



COLLEGE STUDENTS' COMPETENCY IN WRITING MECHANICS: A CROSS-SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Princess Ronalyn C. Macaraan, Katrina Bellah M. Regale

Bachelor of Secondary Education, Major in English, College of Sciences, Technology and Communications, Inc. Sariaya, Quezon

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18646146>

ABSTRACT

The major goal of this study is to determine the level of students' competency in writing mechanics, particularly in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar, and to develop instructional material that helps improve students' competence. This study utilized a descriptive-conceptual analysis research design with 214 respondents from different courses such as STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. Specifically, there were 38 students from the School of Teacher Education (STE), 42 from the School of Information Technology (SIT), 45 from the School of Accountancy, Business, and Management (SABM), and 89 from the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management (STHM). The results showed that while many students demonstrated satisfactory to outstanding performance in writing mechanics, there were notable gaps, particularly in grammar and punctuation, that require reinforcement. Some students experienced difficulty applying proper use of conjunctions, maintaining subject-verb agreement, and using correct punctuation marks such as quotation marks and parentheses. This study was anchored on Skill Acquisition Theory by DeKeyser (2007) and the ADDIE Model developed by Florida State University in the 1970s, which emphasize structured and repetitive practice supported by well-designed instructional materials for skill mastery. The results revealed that students' performance in writing mechanics varied according to their courses, indicating that instructional materials influence writing competence. The findings led to the development of story-based worksheet instructional materials that provide contextualized and engaging exercises targeting students' writing difficulties, fostering confidence and accuracy in written communication.

Keywords: *capitalization, grammar, punctuation, spelling, writing mechanics*

INTRODUCTION

Writing mechanics are considered a key in English to clarify meaning, express tone, and organize sentences effectively in any kind of written communication. This includes punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar, which are typically employed to enhance effectiveness across various forms of writing. However, many Filipino students continue to commit errors and acquire low competency levels in writing mechanics. Mechanical errors such as incorrect use of punctuation, improper capitalization, misspellings and grammatically incorrect sentences continue to occur frequently. These errors represent a lack of mastery when it comes to applying the basic rules of writing. Even at the college level, students often face challenges in accurately applying writing mechanics in their written works. With these problems, their written works often contained unclear sentences, misinterpreted ideas, and grammatical inconsistencies.

Students' frequent misuse, omission and adding of different rules in writing mechanics that often made the sentences unclear led to misinterpretation of ideas and make it grammatically incorrect. Sandrawati (2021) illustrated that university students made errors in punctuation (368), capitalization (291) and spelling (27), with the most frequent errors occurring in the addition of capitalization and the omission of commas. Similarly, Hastini et al. (2014) identified capitalization as the highest issue among university students; the total percentage of the mechanics errors was 60.2%, followed by punctuation with 25.9% and spelling with 13.9%. These findings meant that many students tended to overlook the role of different mechanics in sentence clarity, which resulted in fragmented or ambiguous expressions. The same problem holds true in the Philippines, where writing mechanics are the most identified errors, as stated by Quinto (2020), who examined the writing proficiency of grade 10 students and found that their overall level was classified as developing, which means that the students only possess minimum knowledge and understanding regarding writing mechanics. This problem persists into higher education, as Labicane and Oliva (2022) revealed that college students are still struggling with punctuation and capitalization in their written compositions. The consistency of these problems across different educational levels emphasized the necessity of reinforcing instructional materials to enhance students' competency in written communication.

Despite existing research showing the impact of reading academic text on writing proficiency, there is a lack of studies exploring the potential usage of story-based materials for the same purpose. To address this gap, the researchers had interest in conducted this study that aimed to develop a story-based writing mechanics worksheet that is intended to provide a more engaging and contextualized approach for improving writing mechanics competence. Writing mechanics becomes a very difficult aspect for students to internalize within rote memorization or when drilling them in some isolated drills. Meanwhile, Listyani (2018) discovered that the Reading to Learn strategy was effective in improving the academic writing skills of students, suggesting that engagement with the structured academic materials improves writing competence. However, the study did not examine the improvement of particular writing mechanics such as punctuation,

capitalization, spelling and grammar. Additionally, while discussing the use of academic texts in teaching, it can be mentioned that stories offer a natural language flow, making rules of writing mechanics more intuitive and relatable to students. Brun-Mercer (2022) emphasizes that stories can enhance the instruction in grammar through additional meaningful context, aiding memory retention and fostering deeper connections with the language. By this, the students were able to observe writing mechanics such as punctuation, capitalization, spelling and grammar during real communication, which led to better retention and usage of writing mechanics lessons embedded within stories.

Thus, this study aimed to assess the college students' level of competence in writing mechanics. It also sought to identify if there was a significant difference in the students' competencies when they are grouped according to courses. The results served as a basis for developing story-based writing mechanics worksheets designed to address identified difficulties. The instructional materials featured contextualized exercises to help create independent practice in the correct use of writing rules.

Research Questions

This study aimed to assess the college students' competency in writing mechanics and to determine how instructional materials could be developed to enhance their writing competence. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents according to their courses?
2. What is the level of students' competency in writing mechanics in terms of:
 - 2.1. punctuations;
 - 2.2. capitalization;
 - 2.3. spelling; and
 - 2.4. grammar?
3. Is there a significant difference in the students' competencies when they are grouped according to their courses?
4. What instructional materials can be developed based on the assessment of the college students' competency in writing mechanics?

Hypothesis

H0: There is no significant difference in students' competency levels in writing mechanics when grouped according to their course.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a descriptive- conceptual analysis research design. The descriptive design was aligned with the objective of assessing the students' competency in writing mechanics, including punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar.

According to Bhandari (2023), descriptive research systematically gathered and analyzed numerical data to identify patterns and provide measurable insights.

Furthermore, the conceptual analysis component of this study focused on clarifying the concept of writing mechanics by exploring it into its fundamental elements such as capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar. According to Pamplona (2022), conceptual analysis involved examining a concept into simpler elements to promote clarification and achieve a consistent understanding. In this study, this design helped deepen the understanding of writing mechanics, which supported the formulation of instructional materials grounded in students' actual writing challenges.

Thus, this study combined descriptive and conceptual analysis designs to provide a comprehensive approach in assessing students' writing mechanics competency. The descriptive design allowed for the collection of measurable data on students' performance, while the conceptual analysis helped clarify and broke down the key elements of writing mechanics involved. Together, these approaches supported a thorough understanding of the current status and challenges faced by students in writing.

Research Locale

This study was conducted at the CSTC College of Sciences, Technology, and Communications, Inc. in Sariaya, Quezon, which offered a wide range of programs and had a diverse student population suitable for cross-sectional analysis. It focused on college students from various courses, as they had academic writing skills.

Studies showed that many college students struggled with writing mechanics, which affected their academic performance. According to Labicane and Oliva (2022), students often faced difficulties in organizing coherent and grammatically correct sentences. Evaluating writing mechanics competence across different courses was essential in identifying areas for improvement.

This study aimed to assess CSTC students' writing mechanics competence to develop story-based writing mechanics worksheets that supported their learning. By analyzing differences in competency levels based on their course, the findings were expected to help create instructional materials that enhanced students' writing mechanics and contributed to their academic success.

Research Population and Sample

This study focused on college students' competency in writing mechanics as the basis for developing story-based writing mechanics worksheets. A total of 214 respondents participated in the study, consisting of first-year college students from four different departments at CSTC College of Sciences, Technology, and Communications, Inc. (CSTC) in Sariaya, Quezon. The respondents were distributed across the courses as follows: 38 students from the School of Teacher Education (STE), 42 from the School of Information Technology (SIT), 45 from the School of Accountancy, Business, and

Management (SABM), and 89 from the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management (STHM). The researchers used a stratified random sampling technique to ensure that students from different academic backgrounds were fairly represented.

By selecting a diverse group of respondents, the study provided a clear understanding of challenges when it comes to writing mechanics and how targeted learning materials could help improve their skills.

