

Motivating Factors, Learning Strategies and Engagement: Bases for Oral Communication Proficiency of Selected Grade 11 Students in Flexible Learning

Lea P. Monteron, L.P.T.

lea.monteron@lspu.edu.ph

College English Instructor, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Abstract

The study aimed to determine the effect of motivating factors, learning strategies, and engagement on the oral communication proficiency of selected Grade 11 students at LSPU Santa Cruz, Laguna, Academic Year 2021-2022. It determined the teachers' instructional strategies and students' digital literacy; students' cognitive and metacognitive strategies; behavioral and affective engagement; their oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, organization, and fluency and in terms of GWA; and whether these variables significantly influence their oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA. This study employed a descriptive design and a simple random sampling technique. It involved 189 Grade 11 students of LSPU. A survey questionnaire and an interview were used as the main instrument in obtaining the pertinent information. The data were treated using statistical treatments: Mean, Standard Deviation, and Multiple Regression Analysis. The result of the study revealed that teachers' instructional strategies and students' digital literacy were "Very High". Students' cognitive strategy was "Very High," while metacognitive strategy was "High." Students' behavioral and affective engagement were "High." As a result of these driving factors, the students were highly driven. Students were also engaged in their studies and utilized various learning strategies. Students' general weighted average was "Very Satisfactory." Students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills concerning pronunciation was "Excellent"; vocabulary, grammar, organization, and fluency were "Very Satisfactory." It means that students demonstrated excellent proficiency levels as shown in their general weighted average and speaking skills. These findings led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Motivating factors as to teacher's instructional strategies and students' digital literacy significantly influence the students' Oral Communication Proficiency and GWA.

Keywords: Teacher-Factor, Students' Digital Literacy, Learning Strategies, Engagement, Oral Communication Proficiency

1. Main Text

Introduction

In the sphere of education, English has long been regarded as the most significant worldwide language. English is a foreign language in several nations such as South Korea, Japan, China, and Taiwan. It means that English language is not used as a medium of instruction in EFL countries, although it is taught in schools. On the other hand, ESL countries such as the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and India use English as a medium of instruction in education and administration, despite the fact that English is not the native language or L1 (Nordquist, 2020). English is treated as a second language in those ESL countries and used it in daily communication and transaction. Being proficient in English will make a person locally and globally competitive.

In the Philippines, English is utilized as the medium of teaching and it has become a critical tool for anybody who desires to be successful. The English language is taught in schools from kindergarten to college to help students improve their spoken communication abilities. According to De Vera (2018), oral communication skills are necessary for the development of literacy as well as higher critical thinking and learning. It assembles all of the necessary components of a language. Students do not just discuss and exchange information through oral communication; they also study and attempt to grasp ideas and concepts, as well as express and clarify their thoughts, feelings, and opinions. It is for this reason that English classes are designed to help students improve their English skills.

Even though teachers use a variety of teaching methods and strategies in language classrooms, students appear to be struggling to express themselves and participate in discussions using English in this new typical context where flexible learning

strategy was implemented. It's probably due to their fear, anxiety, and trepidation about speaking in front of a large group of 193 people, even in a virtual setting.

Therefore, this study investigated the effect of motivating factors, learning strategies and engagement on oral communication proficiency of selected Grade 11 students of Laguna State Polytechnic University - Santa Cruz Campus Santa Cruz, Laguna in a flexible learning approach. The result of this study will be the basis for the DepEd officials, school heads, administrators, and teachers to craft an intervention program that will be beneficial for students and teachers as well.

Background of the Study

In School Year 2012-2013, the enhanced K to 12 Curriculum was implemented. In 2013, K to 12 was enacted into law known as RA 10533. SHS Curriculum was finished in 2014 and for 2015, the Department is getting ready for the implementation of the SHS. The curriculum is designed to help Filipino children develop their math, science, and linguistic skills so that they can become more productive and competent. One of the curriculum's ultimate goals is for students to attain communicative competence. Context-based and spiral progression learning are used in all areas to achieve this (Department of Education, 2016).

As stated on the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum 2016, the learner's mastery of basic English abilities is emphasized in the core learning area standard. It means that students can communicate effectively, fluently, and accurately verbally in a variety of social and academic contexts while performing real-world tasks at their level. The Department of Education strives to educate students with all of the required knowledge, skills, and experiences that they can utilize to make themselves more capable and competent in their chosen routes or vocations, regardless of what choices they make after Senior High School.

However, in some situations in language classrooms, particularly in this new normal setting, getting students to talk is a challenge for most language teachers. Though some Filipino students were exposed to the English language because it has been taught from primary education, the learners still find difficulty in developing their oral communication proficiency.

According to Juhana (2012), speaking is one of the oral communication abilities. It was shown that students' ability to talk is hampered by psychological issues. Fear of making a mistake, lack of confidence, and motivation are all psychological barriers. Students are hesitant to voice their thoughts and opinions because they believe their grammar is inadequate. Learners' progress toward improving their oral fluency and accuracy when they join higher levels of education and even when they apply for jobs is hampered by this problem.

According to Baclig (2020), the Philippines' English Proficiency Index (EPI) has declined from the 20th to the 27th spot for 2020. EPI measures the average level of English language skills based on the results of an online Standard English Test (SET) administered by English Proficiency Education First, a Swiss-based global company focusing on language, academic, cultural exchange, and educational travel programs. The gathered data exhibited that the Philippines' EPI from 2016 to 2020 indicated a low rank in the country's performance.

The EPI result is significant because the Philippines has long been known as one of the best English-speaking countries in Asia, and English proficiency is one of the country's strengths that has helped drive the economy and even made the country the top voice outsourcing destinations in the world, surpassing India in 2012. The level of English proficiency affects the chances of Filipinos getting jobs here and abroad.

The said Proficiency Test signifies a need to help Filipino learners boost their interest and confidence in learning English. In addition, there is a need to enhance their oral communication skills and prepare them to be productive and competent locally and globally. With the result given, the Department of Education (DepEd), Commission on Higher Education (CHED), State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), and other stakeholders must intensify their efforts to improve English teaching and learning and grow it as a critical workforce skill.

With the abovementioned data, the following are the reasons why the researcher urges to conduct this study: First, the researcher aims to contribute on the development of student's oral communication proficiency in overcoming their fear and apprehension and making them feel that learning English is fun especially when it is used orally especially in this new normal setting. The result of this study may be considered by the DepEd officials and school administrators to make some guidelines and design program intervention that can help the learners to develop and enhance their oral communication skills.

