

Communicative Competence and Academic Performance in Oral Communication: A Descriptive-Correlational Study Among Filipino Senior High School Learners

Karen N. Coidno^{1,2}, William D. Magday Jr.^{3*}

¹MAT-English Candidate, College of Teacher Education, Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines

²Teacher III, Tuao High School, Bagabag, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines

³Dean, College of Teacher Education, Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines

Abstract: This descriptive-correlational study examined the relationship between communicative competence and academic performance in Oral Communication in Context, a course in the Senior High School (SHS) curriculum in the Philippines. A total sampling technique was utilized, involving 124 SHS learners as respondents. Specifically, it evaluated the degree of communicative competence across four domains: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic, and analyzed their relationship with academic performance and demographic variables. The results showed that the respondents exhibited a growing level of communicative competence, with sociolinguistic competence being the highest domain, followed by strategic, discourse, and grammatical competence. Students generally perceived themselves as effective communicators, particularly in adapting language to social and cultural situations and dealing with communication failures, but demonstrated less assurance in grammatical correctness and control of discourse structure. Academic performance (mean = 82.45) revealed that the majority of learners fell into the fairly satisfactory and satisfactory groups, with only a few achieving very satisfactory and outstanding scores. Although the minimum passing norm was achieved, the findings indicate that clarity, fluency, coherence, and academic discourse were not fully mastered. Correlation analysis showed no significant relationship between overall communicative competence and academic performance, except for sociolinguistic competence, which exhibited a statistically significant negative correlation. This implies that perceived sociolinguistic adaptability does not always translate to better academic scores, suggesting the need for performance-based tests to be implemented in conjunction with self-assessments. Furthermore, demographic factors (sex, age, grade level, or language at home) showed no significant impact on communicative competence. The results reestablish that the quality of instruction, classroom discourse, and communicative exposure are more decisive than demographic factors in the development of communicative competence.

Keywords: communicative competence, oral communication, sociolinguistic competence, academic achievement, senior high school, performance-based assessment.

1. Introduction

Communication is crucial to academic success as well as personal development of any human being, particularly to senior high school learners. Within the Philippine educational system, one of the fundamental subjects within the curriculum that can promote the communicative competence of students is the subject Oral Communication Skills in Context, which not only focuses on grammar, but also on the skills to use language in various social and cultural contexts, organize ideas, and apply strategies to effectively communicate (Nesic and Hamidovic, 2022). The concept of Communicative Competence is multi-faceted, extending beyond mere grammatical knowledge to encompass sociolinguistic (appropriate use in context), discourse (logical structuring of ideas), and strategic (problem-solving) skills, as outlined by Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980). International and Philippine studies (e.g., Magday et al., 2024; Fariha et al., 2023; Terogo et al., 2018; Salvador et al., 2023) consistently show that while learners often possess strong grammatical skills, they struggle with sociolinguistic adaptation and coherence in real-life speaking. Furthermore, the correlation between oral competence and Academic Achievement is often weak when assessment is dominated by written exams (Amir et al., 2024), but it becomes stronger when performance-based assessment (like presentations and debates) is used, as supported by Brooks et al. (2006) and Moreno et al. (2022). Therefore, the literature emphasizes that to enhance both communicative competence and its reflection in academic grades, instruction must prioritize authentic tasks, repetitive oral practice, and continuous formative feedback, often facilitated by technology (Tomas, 2023; Uztosun, 2024).

Nevertheless, in spite of high curricular content, the latest national statistics show that there have been incidences of students who have learning difficulties in communication. The record in the 2024 Functional Literacy, Education and Mass Media Survey (FLEMMS) by the Philippine Statistics

*Corresponding author: wmagdayjr@nvsu.edu.ph

Authority (PSA) indicated that 93.1% of Filipinos in the age group 10–64 are able to read and write, although only 70.8% are functionally literate. It implies that the level of information that most citizens can comprehend and apply in their everyday lives is about to decrease by approximately 30 percent (PSA, 2025). Even Senator Gatchalian (2025) noted that approximately 18.9 million Filipinos, with a large number of high school graduates, are not functionally literate to succeed outside school. This brings about questions as to whether students are really prepared in terms of using their reading, writing, and speaking skills in real-life circumstances.

