

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

Aliazas, Kimberly Joy C.¹, Velasco, Cecilia Q.²

¹Sta. Lucia National High School

²Laguna State Polytechnic University- San Pablo City Campus

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of communicative language teaching, such as content-based and task-based instruction, in enhancing the speaking competence of grade 11 students in terms of fluency, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and pronunciation. The researcher hopes that the problems encountered in speaking might be alleviated through the study's outcomes and further promotes the use of the approaches used in this study.

The use of these approaches paved the way to enhance further speaking competence in fluency, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and pronunciation. This might open doors to those students who are hesitant to express their ideas in speaking not only in English subjects but also in other disciplines. Through the study's findings, the possible approaches in further promoting these approaches will be clear and hopefully effective. Meanwhile, the study's findings on enhancing the students' speaking competence using communicative language teaching resulted in significant differences in fluency and grammatical accuracy. Whereas in terms of vocabulary and pronunciation, no significant difference was found. The results revealed that in terms of speaking competence, students have improved. However, the results also show that vocabulary and pronunciation skills are the competence found to have found the least mastered by the students since they are still in the adjustment period from the pandemic. They needed to be given more exposure to the vocabulary and practiced their pronunciation skills.

KEYWORDS: Content-based Instruction, Fluency, Grammatical Accuracy, Pronunciation, Task-based Instruction, Vocabulary

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the four macro skills vital in building and sharing meaning in various contexts. It is perceived as the most prominent skill compared to three other language skills: reading, listening, and writing. Speaking is the mode of communication most often used to express opinions, make arguments, offer explanations, transmit information, and make impressions upon others. Students need to speak well in their personal lives, future workplaces, and social interactions. Thus, to enhance speaking competence through communicative language teaching by letting learners communicate meaning, and must be provided with authentic situations to make them participate.

Moreover, Spratt et al. (2005) stated that there are four aspects of speaking: fluency, pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. In addition, Spratt et al. explain that fluency is speaking at a normal speed, without hesitation, repetition, or self-correction, and with smooth use of connected speech. Meanwhile, speaking accuracy is using correct grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation.

Communicative language teaching can be done by practicing formal and informal interactions through games, role-play, and problem-solving tasks. This is for the students to have constant interaction and exposure to the target language. In like manner, Moss and Ross-Feldman (2003) mentioned that communication is any action that requires the learner to talk and listen to others. Breaking through boundaries, obtaining information, expressing oneself, and learning about culture may all be aided by communicative activities. In addition, Jeyasala (2014) stated that the teacher should constantly support students' communicative competence and give them opportunities to connect with people or immerse them in speaking activities that will improve their capacity to utilize the target language.

This study aimed to discern how effective communicative language teaching is in enhancing the students' speaking competence through content and task-based instruction. Furthermore, this study will also help learners be more competent in communicating inside or outside the classroom and in any speaking situations they may encounter. A lot of students are found to be hesitant to express themselves when asked because of their inadequacy in knowledge and skills. Hence, someone generally has difficulties in social interaction, such as being unable to communicate his or her views, arguments, or feelings. Communicative refers to a learner's

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

ability to use language to communicate successfully and effectively. This could help learners to be more competent in communicating with other people or to perform more effectively in any speaking activity using the target language.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To determine the effectiveness of communicative language teaching in enhancing the speaking competence of Grade 11 students in Sta. Lucia National High School.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is a quasi-experimental to determine whether communicative language teaching can enhance the students' speaking competence. The researcher used this method because of the nature of the study at hand. Since the focus of the study is to know which among the content-based instruction and task-based instruction is more effective in the enhancement of the students' speaking competence, two groups of students were used as experimental groups and subjected to the two approaches.

Respondents of the Study

Respondents of the study comprised of selected grade 11 students of academic year 2022-2023 at Sta. Lucia National High School located in Sta. Lucia, Dolores, Quezon. A total of sixty students from two different strands with three sections were respondents of the study at hand. They were chosen as experimental groups since one group composed of thirty students used the content-based instruction while the other experimental group used the task-based instruction approach.

Sampling Technique

The researcher used random sampling technique where the respondents are heterogeneous in nature. The respondents' tasks were also identified in the study; these tasks are as follows: experimental group 1 answered pre-test, performed speaking activities and post-test using content-based instruction. While experimental Group 2 answered pre-test, performed speaking activities and post-test using task-based instruction.