Second, for the teachers to help and make them aware on the factors that affect students' motivation towards learning the English language on improving their oral communication skills. By knowing this, they will be more creative, resourceful, and innovative on using varied learning platforms and strategies in their classes which they can apply in various oral communication tasks to improve students' oral communication skills. Teachers may also adopt to use different digital learning tools and applications that can boost the interest of the students to learn the English language especially in this new normal setting even offline or online.

Lastly, this research's result can also be useful to students to uplift their eagerness and confidence to speak using the English language with no apprehension. They will be mindful of the significance of the English language to achieve their future endeavors. This could happen through hand-in-hand cooperation and collaboration of school administrators, teachers, and students.

It is very timely and relevant to conduct research on oral communication proficiency in this new normal setting to identify the motivating factors, learning strategies, and engagement that may or may not affect students' oral communication proficiency. This research is also based on the personal teaching experiences of the researcher in this new normal setting. Students are having difficulties expressing themselves during oral discussion because they feel that their grammar is not as good as expected and think that their classmates will laugh at them. They are not confident expressing their ideas and thoughts using the English language.

Theoretical Framework

It is essential that the following theories are anchored to the present study to determine the role of motivating factors, learning strategies and engagement on students' oral communication proficiency and performance.

This study is anchored to the theory of **Gardner's Model of Motivation** which suggested that those second language learners who have positive attitudes toward the target culture and people will be more successful in learning the target language than those without such positive attitudes. In their previous studies, Gardner and Lambert (1959) came to the conclusion that aptitude and motivation strongly correlated with learners' L2 achievement. In this model, motivation has been defined as the extent to which an individual works or tries to learn the language due to the desire to learn the language and the satisfaction he/she experiences in the process of learning the language. "A motivated learner with is, therefore, defined as one who is: (a) eager to learn the language, (b) willing to expend effort on the learning activity, and (c) willing to sustain the learning activity" (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). In this model, motivation has an important role in three ways. First, it mediates any relationship between language attitudes and language achievement. Second, it also has a causal association with language anxiety. Third, it has a role in the learning context which is informal, revealing the voluntary nature of the motivated learners' participation in informal L2 learning contexts. In his current model, Gardner (2000) focused on motivation and language aptitude as the two most essential factors in language achievement and explains how integrative motivation influences language achievement. Furthermore, the model can predict the fact that the L2 learning situation could impact the learners' attitudes and motivation.

The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is another theory that is pertinent to this research (Dincer & Yesilyurt, 2017). This theory places a strong emphasis on motivation in the field of language education and Second Language Acquisition (SLA). To become motivated, learners in language instruction must meet three basic psychological demands, according to SDT: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Furthermore, under SDT, a learner's motivation can range from non-self-determined to self-determined, with three distinct types of motivation: amotivation, extrinsic, and intrinsic motivation.

This is also inclined to Krashen's (1991) Monitor Model of adult language learning which explains that SLA occurs when students are exposed to adequate comprehensible input through listening and reading (Castrillón, 2017). Nevertheless, Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory (1991) Monitor Model suggests that there are affective factors that influence the intake of the comprehensible input, including the learner's motivation, self-confidence, and emotional status (Lai & Wei, 2019). Therefore, both **SDT and Krashen's Monitor Model** assume that learner's motivation is key to autonomy, self-confidence, and competency (Lai & Wei, 2019). Motivation is crucial to learners' ability to process information and to produce information in a meaningful fashion (Krashen, 1991). Krashen suggests that natural communication happens when speakers are keen to produce meaningful and comprehensible output rather than incomprehensible utterances (Krashen, 1991).

Another theory significant to the present study is the **Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)**. This theory is based on the idea that the people's functioning results from the reciprocal interplay of personal, behavioral and environmental influences (Rowan-Kenyon, Swan, & Creager, 2012; Zimmerman, 2002).

According to **Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)**, learning is a dynamic process involving three elements: the learner, the learning, and the situation. As a result, students' performance can be improved by employing learning strategies, self-regulation, self-efficacy, and effort (Burney, 2008). This can be accomplished by integrating tasks and activities that involve higher levels of critical thinking, encouraging engagement in learning, setting mastery goals, and expanding modeling opportunities by surrounding children with peers who are performing at a higher level. In the subject of foreign and second languages, understanding the SCT is crucial.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to determine the effect of Motivating Factors, Learning Strategies and Engagement on the Oral Communication Proficiency of selected Grade 11 students of the Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus, Santa Cruz, Laguna, Academic Year 2021-2022.

Specifically, it aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How may the level of mean of teacher-factor be described in regards to instructional strategies?
2. How may the level of mean of students technological-factor be described in regards to digital literacy?
3. How may the level of learners learning strategies be described in terms of:
 - a. Cognitive; and

- b. Metacognitive
4. How may the level of students' engagement be described in terms of:
 - a. Behavioral; and
 - b. Affective
5. How may the level of proficiency of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC in Oral Communication, specifically regarding speaking skills, be described in terms of:
 - a. Pronunciation
 - b. Vocabulary;
 - c. Grammar;
 - d. Organization; and
 - e. Fluency
6. How may the level of proficiency of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC in Oral Communication be described in terms of GWA?
7. Does motivating factors, learning strategies and engagement significantly influence students' oral communication proficiency and GWA?

Research Methodology

The study was conducted using the descriptive method of research to find out the effect of Motivating Factors, Learning Strategies, and Engagement on the Oral Communication Proficiency of selected Grade 11 students at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Campus. The procedure followed for the conduct of the research was preparing the requirements needed. A written request was signed and noted by the research adviser and the Dean of the College of Teacher Education to secure the permission to conduct this study. The researcher administered survey questionnaire and interview as the main instrument in gathering all the pertinent information to come up with significant answers for this study.

The total population of the respondents consisted of 360 Grade 11 students. From the total population, the respondents involved in this study are one hundred and eighty-nine (189) randomly selected Grade 11 students from the Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus.

Simple Random Sampling was used to select respondents for the study. It's a basic sampling approach in which we select a group of people (a sample) from a bigger group for investigation (a population). Everyone in the sample is chosen at random, and everyone in the population has an equal chance of being chosen. From among all possible samples, any sample of a specific size can be chosen.

On the entire population of Grade 11 students in LSPU-SCC, the researcher utilized Slovin's Formula ($n=N/(1+Ne^2)$) to estimate the target respondents. The researcher can sample the population with a high degree of precision using Slovin's formula. It will inform the researcher of the sample size required to get a reasonable level of accuracy in the results.