Research Instrument

This research employed a quantitative method in determining college students' competency in mechanics of writing through a self-made assessment test. The test addressed critical areas such as grammar, punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. It contained a combination of multiple-choice questions and exercises in correcting sentences to provide precise and quantifiable information regarding the writing competence of students.

In order to establish the validity and effectiveness of the instrument, a three-step validation process was conducted. It started with a language expert's examination of questionnaire to determine that instructions and questions are understandable and clear. Next, two English language study content specialists evaluated the test items to verify that they accurately assessed writing mechanics competence. Their feedback helped in the improvement of the instrument prior to its application in the study.

The testing was administered in person by a paper version of the questionnaire to maintain consistent data collection. To ensure that the instrument functioned as required, a pilot test was first given with a small student sample prior to the primary study. The instrument was verified using Cronbach's Alpha to ensure it met the standard for internal consistency in quantitative research.

Data Gathering Procedures

To begin the study, the researchers secured all necessary permits from the appropriate authorities at CSTC College of Sciences, Technology, and Communications, Inc. in Sariaya, Quezon. This step ensured that the study, titled "College Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics. A Cross-sectional Analysis," complied with institutional and local regulations. The permits provided the official approval needed to access the campus and conduct the research.

Upon obtaining the requisite approvals, the research was conducted face-to-face, employing a standardized written test to assess college students' competency in writing mechanics such as punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. In order to maintain an equitable and controlled setting, the printed questionnaires were distributed during scheduled class sessions so that students could complete them at ease. The researchers instructed the participants during the process, giving them explicit directions and

responded to any questions to ensure that everyone understood the purpose and significance of the assessment.

Before collecting the data, the researchers gave each participant an informed consent letter explaining the study's purpose and their rights. To ensure privacy, a confidentiality agreement was signed, following the Data Privacy Act of 2012, to protect the respondents' identities.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To analyze college students' competency in writing mechanics, appropriate statistical tools were used to ensure accurate interpretation of data gathered from the standardized written assessment. The following statistical methods were applied:

Frequency and Percentage Distribution were used to present and organize the respondents' profiles clearly and systematically. Through this method, the number and proportion of respondents from each course were identified, providing a better picture of the group's composition. This approach made it easier to see patterns and compare the representation of different courses in the study. The formula were as follows.

$$\text{Percentage (\%)} = \left(\frac{\text{Frequency}}{\text{Total Number of Respondents}} \right) \times 100$$

Where:

Frequency = number of respondents in each course

Total Number of Respondents = overall number of participants

Mean Percentage Score (MPS) was employed to determine how well the students performed in writing mechanics such as punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. It helped demonstrate the average score of students in every skill, thus it is easier to identify where they excel and where they need practice. Using MPS made the results more explicit and understandable. The formula is as follows.

$$MPS = \left(\frac{\text{Total Raw Score Obtained}}{\text{Highest Possible Score}} \right) \times 100$$

Where:

Total Score Obtained = sum of all students' scores in a specific area
Total Possible Score = highest possible score in that area

In order to identify whether there were major differences among students' capabilities depending on their subjects, the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test was applied. The

technique enables us to compare several groups without presupposing a normal distribution. Through ranking scores rather than applying raw values, it identified trends and reduced the influence of outliers, finally enabling us to make better educational choices. The formula is as follows.

$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{R_i^2}{n_i} - 3(N+1)$$

Where:

- H = Kruskal-Wallis test statistic
- N = Total number of observations (college students)
- k = Number of groups (e.g., courses or year levels)
- R_i = Sum of the ranks for group i
- n_i = Number of observations in group i

Scope and Limitation

This study, titled "College Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics: A Cross-Sectional Analysis," aimed to determine the competency of college students in writing mechanics, particularly punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. It determined frequent errors and competency levels across various academic courses. The research employed a stratified random sampling technique of 214 respondents across different courses of the CSTC College of Sciences, Technology, and Communications, Inc, Sariaya, Quezon. A standardized written test was given to measure students' correctness in the use of writing mechanics, reflecting on their strengths and weaknesses. For the questionnaire, there were a total of 10 questionnaire items per each variable: Punctuation, Capitalization, Spelling, and Grammar. The study was conducted at CSTC and was confined to examining students' competency in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar.

This research did not examine higher-order writing skills like sentence construction, paragraph organization, content structure, or argumentation. The study also did not evaluate the effectiveness of certain teaching practices or instructional interventions but will be a starting point for subsequent studies and curriculum development. All outside variables like the previous education of students, prior exposure to writing lessons, and individual study techniques did not take center stage. Rather, the research hoped to give data-informed insights for educators and schools to craft tailored programs and course materials to solidify students' writing mechanics competence.

RESULTS

This chapter outlines the findings of the data collected through research instruments. Their corresponding interpretations are presented through tables to enable

the readers to understand better the meaning of the collected data. It presents the research results covering the assessments of college students from different courses. It determines the level of college students' competencies in writing mechanics, particularly in punctuation, capitalization, spelling and grammar. It also analyzes whether there is a significant difference in students' competencies when they are grouped according to their courses. The discussion of these results forms the foundation for developing instructional materials about writing mechanics.

Part I. Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Courses

Descriptors	Frequency	Percentage
STE	38	17.76%
SIT	42	19.63%
SABM	45	21.03%
STHM	89	41.59%
TOTAL	214	100%

Part II. Level of Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics

Table 2 Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics in Terms of Punctuation

Indicators	STE		SIT		SABM		STHM	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Outstanding	12	31.58	2	4.76	2	4.44	32	35.96
Very Satisfactory	20	52.63	17	40.48	19	42.22	28	31.46
Satisfactory	6	15.79	13	30.95	11	24.44	15	16.85
Fairly Satisfactory	0	0.00	8	19.05	8	17.78	7	7.87
Did Not Meet Expectations	0	0.00	2	4.76	5	11.11	7	7.87
Total	38	100	42	100	45	100	89	100

Note. The *f* stands for the frequency and % stands for the percentage. The performance levels in this table are based on the following score ranges: scores from 9 to 10 are interpreted as Outstanding, 7 to 8 as Very Satisfactory, 5 to 6 as Satisfactory, 3 to 4 as Fairly Satisfactory, and 0 to 2 as Did Not Meet Expectations. These ranges were used to determine the students' levels of competency in writing mechanics.

Table 3 Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics in Terms of Capitalization

Indicators	STE		SIT		SABM		STHM	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Outstanding	27	71.05	6	14.29	15	33.33	39	43.82
Very Satisfactory	10	26.32	15	35.71	10	22.22	27	30.34
Satisfactory	1	2.63	12	28.57	9	20.00	8	8.99
Fairly Satisfactory	0	0.00	4	9.52	11	24.44	7	7.87
Did Not Meet Expectations	0	0.00	5	11.90	0	0.00	8	8.99
Total	38	100	42	100	45	100	89	100

Note. The f stands for the frequency and % stands for the percentage. The performance levels in this table are based on the following score ranges: scores from 9 to 10 are interpreted as Outstanding, 7 to 8 as Very Satisfactory, 5 to 6 as Satisfactory, 3 to 4 as Fairly Satisfactory, and 0 to 2 as Did Not Meet Expectations. These ranges were used to determine the students' levels of competency in writing mechanics.

Table 4 Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics in Terms of Spelling

Indicators	STE		SIT		SABM		STHM	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Outstanding	24	63.16	17	40.48	15	33.33	47	52.81
Very Satisfactory	13	34.21	13	30.95	11	24.44	24	26.97
Satisfactory	1	2.63	7	16.67	14	31.11	15	16.85
Fairly Satisfactory	0	0.00	5	11.90	5	11.11	3	3.37
Did Not Meet Expectations	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	38	100	42	100	45	100	89	100

Note. The f stands for the frequency and % stands for the percentage. The performance levels in this table are based on the following score ranges: scores from 9 to 10 are interpreted as Outstanding, 7 to 8 as Very Satisfactory, 5 to 6 as Satisfactory, 3 to 4 as Fairly Satisfactory, and 0 to 2 as Did Not Meet Expectations. These ranges were used to determine the students' levels of competency in writing mechanics.

