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ABSTRACT

The concept of oral communicative competence dates back to the 1970’s. Linguistic researchers and
linguistic learners have been paying close attention to it including its structures and the
communicative functions that it performs. This study as anchored on the communicative theory of
Canale and Swain which includes three main competencies: grammatical, sociolinguistic and
strategic competence was conducted to determine specifically the level oral Communicative
Competence of the second year Hotel and Restaurant Management Students in the University of the
Immaculate Conception in terms of the voice production, pronunciation, mechanics and content and
what intervention program can be designed. In this study the descriptive-correlational method of
research was employed. The study revealed that the level of oral communicative competence of the
second year HRM students is on the average level. In the hope of becoming highly competent, the
revision of syllabus on English 4 (Speech and Oral Communication) was suggested with the following
inclusions in the revision: in terms of voice production and pronunciation, an insertion of the
discussion of International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) with the emphasis on the specific sounds like the
voiced and voiceless th (ð, θ), ð, ð, ð, ð. In terms of mechanics, an inclusion of segmental and
suprasegmental and in terms of content, lectures and workshops on speech preparation for special
occasion should be considered.

Field of Research: Grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence

I. Introduction

The concept of “communicative competence” dates back to the 1970’s. Linguistic researchers and
linguistic learners have been paying close attention to it including its structures and the
communicative functions that it performs.

The primary function of language is for interaction and communication (Richards, & Rodgers, 1986:
71). According to Walcott in Stern (1990) "Communication or communicative competence has come
to be viewed as the main objective of language teaching; at the same time, communication has
increasingly been seen as the instrument, the method, or way of teaching.

English is recognized as the second language of the Filipinos and is accepted as the medium of choice
among the global workforce. Facility to use English has become both a necessity and a requisite in
most professions. Therefore, it is surmised that oral competence in the English language is a definite
advantage as far as a promising prospect for employment is concerned. One of the competitive
advantages that induce foreign investors to come to the Philippines is that our labor force is English-
speaking.
However, a growing threat that looms is that the use of the English language among Filipinos had deteriorated each year. This is substantiated by the report of the Department of Education (DepEd) on the National Achievement Test in 2004 where more than half of the examinees had a passing grade of only 34% which is way below the “mastery level” of 75% for English (Manila Bulletin, 2005). Accordingly, among graduating high school students, only 6.59 percent could read, speak and comprehend English well enough to enter college while some 44.25 percent had no English skills at all. In the tertiary level, 75 percent of the 400,000 annual graduates have “substandard English Skills”.

One consideration to be put to mind and to be carefully looked into is the Oral Communicative Competence of the students who are enrolled to the Bachelor in Science and Hotel and Restaurant Management (BSHRM) course. It is embedded in the curriculum that the students may opt to have their on the job training (OJT) either in the United States of America or just here in the Philippines. As observed, the frequency of the students who are having their OJT in abroad is higher than those in the Philippines. With this fact, the University is giving consideration on the oral communicative skills among HRM students as they will greatly use this skill in their field in their respective assignments in any of the department in a hotel.

For Filipinos, belonging to an industry like the hospitality services where direct contact with clients who do not speak one’s native language is part of one’s job description, acquiring a working knowledge of the English language is an imperative. By this it refers to oral communicative competence where all four elements of communicative competence defined by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) as: grammatical competence; discourse competence; sociolinguistic competence; and strategic competence all come into play in one’s daily speech situations.

This concept of Canale and Swain on communicative competence is used as the theoretical framework of this study, where it seeks to determine the oral Communicative Competence of the second year Hotel and Restaurant Management Students in the University of the Immaculate Conception. Specifically, it seeks to determine the profile of the second year Hotel and Restaurant Management Students of the University of the Immaculate Conception in terms of the first language spoken, socio-economic status and their grades in English 1, 2 and 3. It also seeks to determine level of the oral communicative competence of the second year Hotel and Restaurant Management Students of the University of the Immaculate Conception in terms of voice production, pronunciation, mechanics and content. Furthermore, the study investigates the significant difference in the students’ level of Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to their profile.

Methods

In this study the researcher used the descriptive correlation method of research which includes correlation tasks which present conditions concerning the nature of the group of persons or class of events which involve procedure of induction, analysis, classification, enumeration and measurement. Furthermore this method of research involves the drawing forth of information regarding current conditions.

In this study too, the researcher correlated the level of communicative competence of second year hotel and restaurant management students in the University of the Immaculate Conception with respect to their profile in terms of voice production, pronunciation, mechanics, and content.

