

## **Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan**



**Ma. Fe B. Belasoto**

School of Education, Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College

**ABSTRACT:** This study determined the communicative competence of the college English language teachers of Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College (NIPSC) in the 5<sup>th</sup> District of Iloilo through a researcher-developed instrument which had undergone validity and reliability testing. Utilizing mixed method approach and with forty-five (45) English language teachers who were chosen through complete enumeration, result showed that the respondents' level of communicative competence in the areas of grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic and discourse was "very good", while the extent of their English language exposure was "sometimes" for the 95.56% and "always" for only 4.44%. There was no significant relationship between the respondents' number of years in teaching, written language proficiency, relevant seminars and trainings attended and all areas of communicative competence. Among the four areas of communicative competence, grammatical and sociolinguistic competence had significant relationship with their oral language proficiency and discourse competence had significant relationship with highest educational attainment. There was no significant relationship between their communicative competence and extent of English language exposure. There was no significant difference between the level of communicative competence of the respondents when they were grouped according to campus. The following factors were perceived to contribute to their communicative competence: the practice of the English language inside and outside the classroom, exposure to mainstream media, experience as English teachers, inherent intelligence, seminars or trainings attended, while the extent of their language exposure was perceived to be influenced by time, attitude or preference of the teacher, environment, teaching load, co-workers and students. Based on the result of the study an action plan was proposed to improve the efficiency, competence, and performance of the English language teachers at the College.

**KEYWORDS:** communicative competence, college English language teachers, English language exposure, oral language proficiency, written language proficiency,

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The idea of communicative competence is originally derived from Noam Chomsky's (1965) distinction between competence and performance (Ohno, 2011). By competence Chomsky meant the grammatical knowledge. Performance on the other hand is concerned with the process of applying the underlying knowledge to the actual language use.

In 1989, Light proposed an initial definition of communicative competence as a relative and dynamic, interpersonal construct based on functionality of communication, adequacy of communication, and sufficiency of knowledge, judgment and skill in four interrelated domains: linguistic competence, operational competence, social competence, and strategic competence (Light & McNaughton, 2014).

To achieve communicative competence teachers need different types of English skills. They need to know and use appropriate language structures and forms; they need to understand how to interpret verbal and written communication in a larger context; they need to be able to use various verbal and non-verbal communication strategies (Speaking for Excellence: Language Competencies for Effective Teaching Practice, 2013).

Based on extensive personal experience, being an English language teacher is very demanding. They have always been expected to become useful and active in any type of professional roles and responsibilities concomitant to their main role in the classroom. Outside of the classroom they communicate with members of the academic community, or they could be a school paper adviser, an emcee, the director of school plays, a speaker, an editor, a coach or a trainer. It is believed that each role and situation requires the different areas of communicative competence. How much of a language does one need to know to be able to teach it effectively and how does proficiency in a language interact with other aspects of teaching (Bailey, 2006; Kamhi-Stein, 2009 in Richards, 2011)? According to Richards (2011), specific language competencies which include the ability to provide good language models, to maintain use of the target language in the classroom, to give correct feedback on learner language and

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

to provide input at an appropriate level of difficulty are essential language competencies essential for a teacher to teach effectively. Research result shows that a language teacher's confidence is also dependent upon his or her own level of language proficiency, so a teacher who perceives herself to be weak in the target language will have reduced confidence in her teaching ability and an inadequate sense of professional legitimacy (Seidlhofer, 1999 in Richards, 2010).

The researcher believed that the college English language teachers must possess along with their disciplinary language requirement, the same communicative competence they seek to develop in their students. As Wang (2010) stated, that teacher's linguistic competence must be addressed first, before students can be adequately taught. Hymes (1987 in Abao, 2013) opines that teachers should be good users of the English language because it is believed that if they are able to convey their ideas to the students with clarity, ease and competence, learning is enhanced. Chambless (2012) also supported the idea by saying that there seems to be a causal relationship between teachers' language proficiency and the quality of teaching and learning which takes place in L2 classrooms. Even Goodwin et al. (2014) established a relationship between students' learning and the quality of their teachers and consider teachers as the most important factor in student achievement.

