

Comparative Assessment of The Communication Strategies Used By The Teachers in Oral Communication in Context in A Private Higher Education Institution in Quezon City

John Timothy Picoy* & Crisanto A. Daing

Our Lady of Fatima University, Lagro, Quezon City 1159, Philippines

Abstract

The study identified the communication strategies (CS's) used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context, compared the assessments of the student-respondents and teacher-respondents, and tested if there were significant relationships among the interplaying variables. It was found out that student-respondents identified asking for clarification as Always used and message abandonment as Rarely used by the teachers. The teacher-respondents identified asking for clarification and asking for repetition as Always used and message abandonment as Rarely used by them. A Mann-Whitney U test examined the significant difference in the assessment of oral communication strategies used by teachers in expressing themselves in English while teaching the identified SHS course when student-respondents are grouped according to gender. The analysis revealed that variables such as paralinguistic devices, literal translation, code switching appeal for help, use of fillers, asking for clarification, and asking for repetition, yielded statistically significant results at .05. Kruskal-Wallis H test was done to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers in expressing themselves in English when student-respondents are grouped according to academic strand. Few identified variables such as circumlocution, message abandonment, topic avoidance, and asking for clarification, yielded statistically significant results at .05. It is recommended that teachers use only the identified most useful CS's and avoid those that are useless.

Keywords: Comparative Assessment; Communication Strategies; Oral Communication; Private Higher Education Institution.

1. Introduction

Since language and communication are lately recognized as parts of one another, the birth of communication strategies (CSs) has turned into a focal point of interest. Language and communication have lately become the focal interest in the study of communication strategies, specifically in the areas of language teaching and learning. CSs have recently become popular especially in the areas of language teaching and learning. A further advancement in teaching is the developing supposition that teachers ought to adjust instructional methods and techniques that prompt the students to be self-reliant and independent in the acquisition of knowledge in a specific subject. Similarly, these strategies should allow students to increase their awareness of their learning process so that they may be able to use them in improving their communicative abilities.

In the Philippines, English is a foreign language and is considered as a second language. However, this language has been a part of the curriculum of the country's education system; in fact, the media of instruction in schools are English and Filipino. However, teaching English, specifically Oral Communication in English, has been a challenge to all teachers in the classroom. Ataollah (2010) in his study, *Techniques to Teach Communication Strategies*, expressed that second language students experience communication issues when they endeavor to utilize the target language, and one way to hurdle these problems is to utilize effective communication strategies in the classroom.

In the K-12 Basic Education curriculum, Oral Communication in Context is a core subject that aims to develop the listening and speaking skills as well as the strategies for effective communication in various situations.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: jpicoy@fatima.edu.ph

The inclusion of the course aims to develop Filipino students to become better communicators whose listening and speaking skills are of utmost importance. The performance standards and the learning competencies embedded in the Course Guide published by the Department of Education (DepEd) underline the tasks that encourage students to craft and exhibit effective controlled and uncontrolled oral communicative performances based on context, compose an essay of their objective observation and evaluation of the various speakers they watched and listened to, illustrate helpful use of approaches in communication from different speech situations, and effectively deliver varied speeches guided on the underlying characteristics of effective speech delivery.

The difficulty in speaking skills using English as a language is not only a problem here in the Philippines but also in other countries which consider English as a foreign language or a second language. In fact, Goh and Burns (2012) expressed that teaching speaking becomes challenging for many teachers because the problem is to determine whether what happens in a speaking classroom is concerned with ‘doing’ teaching or ‘teaching’ speaking.

In the Philippine classroom, there are common observations that teachers made in an English class specifically in an Oral Communication in Context setting. Few of these observations are that (1) students can read and write good English, but they are not good in speaking, (2) most students are afraid to talk; they are shy, and they lack confidence, (3) some students are bookish; they speak as if they were reading from a book, and (4) others speak in English, but they commit so many grammatical flaws.

These observations are not astounding as learning to speak English is indeed a difficult endeavor in the classrooms. Rao (2018) mentioned that speaking is a highly- intricate and interactive skill that involves multifaceted processes such as the cognitive, physical and socio-cultural. Likewise, speaking English requires the knowledge and skills of the speaker that have to be practiced in real-time. Burns (2019) highlighted speaking should be intensively taught in the language classroom because having students do speaking activities is not similar to learning the knowledge, skills and strategies in speaking.

The researchers observed that the students really have issues when it comes to communication- to listening and to speaking- in the classroom. Hence, he is driven to investigate the identified communication strategies used by the teachers in teaching students while learning the said subject. He is similarly determined to distinguish if there will be differences in the assessment of both the students and teachers in the use of the communication strategies..

2. Literature Review

This chapter discusses the review of related literature, which identified and provided some necessary information to be utilized in the research. Moreover, this will aid the researcher in considering what variables should be included in the study, the theoretical framework and research paradigm, which served as the basis of the conduct of this research.

2.1. The Oral Communication in Context in the K-12 Curriculum

The K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum Framework obviously expresses the need of building up the oral relational abilities of students in preparation for the workplace, business or potentially seeking after higher education. Furthermore, communication skill is popularly known to be one among the 21st century skills that a student ought to be geared with. The Republic Act (RA) 10533 or better known as “An Act Enhancing the Philippine Basic Education System by Strengthening Its Curriculum and Increasing the Number of Years for Basic Education, Appropriating Funds Therefore and for Other Purposes,” has a relevant move that led the education sector to improve the basic education curriculum by adding additional two years in the Senior High School. This particular act desires to equip the students with the necessary skills, knowledge and attitude and to make them master the competencies needed in the future workplaces.

In response to this thrust, the Senior High School Program incorporated the core subject, Oral Communication in Context to Grade 11 learners. Cruz (2019) cited Knight and Yorke (2006) who mentioned that oral communication is viewed as a center part of employability and in acknowledgment of its significance for students and graduates likewise incorporated that under adaptable or non-subject specific skills, there is a need to be able to orally present information.

The oral communication skill is really timely and significant to be developed among students to help them acquire the appropriate knowledge of presentations. In this vast, changing and competitive world, the students should be taught how to improve their oral communication skill to be able to compete in the market. Hence, the inclusion of the said course in the SHS curriculum will definitely help prepare the students for their future.

In the study conducted by Cruz (2019) entitled, Improving the oral communication skills of senior high school students through the use of task-based strategy, that the learners in the General Academic Strand (GAS) got low mean performance. It was a surprising result since the said strand really requires students to have better oral communication skills. It was recommended that students in the said strand be given task-based activities like simulations to enhance their oral communication skills.

Tran (2013) cited Kanner (2007) highlighted that simulations can give the learners the opportunity to apply the theories they learned in the class, can develop their creative and critical thinking skills and can provide a welcome relief from the usual classroom routines of reading and preparing for the class. Furthermore, simulations can introduce the aspect of authenticity into the student's real-life experiences. These simulations are popularly known in the medical fields, where mock-up patients take on the signs and symptoms of certain diseases or injury and the student in return will be asked to assess, diagnose or treat the patient. In this particular scenario, the students are required to put into practice the theories they learned into a realistic situation. As Bernstein and Meizlish (2003) underscored, there is long-term retention of the course material that is greatly promoted by experiential learning.

