RISK REDUCTION MANAGEMENT PREPAREDNESS OF STRASUC OLYMPICS: A DISASTER RESPONSE AND GOVERNANCE

Liza L. Bartolome, Ph. D.

Faculty, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz, Laguna College of Teacher Education March 2020.

Abstract

Southern Tagalog Regional Association of State Universities and Colleges (STRASUC) Olympics is a densely populated event and composed of players that are one of the most vulnerable groups in society. To reduce this vulnerability, particularly in sports events, it is important to provide a Disaster Management Plan. STRASUC also have many resources and therefore, has a responsibility towards its immediate locality, just as the neighboring community is linked to them. Pursuant to Republic Act (RA) No. 10121 entitled The Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010, an act mandated to strengthen disaster management in the Philippines, which mandates all national government agencies to institutionalize policies, structures, coordination mechanisms and programs with continuing budget appropriation on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) from national to local levels including CHED guidelines on DRRMO, which is mandated to initiate and spearhead the establishment of mechanisms to prepare, guarantee protection and increase resiliency of STRASUC constituents in the face of disaster, CHED issues the enclosed coordination and information management protocols in STRASUC offices to establish the system of coordination and information management and provide guidance to STRASUC offices on their respective roles and functions relative to DRRM implementation. Furthermore, Commission on Higher Education (CHED) issues the enclosed Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) in their lecture to ensure resilience-building in universities to maintain quality education even during disasters and/or emergencies. The DRRM office institutionalizes the culture of safety at all levels, to systematize the protection of education investments and to ensure continued delivery of quality education services. It shall serve as the focal and coordinative unit for DRRM-related activities. The DRRMO shall perform the following specific functions: Act as the focal point in planning, implementing, coordinating and monitoring of activities related to DRRM, EiE and CCA. Develop and recommend policy standards and actions on management on DRRM/EiE/CCA matters. Initiate and coordinate cooperation and collaborative activities with the national government agencies, NGO and CSO.
Introduction:
Education is a human right, universal and inalienable. It is especially important in enabling people to reach their full potential and exercise other rights. This right on the other hand does not disappear or get suspended because of disasters and emergencies. When education is interrupted or limited, students usually drop out, resulting to negative and permanent economic and social impact on the students, their families, including their communities. Natural hazards are part of the context for educational planning. Whether annually recurring floods, a once-in-5 generations earthquake, the increasing severity of storms and cyclones, water shortages, or the slow onset of rising sea water levels, are known and expected hazards can be mitigated with the determined application of knowledge, education, and ingenuity.

Annually recurring floods regularly prevent millions of children from attending a full year of school. It is understandable that no one is not able to prevent the earth from shaking, the wind from blowing, or the rain from falling. However, with assessment and planning, physical and environmental protection and response preparedness anybody can prevent these events from becoming disasters. Since schools are universal institutions for sharing knowledge and skills, the expectations for schools to be role models in disaster prevention is high. Successful disaster mitigation is one of the ultimate tests of the success of the education they provide over generations.

Today, the global community is experiencing an increasing number of disasters that range from earthquakes, floods, storms, epidemics, fires, landslides, hurricanes, tsunamis and social conflicts, all of which may result in loss of life and property. South Africa, for example just like any other country, experiences its share of disasters such as seasonal floods, fires, road and rail accidents, droughts, sinkholes and epidemics; and these are usually compounded by the prevalence of informal settlements, a lack of proper planning during construction and a lack of political will (Rambu, 2011).

Philippines is also prone to many natural hazards due to its geologic and geographic setting. Throughout the recorded history of the Philippines, disaster in various parts of the country have been reported, unmistakably, considering floods and storms as the most frequently occurring hazards. The frequency, intensity and variabili of hydrometeorological hazards also have heightened the compelling need for the nation to adopt disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) and climate change adaptation (CAA).

It is of every individual’s desire is to ensure the safety and well being of their children. In schools they find it essential to provide adequate infrastructure and educational facilities for children from the primary to advance level in order to create a positive learning environment. The concept of a safe school and overall well being of school children is gaining its significance under the overarching commitment towards quality education for all.