Data were collected using the self-made questionnaire survey. To collect data, the survey was administered using a Google form. The researcher created and designed the questionnaire survey based on the study research questions. An interview via google meet was also conducted to determine the oral communication proficiency of the students in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, organization, and fluency. The researcher prepared a set of vocabulary words and some questions to be read and answered by the respondents. During the interview, the researcher used a rubric and a rating scale to assess the oral communication proficiency of the students.

The data collected were tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of motivating factors, learning strategies and engagement, students' speaking skills, and general weighted average. Meanwhile, Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine if there is a significant influence of motivating factors, learning strategies and engagement on the oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills and general weighted average of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC.

Results and Discussion

1. Level of Teachers' Implementation of Instructional Strategies as a Motivating Factor

Table 1. Level of Teacher's Implementation of Instructional Strategies

<i>The teachers...</i>	<i>MEAN</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. integrate the use of ICT in every lesson.	4.29	0.69	Very High
2. provide corrective feedback in every output/activity made.	4.41	0.68	Very High
3. help students realize the significance of learning for my future endeavors.	4.51	0.62	Very High

4. show compassion, transparency, and leniency towards their students.	4.54	0.65	Very High
5. use varied digital learning tools and applications to make English class interactive and meaningful, which motivates me.	4.38	0.72	Very High
6. motivate learners, make the learning environment free from grammatical errors and tell that everything can be corrected.	4.51	0.61	Very High
7. motivate learners and push them beyond their capabilities.	4.52	0.63	Very High

Overall Mean = 4.45

Standard Deviation = 0.66

Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Very High
3.40 – 4.19	High
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately High
1.80 – 2.59	Less High
1.00 – 1.79	Not high at all

Table 1 illustrates the mean level of teachers' implementation of instructional strategies. The students strongly agree that their teachers show compassion, transparency, and leniency ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.65$). Similarly, the students strongly agree that their teachers integrate the use of ICT in every lesson ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.69$) yet, received the lowest mean score.

Overall, the mean level of the teacher-factor with regard to instructional strategies attained a mean score of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.66 was verbally interpreted as Very high as perceived by the students

2. Level of Students' Technological-Factor with regard to Digital Literacy

Table 2. Mean Level of Student's Technological-Factor with regard to Digital Literacy

The students ...	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. have in-depth knowledge on using MS Office such as MS Word, Excel, Power Point, and Publisher.	4.08	0.70	High
2. like watching educational videos on YouTube and TikTok that enhance my communication skills.	4.11	0.74	High
3. try to explore my curiosity beyond my horizon on using digital learning tools and applications towards learning the English language.	4.23	0.69	Very High
4. explore my creativity and imagination using colorful templates on Canva and other online applications when submitting outputs and online presentations.	4.39	0.67	Very High
5. are knowledgeable enough about using google applications and other related apps towards learning the English language.	4.33	0.70	Very High
6. try to explore my knowledge in learning by watching educational videos on language (TikTok, vlog, etc.)	4.30	0.72	Very High
7. know using different online applications that will enhance my vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation.	4.13	0.71	High

Overall Mean = 4.23

Standard Deviation = 0.71

Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Very High
3.40 – 4.19	High
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately High
1.80 – 2.59	Less High
1.00 – 1.79	Not high at all

Table 2 presents the mean level of students' technological-factor with regard to digital literacy. The students explore their creativity and imagination using colorful templates on Canva and other online applications when submitting outputs and online presentations ($M=4.39$, $SD=0.67$). However, the students perceived that their knowledge on using MS Office such as MS Word, Excel, Power Point, and Publisher was not in-depth and obtained the lowest mean score ($M=4.08$, $SD=0.70$).

The students *strongly agree* that they explore their creativity and imagination using colorful templates on Canva and other online applications when submitting outputs and online presentations because they are already expanding their curiosity and go out of their comfort zone on exploring the use of technology in enhancing their creativity. Though students show high skill in

using MS Office such as MS Word, Excel, Power Point, and Publisher, their skills and knowledge on the use of basic MS Office Software is lacking and that they need to be exposed on the use of it through trainings. 197

Overall, the mean level of the technological-factor with regard to digital literacy attained a mean score of 4.23 and a standard deviation of 0.71 and was verbally interpreted as *Very high* as perceived by the students.

3. Students' Level of Application of Learning Strategies

Table 3. Mean Level of Students' Application of Learning Strategies in terms of Cognitive

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. focus on what they are doing towards learning.	4.18	0.71	High
2. consider the usefulness of what they're studying, especially in learning the English language.	4.35	0.64	Very High
3. do note-taking whenever they encounter unfamiliar words in English.	4.11	0.77	High
4. navigate the google engine to search for the meaning.	4.48	0.69	Very High
5. think of the good reasons why they need to learn and enhance their communication skills.	4.42	0.64	Very High
6. are determined to study English for their future endeavors.	4.48	0.66	Very High
7. realize that learning English will make them a knowledgeable and skillful person.	4.52	0.67	Very High
<i>Overall Mean = 4.36</i>			
<i>Standard Deviation = 0.70</i>			
<i>Verbal Interpretation = Very High</i>			
<i>Range</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		
4.20 – 5.00	Very High		
3.40 – 4.19	High		
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately High		
1.80 – 2.59	Less High		
1.00 – 1.79	Not high at all		

Table 3 demonstrates the mean level of application of learning strategies in terms of Cognitive. Students *strongly agree* that learning English will make them more knowledgeable and skillful persons ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.67$). On the other hand, students *agree* that they do note-taking whenever they encounter unfamiliar words in English and obtained the lowest mean score of 4.11.

As seen on the result, the students realize the significance of learning the English language for future endeavors. However, students were not engaged into note-taking. It shows that students may have their own learning styles and strategies on how they will remember some unfamiliar words in English and how they will get into its meaning.

Overall, the mean level of learning strategies in terms of cognitive attained a mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.70 and was verbally interpreted as *Very high* as perceived by the students.

