

INNOVATION OF AN ORAL COMMUNICATION ONLINE- MODULAR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL FOR GRADE-11 STUDENTS

Cherry Rose A. Bautista-Salcedo¹, Felipa M. Rico²

¹ Department of Education, Schools Division of Zambales, Philippines

² President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7038001>

Published Date: 31-August-2022

Abstract: Having the ability to write and speak well puts an individual at an advantage— may it be in the academe, workplace, or even in the contexts of day-to-day communication. However, developing the writing and speaking skills are also the two macro-skills that the students are often having difficulties with. This study aimed to assess the level of proficiency in Oral Communication particularly speech delivery of Grade-11 students in the far-flung schools of San Marcelino, Zambales, Philippines for the First Semester of School Year 2020-2021. This study also evaluated the usefulness of a crafted Online-Modular Instructional Material in Oral Communication, titled "TICTalk" on the topics of Principles of Effective Speech Writing and Speech Delivery, with Oral Communication teachers as respondent- evaluators.

The researchers used a descriptive-evaluation design with the two sets of questionnaires as the main instrument. The responses were coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics—frequency counts, weighted mean, percentage, and descriptive interpretation. The key findings revealed that the student-respondents are not proficient in Oral Communication and they encountered challenges particularly in Word Choice, Syntax, Logical Organization, and Articulation. In addition, the innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material with the title Trends in Communication Talk (TIC-Talk) was considered "Very Useful" by the teacher-respondent evaluators. The Online-Modular Instructional Material may be used as a learning resource material, for it was rated as Very Useful. Nevertheless, further validation of the material and several consultations must be done by the researcher before the actual wide-range consumption of other educators.

Keywords: Oral Communication, Effective Speech Writing and Speech Delivery, Instructional Material, Innovation, Zambales, Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

Being able to converse well and communicate with different types of people in various situations is now one of the major demands in society, education, the workplace, and the global realm. The skill of a good public speaker is developed through practice and hard work—there is no quick path to a great speech (Lumen Learning, 2020). Anxiety in giving speeches or speaking in public in different contexts is one of the most difficult challenges that someone has to conquer. Many students avoid speaking activities as much as they can, even when they were already having face-to-face classes in the previous years.

A variety of communication strategies are often presented to students for them to cope with the difficulties in speaking and oral communication in general aspect. Inkaew and Thumawongsa (2018) found out that there were significant differences in communication strategies used among the different level Thai EFL students, in their case study of English Oral Communication strategies used among Thai EFL students of different English proficiency levels (Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced). At different proficiency levels, there was approximation by Beginning, language switch by Intermediate, and topic avoidance by Advanced. In another study done by Pangket (2019) regarding the Oral Communication proficiency of Grade-5 pupils, the results showed that the oral proficiency in English of the pupils needs improvement in their fluency in speech, accuracy in the form, and production of grammatically correct linguistic structures, and demonstration of appropriate non-verbal cues as these features in oral communication are interrelated.

Several studies about Oral Communication proposed ways on how to develop speaking and communication skills. A study about the Business Graduate Performance in Oral Communication Skills and Strategies for Improvement done by Jackson (2014), suggested that there is a disparity between graduate and employer perceptions of the standard of oral communication upon graduation. In another study done by Noblitt, Vance, and Smith (2010), the results provided evidence that case studies were a more effective approach for teaching scientific Oral Communication skills. A think-pair-share strategy such as the study of Raba (2017) recommended that in order to improve students' oral communicative skills.

Instructional materials perform various roles that the students find a unique assortment of learning experiences. Evangelista, Ayuste, Belmi, Butron, Cortez, Evangelista, Fernandez, Garcia, Limson, and Tondo (2014) noted that various instructional materials supplement and complement the teacher's verbal explanations thereby making the learning experience richer and providing the teacher with interest in a wide variety of learning activities. Innovative teaching and learning design at the Senior High School level is needed to empower the strength of 21st-century learners, and it is this change that has directed many schools today to emphasize innovative education and embed a student-centered learning approach into the course design (Leow & Neo, 2014). Educators were challenged to innovate, utilizing technological tools in order to support student-centered learning in the classroom.