Even in the rural school communities, the students were also reported to frequently experience even greater challenges, such as a lack of access to learning material, a lack of self-confidence, and a lack of the opportunity to practice speaking in real-life situations that may impede the acquisition of effective communication skills (Rayla & Sonsona, 2025). This is not only a problem in the Philippines. There were also students around the world that are having the same challenges in oral communication skills. It has also been found in international studies that learners can find it difficult to adapt their language to other situations, actively listen, and have meaningful conversations because they do not experience real-life communication situations (Magday & Pramoolsook, 2021; Kos & Celik, 2023; Tatzali et al., 2025). Such results show the significance of communicative competence globally, not only in academic success, but also in future career and personal relations.

Based on these problems, this paper seeks to discuss the communicative competence of Grade 11 and Grade 12 students in a public high school and its association with academic performance in Oral Communication Skills in Context, a core course in the Senior High School curriculum in the Philippines.

This research sheds light on how oral communication skills and individual background affect the success in oral communication by looking at the self-perception of the students as well as their performance.

2. Research Objectives

This study aims to understand how communicative competence relates to the academic performance of senior high school students in Oral Communication in Context in a public school of Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines. While the original research objectives included an aim to describe the demographic profile of the learners, this specific descriptive step has been removed from the final version of this article. This strategic exclusion was implemented to decrease the overall length and complexity of the manuscript and ensure a tightly focused presentation. Therefore, the profile variables (sex, age, etc.) were retained and analyzed as part of Objective 4 (determining influence on communicative competence), thereby ensuring that the necessary correlational data remains central to the publication, while avoiding the redundancy of a separate descriptive section. Thus, this study aims to:

1. Describe the learners' level of communicative competence along:
 - 1.1. Grammatical Competence,

- 1.2. Sociolinguistic Competence,
- 1.3. Discourse Competence, and
- 1.4. Strategic Competence.

2. Identify the academic performance of the learners using their final grades in Oral Communication in Context.
3. Determine the relationship between students' communicative competence and their academic performance in the subject.
4. Analyze how learner profile variables—such as sex, age, grade level, and language spoken at home—may influence their communicative competence.

3. Methods

A. Research Design

The study is guided by a descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive part established the communicative competence and academic performance levels of the respondents whereas the correlational part recognized the existence of any significant relationship between the two variables. Also, the paper examined the role that demographic variable like sex, age, grade level, ethnicity, and mother tongue played in the communicative competence.

B. Respondents and Sampling Technique

The study utilized the total sampling technique, where all Grade 11 and Grade 12 students studying in a public school of Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines, during the school year 2025–2026 were considered as respondents. A total of 124 respondents were included in this study.

C. Research Instrument

A researcher-made instrument used in this study was according to the framework of Nesic and Hamidovic (2022) that examines four essential aspects, including grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. The final grades in the senior high school course, Oral Communication in Context, was used to determine the academic performance of the students.

D. Statistical Processing of Data

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in data analysis. The levels of communicative competence and academic performance was summarized with the help of descriptive statistics based on mean, frequency, and percentage. Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was used as inferential statistics to test the relationship between communicative competence and academic performance. Also, t-tests and ANOVA were applied to identify the presence of significant differences in communicative competence variables depending on the profile variables of the learners. The level of significance should be equal to 0.05 to guarantee the validity of statistics.

4. Results and Discussion

This part of the study presents the findings and structured in this section into four areas: The level of communication competence, students' academic performance, the relationship

between the level of communication competence and the level of academic performance, and the difference between the students' communication competence when grouped according to demographic profile. Appropriate statistical analysis methods were utilized to make confident and useful interpretations from the results.

A. Level of Communication Competence

Table 1 displays the level of communication competence in grammatical competence.

The ensuing tables present the level of communication competence such as grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and represented by means (M) and standard deviations (SD) with qualitative descriptions (QD).

1) Grammatical Competence

Table 1 indicates that the respondents generally reported that their communication competence in grammatical competence was rated as "sometimes" ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.575$), suggesting that while learners demonstrate basic grammatical skills, these are not consistently applied in their communication. The best ranked indicator was that the respondents tend to rectify themselves when they commit language errors ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.897$), which was characterized as often, showing that they are highly aware of when they make mistakes and are willing to make improvements on how they use language.