Additionally, children are one of the most vulnerable groups during disaster. Factors such as their age affect their vulnerability and shape their ability to cope and survive in a disaster context. They have particular needs that must be met for their healthy growth and development. (16th Community Based Disaster Risk Management Course, 2007).

Objectives:
This study aims to show the risk reduction management of STRASUC Olympics (Regional Competition) toward sports hazards.
1. What is the mean level of sports hazards preparedness in terms of:
   1.1 earthquakes
   1.2 typhoon
   1.3 flood/storm surge
   1.4 fire
   1.5 epidemic

2. What is the mean level of risk reduction management of STRASUC Olympics in terms of the following?
   2.1 Disaster Response
   2.1.1 Staffing
2.1.2 Planning  
2.1.3 Training  
2.1.4 Monitoring

Disaster Governance  
Coordinating/Collaboration  
3. Is there a significant relationship between the STRASUC preparedness singly or in combination to risk reduction management?

Methodology:--  
The method of research used is descriptive through survey questionnaire to be able to gather data and information on the relationships of school hazards readiness/preparedness to the risk reduction management of STRASUC.

The descriptive design is intended to give more information about particular characteristics in a particular field of study. Todd (2007) suggested that if a study intends to determine the present facts or current condition, the descriptive method is appropriate since this approach or method maybe used to develop theory, identify problems with current practices, make judgements or identify what others in similar situation maybe doing.

Earl (2009) used to describe the nature of the situation that exist at the time of the study and explore the causes of particular phenomena. Descriptive research involves collection of data in order to test the hypothesis to answer questions concerning the current status of the study.

Literature Review:--  
Spoken English is the more natural and widespread mode of transmission, though ironically the one which most people find much less familiar presumably because it is so much more difficult to see what is happening in speech than in writing. However, communicative competence is very important, it is the ability not only to apply grammatical rules to form grammatically correct sentences but also to know when and where to use these sentences and to whom, Richards (2001). Nonetheless, Chomsky defined Performance as the ability of language user to apply the theory that is produce and understand an infinite number of utterances and the ability of the speaker to pass judgement on the grammaticality of sentences, on ambiguity, and paraphrases. In other words, performance is the application of the theory. “Linguistic performance and its products are in fact complex phenomena. The nature and characteristics of a particular instance of linguistic performance and its product(s) are, in reality, determined by a combination of factors: Some of the factors which influence linguistic performance are: (a) the linguistic competence or unconscious linguistic knowledge of the speaker-hearer, (b) the nature and limitations of the speaker-hearer’s speech production and speech perception mechanisms, (c) the nature and limitations of the speaker-hearer’s memory, concentration, attention and other mental capacities, (d) the social environment and status of the speaker-hearer, (e) the dialectal environment of the speaker-hearer, (f) the idiolect and individual style of speaking of the speaker-hearer, (g) the speaker-hearer’s factual knowledge and view of the world in which he lives, (h) the speaker-hearer’s state of health, his emotional state and other similar incidental circumstances.

In practice, the language performance that we actually produce is limited by these factors. Furthermore, the sentences we actually produce often use the simpler grammatical constructions. Our speech is full of false starts, hesitations, speech errors, and corrections. The actual ways in which we produce and understand sentences are also in the domain of performance.

The degree of learning that students acquire in school has a relation to his/her academic performance. As cited by Collier (2001), language is more than just the sum of discrete parts (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary). It is developed within culture for the purpose of conveying the beliefs and customs of that culture. He said that language usage is dynamic and contextually based (varies depends on the situation, status of the speakers and the topic), the discursive requires connected speech and requires the use of integrative skills to achieve communicative competence.

According to Qian (2008), having a larger vocabulary gives the learner a larger database from which to guess the meaning of the unknown words or behavior of newly learned words, having deeper vocabulary knowledge will very likely improve the results of the guessing work.
One commonality among everyone in the whole world is that they learned to speak before they learned grammar. Speaking is the first step for any English learner. So, if you are a novice at English, please focus on your speaking and listening skills prior to studying grammar. After being able to speak English fluently, you will realize how much easier grammar is. But it does not work the other way around. Being fluent in English speaking will help you with your grammar studies, but studying grammar studies, but studying grammar will not help you with your speaking. Krashen’s theory of Second Language Acquisition states that language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules and does not require tedious drill.

