

Effects of Colloquial Language on the Writing Skills of Grade 11 Students

Sherry H. Briones¹, Leizel V. Abundo², Pauline S. Quiñones³, Krizzia Mae D. Regilme⁴, Joseph C. Catalan Jr.⁵, Donna Claire B. Cañeza⁶, Darrel M. Ocampo⁷

^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7} College of Education, Central Bicol State University of Agriculture, Sipocot, Camarines Sur, Philippines

Received : June 4, 2024

Revised : June 25, 2024

Accepted : June 25, 2024

Published: June 30, 2024

Corresponding Author

Sherry H. Briones

sherry.briones@cbsua.edu.ph

DOI: [10.29303/jeef.v4i2.672](https://doi.org/10.29303/jeef.v4i2.672)

© 2024 The Authors. This open access article is distributed under a (CC-BY License)



Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the effects of colloquial language on the English writing skills of Grade-11 students. It evaluates the prevalence of colloquial language usage, encompassing contractions, abbreviations, and sentence structures. Concurrently, it conducts a comprehensive assessment of students' writing skills, specifically emphasizing grammar, spelling, and coherence. The research methodology employed a quantitative approach, implementing a descriptive-correlational design. A rigorously selected random sample of 83 Grade 11 students from San Juan National High School forms the basis of this study. Data collection procedures include the utilization of a validated researcher-designed survey questionnaire coupled with the systematic analysis of written essays through the application of analytical rubrics. Empirical findings stemming from this investigation underscore the commendable writing proficiency of the students, with 30% demonstrating proficiency in grammar, 80% in spelling, and 28% in coherence. The $p > 0.05$ indicates that there is no significant correlation between colloquial language usage and the level of writing skills of the participants. These findings offer valuable insights into the limited impact of colloquial language on the development of writing skills, irrespective of prevailing linguistic variations within society. Consequently, educators are encouraged to consider the judicious integration of opportunities for students to engage with colloquial language within contextually appropriate boundaries.

Keywords: colloquial language, English writing skills, grammar, spelling, coherence

INTRODUCTION

Language constantly changes as its functions, grammar, and style shift among different social groups. As time progresses, alteration in pronunciation, the emergence of new vocabulary, changes in word meanings, and the dynamic expansion and contraction of linguistic morphology are observed, with these shifts manifesting differently among diverse social groups. Scholars specializing in variationist linguistics undertake the intricate task of scrutinizing and comprehending these linguistic changes, relying on the meticulous examination of genuine data. This process involves the observation of social and linguistic contexts and analyzing data as linguistic shifts unfold (Baesa-Alfelor & Ocampo, 2023).

Within the realm of research programs, language variation takes center stage, driven by the intrinsic fluidity of language itself. Fought (2004) aptly notes that language is inherently transitional, unable to instantaneously shift from one state to another, raising pertinent questions about the malleability of language within the linguistic landscape. Furthermore, language contact surfaces when speakers from distinct linguistic backgrounds communicate, exchanging unique linguistic practices intrinsic to their respective communities. Another dimension to language variation emerges with prolonged engagement on social networking sites, as individuals increasingly blend formal language elements with informal features such as colloquialisms and slang (Adedamola et al., 2015).

Ocampo (2022) delves into the intricate relationship between language and the societies that employ it, highlighting language as a pivotal mode of communication among individuals residing within a society. This symbiotic interplay between language and society gives birth to the field of sociolinguistics, aimed at unraveling the nuances of language usage influenced by factors including race, gender, social class, and regional identity. On the other hand, Karta et al. (2023)

assert that linguistic distinctiveness can be seen through vocabulary, including jargon or slang, pronunciation, morphological procedures, and syntax building. The use of words and expressions, also termed colloquial languages, is not considered standard language and is mostly central to the young generation's experience, where the expressions are measured as an indicator of the speaker's social identity.

Colloquial expressions have grown in popularity among young people in various societies (Sikandar, et al., 2022). Most young people use these words or phrases when communicating, whether in ignorance of formal words or on purpose, to cope with the new trends in their environment. Nevertheless, since colloquial language is a part of informal English and is used in informal writing and speaking, this can cause confusion in formal language usage, which could impact how well students develop their vocabulary and academic writing skills.

In the contemporary landscape, students navigate an environment characterized by exposure to diverse dialects and an increasing reliance on social media. This reality blurs the distinction between informal and formal language, creating a dilemma in educational settings where a more formal tone is expected. Formal writing among university students bears the brunt of this linguistic transition, with frequent informal language and slang infiltrating exams, reports, assignments, and tests. The prevalent use of SMS texting has ushered in shorter spellings, inadequate punctuation, suboptimal word choices, and simplified communication practices. As such, this study explores colloquial language as part of the multifaceted landscape of contemporary language variation, dissecting its influences on writing skills and language usage, as well as its implications for academic development.