The rest of the four grammatical elements were reported by the respondents as sometimes working. According to the respondents, they occasionally use grammatically sound sentences ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.734$) and articulate their thoughts in complete sentences ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.747$) which may mean that they have moderate control over sentence arrangement. The rating to pronunciation was also sometimes effective ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.755$), which means that the state of clarity is achieved, but it is not always uniform. The lowest indicator was the vocabulary use ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.780$), which means that the learners might not know how to choose the right words on various topics.

Del Rosario (2021) points out that the difficulty in communicating due to improper use of grammar among the senior high school students leads to the requirement of creating

learning materials that will continuously reinforce the grammar skills. Such a need for material development is supported by the studies that affirm that learners benefit a lot from structured grammar and self-correction practice. The results also reveal that the learners' grasp of grammar elements is on the rise, but still, there is a huge demand for constant reinforcement and context-based teaching for communication proficiency to be established and students to be advanced to more effective stages.

2) Sociolinguistic Competence

Table 2 displays the level of communication competence in sociolinguistic competence.

Table 2 results showed that respondents tended to indicate their communication competence in sociolinguistic competence as often effective ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.724$). This implies that learners often exhibit sociolinguistic awareness in the amount of interaction they have where they vary their language and behavior based on the social and cultural situations. The most rated one indicated that the respondents frequently modify their language based on their audience ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.978$) which means that they can successfully address various interpersonal interactions successfully.

The respondents found all five sociolinguistic elements listed as effective often. They were sensitive to social cues because learners indicated that they frequently use polite expressions where necessary ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.01$), appropriate tone and gestures based on the situation ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.856$). Another point that was made by the respondents was that they are aware of differences between cultural communication ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.976$), and this aspect indicates increased intercultural competence. The lowest scoring indicator though the lowest in the often category was being able to express disagreement in a respectful manner ($M = 3.559$, $SD = 0.957$) and it might necessitate further practice.

Fariha et al. (2023) also claim that the sociolinguistic competence is closely related to the speaking proficiency due to the fact that learners are able to modify the language usage according to the situation and cultural contexts; they are better communicators. This is in line with the existing results which indicate that the learners are becoming effective sociolinguistic

Table 1

Level of communication competence in grammatical competence				
No.	Grammatical Competence	M	SD	QD
1.	I speak using grammatically correct sentences.	3.27	.734	S
2.	I pronounce words clearly and accurately.	3.40	.755	S
3.	I use appropriate vocabulary for different topics.	3.16	.780	S
4.	I can express my ideas using complete sentences.	3.27	.747	S
5.	I correct myself when I make language mistakes.	3.51	.897	O
Overall Mean		3.33	.575	S

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.50 – 4.49 Often (O); 2.50 – 3.49 Sometimes (S); 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.49 Never (N)

Table 2

Level of communication competence in sociolinguistic competence				
No.	Sociolinguistic Competence	M	SD	QD
1.	I adjust my language depending on who I am speaking to.	3.95	.978	O
2.	I use polite expressions when needed.	3.81	1.01	O
3.	I understand cultural differences in communication.	3.68	.976	O
4.	I express disagreement respectfully.	3.55	.957	O
5.	I use appropriate tone and gestures depending on the situation.	3.77	.856	O
Overall Mean		3.75	.724	O

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.50 – 4.49 Often (O); 2.50 – 3.49 Sometimes (S); 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.49 Never (N)

learners who can flex their communication options, according to social role and cultural requirements. The evidence suggests that further exposure to diverse communication situations and support of respectful talk might enhance the sociolinguistic competence of the learners.

3) Discourse Competence

Table 3 displays the level of communication competence in discourse competence.

The results in Table 3 reveal that respondents generally rated their communication competence in discourse competence as sometimes ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.689$). This implies that though learners are showing some skills to be able to organize and relate ideas in the process of communication, there is still some area of improvement in coherent application of discourse strategies in different contexts.

