Wesleyan Scientific Review

journals.wesleyan.edu.ph
ISSN Online: 2945-4085

Comparative Language Approach and Modular Approach: A Comparative Study in Teaching Oral Communication

[1]**Louise Ruth A. Cabanlong**
[1]College of Education, Wesleyan University-Philippines

How to cite this paper: Cabanlong, L. R. A. (2023). Comparative Language Approach and Modular Approach: A Comparative Study in Teaching Oral Communication. Wesleyan Scientific Review 2(1).

http://doi.org/10.54788.wsr2023.v2i1a02

Received: September 23, 2022
Reviewed: February 25, 2023
Accepted: March 16, 2023
Published: May 31, 2023

Abstract

This study attempted to enhance the oral communication skills of the senior high school learners using the Communicative Language Approach to create opportunities for them to orally use the English language in various situations through technologies despite the implementation of Distance Learning Modality, which deprived the learners from interacting orally due to cancellation of the face-to-face classes. The researcher considered the Communicative Competence theory developed by Dell Hymes. The researcher employed quasi-experimental research to evaluate the effectiveness of the Communicative Language Approach as a strategy in teaching Oral Communication among Grade 11 students pursuing Technology, Vocational and Livelihood track as against the Modular Distance Learning. The researcher and teacher divided her Oral Communication class into two groups with comparable oral communication proficiency. The researcher conducted interviews with all TVL Cookery students and assessed them using the adopted Oral Communication Rubric. After the second grading, the respondents were interviewed for the posttest. The posttest mean of the control group improved by about one point as against compared with their pretest mean, while the posttest mean of the experimental group improved remarkably, gaining eight points compared with their pretest mean. The study offers the following findings: 1) both groups obtained "Very Satisfactory" oral communication proficiency skills for the pretest; 2) the experimental group obtained "Outstanding" in the posttest while the control group obtained "Very Satisfactory"; 3) the posttest scores of the control group are slightly higher than their pretest scores; 4) the posttest scores of the experimental group are significantly higher than their pretest scores.

Keywords: *Communicative Language Learning Approach; Modular Distance Learning Modality; English Oral Proficiency, Communicative Language Competence*

INTRODUCTION

Oral communication serves as a critical and significant part in honing literacy learners (August & Shanahan, 2017). One aspect of literacy is the ability to speak (Webster, 2015). According to Palmer (2018), children who have little or no exposure to important aspects of early literacy are more likely to have issues with oral development. Oral language development and developing skills for using and understanding the spoken word are necessary for improving literacy level.

Development of basic and primary literacy skills in childhood such as the development of spoken language through learning words and their meaning becomes the basis of literacy development in adulthood. Through the implementation of the K-12 program, students who pursue the Technical, Vocational, and Livelihood Track are usually focused on acquiring skills necessary for their chosen industry. On the other hand, they tend to neglect academic subjects, particularly Oral Communication which can be their vehicle to communicate, especially during their Assessment for the National Competency and if they target to work abroad. To help them be equipped with the necessary oral communication skills needed to express themselves taking the National Competency Examination (NC II), they were chosen as the participants of the study.

Another issue that confronted the newly implemented K-12 program was the COVID-19 pandemic, which placed students mostly in the basic education in the Distance Learning Delivery Modality, confining them in their respective homes as the new normal in lieu of the old normal face-to-face classes. This policy is implemented by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) on COVID-19 and the Department of Education in order to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, which brought about a new landscape of teaching learning process that is the traditional Modular Learning Delivery Mode. This said implementation of Distance Learning Modality indeed deprived the students, particularly in senior high school, of the opportunities to practice verbally using the English language, especially in their subject Oral Communication.

Learning a language is indeed a multifaceted undertaking that includes several important methods, drills, and practices. Throughout the year, these methods, drills, and practices became the subject of inquiries, research, and experiments hoping to achieve a concrete explanation of the language acquisition phenomenon to help learners learn to speak the target language. Past studies that zeroed in on teachers, the methods used in teaching, and the second language learning proved various indicators of learner success. These breakthroughs lead to a paradigm shift, giving more focus on the principles of language learning strategies (Cabaysa & Baetiong, 2010).

Language learning strategies are considered as specific behaviors, step-by-step procedures, beliefs, practices, and schemes utilized by learners in deepening and expanding their knowledge and skills regarding a particular language (Griffiths, 2013). Oxford (2010) ventured into formulating a strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) consisting of six domains generally divided into direct strategies and indirect strategies. Under the classification of direct strategies are cognitive, compensatory, and memory. On the other hand, indirect strategies are metacognitive, affective, and social. The aim of this study is to measure the language learning strategies used by the learners in acquiring a specific language. Green and Oxford (2015) indicated that students with diverse levels of

language fluency have this tendency of picking different language strategies based on their varied experiences, which they are accustomed to using different learning activities, resources, and situations. O'Malley and Chamot (2015) claimed that previous research revealed that most learners who are considered proficient choose cognitive, metacognitive, and affective language learning strategies.

In the same manner, Radwan (2011) empirically tested that language learning strategies have strategy to increase the language proficiency of the learners that indicates a which curvilinear correlation. This means that as learners use more language learning strategies, the more they become language (Green & Oxford, 2015). Through the years, descriptive and experimental researches has been conducted relative to this finding.

