meaning from context. Similarly, the ratings for denotative and connotative meanings and the use of figures of speech suggest areas that may benefit from further contextualized practice and analysis.

The overall mean of 3.65 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of semantic competence, with all twelve indicators falling within the high category. The results show that students generally possessed the ability to interpret meaning, select appropriate words, correct inappropriate word usage, and use semantic knowledge in written expression. However, the pattern of results suggests that students were relatively stronger in context-based interpretation and appropriate word usage than in more specialized semantic relationships and distinctions, such as synonymy, antonymy, denotative and connotative meanings, and figurative language.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Asaad (2024) demonstrated that morphological awareness contributes to academic writing partly through vocabulary knowledge, highlighting the connection between language knowledge and effective written expression. Ait Hammou et al. (2023) found that lexical range and contextually appropriate lexical features were associated with writing proficiency. Raufi et al. (2024) further showed that lexical diversity is related to academic vocabulary use, although lexical diversity alone does not guarantee higher writing quality. Similarly, Lee (2024) found that lexical density, diversity, and sophistication were associated with stronger argumentative writing, while Rambe and Daulay (2025) reported that semantic-based instruction improved students' sentence construction. These findings support the present result by emphasizing the importance of appropriate word choice, contextual meaning, and semantic knowledge in developing effective written expression.

Table 5. Level of linguistic competence of the students in terms of phonology

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I consider culture important in language use.	3.95	High	Highly Evident
2. I use language to express emotions appropriately.	3.92	High	Highly Evident
3. I use language to achieve the purpose of communication.	3.85	High	Highly Evident
4. I adjust my language according to the level of formality required by the situation.	3.82	High	Highly Evident
5. I apply pragmatic competence in effective writing and communication.	3.78	High	Highly Evident
6. I understand the speaker's intention based on tone or context.	3.76	High	Highly Evident
7. I adjust my language according to the audience and situation.	3.76	High	Highly Evident
8. I relate the purpose of a text to my choice of language.	3.75	High	Highly Evident
9. I avoid misinterpretation caused by pragmatic context.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
10. I avoid inappropriate expressions in formal conversations or written texts.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
11. I can recognize implied meanings behind what is said or written.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
12. I relate language use to appropriate communicative situations.	3.60	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.78**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of linguistic competence in terms of pragmatics was high, as reflected by the overall mean of 3.78, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that pragmatic competence was highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to use language appropriately according to communicative purpose, cultural considerations, emotional expression, formality, audience, and situational context.

The three highest-rated indicators were *"I consider culture important in language use"* (M = 3.95), *"I use language to express emotions appropriately"* (M = 3.92), and *"I use language to achieve the purpose of communication"* (M = 3.85). These findings indicate that the students were particularly confident in recognizing the influence of culture on language use, expressing emotions appropriately, and using language according to communicative purpose. The highest mean of 3.95 suggests that cultural awareness was the most evident aspect of their pragmatic competence. The high rating for appropriate emotional expression further indicates that students perceived themselves as capable of considering the interpersonal dimension of communication, while the rating of 3.85 demonstrates their awareness that language choices should serve a particular communicative purpose.

The three lowest-rated indicators were *"I relate language use to appropriate communicative situations"* (M = 3.60), *"I can recognize implied meanings behind what is said or written"* (M = 3.66), and *"I avoid inappropriate expressions in formal conversations or written texts"* (M = 3.72). Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means suggest areas of pragmatic

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

competence that were less evident than the students' awareness of culture, emotional expression, and communicative purpose. In particular, the lowest mean of 3.60 indicates that relating language use to specific communicative situations may require greater attention. Similarly, the relatively lower rating for recognizing implied meanings suggests that interpreting meanings beyond the literal level may be comparatively more challenging for the students.

The overall mean of 3.78 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of pragmatic competence, with all twelve indicators falling within the high category. The results demonstrate that the students generally recognized the importance of context, audience, culture, formality, communicative purpose, and appropriate language choices. However, the distribution of means suggests that students were relatively stronger in recognizing the cultural and communicative purposes of language than in interpreting implied meanings and directly relating language choices to particular communicative situations. This distinction is important because pragmatic competence involves not only knowing what language means but also determining how language should be used appropriately in a particular context.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Qin et al. (2024) found that situation, first-language background, and second-language proficiency influenced pragmatic competence in written request emails, emphasizing the importance of communicative context in written language use. Zeng et al. (2022) likewise examined pragmatic competence in English letter writing and demonstrated that pragmatic competence is reflected in learners' choices of vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and organization. Al-Ibadi (2022) found a positive relationship between pragmatic competence and writing performance among Iraqi EFL university students. These findings support the present result by demonstrating that effective language use requires learners to consider communicative situations, contextual appropriateness, and the intended purpose of their language choices.

Research Question 2: What is the level of translation competence of the students in terms of Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring skills?

Table 6. Level of Translation competence of the students in terms of textual competence

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I select words or expressions appropriate to the purpose and tone of the original text.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
2. I maintain the proper sequence of ideas from the source text in my translation.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
3. I can produce a translation that conveys the same meaning and emotion as the original.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
4. I make my translation natural and easy to read.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
5. I can distinguish between literal and free translation based on context.	3.64	High	Highly Evident
6. I ensure that my translation is easy for the target readers to understand.	3.61	High	Highly Evident
7. I am able to preserve the main idea of the original text in my translation.	3.59	High	Highly Evident
8. I use correct punctuation, spelling, and grammatical forms in my translation.	3.59	High	Highly Evident
9. I use appropriate sentence structures to preserve the style of the original text.	3.58	High	Highly Evident
10. I express the ideas of the original text clearly and logically in my translation.	3.58	High	Highly Evident
11. I can translate effectively even when the two languages involve different cultures.	3.58	High	Highly Evident
12. I maintain the coherence and cohesion of the text during translation.	3.54	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.62**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of translation competence in terms of textual competence was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.62, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that textual competence was highly evident among the students. The finding suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to preserve and reconstruct meaning, organize ideas, select appropriate expressions, and produce translations that are understandable and appropriate for the target readers.