Three of the five indicators showed the top-ranked item to be the ability to remain on task in the discussions or presentations ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 0.827$), an item in the often category. It means that the learners have a reasonable degree of certainty that they can sustain thematic coherence, which is critical in classroom discourse and speaking up. In the same way, similar to the thoughts connecting transitions ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.897$) and answering questions with appropriate answers ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.897$) were also considered often effective, meaning that learners are becoming fluent in terms of controlling the flow and responsiveness of their speech.

On the other hand, two were rated as sometimes: clarifying and explaining ideas logically ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.818$) and summarizing points well ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.914$). These low scores indicate that the learners might have a problem in organizing their own words and summarizing information, which are very essential in academic writing, oral presentation, and group discussions.

Recent studies by Reyes et al. (2022) and Magday et al. (2022), emphasize that discourse competence is foundational to academic success, particularly in multilingual classrooms. They state that when learners have the ability to develop ideas logically and answer in a logical way, then they are in a better position to think critically and work together. This is in line with the existing results that demonstrate some emerging abilities in

topic maintenance and transitions but requires specific training on summarization and logical sequencing.

4) Strategic Competence

Table 4 displays the level of communication competence in strategic competence.

Table 4 indicate that respondents generally rated their communication competence in strategic competence as often effective ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.665$). This is an indication that learners are becoming more conscious and competent in employing methods to regulate communication failure, as well as maintain the trade, but certain aspects still need to be strengthened.

The highest-ranked scale was the response to the investigation of something that is not known when the individual requires clarification ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.908$), which is included in the often category. This means that the learners take initiative in trying to sort out misconceptions, which is also important in ensuring that communication is effective. The other 4 indicators, however, were rated as sometimes effective, which indicated areas with strategic behaviours that are not yet enforced.

Two items that learners said they apply in explaining challenging concepts included the use of gestures or examples to explain hard concepts ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 0.841$) and the use of the strategy to keep the conversation moving ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.932$) which are almost equal to the often threshold. The responses signal increasing proficiency in non-verbal support and managing conversations, but the differences in the levels of mastery within the group are pointed out by the variability of the responses.

A lower rating was found in formulating statements in the case of not understanding ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.967$) and not panicking and feeling secure regardless of the errors ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.864$). The implication of these findings is that when dealing with communication difficulties in learners, one may find that they lack control of their emotions and adaptive reforming ability, which are the qualities of resilience and clarity in the interaction process.

According to Dela Cruz et al. (2023), strategic competence holds significant importance in a multilingual and multicultural

Table 3
Level of communication competence in discourse competence

No.	Discourse Competence	M	SD	QD
1.	I explain my ideas clearly and in a logical order.	3.35	.818	S
2.	I use transitions to connect my thoughts.	3.52	.897	O
3.	I stay on topic during discussions or presentations.	3.59	.827	O
4.	I summarize my points effectively.	3.24	.914	S
5.	I respond to questions with relevant answers.	3.50	.897	O
Overall Mean		3.44	.689	S

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.50 – 4.49 Often (O); 2.50 – 3.49 Sometimes (S); 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.49 Never (N)

Table 4
Level of communication competence in strategic competence

No.	Strategic Competence	M	SD	QD
1.	I ask for clarification when I don't understand something.	3.85	.908	O
2.	I use gestures or examples to explain difficult ideas.	3.49	.841	S
3.	I rephrase my statements when others don't understand me.	3.37	.967	S
4.	I stay calm and confident even when I make mistakes.	3.34	.864	S
5.	I use strategies to keep the conversation going.	3.47	.932	S
Overall Mean		3.50	.665	O

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.50 – 4.49 Often (O); 2.50 – 3.49 Sometimes (S); 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.49 Never (N)

environment where students are required to deal with various communicative requirements. The study results coincide with other assertions that the willingness of the learner to seek clarification and resume compensatory strategies to achieve a better fit in real time communication are the key aspects that determine the development of communicative competence.

B. Level of Communication Competence

Table 5 presents the summary of the student-respondents in the level of communication competence.