In the Philippines, Oral Communication is one of the core subjects in the Senior High School curriculum across all tracks and strands, which is usually offered in Grade-11. In this study, the researchers assessed the level of proficiency in Oral Communication particularly speech delivery of Grade 11 learners in the far-flung schools of San Marcelino, Zambales. In addition, this study also evaluated the extent of usefulness of a crafted Online-Modular Instructional Material in Oral Communication regarding the Principles of Effective Speech Writing and Speech Delivery, specifically in terms of content, level of difficulty, and presentation of the material.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of proficiency in Oral Communication particularly the speech delivery of the students in terms of:
 - 1.1 Word Choice and Syntax
 - 1.2 Logical Organization and Duration
 - 1.3 Articulation and Modulation
2. What are the challenges in speech delivery of the students in terms of:
 - 2.1 Word Choice and Syntax
 - 2.2 Logical Organization and Duration
 - 2.3 Articulation and Modulation
3. What is/are the preferred Learning Delivery Modality/ies (LDM) of the students?
4. What type of instructional material (IM) can be innovated based on the preferred Learning Delivery Modality to improve the proficiency in speech delivery of the students?
5. How is the extent of the usefulness of the innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material in terms of:
 - 5.1 Content
 - 5.2 Level of Difficulty
 - 5.3 Presentation of the Material

II. METHODOLOGY

The study used the descriptive- evaluation design since its primary aim was to assess and evaluate the instructional material which would be used in teaching Oral Communication, specifically speech topics that could be supplemented by this particular Online-Modular Instructional Material—which the researcher believed has the potential to improve the speaking and communication skills anchored in the speech delivery process. This method was used to gather relevant data and information about research variables. More specifically, the researcher gathered data through a checklist- questionnaire and further used qualitative questions in order to qualify data, with the standards in Oral Communication subject and the model in the construction of the instructional material, as bases.

The study was anchored on the thought that there have been certain areas in speech communication that the scholars were scuffling with. For that reason, a research-proven instructional material was needed to be developed so as to help the scholars in enhancing their auditory communication skills. Robert Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction was used because the theoretical framework of this study. This theory stipulates that there are several differing types or levels of learning. Gagné's book 'The Conditions of Learning' (1965) noted that the importance of those classifications is that every different type requires differing types of instruction.

The main instruments used in gathering the data for this study were two sets of questionnaires. The first set of questionnaires was for the 52 Grade-11 students of the far-flung schools of San Marcelino, Zambales. The questionnaire was divided into three parts: the Level of Proficiency in Speech Delivery, the Challenges in Speech Delivery, and the Preferred Learning Delivery Modality. The second set of questionnaires was for the 30 Oral Communication teachers of Zone IV. It was a checklist- type of questionnaire which served as an evaluation tool for the usefulness of the innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material in terms of Content, Level of Difficulty, and Presentation of the Material.

The validity of the instrument was proven authentic and reliable based on the rubric in Oral Communication which was designed with the consideration of the standards in speech delivery. The questionnaire was also patterned in the study of Pagcaliwagan (2015) in which the questions were selected and taken from. Experts were also consulted on whether the instrument measures the concept intended.

Using the result of the assessment and evaluation on the Level of Proficiency of students as well as the challenges that must be focused on, the researchers designed an instructional material that was intended to develop the Oral Communication skills of the students. In addition, the researcher also consulted the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) in Oral Communication for the content and the preferred Learning Delivery Modality/ies of the students to consider the format of the Instructional Material.

Data collected from the sets of questionnaires were tallied, analyzed, and summarized accordingly. Assessment and evaluation data provided means to look at the students' performance in order to offer evidence about the status of proficiency level in Oral Communication. Also, the collection of evaluation data on the usefulness of instructional material was essential in order to appropriately utilize and communicate results. In this study, the responses were coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics—frequency counts, weighted mean, percentage, and descriptive interpretation.

In identifying the Level of Proficiency in Oral Communication of students, a modified 4-point Likert Scale was used:

Level of Proficiency in Oral Communication: Point, Scale, and Descriptive Interpretation

Point	Scale	Descriptive Interpretation
4	3.26-4.0	Highly Proficient
3	2.6-3.25	Proficient
2	1.76-2.5	Less Proficient
1	1.0-1.75	Not Proficient

In determining the Usefulness of the Instructional Material, a modified 4-point Likert Scale was also utilized:

Usefulness of Instructional Material: Point, Scale, and Descriptive Interpretation

Point	Scale	Descriptive Interpretation
4	3.26-4.0	Very Useful
3	2.6-3.25	Useful
2	1.76-2.5	Not Useful
1	1.0-1.75	Very Not Useful

The following were used in the analysis of the data:

1. Weighted Mean and Percentage- Frequency distribution was used by the researcher to identify the Level of Proficiency of Students in Oral Communication, as well as their preferred Learning Delivery Modality/ies and the Usefulness of the Innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material.
2. Frequency Count was also used in item analysis for the challenges in Oral Communication.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and interpretation of the findings based on collected data, related literature and studies, and the researcher's observations and actual experience. This section focuses on the quantitative data from the sets of questionnaires and the statistical analyses of the items and parts for a better and clear understanding on the problems asked in Chapter 1.