By simply looking at the course guide of Oral Communication in Context, it can be easily understood that the course aims at the development of the listening and speaking skills and strategies for effective communication in various situations. The content standards, performance standards and learning competencies are all aligned towards the fulfillment of the course contents such as nature and elements of communication, functions of communication, communicative competence in various speech situations that include types of speech context, speech styles, speech acts, and types of communicative strategies as well as the types of speeches.

2.2. *The Teaching of Speaking Skills*

Being able to speak means the foremost challenging portion of a language learning class particularly for speakers of English as a second language. It is also a measure that when one cannot successfully interact with others in English, one cannot be identified as proficient in the use of the language. In English as a Foreign Language or English as Second Language classrooms, it can be explicitly observed that that most of the students are really good at grammar and in written forms. There are even studies to prove that in some instances, the students' knowledge may exceed that of the native speakers of the English language. However, this structural knowledge will be at wanton when a student will be asked to comment on the social issues or on the recent events in the country. Hence, the one of the fundamental goals in an English class is to develop in the students their speaking skills.

In the Philippines, there are so many courses that are designed in the curriculum to help equip students with the strategies and skills to speak in a class that will eventually make them confident speakers of the English language in various situations though the process is complex and challenging. Leong and Ahmadi (2017) opined that speaking is one difficult skill because the foreign language students would sometimes be afraid in committing errors whenever they speak. Likewise, they are reluctant in expressing their thoughts due to the fear of committing mistakes in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation with the people they deal with.

Brown (2004) listed the factors that make speaking more difficult compared to other skills in communication. He enumerated that Clustering- fluent speech is phrasal, not word by word, Redundancy-a broad variety of language forms, alternatives, etc., Reduced Forms- contractions, elisions, reduced vowels, etc., Performance variables- hesitations, pauses, backtracking and corrections, Colloquial Language- idioms, etc, Rate of Delivery and Stress, rhythm, intonation – Interaction are the hindering factors in speaking. These factors make the process of developing the speaking skills of the students complicated; however, when speaking will be managed from an organized and general perspective, it is very much desirable to improve the speaking skills of the students in an admirable level.

On the other hand, Taouis and Perez (2018) mentioned that there are still teachers who would make their interest on the global form of spoken language at the center and on the awareness or proficiency as the fundamental tool for developing the speaking capacity ignoring the significance of teaching specific aspects of the oral discourse in improving the fluency of the students.

Burns (2019) articulated that to be able to teach speaking intensively and holistically, teachers should have the sufficient knowledge on the speaking competencies involved and how the various areas of speaking competencies link with each other. In her study, she presented a framework of second language competence that consisted of knowledge of language and discourse, core speaking skills and communication and discourse strategies. She elaborated all three areas of speaking competencies and highlighted that the third area which is about communication strategies, develops cognitive strategies to compensate for limitations in language knowledge such as circumlocution, paraphrasing, approximation,

avoidance, among others as well as the metacognitive strategies that include planning in advance what to say, thinking consciously about how you say something. Furthermore, interaction strategies such as asking for clarification, repetition, reformulating, rephrasing and checking comprehension are under communication strategies.

The model that was proposed by Burns (2019) indicated that the speaking lessons should not only be used as occasions for practicing speaking but also be conceptualized as structured and supported learning opportunities for the improvement of the speaking competence components. Indeed, to speak English as a second language entails augmenting the capacity to utilize the components identified in order to generate spoken language in a fluent, accurate and socially acceptable manner.

2.3. The Utilization of Communication Strategies in an English Class

Communication Strategies (CSs) have turned into the focal point of interest, particularly in territories of language teaching, since language and teaching are recently considered as parts of each other. A further advancement in instruction is the developing presumption that instructors ought to adjust instructional methods which advance student's independence by making the students mindful of their learning cycles and showing them techniques that they may use to improve their skills.

Taouis and Pérez (2018) in their study titled, *Teaching Written Communication Strategies: A Training to Improve Writing* emphasized that the teaching of English should make students independent learners in which the teacher's sole responsibility is only to guide or judge the learning of the students. The likewise mentioned there are some competencies which are difficult to develop because of the varied interplaying variables that interfere in the process of achieving the competencies. So many studies explored and found out that learners become preoccupied with developing their speaking and writing skills than developing other macro-skills in communication such as reading and listening. In fact, Lin and Hwang (2018) challenged teachers to transform the speaking sessions into authentic opportunities for communication and interaction among students in the classroom.

Moreover, Liu and Zhu (2012) expressed that even if almost all teachers claimed that they utilized communicative approaches in developing the skills of the students, there would still be clear dominance of teachers in speaking in a classroom. This is very much evident in a class of students speaking English as the second language. Due to various factors that hinder students to speak in English, they tend to use some communication strategies to express their view, thoughts and feelings to articulate what they really want to convey.

2.4. The Theoretical Framework

The Communication Theory, which was proposed by S. F. Scudder in 1980 was used in this study. Shannon (2018) cited Scudder (1980) who emphasized that communication theory takes after the thought that human behavior is associated to the environment, which included past encounters, show circumstances, and future desires of all the parties included in data exchange. Communication theory is a concept where a message that is sent and received can impact the unwavering quality of communication. Shannon (2018) cited Shannon (1948) who asserted that communication is not a solitary language work, but a combination of coded discourse and physical features. The fundamental components of Shannon's communication model are data source, transmitter, recipient, and goal.

It is explained that when the teacher and the students understand one other, they respond in a more productive, engaging manner in the class. As a conclusion, communication theory highlights the idea that in order to survive in the class, especially in English, everyone has to communicate and has to interact with others and among themselves because communication is a dire need of survival in a class that requires one to utilize the communication skills.

Since the study described the communication strategies used by the English teachers in teaching Oral Communication in Context, the Communication Accommodation Theory, which was proposed by Howard Giles was also be used. Zhang and Giles (2018) explained that the premise of the theory lies within the thought that individuals alter or accommodate their style of discourse or communication to one another. When one accommodates their style of speech, the sender of the message will gain approval from the receiver, the communication efficiency between and among parties will increase and the sender keeps up positive social personality. This theory is concerned with the connections between language, context and identity.

2.5. Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to investigate the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context among the grade 11 students. Likewise, it sought to compare the assessments done by the students and the teachers on the strategies used in the said course in the second semester of the School Year, 2020-2021.

Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

- 1) What is the profile of the student- respondents in terms of:
 - a. age,
 - b. gender, and
 - c. academic track?
- 2) What is the profile of the teacher- respondents in terms of:
 - a. age,
 - b. gender,
 - c. highest educational attainment, and
 - d. specialization, and
 - e. number of years in teaching English?
- 3) What is the student-respondents' assessment of communication strategies used by the faculty members in expressing themselves in English in teaching in Oral Communication in Context in terms of:
 - a. circumlocution,
 - b. approximation,
 - c. use of all-purpose words,
 - d. appeal for help,
 - e. asking for repetition,
 - f. asking for clarification,
 - g. asking for confirmation,
 - h. use of fillers,
 - i. word coinage,
 - j. paralinguistic devices,
 - k. literal translation,
 - l. code switching,
 - m. message abandonment,
 - n. topic avoidance, and
 - o. self-repair?
- 4) What is the teacher-respondents' assessment of the communication strategies that they use to express themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context in terms of:
 - a. circumlocution,
 - b. approximation,
 - c. use of all-purpose words,
 - d. appeal for help,
 - e. asking for repetition,
 - f. asking for clarification,
 - g. asking for confirmation,
 - h. use of fillers,
 - i. word coinage,
 - j. paralinguistic devices,
 - k. literal translation,
 - l. code switching,
 - m. message abandonment,
 - n. topic avoidance, and

- o. self-repair?
- 5) What is the teacher-respondents' and student-respondents' assessment on the usefulness of the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context?
- 6) Is there a significant difference in the student-respondents' assessment on the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context when their profile is considered?
- 7) Is there a significant difference in the teacher-respondents' assessment on the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context when their profile is considered?
- 8) Is there a significant difference between the student-respondents and the teacher-respondents' assessment of communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context?
- 9) Is there a significant relationship between the student-respondents' and teacher-respondents' assessments of strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context?
- 10) How may the findings of the study be utilized as inputs for the teacher-respondents to improve in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context?

3. Research Methods

3.1. Research Design

The main objective of this study was to investigate on the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching in Oral Communication in Context and to compare the two assessments of the student-respondents and teacher-respondents of the study.

3.2. Research Locale

The study was conducted in a private higher education institution that offers Basic Education, Senior High School and Tertiary programs. It was granted an autonomous status by Commission on Higher Education (CHED), and is ISO certified. This private university is known for having the highest number of SHS students enrolled at the outset of SHS education. It offers the academic track that includes the four strands such as the Accountancy, Business and Management (ABM), Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) and General Academic Strand (GAS). In the year 2019, this institution is a recipient of Philippine Quality Award (PQA) Recognition for Proficiency in Quality Management.

3.3. Population and Sampling

The first set of respondents of this study was all the Grade 11 students enrolled in a private higher education institution. The total Grade 11 enrolment reached to 3,173 for this School Year, 2020-2021. The researcher did not include those who were enrolled in modular learning modality to avoid physical interaction and to ensure safety of students. Out of 3173 students enrolled, there were only 2200 students or 69% who willingly responded to the survey.

The researchers made use of the Google forms to obtain relevant data for the study. Below is the table showing the distribution of the student-respondents according to strand.

The second set of the respondents was all the teachers teaching Oral Communication in Context for the School year, 2020-2021. There were 20 Senior High School teachers, who were teaching or have taught Oral Communication in Context, who answered the questionnaire. Those English teachers who have taught the said course in the past but are not teaching the course in the covered school year were still included as respondents. Those who were English teachers but did not have any background in teaching the subject were excluded in the study. These teachers were either male or female currently teaching the said subject in the identified university.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

The researchers definitely followed some ethical principles in the conduct of the study. The manuscript was submitted for ethical review in the university's Institutional Ethics review Committee (IERC). After the certificate has been released, he proceeded to the gathering of data pertinent to the study.

Before the actual data collection, the respondents were asked to read and agree on the provisions of the Informed Consent Form (ICF). The Grade 11 students enrolled in the Oral Communication in Context are the most appropriate respondents since the study will try to assess the communication strategies commonly used by English teachers in teaching the said course. By agreeing to the ICF, the respondents were assured of the anonymity, confidentiality and beneficence of the present research. The recruitment and participation of the said respondents was voluntary in nature. There was no compensation or any form of reimbursement either in monetary or incentive that was given to respondents who participated in the data collection. It was made clear to them that there would be no risks attached in taking part of the study. If they opted not to participate, that decision would not be taken against them, and there was no deduction of points or whatsoever if they chose to. Likewise, they were informed that whatever data obtained from them would be treated with sanctity and confidentiality; thus, no information about them would be made public unless their permission would be sought.

When the manuscript has been completed, it was submitted to the Research Development and Innovation Center (RDIC) for similarity testing. The obtained an acceptable index of 7% .

3.5. Research Instrument

The researcher-made instrument that is inspired by the work of the Nijaradze and Doghonadze (2015) was subjected for content validation and reliability test.

There were three experts who validated the content of the survey tool. After the content validation, the survey questionnaire was pilot-tested to a group of Grade 11 students who were considered as actual respondents of the study. The responses of these students were tallied and were subjected for validity check through Cronbach's alpha coefficient. It underwent the Test-Retest reliability estimate, which was conducted by correlating pairs of scores from the same people on two different administrations of the same test. It yielded a Cronbach's alpha for all factors that were adequate, $\alpha = 0.791$ for usefulness and $=0.874$ for frequency.

3.6. Data Gathering Procedures

In gathering the pertinent data, the researcher used google forms. This was to ensure safety of both the researcher and the potential respondents. He asked the help of the English teachers to help post the survey tool in their respective group chats (GC's). He also wrote a letter to the Office of Campus Administrator asking her permission in allowing him to do the said survey in the campus.

Each was assured of confidentiality by observing the following: names of the respondents will not be asked- any information that may give a hint about the identity of the respondents used was coded. During the gathering of all data, no other person, but the researcher himself had the access to all of the information.

Once approval was obtained and the survey tool was already accessible, he asked assistance from his fellow teachers handling the subject in reminding the students to answer the tool. The Informed Parental Consent Form was the first part of the google form and was read and agreed on by the parents of the student-respondents. The google sheet was only available to students who are enrolled in the university, and the researcher only sent the link to the students via university official student gmail accounts. External accounts cannot access the said link. The students were oriented regarding the existing privacy policies of the use of the google forms. It was stressed to them that sharing the link to external users is punishable under the Data Privacy Act and is therefore discouraged.

After which, the researchers or the subject teacher who was assisting the researcher only interacted with the student-respondents twice- one was the start of the data collection through answering the survey in the link and the second was the follow up to be made a week after the data collection.

After the results and the integration have been made and the data completed and utilized for statistical purpose, all survey forms saved in folders with password were immediately deleted to make sure that no information would be disclosed and to ensure confidentiality of the respondents’ identities. All the data gathered were tallied, statistically treated and interpreted by the researcher himself.

4. Results and Discussion

This chapter presents, interprets and analyzes the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context. Moreover, this explains the significant differences on the assessments of the two sets of respondents and the significant relationship on their assessments.

4.1. Demographic Profile of the Student-Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the student-respondents in terms of age, gender, and academic strand. It can be seen on the table that out of 2200 student-respondents, 64.5% or 1420 were 17 years old followed by 250 (11.4%), who are 18 years old. On the other hand, there were recorded 5 (0.2 %) student-respondents who were 15 years old and 24 (1.1%) of them were above 20 years old. Macha et al., (2018), in the article on *Education in the Philippines*, they mentioned that in the Senior High School, which is composed of Grades 11 and 12, the Filipino student age entry is within the bracket of 16-18. The result, when it comes to the age of the respondents, is in harmony with the acceptable age range for a Grade 11 student in the Philippine education system. However, there were 24 respondents who more than 20 years old. This is assumed that these were the students who decided to go back to school after years of being idle.