Table 5 Students' Competency in Writing Mechanics in Terms of Grammar

Indicators	STE		SIT		SABM		STHM	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Outstanding	1	2.63	2	4.76	2	4.44	19	21.35
Very Satisfactory	10	26.32	7	16.67	14	31.11	14	15.73
Satisfactory	21	55.26	15	35.71	8	17.78	26	29.21
Fairly Satisfactory	5	13.16	9	21.43	17	37.78	21	23.60
Did Not Meet	1	2.63	9	21.43	4	8.89	9	10.11

Expectations

Total	38	100	42	100	45	100	89	100
-------	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----

Note. The f stands for the frequency and % stands for the percentage. The performance levels in this table are based on the following score ranges: scores from 9 to 10 are interpreted as Outstanding, 7 to 8 as Very Satisfactory, 5 to 6 as Satisfactory, 3 to 4 as Fairly Satisfactory, and 0 to 2 as Did Not Meet Expectations. These ranges were used to determine the students' levels of competency in writing mechanics.

Part III. Significant Difference in Students' Competencies in Following Writing Mechanics When They are Grouped According to Courses

Table 6 Significant Difference in the Students' Competency in Following Punctuations

	SIT		SABM		STHM	
	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value
STE	-4.889	0.001	-4.461	0.001	-1.508	0.132
SIT			-0.151	0.880	-3.179	0.001
SABM					-2.983	0.003

Note. There are 38 respondents from STE, 42 respondents from SIT, 45 respondents from SABM, and 89 respondents from STHM. The difference is analyzed at a 0.05 alpha level.

Table 7 Significant Difference in the Students' Competency in Following Capitalizations

	SIT		SABM		STHM	
	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value
STE	-5.682	0.001	-4.126	0.001	-3.063	0.002
SIT			-0.998	0.318	-3.298	0.001
SABM					-1.674	0.094

Note. There are 38 respondents from STE, 42 respondents from SIT, 45 respondents from SABM, and 89 respondents from STHM. The difference is analyzed at a 0.05 alpha level.

Table 8 Significant Difference in the Students' Competency in Following Spellings

	SIT		SABM		STHM	
	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value
STE	-2.199	0.028	-3.445	0.001	-1.260	0.208
SIT			-0.967	0.333	-1.156	0.247
SABM					-2.363	0.018

Note. There are 38 respondents from STE, 42 respondents from SIT, 45 respondents from SABM, and 89 respondents from STHM. The difference is analyzed at a 0.05 alpha level.

Table 9 Significant Difference in the Students' Competency in Following Grammars

	SIT		SABM		STHM	
	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value	z-statistic	p-value
STE	-2.673	0.008	-1.613	0.107	-0.125	0.900
SIT			-0.879	0.379	-2.401	0.016
SABM					-1.418	0.156

Note. There are 38 respondents from STE, 42 respondents from SIT, 45 respondents from SABM, and 89 respondents from STHM. The difference is analyzed at a 0.05 alpha level.

DISCUSSION

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the respondents based on their courses. It is apparent from the table that a total of 214 students take part in the study, and they represent four departments: STE (School of Teacher Education), SIT (School of Information Technology), SABM (School of Accountancy, Business, and Management), and STHM (School of Tourism and Hospitality Management). Both the frequency and percentage of students by course are presented in the table, and it is evident through the clear differentiation of the respondents' academic background.

The data clearly indicate that the largest respondent group comes from the STHM course with 89 students, or 41.59 percent of all the respondents. The second largest is from SABM with 45 students (21.03%), followed by SIT with 42 students (19.63%), and STE with 38 students (17.76%). This means that STHM has the highest number of respondents among the courses covered, whereas STE has the lowest number of respondents. This suggest that the study's findings are driven more by students' perspective and competencies from the STHM course.

It is important to know the SCOPE profile of respondents so that they can be analyzed correctly. In Creswell's (2015) view, the most highly represented group is capable of profoundly impacting the aggregate findings. The high representation from STHM students in this scenario can contribute to the framing of the conclusions, particularly considering the discipline-related variables that have an impact on their experiences. Researchers should therefore take note of the respondent's profile since this may affect how the findings are interpreted and translated into different settings.

On the next page, Table 2 presents the level of students' competency in writing mechanics, specifically in terms of punctuation. It includes data from four distinct departments: STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. The levels of performance are categorized as Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Fairly Satisfactory, and Did Not Meet Expectations. Each course represents an equivalent percentage of different levels according to students' competence. Additionally, a mean score of each course describes their average level in punctuation. Notably, the STE students' mean score is 8.03, which is described as Very Satisfactory; SIT students' mean score is 5.93 with the level of

Satisfactory; SABM students' mean score is 5.87 also described as Satisfactory; and STHM students' mean score is 7.12 which belongs to Very Satisfactory level.

Table 2 the result shows that 20 students, equivalent to 52.63 percent from STE, are at the Very Satisfactory level. This implies that most STE students demonstrate strong punctuation skills and only make minimal errors in applying punctuation rules. Meanwhile, the Satisfactory level has the lowest percentage of 15.79 percent, suggesting that some STE students still have only a basic understanding of punctuation rules and most of them commit errors using quotation marks when repeating what others say. This may be attributed to the fact that STE students are frequently engaged in academic writing tasks such as lesson plans, reflective journals, writing essays, which require accurate punctuation. The consistent exposure to such tasks likely reinforces their understanding and application of punctuation rules.

For SIT, a total of 17 students, equivalent to 40.48 percent, reach the Very Satisfactory level. This indicates that although many SIT students have this level of punctuation competency, they still frequently make errors or use inconsistent punctuation rules, especially in the use of parentheses. Then, two students, equivalent to 4.76 percent, reach the Outstanding and Did Not Meet Expectations levels.

This means that there are still students who use punctuation incorrectly, and only a few students can use punctuation properly. This difficulty may stem from the limited emphasis on formal writing tasks within their curriculum, which often prioritizes technical documentation and coding over narrative writing. Such an academic focus might lead to less exposure and practice in applying varied punctuation marks, including parentheses.

In SABM, 19 students, equivalent to 42.22 percent, reach the Very Satisfactory level. Their scores suggest a general understanding of punctuation, although the limited number reaching the Outstanding level with 4.44 percent may be due to struggles with quotation marks, which are important in writing business communication, case studies, or marketing dialogues. This difficulty may hinder clarity and professionalism in their writing outputs. Additionally, SABM students may prioritize other writing conventions or formats, such as report writing or financial documentation, where the use of quotation marks is less frequent or emphasized. This could lead to difficulties in consistently applying quotation mark rules, which affects the clarity and professionalism of their written communication.

Lastly, for STHM, 32 of them, equivalent to 35.96 percent, belong to the Outstanding level. This implies that most students developed a strong grasp of punctuation usage, particularly in writing communication relevant to the hospitality and tourism industry. However, seven students equivalent to 7.87 percent, fall under the Fairly Satisfactory and Did Not Meet Expectations levels. Their errors are mostly related to quotation marks, which are commonly used in customer interactions, and promotional writing, showing that even familiar contexts may still present confusion for some of them. This difficulty could be due to insufficient formal instruction and limited practice with these punctuation marks in academic and workplace writing.

These results are backed by multiple research studies emphasizing the persistent difficulties students encounter in mastering punctuation. Wati (2021) emphasizes that students who regularly participate in writing tasks generally exhibit better skills in punctuation, which correlates with the strong performance of STE students in this study. In contrast, Hussein (2019) find that students frequently struggle with correct punctuation use, particularly with less commonly used marks like parentheses and quotation marks. This helps explain why SIT students, despite their strong technical background, still commit errors involving parentheses. Similarly, Mathumathi et al. (2024) discover that business students generally participate in formal and technical writing, restricting their chances to practice with punctuation marks like quotation marks—an issue evident in the SABM students' score outcomes. Furthermore, Sudilah (2015) notes that students continue to misuse quotation marks owing to inadequate instruction and insufficient targeted practice, which aligns with the results from STHM students who, even though they are acquainted with these contexts, still faced challenges with precise punctuation usage. These studies support the idea that students' punctuation performance is affected not just by their exposure to written works but also by the thoroughness and emphasis of the instruction provided.