In the Philippine setting, an attempt to study the phenomenon governing language learning strategy was conducted by Cabaysa and Baetiong (2010) through conducting causal-comparative research involving seventy high school students in a classroom setting. The study revealed that the spoken language produced by the intermediate speakers as participants of the study was significantly different compared to the speakers who were labeled beginner in terms of employing metacognitive strategies. School-related activities, tasks, and achievements obtained from the classroom instruction received the highest frequency in terms of supporting the strategy use. In addition, some other significant factors that influenced the language learning strategies were the attitudes or behavior of the participants toward using English in a communicative context and the situations presented. As an outcome of the academic inquiry, it concludes that the strategies employed in language acquisition directly and significantly influence the level of proficiency of the participants in the spoken language.

There is indeed a need to review language learning strategies since they attempt to map out the long crusade to the Holy Grail of effective and efficient way of language acquisition, and thus this study was conceived to test the wisdom of the Communicative Language Learning Approach.

There is an urgent need to conduct investigations along this line to produce baseline information on English language acquisition through language learning strategies to enhance English language instruction, pedagogy, and appraisal among senior high school students. Furthermore, the output of the ventures will be and add on to the senior high school students when they figure out how the types of language acquisition techniques will help them overcome challenging learning practice exercises in the language learning environment in order to successfully gain communicative ability and proficiency. For the benefit of the English teacher, in the event that the learner participants figure out how they could be benefited by the strategies by recognizing which strategy will work best for them, the teachers can give more focus and consideration to least competent students by using the more competent students showing examples of varied strategies and inspiring the least competent ones. Teachers at this point could have a better opportunity to expose students to several kinds of language acquisition styles, while the participants would have the ability to choose strategies that they think could turn them into receptive and responsive English students.

The Business English Index (BEI) is a report printed by Global English Corporation in 2014 that featured the Philippines as the world's best country in business English proficiency, for two consecutive years. According to the report of the BEI in 2012, the Philippines is the only country that

achieved a score of more than 7.0, placing it in the frontline of a high proficiency that guarantees the capability to initiate and handle business meetings and perform complicated and challenging tasks. Likewise, it is stated in the report of BEI in 2013 that the Philippines received a score of 7.95, which can be perceived as an improved BEI score from the previous year. This condition could be the possible justification that the Philippines became a primary for call centers in Asia surpassing India and other neighboring countries that used to take advancement in the call center industry.

In other cases, a handful of studies indicate that the value of academic excellence in the Philippines is unceasingly deteriorating. The impression of the deteriorating quality of education in the country is evident in the results of achievement tests of students in basic education and board examination results at the tertiary level. The Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC) supported the claim of declining quality in education among Filipinos through their report regarding passers of board examinations in almost all degrees continuing to decrease in number. The decrease in the number of passers in board examinations could be associated with depressed academic achievement in the elementary and secondary levels. The low academic achievement and unsatisfactory performance of elementary and secondary students can be attributed to their low proficiency and competency in the English language. English language proficiency is claimed to be an indicator of academic success. Literacy and numeracy are fundamental skills that heavily depend on language skills. Cummins (2010) explained this phenomenon as the interaction of daily language skills and more advanced communication skills. Therefore, high language proficiency is said to be a vital factor in achieving high academic performance.

A study conducted by Rosenthal (2016) resulted in the conclusion that the learners' lack of ability and poor skills in Science and Mathematics subjects can be traced from students' struggles in English subjects due to poor comprehension. As presented in his results, the difficulty of learners in English involves struggles in making implications and interpretations of information, deducing meaning, drawing conclusions, and summarizing ideas. All these issues lead to comprehension or understanding, heading toward the notion that the students do not understand what they are reading. They fail to develop communicative language proficiency. They struggle expressing their thoughts orally and in writing. Clearly, the macro skills in English are fundamentals comprehending theories and principles in Science and Mathematics. According to the English teachers as they tried it, students usually whine or complain whenever assigned to read literary pieces and novels for home reading, especially when they are tasked to prepare a reaction paper for their impressions and reactions on what they read. This claim really happens to almost all language teachers across the globe based on their experiences.

Science and Mathematics teachers also perceive this as they have similar experiences to this. They shared that the students have a hard time enunciating their thoughts, figuring out problems and situations and applying principles in given conditions. Mostly, the students react negatively that they could not comprehend a language aside from their native language no matter how hard they try to learn it. In their point of view, no matter how competent, proficient, and eloquent their teachers are in English, it is still impossible for them to attain proficiency in the English language. Such empirical studies previously presented relative to poor and weak foundations of students in English language proficiency and academic performance encouraged the researcher to conduct this present inquiry.

Predominantly, this venture will appraise the importance of language proficiency to the academic performance of students in the fields of Technology, Livelihood and Technology.

Generally, the ultimate aim of Communicative language teaching (CLT), or the communicative approach, as a method in language acquisition is to focus on authentic communication.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach as used by the learners making interaction among themselves through creating authentic and unrehearsed conversations with the inclusion of the teacher as he / she facilitates drills and practices that will facilitate learning toward the target language. It holds the principle of "authentic texts". Authentic texts are printed materials in English for literary purposes and making drills in English in doing the daily routine.

Learners are encouraged to hold small conversations about individual daily experiences with their respective buddies, and the teacher considers situational conversations apart from the traditional grammar drill to stimulate and motivate the students to develop their language skills in various types of contexts. The approach also promotes the encouragement of learners to include their personal perceptions and feelings in the actual language learning sessions to appreciate, realize and internalize the whole learning experience, other than just focusing on learning the target language.