The three highest-rated indicators were “I select words or expressions appropriate to the purpose and tone of the original text” (M = 3.74), “I maintain the proper sequence of ideas from the source text in my translation” (M = 3.70), and “I can produce a translation that conveys the same meaning and emotion as the original” (M = 3.68). These results indicate that the students were particularly confident in making appropriate lexical and textual choices while maintaining the intended organization and meaning of the source text. The highest mean of 3.74 suggests that selecting words and expressions according to the purpose and tone of the

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

original text was the most evident aspect of their textual competence. The ratings for maintaining the sequence of ideas and conveying the same meaning and emotion further suggest that students were able to attend to both the organization and communicative effect of the source text.

The three lowest-rated areas were "I maintain the coherence and cohesion of the text during translation" (M = 3.54), followed by the three indicators with a mean of 3.58: "I use appropriate sentence structures to preserve the style of the original text," "I express the ideas of the original text clearly and logically in my translation," and "I can translate effectively even when the two languages involve different cultures." Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means suggest that students were less confident in some aspects requiring more complex textual reconstruction. In particular, maintaining coherence and cohesion received the lowest mean, which may indicate that connecting ideas and preserving the relationships among textual units across languages is relatively more challenging than selecting appropriate words or maintaining the sequence of ideas.

The overall mean of 3.62 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of textual competence. All indicators were classified within the high category, suggesting that the students generally possessed the ability to process and reconstruct meaning across source and target texts. However, the distribution of means indicates that students were relatively stronger in lexical selection, preservation of idea sequence, and maintenance of meaning and emotion than in coherence and cohesion, stylistic preservation, logical expression, and cross-cultural translation. This pattern suggests that while students demonstrate a generally strong foundation in textual translation, greater attention to the relationships among textual units and the reconstruction of discourse across languages may further strengthen their textual competence.

The findings are consistent with the studies included in the review of related literature. Iļinska et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of text analysis and meaning representation in developing textual competence among translation students. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) demonstrated that translation competence involves multiple cognitive and strategic resources beyond linguistic knowledge. Siregar and Stroupe (2025) also emphasized contextual accuracy, idiomatic expression, and cultural meaning in translation learning. These findings support the present result by showing that textual competence involves more than transferring individual words; it requires learners to process texts as meaningful and coherent communicative units while considering context, meaning, and cultural dimensions.

Table 7. Level of Translation competence of the students in terms of disposition

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I want to improve my translation skills through continuous practice.	3.88	High	Highly Evident
2. I believe that translation is a way of expanding my knowledge of culture.	3.82	High	Highly Evident
3. I become more motivated when I receive positive feedback on my translation.	3.81	High	Highly Evident
4. I see translation as a means of improving my writing skills.	3.81	High	Highly Evident
5. I want to use translation as a means of expressing creative thinking.	3.79	High	Highly Evident
6. I see translation as making a significant contribution to my academic development.	3.78	High	Highly Evident
7. I consider learning effective translation part of becoming an educated individual.	3.77	High	Highly Evident
8. I consider translating complex texts an intellectual challenge.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
9. I do not give up easily when I encounter a difficult expression to translate.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
10. I consider translation an important skill in language learning.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
11. I prepare carefully before performing any translation task.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
12. I enjoy the translation process even when it requires time and effort.	3.71	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.78**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of translation competence in terms of disposition was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.78, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that disposition toward translation was highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated positive attitudes, motivation, persistence, and willingness to engage in translation tasks and to improve their translation abilities through continued learning and practice.

The three highest-rated indicators were "I want to improve my translation skills through continuous practice" (M = 3.88), "I believe that translation is a way of expanding my knowledge of culture" (M = 3.82), and the two indicators tied at 3.81, namely "I become more motivated when I receive positive feedback on my translation" and "I see translation as a means of improving my writing skills." These findings indicate that the students were particularly motivated to develop their translation skills through continuous practice and recognized translation as a means of expanding their cultural knowledge and improving their writing abilities.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

The highest mean of 3.88 suggests that the willingness to engage in continuous practice was the most evident aspect of their disposition toward translation.

The three lowest-rated indicators were "I enjoy the translation process even when it requires time and effort" (M = 3.71), "I prepare carefully before performing any translation task" (M = 3.72), and "I consider translation an important skill in language learning" (M = 3.73). Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means suggest that students were somewhat less expressive of their enjoyment of the translation process, preparation before translation tasks, and perception of translation as an important component of language learning. The lowest mean of 3.71, in particular, indicates that while students were highly willing to improve their translation skills, enjoyment of the translation process itself was comparatively less evident.

The overall mean of 3.78 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of disposition toward translation. All twelve indicators were classified within the high category, showing that the students generally possessed positive attitudes toward translation and demonstrated willingness to improve their skills. The pattern of results suggests that students' disposition was particularly evident in their commitment to continuous improvement, recognition of translation's cultural value, and responsiveness to feedback, while comparatively lower ratings were observed in their enjoyment of the process and preparation before translation tasks. This indicates that the students generally possess a favorable orientation toward translation, although opportunities for more engaging and structured translation activities may further strengthen their disposition.

The findings are consistent with the studies included in the review of related literature. Li et al. (2023) found that critical thinking, academic self-efficacy, and cultural intelligence were associated with translation technology competence, suggesting that learners' cognitive and personal orientations are relevant to translation-related competence. Siregar and Stroupe (2025) emphasized the importance of metacognitive strategies, self-regulation, and critical reflection in translation learning. Xie and Wang (2025) further established a positive relationship between metacognition and translation competence. These findings support the present result by emphasizing that translation competence is not dependent solely on linguistic knowledge but also involves learners' cognitive, motivational, and self-regulatory orientation toward translation tasks.