Table 4. Mean Level of Students' Application of Learning Strategies in terms of Metacognitive

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. focus on learning the English language to enhance their communication skills.	4.41	0.65	Very High
2. try to practice their speaking skills with their family at home to enhance their oral skills.	4.10	0.75	High
3. use their time wisely in their studies.	4.04	0.71	High
4. make a plan/organizer of the tasks they need to accomplish for a week to avoid cramming.	4.02	0.78	High
5. list unfamiliar words in every lesson and search its meaning of it to expand their vocabulary.	4.01	0.72	High
6. try to incorporate the significance of what they've learned in my future career.	4.23	0.72	Very High
7. realize that learning English help them boost their self-confidence to converse freely among other groups.	4.34	0.71	Very High

Overall Mean = 4.16
 Standard Deviation = 0.74
 Verbal Interpretation = High

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Very High
3.40 – 4.19	High
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately High
1.80 – 2.59	Less High
1.00 – 1.79	Not high at all

Table 4 illustrates the mean level of application of learning strategies in terms of Metacognitive. The students *strongly agree* that they focus on learning the English language to enhance their communication skills ($M=4.41$, $SD=0.65$). On the other hand, the students *agree* that they list unfamiliar words in every lesson and search its meaning of it to expand their vocabulary received the lowest mean score ($M=4.01$, $SD=0.72$).

The result shows that students are goal-directed towards learning the English for the betterment of their communication skills. On the contrary, the students list unfamiliar words in every lesson and search its meaning of it to expand their vocabulary obtained the lowest mean score maybe students were not into listing nor jotting down notes as they attend their classes. Students may have their own style on how they will remember a particular vocabulary and its meaning.

Overall, the mean level of learning strategies in terms of metacognitive attained a mean score of 4.16 and a standard deviation of 0.74 and was verbally interpreted as *High* as perceived by the students.

4. Level of Learners' Engagement

Table 5. Mean Level of Learners' Engagement in terms of Behavioral

The students ...	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. find it easy to speak using the English language.	3.90	0.73	Engaged
2. do enjoy communicating whenever they speak in English.	3.96	0.74	Engaged
3. can express themselves with confidence whenever they speak English during class presentations.	3.78	0.73	Engaged
4. can express themselves with confidence whenever they do small conversations with their family and friends.	4.07	0.72	Engaged
5. study their lesson in advance.	3.63	0.71	Engaged
6. try hard to enhance their speaking skills.	4.25	0.67	Highly Engaged
7. work hard to develop their speaking ability using the English language.	4.26	0.66	Highly Engaged

Overall Mean = 3.98
 Standard Deviation = 0.74
 Verbal Interpretation = Engaged

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Engaged
3.40 – 4.19	Engaged
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Engaged
1.80 – 2.59	Less Engaged
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all engaged

Table 5 indicates the mean level of learner's engagement in terms of Behavioral. The students *strongly agree* that they work hard to develop their speaking ability using the English language ($M=4.26$, $SD=0.66$). On the contrary, the students agree that they study their lesson in advance and obtained the lowest mean score of responses with ($M=3.63$, $SD=0.71$).

Overall, the mean level of learners' engagement in terms of behavioral attained a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.74 and was verbally interpreted as *engaged* as perceived by the students. This means that the students are more determined and persevere to learn the English in developing their speaking ability. However, the students are not engaged in studying their lesson in advance and they rely on the discussion on the same day. Maybe for some reasons, students are doing other things beyond study hours.

Table 6. Mean Level of Learners' Engagement in terms of Affective

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>	199
1. can speak English with no hesitations.	3.70	0.74	Engaged	
2. are persevering in learning the English language orally to enhance their oral communication skills.	4.08	0.67	Engaged	
3. think that being proficient in English can lead them into a better life.	4.14	0.75	Engaged	
4. can easily use English in their everyday conversations with family and friends.	3.86	0.75	Engaged	
5. think learning English is fun and exciting.	4.31	0.72	Highly Engaged	
6. try to relate what they've learned to their own experiences.	4.28	0.71	Highly Engaged	
7. try to figure out the significance of learning English in a real-life setting.	4.29	0.67	Highly Engaged	

Overall Mean = 4.09

Standard Deviation = 0.75

Verbal Interpretation = Engaged

<i>Range</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Engaged
3.40 – 4.19	Engaged
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Engaged
1.80 – 2.59	Less Engaged
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all engaged

Table 6 illustrates the mean level of learner's engagement in terms of Affective. The students *strongly agree* that learning English is fun and exciting ($M=4.31$, $SD=0.72$). On the other hand, the students *agree* that they can speak English with no hesitations and received the lowest mean score ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.74$). The result shows that students are embracing the fact that learning English is fun and exciting and there is no reason to be afraid of. Students open their door on learning English and see its significance on their lives. On the contrary, the students can speak with no hesitations received the lowest mean score maybe students are not confident enough with regard to their speaking ability. Overall, the mean level of learners' engagement in terms of Affective attained a mean score of 4.09 and a standard deviation of 0.75 and was verbally interpreted as *high* based on the students' perceptions.

5. Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills

Table 7. Mean Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills in terms of Pronunciation

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. pronounced and enunciated words well.	4.14	0.77	Very Satisfactory
2. volume is well adjusted.	4.39	0.62	Excellent
3. voice is modulated.	4.44	0.60	Excellent
4. sentence and word stress are placed accurately.	4.12	0.73	Very Satisfactory
5. intonation is generally appropriate.	4.20	0.73	Excellent

Overall Mean = 4.26

Standard Deviation = 0.71

Verbal Interpretation = Excellent

<i>Range</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement

Table 7 illustrates the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of pronunciation.

The students' voice is modulated ($M=4.44$, $SD=0.60$). On the contrary, the students' placed sentence and word stress accurately received the lowest mean score of responses with ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.73$).

The students know how to control their voice in pronouncing a particular word. In contrast, the students are not familiar and aware on the use of stress. Students will be able to identify proper sentence and word stress if they will be given oral practices and trainings integrated in their lessons. Overall, the mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of pronunciation attained a mean score of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.71 and was verbally interpreted as excellent as perceived by the students. 200

Table 8. Mean Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills in terms of Vocabulary

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. show a wide range of vocabulary words.	3.79	0.69	Very Satisfactory
2. have a good range of relatively well-chosen vocabulary.	3.98	0.72	Very Satisfactory
3. use vocabulary that is appropriate for the purpose.	4.20	0.63	Excellent
4. present vocabulary choice clearly.	4.22	0.63	Excellent
5. use basic vocabulary correctly.	4.48	0.59	Excellent

Overall Mean = 4.14

Standard Deviation = 0.69

Verbal Interpretation = Very Satisfactory

<i>Range</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement

Table 8 illustrates the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of vocabulary. The students showed *excellent proficiency* in the use of correct basic vocabulary ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.59$); in using appropriate vocabulary according to purpose ($M=4.20$, $SD=0.63$); and in presenting vocabulary choice clearly ($M=4.22$, $SD=0.63$). However, the students displayed *very satisfactory* level in showing a wide range of vocabulary ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.69$) and in having a good range of relatively well-chosen vocabulary ($M=3.98$, $SD=0.72$).