Thus, this study was conducted to determine the level of communicative competence of the college English language teachers of NIPSC in the areas of grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic and discourse competence. It further looked into the teachers' profile which include number of years in teaching English, highest educational attainment, oral language proficiency, written language proficiency and number of relevant seminars and trainings attended; extent of language exposure; correlation between profile and communicative competence, profile and extent of language exposure, communicative competence and extent of language exposure; and difference of communicative competence of teachers when grouped according to campus. It also explored the perceived factors that influenced the teachers' communicative competence and extent of language exposure. The result of the investigation served as the basis for an action plan.

## II. METHODOLOGY

### A. Research Design

A mixed-methods approach was used in this study. Mixed methods is a rigorous use and integration of both qualitative and quantitative approaches or collection of quantitative tests data along with qualitative interview data to find out if findings from the two sources converge (Creswell, 2015; Springer, 2010). In quantitative approach, descriptive research was employed to determine the communicative competence of the English language teachers, since the main aim of the study was to describe the existing phenomenon with respect to variables or conditions at a specific time (Mitchel & Jolly, 2013). In analyzing the qualitative data thematic analysis was used. Thematic analysis emphasizes identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns of meaning (or themes) within qualitative data (Guest, Macqueen, and Namely, 2012).

### B. Respondents of the Study

By complete enumeration, the forty-five (45) college English language teachers from the seven campuses of NIPSC in the 5<sup>th</sup> District of Iloilo were utilized as respondents of the study. Complete enumeration means all members of the whole population are measured (FAO of the United Nations, 1998).

### C. Instrument

A 65-item researcher-developed test was constructed for this study which was validated by five jurors with extensive experience in the field of Linguistics and in test construction. The juror's suggestions and recommendations were followed in the final draft of the test. The test was also subjected to reliability and obtained the Cronbach alpha of .747. The instrument was made up of two parts. The first part were questions about the participants' personal data regarding their number of years of teaching English, highest educational attainment, relevant trainings and seminars attended and English language exposure, while the second part was the test proper about grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse competence. To find out the respondents' written language proficiency and oral language proficiency, the researcher used rubric. For the qualitative aspect of the research an interview guide was prepared.

### D. Data Gathering Procedure

Permission from the Office of the College President, then from the office of the School Deans and Campus Administrators of the different campuses was secured before conducting the test. After administering the test, 14 English language teachers were conveniently chosen and were individually approached to gather information about the perceived factors that influence their communicative competence and extent of their English language exposure. For the oral language proficiency the researcher gave the rubric to the department head of each campus and requested the head to rate the English language teachers, while the written language proficiency was rated by the researcher. On the last item of the test the respondents were asked to choose only one among the eight topics given and were instructed to write a paragraph of 10 to 15 sentences which were checked and rated by using a rubric for the respondents' written language proficiency.

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

### E. Treatment of Data

The data in the study were analyzed using mean and assigned scales, standard deviation, ANOVA, and Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation (Pearson's r) for quantitative and thematic analysis for qualitative.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. The profile of the college English language teachers of NIPSC

Table 1 shows the data on the profile of the college English language teachers of NIPSC through the use of frequency and percentage. When the participants were classified according to number of years of service, 12 or 26.67% had already served from 1 to 10 years, 11 or 24.44% had already served for 11-20 years and 22 or 48.89% had already served for 21 years and above.

When classified as to highest educational attainment 4 or 8.89% were bachelor's degree holders, 17 or 37.78% had units in Master's degree, 11 or 24.44% were Master's degree graduates, 10 or 22.22% had units in a doctorate program and 3 or 6.67% were Doctorate degree graduates.

When classified as to oral language proficiency 20 or 44.44% were fair, 25 or 55.56% were good.

When classified as written language proficiency 1 or 2.22% was very poor, 17 or 37.78% were fair, 20 or 44.44% were good and 7 or 15.56 were very good.

When classified as to number of relevant trainings and seminars attended for the last three years 25 or 55.56% had never attended any relevant trainings or seminars, 9 or 20% had attended one to two trainings or seminars, 6 or 13.33% had attended three to five trainings or seminars and 5 or 11.11% had attended more than five trainings or seminars.