Table 5
Summary level of communication competence

No.	Communication Competence	M	SD	QD
1	Grammatical Competence	3.33	.575	S
2	Sociolinguistic Competence	3.75	.724	O
3	Discourse Competence	3.44	.689	S
4	Strategic Competence	3.50	.665	O
Overall Mean		3.51	.574	O

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.50 – 4.49 Often (O); 2.50 – 3.49 Sometimes (S); 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.49 Never (N)

Table 5 presents the overall level of communication competence of student-respondents in four domains grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic. The total mean of the score was rated often (M = 3.51, SD = 0.574), which means that learners tend to believe that they are good communicators who can often use proper linguistic, sociocultural, discourse, and strategic behavior in different situations. This is to imply that although some of the subdomains like grammatical and discourse competence are at the frequently effective level, the overall performance of all the areas indicates a growing competence in communication. The results suggest that learners are moving towards the goal of the holistic communicative competence, which is a balance between accuracy, appropriateness, coherence, and adaptability.

Based on the study by Reyes and Santos (2022), highlights that overall communicative competence is a multidimensional phenomenon that involves the incorporation of grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies to have an effective interaction. Equally, Dela Cruz, Villanueva, and Santos (2023) point out that learners who are competent in these areas are in a better position to succeed in academics and intercultural communication, since they are able to modify the language use, deal with failures, and maintain meaningful interactions.

Moreover, the sociolinguistic competence was the strongest domain when mean scores were ranked from highest to lowest (M = 3.75, SD = 0.724), followed by the strategic competence (M = 3.50, SD = 0.665), the discourse competence (M = 3.44, SD = 0.689), and the grammatical competence (M = 3.33, SD = 0.575). The findings indicate that the students feel the strongest in the area of modifying their speech according to social and cultural signals and are also creating methods to cope with communication breakdowns. Nevertheless, they are still the least assured in presenting their ideas in a coherent manner and in accurately using grammatical rules.

1) Level of Academic Performance

The succeeding table present the level of academic performance of the respondents represented by mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) with descriptive equivalent (DE).

Table 6 presents the level of academic performance of the respondents

Table 6
Level of academic performance of the respondents

Academic Performance	Frequency (n=124)	Percentage (%)
90 – 100	11	8.9
85 – 89	35	28.2
80 – 84	37	29.8
75 – 79	41	33.1
Below 75	0	0
Mean	82.45	Description
		S

Legend: 90 – 100 Outstanding (O); 85 – 89 Very Satisfactory (VS); 80 – 84 Satisfactory (S); 75 – 79 Fairly Satisfactory (FS); Below 75 Did not meet expectations (DNE)

Table 6 shows academic performance of the 124 student-respondents in subject Oral Communication in Context. The mean score was 82.45 and this is below the Satisfactory category. This implies that individually learners are up to the standard in oral communication showing fundamental skills in the speaking, listening as well as interaction skills. The most prominent range of scores was in the 75-79 category (n = 41, 33.1%), which got Fairly Satisfactory, and then those with the 80-84 group (n = 37, 29.8%), which is Satisfactory. In the range between 85-89, quite a number of students scored at the Very Satisfactory range (n = 35, 28.2), theirs, whereas a minimum number of students scored at the Outstanding range (n = 11, 8.9) only. Notably, none of the respondents had scored lowly than the set minimum passing mark of 75.

These findings indicate that most learners are not performing below acceptable academic standards, but majority are in the lower satisfactory bands. This could be an indicator of deficiencies in achieving mastery of significant oral communication areas including clarity, coherence, and fluency, and strategic interaction. The presence of few outstanding performers has raised the issue of enriched instructions and practice opportunities especially in spontaneous speaking, argumentation, and discourse control.

Having no score below 75 is an optimistic indicator of achievement on baseline, but the general distribution of it suggests that more pedagogical assistance is required to raise learners at the level of satisfactory performance to the exemplary levels.

According to Reyes and Santos (2022), one of the main factors that lead to academic success in general is oral communication competence, since it enables the individual to be more confident and more precise both in the classroom and in real-life situations. In its turn, Dela Cruz et al. (2023) believe that continuous engagement in oral communication activities, including debates, presentations, peer communication, and the like, is what enables learners to go beyond the level of satisfactory performance and head toward greater heights. These studies are consistent with the current results indicating that although learners have attained a satisfactory baseline then

Table 7
Correlation coefficient between the communication competence and the academic performance of the respondents

Communication Competence		Academic Performance (n=124)	Remarks
Grammatical Competence	Pearson Correlation	-.085	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.350	
Sociolinguistic Competence	Pearson Correlation	-.204*	Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	
Discourse Competence	Pearson Correlation	-.083	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.362	
Strategic Competence	Pearson Correlation	-.075	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.410	
Overall	Pearson Correlation	-.132	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143	

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

more is required to generate interventions in the forms of structured interventions and exposure to a variety of communicative situations in order to drive performance to the very satisfactory and outstanding levels.