The CLT views that the main objective of language learning is the capability to interact verbally using the target language. This idea is in exact contrary to former insight wherein knowledge about grammatical competence was put on top of the priority. In addition, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) zeroes in on the teacher as a mere facilitator, instead of an instructor. Communicative Language Teaching has no single rule of thumb to be observed in learning the English language. It is more of a nonconventional system that improves comprehensive oral proficiency as a steppingstone to achieve macro skills along reading and writing.

This study aimed to conduct quasi-experimental research to test the effectiveness of the Communicative Language Approach as a strategy in teaching Oral Communication among Grade 11 Senior High School students pursuing Technology, Vocational, and Livelihood track as against the Modular Learning during the implementation of Distance Learning Delivery Modality.

Furthermore, this research aimed to find innovative ways to motivate and encourage the grade 11 senior high school TVL students pursuing Home Economics and Cookery to enhance their oral communication proficiency so that they could prepare themselves for taking the National Competency Assessment and the industry for their future career, especially if they seek employment abroad.

The study aimed to assess the effects of Communicative Language Approach on the oral communication proficiency of grade 11 TVL students compared with the modular learning approach during the implementation of the Distance Learning Delivery Modality due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What was the oral communication proficiency the respondents from the Experimental and the Control Groups before the conduct of the experiment?
2. What is the oral communication proficiency level of the respondents from the Control Group after they were taught oral communication using the modular approach and the respondents from the Experimental Group after they were taught oral communication subject using the Communicative Language Approach?
3. Is there a significant difference between the oral communication proficiency of the respondents from the Control and Experimental Groups before the conduct of the experiment?
4. Is there a significant difference between the oral communication proficiency of the respondents from the Control and Experimental Groups after the conduct of the experiment?
5. What recommendations can be extended based on the results of the study?

METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the quasi-experimental method of research. It is an empirical study that includes interventions used to assess the results of an intervention's causal impact on the target population without random assignment. Quasi-experimental research shares similarities with the traditional experimental design or randomized controlled trial, but it specifically lacks the element of random assignment to treatment or control. Instead, quasi-experimental designs typically allow the researcher to control the assignment to the treatment condition but using some criterion other than random assignment.

Quasi-experiments are subject to concerns regarding internal validity, because the treatment and control groups may not be comparable at baseline. In other words, it may not be possible to convincingly demonstrate a causal link between the treatment condition and observed outcomes. This is particularly true if confounding variables cannot be controlled or accounted for (Walliman, 2017).

The study considered Mataas na Kahoy National High Schools in the District of General Mamerto Natividad, which offer Senior High School program along Technology, Vocational and Livelihood track with specialization in Home Economics and Cookery and academic track.

The researcher used the purposive sampling method in choosing the target samples of the study. Purposive sampling according to Calmorin (2016) is a type of non-scientific sampling design that is based on selecting individuals as samples according to the purpose of the research as controls.

To identify the target respondents of the study, the researcher administered an oral communication test. Students were set for an interview for mock NC II assessment via online Google Meet. Others that were not available during the online interview were interviewed via phone call. The researcher / teacher was the one who conducted the interview with the student-respondents using the Oral Communication Rubric. The researcher thought that the adopted rubric is the most appropriate tool because the four components of Communicative Competence are integrated, namely: linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence.

Their interview performance was appraised using a score card that served as the research instrument for both pretest and posttest. The scores of the students were arranged from highest to lowest. The lowest 80 students assessed were considered as the target respondents, who were divided into two groups using the matching process in order to establish comparability of the two groups. The researcher observed the manner of the distribution of the respondents below.

Respondents Assignment

Rank 1	Control Group
Rank 2	Experimental Group
Rank 3	Experimental group
Rank 4	Control Group
Rank 79	Control Group
Rank 80	Experimental Group

The table presents the distribution of the Control Group and Experimental Group Regarding their Overall Consolidated Pretest Scores along Knowledge and Understanding, Thinking and Inquiry, Communication, and Application.

Table 1. Distribution of the Control Group and Experimental Group Regarding their Overall Consolidated Pretest Scores along Knowledge and Understanding, Thinking and Inquiry, Communication, and the Application

Pretest Score Distribution of the Power and Experimental Group Pre-test Scores of Control Group	**Control Group**		**Experimental Group**	
	Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
40 (Level 4 = Outstanding)	0	0.00	19	47.50
21 - 30 (Level 3 = Very Satisfactory)	25	62.50	21	52.50
11 - 20 (Level 2 = Fairly Satisfactory)	15	37.50	0	0.00
1 - 10 (Level 1 = Did Not Meet Expectations)	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	**40**	**100.00**	**40**	**100.00**

Pre-test Mean Scores of Control Group: 21.70 (Level 3 = Very Satisfactory)
Pre-test Mean Scores of Experimental Group: 30.13 (Level 3 = Very Satisfactory)

The following instruments was used in data gathering:

1. An oral test/ NC II Mock Assessment interview. The oral tests of the students were recorded by the teacher experimenter to assess them in terms of oral language proficiency.

2. Rubric for Oral Communication along knowledge, thinking, communication, and application of language proficiency was used to assess the respondents/ participants in their NCII mock assessment interview. This research instrument was adopted from Pearson Canada School published on December 31, 2020.

The description of the levels of each of the categories in the adopted rubric for oral communication serves as the status of the rating of the oral communication proficiency level of the respondents.