The subjects of the study were the 45 second year Hotel and Restaurant Management students of the University of the Immaculate Conception, Fr. Selga Street, Bankeroohan Davao City school year 2011 – 2012. There were three sections the second year has with a maximum class size of 45
students. The researcher chose 15 students through fish bowl method which is one third of the total population enough to represent the entire population of the second year BSHRM students.

The instruments that were used in the study were The Oral Communicative Rating Sheet. This instrument measured the competence of the students in the voice production, pronunciation, mechanics, and content. Questionnaire on Student’s profile. This instrument surveyed on the students’ first language spoken, socio-economic status and their respective grade in English 1, 2, and 3. IELTS Sample Questionnaire for testing oral communicative competence - This instrument contained particular questions that the rater will ask to the students which will become the basis to measure the students’ competence on oral communication skills most especially with the voice production, pronunciation, mechanics, and content. These instruments were validated by the language experts of the Philippine Normal University, Agusan Campus Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur.

The researcher tabulated, analyzed and interpreted the data as follows: Frequency and percentage distribution was used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents, one way ANOVA was utilized to determine the significant difference in the students’ level of Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to their profile, testing of the hypothesis: there is no significant difference in the students’ level of Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to their profile, was based at α = 0.05 level of significance using a two tailed test.

**Results and Discussion**

**Profile of the respondent**

The profile of the respondents of the study were categorized into three indicators namely: first language spoken, socio-economic status and their grades in English 1, 2 and 3. The following tables help disclose the respondents’ profile.

| Table 2: First Language spoken of the respondents |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| First Language spoken | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Cebuano               | 3         | 6.7        |
| Visayan               | 42        | 93.3       |
| **Total**             | **45**    | **100**    |

Table 2 above discloses that among the total number of respondents of 45, there were 42 of them whose first language spoken is Visayan with a total percentage of 93.3% and the remaining 6.7% which is equivalent to 3 total number of respondents has Cebuano as their first language spoken. This means that, among the second year HRM college students of the University of the Immaculate Conception, almost all of them are speaking Visayan.

| Table 3: Monthly Salary of the Parents of the respondents |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Salary Bracket   | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| 20,000-40,000    | 2         | 4.4        |
| 40,001 – 60,000  | 27        | 60.0       |
| 60,001-80,000    | 16        | 35.6       |
| **Total**        | **45**    | **100.0**  |

Table 3 clearly presents the monthly salary of the parents of the respondents wherein 60% which is equivalent to total number of 27 out of 45 respondents expresses that that their parents earn
40,001-60,000 thousand a month. The remaining percent of 35.6% and 4.4% refers to their parent’s monthly salary between 60,001-80,000 pesos and 20,001-40,000 pesos respectively. This further implies that the parents of the respondents are earning enough.

Table 4: Summary of the Profile of Students According to their Average Academic Performance in English 1, 2 and 3

| Grade grouping | Frequency | Percentage | Description       |
|----------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|
| 86-90          | 18        | 40         | Above Average     |
| 80-85          | 22        | 49         | Average           |
| 76-79          | 5         | 11         | Below Average     |
| Total          | 45        | 100        |                   |

Table 4 above shows the summary of the average academic performance in English 1, 2 and 3 of the second year HRM College students of the University of Immaculate Conception. It is very clear that among the 45 respondents there were 22 of them whose grades fall under the grouping of 80-85 which has the highest percentage of 49% and is interpreted as average. There were only 5 from among the respondents whose grades are below average with reference to the grouping. Therefore, most of the second year students of the University of Immaculate Conception are average in their grades in English 1, 2 and 3.

Level of Oral Competence of Second Year HRM students

With regards to the level of the oral communicative competence of the second year HRM students, consider the following table.

Table 5: Summary of Profile of the Respondent According to Oral Communicative Competence

| Oral Communicative Competence | N  | Standard Deviation | Mean   | Description |
|-------------------------------|----|--------------------|--------|-------------|
| Voice production              | 45 | .18784             | 3.8287 | Average     |
| Pronunciation                 | 45 | .17871             | 3.7462 | Average     |
| Mechanics                     | 45 | .23394             | 3.7400 | Average     |
| Content                       | 45 | .23661             | 3.6993 | Average     |

Scale:
- 4.50 – 5.00 – Very high
- 4.00 – 4.40 – High
- 3.50 – 3.90 – Average
- 3.00 – 3.40 – Low
- 2.00 – 2.90 – Very low

With the four measures on the communicative competence namely; pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and fluency, it is found out that all the respondents from the second HRM students are on the average level in terms of their competence as it is reflected in the scale given to determine the level of the communicative competence of the respondents. This goes without saying that, the respondents are performing well with the said competence.