Acquisition requires meaningful interactions in the target-language natural communication in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding. In obtaining English fluency studying grammar can slow your progress down significantly. Basic grammar is a necessity, but focusing on grammar will prevent you from being able to speak English fluently in a reasonable time frame. Grammar is most effective to improve communication and writing skills, but this only pertains to those who have a solid foundation in English fluency. Swan (2005) believed that knowing how to build and use certain structures makes it feasible to communicate common types successfully. Without these structures, it is difficult to make comprehensible sentences. He stated that in some social contexts, serious deviance from native speakers’ rules can put off integration and arouse prejudice – a person who speaks badly maybe considered uneducated or stupid. This implies that learners should understand English language structures accurately to become fluent. Zhong-guo, LI and SONG Min-yan (2007) state that learners must be competent in language. The language competence means that one has a good knowledge of grammar and words, he or she can speak, read and write in grammatical foreign language. In conversation it is become crucial, if mistakes were made in one’s pronunciation, grammar or words spelling, it will lead to misunderstanding and boredom to others, and even damage their relationship. If we only understand what others say partially and superficially, the communication of ideas can’t be properly realized.

In Oxford International Encyclopedia (2003), grammar is presented in terms of two particular approaches ‘functionalism’ and ‘formalism’ or functional (cognitive and social perspectives) and formal grammars. In one way or another grammar can be defined in many ways and to mean different thing. Byram (2002) views grammars not only technically as a system that studies the features of language but also socially, pedagogically and linguistically. It can be said that English grammar is the set of rules within the English language itself. It has indispensable role in communication though in recent days however its role is changing especially in language teaching. Language teaching now do not too structure oriented, which is teach language through the structure built it. Michell (1996) claims that the main aims of studying grammar by linguist were not only linguistics ones, there are also social and pedagogical aims as he stated. It is clear that his claim is similar to Byram’s definition of grammar who has been mentioned earlier, has introduced grammar from three angles: linguistic, social and pedagogical.

These views of Byram and Mitchell give confidence to the leaners who wish to speak the English language yet apprehensive that they might commit mistakes in doing so.

A theory which has had a great impact on teacher English pronunciation recently is Jenkins’s Lingua Franca Core. Using conversations in English between (NNSs) Non-Native Speaker as data, Jenkins (2000) found that the chief issue for intelligibly in international contexts was pronunciation. In her proposal for a Lingua franca core (LFC) Jennifer Jenkins (2000) seeks to redefine and re-classify pronunciation error, and in so doing to embrace the sociolinguistic facts of regional variation. The proposal recognizes the rights of non-native speakers to their own legitimate regional accents rather than regarding deviation from NS pronunciation norms as error. However, Walker (2001) comments, it should not be assumed that the NS is necessarily best equipped to teach pronunciation, the best instructor is the person with a detailed practical knowledge of both the L1 and L2 phonetics.

When talking about pronunciation in language, pronunciation and perception of different sounds of a language and their meaning in different contexts of language use should be considered. Pronunciation plays a vital role in personal and social lives, identities, individualities and memberships in a certain community. Often learner’s pronunciation is responsible for the intelligibility. (Seidlhofer, 2002) Moreover, he said that effective teaching of pronunciation requires at least three kinds of competence of teachers: linguistic proficiency in the target language, knowledge about this language and the ability to identify and select specific aspects of language and combine them for presentation and practice in ways which are effective for learning. Teachers need to be good models and good instructors for the correct pronunciation of the target language.
Children learn better when they do it with other children of their age and by interaction with other children of their age and by interaction with people who understand their manner of expressions.

Interactive learning is an educational approach to teaching and learning that involves group of students working together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product. It is through the talk that learning occurs. “Collaborative Learning” (Sharec 2011) is a style of education that gets student actively participating in the classroom. This method of educating is appropriate at all age level and for all subjects. Collaborative learning brings students together to engage in team-building activities.