Research Instruments

The study utilized the pre-test and post-test as research instruments to gather data needed to answer the research problems. The written activity consists of two parts namely the 10-item test for grammatical accuracy and the other 10-item test for vocabulary testing the speaking competence of the students using content-based instruction and task-based instruction. Further, the researcher also utilized speaking activities such as role play to test the speaking fluency and reading for pronunciation using both approaches and are graded and evaluated by the three English teachers. Moreover, the instruments that were used in this study is a researcher-adapted activities.

The test was constructed based on the levels of the study which is anchored in the lessons of grade 11 students as well as its most essential learning competencies.

Research Procedure

The experimental group 1 was given a pretest which comprises grammatical accuracy and vocabulary activities focusing on the content-based instruction, whereas the experimental group 2 was also given the pretest containing activities that test their grammatical accuracy and vocabulary skill using the task-based instruction. Then, the pre-performance task was given to each group, as well as the pre-reading task. Afterwards, the researcher started to discuss the lessons intended for the activities accomplished by the two experimental groups. Then, as the lesson was completely done, the posttest was given to the two experimental groups as well as the post-performance and post-reading task. Content-based instruction was still the focus of the experimental group one and task-based instruction for the second group.

Statistical Treatment of Data

In terms of statistical tools in interpreting the data that was collected for the study the researcher employed the T-test to determine what significant difference exists between the use of content-based instruction and task-based instruction focusing on the fluency, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and pronunciation in the post-test result of the respondents. Moreover, to measure the pre-test and post-test result of the respondents, mean and standard deviation were used. Also, frequency is used for the visual representation of the data collected, as well as the application of percentage to make a comparison of one quantity against another, with the second quantity rebased to 100.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Part 1. Pre-test and Post- test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction

Table 1. Pre-test and Post- test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction in terms of Fluency

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
92-100	5	16.7	10	33.3	Excellent
83-91	25	83.3	20	66.7	Good
74-82	-	-	-	-	Fair
65-73	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 92– 100 (Excellent); 83– 91.99 (Good); 74– 82.99 (Fair); 65– 73.99 (Poor)

Table 1 presents the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of fluency. Based on the data above, there is an improvement in respondents’ fluency from 16.7 percent in the pretest who are in good performance now 33.3 percent. This indicates that 7 percent of the total respondents under excellent performance to, 16.6 percent after using the content-based instruction. Additionally, from 83.3 percent under good performance became 66.7 percent. No students got a fair or poor speaking performance before and after using content-based instruction in terms of fluency. Fluency means speaking easily, reasoning quickly, and linking units of speech.

The results of the pretest revealed that the respondents in experimental group one somehow already had prior speaking skills in terms of fluency. However, these learners still fall under good performance. Since these students could not have in-person classes because of the pandemic, caused them to become a little hesitant when speaking. On the other hand, the posttest result shows that there is 16.6 percent of the total respondents progressed to excellent performance because of the intervention given to them that allowed them to practice their speaking skills in terms of fluency, such as making them perform a role-play activity that focused on the content-based instruction approach. This also suggests that using content-based instruction is an effective approach to enhancing speaking competence in fluency.

The previous research conducted by Aisyah Sunarwan (2014) shows that the application of content-based instruction is recommended in teaching English, especially in speaking. The ability to speak fluently is producing speech rapidly and smoothly (Brand & Gotz, 1981). Consequently, fluency occurs when a speaker engages in significant interaction and sustains comprehensible and continuous communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence using the natural language (Richards, 2009, p.14). One reason that makes the content-based instruction approach effective is that it provides the learners with opportunities to practice their speaking skills in authentic contexts while promoting active learning and increasing motivation.

Table 2. Pre-test and Post- test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction in terms of Vocabulary

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
9-10	5	16.7	12	40.0	Excellent
6-8	7	23.3	9	30.0	Good
3-5	9	30.0	8	26.7	Fair
0-2	9	30.0	1	3.3	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 9– 10 (Excellent); 6– 8.99 (Good); 3– 5.99 (Fair); 0– 2.99 (Poor)

Table 2 shows the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of vocabulary. It can be gleaned from the results that the students’ vocabulary performance has improved from 30 percent in the pretest, which falls under poor performance, to only 3.3 percent in the posttest. The finding implies a 23.3 percent increase in the total respondents who have progressed to excellent performance after using the content-based instruction in terms of vocabulary, which refers to the student’s ability to discern what each unfamiliar word might mean in the given sentences. This also shows that utilizing content-based instruction effectively enhances speaking competence in terms of vocabulary. Vocabulary refers to the sentence structure using words in particular and can develop sentences on the given content.