On the next page, Table 3 presents the level of students' competency in writing mechanics in terms of capitalization, categorized by courses: STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. The table shows the frequency and percentage of students per performance level (Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Fairly Satisfactory, and Did Not Meet Expectations), along with the computed mean and its corresponding descriptive interpretation. This aims to reveal which group demonstrated stronger or weaker understanding of capitalization rules. Among the four groups, STE and STHM obtained the highest mean scores, with 8.82 and 7.35 respectively, both interpreted as Very Satisfactory, suggesting a generally strong grasp of capitalization. On the other hand, SIT and SABM students recorded mean scores of 6.17 and 6.71, both described as Satisfactory, which reflects a more moderate level of understanding.

Table 3 The data clearly show that 27 STE students, equivalent to 71.05 percent, reach the Outstanding level. The result points out that almost all STE students can rightly apply capitalization in their writing. With only one student with 2.63 percent at the Satisfactory level, this suggests a high level of consistency across the group. Their strong performance may be attributed to the course's focus on academic and formal writing, where capitalization rules are frequently applied. While occasional error like capitalizing family titles used as proper nouns may arise, they appear to be minimal and do not hinder the overall competency of the students.

For SIT, a total of 15 students, which is equivalent to 35.71 percent, reach the Very Satisfactory level. This implies that most of them have enough understanding of capitalization and use it correctly. While four of the students, equivalent to 9.52 percent, fall under a Fairly Satisfactory level. Students at this level still encounter difficulties in identifying and understanding contextual capitalization. These difficulties may be related to the program's emphasis on technical writing, which focuses more on structured and

formal outputs rather than creative or narrative writing where proper noun capitalization is more frequently practiced.

Meanwhile, SABM has a total of 15 students, equivalent to 33.33 percent, who reach the Outstanding level. This implies that the largest proportion of students can grasp and apply capitalization in their writing. The lowest result is from nine students, and it is equivalent to 20.00 percent, who belong to Satisfactory level. This can be due to occasional struggles in capitalizing proper nouns, especially when writing formal business documents such as client names, company titles, or professional positions, which are key elements in business writing that require precise capitalization.

Lastly, for STHM students, 39 of them, equivalent to 43.82 percent, reach the Outstanding level. This means that most of them can use proper capitalization in their written works, like job titles, locations, or formal terms that are common in tourism and hospitality documents. A total of seven students, which is equivalent to 7.87 percent, reach the Fairly Satisfactory level. Students from this course are still struggling with some difficulty in applying capitalization rules consistently, particularly with internet-related terms. These terms, often used in promotional materials and digital communication within the tourism, may involve newer or non-standard usages, which could explain occasional errors despite overall competence.

The findings are supported by Rahmayanti (2018), who emphasizes that students who are regularly exposed to formal writing tasks—such as those in education-related courses—tend to develop stronger accuracy in capitalization usage. This supports the high performance of STE students with 71.05 percent, who often engage in academic writing where capitalization rules are reinforced. On the other hand, the larger proportion of Outstanding performers in STHM with 43.82 percent, demonstrates what Elfa et al. (2022) observed—that capitalization errors remain a common challenge among students, especially in specialized writing genres such as business and technical communication, where precise application of capitalization rules is critical. Likewise, Tunboontor (2021) found that capitalization errors accounted for 46.95% of the grammatical mistakes in business letter writing, reinforcing the need for explicit instruction on this writing mechanic for students in business-related courses like SABM. This is further supported by Putri et al. (2024), who noted that students in academic settings often struggle with capitalization due to the formal nature of their tasks, emphasizing how even capable students may still commit errors. These comparisons affirm that while many students have achieved high levels of competence, there remain learners who would benefit from focused support.

Table 4 displays the extent of students' competency in writing mechanics in terms of spelling, categorized by departments: STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. It shows the frequency and percentage of students at performance levels (Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Fairly Satisfactory, and Did Not Meet Expectations) along with the calculated mean and its respective descriptive interpretation. This data aims to determine which courses show higher or lower levels in spelling accuracy. The results show that STE students obtain a mean score of 8.87, SIT students 7.62, SABM students 7.27, and STHM students 8.17—each of which falls under the descriptive level of Very

Satisfactory, indicating that most students across courses demonstrate solid spelling competence.

Among the STE, the total of 24 students, which is equivalent to 63.16 percent, reach the Outstanding level. This means that the majority of STE respondents perform well when it comes to spelling. They are likely confident in using correct spelling in both academic and non-academic writing. Only one student, which is equivalent to 2.63 percent, gets the Satisfactory level. This implies that spelling is not a major problem for STE students, as seen by the few students who only commit errors in spelling. Their strong performance may be attributed to their course's emphasis on academic writing, which requires frequent use of correct spelling.

For the SIT, a total of 17 students, which is equivalent to 40.48 percent, also reach the Outstanding level. This indicates that a higher percentage of the students have exceptional spelling competence, although not as high as STE. Only five students, which is equivalent to 11.90 percent, reach the Fairly Satisfactory level. This implies that these students are still developing their spelling competence and need additional ways to help them improve their competence. The technical nature of their course might explain why some students are still developing their spelling competence, particularly in applying suffix rules.

In the SABM, only 15 students, equivalent to 33.33 percent, reach the Outstanding level. Students at this level have a wider understanding of how to apply correct spelling consistently. However, there are still five students, equivalent to 11.11 percent, who belong in the Fairly Satisfactory level. This indicates that students who perform fairly in spelling result in the need for targeted instruction to help them become more competent. The business-focused writing tasks may present challenges in consistent spelling, especially with suffixes, affecting some students' performance.

Lastly, for STHM students, 47 of them, which is equivalent to 52.81 percent, reach the Outstanding level. This implies that more than half of the students have few or no spelling errors in their writing. Three of the STHM students, which is equivalent to 3.37 percent, reach the Fairly Satisfactory level. This means that there are students who are still struggling with writing correct spelling. The most common issue observed is in the doubling of letters in words like business. This kind of error may be attributed to the complexity of spelling rules involving consonant doubling, which can be challenging to apply consistently, especially in a practical, fast-paced course where emphasis may be placed more on communication than strict spelling accuracy.

The results are supported by Daffern et al. (2017), who highlight that spelling significantly predicts writing performance, which accounts for the large percentage of Outstanding performers in STE (63.16%) and STHM (52.81%). These students probably exhibit improved writing clarity and organization as a result of their spelling competence. Meanwhile, the proportion of students in the Fairly Satisfactory level from SIT (11.90%) and SABM (11.11%) corresponds with Fitria (2020), which indicated that challenges in spelling frequently arise from misunderstandings regarding word forms and phonetic

inconsistencies. This leads students to make typical mistakes such as omission and substitution, which can impact the overall clarity of writing. Likewise, Tavşanlı and Kara (2021) emphasized that regular feedback and increased awareness can assist learners in enhancing their spelling precision, which aligns with the current findings that, although numerous students are skilled, a few still need extra assistance to achieve proper spelling. Additionally, Marinus et al. (2021) noted that doubling consonants often poses challenges to learners due to irregular spelling patterns and phonological rules, highlighting the need for targeted spelling instruction in contexts where accurate writing is essential.

Table 5 displays students' competency in writing mechanics, specifically grammar, organized by departments: STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. It shows the frequency and percentage of students at each performance level—Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Fairly Satisfactory, and Did Not Meet Expectations—along with the calculated mean and its related descriptive interpretation. The purpose of this table is to identify which course shows a higher or lower grasp level of grammar competence. The results show that STE students obtained a mean score of 5.87, which is described as Satisfactory; SIT students' mean score is 4.69, which is described as Fairly Satisfactory; SABM students' mean score is 5.16, which is described as Satisfactory; and STHM students' mean score is 5.80, which is also described as Satisfactory.