Interactive learning can be a better method of child education because it encourages student to work together to work together rather than compete against one another. It also presents a more social aspect to learning and a social environment that can help encourage a child’s education. Collaborative learning is a very formal way of structuring activities in a learning environment that includes specific elements intended to increase the potential for rich and deep learning by the participants.

Didicican (2007) said that interactive learning, teachers act as facilitators for incorporating and encouraging intellectual and social development in the formative years of a student’s life. Pupils performance lies on the expertise of a teacher. Applied to classroom setting, expertise connotes the effectiveness of the teachers to attain the objectives of the lesson, the learning activities of the teacher to ask question that develop critical thinking skill.

Caston and Jones (2004) found that interactive learning offered an opportunity to gain better understanding and insight into the preferred learning environment of the participants. According to the responses of all students, cooperative learning was the preferred method of classroom learning.

Social and emotional maturity are intertwined. Therefore, as teens emotional maturity increase their peers change as they become more vulnerable and emotionally intimate with their peers. Because acceptance by a peer group becomes so important, teens may modify their speech, dress, behavior, choices, and activities in order to become more similar to their peers.

Omas-as (2003) stated that the peer is a social group where members have common interest, social position and age. It has a unique understanding at how behave and trying to escape supervision from adult. This is when they try evade their parent’s guidance as Railey (2004) considers peer group as the next most influential entity that mold human personality after the family, it is therefore vital to feel presence of the parent in their children’s day to day activity in order to guide them.

Relatively Brown (2004) claimed that peer group membership can benefit students by providing friendship and by enhancing academic performance, this is where peer becomes a healthy influence to an individual.

Omas-as, Railey and Brown discussed how hefty the peers are to the student’s performance. Children pick up language by echoing or imitating what they hear around them. Constant interaction with the child develops language learning. Learning while enjoying is much better than being confined in a classroom – activity environment where children often get bored and tired. Environment include not only physical stings. But psychological settings for literacy learning as well (Tharp & Gallimore, 1992). Children are influenced by the participants present in a setting, their background experiences, their values and it is the integration of place, people, and occasion that support opportunities for learning. These individuals act as social and psychological resources that provide information and feedback through demonstrations and interactions.

Children who are English language learners experience each of these critical dimensions in the context of learning two languages, which only increases the complexity of the processes of language and literacy development. In order to become proficient in their second language, students need familiarity with the phonology, its vocabulary, its morphology and grammar(Geva, 2006). Research with second language learners has shown that oral language and literacy skills in the first language contribute to the development of those skills in the second language. For example, phonological awareness skills in the first language have been found to predict phonological awareness and word recognition in the second language (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Cisero & Royer, 1995; Durgunl, 1998).
Deliberate approach to the selection and arrangement of materials according to specific design criteria may enhance children’s uses of literacy objects and related print resources. (Beck & McKeown, 2007; Duke, 2000) highlight the importance of introducing children to a wide variety of books in different genres such as information books, poetry, and popular folk tales. Daily interactive book reading routine that introduces students to multiple genres, including information books, narrative, and poetry, will help them develop their English fluency.

Discussion:

Table 1: Level of Students’ Interactive Learning through Oral Presentation.

| Oral Presentation                      | MEAN | SD  | Remarks     |
|----------------------------------------|------|-----|-------------|
| 1. Develops my self-confidence to speak.| 3.81 | 1.02| High Extent |
| 2. Gives exposure to keep me active in the activities. | 3.74 | 0.92| High Extent |
| 3. Develops my creativity to use the language in the classroom. | 3.82 | 0.93| High Extent |
| 4. Encourages me to participate in debates. | 3.69 | 1.06| High Extent |
| 5. Enhances my ability to express myself. | 3.84 | 0.91| High Extent |
| **Overall Mean**                       | **3.78** | **High Extent** |

The table shows the effect of oral presentation in students' behavior towards the use of the English Language. A mean of 3.81 came out in item number one which pertains to developing the self-confidence of the students in speaking followed by 3.74 mean that gives exposure to keep him active in the activities, a 3.82 mean for developing his creativity in using the language in the classroom, however a mean of 3.69 was gathered in encouraging him to participate in debates, nevertheless a 3.84 mean was gathered in enhancing his ability to express herself respectively with 1.02, 0.92, 0.93, 1.06, and 0.91 as standard deviation. Students’ interactive learning activities in terms of oral presentations is of “high extent”.