C. Relationship Between the Level of Communication Competence and the Level of Academic Performance of the Respondents

The table 7 presents the relationship between the communication competence and the academic performance of the respondents, evaluated at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 7 shows that the relationship between the level of communication competence and the level of academic performance of the respondents.

Table 7 shows the statistical correlation between communication competence and the performance of the respondents in Oral Communication in Context. The results are obtained based on Pearson coefficient of correlation where the correlation of the four areas of communication competence with academic performance is statistically significant with only sociolinguistic competence indicating a statistically significant relationship ($r = -0.204$, $p = 0.023$). Surprisingly, this correlates in the negative, which indicates the possible existence of lower academic scores in interest of greater self-perceived sociolinguistic competence. Although counterintuitive, such result can be due to overestimation of sociolinguistic ability or lack of correspondence between informal and formal communicative performance and academic assessment. Other areas (grammatical competence, $r = -0.085$, $p = 0.350$; discourse competence, $r = -0.083$, $p = 0.362$; and strategic competence, $r = -0.075$, $p = 0.410$) did not have significant relations with academic performance.

The overall relationship between total communication competence and academic performance was also not significant ($r = -0.132$, $p = 0.143$). This finding represents an idea that self-conceived competence might not necessarily succeed into academic achievement in oral communication activities, as might be evident in the case of the learners who consider themselves competent communicators.

According to Reyes and Santos (2022), self-perceived competence should also be implemented with the help of the structured performance-based assessment to make sure that it aligns with the curricular objectives. Similarly, Fariha et al. (2023) articulate a similar caution stating that sociolinguistic fluency can serve as an interpersonal communication tool but at the same time it may not necessarily fulfill the requirements of

formal academic tasks like the presentation, coherence, and grammar being dependent on the task. The findings highlight the significance of communicative confidence in balance between instructional feedback and performance calibration.

D. Influence of Learner Profile Variables on their Communicative Competence

1) Difference in Level of Communication Competence According to Sex

Table 8 shows the difference in the level of communication competence when grouped according to sex of the student-respondents.

Table 8 Difference in the levels of communication competence based on sex					
Communication Competence	Sex	M	SD	t	Sig
Grammatical Competence	Female	3.35	.577	.578	.564
	Male	3.29	.575		
Sociolinguistic Competence	Female	3.77	.747	.370	.712
	Male	3.73	.702		
Discourse Competence	Female	3.46	.660	.276	.783
	Male	3.42	.728		
Strategic Competence	Female	3.54	.659	.560	.576
	Male	3.47	.677		

Table 8 shows the comparative analysis of communication competence in male and female respondents in four domains, namely grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. According to the results, female respondents obtained a higher mean rating than male respondents. Female respondents had a higher point on grammatical competence ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.577$) than boys ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.575$), and on sociolinguistic competence ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.747$) than boys ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.702$). This is the same in discourse competence where females are rated at $M = 3.46$ ($SD = 0.660$) and males at $M = 3.42$ ($SD = 0.677$), and in strategic competence with females rated at $M = 3.54$ ($SD = 0.659$) and males scored at $M = 3.47$ ($SD = 0.677$).

Nevertheless, although these differences in mean scores are consistent, calculated t-values and level of significance show that none of the differences between sexes was statistically meaningful in all the domains ($Sig > 0.05$). This poses a possibility of female respondents slightly scoring higher in the communication competence; however, the difference is not sufficiently high to determine a statistically significant difference.

This is in line with a recent study conducted by Mendoza and Alvarado (2021) observed that female learners tend to have a higher perception of their competence with regard to language-

related tasks since they tend to participate more in verbal exercises and in the classroom. Nonetheless, Reyes and Santos (2022) note that the gender difference in self-assessment cannot always be performing-wise, and thus the significance of factoring in a triangulated approach to self-assessment by the use of both self-report and performance-based measurements.