This study aimed to determine the effects of colloquial language on the English writing skills of Grade 11 students of San Juan National High School. Specifically, it seeks to: (1) to determine the extent of use of colloquial language of Grade 11

students along with contraction, abbreviation, and sentence construction; (2) to determine the level of writing skills the respondents in terms of grammar, spelling, and coherence, and; (3) to evaluate the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language and level of writing skills of the respondents.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design. It was used to measure and quantify colloquial language usage within the written expressions of Grade 11 students and to assess their proficiency levels in writing skills quantitatively. Thus, this study explores the intricate relationships between these variables through statistical analysis. The following approach was employed to determine the findings and results of the study objectively.

Research Method

This study utilized a descriptive correlational research method. The descriptive method was used to determine the extent of the use of colloquial language and to describe the level of writing skills of the respondents. Moreover, the correlational method was used to determine the relationship between the use of colloquial language and the level of writing skills of Grade 11 students. The respondents of this study were the Grade 11 students of San Juan National High School Year 2022-2023. The researchers used a random sampling technique in choosing the eighty-three (83) students from all Grade-11 General Academic Strand (GAS), Humanity and Social Sciences (HUMSS), and Technical Vocational Livelihood (TVL) strands of San Juan National High School Year 2022—2023 that served as the respondents of the study. The total number of Grade 11 students in this study was 521. The researchers used Yamane's formula with a 10% significance level to identify the sample size. The population of the study comprised of 83 Grade 11 students, with 42 students were taken from the General Academic Strand (GAS), 19 students were taken from the Technical Vocational Livelihood strand (TVL), and 22 students from Humanity and Social Sciences (HUMSS).

Data Gathering Procedure

The data acquisition methodology in this study entailed the procurement of information from Grade 11 students enrolled in the General Academic Strand (GAS), Humanities and Social Sciences Strand (HUMSS), and Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) program at San Juan National High School, located in Handong, Libmanan, Camarines Sur. Rigorous adherence to the principles of random sampling guided the selection of participants.

Ethical and administrative protocols were conscientiously observed to secure official authorization for data collection. Formal requests for data collection were meticulously composed and subsequently endorsed by the professor, research adviser, College dean, and campus administrator of the Central Bicol State University of Agriculture-Sipocot campus, cementing this research endeavor's ethical and academic integrity.

This study's primary data collection instruments comprised a standardized assessment and a devised survey questionnaire. The investigation into the extent of colloquial language usage in the writing proficiency of Grade 11 students

was executed with precision. To this end, two distinct research instruments were utilized: the survey questionnaire and analytical rubrics. To bolster the authenticity and reliability of the research instruments and assessment tools, input and validation were solicited from the research instructor, research adviser, and panel members.

In the initial segment of the survey questionnaire, respondents were presented with a comprehensive inventory of colloquial language elements, encompassing contractions, abbreviations, and sentence structures. They were tasked with discerning the presence or absence of these colloquial elements and four sub-variables within their written work.

In the second facet of data acquisition, the Grade 11 English teachers helped the researchers guide students in crafting autobiographical essays ranging from 300 to 500 words. Rigorous evaluation of these essays employed analytical rubrics, meticulously scrutinizing facets such as grammar, spelling, and coherence.

Subsequently, the researchers collated and aggregated survey responses from the participants. These datasets were subjected to rigorous data analysis procedures, underpinned by appropriate statistical methodologies, with the overarching objective of elucidating a conclusive correlation between the utilization of colloquial language and the English writing skills of Grade 11 students.

Following the data analysis, the researchers constructed research implications, deriving salient insights and implications from the findings. This study sought to contribute substantively to the wider academic discourse and enhance comprehension of the subject.

Statistical Treatment

To ensure the truthfulness and objectivity of the results, this study uses various statistical tools for the analysis and interpretation of the data in order to obtain proper and accurate results. Several distinct statistical tools and techniques were employed and were carefully selected to address the specific aspects of the objectives. The statistical tools they used are the following:

The weighted mean and ranking technique assigned varying degrees of importance or weight to different indicators. It was applied to assess the extent of colloquial language usage, grammar, spelling, and coherence in the collected data. By assigning weights to these factors, the study quantitatively measures their impact and determines the extent to which colloquial language is used in conjunction with writing quality indicators. Essentially, it quantifies the influence of each aspect on the overall writing quality.

Moreover, the frequency count and percentage technique were used to determine the level of writing skills of the respondents. The method involves counting the occurrence of specific attributes or characteristics related to writing skills (such as correct grammar usage, spelling errors, or coherence issues) within the dataset. These counts are then converted into percentages to understand the prevalence of different writing-related issues among the respondents. This technique allows for a quantitative assessment of writing proficiency. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was used to determine the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language and the level of writing skills of the respondents. In this study, it was employed to determine whether a statistically significant correlation exists between the

two continues variables. This assesses the connection between using colloquial language and the quality of writing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data gathered is divided into three parts, namely: the extent of use of colloquial language by the respondents along with contraction, abbreviation, and sentence construction; the level of writing skills of the respondents in terms of grammar, spelling, and coherence; and the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language and level of writing skills of the respondents.

Extent of Use of Colloquial Language by the Respondents along with Contraction, Abbreviation, and Sentence Construction

This section employed a structured approach, incorporating a survey questionnaire and analytic rubrics. It systematically assesses the utilization of colloquial language contractions, abbreviations, and sentence construction among Grade-11 students. The analysis further employs weighted mean and ranking techniques to evaluate these linguistic aspects within the student cohort.