Table 8. Level of Translation competence of the students in terms of monitoring skills

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I reread my translation to identify possible errors.	3.86	High	Highly Evident
2. I carefully consider each word or phrase before translating it.	3.85	High	Highly Evident
3. I compare my translation with the original text to identify deviations.	3.85	High	Highly Evident
4. I seek feedback from my teacher or classmates to improve my translation.	3.85	High	Highly Evident
5. I make sure that I understand the context of the original text before translating it.	3.82	High	Highly Evident
6. I examine the entire text before starting the translation.	3.80	High	Highly Evident
7. I immediately revise parts of my translation that seem unclear or inappropriate.	3.80	High	Highly Evident
8. I use a dictionary, thesaurus, or online tools to improve my translation.	3.79	High	Highly Evident
9. I can identify which parts of my translation require revision.	3.77	High	Highly Evident
10. I evaluate whether my translation has the same effect on the reader as the original.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
11. I plan the translation process before carrying it out.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
12. I identify my weaknesses in translation and strive to improve them.	3.69	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.79**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of translation competence in terms of monitoring skills was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.79, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that monitoring skills were highly evident among the students. The finding suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to examine, evaluate, revise, and improve their translations through conscious attention to accuracy, context, possible errors, and differences between the source and target texts.

The three highest-rated areas were "I reread my translation to identify possible errors" (M = 3.86), followed by three indicators tied at 3.85: "I carefully consider each word or phrase before translating it," "I compare my translation with the original text to identify deviations," and "I seek feedback from my teacher or classmates to improve my translation." These findings indicate that the students were particularly engaged in reviewing their translations, carefully making translation decisions, checking their output against the original text, and seeking external feedback. The highest mean of 3.86 suggests that rereading the translation for possible errors was the most evident monitoring behavior. The three indicators with a mean of 3.85 further demonstrate that students also employed both self-monitoring and feedback-based monitoring in the translation process.

The three lowest-rated areas were "I identify my weaknesses in translation and strive to improve them" (M = 3.69), followed by two indicators tied at 3.72: "I evaluate whether my translation has the same effect on

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

the reader as the original" and "I plan the translation process before carrying it out." Although these indicators were still classified as high, their comparatively lower means suggest that students were less consistent in higher-level reflective and evaluative monitoring. In particular, identifying one's own weaknesses and deliberately planning the translation process require a more sustained form of metacognitive reflection than simply checking for errors after completing a translation. Similarly, evaluating whether the translation produces the same effect on the target reader requires students to assess not only linguistic accuracy but also communicative effect.

The overall mean of 3.79 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of monitoring skills. All twelve indicators were classified within the high category, suggesting that students generally engaged in various monitoring behaviors throughout the translation process. The results indicate that students were particularly strong in reviewing translations, checking individual translation decisions, comparing the target text with the source text, and seeking feedback. However, comparatively lower ratings in identifying personal weaknesses, evaluating reader effect, and planning the translation process suggest that more deliberate forms of metacognitive reflection may be areas for further development.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Xie and Wang (2025) found a significant positive relationship between metacognition and translation competence (r = .472) based on a three-level meta-analysis of 23 studies. Dong and Chen (2025) found that professional translators demonstrated more sophisticated metacognitive strategies than graduate translation students. Similarly, Siregar and Stroupe (2025) emphasized self-regulation and metacognitive awareness in translation learning, while Iļinska et al. (2025) highlighted continuous text analysis and evaluation in translator training. These findings support the present result by demonstrating that monitoring, self-regulation, evaluation, and metacognitive awareness are important components of translation competence.

Research Question 3: What is the level of writing skills of the students in terms of Correct Grammar, Vocabulary/Lexical Range, Coherence and Cohesion and Organization/Structure?

Table 9. Level of writing skills of the students in terms of correct grammar

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I use modifiers, such as adjectives and adverbs, appropriately.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
2. I use conjunctions to maintain the flow of ideas.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
3. I correctly relate nouns and pronouns within sentences.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
4. I can identify common grammatical errors in my writing.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
5. I correct errors in my writing before submitting it.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
6. I follow proper punctuation and spelling conventions.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
7. I use the appropriate verb aspect when writing.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
8. I follow the standards of formal academic language in my writing.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
9. I avoid excessive use of meaningless fillers (e.g., "you know," "like").	3.61	High	Highly Evident
10. I avoid errors in subject–predicate agreement.	3.58	High	Highly Evident
11. I avoid errors in the use of verbs and pronouns.	3.56	High	Highly Evident
12. I follow grammatical rules when writing sentences.	3.52	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.66**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of writing skills in terms of correct grammar was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.66, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that correct grammar was highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to apply grammatical conventions, organize grammatical elements appropriately, identify errors, and observe the conventions required in written communication.

The three highest-rated areas were the two indicators tied at 3.74, namely "I use conjunctions to maintain the flow of ideas" and "I use modifiers, such as adjectives and adverbs, appropriately," followed by the two indicators tied at 3.73, namely "I correctly relate nouns and pronouns within sentences" and "I can identify common grammatical errors in my writing." These results indicate that the students were particularly confident in using grammatical elements that contribute to the connection and clarity of ideas and in recognizing grammatical relationships within sentences. The highest mean of 3.74 suggests that the appropriate use of conjunctions and modifiers was the most evident aspect of their grammatical writing skills. The high rating for identifying grammatical errors also indicates that students perceived themselves as capable of monitoring the grammatical accuracy of their written work.

The three lowest-rated areas were "I follow grammatical rules when writing sentences" (M = 3.52), "I avoid errors in the use of verbs and pronouns" (M = 3.56), and "I avoid errors in subject–predicate agreement" (M = 3.58). Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

suggest that students were less confident in consistently applying some fundamental grammatical rules than in using specific grammatical elements or identifying errors. The lowest mean of 3.52 for following grammatical rules generally is particularly noteworthy because it suggests that students' perceived ability to apply grammar in actual sentence construction was comparatively less evident. The ratings for verb-pronoun use and subject–predicate agreement likewise point to areas where continued practice in grammatical accuracy may be beneficial.