The pretest result of the experimental group one conveys that they are not exposed to activities that immerse them in speaking using different vocabularies. Most respondents fall under poor, fair, and good performance. But as they went through the

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

intervention, which focused on content-based instruction in terms of vocabulary, they were able to enhance their vocabulary skills through the activities given to them as well as the discussions conducted. As shown in the post-test results, there is a 23.3 percent increase in the total respondents who fall under the excellent performance, which was previously 16.7 percent only. Despite enhancing the students' mean post-test scores, constant exposure to unfamiliar words is still needed.

Besides, Buton et al. (n.d), in their research, suggested implementing Content-Based Instruction (CBI) as a medium in teaching speaking to improve the students' vocabulary. Content-based instruction approach provides learners with opportunities to encounter new vocabulary in context, which helps them understand the meaning of words and how they are used in different situations. This approach also encourages learners to use the language actively, as they must communicate their ideas and opinions using the vocabulary they have learned.

Table 3. Pre-test and Post- test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction in terms of Grammatical Accuracy

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
9-10	11	36.7	22	73.3	Excellent
6-8	18	60.0	8	26.7	Good
3-5	1	3.3	-	-	Fair
0-2	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 9– 10 (Excellent); 6– 8.99 (Good); 3– 5.99 (Fair); 0– 2.99 (Poor)

Table 3 displays the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of grammatical accuracy. The results suggest a great improvement in respondents' grammatical accuracy from 60 percent in the pretest, who perform well, to only 26.7 percent in the posttest. This illustrates that after using the content-based instruction, there is an increase of 36.6 percent of the total respondents who improved to excellent performance and from 3.3 percent in the pretest who belonged to fair performance to 0 percent in the posttest. Moreover, there are no students who fall under poor speaking performance before and after utilizing content-based instruction in terms of grammatical accuracy, which refers to how to correct learners' use of the language system, including their use of grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary and is often compared when we talk about a learner's level of speaking or writing. The data above also suggests that using content-based instruction effectively enhances speaking competence regarding grammatical accuracy.

As indicated in the pretest result of the respondents in experimental group one, there is only 3.3 percent who observed to have no prior knowledge of grammatical accuracy. Since this respondent falls under fair performance. However, most of these respondents fall under the good performance, which conveys that they have the background knowledge of using the language system correctly. Meanwhile, the posttest result suggests that the respondents have greatly improved. Statistically, 36.6 percent of the total respondents reached excellent performance. This implies that the intervention focusing on content-based instruction effectively enhances the students' speaking competence regarding grammatical accuracy.

Stoller (2002) posits that content-based instruction is intended to promote the integration of language and content, which views "language as a medium for learning content and content as a resource for learning and improving the language." Furthermore, content-based instruction provides a more engaging and motivating learning experience for students as they can connect with the content and see its relevance to their lives. This can lead to increased class participation and engagement, further enhancing their learning. The effectiveness of content-based instruction on grammatical accuracy to enhance speaking competence highlights the importance of using authentic materials. By doing so, teachers can help students develop their grammar skills and overall communicative competence.

Table 4. Pre-test and Post- test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction in terms of Pronunciation

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
92-100	4	13.3	8	26.7	Excellent
83-91	25	83.4	22	73.3	Good
74-82	1	3.3	-	-	Fair
65-73	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 92– 100 (Excellent); 83– 91.99 (Good); 74– 82.99 (Fair); 65– 73.99 (Poor)

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

Table 4 shows the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of pronunciation. As seen in the table, the respondents' enhancement is evident in pronunciation, from 3.3 percent in the pretest, who perform well, to 0 percent in the posttest. This suggests a 10.1 percent increase in the total respondents with good performance and a 13.4 percent increase in the total respondents who progressed to excellent performance after utilizing content-based instruction. Further, no students had poor speaking performance before and after using content-based instruction in terms of pronunciation, which pertains to producing the sounds of speech. And this includes articulation, stress, and intonation, often concerning some standard of correctness or acceptability.