Shown in Table 1A was the statistical data concerning the extent of the use of colloquial language along with contraction. Findings revealed that the highest three indicators concerning the extent of the use of colloquial language along with contraction were: the use of contractions such as "I'm", "can't," "won't," and "let's" in written communication to convey the same meaning in a shorter amount of space or time (WM, 3.2); the use of contractions in text messages to make the conversation more engaging (WM, 3.10); and the use of contractions to create a more relaxed and familiar tone to connect with the readers (WM, 2.93). Nevertheless, the lowest three indicators were the use of contractions in writing to convey emotions (WM, 2.57) creatively, the use of contractions in writing to make write-ups more interesting (WM, 2.41); and the use of colloquial language such as making contraction like "ain't," "wanna," "gonna" and "dunno" in academic writing (WM, 2.22).

Table 1A. Extent of use of Colloquial Language by the respondents, along with Contraction

Indicators	Weighted Mean (WM)	Rank	Interpretation
1. I use colloquial languages such as making contraction like "ain't," "wanna," "gonna" and "dunno" in academic writing.	2.22	10	Sometimes
2. I use contractions in writing to make my write-ups more interesting.	2.41	9	Sometimes
3. I use contractions in text messages to make conversation more engaging.	3.10	2	Often
4. I use contractions in writing to creatively convey my emotions.	2.57	8	Often
5. I use contraction in writing to make it more natural and less boring.	2.59	7	Often
6. I make contractions such as "I'm" (I am), "can't" (cannot), "won't" (will not), and "let's" (let us) in written communication to	3.22	1	Often

convey the same meaning in a shorter amount of space or time.			
7. I use contractions to create a more conversational tone in written communication.	2.71	5	Often
8. I use contractions to make my writing more efficient and concised.	2.64	6	Often
9. I use contractions to create a more relaxed and familiar tone to connect with the readers.	2.93	3	Often
10. I use contractions to clarify the meaning of a sentence making it easier for the readers to understand.	2.87	4	Often
Overall Mean (OM)	2.72	--	Often

Legend:

3.26 – 4.00 - Always

2.51 – 3.25 - Often

1.76 – 2.50 - Sometimes

1.00 – 1.75 - Never

The data implied that the extent of use of colloquial language by Grade-11 students and contraction resulted in an Overall Mean (OM) of 2.72, which was interpreted as often. Thus, the findings showed that Grade 11 students often use colloquial language contractions in written communication. The students have adopted the usage of colloquial language contractions in their academic writing, entailing that students' frequent use of colloquial language contractions may affect their writing skills.

The findings of the study state that based on the classification of colloquial types, contraction as one of its types is often applied in oral communication by the students in order to create a more relaxed and familiar tone in communication. Moreover, students often utilize colloquial language contractions to impart and conveniently express words. Besides, when discussing, students mostly used contractions and single words; however, they used colloquial contractions more in speaking than writing.

The findings of the study were in parallel to the study of Armea et al. (2021) stated that the formal writing of university students is seen to be impacted by the frequent use of colloquial and slang language in their exams, reports, assignments, and tests because SMS (Short Messaging System) texting promotes shorter spellings, wrong or no punctuation, poor word choice and easy communication.

Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1977) supports the result of this study, which offers valuable insights into why students frequently incorporate colloquial language and contractions into their speech and writing. This theory emphasizes that students learn language through formal instruction and observing and imitating the language used in their social environment. As students interact with peers, family members, and media, they naturally encounter colloquial language and contractions. Bandura's theory underscores the impact of observational learning, social reinforcement, and contextual adaptation, where positive feedback and the appropriateness of language use in various social settings play crucial roles. Therefore, students often embrace colloquial language and contractions due to their exposure to and imitation of the linguistic patterns they encounter in their social interactions.

Table 1B. Extent of use of Colloquial Language by the respondents, along with Abbreviation

Indicators	Weighted Mean (WM)	Rank	Interpretation
1. I use abbreviation to shorten the form of a word like Corp. (Corporation) and Org. (Organization) in writing.	2.88	5	Often
2. I use abbreviation to make it easier to remember, and easier to read like "Mr.," "Dr.," "Prof" in writing.	3.28	1	Always
3. I use abbreviation in measurement units like ("g" for grams, "m" for meter, and "s" for seconds) or short forms of chemical elements ("Na" for sodium, "Ca" for calcium, and "K" for potassium) in writing.	3.14	3	Often
4. I use colloquial abbreviations such as "LOL" (laugh out loud), "BTW" (by the way), and "OMG" (oh my god) in writing to convey a sense of humor and to make my writing more casual.	3.18	2	Often
5. I use abbreviations in time like "hr" for hour, "mins" for minutes, "AM" for Ante Meridiem and "PM" for Post Meridiem in writing.	3.04	4	Often
6. I use colloquial language abbreviations to express ideas and to be more concise in writing paragraphs.	2.69	10	Often
7. I use colloquial language abbreviations to convey meaning quickly and efficiently.	2.72	8	Often
8. I use colloquial language abbreviations to convey tone and emotion.	2.87	6	Often
9. I use colloquial language abbreviations to create new ways of expressing myself and conveying meaning in written communication.	2.82	7	Often
10. I use colloquial language abbreviations to write quicker and consume less time in writing.	2.71	9	Often
Overall Mean (OM)	2.93	--	Often