The data from STE explicitly show a total of 21 students, which is equivalent to 55.26 percent, reach the Satisfactory level. This implies that most STE students can follow basic grammar rules but may still commit minor errors. The lowest percentage of 2.63 percent can be seen in both the Outstanding and Did Not Meet Expectations levels. This result implies that students in the Outstanding level can excel in grammar rules, and students in the Did Not Meet Expectations level can struggle when it comes to applying grammar rules. Most grammar issues for STE students involve the use of conjunctions, which may reflect the academic nature of their writing tasks where clarity and logical flow are essential.

For SIT, a total of 15 students, which is equivalent to 35.71 percent, reach the Satisfactory level. This implies that some students can generally understand grammar but still need support to improve it and grasp the complex rules of grammar. Only two students, equivalent to 4.76 percent, reach the Outstanding level. This means that only a few students can demonstrate grammar competence and suggests the need for grammar instruction. Common difficulties are seen in maintaining parallel structure using conjunctions. This may be due to the technical nature of their coursework, which often requires students to write complex and detailed descriptions, making it harder to maintain consistent grammar throughout their writing.

In the SABM, a total of 17 students, equivalent to 37.78 percent, reach the Fairly Satisfactory level. This result shows that most students have a basic but limited comprehension of grammar. Two students, equivalent to 4.44 percent, reach the Outstanding level, indicating that only a few SABM students can excel in grammar. Similar to SIT, SABM students often struggled with parallel structure using conjunctions, possibly

due to the business-oriented nature of their writing tasks, which demand clarity and consistency. The challenge may arise from balancing formality with precision in sentence structure, a skill still developing among many students.

Lastly, for STHM students, 26 of them, equivalent to 29.21 percent, reach the Satisfactory level. This indicates that most students have an average grasp of grammar, resulting in grammatically correct sentences but still making errors. The nine students, equivalent to 10.11 percent, reach the Did Not Meet Expectations level. This result indicates that only a few students are struggling or having difficulties when it comes to grammar. The most frequent grammar issue for STHM students is also the use of conjunctions, which may base from their course's focus on practical communication and hospitality-related writing where grammar is applied more casually.

The results align with Singh et al. (2017), who observe that grammatical mistakes, including subject-verb agreement and tense inconsistency, can greatly influence the clarity and coherence of written work. This is evident in the STE group, where 55.26 percent of students achieved the Satisfactory level, showing a fundamental grasp of grammar but remaining prone to minor errors, particularly in the use of conjunctions.

Similarly, Soomro et al. (2023) discover that students lacking strong grammar instruction have difficulty understanding complex grammar rules, reflecting the findings in SIT (35.71% at the Satisfactory level) and SABM (37.78% at the Fairly Satisfactory level), where many students faced challenges with maintaining parallel structure using conjunctions. Iqbal et al. (2017) underscored the significance of teacher training in grammar teaching, indicating that students frequently do not receive the assistance necessary to excel in grammar, which might account for the 10.11 percent of STHM students at the Did Not Meet Expectations level. The results highlight the necessity for improved grammar instructional materials, as Panugot (2023) indicated, to address these weaknesses and improve students' writing competence in academic settings.

Table 6 shows the notable differences in the ability to follow correct punctuation when students are grouped according to their college courses STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. Comparison is made via z-statistics and p-values. A p-value of less than 0.05 means there is a significant or considerable difference between two groups. The aim of this table is to observe if students of various courses have different punctuation abilities.

For STE students, there is a notable difference compared to SIT and SABM students, where both p-values were 0.001. This indicates that STE students performed either better or worse than students in SIT and SABM in punctuation. Yet, p-value 0.132 compared to STHM shows that there is no significant difference between these two courses. This finding implies that STE and STHM students share similar experiences or training levels in terms of punctuation, as both courses contain writing-intensive requirements. The strong performance of STE students in punctuation is attributed to their exposure to technical writing tasks and structured academic outputs that require clarity and accuracy. Their curriculum integrates research projects and formal reports that demand consistent punctuation rules.

In comparing SIT students, no significant difference is indicated by the results when compared with SABM students ($p = 0.880$), indicating equal performance in punctuation. In contrast, a significant difference emerges when comparing SIT to STHM students, with a p -value of 0.001. This indicates that STHM students outperform SIT students, as their course includes extensive practice in writing and communication that emphasizes the proper use of punctuation. The weaker performance of SIT students results from their program's focus on technical competencies such as programming and system development, which involves minimal written output. This lack of consistent writing exposure contributes to their lower punctuation accuracy.

SABM students, compared to STHM students, also reveal a significant difference, with a p -value of 0.003. Once again, STHM students show stronger punctuation skills than SABM students.

However, there is no significant difference between SABM and SIT students, confirming their similar levels of punctuation proficiency. These findings demonstrate that SABM and SIT students encounter more difficulties with punctuation than STHM and STE students. SABM students typically engage in business presentations, entrepreneurial planning, and marketing proposals that prioritize strategic content delivery over strict language mechanics. The limited emphasis on mechanical correctness in writing contributes to the lower punctuation performance of SABM students.

STHM students do not have a large difference from STE students ($p = 0.132$), which confirms comparable levels of performance. However, STHM students exhibit significant differences in comparison with SIT and SABM students. This confirms that STHM students generally performed better in punctuation. A reasonable explanation is that tourism and hospitality courses demand high standards of professional communication in written forms, leading to consistent punctuation training. The STHM curriculum includes subjects such as business correspondence, event documentation, and hospitality communication, which consistently reinforce formal writing conventions. This results in students developing more accurate and precise punctuation usage.

The findings concur with Singh et al. (2017), who indicate that punctuation errors affect the clarity and professionalism of written communication, explaining why STHM students performed better, as their training emphasizes polished and effective writing. Soomro et al. (2023) emphasize that most students lack grammar and punctuation mastery due to insufficient instruction, particularly in general education subjects. This explains the underperformance of SIT and SABM students. Iqbal et al. (2017) note that ineffective grammar instruction from earlier education levels tends to persist in college, which is validated by the results.

The results are further supported by Alharbi (2019), who asserts that regular engagement with writing tasks, especially those requiring formal tone and audience awareness enhances students' mastery of punctuation. This confirms the stronger performance of STE and STHM students, as their academic demands foster continuous development in writing mechanics. These studies confirm that stronger emphasis must

be placed on punctuation instruction in programs where it is not integrated as a core writing skill.

On the next page, Table 7 illustrates the major differences in students' capitalization ability according to course: STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. The table shows the z-statistic and p-values from comparisons between these courses. A p-value below 0.05 indicates a statistically significant difference. The data comes from 38 STE students, 42 from SIT, 45 from SABM, and 89 from STHM. The primary purpose of this table is to determine which courses have students who are weaker or stronger in capitalization.

Table 7 Considering the STE students, the findings indicate that their capitalization is notably different from those of all the other courses. The p-values are all less than 0.05 namely 0.001 using SIT and SABM, and 0.002 with STHM. Since the z-values are negative, this indicates that STE students scored lower in capitalization than the others. This implies that STE students require more practice or help with applying proper capitalization in writing. STE students focus on technical subjects, such as mathematics and science, which involve less writing practice and fewer opportunities to apply capitalization rules in extended written tasks.

SIT college students show no significant difference when compared to SABM college students ($p = 0.318$), meaning that their levels of capitalization skills are fairly similar. However, a strong difference appears when comparing SIT to STHM college students ($p = 0.001$). This indicates that SIT students require more practice or writing exercises on proper capitalization. SIT courses focus on programming or systems thinking, leading to reduced emphasis on grammatical writing and mechanics in communication.

SABM college students did not significantly differ from STHM ($p = 0.094$), meaning that they performed equally in capitalization. However, since the z-score remained negative, there is still a minor performance gap, though not large enough to be statistically significant. This indicates that SABM students also need to improve, but not as intensely as SIT or STE students. SABM programs focus on business documentation and reports but do not reinforce fundamental writing mechanics such as capitalization as rigorously as communication-focused programs do.