**Table 1. The Profile of the College English Language Teachers of the NIPSC**

Profiles	Frequency	Percentage
Number of years in teaching English		
1 -10 years	12	26.67
11-20 years	11	24.44
21 and above	22	48.89
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's degree	4	8.89
Has units in Master's degree	17	37.78
Master's degree graduate	11	24.44
Has units in Doctoral program	10	22.22
Doctorate degree graduate	3	6.67
Oral Language Proficiency		
Fair	20	44.44
Good	25	55.56
Written Language Proficiency		
Poor	1	2.22
Fair	17	37.78
Good	20	44.44
Very Good	7	15.56
Relevant Trainings/Seminars		
0	25	55.56
1-2	9	20.00
3-5	6	13.33
More than 5	5	11.11

#### B. Level of communicative competence of the respondents

Table 2 shows the level of communicative competence of respondents which was determined through mean. In the areas of Grammatical competence (M= 13.56), Sociolinguistic competence (M= 10.47), Strategic competence (M= 10.49), and Discourse competence (M= 10.82) the teachers were "Very good".

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

Based on the result it can be inferred that the respondents had achieved the communicative competence level expected of an English language teacher most especially in the grammar competence of which they are constantly exposed. Their constant practice of teaching the context of the English language sharpened their communicative competence. However, with the continuous quest for quality and excellence the teachers' communicative competence still needs to be strengthened.

**Table 2. Level of Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers**

Areas of Communicative Competence	N	Mean	Description
Grammatical Competence	45	13.56	Very Good
Sociolinguistic Competence	45	10.47	Very Good
Strategic Competence	45	10.49	Very Good
Discourse Competence	45	10.82	Very Good

Arbitrary Scale:

Grammatical	Soc/Strat/Disc	Description
0 — 4.00	0— 3.00	Poor
4.01 — 8.00	3.01— 6.00	Marginal
8.01—12.00	6.01— 9.00	Acceptable
12.0—16.00	9.01—12.00	Very good
16.0—20.00	12.01—15.00	Superior

### C. Extent of English language exposure of the respondents

Table 3 shows the extent of the English language exposure of the respondents which was determined through frequency and percentage. There were 43 or 95.56% who were “sometimes” exposed, while only 2 or 4.44% were “always” exposed.

Result infers that most of the college English language teachers of NIPSC rarely had the ample chance to be exposed to the English language. They had limited opportunities to use the language or to occupy themselves to certain activities or circumstances that give them access to English language.

**Table 3. Extent of English Language Exposure of the Respondents**

English Language Exposure	Frequency, n=45	Percentage
Sometimes	43	95.56
Always	2	4.44

### D. Relationship between respondents' profile and level of communicative competence

Table 4.1 shows the relationship between respondents' profile and level of communicative competence which was determined through Pearson's-r.

Number of years of teaching had no significant relationship with the respondents' level of communicative competence in the following areas: grammatical (p-value = 0.383), sociolinguistic (p-value = 0.355), strategic (p-value = 0.470), and discourse competence (p-value= 0.986), thus the null hypothesis was accepted. Result implies that no matter how long an English language teacher is teaching this does not matter with regards to the teacher's communicative competence. The teacher's communicative competence is not conditioned by how long he/she has been teaching.

Highest educational attainment had no significant relationship with the respondents' level of communicative competence in the areas of grammatical (p-value= 0.159), sociolinguistic (p-value= 0.277), and strategic competence (p-value= 0.677) but with discourse competence (p-value= 0.050) it indicated significant relationship, thus the null hypothesis was accepted in the areas of grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence but rejected with discourse competence. Result implies that educational attainment had nothing to do with the grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competence of the respondents but with discourse competence, it had, which means that discourse competence is contingent with educational attainment. The higher the educational attainment of the teacher the more he is exposed to opportunities to work on well- organized and meaningful writing and speaking activities through reports or assignments.

Oral language proficiency had significant relationship with the respondents' communicative competence in the areas of grammatical (p-value= 0.001) and sociolinguistic competence (p-value= 0.037), but had no significant relationship with strategic (p-value = 0.963) and discourse competence (p-value = 0.371), thus the null hypothesis was rejected in the areas of grammatical

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

and sociolinguistic but accepted in strategic and discourse competence. It can be inferred from the result that usually teachers are strategically conscious with their grammar specifically with subject-verb agreement, correct usage, choice of adjectives to form well-structured messages as well as with social conventions concerning language use when they are speaking or talking. This result holds true with the statement of Nassaji & Fotos (2011) that says, "Efficient and clear communication is always correlative with correct grammar". So as with Sert (2006) who pointed out that grammar is an indispensable part of any particular language, considering that the systematic language rules play the most essential role for mutual intelligibility, as well as for building social relationships through verbal communication.