The overall mean of 3.66 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of writing skills in terms of correct grammar. All twelve indicators were classified within the high category, suggesting that grammatical competence was generally evident across the different aspects measured. The results indicate that students were relatively stronger in using conjunctions and modifiers, identifying grammatical errors, and maintaining grammatical relationships, while comparatively lower ratings were observed in the direct application of grammatical rules, verb and pronoun usage, and subject–predicate agreement. This pattern suggests that students may be more confident in recognizing and applying particular grammatical features than in consistently applying broad grammatical rules during sentence construction.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Wang et al. (2025) found a positive relationship between syntactic accuracy and writing performance, indicating that grammatical accuracy is associated with effective writing. Park (2023) identified recurring grammatical errors in the written production of Korean EFL learners, highlighting the continuing importance of grammatical accuracy in written language. Rustipa et al. (2023) found that mood analysis and self-correction significantly improved students' grammatical accuracy, while Shi et al. (2024) likewise reported significant improvements in writing accuracy following grammar and reformulation feedback. These findings support the present result by emphasizing that grammatical accuracy is an important component of effective writing and that learners' ability to identify, monitor, and correct grammatical errors contributes to improved written performance.

Table 10. Level of writing skills of the students in terms of vocabulary/lexical range

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I use appropriate vocabulary to express abstract ideas.	3.81	High	Highly Evident
2. I determine the meaning of a word based on its context.	3.79	High	Highly Evident
3. I adjust my choice of words according to the level of formality required in the literary context.	3.78	High	Highly Evident
4. I can identify incorrectly used words and correct them.	3.75	High	Highly Evident
5. I avoid colloquial and informal words in formal writing.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
6. I use a wide range of vocabulary in my writing.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
7. I correctly use words with similar meanings.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
8. I select words that are appropriate to the purpose of my writing.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
9. I avoid unnecessary repetition of words within a paragraph.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
10. I use technical or academic words appropriately in context.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
11. I express ideas using a rich vocabulary.	3.66	High	Highly Evident
12. I use figures of speech and idiomatic expressions to enrich my writing.	3.61	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.70**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The results show that the students' level of writing skills in terms of vocabulary/lexical range was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.70, which falls within the high quantitative description. This indicates that vocabulary and lexical range were highly evident among the students. The result suggests that the students generally demonstrated the ability to select, interpret, and use words appropriately in expressing ideas, particularly when dealing with abstract concepts, contextual meanings, and varying levels of formality.

The three highest-rated indicators were “I use appropriate vocabulary to express abstract ideas” (M = 3.81), “I determine the meaning of a word based on its context” (M = 3.79), and “I adjust my choice of words according to the level of formality required in the literary context” (M = 3.78). These findings indicate that the students were particularly confident in using vocabulary to communicate abstract ideas, interpreting words according to context, and adjusting their lexical choices based on the required level of formality. The highest mean of 3.81 suggests that the ability to use appropriate vocabulary for expressing abstract ideas was the most evident aspect of their lexical competence. The high ratings for contextual interpretation and formality further suggest that students were aware that effective vocabulary use depends not only on knowing words but also on selecting them according to meaning and communicative context.

The three lowest-rated indicators were “I use figures of speech and idiomatic expressions to enrich my writing” (M = 3.61), followed by the three indicators tied at 3.66: “I avoid unnecessary repetition of words within a paragraph,” “I use technical or academic words appropriately in context,” and “I express ideas using

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

a rich vocabulary." Although these indicators remained within the high category, their comparatively lower means suggest that students were less confident in some aspects of lexical sophistication and variety. In particular, the lowest mean of 3.61 for the use of figures of speech and idiomatic expressions indicates that figurative and idiomatic vocabulary was comparatively less evident than contextual and formal word selection. The ratings of 3.66 also suggest that avoiding lexical repetition, using specialized academic vocabulary, and demonstrating richness of vocabulary may require further development.

The overall mean of 3.70 indicates that the students demonstrated a high level of writing skills in terms of vocabulary/lexical range. All twelve indicators were classified within the high category, showing that the students generally possessed adequate breadth and appropriateness in their vocabulary use. The pattern of results suggests that students were relatively stronger in contextual and purposeful vocabulary selection, particularly when expressing abstract ideas and adjusting language according to formality, than in demonstrating greater lexical variety through figurative expressions, academic vocabulary, and reduced repetition. Thus, the findings indicate a generally strong lexical foundation while also pointing to opportunities for further development in lexical sophistication and stylistic variety.

The findings are supported by the studies included in the review of related literature. Ait Hammou et al. (2023) found that lexical range and phraseological features distinguished different levels of writing proficiency. Raufi et al. (2024) demonstrated that lexical diversity is related to academic vocabulary use, although lexical diversity alone does not automatically indicate higher-quality writing. Lee (2024) found that lexical density, diversity, and sophistication were associated with better argumentative writing quality. Similarly, Maamuujav et al. (2021) found that academic vocabulary use predicted writing quality in text-based analytical essays. These findings support the present result by emphasizing that effective writing involves not only the number of words students know but also the range, appropriateness, sophistication, and contextual use of vocabulary in written expression.

Table 11. Level of writing skills of the students in terms of coherence and cohesion

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I maintain thematic unity from the beginning to the end of my writing.	3.77	High	Highly Evident
2. I use expressions that show cause and effect, comparison, or connection.	3.76	High	Highly Evident
3. I arrange ideas in the proper sequence.	3.75	High	Highly Evident
4. I match the topic sentence with its supporting details.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
5. I avoid unrelated sentences within a paragraph.	3.73	High	Highly Evident
6. I use transitional devices to maintain the logical flow of my writing.	3.72	High	Highly Evident
7. I relate each paragraph to the main theme of the text.	3.70	High	Highly Evident
8. I ensure that the relationship among ideas is clear.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
9. I avoid abrupt shifts in ideas without appropriate transitions.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
10. I use cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, and conjunctions.	3.65	High	Highly Evident
11. I can present an argument with a logical sequence of ideas.	3.63	High	Highly Evident
12. I can construct paragraphs with logically connected ideas.	3.52	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.69**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

Table 11 presents the level of writing skills of the students in terms of coherence and cohesion. The results show an overall mean of 3.69, indicating a high level of perceived writing skills in this dimension, subject to the study's established interpretation scale. This suggests that the students generally perceive themselves as capable of organizing ideas logically, maintaining thematic unity, and establishing connections among sentences and paragraphs.