1. Level of Proficiency in Speech Delivery

Table 1 shows the summary on the level of proficiency in speech delivery of the student-respondents.

Table 1: Level of Proficiency in Speech Delivery

Articulation and Modulation	Mean	Rating
Word Choice and Syntax	2.23	Not Proficient
Logical Organization and Duration	3.44	Not Proficient
Articulation and Modulation	3.10	Not Proficient
Overall Weighted Mean = 2.92 (Not Proficient)		

The computed mean for word choice and syntax was 2.23, with a qualitative interpretation of "Not Proficient". In logical organization and duration, the computed mean was 3.44, with a qualitative interpretation of "Not Proficient". And for articulation and modulation, 3.10 was the computed mean interpreted as "Not Proficient". The computed overall mean is 2.92 interpreted as "Not Proficient". Consequently, most of the student-respondents are Not Proficient in Speech Delivery.

The entirety of the Speech Delivery Level of Proficiency result of this study was supported by the study of San Jose and Vicencio (2018), which showed that there was a poor level in delivery, language use and topic development of students. The results give a clear condition of the students' speaking in these three aspects; thus, making it a significant reference line of information in improving the speaking skills of the students. Moreover, the oral proficiency in English of the respondents needs improvement, specifically their fluency in speech, and accuracy in the form; also, the production of grammatically correct linguistic structures, and demonstration of appropriate nonverbal cues should be developed as these features in oral communication are interrelated (Pangket, 2019).

2. Challenges in Speech Delivery

2.1. Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Word Choice and Syntax

Table 2 presents the challenges in speech delivery in terms of word choice and syntax of student-respondents.

Table 2: Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Word Choice and Syntax

Word Choice	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Words are constantly being used incorrectly	35	67.31
Unclear	27	51.92
Specific	21	40.38
Accuracy	19	36.54
Repetitive	19	36.54
Use different expression or sentence pattern	12	23.08
Awkward Phrasing	11	21.15
Wordy	7	13.46
Use specialized language	4	7.69

Off the subject.	3	5.77
Obvious	2	3.85
Condense	1	1.92
Syntax	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Grammar	41	78.85
Faulty Tense of Verb	33	63.46
Agreement	24	46.15
Article	23	44.23
Fragment	22	42.31
Misplaced Modifier	20	38.46
Preposition	16	30.77
Dangling Modifier	13	25.00
Adverb	6	11.54
Adjective	4	7.69
Parallelism	3	5.77
N=52 (Total number of Respondents)		

As to the word choice, out of fifty-two student-respondents, 35 or 67.31% were having some problems with words that are constantly being used incorrectly; twenty-seven (27) or 51.92% were unclear such as “*you wash your hands like this*”, “*wear your facemask this way*”, “*just do this*” etc.; twenty-one (21) or 40.38% were unspecific like: “*I discovered new things*”, “*we should follow protocols*”, “*only go outside when necessary*”, etc.; nineteen (19) or 36.54% did not ensure the accuracy of the information (accuracy) and repetitive, they did not employ different expressions; twelve (12) or 23.08% did not vary their sentence pattern; eleven (11) or 21.15% used awkward phrases; seven (7) or 13.46% were wordy, which means that there were unnecessary words used; four (4) or 7.69% used specialized language; three (3) or 5.77% were off the subject; two (2) or 3.85% were obvious, in which there was no need to state the point in such detail; and one (1) or 1.92% did not verbally condense large amount of information in to a concise one. This study then found that the top three word choice difficulties of student-respondents were: incorrect use of words, followed by unclear terms or sentences, and the use of unspecific terms on the third spot.