Written language proficiency had no significant relationship with the respondents' level of communicative competence in areas of grammatical (p-value = 0.073), sociolinguistic (p-value = 0.074), strategic (p-value = 0.127) and discourse competence (p-value = 0.269), thus the null hypothesis was accepted. Result shows that the written language proficiency of teachers was independent from their communicative competence. It means that if they write well or poorly, communicative competence had nothing to do with it or even if they have very good level of communicative competence this does not necessarily influence or affect their written language proficiency.

Relevant seminars or trainings attended had no significant relationship with the respondents' communicative competence in the areas of grammatical (p-value = 0.562), sociolinguistic (p-value = 0.545), strategic (p-value = 0.224), and discourse competence (p-value = 0.448), thus the null hypothesis was accepted. Based on the result it can be inferred that because only a chosen few of English language teachers were given the chance to be sent to relevant seminars or trainings to enhance their knowledge and competence therefore relevant seminars and trainings have no direct effect or influence to communicative competence.

**Table 4.1 Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Level of Communicative Competence**

Profile/Indicators	Pearson-r	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Number of years in Teaching				
Grammatical competence	-0.133	0.383	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	-0.173	0.355	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Strategic competence	-0.111	0.470	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	-0.003	0.986	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment				
Grammatical competence	0.214	0.159	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	0.166	0.277	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Strategic competence	0.064	0.677	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	0.294	0.050	Reject Ho	Significant
Oral Language Proficiency				
Grammatical competence	0.489	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	0.311	0.037	Reject Ho	Significant
Strategic competence	-0.007	0.963	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	0.137	0.371	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Written Language Proficiency				
Grammatical competence	0.270	0.073	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	0.269	0.074	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Strategic competence	0.231	0.127	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	0.169	0.269	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Relevant Trainings/Seminars				
Grammatical competence	0.089	0.562	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	0.093	0.545	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Strategic competence	-0.185	0.224	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	-0.116	0.448	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Significance at 0.05 alpha level

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

### E. Relationship between the respondents' profile and extent of English language exposure

Table 4.2 shows the relationship between the respondents' profile and extent of English language exposure which was determined through Pearson's-r. Result revealed no significant relationship between English language exposure and number of years in teaching (p-value = 0.223); between English language exposure and highest educational attainment (p-value = 0.363); between English language exposure and oral language proficiency (p-value = 0.204); between English language exposure and written language proficiency (p-value = 0.613); between English language exposure and relevant seminars/trainings attended (p-value = 0.581), hence the null hypothesis was accepted. Result implies that the exposure of teachers to English language could be a matter of choice, opportunity and situation and does not depend on their profile. Choice, because if they really wanted to read books, magazines, watch films or TV programs they would really find a way to do so. As it is said, "if there's a will, there's a way". It is a matter of situation, in the sense that no matter how much a teacher wanted to do so but time and responsibilities would not permit. An opportunity because not all teachers were given the chance to become an emcee, director/ trainer for declamation, oration or plays or others simply decline when assigned to do so.

**Table 4.2. Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Extent of English Language Exposure**

Profile/ Indicators	Pearson-r	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Number of years in teaching	-0.185	0.223	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	0.139	0.363	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Oral Language Proficiency	0.193	0.204	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Written Language Proficiency	0.077	0.613	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Relevant Seminars/Trainings	0.085	0.581	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Significance at 0.05 alpha level

### F. Relationship between respondents' communicative competence and extent of English language exposure

Table 4.3 shows the relationship between level of communicative competence of respondents and extent of English language exposure which was determined through Pearson's-r. The level of respondents' communicative competence in the areas of grammatical (p-value = 0.785), sociolinguistic (p-value = 0.402), strategic (p-value = 0.321), and discourse competence (p-value = 0.583) had no significant relationship with their extent of English language exposure, hence the null hypothesis was accepted. It can be inferred from the result that the teachers' English language exposure has no contribution to their "very good" level of communicative competence. This can be contributed to the minimal (sometimes) exposure of majority of the respondents to the English language.

