

Remediating Technical Vocational Livelihood (TVL) Students' Oral Communication Skills Using Active and Didactic Learning Approaches

Alvin S. Taneo¹ / Kurt S. Candilas²

¹Lourdes College, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

E-mail: alvin.taneo@lccdo.edu.ph

²Lourdes College, Cagayan de Oro, Philippines

E-mail: kurt.candilas@lccdo.edu.ph

Received: May 9, 2024

Revised: July 15, 2024

Accepted: August 21, 2024

Abstract

The ability to successfully convey information and ideas through spoken words, tone of voice, and non-verbal clues like body language is referred to as oral communication skills. The purpose of oral communication is to assist students in comprehending the characteristics and dynamics of various speaking contexts. In order to investigate the efficacy of didactic learning and active learning approaches in enhancing Grade 11 oral communication skills performance in a National Comprehensive High School in the Division of Misamis Oriental during the academic year 2023-2024, this research used a quasi-experimental design. Two (2) participant groups in the study: the first group, consisting of 34 students, was exposed to active learning, and the second group, also consisting of 34 students, was exposed to the didactic learning approach. The participants in the Active Learning Group has the mean equivalent to “fair” level while in the sub skills, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation, and grammar has the same mean level which is on the “fair” level and improved their performance in most sub-skills in Oral Communication from “fair” to “good” level, except for fluency, where they remained at the “fair” level. Furthermore, in terms of the test of difference, significant difference posted by the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in terms of their oral communication skills using the didactic learning approach is minimal in terms of its effects on their overall application and utilization of their oral communication skills in real life situations. In terms of Increment, there is a significant difference posted by the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in terms of their oral communication skills using the active learning approach. In terms of increment results, it can be inferred that the Active Learning Approach is more effective than the didactic Learning approach based on their means score. This implies that students become active knowledge creators when teachers implement an active learning approach in the classroom.

Keywords: oral communication, active learning approach, didactic learning

Introduction

Oral communication ability has become crucial in the Philippines, a resource that can help someone succeed in their academic endeavors because involvement in classrooms typically uses English as the primary medium of educational method. Oral communication, which includes formal and informal contacts, is the process of exchanging information and conveying meaning through spoken language. English classes aim to improve students' ability to use English correctly and effectively in such situations. Although schools and other organizations have made attempts, there are still learners who need help to develop their proficiency and accuracy in using the English language.

Oral communication is the ability to engage in verbal discussions and exchange information through presentations. These skills are necessary for effective teaching (Jaca et al., 2020). Moreover, Pratiwi et al. (2020) stated that the curriculum is the foundation for the English teaching and learning process in senior high school.

It is the priority of the Department of Education (DepEd) that pupils acquire the English language in its entirety. The goal of Language Arts in grades K–12 and a multiple literacies curriculum is to produce graduates who can use the language conventions, ideas, tactics, and understanding and learn other content areas and fend for themselves in whatever field of endeavor they may engage in (DepEd, 2016). In order to address the current issue, the Department of Education integrated the K-12 curriculum, which emphasizes communication instruction and includes oral communication as a topic in context to expose students to a variety of speaking exercises and strategies that will help them become proficient communicators. The majority of the tasks that students complete in this course involve speaking, and having conversations is a significant component of those tasks. To perform well in the various oral communication tasks, students should possess sufficient conversational skills.

As an oral communication subject teacher, the researcher noticed that the learners found it difficult to participate in conversations or discussions utilizing English; when expressing their thoughts in the lesson, students more frequently just utilized Cebuano -the Visayan language. Due to their weak oral communication abilities, students frequently need to improve in their classes. When asked a question, they need help responding in clear, conversational English, and engaging in conversation with them becomes even more difficult. This finding was further supported by a study by Candilas (2016) found that a number of factors could be to blame for current oral communication difficulties, particularly in the Philippines. It revealed that many Filipino college students still need help with their English language proficiency, particularly regarding recitations, reports, oral presentations, and everyday conversations. According to Lucanus (2017), effective oral communication is the process of exchanging knowledge, thoughts, opinions, and ideas so that a specific message is conveyed, received, and understood clearly and purposefully. Also, in the English classroom, students must exhibit analytical and critical thinking abilities in their written or spoken responses. Due to this, the researcher found the need to conduct the study since the speaking problem was predominantly observed in the school. This problem has to be addressed to realize the goal and importance of English Language Teaching (ELT).