The result denotes that the students are mindful on using the basic vocabulary and this shows a good start. Still, students need to be exposed on the use of different learning tools and applications that may help to broaden their vocabulary. However, the students find difficulty in showing a wide range of vocabulary. Maybe students are not exposed on exploring new set of vocabularies and they are contented on using the basic. Students' vocabulary should be enhanced by providing some vocabulary tests and skills which can be integrated in their lessons.

Overall, the mean level of oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of vocabulary attained a mean score of 4.14 and a standard deviation of 0.69 and was verbally interpreted as *very satisfactory* among the students.

Table 9. Mean Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills in terms of Grammar

<i>The students ...</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. demonstrate correct sentence construction.	3.83	0.67	Very Satisfactory
2. use a variety of structure without grammatical mistakes.	3.77	0.64	Very Satisfactory
3. use grammar to communicate effectively.	4.30	0.68	Excellent
4. use basic grammatical rules effectively.	4.47	0.62	Excellent
5. show few minor difficulties from not using grammatical rules.	3.73	0.63	Very Satisfactory

Overall Mean = 4.02

Standard Deviation = 0.72

Verbal Interpretation = Very Satisfactory

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement

Table 9 presents the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of grammar. The students showed excellent proficiency in using effective basic grammatical rules ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.62$) and in using grammar to communicate effectively ($M=4.30$, $SD=0.68$). On the contrary, the students displayed very satisfactory level in demonstrating correct sentence construction ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.67$); in using a variety of structure without grammatical mistakes ($M=3.77$, $SD=0.64$); and in showing few minor difficulties from not using grammatical rules ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.63$).

The result shows that the students are aware on using basic grammatical rules such as the use of simple subject-verb agreement. It is also a good start for the students that they are mindful on some basic grammatical rules. On the other hand, students find it hard to construct their ideas using basic grammatical rules. Students are nervous and afraid because they might think that their grammar is wrong. Still, students are careful on applying grammatical rules as they construct sentences.

Overall, the mean level of oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of grammar attained a mean score of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 0.72 and was verbally interpreted as *very satisfactory* among the students.

Table 10. Mean Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills in terms of Organization

The students ...	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. demonstrate ideas clearly and organized.	4.10	0.72	Very Satisfactory
2. present ideas clearly.	4.08	0.73	Very Satisfactory
3. use signal words effectively.	3.89	0.72	Very Satisfactory
4. use clear and engaging language and delivery.	3.96	0.73	Very Satisfactory
5. show powerful language and effective.	3.94	0.76	Very Satisfactory

Overall Mean = 3.99

Standard Deviation = 0.73

Verbal Interpretation = Very Satisfactory

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement

Table 10 illustrates the mean level of student's oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of organization. The students showed *very satisfactory* proficiency in demonstrating their ideas that is clearly and organized ($M=4.10$, $SD=0.72$), presenting ideas clearly ($M=4.08$, $SD=0.73$), using clear and engaging language and delivery ($M=3.96$, $SD=0.73$), in showing powerful and effective language ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.76$), and in using signal words effectively ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.72$).

Overall, the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of organization attained a mean score of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.73 and was verbally interpreted as *very satisfactory* as perceived by the students.

Table 11. Mean Level of Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills in terms of Fluency

The students ...	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. avoid fillers.	3.75	0.68	Very Satisfactory
2. use pauses effectively.	3.81	0.73	Very Satisfactory
3. speak fluently with only occasional repetition or self-correction.	3.89	0.83	Very Satisfactory
4. speak at length without apparent effort or loss of coherence.	3.69	0.68	Very Satisfactory
5. speak fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction.	3.75	0.70	Very Satisfactory

Overall Mean = 3.78

Standard Deviation = 0.73

Verbal Interpretation = Very Satisfactory

Range	Verbal Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement

Table 11 illustrates the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills in terms of fluency. The students showed *very satisfactory* proficiency in showing fluency with only occasional repetition or self-correction score ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.83$), in using pauses effectively ($M=3.81$, $SD=0.73$), in speaking fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.70$), in avoiding fillers ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.68$), and in speaking at length without apparent effort or loss of coherence ($M=3.69$, $SD, 0.68$).

Overall, the mean level of students' oral communication proficiency of as to speaking skills in terms of fluency attained a mean score of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.73 and was verbally interpreted as *very satisfactory* as perceived by the students.

6. Level of Oral Communication Proficiency of Selected Grade 11 students in terms of GWA

Table 12. Mean Level of Students Oral Communication Proficiency in terms of GWA

Range	Frequency	percentage	descriptor
90 – 99.99	110	58.20	Excellent
85 – 89.99	58	30.69	Very Satisfactory
80 – 84.99	21	11.11	Satisfactory
75 – 79.99	0	0.00	Fair
Below 75	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
Total	100	100.00	

Overall Mean = 89.97

Standard Deviation = 3.97

Verbal Interpretation = Very Satisfactory

Range	Verbal Interpretation
90 - 99.99	Excellent
85 – 89.99	Very Satisfactory
80 – 84.99	Satisfactory
75-79.99	Fair
Below 75	Needs Improvement

Table 12 presents the mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students in terms of general weighted average. Out of one hundred eighty-nine (189) respondents, one hundred ten (110) or 58.20% of the total population has a proficiency on an outstanding level. This is followed in frequency by students who had performed very satisfactorily, with fifty-eight (58) or around 30.69% of the population. The remaining number of respondents, which is twenty-one (21) all belong to the demographic that performed on a satisfactory level.

Overall, the respondents' level of proficiency in oral communication in terms of GWA is very satisfactory as shown by the mean of 89.97. This shows that students perform well academically. They are motivated and determined to excel in their studies, to strive harder, and to gain academic achievements.

7. Effect of Motivating Factors, Learning Strategies and Engagement on the Students' Oral Communication Proficiency as to Speaking Skills and GWA

Table 13 presents the effect of motivating factors as determined by motivating factors on the oral communication proficiency and GWA.

Specifically, it presents the effect of instructional strategies and digital literacy on the Oral Communication Proficiency as determined by speaking skills and GWA.