When it comes to gender, 1443 (65.6%) female student-respondents dominated the male student-respondents with only 757 (34.4%) who responded to the survey. In an online news article written by Cruz and published online (2019), it expressed that there were more female students in high school and college compared with male. He cited the report done by the 2020 Global Gender Gap report of the World Economic Forum (WEF), which highlighted that 71.3% of female students were enrolled in secondary education and 40.4% in tertiary level, compared to the 60.2% and 40.4% respectively, among male students.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Student-Respondents

Profile	<i>M(SDn (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Age		
15	5	(0.2%)
16	459	(20.9%)
17	1420	(64.5%)
18	250	(11.4%)
19	42	(1.9%)
≥20	24	(1.1%)
Gender		
Female	1443	(65.6%)
Male	757	(34.4%)
Academic Strand		
ABM	651	(29.6%)
STEM	1118	(50.8%)
HUMSS	410	(18.6%)
GAS	21	(1.0%)

Note. *N* = 2200. *M* and *SD* represent mean and standard deviation.

In terms of the academic strand where the student-respondents belonged, more than half of the total population or 1118 (50.8%) came from the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) strand while only 21 (1.0%) belonged to the General Academic Strand (GAS).

It can be recalled that in the institution’s records for the school year 2020-2021, there were 3173 Grade 11 students enrolled in all academic strands and 1626 of them came from the STEM strand. This only means that 51.24% of the

total Grade 11 SHS population was from STEM, and out of 2200 student-respondents, 1118 or (50.8%) were from the same strand.

4.2. Demographic Profile of the Teacher-respondents

Table 2 reflects the demographic profile of the teacher- respondents who participated in the survey. Out of 20 teacher-respondents, 10 of them (50%) belonged to 20-30 years old age bracket while seven (7) or 35% were from 31-40 years old, and there three (3) teachers or 15% who belonged to the 41 years old and above age bracket. When it comes to gender, 15 teachers (75%) were females and only 5 (25%) were males. It can be gleaned from the presented data that obviously, female teachers dominated the population of the teacher-respondents in the identified research locale.

In terms of highest educational attainment, there were 6 teachers (30%) who were bachelor’s degree holder and nine (9) or 40% who were presently enrolled in their Masters program when the data were collected. On the other hand, there were three (3) teachers (15%) who were Masters degree holders and there was one (1) PhD holder and one (1) teacher with PhD units.

With regard to their specialization, most of the teacher-respondents were specialized in English. In fact, 14 teachers (70%) were English major holders while the remaining 7 teachers (30%) were specializing in communication management, communication, education, educational management, broadcast journalism and speech communication.

Table 2. Demographic Profile of the Teacher-Respondents

Variable		<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Age		22	1 (5%)
		24	3 (15%)
		27	2 (10%)
		28	2 (10%)
		29	2 (10%)
		31	1 (5%)
		35	2 (10%)
		36	1 (5%)
		38	3 (15%)
		42	1 (5%)
		56	1 (5%)
		58	1 (5%)
	Gender	Female	15
Male		5	(25.0%)
Highest Education Attainment	Bachelor’s Degree	6	(30.0%)
	Master’s Degree	3	(15.0%)
	Master’s Units	9	(45.0%)
	Doctorate Units Earner	1	(5.0%)
	Doctorate Degree Holder	1	(5.0%)
Specialization	English	14	(70.0%)
	Communication Management	1	(5.0%)
	Communication	1	(5.0%)
	Educational Management	1	(5.0%)
	Education	1	(5.0%)
	Broadcast Journalism	1	(5.0%)
	Speech Communication	1	(5.0%)

Note. *N* = 20. *M* and *SD* represent mean and standard deviation.

4.3. Student-respondents' Assessment on the Communication Strategies Used by the Teachers in Expressing Themselves in English

It can be seen on Table 3 that the student-respondents rated *asking for clarification* as *Always* on a scale of 1-4. This particular communicative strategy used by the English teachers whenever they expressed themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context had a mean of 3.55 and standard deviation of 0.65. This is followed by *asking for repetition* and *asking for confirmation* that had means scores of 3.52 (SD- 0.68) and 3.45 (SD-0.67) respectively. These two had an interpretation of *Often*. On the other hand, *message abandonment*, as a communicative strategy, had a mean score of 2.00 and a standard deviation of 1.00 interpreted as *Rarely*. This only means that the teachers seldom leave the conversation incomplete due to lack of speaking ability or unable to express themselves in English.

Asking for clarification refers to a certain situation in which the teacher requests explanation of an unfamiliar meaning structure. This is when a teacher asks questions like 'Do you follow me?' 'Do you understand?' and etc. to check whether an interlocutor understands what he/she has said or not. This is obviously the only CS that the student-respondents rated *Always* as used by their teachers in expressing themselves in English.

In a study conducted by Nijaradze and Doghonadze (2015) titled, *Teaching Oral Communication Strategies: Effects and Possibilities*, *asking for clarification* is one of the identified CS's that teachers frequently used among all speakers of English as a second language. Moreover, when it comes to the usefulness of the CS, it is second to the most useful strategy as perceived by the students and teachers. This can be interpreted that the teachers teaching the identified SHS course always took opportunities to clarify things to their students to make certain that their students really understood the discussion.

On the other hand, Karpati (2017) expressed that *message abandonment* happens when the user of the language starts to speak about a certain idea but is unable to continue in the discussion due to lack of phrases and expressions. Because of this situation, the user of the language stops in the middle of the utterance. Since this communication strategy was rated *Rarely* by the student-respondents, it only means that they have observed their English teachers, who just did not abandon messages or ideas whenever the scenario would become very hard for them to explain. In other words, their English teachers were able to express and explain thoughts, concepts and ideas relative to the course.

Table 3. Student-respondents' Assessment on Communication Strategies Used by the Teachers in Expressing Themselves in English

Communication Strategies	Scale	M	SD	Interpretation
Circumlocution	1-4	2.94	0.84	Often
Approximation	1-4	3.04	0.81	Often
Use of all-purpose words	1-4	3.14	0.80	Often
Word coinage	1-4	2.90	0.87	Often
Paralinguistic devices	1-4	3.18	0.80	Often
Literal translation	1-4	3.22	0.81	Often
Code switching	1-4	3.26	0.80	Often
Appeal for help	1-4	3.00	0.81	Often
Message abandonment	1-4	2.00	1.00	Rarely
Topic avoidance	1-4	2.61	0.95	Often
Use of fillers	1-4	3.32	0.71	Often
Self-repair	1-4	3.23	0.73	Often
Asking for clarification	1-4	3.55	0.65	Always
Asking for confirmation	1-4	3.45	0.67	Often
Asking for repetition	1-4	3.52	0.68	Often

Note. N = 2200. M and SD represent mean and standard deviation respectively. 1.00 – 1.49 Never; 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely; 2.50 – 3.49 Often; 3.50 – 4.00 Always

4.4. Teacher-respondents' Assessment on the Communication Strategies They Used in Expressing Themselves in English

Table 4 depicts the results of the teacher-respondents' assessment on the communication strategies they used whenever they expressed themselves in English when they taught the Oral Communication in Context. Of the 15 identified

communication strategies, the respondents evaluated *asking for repetition* with a mean score of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.44, and *asking for clarification* with a mean score of 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.47 as *Always*.