The researcher asked permission from the Division Superintendent Office, Schools Division of Nueva Ecija; the Public Schools District Supervisor of General Mamerto Natividad, and the School Principal of Mataas na Kahoy National High School to allow her to conduct her quasi-experimental research to the target respondents. She also asked permission from the parents of the respondents to allow their children to participate in the experiment in a form of written assent since the student participants were minors when the experiment was conducted.

The researcher administered an oral proficiency test to assess the respondents' oral proficiency level. The said oral proficiency test was administered by the researcher using online platforms like Google Meet, Messenger, phone call, or video call.

The data gathered analyzed and interpreted using the following statistical tools:

1. The frequency distribution was used to present the frequency count of the categories per variable.
2. Percentage was used to describe the profile of the teachers.
3. The weighted mean was used to assess oral communication proficiency of the students along knowledge, thinking, communication and application.
4. A T-test was used in comparing the pretest and posttest scores of the two groups.

RESULTS

1. Oral Communication Proficiency Level of the Two Groups Before the Experiment

1. Knowledge and Understanding

1.1 In terms of pretest scores for language forms and conventions, the Control Group obtained 21 student- respondents or 52.5 percent under Level 2 who were able to demonstrate some knowledge and specified language structures and vocabulary; followed by those under Level 3, 10 or 25 percent who were able to demonstrate considerable knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary; and the least were those 9 respondents or 22.5 percent under Level 1 who were able to demonstrate limited knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary.

The Experimental Group obtained 18 or 45 percent of the student- respondents were classified under Level 3 and marked as able to demonstrate considerable knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary; followed by those 15 or 37.5 percent of the student- respondents who demonstrated some knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary; and the last were those 7 or 17.5 percent student- respondents who were able to demonstrate limited knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary.

1.2 Along understanding of content, the Control Group obtained 21 or 52.5 percent of the student-respondents who achieved the category Level 3 or those who were able to demonstrate considerable understanding of content of required task and include most of the specified elements; 10 or 25 percent of the student respondents achieved Level 2 or those who can demonstrate limited understanding of content of required task and few of the specified elements; while the remaining 9 or 22.5 percent attained Level 2 which is described as able to demonstrate some understanding of content of required task and include some of the specified elements.

Experimental Group achieved 24 or 60 percent of the student respondents who reached Level 3 which is described as able to demonstrate considerable understanding of content of required task and include most of the specified elements; 8 or 20 percent attained Level 2 which is described as able to demonstrate some understanding of content of required task and include some of the specified elements; and the other remaining 8 or 20 percent were categorized under Level 1 or those who are bale to demonstrate limited understanding of content of required task and few of the specified elements.

2. Thinking/ Inquiry

2.1 Along with critical and creative thinking skills, the Control Group obtained 27 or 67.5 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 2 which denotes moderate effectiveness in using critical and creative thinking skills; 9 or 22.5 percent reached Level 3 which denotes considerable effectiveness in using critical and creative thinking skills; and the remaining 4 or 10 percent attained Level 1 which means limited effectiveness in using critical and creative thinking skills.

The experimental group obtained 20 or 50 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 with moderate effectiveness in using critical and creative thinking; followed by 16 or 40 percent who were rated Level 3 with considerable effectiveness in using critical and creative thinking skills; while the 4 or 10 percent were rated Level 1 with limited effectiveness in terms of using critical and creative thinking skills.

2.2 For inquiry skills such as explaining personal opinions, and develping and supporting judgment, the control group had 19 or 47.5 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 3 which denotes the ability to apply most of the skills involved in an inquiry process; 14 or 35 percent of the respondents were rated Level 2 which denotes ability to apply some of the skills involved in an inquiry process; while only 7 or 17.5 percent placed in Level 1 with the ability to apply few of the skills involved in an inquiry process.

The experimental group obtained 17 or 42.5 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 3 which means the respondents were able to apply most of the skills involved in an inquiry process; another 17 respondents or 42.5 percent were rated Level 2 with a corresponding description of applying some of the skills involved in an inquiry process; and 6 or 15 percent of the respondents were rated Level 1 which express the ability to apply few of the skills involved in an inquiry process.

3. Communication

3.1 In the aspect of Communication of Information and Ideas, the control group obtain 18 or 45 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 where they can communicate information and ideas with some clarity; followed by 13 or 32.5 percent who were rated Level 3 with the ability to communicate information and ideas with considerable clarity; while 9 or 22.5 percent obtained Level 1 with the ability to communicate information and ideas with limited clarity.

The experimental group received 21 or 52.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 which means that the respondents communicate information and ideas with some clarity; 13 or 32.5 percent of them were rated Level 3- communicate information and ideas with considerable clarity; and the rest, 6 or 15 percent were rated Level 1 or with the ability to communicate information and ideas with limited clarity.

3.2 In terms of the use of language effectively to convey meaning, the control group obtained 22 or 55 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 with the ability to use the language with some accuracy and efficiency; 10 or 25 percent were rated Level 1 with the ability to use language with limited accuracy and efficiency; and 8 or 20 percent were marked Level 3 with the capability to use language with considerable accuracy and efficiency.

For the experimental group, 23 or 57.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 2 with the ability of using the English language with some accuracy and efficiency; followed by those 9 respondents or 22.5 percent who were rated Level 1 with the ability to use language with limited accuracy and efficiency; and last were those 8 or 20 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 3 with the ability to use language with considerable accuracy and efficiency.