As to syntax, out of fifty-two student-respondents, forty-one (41) or 78.85% were found to have grammatical errors; thirty-three (33) or 63.46% had faulty tense of verb; twenty-four (24) or 46.15% had subject and verb agreement errors; twenty-three (23) or 44.23% committed errors on the proper use of articles; twenty-two (22) or 42.31% had sentence fragment; twenty (20) or 38.46% had misplaced modifiers; sixteen (16) or 30.77% used incorrect prepositions; six (6) or 11.54% had misused the adverbs; four (4) or 7.69% had used the adjectives wrong and three (3) or 5.77% had faulty parallelism.

Hence, it was then found in this study that the top three syntax errors of the student-respondents were: first, grammar, then tense of verb, and subject and verb agreement. The results of this study was supported by the claims of Dutro, Levy, and Moore (2011) which stated that while English learners often master everyday conversational language, they struggle to master the vocabulary and syntax required for academic tasks, such as argumentation. Pescante-Malimas and Samson (2017) also noted that across all programs of their student-respondents, the top linguistic error is grammar, of which, the top three grammatical errors were: disagreement between the pronoun and antecedent which marked the highest number of errors, followed by the wrong usage of tense, and lastly, disagreement between the verb and the subject. The result of this study also concurred with the study of Ulla (2014) in which she noted that pronoun-antecedent agreement has not been fully grasped by the respondents resulting in this particular grammatical error being one of the highest percentages of errors in her study.

However, Ting (2010) identified in her study that in a linguistic description of the errors, prepositions and questions are the most difficult for the less proficient students constituting about 35% of total errors, followed by word form and article (about 11% each). The other types of errors are relatively less frequent: subject-verb agreement, plural form, tense, pronoun, the disordering of a question, and negative statements. There are also severe grammatical errors and the types of errors are not easily identifiable.

2.2. Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Logical Organization and Duration

Table 3 presents the challenges in speech delivery in terms of logical organization and duration of student-respondents.

Table 3: Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Logical Organization and Duration

Logical Organization	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Transition	38	73.08
Organization	33	63.46
Reference	32	61.54
Develop	30	57.69
Weak Explanation	29	55.77
Choppy Sentences	21	40.38
Incomplete	17	32.69
Logic	15	28.85
Redundant	13	25.00
Emphasize	12	23.08
Direct	8	15.38
Off the subject	3	5.77
Use shorter sentences	3	5.77
Follow proper organizational approach	2	3.85
Duration	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Duration	13	25.00
N=52 (Total number of Respondents)		

As to logical organization, out of fifty-two student-respondents, thirty-eight (38) or 73.08% were not able to employ correct transition, which means that they failed to show connection between points of argument; thirty-three (33) or 63.46% were found to have problems with organization, in a way that the outline of discussion of the oral performance task was messy; thirty-two (32) or 61.54% had problems with reference, in which they failed to cite their sources of information; thirty (30) or 57.69% were not able to develop their ideas when they should have had provided greater details; twenty-nine (29) or 55.77% had weak explanation of concepts; twenty-one (21) or 40.38% had choppy sentences, for they were unsuccessful in using transitional phrases and longer sentences ; seventeen (17) or 32.69% had incomplete development of thoughts and ideas; fifteen (15) or 28.85% had a lack of logic or logical proof and failed to develop their arguments; thirteen (13) or 25% were redundant in stating their points; twelve (12) or 23.08% had underdeveloped points which they did not emphasize; eight (8) or 15.38% were being indirect when they should have used direct approach in clarifying their points; three (3) or 5.77% were off the subject and needs to use shorter sentences; two (2) or 3.85% did not follow proper organizational approach. As to duration, 13 or 25% of the student respondents did not meet the time limit required to deliver the speech.

Thus, this study identified that the first three challenges in the logical organization of the student-respondents were failing to show a transition from one point to another, lack of organization or outlining of ideas, and citing references of the information they used. The results were comparable to the results of the study of San Jose and Vicencio (2018), which showed that students had limited ability in expounding a given topic in English. They were able to observe that students have ideas; yet, they are hindered to express them because of their lack of English vocabulary, confusion on collocation, anxiety, and inability to pronounce long and hard words. Logical organization of ideas was then tied to grammatical and syntactic competence, as well as articulation.

In contradiction to the result of this study, Malenab-Temporal (2016) noted in her study that student-respondents had the ability to logically organize paragraphs which had a positive significant relationship to their skills of identifying topic sentences and subordinate ideas. Similarly, students have loose-organization skills but main ideas stand out, limited support, and logical but incomplete sequencing (Pratiwi, 2012).

2.3. Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Articulation and Modulation

Table 4 presents the challenges in speech delivery in terms of articulation and modulation of student-respondents.