Among the indicators, "I maintain thematic unity from the beginning to the end of my writing" obtained the highest mean of 3.77. This was followed by "I use expressions that show cause and effect, comparison, or connection," with a mean of 3.76, and "I arrange ideas in the proper sequence," with a mean of 3.75. These findings suggest that maintaining a consistent theme, expressing relationships among ideas, and arranging information logically are the strongest perceived aspects of the students' coherence and cohesion skills.

In contrast, "I can construct paragraphs with logically connected ideas" received the lowest mean of 3.52, followed by "I can present an argument with a logical sequence of ideas," with a mean of 3.63. Although these indicators may still fall within the high category under the study's scoring scale, their comparatively lower means suggest areas that may benefit from further development. In particular, students may need additional opportunities to practice connecting supporting details within paragraphs and organizing arguments into a coherent progression of claims and evidence.

Overall, the findings indicate that the students demonstrate a generally positive perception of their coherence and cohesion skills. However, the relatively lower ratings for paragraph construction and logical argumentation suggest that instructional activities should place greater emphasis on paragraph unity, the

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

logical sequencing of supporting details, and the development of arguments. These results should be interpreted as students' self-reported assessments rather than direct evidence of their actual writing performance.

Table 12. Level of writing skills of the students in terms of organization/structure

Statement	Mean	Quantitative Description	Qualitative interpretation
1. I can produce a written text with a clear beginning, middle, and end.	3.92	High	Highly Evident
2. I can develop a conclusion that summarizes the main idea.	3.80	High	Highly Evident
3. I present ideas clearly and appropriately in the body of the text.	3.80	High	Highly Evident
4. I revise the structure of my writing based on my teacher's feedback.	3.77	High	Highly Evident
5. I relate each paragraph to the main purpose of the text.	3.75	High	Highly Evident
6. I can present a clear introduction in my writing.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
7. I present ideas in a logical sequence.	3.74	High	Highly Evident
8. I maintain a balanced length among the different parts of my writing (introduction, body, and conclusion).	3.70	High	Highly Evident
9. I use the appropriate format for different types of writing (e.g., essay, letter, report).	3.70	High	Highly Evident
10. I avoid ideas that are unrelated to the topic.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
11. I avoid jumping from one topic to another within my writing.	3.68	High	Highly Evident
12. I use an outline before writing.	3.67	High	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	**3.75**	**High**	**Highly Evident**

The students demonstrated a high level of writing skills in terms of coherence and cohesion, as reflected by the overall mean of 3.69. This indicates that the students generally demonstrate the ability to organize ideas logically, maintain connections among sentences and paragraphs, and use linguistic devices that contribute to the unity and flow of their written texts. The consistently high ratings across all indicators suggest that coherence and cohesion are highly evident in the students' writing skills.

The three highest-rated indicators were maintaining thematic unity from the beginning to the end of writing (M = 3.77), using expressions that show cause and effect, comparison, or connection (M = 3.76), and arranging ideas in the proper sequence (M = 3.75). These results suggest that the students are particularly capable of sustaining the central theme of their writing while establishing logical relationships among ideas. Their high rating in arranging ideas in the proper sequence further indicates that they are generally able to present information in an orderly and understandable manner.

On the other hand, the three lowest-rated indicators were constructing paragraphs with logically connected ideas (M = 3.52), presenting an argument with a logical sequence of ideas (M = 3.63), and using cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, and conjunctions (M = 3.65). Although these indicators remained within the High category, their relatively lower means indicate areas where the students may still further develop their writing skills. In particular, constructing logically connected paragraphs and presenting arguments in a systematic sequence may require greater attention to the explicit connections between individual ideas, while the use of cohesive devices may be strengthened to make relationships among sentences more apparent.

Overall, the findings indicate that the students possess a generally strong capacity for producing coherent and cohesive written texts. Their strongest performance is evident in maintaining thematic unity, expressing logical relationships, and sequencing ideas. However, the comparatively lower ratings for paragraph-level connections, argumentative sequencing, and explicit cohesive devices suggest that the students' coherence and cohesion may be further enhanced through activities that emphasize paragraph development, argument organization, and deliberate use of cohesive linguistic resources.

These findings are consistent with the studies presented in the review of related literature. Siekmann et al. (2022) noted that less proficient EFL writers may experience difficulties with text structure and coherence, emphasizing the importance of organizing ideas effectively. Palacios Briones et al. (2021) likewise identified coherence and cohesion as important indicators of writing quality, while Osawa (2025) highlighted the relevance of genre-based instruction in developing organization and cohesion in writing. These studies support the present finding that effective organization of ideas and the establishment of clear relationships among textual elements are important components of students' writing performance.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills?

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Table 13. Assessment of Normality of Linguistic Competence, Translation Competence, and Writing Skills

Variables	Shapiro-wilk W	P-Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Linguistic Competence	0.948	<.001	Significant	Reject the null hypothesis
2. Translation Competence	0.937	<.001	Significant	Reject the null hypothesis
3. Writing Skills	0.938	<.001	Significant	Reject the null hypothesis

Table 12 presents the results of the Shapiro–Wilk test used to assess the normality of the distributions of linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills. The results show that linguistic competence obtained a Shapiro–Wilk statistic of 0.948 with a p-value of less than .001. Similarly, translation competence yielded a statistic of 0.937, while writing skills obtained a statistic of 0.938; both variables also had p-values of less than .001.

Since all p-values are below the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of normality is rejected for all three variables. These findings indicate statistically significant departures from a normal distribution. Therefore, the assumption of normality is not supported for the observed distributions of linguistic competence, translation competence, and writing skills.