Table 2: Level of Students’ Interactive Learning through Dialogues.

| Dialogue                                               | MEAN | SD  | Remarks     |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-------------|
| 1. Encourage me to speak and cooperate with my partner. | 3.87 | 0.93| High Extent |
| 2. Helps me develop my ability to express myself in a given task. | 3.77 | 0.91| High Extent |
| 3. Gives me opportunity to use my speaking style.     | 3.53 | 0.97| High Extent |
| 4. Uplifts my interest to participate more             | 3.83 | 0.91| High Extent |
| 5. Develops my interest in speaking.                   | 3.76 | 1.01| High Extent |
| **Overall Mean**                                       | **3.75** | **High Extent** |

The table shows the effect of dialogue in encouraging the pupils to speak and cooperate with partners, develop their abilities in expressing themselves and how dialogue gives them opportunity to speak based on their style, uplifts their interest to be participative and develop their interest in speaking. The items received mean scores of 3.87, 3.77, 3.53, 3.83, 3.76 respectively with standard deviations of 0.93, 0.91, 0.97, 0.91 and 1.01. Based on their overall mean which was 3.75 they got “Much” as remark and “high extent” as verbal interpretation.

Table 3: Level of Students’ Interactive Learning through Small Group Activity.

| Small Group Activity                                      | MEAN | SD  | Remarks     |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-------------|
| 1. Motivates members to participate in the activity.     | 3.96 | 0.91| High Extent |
| 2. Develops keen observation and listening to learn the script and deliver it spontaneously. | 3.77 | 0.99| High Extent |
| 3. Helps me to be responsible to learn the target lessons for the day. | 4.09 | 0.88| High Extent |
| 4. Boosts my interest to be a part of the activity.     | 4.01 | 0.91| High Extent |
| 5. Enables me to work with others with confidence.      | 3.95 | 0.93| High Extent |
| **Overall Mean**                                        | **3.95** | **High Extent** |

The items in this table gathered an overall mean of 3.95 and a standard deviation of 0.92 with a “much” remark and “high extent” verbal interpretation. Item number one which motivate members to participate in the activity got a mean of 3.96, 3.77 was given to item number two which is developing keen observation and listening to learn the
script and deliver it spontaneously, item number three which help the respondent to be responsible to learn the target lesson for the day gathered 4.09 mean, a 4.01 mean was given for boosting the interest of the learner to be a part of the activity and enabling him to work with others with confidence got a rate of 3.95.

Table 4.- Level of Students’ Interactive Learning through Role Playing.

| Role Playing                                                                 | MEAN | SD  | Remarks      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| 1. Keeps me aware of my specific part to learn.                             | 3.74 | 1.04| High Extent  |
| 2. Helps me to be alert on a given task in the play.                        | 3.86 | 0.95| High Extent  |
| 3. Gives me sense of responsibility as a member/leader                      | 3.92 | 1.00| High Extent  |
| 4. Lets others express themselves as part of the play                        | 3.93 | 0.95| High Extent  |
| 5. Helps me to keep alert for my specific role.                             | 3.85 | 1.00| High Extent  |

| Role Playing                                                                 | MEAN | SD  | Remarks      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| Overall Mean                                                                | 3.86 |    | High Extent  |

Legend: Remarks

| Remarks   | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 4.51-5.00 | Very Much             |
| 3.51-4.50 | Much                  |
| 2.51-3.50 | Low Extent            |
| 1.51-2.50 | Very Low Extent       |
| 1.00-1.50 | Not at all            |

The table shows item number 3 got the highest mean of 3.93 with 0.95 standard deviation, it displays how interactive learning activity like role playing gives a sense of responsibility as a member/leader, it is followed by item number 4 with 3.92 mean, a difference of one point from the previous one, this item shows how others express themselves as part of the play and since being part of the play requires a person of being alert it is shown to be the third with 3.86 mean and 3.85 from item number 4. Item number 1 got the least of mean which is 3.74, it deals with keeping the person aware of his specific part to learn. To sum up, table 6 gathers an overall mean of 3.86 with a standard deviation of 0.99 with a remark of “much” and a “high extent” of verbal interpretation.