Framework

This study assumes that Active Learning and Didactic Learning Approaches help enhance the Oral Communication Skills of Grade 11 TVL students. This assumption is supported by the theories of Lev Vygotsky, zone of proximal development (1997), Jean Piaget's constructivism (1993), and Martin Bygate's theory on speaking (1972).

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development Theory, developed by Vygotsky, focuses on the differences between what a learner can accomplish on their own and with assistance from another person. Through a technique known as "Vygotsky scaffolding," a teacher or another capable student assists a student who is within their zone of potential. When the student and teacher start working together, the teacher demonstrates the majority of the work and explains the steps involved in order to aid the student in understanding the material. The teacher's help decreases as the student gains more familiarity with the subject matter and performs more work independently. The scaffolding keeps getting smaller until the student has mastered the material and no longer needs scaffolding. In this study, the theory explains that when a teacher uses questioning methods, those questions are not just for assessing students' knowledge. Effective, engaging, and sufficiently difficult questions foster group discussion and motivate students to delve deeper into and improve their comprehension of essential ideas.

Furthermore, this study is also anchored on the Constructivism Theory of Jean Piaget. Driscoll (2005) states, "Learners construct knowledge as they attempt to make sense of their experiences." Constructivists emphasize that firsthand experience is required in order to acquire knowledge. Additionally, they emphasize that understanding information requires knowledge derived from experience (Thompson, 2018). In constructivist learning, the learning process is more significant than the products of learning (Amineh et al., 2015). The constructivist method argues that information should be improved so students can use it effectively. It is, therefore, crucial to be an active learner, a lifelong learner, to absorb the intended instruction.

On the other hand, this study is also supported by the theory of Martin Bygate on speaking (1972), which state that to accomplish speaking as means of communication there are two things to think about. Knowledge is the first language, and the other is the application of skill in this vocabulary. It is insufficient to just know something of the language, but an individual who speaks it ought to be adaptable to a variety of circumstances. Speaking, according to Widdowson (2017), is the active use of oral production skills. It is the capacity for oral communication using all four of the major language skills. For students to speak English fluently, they must be able to competently use the proper stress, pronounce phonemes correctly, and intonation patterns and communicate in coherent sentences. However, there is more to better than that. English speakers, particularly in places where it is widely spoken, will need to be capable of speaking in a variety of contexts and genres, and they'll need to be proficient in a variety of conversational and repair techniques for conversations. They'll have to have the ability to endure in normal function trade-offs as well. However, "speaking fluently require more than just knowledge but both the knowledge of linguistic elements and the capacity to interpret language "on the spot" (Harmer, 2017). In order to speak more boldly and fluently, there are six key components that are thought to be helpful. The key components are sounding natural, projecting our intended message, finding the

right words, speaking with assurance, and speaking fluently and accurately. Learning engagement and retention are goals of language classrooms. Essential elements of the curriculum are the instructional tasks, hold a central place in the learning process within the language learning environment (Ellis, 2018). Speaking is a very important part of people's daily lives, even though it is often taken for granted. Speaking is the "par excellence" mode of social cohesion, professional success, and business, according to Bygate (1987). People are most often judged by the words they use. Furthermore, speaking is a method used to acquire a lot of languages, including English. Speaking is more than just pronouncing words in the right order. If a speaker can effectively convey his ideas and help his audience understand him, then they are considered good speakers. Students will have a communicative purpose in addition to a desire to communicate wherein the pupils are engaged in repetition or a drill. They were inspired by the necessity of achieving the accuracy target. The language's structure is the main focus. In order to accomplish the goal, a teacher should be involved in developing the teaching procedures. Mastering the four skills is essential to learning any foreign language. The four oral skills speaking, listening, and listening-are thought to be related to language that is expressed audibly.

The independent variables in this study are Active Learning and Didactic Learning Approaches. Active learning approaches encourage students to participate in their education by pondering, debating, exploring, and producing. During class, students work on skills, solve problems, struggle with difficult questions, make decisions, offer solutions, and use writing and discussion to explain concepts in their own words. For this learning process to be successful, prompt feedback from the teacher or other students is essential (Theobald et al., 2020).

Consequently, didactic strategies refer to the collection of created tasks that are considered, as a general norm of input, not only students' comprehension of concepts but also the reciprocal relationship between particular information and a given activity. As strategies are implemented in English teaching, the professor searches for a collaborative project. When students work in a collaborative group, they assign tasks to each other and build knowledge collaboratively (Navarro & Piñeiro, 2012). Cruz (2017) states that didactic approaches to second language acquisition are essential for triggering learners' empowerment. They pursue successful learning outcomes and meaningful learning through games that help them build their knowledge.