Table 4: Challenges in Speech Delivery in Terms of Articulation and Modulation

Articulation	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Enunciation Word not clearly stated.	49	94.23
Verbal Fillers	45	86.54
Faulty Pronunciation	40	76.92
Uncertain about what to say	33	63.46
Faulty Phrasing	19	36.54
Delivery	2	3.85
Modulation	Frequency (Number of Respondents with errors)	Percentage
Intonation needs improvement.	11	21.15
Voice modulation needs improvement.	6	11.54
Speaking rates affect performance.	3	5.77
N=52 (Total number of Respondents)		

As to articulation, out of fifty-two student-respondents, forty-nine (49) or 94.23% had problems with enunciation for they were not able to speak certain words clearly; forty-five (45) or 86.54% had verbal fillers, such as “ah”, “uhm”, “you know”, etc.; forty (40) or 76.92% had faulty pronunciation for they were not able to produce the correct sounds of each syllable of some words; thirty-three (33) or 63.46% were uncertain about what to say, meaning they were halting or hesitating; nineteen (19) or 36.54% had faulty phrasing, meaning they were not able to group the words correctly in their performance which caused the distorted meaning of ideas; and two (2) or 3.85% had some delivery problems causing disruption to the speech, of which the respondents had difficulty in expressing ideas in English and affected the whole performance and rating according to the given criteria.

The first three most frequent challenges in the articulation of the student-respondents were enunciation, verbal fillers, and pronunciation. The results were parallel to the findings of San Jose and Vicencio (2018) which stated that typically, students stuttered, mumbled, and repeated most of the words, which implied the struggles of the respondents in making the words sound correct.

As to modulation, out of fifty-two student-respondents, eleven (11) or 21.15 needed improvement in intonation; six (6) or 11.54 needed improvement in voice modulation, and three (3) or 5.77% had speaking rates problem which affected the outcome of speech delivery. Pisanski, Cartei, McGettigan, Raine, and Reby (2016) argue that ‘human’s ability to modulate nonverbal vocal features evolutionarily linked to expression of body size and sex. While a study done by Cabrera, Tsao, Liu, Li, Hu, Lorenzi, and Bertocini (2015), revealed that the perceptual reorganization occurring during the first year of life for lexical tones is joined with changes in the hearing ability to use speech modulation signals.

Huang and Gráf (2020) investigated speech rates and unfilled silences which revealed that both can be used to distinguish not only native speech from learner speech but also one level of proficiency from another. The learners of both levels halt oftentimes than native speakers.

3. Preferred Learning Delivery Modality of Students

Out of fifty-two respondents, fifty-two (52) or 100% of the student-respondents preferred modular learning, and fifteen (15) or 28.85% preferred both modular and online learning. The results were in resemblance to the nationwide partial data results of the Learner Enrollment and Survey Forms (LESFs) which showed 7.2 million enrollees chose to use modular distance learning, TV & Radio based instructions, and other modalities while only 2 million enrollees prefer online for the school year 2020-2021 (Malipot, 2020).

4. Type of Instructional Material (IM)

This research question required the results of research questions 1, 2, and 3 as the basis for the creation of the Instructional Material.

The researchers needed to gauge the level of proficiency of student-respondents in Oral Communication first, in order to find out the status of the (sample of the population) target users of the Instructional Material. Since the Level of Proficiency in Oral Communication garnered a computed overall mean of 2.92 which was interpreted as “Not Proficient”, the researcher then used the result as a springboard on the specific areas in Oral Communication namely Word Choice and Syntax, Logical Organization and Duration, and Articulation and Modulation as the topics that should be included in the Instructional Material.

Likewise, the results of research question number 2 pertaining to the challenges in Oral Communication of the student-respondents needed to be identified in order to address these difficulties by including discussions, performance tasks, and activities in the Instructional Material that would develop their competence in the challenges noted in this study.