The findings from Table 1B provide insights into the extent of colloquial language abbreviation usage by the respondents. The highest-rated indicators indicate frequent use of abbreviations, including those used to enhance readability and memorability (WM 3.28), measurement units and chemical elements (WM 3.14), and colloquial abbreviations for humor and informality (WM 3.18). Conversely, the lowest-rated indicators suggest less frequent usage for creating new means of self-expression (WM 2.71), conveying tone and emotion (WM 2.72), and expediting writing (WM 2.69). The Overall Mean (OM) of 2.93 indicates an overall frequent usage of colloquial language abbreviations. The results indicated that students often utilize colloquial language abbreviation in their written works. Consequently, it implied that Grade 11 students utilized colloquial abbreviations to enhance their readability and memorability. These findings shed light on the respondents' preferences for different types of abbreviations and their frequency of use in written communication.

The result was similar to the study of Hafeez and Qadir (2018), which states that written communication especially mobile text messaging, is offenders of normal language usage among students because it is considered to be a source of instant messaging, which promotes reductions and omissions

in spellings of words, shortening of sentences and usage of abbreviations. This form of written communication affects students' writing, which they adapt and utilize short sentences and abbreviations in their written works.

Shown in table 1C was the statistical data concerning the extent of colloquial language usage along with construction.

Table 1C. Extent of use of Colloquial Language by the respondents, along with Sentence Construction

Indicators	Weighted Mean (WM)	Rank	Interpretation
1. I use colloquial languages to make my sentence constructions more interesting.	2.73	6	Often
2. I use colloquial language in sentence construction to add character and authenticity in writing.	2.63	9	Often
3. I use colloquial language in sentence construction to make my essay engaging and more persuading to the readers.	2.75	5	Often
4. I use colloquial language in sentence construction to convey emotion and enthusiasm.	2.37	10	Sometimes
5. I use colloquial language in constructing sentences to add beauty and creativity in writing.	2.90	3	Often
6. I use colloquial language in constructing sentences to convey emotions and express personal ideas in writing.	2.92	2	Often
7. I use colloquial language in constructing sentences to make writing more natural and to understand easier by the readers.	2.84	4	Often
8. I use colloquial language in writing to create a sense of familiarity and shared culture to the readers.	2.67	8	Often
9. I use colloquial language in constructing sentences to create a sense of credibility particularly in contexts where the use of formal language might seem insincere or pretentious.	2.69	7	Often
10. I use colloquial language in constructing sentences to express myself freely.	3.01	1	Often
Overall Mean (OM)	2.75	--	Often

Legend

3.26 – 4.00 - Always

2.51 – 3.25 - Often

1.76 – 2.50 - Sometimes

1.00 – 1.75 - Never

Table 1C reveals that the respondents use colloquial language quite frequently in their sentence construction, as indicated by the "Often" ranking for all indicators. This suggests a common tendency among the respondents to incorporate colloquial language in their writing.

It shows that the top three indicators were: the use of colloquial language in constructing sentences to express themselves freely with a weighted mean of 3.01, which suggests that respondents perceive colloquial language as a means of personal expression in their writing; the use of colloquial language in constructing sentences to convey emotions and express personal ideas in writing with a weighted mean of 2.92; and the use of colloquial language in constructing sentences to add beauty and creativity in writing

with a weighted mean of 2.92. This suggests that colloquial language is seen as a tool to enhance communication and engage readers.

Nevertheless, the top three lowest indicators were the use of colloquial language in sentence construction to convey emotion and enthusiasm with a weighted mean of 2.37 (ranked 10); the use of colloquial language in sentence construction to add character and authenticity in writing with a weighted mean of 2.63 (ranked 9); and the use colloquial language in writing to create a sense of familiarity and shared culture to the readers with a weighted mean of 2.67 (ranked 8). This implies that while colloquial language may add some emotion, authenticity, and enthusiasm to their writing, these are not the primary factors.

The data indicates that the respondents often use colloquial language in their sentence construction primarily to express themselves freely, convey emotions, and make their writing more engaging and comprehensible. These findings highlight the potential benefits of incorporating colloquial language in writing to enhance personal expression and connect with readers.

Likewise, the study's findings are similar to Biber and Conrad (2009) who show that using colloquial language in writing can enhance engagement and improve understanding among readers. It creates a conversational tone, making the text more accessible and relatable to a wider audience.

Table 1D. Summary table of the extent of use of Colloquial Language by the respondents

Domain	Weighted Mean (WM)	Rank	Interpretation
Contraction	2.72	3	Often
Abbreviation	2.93	1	Often
Sentence construction	2.75	2	Often
Overall Mean	2.87		Often

The Findings in Table 1D show the summary of the extent of use of colloquial language by the Grade 11 students of San Juan National High School; abbreviation has the highest weighted mean of 2.93 when it comes to the extent of use of colloquial language. Moreover, sentence construction is rated as the second domain used by the respondents with a weighted mean of 2.75. Hence, contraction has the least of usage, with the weighted mean of 2.72. The overall mean of the findings were interpreted as often with an average of 2.87, this indicates that the respondents uses colloquial language and informal elements quite frequently in their communication. The data from the abovementioned table suggests that the respondents generally have a tendency to use colloquial language in various forms, including contractions, abbreviations, and sentence construction. This indicates that they find value in employing these informal elements to enhance their communication. They perceive contractions as a way to convey meaning concisely, abbreviations as a means of saving time and space, and sentence construction techniques as a way to achieve a more natural and less formal communication style.