The identified *message abandonment*, as a communication strategy, used by teacher-respondents was also determined by the student-respondents as *Rarely* used. It obtained a mean score of 2.00 with a standard deviation of 1.12 on a scale of 1-4. This result corroborates with the result of the student-respondents’ assessment.

This can be interpreted that when teachers just left their discussion incomplete due to some speaking ability in expressing themselves, the students recognized it. Likewise, the teacher-respondents identified *asking for confirmation* and *self-repair* as communication strategies they often used in the classroom engagements. It only means that the teachers of the subject would correct themselves automatically whenever they committed some errors in expressing the ideas in the classroom discussion, but the student-respondents did not always observe this.

According to Emrani and Hooshmand (2018), repair is not just correcting an error because it is defined as “practices” for handling with difficulties or troubles whenever one speaks, writes, and understands in the communication.

for handling with difficulties or troubles whenever one speaks, writes, and understands in the communication.

Table 4. Teacher-respondents’ Assessment on Communication Strategies They in Expressing Themselves in English

Communication Strategies	M	SD	Interpretation
Circumlocution	3.05	0.76	Often
Approximation	3.35	0.67	Often
Use of all-purpose words	3.05	0.89	Often
Word coinage	2.70	0.98	Often
Paralinguistic devices	3.05	0.89	Often
Literal translation	2.68	0.95	Often
Code switching	2.95	0.83	Often
Appeal for help	3.10	0.72	Often
Message abandonment	2.00	1.12	Rarely
Topic avoidance	2.45	1.05	Often
Use of fillers	3.05	0.89	Often
Self-repair	3.40	0.68	Often
Asking for clarification	3.70	0.47	Always
Asking for confirmation	3.45	0.69	Often
Asking for repetition	3.75	0.44	Always

Note. N = 20. M and SD represent mean and standard deviation respectively

4.5. Teacher-respondents’ Assessment on the Usefulness of the Communication Strategies

Table 5 displays the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the usefulness of the communication strategies whenever they articulate themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context. It can be gleaned on the table that *asking for confirmation*, *asking for repetition*, *asking for clarification*, *approximation* and *self-repair* were the CS’s teachers found *most useful* to them. Conversely, *message abandonment* and *topic avoidance* were distinguished as *useless* and *least useful* respectively.

It can be interpreted that teachers would resort into these CS’s whenever their communication with their students in the classroom would become vague. *Asking for confirmation* happens teacher repeats the words the interlocutor says in order to confirm what he/she has heard is correct or not. Moreover, *asking for repetition* occurs when the English teacher uses ‘Pardon?’, ‘Sorry?’, ‘Could you say that again, please?’ to ask the interlocutor to explain an unfamiliar word. On the other hand, *asking for clarification* takes place when the teacher asks questions to clarify and check whether the interlocutor understands what has been discussed while *approximation* arises when the teacher does not know how to express something in English, he/she uses a word that has roughly the same meaning. On the other hand, *self-repair* happens when the teacher does the self-initiated corrections while using the English language in the class discussion.

The teacher-respondents rated *topic avoidance* as *least useful* and *message abandonment* as *useless*, so this only means that they seldom utilized these CS’s in an English classroom. This can be further interpreted that the SHS English teachers tried their best not to avoid talking about concepts for which the vocabulary meaning structure is not known. Likewise, since *message abandonment* was rated *useless*, this can be deduced that teachers made certain not to leave a

conversation incomplete due to some difficulty in speaking the English language. Karpati (2017) expressed that topic avoidance happens when one is exclude concepts for which his/her vocabulary is inadequate at that very moment of speaking while message abandonment occurs when the speaker begins talking a concept but is unable to continue due to lack of phrases and organization, and so quits in the middle of the communication. As assessed by the teachers themselves, they rated these two as useless.

Table 5. Teacher-respondents Assessment on the Usefulness of the Communication Strategies

Communication Strategies	Most Useful	Useful	Least Useful	Useless
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
C.ircumlocution	12 (60)	8 (40)	0	0
Approximation	15 (75)	5 (25)	0	0
Use of all-purpose words	7 (35)	9 (45)	3 (15)	1 (5)
Word coinage	5 (25)	8 (40)	5 (25)	2 (10)
Paralinguistic devices	9 (45)	7 (35)	2 (10)	2 (10)
Literal translation	4 (20)	15 (75)	1 (5)	0
Code switching	5 (25)	12 (60)	2 (10)	1(5)
Appeal for help	8 (40)	10 (50)	1(5)	1(5)
Message abandonment	2 (10)	1 (5)	10 (50)	7 (35)
Topic avoidance	5 (25)	7 (35)	7 (35)	1 (5)
Use of fillers	9 (45)	9 (45)	1 (5)	1 (5)
Self-repair	13 (65)	7 (35)	0	0
Asking for clarification	15 (75)	5 (25)	0	0
Asking for confirmation	17 (85)	3 (15)	0	0
Asking for repetition	16 (80)	3 (15)	1 (5)	0

4.6. Student-respondents' Assessment on the Usefulness of the Communication Strategies

Table 6 depicts the assessment of the student-respondents on the usefulness of the communication strategies whenever teachers express themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context. It can be gleaned on the table that *asking for repetition*, *asking for clarification*, *asking for confirmation*, *literal translation* and *code switching* were the CS's the student-respondents identified *most useful* to them. On a contrary, *message abandonment* and *topic avoidance* were rated as *useless* and *least useful* respectively.

Table 6. Student-respondents Assessment on the Usefulness of the Communication Strategies

Communication Strategies	Most Useful F (%)	Useful F (%)	Least Useful F (%)	Useless F (%)
Circumlocution	873 (39.68)	1140 (51.82)	184 (8.36)	3 (.14)
Approximation	898 (40.82)	1035 (47.05)	213 (9.68)	54 (2.45)
Use of all-purpose words	973 (44.23)	881 (40.05)	239 (10.86)	107 (4.86)
Word coinage	816 (37.09)	954 (43.36)	363 (16.5)	67 (3.05)
Paralinguistic devices	1014 (46.09)	876 (39.82)	249 (11.32)	61 (2.77)
Literal translation	1312 (59.64)	685 (31.14)	155 (7.04)	48 (2.18)
Code switching	1305 (59.32)	735 (33.41)	104 (4.73)	56 (2.54)
Appeal for help	952 (43.27)	944 (42.91)	248 (11.27)	56 (2.55)
Message abandonment	339 (15.41)	488 (22.18)	796 (36.18)	577 (26.23)
Topic avoidance	427 (19.41)	767 (34.86)	651 (29.59)	355 (16.14)
Use of fillers	1088 (49.45)	924 (42)	160 (7.27)	28 (1.28)
Self-repair	992 (45.09)	1003 (45.59)	172 (7.82)	33 (1.5)
Asking for clarification	1590 (72.27)	538 (24.45)	51 (2.32)	21 (.96)
Asking for confirmation	1409 (64.05)	685 (31.14)	90 (4.09)	16 (.72)
Asking for repetition	1489 (67.68)	591 (26.86)	88 (4)	32 (1.46)

Asking for clarification, *asking for confirmation* and *asking for repetition* were also the same CS's identified as the *most useful* by the teacher-respondents. This only means that even the students themselves appreciated whenever their English teachers employed these strategies in the classroom to make sure that they understood the discussion. Moreover, the student-respondents rated *literal translation* and *code switching* as useful CS's as well. This can be understood that

students wanted their teachers to translate word for word from Filipino to English whenever they did not know the word in English, and they also appreciated it when their teachers used a Filipino word or words when they could not say those words in English.