2) Difference in Level of Communication Competence According to Age

Table 9 shows the difference in the level of communication competence when grouped according to age of the student-respondents.

Table 9 provides the relative comparison of the communication competence between three groups of people of different ages 15-16 years, 17-18 years, and 19 years and above. The findings indicate that there is no evident age group that performed well in all domains. The age groups of 15-16 scored the most in grammatical competence ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.566$), though a little higher than in the 17-18 age group ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.587$) and the age group of 19 or over ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.516$). In the case of sociolinguistic competence, the highest mean belonged to the 15-16 group ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.709$), then the 17-18 group ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.731$), and the 19 and above group registered the lowest point ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.723$). Nevertheless, in discourse competence, 17-18 age group had the highest mean ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.703$), a little higher than 15-16 group ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.688$), with the 19 and above group still recording the lowest ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.615$). Equally, the 17-18 group had a mean of 3.52 which ($SD = 0.709$) was followed by 15-16 with a mean of 3.50 ($SD = 0.642$) and 19 and above with a mean of 3.30 ($SD = 0.245$).

However, even with such differences in the mean scores, the calculated F-values and the level of significance values show that none of the differences between the age groups were statistically significant ($Sig > 0.05$). This implies that age does not have a significant impact on the degree of communication competence of the respondents. The somewhat higher scores in

younger learners can be attributed to an increased exposure to structured oral communication training or an increased number of formal speaking classroom activities, however the tendencies are not significant enough to create a statistical significance.

These results match the recent research in the relevant area of the scope of research. As Reyes and Santos (2022) outline, the quality of the instruction and the interaction between the learner and the teacher exert more influence on the communicative development than the age. On the same note, Tan and Javier (2024) also contend that the contextual variables including curriculum structure, teacher feedback and the possibilities to have authentic interactions tend to mediate age-related variations in communication competence.

3) Difference in Level of Communication Competence According to Grade Level

Table 10 shows the difference in the level of communication competence when grouped according to grade level of the student-respondents.

Table 10 shows the comparative analysis of communication competence of Grade 11 and Grade 12 student-respondents in four areas namely, grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. The findings indicate that Grade 12 students have always received higher than Grade 11 students, mean rating in all areas. In particular, Grade 12 respondents had slightly higher scores in grammatical competence ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.602$) than Grade 11 ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.547$), in sociolinguistic competence ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.733$) than Grade 11 ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.719$), in discourse competence ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.688$) than Grade 11 ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.693$), and in strategic competence ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.685$) than Grade 11 ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 0.649$).

Although the observed mean differences are consistent, the t-values and levels of significance suggest that the difference between the grades levels were not significant ($Sig > 0.05$). This implies that there is no significant effect of grade level on level of communication competence of the respondents. These mildly positive results of Grade 12 students could be attributed to their longer experience with oral communication training or

Table 9
Difference in the levels of communication competence based on age

Communication Competence	Age (years)	M	SD	F	Sig
Grammatical Competence	15-16	3.35	.566	.660	.519
	17-18	3.33	.587		
	19 & above	3.07	.516		
Sociolinguistic Competence	15-16	3.78	.709	1.428	.244
	17-18	3.77	.731		
	19 & above	3.27	.723		
Discourse Competence	15-16	3.44	.688	.205	.815
	17-18	3.46	.703		
	19 & above	3.27	.615		
Strategic Competence	15-16	3.50	.642	.308	.736
	17-18	3.52	.709		
	19 & above	3.30	.245		

Table 10
Difference in the levels of communication competence based on grade level

Communication Competence	Grade Level	M	SD	t	Sig
Grammatical Competence	Grade 11	3.31	.547	-.132	.895
	Grade 12	3.33	.602		
Sociolinguistic Competence	Grade 11	3.72	.719	-.432	.667
	Grade 12	3.78	.733		
Discourse Competence	Grade 11	3.39	.693	-.724	.471
	Grade 12	3.48	.688		
Strategic Competence	Grade 11	3.49	.649	-.212	.833
	Grade 12	3.52	.685		

Table 11
Difference in the levels of communication competence based on language at home