The data implied that the respondents exhibit a preference for using colloquial language often, indicating a desire to establish a more informal and conversational tone in their communication. It suggests that colloquial language elements contribute to making their writing and conversations more engaging, interesting, and relatable.

The Universal Grammar Theory by Chomsky (1960) supports the results of this study based on the concept of innate

language structures which it provides valuable insights into the phenomenon of students frequently incorporating colloquial language, contractions, abbreviations, and unconventional sentence construction. From a third-person perspective, it becomes evident that these linguistic variations are intrinsic to the natural progression of language acquisition and development. Students, driven by their innate language instincts, instinctively explore and integrate colloquialisms and informal language features into their writing as they refine their linguistic skills.

From an educational standpoint, a comprehensive understanding of Universal Grammar allows educators to recognize the significance of linguistic adaptability in students' language use. It enables them to strike a delicate balance between nurturing formal writing skills and acknowledging students' innate creativity and capacity to adapt their language to various communicative contexts. This perspective emphasizes the importance of fostering grammatical proficiency while appreciating the dynamic nature of language development among students.

Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents in terms of Grammar, Spelling, and Coherence

Grammar, spelling, and coherence as part of considerations to evaluate the respondents' writing skills, provides information on the respondents' written communication accuracy, clarity, and overall effectiveness. Utilizing frequency count and percentage technique with corresponding ratings and interpretations, this section discusses the level of writing skills of Grade 11 students in three categories of the writing skills test including an overview of the three areas.

Table 2. Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents in terms of Grammar, Spelling, and Coherence

Score	Descriptive Rating	Level of writing skills 1			Total	Rank
		Grammar	Spelling	Coherence		
8.1-10	Advance	2(2%)	4(5%)	0(0%)	6(2%)	4
6.1-8	Proficient	25(30%)	66(80%)	23(28%)	114(46%)	1
4.1-6	Developing	51(61%)	13(16%)	56(67%)	120(48%)	2
01-Apr	Beginning	5(6%)	0(0%)	4(5%)	9(4%)	3
Total		83	83	83		
Average		6.11	7.27	6.02	6.28	
Descriptive rating		Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	
Rank		2	1	3	---	

Presented in Table 2 is the evaluation of the respondents' level of writing skills in terms of grammar, spelling, and coherence. Based on the findings, scores ranging from 8.1 to 10 have descriptive ratings of advanced, while 2 of the respondents, which is equivalent to (2%), achieved an advanced level of grammar skills. Thus, 6 respondents (2%) obtained scores within the advanced range.

In terms of spelling, the scores range from 6.1 to 8, and the descriptive rating is proficient. Moreover, 25 of the respondents (30%) achieved a proficient level of spelling skills. Consequently, 66 respondents (80%) obtained scores within the proficient range. Furthermore, in terms of coherence, scores ranging from 6.1 to 8 have the descriptive

rating of proficient. 23 respondents (28%) achieved a proficient level of coherence in their writing. Thus, of the overall total of the respondents, 114(46%) obtained scores within the proficient range.

The highest percentage of proficiency was observed in spelling (80%), followed by grammar (30%), and coherence (28%). Grammar receives an average score of 6.11, spelling receives an average score of 7.27, and coherence receives an average score of 6.02. The average scores indicate that the writing skills in grammar, spelling, and coherence are proficient. The results suggest that spelling skills had the highest average score and were ranked first, followed by grammar and coherence skills.

The result of the study was aligned with the study of Linda Hinkley et al. (2014), wherein they examined the impact of spelling skills on writing quality. The study concluded that students with strong spelling skills demonstrated better coherence and cohesion in their writing. In addition, a study published in the Journal of Educational Psychology in 2017 examined the writing skills of 230 middle school students. The researchers found that students who displayed a good understanding of grammar rules and vocabulary had better writing skills in terms of coherence.

The Cognitive Process Theory of Writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981) also supports the present by offering a coherent framework that logically supports Grade 11 students in reaching a proficient level in their writing skills. This theory emphasizes key components of the writing process in a chronological sequence. This theory encourages students to set clear composition objectives, establishing a strong foundation for goal-oriented writing. It then emphasizes the significance of effective planning and organization, leading to well-structured and coherent compositions. Additionally, this theory highlights the translation of abstract ideas into articulate written form and the importance of rigorous revision. Furthermore, it underscores the role of cognitive development in enabling students to express ideas effectively and navigate writing challenges. When these principles are comprehensively understood and applied, students demonstrate proficient writing skills.