The learning modality preferences of the student-respondents, as reflected in the result of research question 4 were also considered in the creation of such Instructional Material. Based on the preferences reflected in the results of research question 4, all of the respondents preferred modular learning and there are some who preferred online learning aside from modular. By definition, Modular Distance Learning involves individualized instruction that allows learners to use self-learning modules (SLM) in print or digital format/electronic copy, whichever is applicable in the context of the learner. The suggested platforms/ mechanisms were: (1) use of Learning Resource Materials/ Modules in multimedia (slides, video, and audio files); (2) Digital Packets (Learning Materials); (3) use of e-learning materials; and (4) use of computer-based learning resources. On the other hand, Online Distance Learning features the teacher as the facilitator and engages learners' active participation in real-time (Synchronous) or in the available time of the learners to self-study online (Asynchronous) through the use of various technologies accessed through the internet. The suggested platforms/ mechanisms were: (1) use of virtual classrooms— Google Classroom, Edmodo, etc.; (2) use of web-enhanced learning activities; (3) free access to Open Educational Resources (OERs); (4) access to LR portals; and (5) access to DepEd Commons (Llego, 2020).

Thus, the researchers innovated an Online-Modular Instructional Material in Oral Communication that would be inclusive to all types of learners; an IM that would be operational in whichever available resources that they have; and an IM that would still be usable with or without pandemic, Distance Learning or Face-to-Face Learning or Blended Learning. The researcher titled it Trends In Communication Talk or TIC-Talk, an Interactive Multimedia PowerPoint presentation. Hossain (2015) noted that modern technology helps to teach, learn and test oral/aural ability more easily than the old equipment. Modern teaching aids should be used in classes, such as Multi-Media, overhead projectors, audio-visual aids, tape recorders, video films/movies, computers, and the internet because these modern technologies will help facilitate better speaking.

The presentation was composed of macro-enabled PowerPoint slides of discussions with diagrams/charts; various activities and tasks (interactive and individual); and embedded educational videos to enhance the presentation. These features were necessary to capacitate the students on learning how to speak properly, as well as develop speech writing and delivery. A printed format of the IM was also developed by the researcher in order to cater to those who do not have the resources for online learning. However, the additional features of the presentation would not be functional in the printed format, so a separate copy of the videos was provided on a CD. Therefore, the IM may be used for both Online Learning (Synchronous and Asynchronous) and Modular Learning (Digital and Printed). If the few available instructional materials were not judiciously utilized, this rightly prevents the objectives of education to be adequately attained (Bukoye, 2019).

In addition to the results of research questions 1, 2, and 3, the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) in Oral Communication as prescribed by the Department of Education was also utilized by the researcher to furthermore strengthen the outline of the content of the Instructional Material, as well as the basis for standard learning competencies required in the grade level of the student-respondents. Lastly, the researcher used Robert Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction, under the umbrella of his theory— Conditions of Learning, as a framework in designing the IM.

According to Miner, Mallow, Theeke, and Barnes (2016), the integration of Gagné's nine events of instruction resulted in a positive change in student evaluations, indicating an enhancement of the student learning experience. The nine events of instruction could be operationalized in both synchronous and asynchronous online courses. Furthermore, Khadjooi, Rostami, and Ishaq (2011) concluded that applying Gagné's nine-step model is an excellent way to ensure an effective and

systematic learning program as it gives structure to the lesson plans and a holistic view to teaching; keeping in mind that the exact form of these events is not something that can be specified in general for all instructions but must be decided for the individual learning task. Leow and Neo (2014) also proved that Gagné's model could provide a proper and sound pedagogy to use in guiding the design of learning content for a student-centered learning environment. Aside from that, their study also showed that this model could flexibly accommodate the use of multimedia elements in presenting the information in a non-linearity manner.

5. Usefulness of the Innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material

Table 5 presents the summary table of the innovated online-modular instructional material.

Table 5: Usefulness of the Innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material

Usefulness of the Innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating
Content	3.84	Very Useful
Level of Difficulty	3.84	Very Useful
Presentation	3.89	Very Useful
Overall Weighted Mean	3.86	Very Useful

As shown in Table 5, the teacher respondents evaluated the usefulness of the innovated online-modular instructional material as "Very Useful" with an overall weighted mean of 3.86. The usefulness refers to the ability of multimedia elements in the educational material to meet pedagogical goals or effectiveness, cognitive efficiency, and appeal; users can learn from their interactions with useful multimedia material (Newby, Stepich, Lehman, & Russel, 2011). According to Teacher Training Reference Manual, when materials will be used as part of the instructional process, the materials themselves should be assessed for their relevancy, practicality, and usefulness in the lesson or unit. Moreover, Funa and Ricafort (2019) concluded that, in order to deliver better education, it is imperative that instructional material undergo validation to ensure quality.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the summary of investigations conducted, the researchers have concluded that the student-respondents are Not Proficient in Speech Delivery. Thus, alternative hypothesis 1 is accepted. Furthermore, the challenges in speech delivery encountered by students were mostly in Word Choice and Syntax, Logical Organization, and Articulation. Therefore, alternative hypothesis 2 is also accepted. Moreover, the student-respondents preferred Modular Learning Delivery Modality, but a number of these students also preferred Online Learning. Also, the type of instructional material created by the researcher is applicable for both Online Learning and Modular Learning. Lastly, the innovated Online-Modular Instructional Material with the title Trends In Communication Talk (TIC-Talk) is deemed "Very Useful" by the teacher-respondents. Hence, the content, level of difficulty, and presentation of the material are suited to the level and needs of the learners and in parallel to the standards of the department.