The respondents, before the use of the content-based instruction approach, are found to have difficulty pronouncing words correctly. Although there is only one respondent who falls under fair performance, as seen in the result, twenty-five respondents fall under good performance. This conveys that the respondents were not given enough opportunity to speak to practice their pronunciation during their modular learning mode as a result of the pandemic. But as they were allowed to practice pronouncing words, they could read words more correctly. Because of the pronunciation intervention focused on the content-based instruction approach to these respondents, they could utter a sequence of sounds correctly. This also indicates that the content-based instruction approach effectively enhances speaking competence regarding pronunciation.

Pronunciation is how words are uttered, which produces individual sounds (Carter in Tahir, 2012: 150). Buton et al. (n.d.), in their research, suggested implementing Content-Based Instruction (CBI) as a medium in teaching speaking to improve the student's pronunciation. For instance, a study by Derwing et al. (2009) found that students who received CBI had better pronunciation scores than those who did not. Pronunciation is a crucial aspect of language learning. It is the foundation upon which communication is built. However, due to insufficient research, the results showed that using content-based instruction can enhance students' speaking competence.

Table 5 presents the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of fluency. As shown on the data above, there is an explicit improvement with respondents' fluency from 100 percent in the pretest who are in good performance to 83.3 percent in the posttest and there are no students who got an excellent performance in the pretest. This suggests that 16.7 percent of the total respondents now belong to excellent performance after utilizing the task-based instruction. There are no students who got a fair or poor speaking performance before and after utilizing task-based instruction.

Table 5. Pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents in speaking competence using Task-Based Instruction in terms of Fluency

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
92-100	-	-	5	16.7	Excellent
83-91	30	100	25	83.3	Good
74-82	-	-	-	-	Fair
65-73	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 92– 100 (Excellent); 83– 91.99 (Good); 74– 82.99 (Fair); 65– 73.99 (Poor)

As indicated in the pretest result, the respondents fall under the good performance and none of them falls under the excellent performance. This implies that they have already the skill in speaking in terms of fluency. But this speaking skill that they already have still need to improve to reach the excellent performance, which is able to speak more easily, without having to pause a lot. Further, as revealed in the posttest results of the respondents, 16.7 percent progressed to excellent performance. This suggests that there is a little improvement in their speaking competence in terms of fluency after the intervention was given. The respondents were given the opportunity to be immersed in speaking activity like role playing which helps students to practice speaking with fluency which focuses on the task-based instruction approach. Task-based instruction (TBI) is an effective approach that emphasizes the use of authentic tasks to promote fluency and speaking competence. This approach has been shown to be effective in enhancing learners' speaking competence.

Thus, Alwi, et.al. (2015); Haghi et. al. (2014) believes that if students were exposed to active, engaging, and collaborative language learning activities, speaking fluency and confidence would improve. Research has demonstrated that TBI can lead to significant improvements in learners' speaking proficiency, as it provides them with opportunities to practice using the language in meaningful contexts. By engaging in tasks that require them to communicate with others, learners are able to develop their ability to express themselves clearly and effectively. Overall, the effectiveness of TBI on fluency is clear. By providing learners with opportunities for authentic communication through meaningful tasks, this approach can enhance their speaking competence and promote greater fluency in the target language.

Table 6. Pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents in speaking competence using Task-Based Instruction in terms of Vocabulary

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
9-10	1	3.3	16	53.3	Excellent
6-8	7	23.3	12	40.0	Good
3-5	20	66.7	2	6.7	Fair
0-2	2	6.7	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 9– 10 (Excellent); 6– 8.99 (Good); 3– 5.99 (Fair); 0– 2.99 (Poor)

Table 6 illustrates the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of vocabulary. It can be gleaned from the results that there is a great improvement with respondents' vocabulary from 6.7 percent in the pretest who belong to poor performance to 0 percent in the posttest. This conveys that there is 60 percent decrease from the pretest in the total respondents who belong to fair and there is 16.7 percent and 50 percent increase in the total respondents who fall under good and excellent performance respectively after using task-based instruction.