**Table 4.3. Relationship between Respondents' Communicative Competence and Extent of English Language Exposure**

Profile/Indicators	Pearson-r	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Extent of English language exposure				
Grammatical competence	0.042	0.785	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sociolinguistic competence	-0.128	0.402	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Strategic competence	-0.151	0.321	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Discourse competence	-0.084	0.583	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Significance at 0.05 alpha level

### G. Difference on the level of respondents' communicative competence when grouped according to campus

Table 5 shows that there was no significant difference existed on the level of college English language teachers' communicative competence when grouped according to campus ( $F = 0.797$ ; p-value = .545), hence the null hypothesis was accepted. Based on the result it can be inferred that the English language teachers of the seven campuses of the NIPSC had the same level of communicative competence.

**Table 5. Difference on the Level of Respondents' Communicative Competence when Grouped According to Campus**

Source of Variation	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Campus						
Estancia	10.95	1.56	0.797	0.545	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sara	9.80	1.34				
Ajuy	10.00	1.37				
Batad	10.80	2.41				
Concepcion	11.70	1.71				

Significance at 0.05 alpha

Note: Analysis of variance should be balanced, that is, equal number of respondents, considering 5 teachers from each campus, so that campuses with 3 and 4 teachers were disregarded.

**H. Perceived factors that influence the respondents' communicative competence**

Table 6.1 shows the factors that influence teachers' communicative competence through interview. Technology or mass media was considered by eleven teachers to influence their communicative competence; reading was considered by seven teachers; speaking or using the language was considered by six teachers; listening or hearing the language was considered by three teachers while experience in teaching, inherent (genetic) intelligence, trainings or seminars, each was considered by two teachers; environment and lastly position in school, each was considered by one teacher.

Respondents believed that technology/ mass media (watching TV programs/ films or reading) would build their communicative competence as they would be able to gain vocabulary, expressions, augment their grammar, observe how native speakers say the words or expressions. As Wang (2012) had said that TV/ videos provide a context to perceive the linguistic feature of a language. Teachers may also be able to access for learning and improvement for there are online trainings and programs they may enroll. But there are respondents who also believe that media may undo their competence for there are some television hosts, or radio broadcasters who may mispronounce words or wrongly use words, or there are TV announcements or printed advertisements which misspell words and these may adversely affect the competence of teachers.

By using (or hearing) the language in the classroom or at home the respondents believe that it would help in their spontaneity and automaticity in speaking the language. If they use the language more often they will come to master the language.

Sending teachers to seminars or trainings especially in English speaking countries was also mentioned because the teachers thought that they would be forced to speak in English.

Inherent intelligence because respondents believe that there are teachers who are really endowed with communicative competence or it is easy for them to learn.

If the people around are speaking the language, the teacher can be enticed if not forced to also do it.

Having a position, the respondent believed that a teacher could also be forced to speak English because it is expected from him. This could be at his advantage as it will develop him to become a good speaker.

**Table 6.1. Perceived Factors that Influence the Respondents' Communicative Competence**

Perceived Factors	Number of Responses
Technology/ Mass media	11
Reading	7
Speaking the English Language	6
Listening or hearing the Language	3

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

Experience in Teaching	2
Inherent (genetic) intelligence	2
Seminars/ Trainings	2
Environment	1
Position in School	1

### *I. Perceived factors that influence the extent of respondents' English language exposure*

Table 6.2 shows that time was highly considered by eleven teachers as a factor that influences their extent of English language exposure, environment was considered by six teachers, teacher's attitude was answered by two teachers and teaching load also by two teachers while one teacher answered support from the institution, another one answered co-workers and another one considered students.

Most teachers considered lack of time as a factor that influenced their language exposure. This is contributed to the fact that most of the teachers were parents, so they are just trying to balance their schedule between their work and their family. Most of them reasoned out that they have little or no more time to read or to watch TV program or movies because they have to check papers, prepare their lessons (especially if they have lots of teaching load) and have house works to do and attend to their children. Another thing is that they are most of the time exposed to people who are not speaking straight English – in as much as they are not living in an English speaking country - starting from home, the neighbors, in the market, on the way to the school and even in the school. Inside the classroom, most of them often result to code switching to explain better and be understood by their students. They said, they never speak English when conversing even with their fellow English teachers because they find it awkward. They just use their lingua franca, thus, curtailing the opportunity to use the language

**Table 6.2 Perceived Factors that Influence the Extent of Respondents' English Language Exposure**

Factors	Number of Responses
Lack of Time	10
Environment	6
Teacher's Attitude	2
Teaching Load	2
Support from the Institution	1
Co-workers	1
Students	1

## PROPOSED ACTION PLAN IN ENGLISH

### *Introduction*

Evidence suggests that the quality of teaching in the school has the most influence on the learner achievement. Results of the research study on Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers showed the need to provide more avenues and opportunities to develop the grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence of teachers who are teaching English subjects in NIPSC.