Relationship between the Extent of Use of Colloquial Language and Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents

Table 3A. Relationship between the Extent of Use of Colloquial Language along with Contraction and Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents

Level of writing skills	Abbreviation		
	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Grammar	0.036	0.746	Not Significant
Spelling	-0.006	0.959	Not Significant
Coherence	0.014	0.899	Not Significant

The table provides statistical values such as the correlation coefficient (r-value) and the p-value, which serves as indicator to determine the significance of the observed relationships between these variables.

The table presents the findings regarding the relationship between the extent of using colloquial language along with contractions and the level of writing skills among the respondents. It includes the correlation coefficient (r-value), the p-value, and an interpretation of the significance of the findings for each relationship.

It can be gauged from the table that the relationship between the use of contractions and the respondents' grammar skills has the r-value of 0.090, indicating a very weak positive correlation. However, the p-value is 0.417, which is above the conventional threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. Therefore, the interpretation suggests that the relationship is not significant. This means that there is no statistically significant correlation between the use of contractions and the level of grammar skills among the respondents.

Moreover, the relationship between the use of contractions and the respondents' spelling skills has the r-value of 0.125, indicating a weak positive correlation. Similarly, the p-value is 0.259, which is above the significance threshold. Thus, the interpretation concludes that the relationship is not significant. This implies no significant correlation exists between the use of contractions and the level of spelling skills among the respondents.

Furthermore, the relationship between the use of contractions and the respondents' coherence skills has the r-value of 0.005, indicating an extremely weak positive correlation. Additionally, the p-value of 0.963 is not statistically significant. Consequently, the interpretation states that the relationship is not significant. This suggests no significant correlation exists between the use of contractions and the level of coherence skills among the respondents.

Thus, there is no significant relationship between the extent of using colloquial language along with contractions and the level of grammar, spelling, or coherence skills among the respondents. This indicates that the use of colloquial contractions does not have a notable impact on these specific writing skills but rather on the adaptability of contractions in informal oral communication.

Shown in Table 3B was the statistical data concerning the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language along with abbreviation and the level of writing skills of the respondents.

Table 3B. Relationship between the Extent of Use of Colloquial Language along with Abbreviation and Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents

Level of writing skills	Contraction		
	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Grammar	0.090	0.417	Not Significant
Spelling	0.125	0.259	Not Significant
Coherence	0.005	0.963	Not Significant

Table 3B indicates the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language along with abbreviation and the level of writing skills of the respondents. The table includes an explanation of the findings and the r-values and p-values for each relationship.

The relationship between the use of colloquial language and abbreviation and the respondents' grammar skills has an r-value of 0.036, indicating a weak positive correlation. However, the p-value is 0.746, which is above the conventional threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. Consequently, the interpretation states that the relationship is not significant. This means that the data does not provide enough evidence to suggest a significant correlation between the use of colloquial language and abbreviation and the level of grammar skills among the respondents.

Moreover, the relationship between using colloquial language and abbreviation and the respondents' spelling skills

has an r-value of -0.006, indicating a very weak negative correlation. Furthermore, the p-value is 0.959, well above the significance threshold. Thus, the interpretation concludes that the relationship is not significant. Therefore, there is no significant correlation between the use of colloquial language and abbreviation and the level of spelling skills among the respondents.

In conclusion, the relationship between using colloquial language and abbreviation and the respondents' coherence skills has an r-value of 0.014, indicating a very weak positive correlation. Similar to the previous cases, the p-value of 0.899 is not statistically significant. Consequently, the interpretation states that the relationship is not significant. This suggests that the extent of using colloquial language and abbreviation does not significantly correlate with the level of coherence skills among the respondents.

Generally, there is no significant relationship between the extent of using colloquial language and abbreviation and the level of grammar, spelling, or coherence skills among the respondents. The results implied that Grade 11 students are knowledgeable enough to use colloquial language in their writings. In the same way, the findings revealed that students can manage their own level of writing skills even by utilizing colloquial language in writing. Thus, the students' consciousness of using colloquial language in formal writing is well conducted.

The Theory of Linguistic Evolution and Adaptation by Noam Chomsky (1950) likewise supports the findings of this study which explained how abbreviations do not have a significant rapport towards writing skills. This explains that colloquial abbreviations emerge as a natural response to the changing landscape of language and communication.

The study mentioned suggests that the use of abbreviations in colloquial language does not have a significant negative impact on writing skills. This finding aligns with Chomsky's theory that language is adaptable and can accommodate new forms and styles of communication without fundamentally affecting its core structure.

As society evolves and new technologies and platforms for communication emerge, language undergoes a process of adaptation to meet the needs of the users. Colloquial abbreviations can be seen as a manifestation of this adaptation process. They are created to streamline communication, make it more efficient, and accommodate the constraints of certain communication channels, such as text messages or social media platforms with limited character counts.

In this theory, colloquial abbreviations are viewed as linguistic innovations that reflect the dynamic nature of language and its ability to adapt to new contexts and technologies. Like the present study, colloquial abbreviations as linguistic innovations do not necessarily indicate a decline in writing skills but rather reflect the changing norms and conventions of informal communication.