STHM college students are the steadiest in capitalization ability. They are far more different from the results of STE and SIT, and the difference indicates that they have better training or are more frequently taught writing activities requiring proper capitalization. Considering that STHM emphasizes communication and hospitality, their topics assist students in developing superior writing habits. The integration of modules on professional correspondence and customer service in STHM exposes students to the importance of precise writing, including capitalization.

The results presented in this table collaborate with Arif Khan Pathan's (2021) research, which indicates that most EFL students at college level commit capitalization mistakes as a result of low exposure to effective writing norms. Siddiqui (2016) also

concludes that EFL learners, particularly at Bisha University, struggle with capitalization within their scholarly work, which indicates a prevailing trend across various schools. Finally, the study by Shweba and Mujiyanto (2017) reveal that Libyan first-year college students frequently misuse capitalization, underscoring the necessity of better instruction and practice in elementary writing rules. These findings are aligned with the current study, where weaker capitalization skills of STE (with consistent p -values < 0.05) and SIT students result from minimal writing exposure and insufficient reinforcement of grammar in their curriculum. Conversely, STHM students who significantly outperformed others benefit from coursework that demands strong written communication, mirroring Shweba and Mujiyanto's (2017) observation. This confirms the role of field-specific instruction in cultivating essential writing mechanics like capitalization.

Table 8 illustrates the gap in spelling ability depending on students' courses STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM. It uses z -statistics and p -values to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in spelling abilities among each group. If the p -value is less than 0.05, it means that the difference among the groups is statistically significant. The respondents include four courses: STE with 38 students, SIT with 42 students, SABM with 45 students, and STHM with 89 students. This table compares the performance of students of various courses on spelling and if their scores meaningfully vary with each other. The variation in spelling performance among these courses reflects differences in curriculum emphasis, instructional strategies, and the nature of writing tasks assigned in each department. This disparity shows how academic context shapes student competencies in spelling.

Given the results of the STE students, the p -values in contrast to SIT (0.028) and SABM (0.001) are both less than 0.05, which means there are statistically significant differences in spelling ability. This implies that STE students are taught more about spelling or are given writing tasks that support their spelling abilities. The nature of the STE curriculum, which involves technical writing and precise documentation, contributes to this advantage by requiring accuracy in language use. Conversely, the p -value between STE and STHM is 0.208 and is not significant, which means these two groups are equally skilled at spelling. This similarity results from both programs emphasizing professional communication, where correct spelling is crucial.

For SIT students, comparison to both SABM and STHM does not show that they are different because the p -values are 0.333 and 0.247 respectively. This shows that these students are similarly capable in spelling due to equally demanding workloads and how the courses approach writing activities. Another explanation is that spelling is not a key priority in these courses, which results in consistently average but not exceptionally developed spelling skills in all areas. The uniformity reflects a generalized approach to writing instruction in these departments, which focuses less on spelling mechanics and more on other competencies like technical skills or business communication formats.

SABM students, on the other hand, have a significant difference compared to STHM students, with a p -value of 0.018. This indicates that SABM students have more difficulty with spelling or are exposed to less spelling practice or writing instruction than

STHM students. Since SABM courses focus on business management concepts, the emphasis on linguistic precision is less pronounced than in hospitality or technical programs. Because the difference is significant, it is worth investigating the curriculum or teaching methods employed in both courses to determine what creates this disparity. The finding shows that SABM students benefit from enhanced spelling-focused exercises or more frequent writing tasks to boost their skills.

For STHM students, there is no significant difference when compared to STE and SIT. But there is a large contrast with SABM students, so STHM students have superior exposure to writing activities that enhance them in terms of spelling. They receive more instructor feedback, and the program is more engaged in enhancing students' fundamental writing mechanics. This is due to the hospitality and tourism sector's demand for professionalism in communication, which motivates instructors to place greater emphasis on correct spelling. The structured feedback and revision processes in STHM help students refine their spelling accuracy over time.

The findings in this table align with the findings from previous research. Aloudat (2017) explains that students even English majors find difficulty with spelling, particularly when teaching does not emphasize the rules of spelling. Fitria (2020) points out how spelling mistakes occur when students do not understand English spelling patterns and receive no consistent correction. Likewise, Muhassin et al. (2020) note that spelling problems are prevalent among English learners, especially when English is not frequently used outside the classroom. These researches confirm that spelling difficulties differ based on the writing done by students and the type of feedback and instruction they have in their own courses. The current results imply that differences in departmental focus, curriculum design, and instructional methods contribute to the varied spelling abilities among students of different courses.

Table 9 is a comparison of how students from various courses STE, SIT, SABM, and STHM perform grammar-wise. This table employs z-statistics and p-values to test whether there exist differences in their levels of competence. If the p-value is less than 0.05, then the difference in their performances is not by chance, and there is something that differentiates one group's performance from the others. This helps determine which group requires extra attention to grammar. The variation in grammar performance among these groups reflects differences in curriculum emphasis on grammatical rules, the extent of writing practice, and the instructional methods employed by each department. These differences provide insight into how academic programs influence students' mastery of grammar.

Considering the STE students' results, there is a significant difference in grammar between them and the SIT students ($p = 0.008$). STE students perform better in grammar due to the STE program's focus on technical communication, where precise grammar is critical for clarity and professionalism in writing. When compared with SABM and STHM students, there is no significant difference ($p = 0.107$ and $p = 0.900$, respectively). This indicates that STE students have a good grasp of grammar, and their performance is

comparable to SABM and STHM students, who also receive sufficient grammar instruction through writing-intensive activities in their courses.

For SIT, the grammatical differences are more apparent compared to STHM ($p = 0.016$), but there is no significant difference compared to SABM ($p = 0.379$). SIT students struggle more with grammar than STHM students because the SIT curriculum prioritizes technical or practical skills over language mechanics, resulting in less focused grammar instruction and fewer writing opportunities requiring grammatical accuracy. The similarity in grammar scores between SIT and SABM students indicates that both programs have similar approaches and levels of emphasis on grammar, leading to moderate competence in this area.

SABM students do not display any appreciable differences in grammar compared to STE ($p = 0.107$), SIT ($p = 0.379$), or STHM ($p = 0.156$). These p -values above 0.05 confirm that their grammar competence is average across courses, due to a balanced but not intensive focus on grammar within their curriculum. The business management program emphasizes content knowledge and professional communication skills, resulting in a general but not advanced mastery of grammar.

With STHM, their grades in grammar do not significantly vary from those of STE ($p = 0.900$) or SABM ($p = 0.156$). There is a significant difference when compared to SIT students ($p = 0.016$). The hospitality and tourism management program emphasizes communication skills, including grammar, given the customer-facing nature of the industry. STHM students receive targeted grammar teaching and more instructor feedback on writing tasks that demand a high level of grammatical accuracy. This explains their higher grammar scores than SIT students, while maintaining parity with STE and SABM.

These findings are aligned with the recent research. Garduce and Baluyos (2023) find that students have difficulty with grammar and writing mechanics in the classroom, explaining the significant differences observed here. Pontillas et al. (2024) state that grammar abilities strongly predict writing success overall, so the variation in group performances demonstrates the need for targeted grammar support. Sacal and Potane (2023) emphasize mastering English grammar not only for writing but for communication in general. These studies confirm that more focused and intensive grammar instruction across departments will improve students' writing performance, as shown in Table 9.

Conclusions

In light of the findings of the study, the present researchers arrive at the following conclusion:

1. The distribution of respondents in various courses indicated significant diversity within the population, with the largest group originating from the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management (STHM). The course differences representation was crucial for comprehending the study's results and how they might have been influenced by the

academic backgrounds of the respondents. The profile of the respondents emphasized the importance of considering perspectives and experiences from each course, especially in relation to the results on writing mechanics.