The responses on the interview conducted to the fourteen (14) college English faculty members on the entire NIPSC system who were conveniently chosen showed commonalities such as: a) the need to expose themselves to a continuing relevant experience like trainings and seminars b) supportive environment, one that allows them to continue their personal and professional development, and c) provision for the use of technology in teaching and exposure to mass media.

The effort to improve teaching is crucial for sustained improvement in the learner's academic performance and achievement. Therefore, it is essential to address the existing predicaments of teachers and flaws that prevent the occurrence of effective learning and teaching process inside the classroom.

Specifically, there is a need to identify the "what", "how", and the "why" of teaching to remedy the existing shortcomings of English language teachers in terms of their grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.



## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

Systems need to be in place to ensure that such development programs for English language teachers are visible and functional in the College.

These programs should contain specific and measurable activities in order to gauge not just the number of teacher beneficiaries, but also the quality and impact of these programs in terms of teachers' efficiency and competence in their teaching job.

It is in this context therefore that the proponent of the study had devised and recommended an action plan to improve the efficiency, competence, and performance of English language teachers in the College.

### PROPOSED ACTION PLAN IN ENGLISH

Key Reform Areas (KRAs)	Objectives	Activities/ Strategies	Time Frame	Persons Involved	Budget	Evaluation And Expected Outcome
Grammatical Competence	<p>1. Develop the lexical, morphological, syntactic, and phonological competence of English teachers.</p> <p>2. Improve teachers' skills to interpret stories, essays and lessons in English;</p> <p>3. Improve teachers' vocabulary and communicative fluency in English;</p> <p>4. Demonstrate precise and correct sentence constructions in both written and oral instructions.</p>	<p>1. Mandatory professional development program for all English teachers by requiring them to pursue Graduate Education in their field of specialization.</p> <p>2. There must be a visible and functional calendar of activities approved by the College President every year for English teachers such as their in-service trainings and seminars properly plotted to give each one a chance to undergo the said professional development and to prevent monopoly by some faculty members.</p> <p>3. Module making and</p>	<p>1. Two-years for Master's Degree starting 2015 onward;</p> <p>2. Three-years for Doctoral Degree starting 2015-onward.</p> <p>3. The calendar of activities for professional development should commence next year, 2015 and onward.</p> <p>4. The activity should start next academic year 2015 and onward.</p>	<p>1. At least two English teachers should be required to pursue Graduate Education as scholars under the Faculty Development Program of the College starting 2015-2016.</p> <p>2. At least two English teachers every two years should also be required to finish their Doctoral Degree in accordance with their area of specialization starting 2015-2016 until such time that all faculty members in the department are all full-fledged Doctor of Education either Ph.D./</p>	<p>1. M.A.'s (100,000 inclusive of thesis writing per scholar/student)</p> <p>2. There must be at least a minimum amount of ten thousand (10,000) which will be allocated for every English faculty member every year for his/her possible seminar or training as maybe indicated in the calendar of activities for teachers in the department.</p> <p>3. Service credits should be provided as incentives to teachers during their summer training on module making and syllabus writing; An</p>	<p>1. At least 2 or 11 percent of the English faculty members should have finished their Master's degree in their area of specialization starting 2017. should have finished their Doctoral Degree in their area of specialization starting 2017.</p> <p>3. At least 2 or 11 percent of the English faculty members in the College</p> <p>2. At least 2 or 11 percent or 3 or 16.7 percent of the English faculty members should have undergone a professional seminar/or in service training in their area of specialization every year starting 2015.</p> <p>4. At least 45 or 100 percent of the English faculty members</p>

**Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan**

		syllabus writing in English should be sponsored by the College every summer.		Ed. D.  3.At least two or three English teachers should be sent to a seminar or training relative to their area of specialization and for the purpose of upgrading their grammatical and other related competencies .  4.All English teachers must be required to undergo the summer training every year starting 2015 and onward.  5.Adminis- tration  6.Accountant	amount that would be determined by the Accountant of the College should be allocated to the honorarium of the trainers/resou rce persons every summer training every year.	of the college should have participated in the summer module making and syllabus writing starting 2015.
Socio- linguistic Competence	1.Contextualize the importance of the language in the socio-economic, political, and cultural and religious life of their students.	1.English teachers regardless of their academic rank should be required to come up with at least one action research every semester on the economic, cultural, political and religious plights of their students in	Starting next Academic Year 2015-onward	1.All English teachers  2.The Administratio n  3.VP for Research  4.PRAISE Committee	1.An amount of at least five thousand (5,000) should be allocated through the recommendat ion of the office of the VP for research should be allocated to defray the expenses of the researcher	1.It is expected that 100 percent of the English teachers in the College will be able to come up with a visible research output every semester starting next school year.  2.It is expected that teachers' research output will improve their

**Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan**

		order to determine not only the level of relationship between these factors and their academic performance but also for teachers to develop an appreciation of how a particular medium like English language could serve as an instrument in understanding the life of their students and hence, develop their sociolinguistic competence.			for each accomplished action research.	sociolinguistic competence at a considerable level and hence, will develop their English teaching efficiency.
Discourse Competence	<p>1. Develop the teachers' level of comprehension and skills in the use of English as a medium in their oral and written communication;</p> <p>2. Improve teachers' competence in handling new and emerging technology which are essential in improving the quality of classroom instructions and activities;</p> <p>3. Update and upgrade teachers' competence and</p>	<p>1. Identify teachers who will be given the opportunity to avail of the institution's faculty development program.</p> <p>2. Deans of schools in collaboration with the Human Resource Officer should provide a short list of English faculty members who should be required to undergo seminars and trainings every semester.</p>	1. Next academic year 2015 and onward.	<p>1. All English teachers</p> <p>2. The Administration</p> <p>3. The HRMO of the College</p> <p>4. School Dean</p> <p>5. Academic Council</p>	<p>1. Fifty thousand (50,000) should be allocated for every training program per faculty member or as the need may require thus, an increase or decrease of allocation be made.</p>	<p>1. At least 2 of the English faculty members should have been given the opportunity to undergo a training program every semester starting next academic year, 2015 and onward.</p>

**Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan**

	<p>skills in teaching their subjects;</p> <p>4. Equip themselves with the current and emerging technology in the information and communication technology (ICT).</p>	<p>3. Calendar of Activities for English teachers should be made visible in the department in terms of their “what”, “why”, “how” “where” of their activities and duties. The duration of the training should be indicated in the calendar of activities for transparency and monitoring.</p>				
Strategic Competence	<p>1. Improve the quality of classroom instructions and activities;</p> <p>2. Develop teachers’ knowledge and skills in facilitating the teaching and learning process.</p>	<p>1. English teachers will be required to report every summer for syllabus making and lesson planning to improve their teaching competence;</p> <p>2. In-service training should be conducted for English teachers every semester break. Trainers from other Higher Academic institutions will be invited to act as resource persons of the trainings.</p>	<p>1. The program of activities will commence next year 2015 and onward.</p>	<p>1. All English Teachers</p> <p>2. The Dean of the School</p> <p>3. The Administration</p> <p>4. The Academic Council</p>	<p>1. An amount of not less than 10,000 but not more than 10,000 should be allocated for the purchase of possible materials and their corollaries during the syllabus and lessons planning every semester break.</p> <p>2. An amount of 50,000 but not less than 50,000 should be provided by the college for the conduct of the in-service trainings inclusive of</p>	<p>1. It is expected that the activities will be able to improve the discourse competence of the English teachers by at least 95%.</p> <p>2. All English teachers should be able to come up with visible outputs such as lesson plans and syllabus at the end of the trainings.</p>

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

					the honoraria of the resource persons and snacks of the teachers during the training.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result which reveals a “very good” communicative competence of college English language teachers simply proves that they meet the required desirable level of communicative competence threshold. Therefore, it can be said that the teachers can generally and operationally form well-structured messages and communicate in English as they fulfill their functions and perform their duties and responsibilities which involves understanding of the mechanics and relationships within the classroom and the rules and conduct specific to a particular setting. They are also exemplary to their students.