Research Objectives

This study aims to determine the impact of active and didactic learning approaches on enhancing the Oral Communication Skills of Technical Vocational Livelihood students enrolled in a public comprehensive High School in the Division of Misamis Oriental.

Research Questions:

This study sought to determine TVL Students Oral Communication Skills through Active and Didactic Learning approaches.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the two participant groups' oral communication skills before and after the intervention taking into account:

1.1 comprehension;

- 1.2 fluency;
 - 1.3 vocabulary;
 - 1.4 pronunciation
 - 1.5 grammar?
2. How does the oral communication proficiency of each group's members compare before and after the intervention?
 3. How do the two groups of participants compare in their level of Oral Communication Skills Increment?

Methodology

This study used a quasi-experimental design and examined the effect of the Active Learning Approach and Didactic Learning Approach in enhancing oral communication skills. Abraham and MacDonald (2018) state that quasi-experimental research is similar to experimental research, but it is often performed in cases where a control group cannot be created or random selection cannot be performed. Similarly, Thomas (2023) stated that quasi-experimental design aims to link an independent and dependent variable in a cause-and-effect manner. A quasi-experimental design is helpful when actual experiments cannot be conducted for moral or practical reasons. This study's decision to use a quasi-experimental design is justified because it will allow researchers to assess how well the Active learning and Didactic Learning Approaches affect the target students' oral communication abilities. A pre-test and post-test in speaking skills were administered to measure the Senior High School TVL students' Oral Communication Skills. The instrument used in assessing students' English communication skills was the Student Oral Observation Matrix (SOLOM) adapted from the study of Candilas (2015). The Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) is an informal rating tool used to assess students' command of oral language based on what teachers observe continually. The SOLOM is not a test but a rating scale that assessor can use to rate and monitor students' oral language proficiency. The SOLOM was used to group and regroup students for instruction and to identify instructional and curricular areas needing more attention. The researcher used the following statistical tools to organize the data. For Problem 1, descriptive statistics such as percentage, mean, frequency distribution, and standard deviation was used. For Problem 2, a T-test for paired samples was used to show the significant differences in the participants' oral communication skills performance before and after the interventions. Finally, for Problem 3, a T-test for independent samples was used to see significant differences in the score increments of the oral communication skills of the two groups of participants.

Results and Discussion

The data collected from the study participants is analyzed and interpreted in this section. The data is displayed by the researcher in tables along with an explanation and ramifications.

Table 1*Participants' Oral Communication Skills before and after the Interventions*

Oral Communication Skills Performance Test	ACTIVE LEARNING GROUP				DIDACTIC LEARNING GROUP			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	M	Inter	M	Inter	M	Inter	M	Inter
Comprehension	2.51	G	3.19	G	3.06	G	3.18	G
Fluency	2.41	F	2.51	G	2.99	G	3.06	G
Vocabulary	2.28	F	3.47	G	3.06	G	3.28	G
Pronunciation	2.49	F	3.49	G	2.81	G	3.31	G
Grammar	2.24	F	3.60	VG	2.94	G	3.31	G
Total	11.93		16.26		14.86		16.14	
Mean	2.39		3.25		2.97		3.23	
Interpretation	Fair		Good		Good		Good	

*Legend: Ad- Advanced: 4.51-5.0 O – Outstanding: 3.51-4.50 VG – Very Good: 2.51-3.50
G- Good: 1.51-2.50 F- Fair: 1.0-1.50 P- Poor*

Table 1 presents the summary of the participant's Oral Communication Skills before and after the intervention. As we can see in the table, the active learning approach in the pretest had the mean of 2.39 equivalent to "fair" level, while in the sub skills, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation and grammar had the same mean level which is on the "fair" level during the pretest while in the didactic learning approach comprehension also had the mean of 2.97 and fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar also in the "good" level, the same with the active learning approach group which we can infer that both of the participants in the study has the same level before the conduct of the study. Meanwhile in the post test grammar in both of the approaches had the highest mean of 3.23 which is on the "good" level while comprehension, fluency, vocabulary and pronunciation is on the "good" level. This can be interpreted that both of the approaches have the same effect on the improvement of oral communication skills of participants. Thus, it can be utilized in providing interventions for the students especially those that have low oral communication skills. This is in line with the findings of Silva (2018) that teachers should use a wider range of techniques to promote communication in the classroom, as students prefer interactive tasks, and not merely to one unitary routine. The results also align with the research conducted by Asratie et al. (2023), who similarly employed a pre-test in their investigation. According to their research, students who received their instruction in an active and didactic structured activities performed better when speaking in class than those who received not using the approaches mentioned. They discovered that the students who are exposed to active learning learn were more proficient in pronunciation, had a wider vocabulary, spoke clearly, coherently, and accurately. Additionally, the students exposed to didactic learning also showed same improvement. As a result, the study suggests that scholars, educators, and learners adopt these strategies.