3.3 In the aspect of communication for different audiences using various forms such as debate, dialogue, and speech, the control group obtained 19 or 47.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 3 which denotes ability to communicate with a clear sense of audience and purpose; 16 or 40 percent were rated Level 2 with a description of ability to communicate with some sense of audience and purpose; and the remaining 5 or 12.5 percent were rated Level 1 which signifies ability to communicate with a limited sense of audience and purpose.

The experimental group obtained 20 or 50 percent respondents who were rated Level 3, which means the ability to communicate with a clear sense of audience and purpose; 14 or 35 percent were rated Level 2 which signifies ability to communicate with some sense of audience and purpose; while the remaining 6 or 15 percent obtained a rating of level 1, which means the ability to communicate with a limited sense of audience and purpose.

4. Application

4.1 With respect to application of knowledge and skills in familiar way, the control group received 23 of 57.5 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 3 which denotes the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with occasional errors; 15 or 37.5 percent of

the respondents were rated Level 2 with the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with some errors; and last were those 2 or 5 percent who were rated Level 1 which denotes the ability to use structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with numerous errors.

The experimental group obtained 25 or 62.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 3 rating which expresses the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar context with occasional error; 12 or 30 percent obtained Level 2 which expresses the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with some errors; and only 3 or 7.5 percent attained level 1 with the corresponding ability of using specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with numerous errors.

4.2 In terms of use of language in new contexts, the control group achieved 19 or 47.5 percent of the respondents who were rated level 2 which denotes ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with some accuracy; 16 or 40 percent attained Level 1 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with limited accuracy; last were the remaining 5 or 12.5 percent who achieved a rating of Level 3 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with considerable accuracy.

The experimental group under the same category gained 20 or 50 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 which expresses the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with some accuracy; 13 or 32.5 v of the respondents achieved Level 1 which expresses the use of language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with limited accuracy; while the remaining 7 or 17.5 percent were rated Level 3 which means they were able to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with considerable accuracy.

4.3 In the aspect of making connections throughout oral presentation that go beyond scope of required material, the control group obtained 19 or 47.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 2 which means they were able to make connections with moderate effectiveness; 15 or 37.5 percent were rated Level 3 which means they were able to make connections with considerable effectiveness; and 6 or 15 percent were rated Level 1, which means that they were able to make connections with limited effectiveness.

The experimental group achieved 17 or 42.5 percent who were rated Level 3 which denotes the ability to make connections with considerable effectiveness; 14 or 35 percent were rated Level 2 which corresponds to the ability to make connections with moderate effectiveness; 9 or 22.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 1, which corresponds to the ability to make connections with limited effectiveness.

1.2 Pretest Score Distribution of the Control Group

In the control group, 25 or 62.5 percent obtained pretest scores ranging from 21- 30 and categorized as Level 3 or "Very Satisfactory", while the remaining 15 or 37.5 percent obtained pretest scores ranging from 11- 20 and categorized as Level 2 or "Fairly Satisfactory".

1.3 Pretest Score Distribution of the Experimental Group

In the experimental group, 21 or 52.5 percent obtained pretest scores ranging from 21- 30 and categorized as Level 2 with a verbal rating of "Very Satisfactory"; while 19 or 47.5 percent obtained pretest scores ranging from 31-40 and categorized as Level 3 with a verbal rating of "Outstanding". The pretest mean score obtained by the experimental group was 30.31, categorized as Level 3 with a verbal rating of "Very Satisfactory".

2. Oral Communication Proficiency Level of the Two Groups After the Experiment

1. Knowledge and Understanding

1.1 In terms of the knowledge of language forms and conventions, the respondents from the control group achieved the following posttest distributions: 22 or 55 percent of the respondents obtained a rating of Level 3 which denotes the ability to demonstrate considerable knowledge of specified language structure and vocabulary; the remaining 18 or 45 percent achieved a rating of Level 4 which denotes the ability to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of specified language structures and vocabulary.

The experimental group obtained 37 or 92.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 4 in the same category which denotes the ability to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of specified language structures and vocabulary; while the remaining 3 or 7.5 percent were rated Level 3 which corresponds to the ability to demonstrate considerable knowledge of specific language structure and vocabulary.

1.2 In the aspect of understanding of content, the control group achieved 23 or 57.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 3 with corresponding ability to demonstrate considerable understanding of the contents of required task and includes most of the specified elements; 12 or 30 percent were rated Level 4 with the ability to demonstrate thorough understanding of contents of required tasks and includes all of the specified elements; and 3 or 7.5 percent were rated Level 2 with the ability to demonstrate some understanding of content of required tasks and includes most of the specified elements.

The experimental group obtained 33 or 82.5 percent of the respondents who achieved Level 4, which denotes ability to demonstrate thorough understanding of the contents of required tasks and includes all of the specified elements; while the 7 or 17.5 percent achieved Level 3 which denotes ability to demonstrate considerable understanding of the contents of required tasks and includes most of the specified elements.

2. Thinking and Inquiry

2.1 Along critical and creative thinking skills, the control group obtained 34 or 85 percent of the respondents with a rating of Level 3 marked by their ability to use critical and creative thinking skills with considerable effectiveness, 3 or 7.5 percent were rated Level 2 marked by the ability to use critical and creative thinking skills with moderate effectiveness; and the other remaining 3 or 7.5 percent were

rated Level 4 with corresponding ability to use critical and creative thinking skills with a high degree of effectiveness.

The experimental group received 31 or 77.5 percent of the respondents who were rated Level 4 with the corresponding ability of using critical and creative thinking skills with a high degree of effectiveness; while the remaining 9 or 22.5 percent achieved Level 3 rating with the corresponding ability of using critical and creative thinking skills with considerable effectiveness.