Recommendations

Based on the summary of investigations and conclusions arrived at, the researchers have offered the following recommendations:

The data gathered by the researchers regarding the level of proficiency of students in Oral Communication may be used by the teachers as a reference in identifying the topics in the subject/course on which they need to focus on, in order to develop the students' level of proficiency. It may also be considered the baseline in the selection of strategies to be used in class.

The challenges encountered by the students in speech delivery may be utilized as a basis for designing and providing activities, drills, and tasks that will address the difficulties and enhance their speaking skills.

Since most students prefer modular learning, they must be given appropriate learning materials which will develop their competence in Oral Communication. The printed modules might not suffice, for the core macro-skill which they should develop in this subject/course is speaking. Thus, additional learning resources should be made available to them such as videos and other multimedia materials which will guide them in the development of their speaking skills. Also, various speaking activities should also be included in the modules of the students, whichever learning delivery modality they prefer, with the intention of putting their speaking skills into practice.

TIC-Talk: An Online-Modular Instructional Material is at its maximum use when it is going to be played on a laptop/computer where hyperlinks and several interactive attachments are working. Nevertheless, other gadgets such as cellphones, tablets, and the likes may still make the slides work, as long as they have saved an application that can read documents and PowerPoint presentations such as, but not limited to WPS and Kingsoft. In the printed version of TIC-Talk, the users need to have a separate CD, Micro-SD, or any device which can be used to save other video and MP4 attachments of the learning material; a video and MP4 player should also be available to play the aforementioned files.

The Online- Modular Instructional Material may be used as a learning resource material, for it was rated as Very Useful. However, further validation of the material and several consultations must be done by the researcher before the actual wide-range consumption of other educators. A follow-up study may also be done to measure the effectiveness of TIC-Talk as an Instructional Material in the enhancement of Oral Communication proficiency and development of the target skills based on the standard competencies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bukoye, R.O. (2019). Utilization of Instruction Materials as Tools for Effective Academic Performance of Students: Implications for Counselling. *Proceedings* 2, 1395; doi: 10.3390/proceedings2211395 www.mdpi.com/journal/proceedings.
- [2] Cabrera, L., Tsao, F. M., Liu, H. M., Li, L. Y., Hu, Y. H., Lorenzi, C., & Bertoncini, J. (2015). The perception of speech modulation cues in lexical tones is guided by early language-specific experience. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6, 1290.
- [3] DepEd Learning Delivery Modalities for School Year2020-2021.<https://www.teacherph.com/deped-learning-delivery-modalities/> Retrieved: June 29, 2020
- [4] Dutro, S., Levy, E., & Moore, D. W. (2011). Equipping adolescent English learners for academic achievement: An interview with Susana Dutro and Ellen Levy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(4), 339-342. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00041
- [5] Evangelista, E. V., Ayuste, T. O. D., Belmi, R. M., Butron, B. R., Cortez, L. A. S., Evangelista, L. T., ... & Tondo, J. E. (2014). Development and evaluation of grade 7 and grade 8 biokit. *The Normal Lights*, 8(2).
- [6] Funa, A. & Ricafort, J. (2019). Validation of gamified instructional materials in genetics for grade 12 STEM students. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*. ISSN 2307-4531. Retrieved November 22, 2020 from <http://gssr.org.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>
- [7] Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction. Retrieved June 26, 2020 from http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/learning/id/nine_step_id.html
- [8] Hernando-Malipot, M. (2020). DepEd: Most students prefer 'modular' learning over online. *Manila Bulletin*, published July 3, 2020. Retrieved August 4, 2020 from <https://mb.com.ph>
- [9] Hossain, M. (2015). Teaching Productive Skills to the Students: A Secondary Level Scenario. BRAC University: Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- [10] Huang, L.F. & Gráf, T. (2020). Speech rate and pausing in English: comparing learners at different levels of proficiency with native speakers. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, Vol. 17.1, 57-86, 2020, DOI:
- [11] Inkaew, C., & Thumawongsa, N. (2018). A Study of English Oral Communication Strategies Used Among Thai EFL Students of Different English Proficiency Levels: A Case Study of First Year English Major Students, Srinakharinwirot University.
- [12] Jackson, D. (2014). Business graduate performance in oral communication skills and strategies for improvement. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(1), 22-34.
- [13] Khadjooi, K., Rostami, K., & Ishaq, S. (2011). How to use Gagné's model of instructional design in teaching psychomotor skills. *Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench* 2011; 4 (3): 116-119. Retrieved November 22, 2020 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>