Table 2

Test of Difference in the Participants' Oral Communication Skills before and after the Interventions

Oral Communication Skills	ACTIVE LEARNING APPROACH GROUP				Effect Size	DIDACTIC LEARNING APPROACH GROUP				Effect Size
	Pre Test	Post Test	t	p		Pre Test	Post Test	t	p	
Comprehension	2.52	3.20	6.42**	.000	-1.1	3.06	3.18	-.903	.373	-.156
Fluency	2.41	2.52	-.890	.334	-168	2.99	3.06	.842	.406	-.144
Vocabulary	2.28	3.47	8.41**	.000	-1.44	3.06	3.28	1.97	.058	-.388
Pronunciation	2.49	3.49	6.70**	.000	-1.15	2.81	3.31	3.42**	.002	-.586
Grammar	2.24	3.60	8.79**	.000	-1.51	2.94	3.31	2.85**	.007	-.489
OVERALL	2.39	3.25	9.12	.000	-1.56	2.97	3.23	2.99**	.005	-.507

**significant at 0.01 level

*significant at 0.05 level

Table 2 exhibits the Result of the Test of Difference in the Participants' Oral Communication Skills before and after the Interventions. For Active Learning Approach, it registered an overall computed t-value of 9.12 with computed p-value of 0.00. The computed p-value is less than the t-critical value at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under active learning approach was registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Moreover, Comprehension skills t-value is 6.42, p-value 0.00, Vocabulary skills t-value is -8.41, p-value of 0.000, pronunciation t-value is 6.70, p-value of 0.000, and Grammar t-value is 8.79, p-value of 0.00, showed significant difference indicating that these skills have made difference or important effects on the students overall oral communication skills performance. This means that in improving the students' performance and knowledge on their oral communication skills they must be given more attention on doing activities and exercises pertaining to comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar.

Meanwhile, Fluency registered computed t-value of -.890 with computed p-value of 0.334. The computed p-value is greater than the p-critical value at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that no significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under active learning approach was registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This data implies that aspect of fluency in developing the students' oral communication skills has no bearing at all. Teachers may still provide activities that utilizes this approach as it form part of their overall oral communication skills development.

When considering the value of effect size, it registered an overall result of -1.56. This means that the significant difference posted by the pretest and posttest scores of the students in terms of their oral communication skills using the active learning approach is very minimal in terms of its effects on their overall application and utilization of their oral communication skills in real life situations. This only mean that the teachers must make innovation in utilizing and applying the active learning approach in improving the students' oral communication skills.

For Didactic Learning Approach, it registered an overall computed t-value of 2.99 with computed p-value of 0.005. The computed p-value is less than the t-critical value at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under didactic learning approach was registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Moreover, pronunciation t-value is 3.42, and p-value of 0.002, and grammar t-value of 2.85, p-value of 0.007, showed significant difference indicating that these skills have made difference or important effects on the students overall oral communication skills performance. This means that in improving the students' performance and knowledge on their oral communication skills they must be given more attention on doing activities and exercises pertaining to pronunciation and grammar.

Meanwhile, comprehension t-value is -0.9-3, and p-value of 0.373, fluency t-value is 0.842, p-value of 0.406 and vocabulary t-value of 1.97, p-value of 0.058 registered computed p-value that is greater that the p-critical value at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that no significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under didactic learning approach was registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This data implies that aspect of comprehension, fluency and grammar in developing the students' oral communication skills has no bearing at all. Teachers may still provide activities that utilizes this approach as it form part of their overall oral communication skills development.