Results from Table 13 revealed that motivating factors with regard to teacher's instructional strategies have a significant influence on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA. The beta coefficient of 0.216 and -1.795 indicate that for every standard deviation increase in instructional strategies, there is a corresponding 0.216 and -1.795 in the students' oral communication proficiency and GWA. The t-value of 2.526 and -2.588 are significant having a p-value of 0.012 and 0.010.

Table 13. Regression on Student's Oral Communication Proficiency and Performance as determined by Motivating Factors

Likewise, students' digital literacy had a significant influence on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills. As the students' level of digital literacy increase, there is a corresponding -0.201 unit increase in their oral communication

Variables	Proficiency				GWA			
	beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis	beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Instructional Strategies	0.216	2.526	0.012	Significant	-1.795	-2.588	0.010	Significant
Digital Literacy	-0.201	-2.410	0.017	Significant	0.667	0.676	0.325	Not significant
<i>Adjusted R2 = 0.040</i> <i>F value = 3.829</i> <i>Sig = 0.023</i>					<i>Adjusted R2 = 0.0371</i> <i>F value = 3.584</i> <i>Sig = 0.030</i>			

proficiency. The t-value of -2.410 is significant at 0.017 level of significance. On the other hand, students' digital literacy with a beta coefficient of 0.667, t-value of 0.676, and p-value of 0.325 has no direct significant influence in the students' GWA or General Weighted Average.

The adjusted R-square indicates that 4% of the variation in the students' oral communication proficiency and 3.71% of students GWA is explained by teacher's instructional strategies and students' digital literacy. The F-value of 3.620 (oral communication proficiency) and 3.584 (GWA) is significant at 0.023 and 0.030 level of significance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the motivating factors with regard to teacher-factor on using instructional strategies and students' digital literacy have a significant influence on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA of the selected Grade 11 students. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The result is similar by the study of Thomas (2015) that instructional strategies used by the teachers have a positive impact towards the academic achievement of students. Students are likely to experience academic success in an environment that encourage them to achieve, become actively engaged, and feel a sense of belonging. With this, teachers may take into consideration varied teaching strategies to cater all the needs of the students.

Motivating factors have a significant influence on the students Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA. It shows that these factors are pivotal on the students' academic achievement. Students tend to perform and excel well when their teachers' implementation of varied instructional strategies was properly observed and integrated in every lesson. It makes the students highly motivated in studying and learning the English language with fun and excitement.

Table 14 shows the effect of learning strategies and engagement on the students' oral communication proficiency and GWA.

Specifically, it shows the effect of learning strategies and engagement on the Oral Communication Proficiency as determined by speaking skills and GWA.

Table 14. Regression on Students' Oral Communication Proficiency and Performance as determined by Learning Strategies and Engagement

Results from Table 14 revealed that learning strategies with a beta coefficient of -0.066, t-value of -0.615, and p-value of 0.539 are not significant on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills. Similarly, learning strategies are not significant with a beta coefficient of 0.264, t-value of 0.305, and p-value of 0.761 as determined by GWA.

	Proficiency				GWA			
	beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis	beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Learning Strategies	-0.066	-0.615	0.539	Not Significant	0.264	0.305	0.761	Not Significant
Learning Engagement	-0.011	-0.100	0.920	Not Significant	-0.506	-0.582	0.561	Not Significant
<i>Adjusted R2 = 0.006</i> <i>F value = 0.524</i> <i>Sig = 0.593</i>					<i>Adjusted R2 = 0.002</i> <i>F value = 0.187</i> <i>Sig = 0.830</i>			

The result also revealed that learning engagement with a beta coefficient of -0.111, t-value of -0.100, and p-value of 0.920 are not significant on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills. Moreover, the beta coefficient of -0.506, t-value of -0.582, and p-value of 0.561 indicated that learning engagement are not significant with regard to students GWA.

The adjusted R-square indicates that 0.6% of the variation in the students' oral communication proficiency and 0.2% of students GWA is explained by students learning strategies and engagement. The F-value of 0.524 (oral communication proficiency) and 0.187 (GWA) is not significant at 0.593 and 0.0830 level of significance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the learning strategies and engagement have no significant influence on the Oral Communication Proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA of the selected Grade 11 students. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The result shows that learning strategies and engagement do not have a significant influence on the students' Oral Communication Proficiency and GWA.

Students are facing hurdles as the educational system transitions from face-to-face to virtual classes and adopts a flexible learning strategy. These difficulties such as lack of social interaction, unstable internet connectivity, conflict with home and work responsibilities, overloaded lesson activities, etc. have an impact on their learning strategies and engagement, as well as their ability to concentrate on their academics. Due to these challenges, students were not highly engaged in their studies nor applying learning strategies to perform well, academically.

Academic performance is highly dependent on a student's learning tactics and involvement. Student's study and work hard academically if they are motivated and guided with the right learning strategy and engagement. The more involved and motivated students are, the higher their academic performance will be. The less engaged and driven they are, the worse their academic performance will be.

Even though students were not highly engaged due to the situation, they can still perform and excel in their studies by focusing on their goals and cultivating a positive mindset. Doing things that they enjoy could help them become more self-engaged. This can be done with the assistance of family, teachers, and friends.

Summary of Findings

The salient points of the study presented found that the mean level of teacher-factor with regard on using instructional strategies attained a mean score of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.66 and was verbally interpreted as **“Very High”**. Mathew and Alidmat (2013) believe that teachers' use of audio-visual aids helps students grasp classes better and enhances their English language skills, such as pronunciation and conversational skills. Furthermore, audio-visual elements make classroom activities more engaging and help pupils retain teachings for longer. This means that the role of the teacher in shaping students' learning experiences plays a significant role in support to the speaking development of the students in and outside the classroom. This can be done by designing exciting and appropriate materials.

In terms of the Level of Motivating Factors with regard to **Technological – Factor (digital literacy)**, with the mean score of 4.23 and a standard deviation of 0.71 was verbally interpreted as **“Very High”**. The result was supported by the study of Parvin and Salam (2015) that by using technology, learners get the chance to increase their exposure to language in a meaningful context and make their knowledge. Learners should have opportunities for social interactions to practice real-life skills.

Next, the mean level of learning strategies in terms of Cognitive attained a mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.70 and was remarked as **“Very High”**. Then, the mean level of learning strategies in terms of Metacognitive attained a mean score of 4.16 and a standard deviation of 0.74 and was verbally interpreted as **“High”**. The result is supported by the study of Rashid and Rana (2019) that learning methods such as metacognitive self-regulation, cognitive strategies, rehearsal, and elaboration are major determinants of students' achievement in distance learning systems. This suggests that learning strategies are extremely important for pupils to achieve specific educational goals.