Table 5:- Level of Students’ Linguistic Environment created by Peers.

| Peers                                                   | MEAN | SD  | Remarks      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| 1. Use English in casual conversation.                  | 2.57 | 1.11| Moderate Extent |
| 2. Understand instructions in English in doing activities.| 2.64 | 1.07| Moderate Extent |
| 3. Show confidence in the use of English in different situations.| 2.40 | 1.11| Low Extent    |
| 4. Encourage me to talk using English language.         | 2.66 | 1.22| Moderate Extent |
| 5. Serve as models to encourage me to speak English.    | 2.66 | 1.32| Moderate Extent |

| Peers                                                   | MEAN | SD  | Remarks      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| Overall Mean                                            | 2.59 |    | Moderate Extent |

The table reveals the effect of peers in the oral English Performance of the learners, “moderate extent” appears to be the result as each determiner was given. Item number one which deals in the use of English in casual conversation gathers 2.57 mean with a standard deviation of 1.11 and a remark of “Sometimes”, item number two which use English in giving instructions in doing activities garnered a mean of 2.64 with 1.07 standard deviation. However, showing confidence in the use of English in different situations reveals a “Rarely” remark and a mean of 2.40 which shows to be the lowest among the means given and gathered a 1.11 standard deviation. Item number 4, encouraging students to talk using English language receives a 2.66 mean as well as item number 5 which says that peer serves as model in encouraging the learner to speak English.

Table 6:- Level of Students’ Linguistic Environment created by Home (Family).

| Peers                                                   | MEAN | SD  | Remarks      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| 1. Using English in casual conversation by every member of the family. | 3.07 | 1.14| Moderate Extent |
| 2. Watching English TV shows                           | 1.95 | 1.11| Low Extent   |
| 3. Watching TV news in English                         | 2.70 | 1.18| Moderate Extent |
| 4. Provides gadgets in English instructions             | 2.32 | 1.40| Low Extent   |
5. Shows confidence in using English in conversation | 2.64 | 1.22 | Moderate Extent

**Overall Mean** | 2.54 | Moderate Extent

**Legend:**

| Remarks | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------|-----------------------|
| 4.51-5.00 Always | Very High Extent |
| 3.51-4.50 Often | High Extent |
| 2.51-3.50 Sometimes | Moderate Extent |
| 1.51-2.50 Rarely | Low Extent |
| 1.00-1.50 Never | Very Low Extent |

The table presents level of student’s linguistic environment created by home (family). Item number 1 which use English in casual conversation by every member of the family gathered a mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 1.14 with a remark of “sometimes” and verbal interpretation of “moderate extent”. It is followed by a 2.70 mean, watching TV news in English, 2.64 is given in item number 5 where the learner shows confidence in using the English language in conversation. Items number 2 and 4 appear to be both “low extent” in verbal interpretation with 1.95 and 2.32 mean respectively.

**Table 7:- Frequency and Percentage Distribution Exposure to Print Materials contributory to Linguistic Environment.**

| Print Materials | F | % | Remarks |
|-----------------|---|---|--------|
| 1. Comics       | 70 | 47 | Sometimes |
| 2. Magazines    | 122 | 81 | Always |
| 3. Journals     | 59 | 39 | Often |
| 4. Books        | 141 | 94 | Always |
| 5. Readers Digest | 50 | 33 | Often |
| 6. Newspapers   | 126 | 84 | Always |
| 7. Encyclopedia  | 61 | 41 | Sometimes |
| 8. Others       | 58 | 39 | Often |

The table reveals the importance of print materials in acquiring knowledge about spoken language. The more exposure a learner gets from informative reading materials the more likely he learns the language.