When considering the value of effect size, it registered an overall result of -0.507. This means that the significant difference posted by the pretest and posttest scores of the students in terms of their oral communication skills using the didactic learning approach is minimal in terms of its effects on their overall application and utilization of their oral communication skills in real life situations. This only mean that the teachers must make innovation in utilizing and applying the didactic learning approach in improving the students' oral communication skills. Similarly Ngoc (2021) concluded that in the classroom, students must be able to speak with confidence and in the right way; they must learn how to participate in class discussions in a constructive way. Low participations caused by lack of drive due to inadequate didactic materials to enhance their oral communication, they avoided making mistakes, interacted erratically, and the instructor's presence.

Table 3

Test of Difference in the Two Groups of Participants' Oral Communication Skills Increment

Oral Communication	ACTIVE LEARNING APPROACH GROUP		DIDACTIC LEARNING APPROACH GROUP		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect Sizes
	M	SD	M	SD			
Comprehension	.676	.614	.118	.759	3.34**	.001	.809
Fluency	.676	.614	.088	.764	3.50**	.001	.849
Vocabulary	.103	.613	.088	.500	.108	.914	.026
Pronunciation	1.19	.826	.250	.666	5.17**	.000	1.26
Grammar	1.0	.870	.485	.848	2.47*	.016	.599
Oral Communication	.1.37	.907	.444	.886	4.78**	.000	1.16
Overall	.868	.555	.2556	.499	4.78**	.000	1.16

Significant at 0.01level

Table 3 exhibits the Result of the Test of Difference in the Two Groups Participants' Oral Communication Skills Increment. For both Approaches, they registered an overall computed t-value of 4.78** with computed p-value of .000. The computed p-value is less than the t-critical value at 0.01level of significance. This implies that significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores in terms of incremental scores under active learning approach are registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Moreover, Comprehension skills t-value=3.34**, p-value=.001, Vocabulary skills t-value=.108, p-value=.914, pronunciation t-value=5.17**, p-value=.000, and Grammar t-value=2.47*, p-value=.000 showed significant difference indicating that these skills have made difference or important effects on the participant's overall oral communication skills performance.

This means that in improving the students' performance and knowledge on their oral communication skills they must be given more attention on doing activities and exercises pertaining to comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar.

Conversely, vocabulary registered computed t-value of .108 with computed p-value of .914. The computed p-value is greater than the p-critical value at 0.01 level of significance. This implies that no significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under active learning approach was registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This data implies that aspect of fluency in developing the students' oral communication skills has no bearing at all in terms of vocabulary sub skills. Teachers may still provide activities that utilizes this approach as it forms part of their overall oral communication skills development.

For Didactic Learning Approach, it registered an overall computed t-value of .499 with computed p-value of .000. The computed p-value is less than the t-critical value at 0.01 level of significance. This implies that significant difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores under didactic learning approach are registered. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that in improving the students' performance and knowledge on their oral communication skills they must be given

more attention on doing activities and exercises pertaining to pronunciation and grammar.

Meanwhile, when considering the value of effect size, it registered an overall result of 1.16. This means that the significant difference posted by the pretest and posttest scores of the students in terms of their oral communication skills using the didactic learning approach is average in terms of its effects on their overall application and utilization of their oral communication skills in real life situations. This only means that the teachers must make innovation in utilizing and applying the didactic learning approach in improving the students' oral communication skills to make it more effective and efficient.

Overall, in terms of using the approaches in group activities, Didactic approach is more effective compared to Active Learning approach based on their effect size value. This is normal as didactic learning approach is more applicable to due to its concept, that it is traditional in nature and some learners still often learn this way. In terms of increment results it can be inferred that Active Learning Approach is more effective than didactic Learning approach based on their means score. In active learning approach the students are given the chance to learn and acquire knowledge in oral communication individually and with peers. This further means that the students can apply their oral communication skills confidently even without the assistance or presence of their teacher.

The result is congruent with Fitri et al. (2022), who stated that the application of active Learning techniques is among the advantageous and stimulating methods to quickly make students speak up without fear and enhance their comprehension of the points of teaching. Samaddar et al. (2023), cited the two ways that active learning varies from the traditional teaching techniques in which the student's involvement in class and, secondly, their cooperation. Anwar (2019) said that activity-based learning increased students' motivation and academic achievement. Higher-order thinking skills are more successfully developed in students through activity-based learning.