The mean level of learners' engagement in terms of Behavioral attained a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.74 and was remarked as **“High”**. The mean level of learners' engagement in terms of Affective attained a mean score of 4.09 and a standard deviation of 0.75 and was verbally interpreted as **“High”**. The result was similar by the study of Buelow, Janeth et al., (2018) that learner engagement is critical for student satisfaction and course completion. It is regarded as one of the most important criteria in determining a student's academic success. It shows that student learning engagement is critical to their academic success. The more involved and motivated students are, the higher their academic performance. The less engaged and driven they are, the worse their academic performance will be.

The mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of pronunciation attained a mean score of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.71 and was remarked as **“Excellent”**. The mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of vocabulary attained a mean score of 4.14 and a standard deviation of 0.69 and was remarked as **“Very Satisfactory”**. The mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of grammar attained a mean score of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 0.72 and was **“Very Satisfactory”**. The mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of organization attained a mean

score of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.73 and was **“Very Satisfactory”**. The mean level of oral communication proficiency of selected grade 11 students as determined by speaking skills in terms of fluency attained a mean score of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.73 and was **“Very Satisfactory”** among the students. De Vera et al. (2018) stated that Oral communication proficiency had been emphasized as essential for academic and professional achievements. It only shows that students being equipped with oral communication skills will help them become proficient and achieve future personal success. They will be able to become competent and competitive, possessing those skills.

Based on the data gathered, the mean level of oral communication proficiency attained through GWA of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU was remarked as **“Very Satisfactory”**. The result was similar by the study of Salustiano (2013) that GWA, or the General Weighted Average, is the important parameter in the promotion of students to the next level. It is the numerical output of their academic achievement. It would serve as one of the bases if the students learned or not.

These findings led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Motivating factors as to teacher’s instructional strategies and students’ digital literacy significantly influence the students’ Oral Communication Proficiency and GWA. This means that learners’ motivation and learning practices are critical to their educational success. Students’ study and work hard academically if they are motivated and guided with the right motivation.

Conclusion

In accordance with the findings, the conclusions were made:

The researcher, therefore, concludes that motivating factors with regard to teacher-factor on using instructional strategies and students’ digital literacy have a significant influence on the oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC; hence the null hypothesis that there is no significant influence had been rejected. Based from the theory of Gardner’s Model of Motivation, an individual tries to learn the language due to the desire to learn the language and the satisfaction he/she experiences in the process of learning the language. In consonance with the theory, the result showed that students were highly motivated towards learning the English language as determined by teacher’s implementation on using instructional strategies and student’s digital literacy. The more driven students are, the higher their academic achievements will be. On the other hand, learning strategies and engagement have no direct significant influence on the oral communication proficiency as to speaking skills and GWA of selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC; therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant influence had been accepted. Even though students were not highly engaged due to the situation, they can still perform and excel in their studies by focusing on their goals and cultivating a positive mindset. Doing things that they enjoy could help them become more self-engaged. This can be done with the assistance of family, teachers, and friends.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, the following were recommended:

1. Since it was found that motivating factors in terms of teacher-factor and technological factor have a significant influence on the oral communication proficiency of Selected Grade 11 students of LSPU-SCC, School Heads may craft an intervention program so that these factors shall be maintained and enhanced. Activities such as training on communication skills, personality development, and employability skills training may be considered and planned to cater to the needs of the teachers and students.

2. The researcher also suggests that the DepEd officials and school administrators may increase teachers' oral communication skills by providing some training, seminar, webinar, and workshops. Teachers’ communicative competence is pivotal in the teaching-learning process, and it should be developed and enhanced to attain students’ communication proficiency.

3. Language teachers are also recommended to be more creative, adaptive, and innovative in using more technological resources to make their English class interactive and meaningful. However, it is one of the lowest points based on the responses, and it should be addressed since the education sector is already implementing the flexible learning approach.

4. Language Teachers may also design their intervention program, which they think would help their students develop and enhance their oral communication skills. The integration of primary activities such as vocabulary and pronunciation enhancement may also be considered in every lesson. They may also continue making the four corners of the room a training ground, even if it is in a virtual space. Doing this may help the students boost their confidence and make them realize the significance of learning the English language. Proper coaching and mentoring may also be considered.

5. The researcher also recommends that the students continue aiming high to lead to their success. Through learning strategies and engagement have no significant influence on the oral communication proficiency of the students in this study, they may continue doing things they think they enjoy, which could help them become more self-engaged, strive harder, and excel in their studies.

6. This study will be relevant for future researchers to further elaborate on different variables in terms of motivating factors, learning strategies, and engagement that can contribute to the student’s oral communication proficiency and achievements.

They may also use other instruments to determine further the significance of learning strategies and engagement in the oral communication proficiency of the students in a flexible learning strategy in a broader area of study. Replication of this study into other grade levels may also be considered to validate the study result. 206