2. The results of this research indicated that although numerous students demonstrated competence in writing mechanics, there were specific areas that require enhancement. Students performed well in fundamental punctuation and capitalization, yet found difficulty with complex punctuation rules and contextual capitalization. Regarding spelling and grammar, the majority of students did reasonably well, yet there were still difficulties, particularly in higher-level writing skills such as subject-verb agreement and complex spelling patterns. The results indicated that even if certain students possessed a strong base, instructional materials were necessary to address the particular difficulties they encountered. To improve writing competency across these areas, it was essential to create instructional materials customized to students' requirements, concentrating on the areas where they experienced challenges. These materials were essential in enhancing students' overall writing competence and making sure they were more prepared to use writing mechanics accurately in written works.

3. With the presented findings, the ideas emerging from the third target statement problem indicated that significant differences existed in students' writing mechanics when they were grouped according to their courses. Regarding punctuation, students from STHM and STE generally performed better than those from SIT and SABM, possibly due to their courses placing more importance on communication and accuracy in writing. In capitalization, STE students demonstrated much lower performance than the other groups of courses, indicating a necessity for developing instructional materials in this area. Spelling also revealed significant gaps, with STHM students outperforming those from SABM and SIT, while STE students excelled in comparison to both SABM and SIT as well, indicating that regular written works and feedback in certain courses enhanced spelling competence. As for grammar, SIT students showed the most challenges, particularly in relation to STE and STHM, whereas SABM students were fairly average in all comparisons. These results indicated that writing mechanics varied among courses, likely due to the differing academic demands and the specific teaching focus in each course. Therefore, developing instructional materials tailored to overall courses that focus on writing mechanics was crucial for enhancing the areas where students encountered difficulties.

4. The story-based writing mechanics worksheet developed in this study served as a useful and engaging material to assist college students in enhancing their competence in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. Based on the assessment results, the worksheet specifically targeted the areas where students struggled the most—especially grammar and punctuation—while also reinforcing areas of strength. By using short stories and relatable narratives paired with targeted exercises, the material encouraged students to apply the rules of writing mechanics in meaningful, real-life contexts. It encourages practice, a deeper comprehension, and independent learning, making writing mechanics more tangible and instinctive. By providing this contextualized and adaptable material,

the worksheet not only addressed learning gaps but also supported the goal of developing students who were both confident and competent in writing mechanics.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and the conclusions obtained from this study, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. College students must write frequently, focusing on punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar these being the primary emphasis of this research. They are encouraged to read their written work more cautiously, consult their teachers, and engage in writing activities or exercises with the goal of improving writing mechanics. By recognizing areas for improvement and making consistent efforts, students can enhance their academic performance and develop stronger communication skills for professional and ethical use.

2. Educators must design additional activities and lessons that address the specific writing difficulties identified in this research. Since students' competencies may differ based on course and year level, it is important for educators to adapt their teaching strategies with compassion and fairness to meet these diverse needs. Providing frequent feedback, incorporating writing exercises, and developing instructional materials focused on writing mechanics can help students strengthen their writing abilities over time.

3. The school administration is urged to arrange writing workshops, seminars, and tutoring programs that specifically address punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. It is also encouraged that writing practice be integrated across disciplines not just in English courses in order to foster a school-wide culture that values and promotes good writing across all subjects.

4. Future researchers are encouraged to replicate this study with a larger and more representative sample to validate the findings. They may also explore other influencing factors such as writing apprehension, motivation, or linguistic background that may affect writing performance. Furthermore, it is recommended that future researchers investigate the effectiveness of instructional materials derived from this study to further support writing education.

Output of the Study

The output of this study is a story-based writing mechanics worksheet titled "WRITE IT RIGHT: Mastering Writing Mechanics Through Stories," comprised of a short story, each followed by a set of exercises, focusing on punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar. These stories are carefully crafted based on the results of the assessment, which identify both the strengths and the learning gaps in students' writing mechanics. Each part of a story presents relatable, everyday situations that naturally incorporate writing rules, allowing students to engage with mechanics in meaningful, real-life contexts. Following each part, learners complete targeted exercises such as

identifying punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and grammar errors, and rewriting the correct answers. This approach promotes varied and repeated practice that enhances students' mastery of writing rules in a more dynamic and engaging way.

The design of the worksheet is based on the idea that contextualized, meaningful practice improves mastery of writing mechanics. Instead of isolated drills, the inclusion of diverse short story allows students to observe how writing mechanics function in actual written communication. This makes learning more intuitive, as students are not just memorizing rules but actively applying them. The diversity in story topics sustains students' interest and motivation throughout the activities. Since the study revealed that students showed stronger performance in spelling and capitalization but encountered difficulties in grammar and punctuation, the worksheet offers more structured and focused practice in those specific areas. In addition, the featured story "One Group, Four Battles" is divided into six parts, forming the core of the exercises in which students identify and correct errors, reinforcing their learning step by step.

The "WRITE IT RIGHT" worksheet serves as a valuable and adaptable tool for both students and educators. It presents rich, applicable content that encourages learners to implement writing rules in context, helping solidify their understanding and build confidence in their writing. For educators, it offers a flexible instructional resource that can supplement classroom activities and support targeted skill development. Furthermore, it models how contextualized materials can effectively bridge the gap between rule-based instruction and practical writing application. Ultimately, this instructional material aims to help students become more capable and confident writers, better prepared for academic success and real-world communication.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The researchers ensured full compliance with ethical standards throughout the conduct of the study. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all respondents, clearly explaining the purpose, procedures, and significance of the research. The respondents were informed of their freedom to withdraw from participation at any stage without any consequences. The anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents were strictly maintained by not collecting identifiable personal information and by securing all gathered data. The researchers complied with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act by ensuring that all collected information was used solely for academic and research purposes and was stored securely. The well-being of the respondents was safeguarded by ensuring that participation did not expose them to psychological, emotional, or academic harm. The researchers declare that no conflict of interest existed during the conduct of the study. Academic integrity was observed by strictly avoiding plagiarism and properly acknowledging all referenced sources. The interpretation of the findings was conducted objectively, ensuring that no personal bias influenced the results of the study. The findings and results were utilized purely for research and educational purposes. The researchers also declare that artificial intelligence tools were used only for grammar checking and language refinement, ensuring that the originality, analysis, and intellectual content of the study remained the work of the researchers.

Acknowledgments

This study would not be possible without the generous assistance and support of several individuals who, in one way or another, contributed and extended their valuable time and help in the preparation and completion of the study.

To Mr. Reden P. Latag, LPT, MAEd, their research adviser, who is more than generous for parting his expertise and precious time. The researchers are heartily thankful to him, whose encouragement, guidance, and support from the initial to the final level enabled them to finish this research;

To Mr. Jon Paolo M. Ordoñez, LPT, MAAL, their research instructor, for sharing her knowledge and enlightening the researchers about the basic to complex research concepts. The researchers are grateful for her efforts in providing them with the care and encouragement to finish this study;

The panel members of the Oral Examination Committee, Dr. Luis Miguel P. Saludez, Mrs. Milcah Shem V. Magsino, LPT, MAEd, and Mr. Jon Paolo M. Ordoñez, LPT, MAAL, for extending their time and effort to review the study and in giving comments, suggestions, and recommendations to improve the contents of the study;

To statistician, Mr. Edilberto Pasamba, LPT, for sharing his expertise valuable time, endless patience and expertise regarding the statistical tools and computation of the study.

To validator, Ms. Nicole P. Hernandez, LPT, MAAL, and Ms. Elen Pablo, LPT, MAAL, for providing their precious time and expertise in validating the research questionnaire.

To Mr. John Marc R. Mendoza, PhD, MLIS, Mr. Jorge T. Jader, MIT, Mrs. Nona Bhel Sevilla-Limbo, DBA, and Mrs. Diana Gracia T. Evangelista, MM, PhD, for giving their valuable time and a warm welcome to the researchers during the Data Gathering Procedure;

The researchers loving parents, Mr. and Mrs. Macaraan, Mr. and Mrs. Regale, for their kind understanding, sacrifices, and unwavering support and for providing them financially and also the greatest motivation and perseverance to complete the study; and Most importantly, they thank Almighty God for giving them the knowledge, wisdom, patience, and determination to conduct this research with humility and gratitude.