The profile of the teachers has no significant relationship to their communicative competence. Meaning no matter how long the respondents were teaching, with master’s degree or units, doctoral degree or units, were sometimes or always exposed to English language, with fair or good oral language proficiency, with fair or good written language proficiency they are all capable to be communicatively competent.

On the other hand, oral language proficiency had significant relationship with grammar and sociolinguistic competence of the teachers. This shows that an articulate teacher has a good control of his grammar and could speak English in real life settings observing rules of conventions. Educational attainment has significant relationship with discourse competence. This suggests that teachers who have higher educational attainment become more knowledgeable and are exposed to particular platforms that help enhance their mastery of rules and organization of meaning.

Majority of the teachers were only sometimes exposed to English language. The result of their interview showed the reasons which include time and environment or surroundings.

Extent of language exposure has no significant relationship with the teachers’ communicative competence meaning their communicative competence is not dependent to their language exposure. But when interviewed they considered different factors which are more on English language exposure like technology/ media or speaking and hearing the language that influenced their communicative competence.

There is no significant difference in the level of communicative competence when teachers were grouped according to campus. Therefore, it can be said that the teachers might be coming from the main or the external campus all of them have the knowledge and skill needed in communication.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author acknowledges the invaluable contributions of the following: Dr. Clara Rebecca Falconi, Dr. Leovigildo Manalo, Dr. Haydee Gabriel, Dr. Louise Anne Librando and Dr. Deletah Polinar for their intellectual inputs in this endeavor.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Abao, E. (2013). Second Language Facility of Student Teachers in the Philippines: An Opportunity or a Challenge? Cebu Normal University, Cebu City, Philippines in European Scientific Journal: December, 2013 edition Vol. 9, No. 34 ISSN:1857-7881 (Print)e—ISSN1857-7431 193
- 2) Bailey, K. M. (2006). Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach. New York: Cambridge University Press
- 3) Chambless, K. S. (2012). Teachers’ oral proficiency in the target language: research on its role in the language teaching and learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(51), 141-162
- 4) Creswell, J.W. (2015). A concise introduction to mixed methods research. SAGE Publications. Google Scholar
- 5) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (1998). Bangkok, Thailand: FAOI DANIDA Expert Consultation ISSN 0429-9345, ISBN 92-5-104304-3
- 6) Goodwin, A., Smith, L., SoutoManning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M., Reed, R.,& Taveras, L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives from practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 284–302.10.1177/0022487114535266 [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

## Communicative Competence of College English Language Teachers: Using Results as Basis for an Action Plan

- 7) Guest, G., Macqueen, K., Namely, E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications
- 8) Khamhi-Stein, L.D. (2009). Teacher preparation and nonnative Englishspeaking educators. In A. Burns & J.C. Richards (Eds). *The Cambridge Guide to second language teacher education* (pp.91-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 9) Light, J. & McNaughton, D. (2014). Communicative Competence for Individuals who Require Augmentative Alternative Communication: A New Definition for a New Era of Communication? *Augmentative and Alternative Communications* 30 (1): 1-18 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3109/07434618.2014.885080>
- 10) Mitchel, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2013). *Research design explained*. California: Cengage Learning.
- 11) Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S.S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating form-focused in communication context*. New York: Routledge
- 12) Ohno, A. (2011). *Communicative Competence and Communicative Language Teaching*. Retrieved from <http://cicero.u-bunkyo.ac.jp/lib/kiyo/fsells002/25-32.pdf>.
- 13) Richards, J. C. (2010). *Competence and performance in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 14) Richards, J.C. (2011). *Exploring teacher competence in language teaching*. The Language Teacher JACT 2011 special issue, Singapore, University of Sydney: Regional Language Centre
- 15) Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18 (2), 233-245.
- 16) Sert, O. (2006). Heightening grammatical awareness in English. Retrieved from <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/awareness>
- 17) *Speaking for Excellence: Language Competencies for Effective Teaching Practice* (2013). Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC)
- 18) Springer, K. (2010). *Educational Research: a contextual approach*: Wiley. Google Scholar
- 19) Wang, F. (2010). The necessity of grammar teaching. *English Language Teaching* 3(2), 78-81 Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/6241/5013>
- 20) Wang, Y. (2012). Learning L2 Vocabulary with American TV Drama From the Learner's Perspective. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 5, No. 8; 2012 ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750, Canadian Center of Science and Education