Panggabean and Wardhono (2017) expressed that *literal translation* and *code switching* are two of the eleven communication strategies used by the more proficient students in English. They furthered that students utilized these strategies when they encountered some difficulties to use the English word or when they thought that it would be a lot easier for their classmates to understand what they meant when they translated or switched some words to local language.

4.7. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Age

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis H test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when student-respondents are grouped according to demographic profile. The variables such as *circumlocution* $X 2(5) = 17.03$, $p = 0.004$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *approximation* $X 2(5) = 13.12$, $p = 0.002$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *use of all-purpose words* $X 2(5) = 16.42$, $p = 0.006$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *word coinage* $X 2(5) = 17.06$, $p = 0.004$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *literal translation* $X 2(5) = 11.45$, $p = 0.043$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *code switching* $X 2(5) = 30.87$, $p < 0.001$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *self-repair* $X 2(5) = 14.73$, $p = 0.006$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *asking for clarification* $X 2(5) = 16.13$, $p = 0.012$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *asking for confirmation* $X 2(5) = 28.15$, $p < .001$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$ and *asking for repetition* $X 2(5) = 12.64$, $p = 0.027$, $\epsilon^2 = 0.01$ yield statistically significant result at .05. Median scores were specified in tables 7.

Table 7. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Age

Communication Strategies	H Statistic	df	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	17.03	5	0.01	0.004	Significant (Reject Ho)
Approximation	13.12	5	0.01	0.002	Significant (Reject Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	16.42	5	0.01	0.006	Significant (Reject Ho)
Word coinage	17.06	5	0.01	0.004	Significant (Reject Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	10.10	5	0.00	0.072	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	11.45	5	0.01	0.043	Significant (Reject Ho)
Code switching	30.87	5	0.01	<0.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Appeal for help	8.14	5	0.00	0.149	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	6.03	5	0.00	0.303	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	9.18	5	0.00	0.102	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	10.66	5	0.00	0.059	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	14.73	5	0.01	0.006	Significant (Reject Ho)
Asking for clarification	16.13	5	0.01	0.012	Significant (Reject Ho)
Asking for confirmation	28.15	5	0.01	<0.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Asking for repetition	12.64	5	0.01	0.027	Significant (Reject Ho)

Note. $N = 2200$. H, df, effect size/ ϵ^2 and p value represent Kruskal-Wallis H Test, degrees of freedom, effect size and p value respectively

4.8. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Gender

A Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine the significant difference in the assessment of oral communication strategies used by teachers when student-respondents are grouped according to gender. The analysis revealed that variables *paralinguistic devices* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 502808$, $p = 0.002$, *literal translation* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 457196$, $p = <.001$, *code switching* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 467924$, $p < .001$, *appeal for help* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 496422$, $p = 0.001$, *use of fillers* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 487287$, $p < .001$, *asking for clarification* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 500429$, $p <.001$, and *asking for repetition* $U (N_{\text{female}} = 1443, N_{\text{male}} = 757) = 492508$, $p <.001$ yield statistically significant results at .05.

Table 8. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Gender

Communication Strategies	<i>U</i> Statistic	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	537435	0.01	0.625	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	531233	0.02	0.392	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	533695	0.01	0.712	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	517601	0.04	0.080	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	502808	0.07	0.002	Significant (Reject Ho)
Literal translation	437196	0.13	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Code switching	467924	0.13	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Appeal for help	496422	0.15	0.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Message abandonment	521443	0.04	0.225	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	517654	0.04	0.126	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	487287	0.10	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Self-repair	526284	0.02	0.460	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	500429	0.08	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Asking for confirmation	520614	0.04	0.075	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	492508	0.08	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)

Note. *N* = 2200. *M*, *U*, effect size/ ϵ^2 and *p* value represent mean, Mann-Whitney *U* Test, effect size and *p* value respectively

4.9. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Strand

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis *H* test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when student-respondents are grouped according to academic strand. Variables such as *circumlocution* $X^2(3) = 11.48, p = .009, \epsilon^2 = 0.01$, *message abandonment* $X^2(3) = 51.32, p < .001, \epsilon^2 = 0.02$, *topic avoidance* $X^2(3) = 18.01, p < .001, \epsilon^2 = 0.00$, and *asking for clarification* $X^2(3) = 22.09, p < .001, \epsilon^2 = 0.01$ yield statistically significant result at .05 (Table 9).

Table 9. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Strand

Communication Strategies	<i>H</i> Statistic	<i>df</i>	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	11.48	3	0.01	0.009	Significant (Reject Ho)
Approximation	7.42	3	0.00	0.060	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	1.95	3	0.00	0.582	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	6.26	3	0.00	0.100	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	4.71	3	0.00	0.194	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	1.02	3	0.00	0.785	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	4.94	3	0.00	0.176	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	2.54	3	0.00	0.468	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	51.32	3	0.02	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Topic avoidance	18.01	3	0.00	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)

Use of fillers	1.25	3	0.00	0.742	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	6.14	3	0.00	0.105	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	22.09	3	0.01	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Asking for confirmation	6.33	3	0.00	0.097	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	7.48	3	0.00	0.058	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

4.10. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Age

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis H test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when teacher-respondents are grouped according to age. The results manifested that there was no variable that yielded statistically significant result at .05. This can be assumed that the teacher-respondents' age did not influence as to how frequent they utilized the communication strategies in the English classroom.

Table 10. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Age

Communication Strategies	H Statistic	df	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	13.59	12	0.71	0.334	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	17.12	12	0.90	0.145	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	14.50	12	0.76	0.270	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	10.42	12	0.55	0.579	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	13.24	12	0.70	0.352	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	14.49	12	0.81	0.271	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	12.36	12	0.65	0.417	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	10.08	12	0.53	0.609	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	9.35	12	0.49	0.673	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	11.98	12	0.63	0.447	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	10.67	12	0.56	0.558	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	15.24	12	0.80	0.229	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	9.20	12	0.48	0.686	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	12.67	12	0.67	0.394	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	8.02	12	0.42	0.783	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. $N = 20$. H, df, effect size/ ϵ^2 and p value represent Kruskal-Wallis H Test, degrees of freedom, effect size and p value respectively

4.11. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Gender

The researcher conducted Mann-Whitney U test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when teacher-respondents are grouped according to gender, and it was found out that there was no variable yielded statistically significant result at .05. This only means that there is no significant difference on the teacher-respondents' assessment on the communication strategies when their gender was considered. Clearly, it is explained that the teacher's gender will not affect as to how frequent they would use the CS's when they express themselves in English during the class discussion in Oral Communication in Context.