Also, the researcher observed that in the intervention in both groups, students were motivated to participate in class discussions and activities when given tasks that caught their interest. Furthermore, the researcher also observed that the student's attention in both interventions differs; students in the Active Learning Approach mostly have longer attention spans than students in the Didactic Learning Approach. This is in connection with the study conducted by Brigs (2015), which stated that active learning methods may have 'dual benefits', engaging attention in one segment and refreshing attention in another segment.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered:

1. For English Teachers that they may:
 - 1.1. Improve learning engagement and retention in in-person classes; through designing activities that can engage students' attention in class.
 - 1.2 introduce to the students to didactic and active learning strategies.
 - 1.3 Use this study as a guide to help students perform better in oral communication, especially in their chosen fields.

2. For School Administrators that they may:
 - 2.1 Encourage all teachers to create lessons based on a didactic and active learning approach and give students a schedule that suits their needs; and
 - 2.2 Include Active Learning Approach in In-service Training (INSET) as part of teacher development training.
3. For Future Researchers that they may:
 - 3.1 use this paper as a reference to conduct additional research using the Active Learning Approach and Didactic Learning approach, particularly in Writing as another skill; and
 - 3.2 Increase the duration of the research project and the intervention's execution to ascertain its efficacy

References

- Abraham and MacDonald Research Methodologies. (2018). *Understanding and evaluating research: A critical guide*, 21-50.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802656.n2>
- Amineh, R. J., & Asl, H. D. (2015). Review of constructivism and social constructivism. *Journal of Social Sciences, Literature, and Languages*, 1(1) 9-16.
- Candilas, K. (2016). Language exposures: Determinants of English-speaking proficiency. *Journal of English Language and Literature (JOELL)*, 3(3), 53.
- DepEd. (2016). Do 36, S. 2016 - Policy guidelines on awards and recognition for the K to12 basic education program. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_036.pdf.
- Driscoll, M.P. (2005). Psychology of learning for instruction (pp. 384-407; Ch. 11 – Constructivism). Pearson. E-ISSN: 2723-3669
- Fitri, N., & Aeni, N. (2022). The contribution of active learning strategies in activating students' oral communication: (Kontribusi Strategi Active Learning Dalam Mengaktifkan Komunikasi Lisan Siswa). *Uniqbu Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), 98-106. <https://doi.org/10.47323/ujss.v2i3.96>
- Jaca, C. A. L., & Javines, F. B. (2020). Oral communication needs of pre-service teachers in practice teaching. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 1(1), 67-73.
<https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v1i1.31>
- Lucanus, A. (2017, November 21). *Oral communication skills are important for students. The college puzzles*. <https://collegepuzzle.stanford.edu/oral-communication-skills-are-important-for-students>.
- Piaget, J. (1964). Cognitive development in children: Piaget development and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching (JRST)*, 2(3) 176-186.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660020306>
- Pratiwi, Syahriana Dj, Muhammad, & Nur, Hasriati. (2020). The students' speaking anxiety: Psycho-social approach. *International Journal of Research on English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1) 16-27.
DOI: 10.30863/ijretal.v1i1.1195

Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (eds.). The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. Vol. 1. Problems of General Psychology (pp. 39-285).

Authors

Mr. Alvin S. Taneo, LPT earned his undergraduate degree of Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English at PHINMA- Cagayan de Oro College, Cagayan de Oro City. He is currently taking his Master's Degree in Education, major in Teaching English Communication Arts at Lourdes College, Inc., Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. He is currently affiliated with the Department of Education, Division of Misamis Oriental Philippines as a faculty member of Alubijid National Comprehensive High School, Alubijid Misamis Oriental. He is teaching English subjects such as Oral Communication, Reading and Writing, and Practical Research 1 in the Senior High School Department. He is also the current adviser of the Supreme Secondary Learner Government (SSLG) of the said school.

Dr. Kurt S. Candilas is the Dean of the Arts and Sciences Program of Lourdes College, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. He earned his undergraduate degree of Arts in English at Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City. He acquired his Master's degree in Education major in Teaching English Communication Arts at Lourdes College, Cagayan de Oro City. He completed his Doctorate degree in English major in Literature at the University of San Jose Recoletos, Cebu City, Philippines. He also earned his TESOL advanced certification with the American TESOL Institute of the Philippines, Inc. Presently, he is an advisory board member, editorial board, and peer-reviewer of research journal articles in local and international journals and conference proceedings such as Asia CALL Online Journal, International Journal of TESOL and Education, OPENTesol Annual International Conference Proceedings, USEP Journal of Research and Development, Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal, and International Review of Social Sciences Research. His research interests include the following areas: communication, literature, linguistics, education, and religion.