- [14] Learning, L. (2020). Principles of Public Speaking | Simple Book Production. Retrieved November 22, 2020, from <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/publicspeakingprinciples/>
- [15] Leow, F. T., & Neo, M. (2014). Interactive multimedia learning: Innovating classroom education in a Malaysian university. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 13(2), 99-110.
- [16] Llego, M. A. (2020). DepEd learning delivery modalities for school year 2020-2021. <https://www.teacher.ph> retrieved November 22, 2020.
- [17] Malipot, M. (2020). Parents prefer modular learning for their children this school year, DepEd survey finds out. *Manila Bulletin*. Retrieved November 22, 2020 from <https://mb.com.ph/2020/07/30/>
- [18] Miner, A., Mallow, J., Theeke, L. & Barnes, E. (2016). Using Gagné's nine events of instruction to enhance student performance and course evaluations in undergraduate nursing course. *Nurse Educator*. 40 (3): 152-154. doi:10.1097/NNE.000000000000138. Retrieved November 22, 2020 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>.
- [19] Newby T., Stepich, D., Lehman, J., & Russel, J. (2011) *Educational Technology for Teaching and Learning*. Pearson. 4th Edition. ISBN-13: 9780130467140.
- [20] Noblitt, L., Vance, D. E., & Smith, M. L. D. (2010). A comparison of case study and traditional teaching methods for improvement of oral communication and critical-thinking skills. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 39(5), 26.
- [21] Pagcaliwagan, S. (2015). Assessment of Instructional Materials in Speech and Oral Communication: Basis for Curriculum Enhancement. *International Advanced Research Journal in Science, Engineering and Technology*. Vol. 2, No.11.
- [22] Pangket, Willow. (2019). Oral Communication Proficiency in English of the Grade 5 Pupils. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 11, 42-50. 10.26803/ijhss.11.2.4.
- [23] Pescante-Malimas, M. A., & Samson, S. C. (2017). Linguistic Error Analysis on Students' Thesis Proposals. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 193-209.
- [24] Pisanski, K., Cartei, V., McGettigan, C., Raine, J., & Reby, D. (2016). Voice modulation: a window into the origins of human vocal control?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20(4), 304-318.
- [25] Pratiwi, K. (2012). Students' Difficulties in Writing English (A Study at the Third Semester Students of English Education Program at University of Bengkulu Academic Year 2011-2012). Retrieved November 21, 2020 from <https://ejournal.ianbengkulu.ac.id/index.php/linguistics/article/download/106/101>
- [26] Raba, A. A. A. (2017). The influence of think-pair-share (TPS) on improving students' oral communication skills in EFL classrooms. *Creative Education*, 8(1), 12-23.
- [27] Robert Gagne's Instructional Design Approach. Retrieved: June 30, 2020 from <http://www.gsu.edu/~mstsw/courses/it7000/papers/robert.htm>
- [28] San Jose, A. & Vicencio, J. (2018). Delivery, Language Use and Topic Development in Speaking of EFL Students. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies* ISSN: 2559 – 7914; ISSN-L: 2559 – 7914, Volume 2, Issue 1. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1146840
- [29] Ting, S.H. (2010). Grammatical errors in spoken English of university students in oral communication course. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*. Retrieved: November 21, 2020 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228728819>
- [30] Ulla, M. B. (2014). Analysis of the language errors in writing among BSEE and AB English students. *European Journal of Academic Essays*, 1(3), 39–47
- [31] Wang, Z. (2014). Developing Accuracy and Fluency in Spoken English of Chinese EFL Learners. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*. Vol. 7, No. 2; 2014 ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750.