Table 3C. Relationship between the Extent of Use of Colloquial Language along with Sentence Construction and Level of Writing Skills of the Respondents

Level of writing skills	Sentence Constructions		
	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Grammar	-0.026	0.818	Not Significant
Spelling	0.089	0.426	Not Significant
Coherence	-0.024	0.830	Not Significant
Overall	0.041	0.712	Not Significant

Table 3C presents the results of an analysis investigating the relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language along with sentence construction and the level of writing skills of the respondents. It includes the correlation coefficient (r-value), the p-value, and an interpretation of the significance of the findings for each relationship.

The data disclosed that the r-value on grammar skills was -0.026 and interpreted with a very weak negative correlation. The p-value was 0.818, which is well above the conventional threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. Therefore, there is no significant correlation between sentence construction and the level of grammar skills among the respondents. Data also revealed the r-value on spelling was 0.089 and interpreted with a very weak positive correlation. The p-value was 0.426 which is above the significance threshold. Therefore, the interpretation concludes that the relationship is not significant. Thus, there is no significant correlation between sentence construction and the level of spelling skills among the respondents.

Finally, the relationship between sentence construction and the respondents' coherence skill has the r-value of -0.024, indicating a very weak negative correlation. Additionally, the p-value of 0.830 is not statistically significant. Thus, the interpretation states that the relationship is not significant. This indicates that the extent of sentence construction does not significantly correlate with the level of coherence skills among the respondents.

The overall relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language along with sentence construction and the respondents' overall writing skills has an r-value is 0.041, indicating a very weak positive correlation. Moreover, the p-value of 0.712 is not statistically significant. Therefore, the interpretation concludes that the relationship is "Not Significant." There is no significant relationship between the extent of using colloquial language along with sentence construction and the level of grammar, spelling, coherence skills, or overall writing skills among the respondents.

The study's findings showed no significant correlations between sentence construction and the level of writing skills along with grammar, spelling, and coherence skills. The correlations among these variables are quite weak and lack statistical significance, indicating that the quality of sentence construction has little impact on the respondents' grammar, spelling, or coherence skills in this dataset. It implied that Grade 11 students are knowledgeable enough to use colloquial language in their written works. In the same way, the findings revealed that students can manage their level of writing by being aware of the appropriate utilization of colloquial language in their written works. Thus, the students are consciously prudent in using colloquial language in formal contexts.

The Register Variation Theory by Biber (1988) supports the findings of this study, which states that colloquial sentence construction is characterized by greater flexibility and deviation from formal grammar rules. While this theory focuses on the sociolinguistic aspects of colloquial sentence construction, it does not emphasize the impact of these constructions on formal writing skills. It recognizes that different registers and language styles can coexist and be used appropriately based on the social context, without necessarily undermining one's writing skills when adhering to the appropriate conventions of formal writing.

A study by Ocampo (2023) was congruent with the study's findings, which determined that translanguaging and use of local words do not impede cognition. The study examines the role of translanguaging in reading, which also involves shifting between different language varieties, including colloquial language. The study found that students who incorporated translanguaging could effectively communicate with different audiences and navigate multiple linguistic and cultural contexts, yet without obstructing their knowledge of the absolute utilization of colloquial languages.

CONCLUSION

Based on the significant findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn: It was found that the extent of use of colloquial language by Grade 11 students in terms of contraction, abbreviations, and sentence construction was interpreted as often. Thus, individuals often employ contractions and abbreviations to save time or space, improve readability, and allow for more freedom of expression.

Furthermore, the findings revealed that most respondents displayed proficient grammar, spelling, and coherence writing skills. It was inferred that spelling skills were the strongest among the three categories, while coherence skills had the lowest proficiency percentage. These findings emphasize the importance of focusing on coherence improvement for the respondents. The results indicate a satisfactory level of writing proficiency among most respondents, demonstrating their competence in grammar, spelling, and coherence. However, there is still room for improvement, especially in coherence skills, to achieve higher proficiency levels in written communication.

Moreover, based on the results, there is no significant relationship between the extent of use of colloquial language, including contractions and abbreviations, sentence construction, and the level of writing skills of the respondents. This suggests that these specific factors do not have a noticeable impact on the overall writing skills of the Grade 11 students.