References

- Abad, Jose Vicente & Alzate, Paula Andrea (2016). Strategies Instruction to Improve the Preparation for English Oral Exams. *PROFILE*. Vol. 18, No. 1, January-June 2016. (n.d.).
- Abebe, T. T., & Davidson, L. (1970, January 1). *Assessing the role of visual teaching materials in teaching English vocabulary: Semantic scholar*. from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Assessing-the-Role-of-Visual-Teaching-Materials-in-Abebe->
- Adeyamo, D. A. O. (2012). *Emotional Intelligence and Academic Achievement: The Moderating Influence of Age, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. The African Symposium: An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network*.
- Aduwa and Iyamu, S. E. (2006). *Factors affecting quality of English language teaching and learning in secondary schools in Nigeria. College Student Journal*. 40, 3. - references - scientific research publishing. Retrieved May 18, 2022
- Ali, et al. Y. (2017, June 9). *Fostering Students' Oral Communication Skills in the Second Language Classroom*. from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1128442/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Azam, M., & Kingdon, G. G. (2014, November 22). *Assessing teacher quality in India*. SSRN. from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2529331
- Badral, R. (2017). *Students' Learning Strategies in Successfully Studying at Two Majors*.
- Bennett, L. (2014). *Learning from the early adopters: Developing the digital practitioner*.
- Buelow, et al., J. R., Barry, T. A., & Rich, L. (2018, December). *[PDF] supporting learning engagement with online students: Semantic scholar*. from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Supporting-Learning-Engagement-with-Online-Students-Buelow->
- Chan, B. S., Churchill, D., & Chiu, T. K. (2017). Digital Literacy Learning in higher education through digital storytelling approach. *Journal of International Education Research (JIER)*, 13(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v13i1.9907>
- Chen, et al., W. (2017, December). "Go Kahoot!" *Enriching classroom engagement, motivation and learning experience with games. Paper Presented at the New Zealand International Conference on Computers in Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322150947>.
- Cohen & Weaver, A. D. (2006). *Styles and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew-Cohen-8/publication/267796204_Styles_and_Strategies-
- Department of Education.(2016). K to 12 English curriculum guide May 2016.
- De Vera, J. S., & De Vera, P. V. (2018, September 30). *Oral communication skills in English among grade 11 humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) students*. Online Submission. Retrieved May 18, 2022, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED604403>
- Dincer, A., & Yesilyurt, S. (2016, November 30). *Motivation to speak English: A self-determination theory perspective*. PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand.
- Ella, R. B., & Dapudong, R. C. (2014, December 22). *Oral Communication Achievement of the bachelor of arts students major in English at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Thailand*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*.
- Fredricks, et al., J. A. (2004). *School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of educational research*, 74(1), 59-109. Fredericks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). *school engagement potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research*, 74
- Gençliter, B. (2015). *How does technology affect language learning process at an early age? Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(2015), 311 – https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283165281_How_does_Technology_Affect_Language_Learning_Process_at_an_Early_Age/fulltext/
- Gunuc, S. (2014). *The relationships between student engagement and their academic achievement. International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 5(4), 216–231.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2000). *Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. The Internet TESL Journal*.
- Ikram, H., Perveen, S., & Javed, H. (2021). Relationship between learning strategies and motivation of distance learners. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 9(3), 617–625. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2021.9361>
- Juhana, J. (2012). *Psychological factors that hinder students from speaking in ... - IISTE*. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/IJEP/article/viewFile/2887/2913>
- Khalid, F., Mirza, S. S., Bin-Feng, C., & Saeed, N. (2020). Learning engagements and the role of religion. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 215824401990125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019901256>
- Kyoshaba, M. (2009). *Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Undergraduate Students at Uganda Christian University* from <https://www.coursehero.com/file/p112an3/Kyoshaba-M-2009-Factors-affecting-academic-performance-of-undergraduate/>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Liang, T. (2009). *Language learning strategies --- the theoretical framework and some suggestions for Learner Training Practice. English Language Teaching*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n4p199>
- Machin-Mastromatteo, J. D. (2012). Participatory action research in the age of social media: Literacies, affinity spaces and learning. *New Library World*, 113(11/12), 571–585. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03074801211282939>
- Mahmud, M. M. (2014). *Communication aptitude and academic success. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.230>
- Mathew, N. G., & Alidmat, A. O. (2013). A study on the usefulness of audio-visual aids in EFL classroom: Implications for effective instruction. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v2n2p86>
- Mohammadi, N., Ghorbani, V., & Hamidi, F. (2011). Effects of e-learning on language learning. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 464–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.078>
- Morales, et. al, A. A. T. (2017). Analysis of factors that affect the oral communication of Students from the third-year afternoon shift, at the Miguel de Cervantes High School, in Managua during the second semester 2017.
- Mosimege & Winnaar, M. (2021). Teachers' instructional strategies and their impact on learner performance in grade 9 mathematics: Findings from TIMSS 2015 in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 39(2). <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593x/pie.v39.i2.22>
- Namaziandost, E., Neisi, L., Kheryadi, & Nasri, M. (2018, November 30). *Enhancing oral proficiency through Cooperative Learning Among Intermediate EFL Learners: English learning motivation in focus*. Cogent Education.
- Nguyen, H. T., Warren, W., & Fehring, H. (2014). Factors affecting English language teaching and learning in higher education. *English Language Teaching*, 7(8). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n8p94>

- Oxford, R. L. (1991). Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(1), 130. 207
<https://doi.org/10.2307/329849>
- Pangket, W. F. (2019). Oral communication proficiency in English of the grade 5 pupils. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 42–50.
<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijhss.11.2.4>
- Parvin, R. H., & Salam, S. F. (2015). The effectiveness of using technology in English language classrooms in government primary schools in Bangladesh. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.18275/fire201502011049>
- Puška, E., Ejubović, A., Đalić, N., & Puška, A. (2020). Examination of influence of e-learning on academic success on the example of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(2), 1977–1994. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10343-9>
- Ryan & Deci. (2011).). *How youth get engaged: Grounded-theory research on motivational development in organized youth programs. Developmental psychology*. .
- Radovan, M. (2011, December 31). *The relation between distance students' motivation, their use of learning strategies, and academic success*. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology - TOJET. Retrieved May 18, 2022, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ926571>
- Rashid and Rana. (2019). *Relationship between the levels of motivation and learning strategies of prospective teachers at higher education level. Bulletin of Education and Research*, 41(1), 57–66.
- Riasati, M. J., Allahyar, N., & Tan, K.-E. (2012). *Technology in language education: Benefits and barriers*. Journal of Education and Practice. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/1495>
- Salustiano, R. (2013).). *Correlation Analysis of Performance in College Admission Test, Nursing Aptitude Test, General Weighted Average and Nurse Licensure Examination of Nursing Graduates. Arellano University Graduate School J., Vol 11, No 1*.
- Savaşçı, M. (2014). Why are some students reluctant to use L2 in EFL speaking classes? action research at tertiary level. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2682–2686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.635>
- Stewart, B. (2013). *Massiveness + openness = new literacies of participation?* http://jolt.merlot.org/vol9no2/stewart_bonnie_0613.pdf
- Stordy, P. (2015). Taxonomy of literacies. *Journal of Documentation*, 71(3), 456–476. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jd-10-2013-0128>
- Tan, C. (2017). A Confucian perspective of self-cultivation in learning: Its implications for self-directed learning. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 23(2), 250–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477971417721719>
- Thomas, I. (2015). *Using Instructional Strategies to Enhance Student Achievement. NATIONAL FORUM OF TEACHER EDUCATION JOURNAL VOLUME 25, NUMBER 3, 2015*.
- Treacy, et. al., J. (2021). *DOD Linguists' Perceptions of the Use of Virtual Learning Environments on the Motivation to Speak a Foreign Language. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.2021*.
- Walsh, F. (2012). Normal family processes: Growing diversity and complexity. Guilford Press. *NORMAL FAMILY PROCESSES*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203428436_chapter_15