Table 11. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Gender

Communication Strategies	<i>U</i> Statistic	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	32.0	0.15	0.640	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	28.0	0.25	0.385	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	31.5	0.16	0.610	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	35.0	0.07	0.850	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	29.5	0.21	0.485	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	31.0	0.11	0.728	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	32.5	0.13	0.677	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	34.5	0.08	0.812	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	29.5	0.21	0.482	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	36.0	0.04	0.928	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	27.0	0.28	0.354	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	30.5	0.19	0.529	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	32.5	0.13	0.621	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	33.0	0.12	0.695	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	30.0	0.20	0.416	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. *N* = 20. *M*, *U*, effect size/ ϵ^2 and *p* value represent mean, Mann-Whitney *U* Test, effect size and *p* value respectively

4.12. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis *H* test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when teacher-respondents are grouped according to highest educational attainment. The findings revealed that was no variable yielded statistically significant result at .05. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference on the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the communication strategies used by the teachers themselves when grouped according to their highest educational attainment. This can be deduced that the teacher’s educational attainment does not have any bearing as to the frequency of the utilization of CS’s in articulating their thoughts in English as a second language.

Table 12. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

Communication Strategies	<i>H</i> Statistic	<i>df</i>	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	4.40	4	0.23	0.355	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	5.03	4	0.27	0.266	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	4.45	4	0.23	0.348	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	3.39	4	0.18	0.495	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	1.58	4	0.08	0.813	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	2.65	4	0.15	0.619	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	3.91	4	0.21	0.418	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	3.00	4	0.16	0.559	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	3.58	4	0.18	0.466	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	5.56	4	0.29	0.234	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	4.60	4	0.24	0.330	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	5.32	4	0.28	0.256	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	3.92	4	0.21	0.417	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	4.10	4	0.22	0.393	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	2.11	4	0.11	0.715	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. *N* = 20. *H*, *df*, effect size/ ϵ^2 and *p* value represent Kruskal-Wallis *H* Test, degrees of freedom, effect size and *p* value respectively

4.13. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Specialization

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis H test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when teacher-respondents are grouped according to specialization. It was found out that no variable yielded statistically significant result at .05. This means that the null hypothesis has been accepted; hence, there is no significant difference in the teacher-respondents’ assessment on the communication strategies when grouped according to their major or specialization.

Table 13. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Specialization

Communication Strategies	H Statistic	df	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	10.55	7	0.550	0.159	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	7.26	7	0.382	0.402	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	4.44	7	0.234	0.728	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	7.69	7	0.410	0.361	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	5.15	7	0.271	0.641	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	5.91	7	0.328	0.550	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	7.65	7	0.403	0.364	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	7.52	7	0.396	0.377	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	8.06	7	0.424	0.327	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	7.84	7	0.413	0.347	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	4.81	7	0.253	0.684	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	5.38	7	0.283	0.614	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	5.08	7	0.267	0.650	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	5.62	7	0.296	0.585	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	4.97	7	0.26	0.664	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. N = 20.H, df, effect size/ ϵ^2 and p value represent Kruskal-Wallis H Test, degrees of freedom, effect size and p value respectively

4.14. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Number Years of Teaching

The researcher conducted Kruskal-Wallis H test to examine if there was a significant difference in the scores in terms of oral communication strategies used by teachers when teacher-respondents are grouped according to number of years in teaching, and it was revealed that there was no variable that yielded statistically significant result at .05. hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted (Table 14). There is no significant difference on the teacher-respondents’ assessment on the communication strategies used by the English teachers when the number of years in teaching was considered. This highlights that the English teachers used CS’s in expressing their thoughts and ideas in English during the classroom engagements particularly in teaching Oral Communication in Context to Grade 11 students, and their use was not influenced by their number of years in teaching.

4.15. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents’ and Teacher-Respondents’ Assessment on the Communication Strategies

A Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine the significant difference in the assessment of oral communication strategies used by teachers and students. The analysis revealed that out of fifteen communication strategies identified and considered, only *literal translation*U (N_{students} = 2200, N_{teachers} = 20 = 138343 p = 0.007) yielded significant results at .05 level. (Table 15). This entails that based on the assessments done by the two sets of respondents; only literal translation was identified to have significant difference. The teacher-respondents did not rate this CS as one of the most useful CS’s, but the student-respondents identified it as most useful.

Table 14. Test of Difference in the Teacher-Respondents Assessment on the Oral Communication Strategies when Grouped According to Number Years of Teaching

Communication Strategies	H Statistic	df	EffectSize/ ϵ^2	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	2.183	3	0.11	0.530	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	1.630	3	0.08	0.658	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	2.477	3	0.13	0.479	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	1.974	3	0.10	0.578	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	2.281	3	0.12	0.516	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	2.211	3	0.12	0.530	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Code switching	4.741	3	0.25	0.192	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	1.819	3	0.10	0.611	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	4.408	3	0.23	0.211	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	2.637	3	0.14	0.451	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	2.477	3	0.13	0.479	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	2.026	3	0.11	0.567	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	0.850	3	0.05	0.837	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	1.143	3	0.06	0.767	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	2.050	3	0.11	0.562	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. N = 20.H, df, effect size/ ϵ^2 and p value represent Kruskal-Wallis H Test, degrees of freedom, effect size and p value respectively

Table 15. Test of Difference in the Student-Respondents' and Teacher-Respondents' Assessment on the Communication Strategies

Communication Strategies	U Statistic	Effect Size/ ϵ^2	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	20681	0.06	0.637	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	17433	0.20	0.090	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	20892	0.04	0.714	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	18938	0.14	0.267	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	20065	0.09	0.479	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	13843	0.33	0.007	Significant (Reject Ho)
Code switching	17053	0.22	0.066	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Appeal for help	21099	0.33	0.779	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	17546	0.20	0.114	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	19781	0.09	0.447	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	18304	0.16	0.170	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	19178	0.12	0.315	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	19843	0.10	0.387	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	21895	0.00	0.986	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	18290	0.16	0.142	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

Note. N = 2220. M, U, effect size/ ϵ^2 and p value represent mean, Mann-Whitney U Test, effect size and p value respectively

4.16. Test of Significant Relationship between Student-respondents' and Teacher-respondents' Assessments on Oral Communication Strategies

A chi-square test found the there was a significant relationship between student-respondents and teacher-respondents assessment on oral communication strategies in terms of word coinage $X^2(2212) = 8.63$, $p = 0.035$, literal translation $X^2(2201) = 20.2$, $p < .001$ and code switching $X^2(2206) = 8.90$, $p = 0.031$. This can be interpreted that if the teacher-respondents resorts to making a new English word by adding suffixes or prefixes to familiar English words or to changing the beginning or the ending of the words students do not know, the students would have the tendency to understand the English word. Moreover, if they literally translate the statement word for word from English to Filipino, and they switch to using Filipino instead of English to make students understand, the student-respondents would appreciate the strategies of the teachers.