REFERENCES

- Agonia, A. (2020). *The Effects of Internet Slang Language in Writing Skill of Grade 10 Students of The Mabini Academy*. [Students' dissertation, University of Lipa Campus]. <https://www.studocu.com/ph/document/batangas-state-university-lipa-campus/secondary-education/chapter-i-ii-iii-iv-group-6/39853504>
- Annab, A. (2016). *The Effect of Colloquial English In Students' Essay Writing*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/198366689/The_effect_of_colloquial_english_in_students_essay_writing?fbclid
- Arnea, A. P., Castro, M. P., Llamado, M. N., Lotino, R. B., San Esteban, A. A., & Ocampo, D. M. (2022). English Proficiency and Literary Competence of English Major Students: Predictor for Effective Language and Literature Teaching. *Online Submission*, 12(1), 141-151. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED620161>
- Baesa-Alfelor, X. S., & Ocampo, D. M. (2023). English
- Benwell, T. (n.d.). *Universal Grammar*. Retrieved from <https://www.englishclub.com/grammar/theory/universal.php>
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511814358>
- Biber, D. (1988). *The Register Variation Theory*. https://www.blackwellpublishing.com/content/BPL_IMAGES/Content_store/WWW_Content/9780631205951/009.pdf
- Canagarajah, A. (2002). *Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship*. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 29-44. [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=836660](https://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=836660)
- Chen, H. H. J. (2020). *The impact of Google assistant on adolescent EFL learners' willingness to communicate*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10494820.2020.1841801?journalCode=nile20>
- Cilliers, EJ. (2021). *Reflecting on Social Learning Tools to Enhance the Teaching-Learning Experience of Generation Z Learners*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/educ.2020.606533/full>
- Dąbrowska, E. (2018). *Experience, aptitude and individual differences in native language ultimate attainment*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29886057/>
- Dąbrowska, M. (2018). *Abbreviated English - A typical feature of online communication?* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329633551_Abbreviated_english_A_typical_feature_of_online_communication&ved
- Dueraman, B. (2014). *The Development of Writing Skills among English Majors at Two Universities in Thailand*. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://etd.uum.edu.my/4430/2/s93025_abstract.pdf
- Epoge, N. K. (2012). Slang and colloquialism in cameroon English verbal discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(1), 130-145. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268380570_Slang_and_Colloquialism_in_Cameroon_English_Verbal_Discourse
- Formal and informal style | Effective Writing Practices Tutorial | Northern Illinois University. (n.d.). Northern Illinois University. <https://www.niu.edu/writingtutorial/style/formal-and-informal-style.html?fbclid>
- Godley, A., Carpenter, B., & Werner, C. (2007). "I'll speak in proper slang": Language ideologies in a daily editing activity. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 100-131. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.42.1.4>
- Hafeez, W., & Qadir, M. (2018). *Impact of the language used by social media. (Chatting and SMS) in English language*. <https://www.webology.org/datacms/articles/>
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. L., & Trimbur, J. (2011). *Opinion: language difference in writing: toward a translingual approach*. <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1065&context=faculty>
- Intiaz, A. (2017). *BEFORE. B-e-f-o-r-e. Not b4. We Write English, not Bingo! Academic English and Pakistani Digital Natives*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354696567_BEFORE_B-e-f-o-r

- Karta, I. W., Farmasari, S., & Ocampo, D. M. (2023). Online Assessment of Primary Students' Cognitive, Psychomotor, and Affective Domains: Practices from Urban and Rural Primary Schools in Indonesia. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 173, p. 01014). EDP Sciences. https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/abs/2023/22/shsconf_access2023_01014/shsconf_access2023_01014.html
- Language Teaching (ELT) Appraisal in the Trifocal System of the Philippine Education-Basis for Policy and Advancement Program. *Journal of Innovative Research*, 1(3), 40-48. <https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/jir/article/view/2026>
- Language Variation and Change* | Linguistic Society of America. (n.d.). <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/language-variation-and-change?fbclid>
- Linda, S. (n.d.). *Sociolinguistics in relation to language, social identity, and communication*. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/sociolinguistics-relation-language-social-identity-shafira-linda?fbclid>
- Linguistics 001 -- *Language Change and Historical Reconstruction*. (n.d.). https://www.ling.upenn.edu/courses/Fall_2003/ling001/language_change.html?fbclid
- McLeod, S. (2023). *Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>
- Montsaye Academy, (n.d.). *Theories of Language Acquisition*. <https://www.montsaye.northants.sch.uk/assets/Uploads/English-Language-Summer-Work-2.pdf>
- Ocampo, D. (2023). Translanguaging and Reading Comprehension of Filipino ESL Intermediate Learners. *Online Submission*, 1(1), 13-21. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED628266>
- Ocampo, D. M. (2022). Disempowering the powerful: A critical pragmatic analysis of political discourse using Brown and Levinson's Face Theory. *Rajasthali Journal*, 2(1), 55-62. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Darrel-Ocampo/publication/364291492_Disempowering_the_powerful_A_critical_pragmatic_analysis_of_political_discourse_using_Brown_and_Levinson's_Face_Theory/links/6343a9caff870c55ce14711a/Disempowering-the-powerful-A-critical-pragmatic-analysis-of-political-discourse-using-Brown-and-Levinsons-Face-Theory.pdf
- Saenger, (2010). *Abbreviated English – A Typical Feature of Online Communication?* https://www.academia.edu/37980299/ABBREVIATED_ENGLISH_A_TYPICAL_FEATURE_OF_ONLINE_COMMUNICATION
- Sikandar, M. H., Riaz, A., & Mah-e-Nao. (2022). The impact of slangs on the academic writing of undergraduate students in Pakistan. *Webology*, 19(3), 1115-1127. [https://www.webology.org/data-cms/articles/20220522010852pmwebology%2019%20\(3\)%20-%2078%20pdf.pdf](https://www.webology.org/data-cms/articles/20220522010852pmwebology%2019%20(3)%20-%2078%20pdf.pdf)
- UM Students' Repository. (2010). *Chapter 2 Literature Review 2.0 Introduction*. Retrieved from http://studentsrepo.um.edu.my/3305/5/Chapter_2.pdf