**Table 8:-Level of Students in Oral English Vocabulary Performance.**

| Vocabulary | MEAN | SD | Remarks |
|------------|------|----|---------|
| 1. Say/use varied words when performing a dialogue | 3.33 | 1.03 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Easily grasp words appropriate for the group play. | 3.24 | 1.07 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Use exact word to convey meaning. | 3.16 | 1.09 | Moderate Extent |
| 4. Express him/herself freely with no hesitance | 3.37 | 1.07 | Moderate Extent |
| 5. Show confidence in the use of words learned for the day. | 3.27 | 1.07 | Moderate Extent |

The table shows item number 4 to have the highest frequency, it shows that learners are confident in speaking.

**Table 9:-Level of English Language in Terms of Grammar Performance.**

| Grammar | MEAN | SD | Remarks |
|---------|------|----|---------|
| 1. Show consistency of the verbs used in writing. | 3.23 | 1.08 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Knows how to put punctuation junction in writing paragraphs. | 3.47 | 1.07 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Manifest fluency in writing short story. | 3.15 | 1.12 | Moderate Extent |
| 4. Apply correct usage of words. | 3.19 | 1.13 | Moderate Extent |
5. Aware of the usage of parts of speech.  

| Overall Mean | 3.26 Moderate Extent |

The table shows that student performance in English language in terms of grammar is of moderate extent, it is reflected on the overall mean of 3.26 and with a standard deviation of 1.13. Item number 2 which refers to punctuation junction reflects the knowledge of the students of the language.

### Table 10: Level of English Pronunciation Performance.

| Pronunciation | MEAN | SD | Remarks          |
|---------------|------|----|------------------|
| 1. Speak clearly at all times. | 3.46 | 1.00 | Moderate Extent  |
| 2. Project voice to be heard by everybody while doing the activity. | 3.40 | 0.90 | Moderate Extent  |
| 3. Give the correct sound needed in the role portrayed. | 3.33 | 1.03 | Moderate Extent  |
| 4. Vary his/her voice when necessary to avoid monotony. | 3.29 | 1.04 | Moderate Extent  |
| 5. Apply the correct sound of words in English | 3.26 | 1.17 | Moderate Extent  |
| Overall Mean | 3.35 Moderate Extent |

### Legend:

| Remarks | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------|-----------------------|
| 4.51-5.00 | Very Much | Very High Extent |
| 3.51-4.50 | Much | High Extent |
| 2.51-3.50 | Moderate | Moderate Extent |
| 1.51-2.50 | Little | Low Extent |
| 1.00-1.50 | Not at All | Very Low Extent |

The table shows that students can speak English with correct pronunciation as appeared on item number 5 with a percentage of 1.17 with “moderate” verbal interpretation. The least as item number 2 with 90% and with a verbal interpretation of “moderate”. It was followed by 1% in item number 1 1.03% in item number 2 and 1.04% in item number 4 which all gathered a “moderate” verbal interpretation as well.

### Table 11: Relation between Interactive Learning Activities and Linguistic Environment and Students English Vocabulary Performance.

| Predictor | beta | t   | Sig.  | Analysis     |
|-----------|------|-----|-------|--------------|
| Oral Presentations | 0.296 | 2.180 | 0.031 | Significant  |
| Dialogue   | -0.334 | -2.346 | 0.020 | Significant  |
| Small Group Activity | 0.064 | 0.435 | 0.664 | Not Significant |
| Role Playing | -0.076 | -0.651 | 0.516 | Not Significant |

### Linguistic Environment

| Predictor          | beta | t   | Sig.  | Analysis     |
|--------------------|------|-----|-------|--------------|
| Peers              | 0.04 | 0.038 | 0.969 | Not Significant |
| Home (Family)      | -0.285 | -2.701 | 0.008 | Significant  |
| Print Materials    | 0.38 | 0.436 | 0.663 | Not Significant |

### Dependent Variable Vocabulary

| Adjusted R-Square | = 0.136 |
| F Value           | = 3.578 |
| Sig.              | = 0.000 |
The table shows that interactive learning as to oral presentations, dialogue, and linguistic environment as to home (family) predicts the student’s oral English language performance in terms of vocabulary. The beta coefficient indicates that for every standard deviation unit increase in oral presentations, dialogue and home (family) there is a corresponding 0.296 standard deviation unit increase, -0.334 and -0.285 standard deviation unit decrease in vocabulary in student’s oral English language performance in terms of vocabulary. The t-value of 2.180, -2.346 and -2.701 is significant at 0.031, 0.020 and 0.008 levels, respectively.