Significant difference in the students’ level of Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to their profile
On the account of the significant difference in the students’ level of Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to their profile, a good look into the following tables would be necessary.

**Table 6: Analysis of Variance on the Oral Communicative Competence when grouped according to the first language**

|                          | N  | Weighted Mean | Std. Deviation | F    | P-value | Interpretation |
|--------------------------|----|---------------|----------------|------|---------|----------------|
| **Voice Production**     |    |               |                |      |         |                |
| Cebuano                  | 3  | 15.3778       | .38490         | .022 | .883    | Not significant |
| Visayan                  | 42 | 15.3103       | .77349         |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 15.3148       | .75135         |      |         |                |
| **Pronunciation**        |    |               |                |      |         |                |
| Cebuano                  | 3  | 25.8222       | 1.28510        | .326 | .571    | Not significant |
| Visayan                  | 42 | 26.2524       | 1.25946        |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 26.2237       | 1.25097        |      |         |                |
| **Mechanics**            |    |               |                |      |         |                |
| Cebuano                  | 3  | 11.2333       | .05774         | .001 | .973    | Not significant |
| Visayan                  | 42 | 11.0881       | .73425         |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 11.0978       | .70983         |      |         |                |
| **Content**              |    |               |                |      |         |                |
| Cebuano                  | 3  | 22.4667       | .90185         |      |         |                |
| Visayan                  | 42 | 22.4381       | 1.44035        |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 22.4400       | 1.40363        |      |         |                |
| **Overall Competency**   |    |               |                |      |         |                |
| Cebuano                  | 3  | 74.9000       | 2.25389        |      |         |                |
| Visayan                  | 42 | 75.0883       | 3.37820        |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 75.0758       | 3.29656        |      |         |                |

Table 6, displays the significant difference in the respondents’ level of Oral Communicative Competence in terms of their first language spoken. It was found out that since the overall computed value of probability is higher than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 7: Analysis of Variance on the level of the oral competence when respondents are grouped according to the socio-economic status of their parents**

|                          | N | Weighted Mean | Std. Deviation | F    | P-value | Interpretation |
|--------------------------|---|---------------|----------------|------|---------|----------------|
| **Voice Production**     |   |               |                |      |         |                |
| 20k-40k                  | 2 | 15.2500       | 1.43778        | .033 | .967    | Not Significant |
| 40,001-60k               | 27| 15.3383       | .66408         |      |         |                |
| 60,001-80k               | 16| 15.2833       | .86667         |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45| 15.3148       | .75135         |      |         |                |
| **Pronunciation**        |   |               |                |      |         |                |
| 20k-40k                  | 2 | 25.7167       | 2.23917        | .777 | .466    | Not Significant |
| 40,001-60k               | 27| 26.4099       | 1.11535        |      |         |                |
| 60,001-80k               | 16| 25.9729       | 1.39147        |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45| 26.2237       | 1.25097        |      |         |                |
| **Mechanics**            |   |               |                |      |         |                |
| 20k-40k                  | 2 | 21.9000       | .70711         | 1.680| .199    | Not Significant |
| 40,001-60k               | 27| 22.7481       | 1.42245        |      |         |                |
| 60,001-80k               | 16| 21.9875       | 1.34555        |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45| 22.4400       | 1.40363        |      |         |                |
| **Content**              |   |               |                |      |         |                |
| 20k-40k                  | 2 | 10.9500       | 1.06066        | .100 | .905    | Not Significant |
| 40,001-60k               | 27| 11.1333       | .62634         |      |         |                |
| 60,001-80k               | 16| 11.0562       | .84614         |      |         |                |
| Total                    | 45| 11.0978       | .70983         |      |         |                |
| **Overall**              |   |               |                |      |         |                |
| 20k-40k                  | 2 | 73.8200       | 3.32340        | .967 | .388    | Not Significant |
Considering the monthly salary of the parents of the respondents, it was found out that there is no significant difference between the socio-economic status of the parents of the respondents with the oral communicative competence since the overall computed value of probability is higher than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 8: One Way Analysis of Variance in level of the oral communicative competence when grouped according to the Academic performance in English