2.2 In the category inquiry skills, the control group obtained 32 or 80 percent who were rated Level 3 with corresponding ability of applying most of the skills involved in an inquiry process; 4 or 10 percent were rated Level 2 marked by the ability to apply some of the skills involved in an inquiry process; and the other 4 or 10 percent left were rated Level 4 which is distinguished by their ability to apply all or almost all of the skills involved in an inquiry process.

The experimental group obtained 33 or 82.5 percent who were rated Level 4, which is distinguished by the ability to apply all or almost all of the skills involved in an inquiry process; the remaining 7 or 17.5 percent were rated 3 with the corresponding ability to apply most of the skills involved in an inquiry process.

3. Communication

3.1 In terms of communication of information and ideas, the control group received 31 or 77.5 percent who were rated Level 3 which denotes ability to communicate information and ideas with considerable clarity; 7 or 17.5 percent were rated Level 2 which denotes ability to communicate information and ideas with some clarity; and only 2 or 5 percent were rated Level 4 which indicates ability to communicate information and ideas with a high degree of clarity.

The experimental group obtained 36 or 90 percent who were rated Level 4, which signifies the ability to communicate information and ideas with a high degree of clarity, and the remaining 4 or 10 percent of the respondents were rated Level 3, which corresponds to the ability to communicate information and ideas with considerable clarity.

3.2 In the aspect of language, the control group obtained 33 or 82.5 percent and were rated Level 3 with corresponding ability of using language with considerable accuracy and efficiency; 5 or 12.5 percent were rated Level 2 with corresponding ability of using the language with some accuracy and efficiency; and the remaining 2 achieved Level 4 with corresponding ability of using the language with a high degree of accuracy and efficiency.

The experimental group achieved 29 or 72.5 percent of the respondents achieved Level 4 with the corresponding ability of using the language with a high degree of accuracy and efficiency; while the remaining 11 or 27.5 percent achieved Level 3, which denotes use of the language with considerable accuracy and efficiency.

3.3 In the category Communication for different audiences using various forms such as debate, dialogue, and speech, the control group obtained posttest scores of 34 or 85 percent of the respondents and were rated Level 3 with the corresponding ability to communicate with a clear sense of audience and purpose; 3 or 7.5 percent were rated Level 2 which denotes communicating with some sense of audience and purpose; and the other remaining 3 achieved a rating of Level 4 which indicates ability to communicate with a strong sense of audience and purpose.

The experimental group obtained posttest scores of 28 or 70 percent of the respondents who were able to achieve Level 4, which means the ability to communicate with a strong sense of audience and purpose; the remaining 12 or 30 percent achieved Level 3 with the corresponding ability to communicate with a clear sense of audience and purpose.

4. Application

4.1 In the aspect of application of knowledge and skills in familiar contexts, the control group received 24 or 60 percent who were rated Level 3 with the corresponding ability of using specified language structures and vocabulary on familiar contexts with occasional errors; 10 or 25 percent were rated Level 2 with the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with some errors; and only 6 or 15 percent reached Level 4 with the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with few or no errors.

The experimental group obtained 33 or 82.5 percent of the respondents who were able to achieve Level 4 with the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with few or no errors, and 7 or 17.5 percent were able to achieve Level 3 marked by the ability to use specified language structures and vocabulary in familiar contexts with occasional errors.

4.2 In terms of use of Language in New Contexts, the control group achieved the following posttest score distribution: 29 or 72.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 3 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with considerable accuracy; 9 or 22.5 percent were rated Level 2 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with some accuracy; and only 2 or 5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 4 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with a high degree of accuracy.

From the experimental group, 28 or 70 percent of the respondents were rated Level 4 with the ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with a high degree of accuracy, while the remaining 12 or 30 percent were rated Level 3 marked by their ability to use language structures and vocabulary in new contexts with considerable accuracy.

4.3 In the item making connections through oral presentation that go beyond scope of required material, the control group achieved the distribution of its posttest scores as follows: 35 or 87.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 3 marked by their ability to make connections with considerable effectiveness; 3 or 7.5 percent were rated Level 2 with the ability to make connections with moderate effectiveness; and only 2 or 5 percent reached Level 4 which denotes making connections with a high degree of effectiveness.

For the experimental group, the posttest scores of the respondents achieved the following distributions under the same category: 35 or 87.5 percent of the respondents were rated Level 4 with the ability to make connections with a high degree of effectiveness; while the remaining 5 were rated Level 3 with the ability to make connections with considerable effectiveness.

2.2 Posttest Score Distribution of the Control Group

There were 37 or 92.5 percent of the respondents in the control group who obtained posttest scores ranging from 21 to 30 which is categorized as Level 3 with a verbal description of "Very Satisfactory"; while 3 or 7.5 percent obtained posttest scores ranging from 11 to 20, Level 2, with a verbal description of "Fairly Satisfactory". The posttest scores of the respondents from the control group obtained a mean of 22.68, classified as Level 3 with the corresponding verbal description of "Very Satisfactory".

2.3 Posttest Score distribution of the Experimental Group

All the respondents in the Experimental Group obtained posttest scores ranging from 31 to40. The data reveal that the posttest scores of the respondents from the experimental group obtained a mean of 38.08, classified as Level 4 with the corresponding verbal description of "Outstanding".