The adjusted R-square of 0.136 indicates that 13.6% of change in vocabulary is due primarily to oral presentations, dialogue, and home (family). The F-value of 3.578 is significant at 0.000 levels.

### Table 12: Relation between Interactive Learning Activities and Linguistic Environment and Students English Grammar Performance

| Predictor                  | beta  | t      | Sig.   | Analysis         |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|
| **Interactive Learning Activities** |       |        |        |                  |
| Oral Presentations         | 0.129 | 0.943  | 0.348  | Not Significant  |
| Dialogue                   | -0.205| -1.430 | 0.155  | Not Significant  |
| Small Group Activity       | 0.050 | 0.341  | 0.733  | Not Significant  |
| Role Playing               | -0.094| -0.803 | 0.423  | Not Significant  |
| **Linguistic Environment** |       |        |        |                  |
| Peers                      | -0.002| -0.021 | 0.983  | Not Significant  |
| Home (Family)              | -0.343| -3.220 | 0.002  | Significant      |
| Print Materials            | 0.015 | 0.171  | 0.865  | Not Significant  |

**Dependent Variable: Grammar**

Adjusted R-square = 0.122  
F Value = 3.295  
Sig. = 0.001

The table reveals as for English language performance in terms of grammar only the linguistic environment such as family made a great impact for it is the only determinant found to be significant.

### Table 13: Relation between Interactive Learning Activities and Linguistic Environment and Students English Pronunciation Performance

| Predictor                  | beta  | t      | Sig.   | Analysis         |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|
| **Interactive Learning Activities** |       |        |        |                  |
| Oral Presentations         | 0.227 | 1.647  | 0.102  | Not Significant  |
| Dialogue                   | -0.296| -2.051 | 0.042  | Significant      |
| Small Group Activity       | -0.006| -0.042 | 0.967  | Not Significant  |
| Role Playing               | 0.019 | 0.163  | 0.871  | Not Significant  |
| **Linguistic Environment** |       |        |        |                  |
| Peers                      | -0.005| -0.042 | 0.966  | Not Significant  |
| Home (Family)              | -0.274| -2.563 | 0.011  | Significant      |
| Print Materials            | 0.054 | 0.602  | 0.548  | Not Significant  |

**Dependent Variable: Pronunciation**

Adjusted R-square = 0.111  
F Value = 3.050  
Sig. = 0.002

As shown in the table, interactive learning activities such as dialogue is relatively significant to linguistic environment such as Home (Family). The role of parents in developing the vocabulary cannot be over emphasized.
Conclusion:

The interactive learning activities and linguistic environment recorded significant relationship on English language performance in terms of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation.

Inasmuch as interactive learning and linguistic environment registered significant relationship to the student’s performance in oral English language; hence in this study the hypothesis stating that there is no significant relation between interactive learning and linguistic environment was completely rejected.

Recommendations:

Based on the findings and conclusions made, the following are recommended:

1. It is recommended that teachers continue to engage ESL students into interactive learning activities in the classroom to encourage the students in using the English language.
2. Teachers should do some modifications in interactive learning to stimulate higher participation among learners. They should be the role models of the English language speakers.
3. Teachers should provide more reading materials for the learners and feed them with words that will enrich their vocabulary.
4. Home (family) as part of the linguistic environment and considered as a big factor that influence the oral English language of the learners must provide, if not all, the available materials needed for the students language development.
5. Vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation can be learnt through constant practice; thus, the students should be made to talk during the English classes.
6. For the administrators, keep on encouraging the teachers to speak English inside and outside the classroom to motivate their students to speak the language, or when the situation calls for it.
7. Send teachers to seminars and trainings pertaining to English language proficiency and confidence.
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