| Competency      | N  | Weighted Mean | Std. Deviation | F      | P-value | Interpretation |
|-----------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------------|
| Voice Production|    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average(86-90) | 15 | 15.2867       | .56030         | .480  | .750    | Not Significant |
| Average(80-85)   | 23 | 15.3333       | .90163         |       |         |                |
| Below Average(76-79) | 5  | 15.2000       | .59628         |       |         |                |
| Fair/Passing(75) | 1  | 14.9333       | .       |       |         |                |
| Failed(below75) | 1  | 16.2667       | .       |       |         |                |
| Total           | 45 | 15.3148       | .75135        |       |         |                |
| Vocabulary      |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average(86-90) | 15 | 25.7978       | 1.16908        | 1.873 | .134    | Not Significant |
| Average(80-85)   | 23 | 26.4783       | 1.23242        |       |         |                |
| Below Average(76-79) | 5  | 26.1333       | 1.16667        |       |         |                |
| Fair/Passing(75) | 1  | 24.9667       | .       |       |         |                |
| Failed(below75) | 1  | 28.4667       | .       |       |         |                |
| Total           | 45 | 26.2237       | 1.25097       |       |         |                |
| Mechanics       |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average(86-90) | 15 | 22.1333       | 1.16292        |       |         | Not Significant |
| Average(80-85)   | 23 | 22.5652       | 1.70737        |       |         |                |
| Below Average(76-79) | 5  | 22.8000       | .54772         | .287  | .884    | Not Significant |
| Fair/Passing(75) | 1  | 22.4000       | .       |       |         |                |
| Failed(below75) | 1  | 22.4000       | .       |       |         |                |
| Total           | 45 | 22.4400       | 1.40363       |       |         |                |
| Content         |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average(86-90) | 15 | 10.9000       | .56061         | .962  | .439    | Not Significant |
| Average(80-85)   | 23 | 11.1739       | .81532         |       |         |                |
| Below Average(76-79) | 5  | 11.1000       | .54772         |       |         |                |
| Fair/Passing(75) | 1  | 11.2000       | .       |       |         |                |
| Failed(below75) | 1  | 12.2000       | .       |       |         |                |
| Total           | 45 | 11.0978       | .70983        |       |         |                |
| Overall Competency|   |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average(86-90) | 15 | 74.1180       | 2.46030        | .904  | .471    | Not Significant |
| Average(80-85)   | 23 | 75.5500       | 3.85176        |       |         |                |
| Below Average(76-79) | 5  | 75.2320       | 2.61671        |       |         |                |
Table 8 talks about the significant difference between their performance in English 1 and the Level of Oral Communicative Competence, the grades of the respondents do not affect in their oral communicative competence since the overall computed value for the probability is .471 that is higher than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 9: One Way Analysis of Variance in of level of the oral communicative competence when grouped according to the Academic performance in English 2

|                         | N  | Weighted Mean | Std. Deviation | F   | P-value | Interpretation     |
|-------------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-----|---------|--------------------|
| **Voice Production**    |    |               |                |     |         |                    |
| Above Average (86-90)   | 18 | 15.1685       | .71624         | .807| .453    | Not Significant    |
| Average (80-85)         | 22 | 15.4606       | .78340         |     |         |                    |
| Below Average (76-79)   | 5  | 15.2000       | .76012         |     |         |                    |
| Total                   | 45 | 15.3148       | .75135         |     |         |                    |
| **Pronunciation**       |    |               |                |     |         |                    |
| Above Average (86-90)   | 18 | 25.7370       | 1.09083        | 2.824| .071    | Not Significant    |
| Average (80-85)         | 22 | 26.6424       | 1.18680        |     |         |                    |
| Below Average (76-79)   | 5  | 26.1333       | 1.64992        |     |         |                    |
| Total                   | 45 | 26.2237       | 1.25097        |     |         |                    |
| **Mechanics**           |    |               |                |     |         |                    |
| Above Average (86-90)   | 18 | 21.9667       | 1.18471        | 1.807| .177    | Not Significant    |
| Average (80-85)         | 22 | 22.7909       | 1.62067        |     |         |                    |
| Below Average (76-79)   | 5  | 22.6000       | .44721         |     |         |                    |
| Total                   | 45 | 22.4400       | 1.40363        |     |         |                    |
| **Content**             |    |               |                |     |         |                    |
| Above Average (86-90)   | 18 | 10.8444       | .55754         | 2.005| .147    | Not Significant    |
| Average (80-85)         | 22 | 11.2591       | .77929         |     |         |                    |
| Below Average (76-79)   | 5  | 11.3000       | .74162         |     |         |                    |
| Total                   | 45 | 11.0978       | .70983         |     |         |                    |
| **Overall Competency**  |    |               |                |     |         |                    |
| Above Average (86-90)   | 18 | 73.7167       | 2.65259        | 2.948| .063    | Not Significant    |
| Average (80-85)         | 22 | 76.1523       | 3.50272        |     |         |                    |
| Below Average (76-79)   | 5  | 75.2320       | 3.24148        |     |         |                    |
| Total                   | 45 | 75.0758       | 3.29656        |     |         |                    |