3. Difference between the Oral Communication Proficiency Level of the Respondents from the Control and Experimental Groups Before the Conduct of the Experiment

The difference between the pretest means of the control and the experimental groups obtained a computed p value of 0.000, which is greater than the computed t-value of -19.824 and significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that there is a significant difference between the pretest scores of the respondents in the control and experimental group. The pretest score mean of the experimental group that is 30.13, is higher than the pretest score mean of the control group, that is 21.70. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected because there is a significant difference between the pretest score means of the control and experimental groups.

4. Difference between the Oral Communication Proficiency Level of the Respondents from the Control and Experimental Groups After the Conduct of the Experiment

The difference between the posttest means of the control and the experimental groups obtained a computed p value of 0.000, which is greater than the computed t-value of -57.577 and significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that there is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the respondents from the control and experimental groups. The posttest score mean of the experimental group that is 38.08, is higher than the pretest score mean of the control group, that is 22.67. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and there is a significant difference between the posttest score means of control and experimental groups.

5. Difference between Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Respondents in the Control Group

The difference between the pretest and posttest mean of the control group obtained a computed p value of 0.001, which is greater than the computed t-value of -3.824 and significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that there is a significant difference between the pretest scores of the respondents in the control group. The posttest mean of the control group that is 22.68, is higher than its pretest score which is 21.70. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and there is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest score means of the control group.

6. Difference between Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Respondents in the Experimental Group

The difference between the pretest and the posttest mean of the experimental group obtained a computed p value of 0.001, which is greater than the computed t-value of -22.o98 and significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that there is a significant difference between the pretest scores of the respondents in the control group. The posttest mean of the control group which is 38.08, is higher than its pretest score which is 30.13. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and there is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest score means of the control group.

Conclusions

1. Based on the pretest result, Grade 11 TVL- Home Economics learners from both the control and experimental groups were on the "Very Satisfactory Level", marked by considerable oral communication proficiency level, which was supported by the DepEd as it describes senior high school students' English oral communication skills such as lack of transitional words to connect their ideas, slips in pronunciation and articulation of words, and struggle along elaborating ideas.
2. Learners in the control group were rated "Very Satisfactory" in terms of their English oral communication skills, while the learners in the experimental group were rated "Outstanding" based on the results of the posttest, which means that the use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach can evidently improve students' English oral communication proficiency level compared with the use of the Modular Distance Learning Modality through self-learning module.
3. The respondents from the control and experimental groups demonstrated some to considerable Knowledge and Understanding, Thinking and inquiry, Communication, and Application of English oral communication proficiency during the pretest.
4. The pretest rating of the respondents in both control and experimental group were significantly different, manifesting that the pretest scores of the experimental group were significantly higher than the pretest scores of the control group.
5. The respondents in the experimental group achieved thorough Knowledge and Understanding; Thinking and inquiry; Communication; and Application of English oral communication proficiency during the posttest, while the control group was left behind and demonstrated only some to considerable Knowledge and Understanding, Thinking and inquiry, Communication, and Application of English oral communication proficiency.

6. The posttest scores of the control and the experimental groups differ significantly, manifesting that the posttest scores of the experimental group are significantly higher than the pretest scores of the control group.
7. There was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the respondents in the control group. The posttest mean of the control group was slightly higher by less than a point than its pretest score. This means that students from the control group did not achieve much progress in terms of oral proficiency in English using the Modular Distance Learning Modality.
8. There was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the respondents in the Experimental Group. The posttest mean of the experimental group was higher by more than seven points than its pretest score. This means that the students from the experimental group achieved higher proficiency in English using the Communicative Language Approach.

Recommendations

Based on the gathered findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are drawn:

1. Future researchers who will conduct a similar study may establish comparability between the experimental and control groups before conducting the experiment.
2. Teachers may consider the use of Communicative Language Teaching Approach with the integration of technology using different platforms in teaching Oral Communication to Senior High School students in order to make interactions among the learners through creating authentic and unrehearsed oral conversations to hone the capability of the learners to interact verbally using the target language.
3. Future researchers may find ways to make learning possible and may use schools with a larger population for better results.
4. Teachers in using Communicative Language Approach, may use the six communicative based tasks as communication starters, namely: 1) role playing, 2 interviews, 3) group work, 4) information gap, 5) opinion sharing, 6) Scavenger hunt, and integrate them with games where innovative ways may apply. In this way, the students can use and apply the knowledge that they have learned.

Conflict of Interest

This research was not funded by any organization. Hence, there is no conflict of interest.

References

Alaga, N. A. C. & Palencia, R. (2015) *Media Exposure and Students' Communicative English as Second Language (ESL) Performance. Countryside Development Research Journal*, *Vol.3, No.2, 45-46* http://cdrj.ssu.edu.ph/index.php/CDRJ/article/view/114

Arrell, T. S. C. (2015) *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice.* London: Continuum Publishing. 112-114

Barrot, J. S., Llenares, I. I., Del Rosario, L. S. (2021) *Students' Online Learning Challenges During the Pandemic and How they Cope with them: The Case of the Philippines. Education and Information Technologies, Springer.* 36-38 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-021-10589-x

Brown, D. H. & Lee, H. (2015) *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*, fourth Edition. Ney York, USA: Pearson Education, Inc. 154-156

Burton, Lisa Ann (2013) *Mother Tongue- Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines" Studying Top Down Policy Implementation for the Bottom Up.* An unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota, USA: University of Minnesota ProQuest Dissertation Publishing. 67-68 https://www.proquest.com/openview/ebd9bb7445784be2a3ba121f42f64cc6/1?pq-