REFERENCES

- Alharbi, M. A. (2019). EFL university students' voice on challenges and solution in learning academic writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 577–588. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331490672_Saudi_Arabia_EFL_university_students_voice_on_challenges_and_solution_in_learning_academic_writing
- Aloudat, A. (2017). Spelling errors in English writing committed by English-major students at BAU. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(4), 168–176. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318645761_Spelling_Errors_in_English_Writing_Committed_by_English-Major_Students_at_BAU
- Arseneau, R., et.al. (2023). Improving students' punctuation: classroom experimentation and results in texts by primary and secondary school students in Quebec. *Didactique*, 4(1),

- 117-151. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/RosianneArseneau/publication/375973861_Improving_students_punctuation_classroom_experimentation_and_results_in_texts_by_primary_and_secondary_school_students_in_Quebec/links/6567507ab1398a779dc6d2e3/Improving-students-punctuation-classroom-experimentation-and-results-in-texts-by-primary-and-secondary-school-students-in-Quebec.pdf
- Bhandari, P. (2023, June 22). What Is Quantitative Research? | Definition, Uses & Methods. Scribbr. Retrieved February 13, 2025, from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quantitative-research/>
- Brun-Mercer, N. (2022, February 23). Once upon a noun: Using stories to teach grammar. Cambridge University Press ELT. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2022/02/23/once-upon-a-noun-using-stories-to-teach-grammar%EF%BF%BC>
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (5th ed.). Pearson. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED556110>
- Daffern, T., et al. (2017). Predictors of writing success: How important are spelling, grammar, and punctuation? *The Australian Journal of Education*, 61(1), 75–87. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0004944116685319>
- DeKeyser, R. (2007). Skill Acquisition Theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 97–113). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. Retrieved from <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=410472>
- Elfa et al.(2022) The student's errors investigation in using punctuation, capitalization, and spelling in writing business letters. *INOVISH JOURNAL*, 7(1), 92–102. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.polbeng.ac.id/index.php/IJ/article/view/2523>
- Fitria, T. N. (2020). Spelling error analysis in students' writing English composition. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(3), 349–361. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346588908_Spelling_Error_Analysis_in_Students'_Writing_English_Composition
- Garduce, S. J. S., & Baluyos, E. L. (2023). Common errors in grammar and mechanics in academic writing by senior high school students. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i06.9135>
- Hastini, et al. (2014). Mechanics Problems In Writing Faced By The Fourth Semester Students Of The English Study Program. *Deleted Journal*, 2(2), 2331–1841. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.untad.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/ELTS/article/download/3037/2111>
- Hussein, Abeer. (2019). Analyzing Punctuation Errors in Paragraph Writing for EFL Students at University Level. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340183577_Analyzing_Punctuation_Errors_in_Paragraph_Writing_for_EFL_Students_at_University_Level
- Iqbal, M. J., Akbar, M., & Ahmad, D. M. (2017). Problems in teaching grammar to English learners at secondary level. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(7), 110–118. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330846019_Problems_in_Teaching_Grammar_to_English_Learners_at_Secondary_Level
- Labicane, G. E. M., & Oliva, R. M. (2022). Common errors in composition writing by college students. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 6(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v6i1.4975>
- Listyani, (2018). Enhancing Academic Writing Skills through “Reading to Learn” Strategy. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (1). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.19>

- Marinus, E., Torppa, M., Hautala, J., & Aro, M. (2021). Spelling in Finnish: The case of the double consonant. *Reading and Writing*, 35(5), 1157–1176.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10217-7>
- Mathumathi, P., et al. (2024). Assessment of factors that affect students' business writing skills. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(5), 424. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n5p424>
- Muhassin, M., et al. (2020). Investigating Spelling Errors Among Indonesian EFL Secondary School Students. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 13(2), 1-24.
Retrieved from <https://ejournal.radenintan.ac.id/index.php/ENGEDU/article/view/7699>
- Pamplona (2022). A Guide to Conceptual Analysis Research. *Mind the Graph Blog*. Retrieved from <https://mindthegraph.com/blog/conceptual-analysis-research/>
- Panugot, E. B. (2023). Grammatical competence of college freshmen: Basis for the development of instructional materials. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences, and Scientific Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.ijmsssr.org/paper/IJMSSSR001035.pdf>
- Pontillas, M., et al. (2024). Grammar skills as predictors in writing composition among college freshmen students. *ResearchGate*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Marlon-Pontillas/publication/385700306_Grammar_Skills_as_Predictors_in_Writing_Composition_among_College_Freshmen_Students/links/673158cddb208342def757d1/Grammar-Skills-as-Predictors-in-Writing-Composition-among-College-Freshmen-Students.pdf
- Pathan, A. K. (2021). The Most Frequent Capitalization Errors Made By the EFL Learners at Undergraduate Level: An Investigation. *Sch Int J Linguist Lit* Retrieved from https://saudijournals.com/media/articles/SIJLL_43_65-72.pdf
- Putri et al. (2024) Errors found in students' theses: Capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. *JETAL Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 132–138.
<https://doi.org/10.36655/jetal.v5i2.1484>
- Quinto, D. C. (2020). Proficiency on mechanics of writing among grade 10 students in selected private schools in Iloilo City: Basis for developing an English proficiency teaching module (Unpublished Master's thesis). Central Philippine University, Jaro, Iloilo City. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12852/1360>
- Rahmayanti, S. (2018). An Analysis of English Grammatical Errors in Students' Writing Assignments. *UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh*. Retrieved from <https://repository.ar-raniry.ac.id/id/eprint/8307/>
- Sacal, P. G. Y., & Potane, J. D. (2023). Students' mastery of English grammar towards effective writing and speaking competence. *International Journal of Management, Accounting, Business, and Economics Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.ijmaberjournal.org/index.php/ijmaber/article/view/1251>
- Sandrawati (2021). Investigating Errors In Writing Mechanics In University Students' Essays. *LinguaMedia*, 2(1), 2721–4192. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.untagsmg.ac.id/index.php/linguamedia/article/viewFile/2308/1729>
- Shweba, A., & Mujiyanto, Y. (2017). Errors of Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation Marks in Writing Encountered by First Year College Students in Al-Merghib University Libya. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 93-103. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v7i2.15731>
- Siddiqui, A (2016) Evaluating Capitalization Errors in Saudi Female Students' EFL Writing at Bisha University (2015). *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, Vol.6, No.1, p. 232-250, 2015 , <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2834445>
- Singh, C. K., et al. (2017). Grammar Errors Made by ESL Tertiary Students in Writing. *English Language Teaching* Vol. 20, No. 5, 16-27. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316028867_Grammar_Errors_Made_by_ESL_Tertiary_Students_in_Writing

- Soomro, A. R., et al. (2023). A Study on Difficulties in Teaching Grammar to English Learners at Secondary Level in District Multan. *Journal of Policy Research*, 9(2), 382-389. Retrieved from <https://jprpk.com/index.php/jpr/article/view/322>
- Sudilah, S. (2015). Punctuation Errors by The Fourth Semester Students of The English Department. *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies*, 2(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/ADJES/article/view/2025>
- Tunboontor, T. (2021). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors in English Business Letter Writing. *Journal of Social Science for Local Rajabhat Mahasarakham University*, 5(4). Retrieved from <https://so02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/soc-rmu/article/view/249708>
- Wati, N. (2021). Exploring the impact of punctuation usage on students' writing skills. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(2), 108–120. <https://doi.org/10.32332/joelt.v9i2.3654>

APA Citation:

Macaraan, P. R. C., & Regale, K. B. M. (2026). COLLEGE STUDENTS' COMPETENCY IN WRITING MECHANICS: A CROSS-SECTIONAL ANALYSIS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(2), 485–513. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18646146>

Corresponding author: macaraanprincess2@gmail.com