Table 9 talks about the significant difference in the respondents’ level of Oral Communicative Competence and their grade in English 2. With the overall computed value of probability of .063 that is higher than 0.05, it is therefore expressed that the null hypothesis is accepted that is, there is no significant difference in the respondents’ level of Oral Communicative Competence and their grade in English 2.
Table 10: One Way Analysis of Variance in of level of the oral communicative competence when grouped according to the Academic performance in English 3

|                          | N  | Weighted Mean | Std. Deviation | F     | P-value | Interpretation |
|--------------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------------|
| **Voice Production**     |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average (86-90)    | 22 | 15.3076       | .75494         | .082  | .921    | Not Significant|
| Average (80-85)          | 18 | 15.3556       | .78449         |       |         |                |
| Below Average (76-79)    |  5 | 15.2000       | .76012         |       |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 15.3148       | .75135         |       |         |                |
| **Pronunciation**        |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average (86-90)    | 22 | 25.9258       | 1.19092        | 1.546 | .225    | Not Significant|
| Average (80-85)          | 18 | 26.6130       | 1.17480        |       |         |                |
| Below Average (76-79)    |  5 | 26.1333       | 1.64992        |       |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 26.2237       | 1.25097        |       |         |                |
| **Mechanics**            |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average (86-90)    | 22 | 22.1455       | 1.43849        | .970  | .387    | Not Significant|
| Average (80-85)          | 18 | 22.7556       | 1.50693        |       |         |                |
| Below Average (76-79)    |  5 | 22.6000       | .44721         |       |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 22.4400       | 1.40363        |       |         |                |
| **Content**              |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average (86-90)    | 22 | 11.0500       | .74242         | .244  | .784    | Not Significant|
| Average (80-85)          | 18 | 11.1000       | .69197         |       |         |                |
| Below Average (76-79)    |  5 | 11.3000       | .74162         |       |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 11.0978       | .70983         |       |         |                |
| **Overall Competency**   |    |               |                |       |         |                |
| Above Average (86-90)    | 22 | 74.4286       | 3.32936        | .888  | .419    | Not Significant|
| Average (80-85)          | 18 | 75.8233       | 3.28955        |       |         |                |
| Below Average (76-79)    |  5 | 75.2320       | 3.24148        |       |         |                |
| Total                    | 45 | 75.0758       | 3.29656        |       |         |                |

The overall computed value of the probability is .419. This value is higher than 0.05, therefore, it is very clear that the null hypothesis which says that there is no significant difference between their grade in English 3 with their oral communicative competence is accepted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study found out that most of the respondents had Visayan as their first language spoken with 93.3% and this consists the 42 respondents out of 45 total number of respondents.

Most of the respondents belong to the middle class in the society considering the socio-economic status of their parents with regards to their monthly salary. The respondents were on the average level in terms of their grades in English 1, 2, & 3 with the consideration of the mean score of their grades. The level oral communicative competence of the respondents was on the average level. The different computed value for each probability was not significant since they are all higher than 0.05.
Based on the findings the following revisions were made: in terms of voice production and pronunciation, an insertion of the discussion of IPA with the emphasis on the specific sounds like the voiced and voiceless th (ð,θ), tʃ, dʒ, j, ʒ. In terms of mechanics there was the inclusion of segmental and suprasegmental and in terms of content, lectures and workshops on speech preparation for special occasion were considered.

Therefore, it is further notified that the respondents performed well in their English classes as their mean score for their grade is average. The level of the oral communicative competence of the respondents was average. Therefore the respondents are quite competent.

However, it was concluded that there is no significant difference between the profile of the respondents in term of first language spoken, socio-economic status and their grades in English 1, 2, & 3 with their level of oral communicative competence.
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