Table 13. Test of significant relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills

Variables	Correlation	P-Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Linguistic Competence correlated with Writing skills	0.789	<.001	Significant	Accept the Alternative Hyposthesis

The result indicates a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of r = 0.789 and a p-value of < .001. This indicates that students with higher levels of linguistic competence tend to demonstrate higher levels of writing skills. The magnitude of the correlation suggests a strong association between the two variables, while the positive direction indicates that improvements or higher levels in linguistic competence are generally accompanied by higher levels of writing skills.

Since the p-value of < .001 is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, the relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills is statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The finding provides sufficient statistical evidence that linguistic competence is significantly related to the writing skills of the students.

The findings are supported by the study of Quessep et al. (2024) and Grigorakis and Manolitsis (2021) linked phonological and morphological awareness with accurate writing and spelling, while Asaad (2024), Allen and Lembke (2022), and Venoza and Ramos (2026) demonstrated positive associations between morphological competence and writing performance. For syntax, Wang et al. (2025), Park (2023), and Shi et al. (2024) emphasized the relationship of syntactic accuracy, grammatical knowledge, and writing performance. Likewise, Ait Hammou et al. (2023), Raufi et al. (2024), and Lee (2024) associated lexical and semantic resources with writing proficiency and quality. In terms of pragmatics, Qin et al. (2024), Zeng et al. (2022), and Al-Ibadi (2022) highlighted the importance of appropriate language use in written communication and its relationship with writing performance. Taken together, these studies support the present finding that phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are important dimensions associated with writing skills, consistent with the observed strong positive and significant relationship (r = 0.789, p < .001) between linguistic competence and writing skills.

Research Question 5: Is there a significant relationship between translation competence and writing skills?

Table 14. Test of significant relationship between translation competence and writing skills

Variables	Correlation	P-Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Translation Competence correlated with Writing skills	0.869	<.001	Significant	Accept the Alternative Hyposthesis

The result shows a very strong positive and statistically significant relationship between translation competence and writing skills, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of r = 0.869 and a p-value of < .001. This indicates that students with higher levels of translation competence tend to demonstrate higher levels of writing skills. The strength of the correlation suggests that translation competence is strongly associated with the students' ability to produce effective written texts.

Since the p-value of < .001 is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, the relationship between translation competence and writing skills is statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This provides sufficient statistical evidence that translation competence is significantly related to the writing skills of the students.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

The findings are supported by the study of Iļinska et al. (2025), Li et al. (2023), and Siregar and Stroupe (2025) emphasized textual analysis, cognitive and strategic resources, contextual accuracy, and preservation of meaning in translation. For disposition, Li et al. (2023), Siregar and Stroupe (2025), and Xie and Wang (2025) highlighted the roles of critical thinking, self-regulation, reflection, and metacognition. For monitoring skills, Xie and Wang (2025), Dong and Chen (2025), Siregar and Stroupe (2025), and Iļinska et al. (2025) emphasized evaluation, metacognitive strategies, self-regulation, and continuous text analysis. Taken together, these studies support the present finding that the major dimensions of translation competence are closely associated with effective written performance, consistent with the very strong positive and significant relationship ($r = 0.869$, $p < .001$) between translation competence and writing skills.

Research Question 6: Which dimensions of linguistic competence and translation competence, singly or in combination, significantly predict the students' writing skills?

Table 15. Normality Test of Regression Residuals

Test	Statistic	P-Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Shapiro-wilk	0.979	<.001	Significant	Reject the null hypothesis

The Shapiro–Wilk test yielded a statistic of 0.979 and a p-value of less than .001. Since the p-value is below the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of normality is rejected, indicating that the regression residuals significantly deviate from a normal distribution.

Table 16. Multiple Regression Analysis of Linguistic and Translation Competence as Predictors of Writing Skills

Predictor Variables	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
Constant	0.611	0.122	—	5.021	<.001	
1. Linguistic Competence						
Phonology	1.915	1.044	2.06	1.835	.068	Not Significant
Morphology	2.095	1.041	2.28	2.012	.045	Significant
Syntax	1.953	1.044	2.10	1.871	.063	Not Significant
Semantics	2.109	1.036	2.33	2.036	.043	Significant
Pragmatics	1.981	1.045	2.21	1.896	0.59	Not Significant
2. Translation Competence						
Textual Competence	-0.984	1.701	-1.13	-0.579	.563	Not Significant
Disposition	-1.007	1.706	-1.16	-0.590	.556	Not Significant
Monitoring Skills	-1.122	1.705	-1.37	-0.658	.511	Not Significant

The multiple regression analysis examined the predictive contributions of linguistic and translation competence and their respective dimensions to students' writing skills. Based on the obtained coefficients, Morphology and Semantics were the only predictors that reached statistical significance at the 0.05 level. Morphology obtained an estimate of 2.095, a standardized estimate of 2.28, $t = 2.012$, and $p = .045$, while Semantics obtained an estimate of 2.109, a standardized estimate of 2.33, $t = 2.036$, and $p = .043$. These results indicate that, within the specified regression model, morphology and semantics made statistically significant contributions to the prediction of writing skills.

In contrast, Linguistic Competence ($p = .059$), Phonology ($p = .068$), Syntax ($p = .063$), Translation Competence ($p = .463$), Pragmatics ($p = .059$), Textual Competence ($p = .563$), Disposition ($p = .556$), and Monitoring Skills ($p = .511$) did not reach the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, these variables did not demonstrate statistically significant unique contributions to writing skills within this particular regression specification.

The significant contribution of Morphology is supported by the study of Asaad (2024) who reported that morphological awareness was related to academic writing, while Allen and Lembke (2022) found positive effects of morphological-awareness instruction on writing. Venoza and Ramos (2026) likewise reported a significant positive relationship between morphological awareness and writing proficiency. These studies provide empirical support for the present finding that morphological competence is significantly associated with writing performance.

The significant contribution of Semantics is likewise supported by Ait Hammou et al. (2023) who found out that lexical range and contextually appropriate lexical features were associated with writing proficiency, while Raufi et al. (2024) examined the relationship between lexical diversity and academic vocabulary. Lee (2024) reported that lexical density, diversity, and sophistication were associated with stronger argumentative writing, and Rambe and Daulay (2025) found that semantic-based instruction improved sentence construction. These findings support the present result showing semantics as a significant predictor within the regression model.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Overall, the regression coefficients indicate that Morphology and Semantics were the only statistically significant predictors among the variables entered into the model.