Cabaysa, C.C. & Baetiong, L. R. (2010). *Language learning strategies of students at different levels of speaking proficiency. Education Quarterly 89-90*

Calmorin, L. P. (2016) *Research and Thesis Writing with Statistics Computer Application* (Revised Edition) Metro Manila, Philippines: Rex bookstore. 142

Checkettes, H. B. (2019) *Guiding language students to self-sustained learning.* An Unpublished Master's Thesis, Second Language Teaching, Language, Philosophy and Communication, Utah State University. 113

Cummins, J. (2010) *Language Proficiency, Bilingualism and Academic Achievement,* White Plains, New York: Longman, 211-212

Fakeye D. & Ogunsiji, Y. (2010) *"English language proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among ELF students in Nigeria," Journal of Science Research, vol. 37.45*

Fewell, N. (2010). *Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: An investigation of Japanese EFL university students. TESOL Journal*, 67-68

Global English Corporation, *"Philippines: World's best country in Business English," Business English Index (BEI), vol. 23, no. 4.* pp. 35-40, September 2014.

Green, J. & Oxford, R. (2015). *A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender.* TESOL Quarterly, 98-101

Griffiths, C. (2013). *Patterns of language learning strategy use*. System 31 (3), 367-383.

Huang, S. H. (2016). *Language learning strategies in context. The Language Learning Journal*, 114-117.

Javier, M. M. (2010) "*Language proficiency and mental ability as related to critical; Thinking and academic achievement of secondary students: A casual modeling study,"* M.S. thesis, Philippine Normal University, Manila. 78-81.

K to 12 Toolkit (2012) *Reference Guide for Teacher Educators, School Administrators and Teachers. Southeast Asian Ministers of Education (SEAMEO) Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology (INNOTECH), 36-38.*

Hammond, L. & Moore, W. M. (2018) *Teacher taking up explicit instruction: The impact of a professional development and directive instructional coaching model.* Sydney, Australia: Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 81-84

Han, Z. (2018) *Task- based learning in task- based teaching: Training teachers of Chinese as a foreign language. England, UK: Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Volume 38*. Published by Cambridge University Press. 110- 112. Retrieved from : https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/annual-review-of-applied-linguistics/article/abs/taskbased-learning-in-taskbased-teaching-training-teachers-of-chinese-as-a-foreign-language/8FB7586351C7F2548F8500F0C147240C Retrieved Date: 10/19/ 21

Huang, Y. (2014) *Constructing intercultural communicative competence framework for English Learners. Quebec, Canada: Cross- Cultural Communication. 61-63*

Retrieved from: http://flr-journal.org/index.php/ccc/article/view/j.ccc.1923670020141001.3970 Retrieved Date: 10/ 20/21

Lee, L. (2016) *Autonomous learning through task-based instruction in fully online language course. USA: University of New Hampshire, Language Learning and Technology. Volume 20, Number 2 56-58*

Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/issues/june2016/lee.pdf Retrieved Date: 10/22/21

National Statistics Coordination Board (2016) "*Quality of basic education remains poor but improving," Eastern Visayas Tops, vol. 12, no.3, 122-123.*

Natividad, A.C.A. & Ballena, C. (2021) *Communicating with Students Under the Modular Distance Learning Modality in the Midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic*. 34-35

Researchgate.net
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anna_Corina_Natividad/publication/357505506

Nikoopour, J. & Farsani, M. (2010). *On the relationship between language learning strategies and personality types among Iranian EFL learners.* Journal of English studies, 67

Nisbet, R. A. (2017) *The degradation of the academic dogma.* New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 241-243

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot A. U. (2015). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 69-71

Oxford, R. L. (2015). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House. 134-135

Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (2015). *Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students.* Modern Language Journal, 126-127

Radwan, A.A. (2011). *Effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language learning strategies by university students majoring in English.* Asian EFL Journal, 168-169

Richards, J. C. (2014) *Error Analysis: Perspective on second language acquisition*. USA: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 128-131

Rosenthal, J. W. (2016) *Teaching Science to Language Minority Students,* England: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 38-40

Samortin, M. , Corcuera, L. , Alvarez, A. J. & Palmero, H. (2022*). Education and the Pandemic: Examining Students' Remote Learning Experiences in the Philippines . International Journal of Scholars in Education Vol. 5, Issue , 37-39.*

https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ueader/issue/71159/1064312

Santengco, R.T. & Florida, J.S. (2018) *Family Literacy in a Low- Income urban Community in the Philippines. Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, Vol. 20, Issue 2,* Sage Journals, 23-26.

Saunders, C. (2015) *Facilitating development of foreign language, literacy and culture*. An Unpublished Thesis in Master's Degree, Language, Philosophy and Communication Studies, Utah State University. 36-38.

Vertongen, N. (2014). *The relationship between the use of language learning strategies and English language proficiency.* Master's Thesis, Ghent University, 52-53.

Vidal, R. T. (2012). *Is there a correlation between reported language learning strategy use, actual strategy use, and achievement?* Linguagem & Ensino, 43-46.

Walliman, N. (2017) *Research Methods: The Basics*, 2nd Edition. London: Routledge 327-328.

Ying, Chun-Lai (2011). *Language learning strategy use and English proficiency of university freshmen in Taiwan.* TESOL Quarterly, 116-117

Zhao, J. (2011). *Language learning strategies and English proficiency: A study of Chinese undergraduate programs in Thailand.* Graduate School of Education. Assumption University of Thailand, 91-93