The pretest result shows that the respondents are found to have not enough exposure to the different vocabularies that make them unfamiliar to most of the words presented to them. One of the reasons that the researcher has observed why this was so, was these students were not able to attend their face-to-face classes because of the pandemic. This made them to have a fair performance in vocabulary. But there is only one student who reached the excellent performance. On the other hand, in terms of the posttest results of the respondents, it is found that there are fifty percent of the total respondents who reached the excellent performance after the intervention focuses on the task-based instruction approach that was provided to them. The intervention given to them has helped them to increase their knowledge on the vocabularies they seldom encounter in their daily lives. The results also show that task-based instruction is an approach effective in enhancing speaking competence with regard to vocabulary.

As indicated in the research of Richards and Rodgers (2001), task-based instruction seeks to teach vocabulary both directly and indirectly in a natural context. The acquisition of vocabulary plays a vital role in how learners will speak confidently and language learning as well. Thus, Richards & Renandaya (2002) asserts that vocabulary is the primary component of language proficiency and gives much of the basis for how well learners listen, speak, write and listen. By using tasks that require learners to use new vocabulary in context, they are more likely to remember and use these words in their own speech. Research has shown that task-based instruction can lead to significant improvements in speaking competence and vocabulary acquisition.

Table 7. Pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents in speaking competence using Task-Based Instruction in terms of Grammatical Accuracy

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
9-10	6	20.0	12	40.0	Excellent
6-8	20	66.7	16	53.3	Good
3-5	4	13.3	2	6.7	Fair
0-2	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 9– 10 (Excellent); 6– 8.99 (Good); 3– 5.99 (Fair); 0– 2.99 (Poor)

The table above shows the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of grammatical accuracy. Based on the data above, there is an explicit improvement in respondents' grammatical accuracy from 13.3 percent in the pretest who are in fair performance to 6.7 in the posttest. This implies that there is a 13.4 percent decrease in the total respondents who got good performance; however, there is a 20 percent increase in the total respondents who got excellent performance after utilizing task-based instruction. Also, no students fall under poor performance before and after using task-based instruction.

The pretest result indicates that the respondents do not have enough basic knowledge of grammatical accuracy. They committed numerous errors in the basic rules of grammar, which these students supposedly mastered. Although twenty percent of the total respondents fall under the excellent performance, the researcher conducted a discussion on the basic rules of grammar as one of the interventions provided to them. Whereas the posttest result conveys that the respondents attained a little improvement in their grammatical accuracy, some still fall under fair performance. Through the intervention given to the respondents, which focused on the task-based instruction approach, they improved their grammatical accuracy. The data also shows that using task-based instruction effectively enhances speaking competence in terms of grammatical accuracy.

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

The importance of grammatical accuracy was highlighted by Russel Paul of America's World New Site, that grammar gives language users control of expression and communication in everyday life. The research has shown that task-based instruction improves learners' grammatical accuracy. Tasks provide opportunities for learners to practice using grammar structures in context, which helps them understand how grammar works and how it is used in communication.

Table 8. Pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents in speaking competence using Task-Based Instruction in terms of Pronunciation

Scores	Pre-test		Post-test		Remarks
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
92-100	1	3.3	6	20.0	Excellent
83-91	23	76.7	22	73.3	Good
74-82	6	20.0	2	6.7	Fair
65-73	-	-	-	-	Poor
Total	30	100	30	100	

Legend: 92– 100 (Excellent); 83– 91.99 (Good); 74– 82.99 (Fair); 65– 73.99 (Poor)

Table 8 presents the pretest and posttest results of the respondents in speaking competence in terms of pronunciation. It can be found from the results that the respondents have enhanced their pronunciation from 20 percent in the pretest belonging to fair performance, to 6.7 in the posttest. This illustrates a slight decrease in the total number of respondents who perform well, such as 3.4 percent. However, 16.7 percent of the total respondents progressed to excellent performance. No students got a poor speaking performance before and after using the task-based instruction.

The result obtained in the pretest of the respondents in terms of pronunciation implies that they still find difficulties when asked to pronounce words. Since these students could not practice speaking as they were affected by the pandemic, they were not given enough opportunities to be immersed in speaking activities. In contrast, the posttest result shows that the respondents made little improvement after an intervention focusing on the task-based instruction approach. This suggests that students who are exposed to different speaking activities can speak with proper intonation, articulation, and stress. This also indicates that using task-based instruction is an effective approach to enhancing speaking in terms of pronunciation.