Ethical Considerations

The researchers observed appropriate ethical principles throughout the conduct of the study to protect the rights, privacy, safety, and welfare of the participants. Before the data collection, the researchers secured the necessary permission from the concerned authorities of Don Carlos Polytechnic College and coordinated with the appropriate program officials regarding the administration of the research instrument. The participants were provided with sufficient information about the purpose, nature, and procedures of the study before they were invited to participate. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and they were given the opportunity to ask questions and clarify any concerns before providing their consent. Participation was entirely voluntary, and the participants were informed of their right to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, disadvantage, or negative consequences. The researchers also ensured the privacy and confidentiality of the participants throughout the research process. Personal information that could directly identify individual participants was not unnecessarily collected or disclosed, and the information obtained through the research instrument was used solely for academic and research purposes. The collected data were securely stored and were accessible only to the researchers and authorized individuals involved in the study. The findings were presented in aggregated form to prevent the identification of individual participants. The researchers likewise ensured that participation would not affect the students' academic standing, grades, relationship with instructors, or access to institutional services. All participants were treated fairly, respectfully, and without discrimination. Furthermore, the researchers observed the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence by ensuring that the research procedures posed minimal risk and did not intentionally expose participants to unnecessary physical, psychological, academic, social, or emotional harm. The researchers maintained integrity in data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting by ensuring that the data were neither fabricated nor falsified and that the findings were reported based on the actual responses and statistical results obtained. Appropriate acknowledgment of sources was also observed to prevent plagiarism and recognize the contributions of previous researchers. Finally, research materials and electronic data were securely maintained for legitimate academic and documentation purposes, with appropriate measures taken to prevent unauthorized access, disclosure, alteration, or loss. After the required retention period, research materials containing identifiable information shall be properly disposed of or permanently deleted to further protect the confidentiality and privacy of the participants.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn in accordance with the research questions. First, the students demonstrated a high level of linguistic competence across the dimensions of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. This indicates that the students generally possessed a well-developed understanding and application of the linguistic components necessary for effective language use. Second, the students demonstrated a high level of translation competence in terms of textual competence, disposition, and monitoring skills. This indicates that the students generally possessed the ability to process and express meaning appropriately, maintain a positive and persistent orientation toward translation tasks, and monitor and evaluate their translation decisions. Third, the students demonstrated a high level of writing skills in terms of correct grammar, vocabulary and lexical range, coherence and cohesion, and organization and structure. This indicates that the students generally possessed the ability to produce written texts with appropriate grammatical structures, adequate vocabulary, logical relationships among ideas, and organized textual presentation. Fourth, the study established a significant and strong positive relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills. This indicates that students with higher levels of linguistic competence tended to demonstrate higher levels of writing skills. The finding confirms that knowledge and application of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are closely associated with students' ability to produce effective written texts. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between linguistic competence and writing skills was rejected. Fifth, the study established a significant and very strong positive relationship between translation competence and writing skills. This indicates that students with higher levels of translation competence tended to demonstrate higher levels of writing skills. The finding highlights the close association between students' ability to process meaning, make appropriate translation decisions, engage actively in translation tasks, and monitor their work and their ability to produce effective written texts. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between translation competence and writing skills was rejected. Sixth, the multiple regression analysis revealed that Morphology and Semantics significantly predicted the students' writing skills within the specified regression model. In contrast, Phonology, Syntax,

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Pragmatics, Textual Competence, Disposition, and Monitoring Skills did not demonstrate statistically significant individual predictive contributions. This indicates that, when the dimensions were considered simultaneously within the specified model, morphological and semantic competence emerged as the dimensions that significantly contributed to the prediction of students' writing skills. Overall, the study concludes that linguistic competence and translation competence are closely associated with the writing skills of language education students. The high levels demonstrated across the three major variables, together with the significant relationships between linguistic competence and writing skills and between translation competence and writing skills, highlight the importance of linguistic and translation-related competencies in students' written communication. Furthermore, the regression findings emphasize the particular relevance of morphological and semantic competence in predicting writing skills within the specified model.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, language education instructors are encouraged to provide continuous learning activities that strengthen students' overall linguistic competence, particularly in phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Although the students demonstrated a high level of linguistic competence, sustained practice should be provided to further develop their ability to apply linguistic knowledge accurately and appropriately in different writing contexts. Particular emphasis may be given to morphological competence through activities involving word formation, affixation, root-word analysis, derivational and inflectional processes, and contextual word use, considering that morphology emerged as a significant predictor of writing skills. Semantics should likewise be given greater emphasis in writing instruction through activities involving contextual meaning, appropriate word selection, denotative and connotative meanings, figurative language, lexical relationships, and interpretation of implied meanings. Such activities may help students develop greater precision and appropriateness in expressing ideas through writing. In addition, translation activities may be integrated into language and writing instruction to strengthen students' textual competence, disposition, and monitoring skills. These may include source and target text analysis, preservation of meaning, contextual adaptation, revision, self-evaluation, and reflection on translation decisions. Writing instruction may also incorporate integrated linguistic and translation-based tasks wherein students analyze language forms and meanings, translate selected texts, revise their translations, and subsequently produce their own written compositions. Students are likewise encouraged to engage in continuous independent practice in writing, translation, vocabulary development, and language analysis through reading, writing journals, translation exercises, peer feedback, self-editing, and reflective activities. These practices may help them strengthen their ability to organize ideas, select appropriate language, and communicate meaning effectively. The College of Teacher Education and program administrators may consider developing enrichment activities, workshops, and intervention programs focused on academic writing, morphological awareness, semantic competence, and translation skills. These may be incorporated into relevant language and literature courses or offered as supplemental activities to address students' continuing developmental needs. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies involving students from other programs, institutions, or educational contexts to determine whether the findings are consistent across different populations. They may also examine other factors that could contribute to writing skills and employ more refined predictive models to determine how specific dimensions of linguistic and translation competence contribute to particular components of writing, such as grammatical accuracy, lexical development, coherence and cohesion, and organization.