Table 16. Test of Significant Relationship between Student-respondents' and Teacher-respondents' Assessments on Oral Communication Strategies

Communication Strategies	X^2 Statistic	N	df	p value	Interpretation
Circumlocution	1.07	2214	3	0.784	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Approximation	2.99	2211	3	0.394	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of all-purpose words	1.57	2205	3	0.667	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Word coinage	8.63	2212	3	0.035	Significant (Reject Ho)
Paralinguistic devices	7.50	2213	3	0.057	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Literal translation	20.2	2201	3	<.001	Significant (Reject Ho)
Code switching	8.90	2206	3	0.031	Significant (Reject Ho)
Appeal for help	1.17	2204	3	0.761	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Message abandonment	7.50	2204	3	0.058	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Topic avoidance	1.51	2204	3	0.680	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Use of fillers	4.29	2204	3	0.232	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Self-repair	1.25	2197	3	0.741	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for clarification	1.57	2214	3	0.666	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for confirmation	0.33	2214	3	0.955	Non-significant (Accept Ho)
Asking for repetition	2.48	2209	3	0.479	Non-significant (Accept Ho)

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

Majority of the student-respondents were 17 years old (64.5%), female (65.6%) and enrolled in STEM strand (50.8%).

Most of the teacher-respondents were 24 years old (64.5%), female (75.5%), with master's units (45.0%) and were specialized in English (65.0%).

In terms of the student-respondents' assessment on the communication strategies used the teachers in expressing themselves in English, they identified asking for clarification as used Always and message abandonment as Rarely used.

In terms of the teacher-respondents' assessment, it reported asking for repetition and asking for clarification as Always used and message abandonment as Rarely used as communication strategies they utilized in expressing themselves in English in teaching the said course.

The student-respondents identified asking for clarification, asking for repetition, asking for confirmation, literal translation and code switching as the most useful CS's utilized by the teachers in expressing themselves in English. On the other hand, the teacher-respondents distinguished asking for clarification, asking for repetition, asking for confirmation, self-repair, and approximation as the most useful CS's for the teachers themselves. Both sets of respondents identified message abandonment as useless for the teachers to use in expressing themselves.

There were significant differences of the student-respondents' assessment of the communication strategies used by the English teachers in expressing themselves in the said language when the age of the respondents was considered in terms of the circumlocution, approximation, use of all-purpose words, word coinage, literal translation, code switching, self-repair, asking for clarification, asking for confirmation, and asking for repetition.

There were significant differences of the student-respondents' assessment of the communication strategies used by the English teachers in expressing themselves in the said language when the gender of the respondents was considered. The significant differences were found on paralinguistic devices, literal translation, code switching, appeal for help, use of fillers, asking for clarification, and asking for repetition.

There were significant differences of the student-respondents' assessment of the communication strategies used by the English teachers in expressing themselves in the said language when the academic strand of the respondents was considered. The significant differences were found in circumlocution, word coinage, message abandonment, topic avoidance, and asking for clarification.

There was no significant difference on the assessment of the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English when the teacher-respondents were grouped according to their demographic profile such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, specialization and number of years in teaching.

There was significant difference on the assessments done by the student-respondents and teacher-respondents, and the difference was only found in literal translation.

There is a significant relationship between the two sets of respondents' assessments on the communication strategies used by the teachers in expressing themselves in English in teaching Oral Communication in Context in terms of word coinage, literal translation, and code switching.

References

- Ardianto, P. (2016, January). Communication strategies in English conversations. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved November 17, 2021, from <https://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/FTL/article/view/2021>.
- Attaollah, M. (2010). Techniques to teach communication strategies. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47716177_Techniques_to_Teach_Communication_Strategies.
- Bernstein, J., & Meizlish, D. (2003, November 30). Becoming Congress: A Longitudinal Study of the Civic Engagement Implications of a Classroom Simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ675109>.
- Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burns, A. (2019). A holistic approach to teaching speaking in the language ... https://www.andrasprak.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.204517.1411636356!/menu/standard/file/Anne_Burns.pdf.
- Cruz, M. (2019). More women in Hs, college than men in Ph, says report. *Inquirer.net*. Retrieved October 25, 2021, from <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1206375/more-women-in-hs-college-than-men-in-ph-says-report>.
- Cruz, N. (2019). Improving the oral communication skills of senior high school students through the use of task-based strategy. *GRIN*. <https://www.grin.com/document/490074>.
- Daing, C. (2020). School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Skills and Teachers' Performance and Efficacy in Senior High Schools in the National Capital Region, Philippines. <https://www.researchgate.net/>.
- Emrani, F. H. (2018, December 31). A conversation analysis of self-initiated self-repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners. Online Submission. Retrieved November 17, 2021, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED591531>.
- Emrani, F., & Hooshmand, M. (2018, December 31). A conversation analysis of self-initiated self-repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners. Online Submission. Retrieved November 5, 2021, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED591531>.
- Goh, C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach*. http://assets.cambridge.org/97811070/11236/frontmatter/9781107011236_frontmatter.pdf.
- Karpati, L. (2017). The use of communication strategies in English language education. *Researchgate*. Retrieved November 17, 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Laszlo-Karpati/publication/320407570_The_Use_of_Communication_Strategies_in_English_Language_Education/links/59e3334e458515393d5b4b50/The-Use-of-Communication-Strategies-in-English-Language-Education.pdf.
- Leong, L., & Ahmadi, M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English ... https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315437786_An_Analysis_of_Factors_Influencing_Learners'_English_Speaking_Skill.
- Lin, C.-J., & Hwang, G.-J. (2018). A Learning Analytics Approach to Investigating Factors Affecting EFL Students' Oral Performance in a Flipped Classroom. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26388398?refreqid=search-gateway>.
- Liu, M. & Zhu, L. (2012). An Investigation and Analysis of Teacher Talk in College English Class. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 2, No. 5. Retrieved January 15, 2021 from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijel/article/download/20965/13699>

- Luz, J.M. (2020, November 19). Too many children not enrolled this school year is a major concern. Retrieved November 7, 2021, from <https://www.rappler.com/voices/ispeak/analysis-too-many-children-not-enrolled-this-school-year-major-concern>.
- Macha , W., Mackie , C., & Magaziner, J. (2018, March 6). Education in the Philippines. Retrieved June 18, 2021, from <https://wenr.wes.org/2018/03/education-in-the-philippines>.
- Nijaradze, N., & Doghonadze, K. (2015, May 12). (PDF) teaching Oral Communication Strategies: Effects and Possibilities. ResearchGate. Retrieved November 17, 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321300320_Teaching_Oral_Communication_Strategies_Effects_and_Possibilities.
- Panggabean, C. I. T., & Wardhono, A. (2017, December 1). Directory of open access journals. Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature. Retrieved December 7, 2021, from <https://doaj.org/article/8aa6f04a679e43039fdd7512580593f2>.
- Rao, P. (2018) Teaching Speaking Skills In English Language Classrooms Through Various Techniques And Activities. *ELT Vibes: International E-Journal For Research in ELT*. 4(4) 141- 157
- Republic Act No.10533. Republic Act. (2015). <http://republicact.com/docs/statute/4315/ra-10533-enhanced-basic-education-act-2013#!>
- Shannon, C. (2018). Effective Management Communication Strategies. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7058&context=dissertations>.
- Taouis, H., & Perez, S. (2018). Teaching Written Communication Strategies: A Training to ... *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323493792_Teaching_Written_Communication_Strategies_A_Training_to_Improve_Writing.
- Tran, V. (2013). Theoretical Perspectives Underlying the Application of ... <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1067527.pdf>.
- Zhang, Y. B., & Giles, H. (2018). Communication accommodation theory. In Y. Y. Kim (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication* (pp. 95-108). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0156>