In totality, it is evident that the scores and performance of the students have improved after using both approaches; content-based instruction and task-based instruction. This can be attributed to several factors. One of these is that Communicative Language Teaching focuses on authentic communication, which means that students are encouraged to use the language they are learning in real-life situations. This helps them develop their speaking skills more quickly and effectively. Thus, Communicative Language Teaching effectively improves students' speaking skills because it focuses on authentic communication, encourages interaction between students, and uses a variety of engaging activities and materials.

Part II. Test of Difference in the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction

Table 9. Difference in the Pre-test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction

Variables	CBI		TBI		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Fluency	88.35	2.012	87.35	2.004	2.206	29	.035
Vocabulary	4.80	3.221	4.70	1.860	.154	29	.879
Grammatical Accuracy	7.90	1.605	7.27	1.507	1.482	29	.149
Pronunciation	87.37	3.102	85.90	3.336	1.967	29	.059

Legend: If p-value (Sig.) < 0.05, it is statistically significant.

If p-value (Sig.) > 0.05, it is NOT statistically significant.

Table 9 presents the pretest score of the respondents in speaking competence before using content-based and task-based instruction.

Based on the data above, a significant difference between the two groups is found in fluency. A mean of 88.35 using content-based instruction and 87.35 using task-based instruction indicates that the respondents in the experimental group who focused on the content-based instruction approach could already express with a little confidence and without undue hesitation when speaking as they performed their role-play activity. While the second experimental group also has the same competence, only with a little difference. Both groups fall under good performance.

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

Results also suggest that there is still a need to improve the students' speaking competence to reach excellent speaking performance and be prepared for the advanced level of schooling.

Table 10. Difference in the Post-test Scores of the Respondents in Speaking Competence using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction.

Variables	CBI		TBI		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Fluency	90.56	1.524	89.07	1.838	3.686	29	.001
Vocabulary	7.27	2.651	8.40	1.673	1.958	29	.060
Grammatical Accuracy	9.03	1.066	8.00	1.486	3.346	29	.002
Pronunciation	89.30	3.515	89.27	3.331	.039	29	.969

Legend: If p-value (Sig.) < 0.05, it is statistically significant.

If p-value (Sig.) > 0.05, it is NOT statistically significant.

Table 10 illustrates the posttest scores of the respondents in speaking competence after using content-based and task-based instruction.

As indicated in the table, a significant difference between the two groups is found. In fluency, a mean of 90.56 using content-based instruction and 89.07 using task-based instruction indicates that the respondents in the experimental group one can already express with a little confidence, reasonably quickly, and with correct facial expression when speaking as they performed their role-play activity. The second experimental group has the same competence, only with a little difference. Both groups fall under good performance.

In like manner, a mean of 9.03 using content-based instruction and 8.00 using task-based instruction in terms of grammatical accuracy conveys that the respondents in the experimental group one already know the correct use of the language system. While the second experimental group also has the same competence with too little difference. Both groups fall under good performance.

Results also indicate that both approaches under communicative language teaching effectively enhance the respondents' speaking competence. In his research, Vanichvasin (2019) shows that content-based instruction could be used as an effective methodology and essential aid in providing opportunities to use English, which produced positive results such as increased English language performance. Many researchers considered this teaching approach an effective and realistic method of combining language and content learning. Content-based instruction can be utilized in different ways depending on the skills being taught and includes not only the methods in traditional teachings, such as grammar-based instruction or vocabulary development, but also contemporary approaches, such as communicative language teaching. (Crandall, J.,1999)

In the same way, Yousif (2017) pointed out in his study that task-based instruction has a positive effect on improving students' speaking. This provides opportunities to employ significant and effective activities and thus foster communicative language use in the classroom. Further, task-based instruction is considered an effective approach that promotes a learning environment in which learners can choose freely and utilize the target language forms which they suppose are most likely to achieve the goal of accomplishing defined communicative goals (Ellis, 2003; Willis, 1996).