References

Ait Hammou, B., Larouz, M., Fagroud, M., & Akki, F. (2023). Aspects of EFL university learners' lexical and phraseological proficiency as predictors of writing quality. Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26(1), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2023.32726

Al-Ibadi, Q. H. (2022). A pragmatic competence, language proficiency and writing performance of Iraqi EFL university students: A correlational study. Journal of Basic Sciences, 8(13), 443–466. https://doi.org/10.31185/bsj.Vol8.Iss13.317

Allen, A. A., & Lembke, E. S. (2022). The effect of a morphological awareness intervention on early writing outcomes. Learning Disability Quarterly, 45(2), 72–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948720912414

Asaad, H. Q. M. (2024). The role of morphological awareness in L2 postgraduates' academic writing: Is vocabulary knowledge a mediating variable? Cogent Education, 11(1), Article 2327787. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2327787

Collins, G., Wolter, J. A., Meaux, A. B., & Alonzo, C. N. (2020). Integrating morphological awareness in a multilinguistic structured literacy approach to improve literacy in adolescents with reading and/or

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

language disorders. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 51(3), 531–543. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_LSHSS-19-00053

Dong, D., & Chen, M.-L. (2025). Metacognitive strategies in translation: A comparative study of student and professional translators. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12, Article 890. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05289-7

Grigorakis, I., & Manolitsis, G. (2021). Longitudinal effects of different aspects of morphological awareness skills on early spelling development. Reading and Writing, 34, 945–979. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10098-2

Iļinska, L., Ivanova, O., & Ivanova, D. (2025). Mosaic of translation teaching: Textual competence. Research in Language, 23, 256–269. https://doi.org/10.18778/1731-7533.23.15

Lee, Y. (2024). Writing quality in university students' argumentative texts: Focusing on lexical features and rhetorical strategies. The Journal of Studies in Language, 40(3), 335–349.

Li, X., Gao, Z., & Liao, H. (2023). The effect of critical thinking on translation technology competence among college students: The chain mediating role of academic self-efficacy and cultural intelligence. Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 16, 1233–1256. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S408477

Maamuujav, U., Crossley, S. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2021). Examining lexical features and academic vocabulary use in adolescent L2 students' text-based analytical essays. Assessing Writing, 49, Article 100539.

Osawa, K. (2025). Genre-based writing instruction for secondary school students in an English as a foreign language context: Facilitating text organization and cohesion. SAGE Open, 15(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251375196

Palacios Briones, F. E., Gómez-Parra, M. E., & Espejo Mohedano, R. (2021). Coherence, concordance and cohesion in teaching writing. DIGILEC: Revista Internacional de Lenguas y Culturas, 7, 105–115. https://doi.org/10.17979/digilec.2020.7.0.7189

Park, S. (2023). Grammatical accuracy among Korean EFL learners by proficiency level. The Mirae Journal of English Language and Literature, 28(4), 139–160.

Qin, W., Jia, R., & Ren, W. (2024). Pragmatic competence in an email writing task: Influences of situation, L1 background, and L2 proficiency. Written Communication, 41(4), 726–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883241263543

Quessep, I. P., Redondo Martínez, L., & Medina, B. (2024). Phonological awareness and its relationship with dictated writing. Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research, 7(S6), 2456–2463.

Rambe, A. A., & Daulay, S. H. (2025). Enhancing students' linguistic by using colourful semantics game. SCOPE: Journal of English Language Teaching, 9(2), 699–704. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v9i2.22548

Raufi, B. S., Mulyono, H., Ilyas, H. P., & Zulaiha, S. (2024). Exploring Indonesian EFL students' lexical diversity and its correlation with academic vocabulary use in an online academic writing environment. Ampersand, 13, Article 100196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2024.100196

Rustipa, K., Rahayu, E. Y., & Yulistiyanti. (2023). Mood analysis and self-correction to enhance EFL students' grammatical accuracy. EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture, 8(1), 209–226. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.8.1.209-226

Salih, N. T., & Sahab, M. M. (2025). Investigating pragmatic failure of Iraqi EFL university students in academic writing. Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities, 32(6, Part 2), 39–59. https://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.32.6.2.2025.25

Shi, J., Shim, J., & Ryu, T. (2024). The effect of ChatGPT's grammar and reformulation feedback on EFL college students' writing performance. Journal of AI Humanities, 18, 49–74. https://doi.org/10.46397/JAIH.18.2

Siekmann, L., Parr, J. M., & Busse, V. (2022). Structure and coherence as challenges in composition: A study of assessing less proficient EFL writers' text quality. Assessing Writing, 54, Article 100672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100672

Siregar, M., & Stroupe, R. (2025). Theoretically informed students' worksheet based on metacognitive strategies for a translation course. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15(1), 198–208. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.76549

Venoza, D. L., & Ramos, L. (2026). Morphological awareness and writing proficiency in English of Grade 7 students. Philippine Journal of Basic Studies, 2. https://pjbs.pti.edu.ph/index.php/pjbs/article/view/22

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 143-166, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Vernon, S., & Ferreiro, E. (1999). Writing development: A neglected variable in the consideration of phonological awareness. Harvard Educational Review, 69(4), 395–416. https://doi.org/10.17763/HAER.69.4.P411667586738X0W

Wang, J., Kim, Y.-S. G., Lam, J. H. Y., & Leachman, M. A. (2025). A meta-analysis of relationships between syntactic features and writing performance and how the relationships vary by student characteristics and measurement features. Assessing Writing, 63, Article 100909. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100909

Xie, H., & Wang, P. (2025). Metacognition and translation competence: A three-level meta-analytic study. Acta Psychologica, 260, Article 105722. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105722

Zeng, Z., Nair, S. M., & Wider, W. (2022). Chinese EFL undergraduates' pragmatic competence in English letter writing. World Journal of English Language, 12(5), 239. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n5p23

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.