Nonetheless, as indicated in the results, communicative language teaching is effective to utilize in enhancing the students' speaking competence which is evident in the posttest results of this study. However, the respondents need more exposure in terms of vocabulary and more practice when it comes to pronunciation.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results presented, the following conclusion is drawn;

1. There is no significant difference between pretest scores of the respondents in speaking competence using content-based instruction and task-based instruction in terms of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy and pronunciation. However, in terms of fluency significant difference was found before using content-based instruction and task-based instruction. Thus, the hypothesis is partially supported.
2. Based on the result, there is significant difference between the posttest scores of the respondents in fluency and grammatical accuracy. However, in terms of vocabulary and pronunciation it is found that there is no significance. This is because limited timeframe and exposure was given to them. Since the respondents are still in the adjustment period from the pandemic. Overall, in terms of fluency and grammatical accuracy, a little difference was found after using content-based instruction and task-based instruction. Thus, the hypothesis is partially supported.

Communicative Language Teaching for an Enhanced Speaking Competence of Grade 11 Students in Sta. Lucia National High School

RECOMMENDATIONS

Established from the summary of findings and conclusion previously discussed and presented, the following recommendations are hereby suggested.

1. Teachers may utilize both approaches in communicative language teaching, content-based instruction and task-based instruction, in teaching speaking since enhancement in speaking competence, such as fluency and grammatical accuracy, is evident. They may provide more speaking activities that will use either of the two approaches but focus more on vocabulary and pronunciation.
2. Teachers may use task-based instruction in immersing learners in real-world speaking situations and providing them with many opportunities to speak to promote further development of their vocabulary and pronunciation skills.
3. Future researchers may conduct a study using the same approaches but focusing more on vocabulary and pronunciation, which are also important in the development of the students' speaking competence to transform teaching by providing teachers with new tools for helping learners to enhance their speaking competence more effectively.

REFERENCES

- 1) Alwi, N. A. N. M., et. al. (2015). The role of task complexity and task motivation in language production. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 15(2), 33-49.
- 2) Brand, C., & Götz, S. (2011). Fluency versus accuracy in advanced spoken learner language: A multi-method approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 16, 255-275. doi:10.1075/ijcl.16.2.05bra
- 3) Crandall, J. (1999). Content-Based Instruction (CBI). *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 208-604). Oxford, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 4) Davies, S. (2003). Content Based Instruction in EFL Contexts. *Internet Tesl Journal*, 2
- 5) Derwing, Tracey & Munro, Murray & Thomson, Ron & Rossiter, Marian. (2009). The relationship between L1 fluency and L2 fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 31. 533 - 557. 10.1017/S0272263109990015.
- 6) Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 7) Haghi, E. B. et. al. (2014). The impact of task-based approach on Iranian EFL learners' motivation in writing research abstracts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 953-962. doi:10.4304/jltr.5.4.953-962
- 8) Jeyasala, V. R. (2014). A prelude to practice: Interactive activities for effective communication in English. *Alternative pedagogies in the English language & communication classroom*, 164-170.
- 9) Moss, D., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2003). Second language acquisition in adults: From research to practice. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/CAELA/esl_resources/digests/SLA.html
- 10) Richards, Jack C. 2009. *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From theory to Practice* (REL C Portfolio Series). Singapore: Regional Language Center available at: <http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/teachinglistening-and-speaking-from-theory-to-practice.pdf>
- 11) Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190>
- 12) Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 13) Spratt, M., Pulverness, A. & Williams, M. (2005). *The TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) Course*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- 14) Stoller, F. L. (2002). Promoting the Acquisition of Knowledge in a Content-based Course. In J. Crandall, & D. Kaufman (Eds.). *Content-based Instruction in Higher Education Settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- 15) Sunarwan, Aisyah. "The Effectiveness of Content-based Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed From Students' Creativity." *Pedagogy*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2014, pp. 19-29.
- 16) Tahir, S. Z. B. (2012). Redefining Terms of Teaching and Learning Strategy, Method, Approach, Technique, and Model. Public lecture on Microteaching at English Education Department of University of Iqra Buru, November 01st 2012.
- 17) Vanichvasin, P. (2019). Effects of content-based instruction on English language performance of Thai undergraduate students in a Non-English program. *English Language Teaching*, 12(8), 20. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n8p20>
- 18) Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. London: Longman. WU, Wen. (2008). Misunderstanding of Communicative Language Teaching. *CCSE*, 1(1): 50-53.
- 19) Yousif, A. S. A. (2017). The effect of communicative task-based instruction on developing students' oral communication skills at Sudanese universities (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sudan University of Science and Technology, Khartoum, Sudan.