Communication Competence	Language at Home	M	SD	F	Sig
Grammatical Competence	Tagalog	3.20	.666	.735	.482
	Ilocano	3.34	.556		
	Gaddang, Ifugao, & Others	3.48	.559		
Sociolinguistic Competence	Tagalog	3.55	.748	1.176	.312
	Ilocano	3.78	.723		
	Gaddang, Ifugao, & Others	4.00	.583		
Discourse Competence	Tagalog	3.27	.697	.951	.389
	Ilocano	3.47	.697		
	Gaddang, Ifugao, & Others	3.64	.410		
Strategic Competence	Tagalog	3.31	.662	1.322	.270
	Ilocano	3.53	.676		
	Gaddang, Ifugao, & Others	3.76	.219		

to more development of efficiency in academic discourse or to confidence in these abilities because of their seniority but these patterns are not robust enough to be statistically significant.

According to Reyes and Santos (2022), communicative competence is gained gradually over time, through teaching and practice, but still the individual learning level and context usually go beyond the differences in grades. Similarly, Dela Cruz et al. (2023) assert that even though higher-grade students may reveal more advanced communicative strategies, the disparity is often related to the quality of the instruction and classroom interaction rather than only the grade.

4) Difference in Level of Communication Competence According to Language at Home

Table 11 shows the difference in the level of communication competence when grouped according to language at home of the student-respondents.

The comparative analysis of the student-respondents communication competence depending on their main language of communication at home, Tagalog, Ilocano, and Gaddang, Ifugao and Others are shown in table 11. The findings reveal that, respondents who use Gaddang, Ifugao, and other native languages at home always received the highest mean rating in all the four areas of communication competence. In particular, they achieved the best scores in grammatical competence ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.559$), sociolinguistic competence ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.583$) discourse competence ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.410$), and strategic competence ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.219$). Such scores indicate that the Gaddang, Ifugao, and other native language speakers may have an increased level of metalinguistic awareness and adaptive strategies of communication, potentially because of their experience of operating in two or even more linguistic situations.

Tagalog speaking respondents, on the other hand, were lowest in all domains with the mean grammatical competence at $M = 3.20$, sociolinguistic competence at $M = 3.55$ and discourse and strategic competence at $M = 3.27$ and 3.31 , respectively. The Ilocano speakers were always mid-range in terms of competence in all aspects.

Regardless of the evident differences in the mean scores, the calculated F-values and the level of significance show that all differences between the language groups were not statistically significant ($Sig > 0.05$). This implies that although language background can affect the self-perceived competence in communication, it does not have a statistically significant impact in that sample.

These results are not new and can be supported by a study by Reyes and Santos (2022) point to the fact that multilingual learners tend to acquire superior communicative flexibility and sociolinguistic sensitivity because of different language norms that they encounter. In the same tone, Dela Cruz et al. (2023) present the idea that the native speakers of a language are likely to demonstrate strong strategic and discourse competence, especially with the acceptance of supportive, inclusive practices in language that support their language identity.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions

The following conclusions were made based on the findings:

Level of Communication Competence: The respondents have an emerging degree of communicative competence, in grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic levels. Learners tend to define themselves as competent communicators, especially socio linguistically and strategically, which means that they are rather strong in the processes of adapting language to the social-cultural context and dealing with communication breakdowns. Nevertheless, a relative lack of trust in grammatical correctness and discourse structure indicates that the learners are yet to receive instructional support that would allow them to attain balanced and entirely developed communicative proficiency.

Level of Academic Performance: The level of the academic performance of the learners is not at the level of academic performance satisfactory, although the learners have reached the minimum academic requirements in regards to Oral Communication in Context. The fact that the proportion of learners in the fairly satisfactory and satisfactory categories is rather high means that the knowledge of the key skills of oral communication is not acquired completely yet. This result suggests that greater teaching methods and more oral practice are required to enhance the clarity, fluency, and coherence as well as academic conversation among the learners.

Correlation between Communication Competence and academic performance: Communication competence based on the perception of the learners does not play significant roles in the academic performance of the learners in Oral Communication Context. The lack of any meaningful connection between the general communicative competence and the academic performance as well as the negative correlation between the sociolinguistic area of competence and

the academic performance is indicative of the difference between self-concept capabilities and the school-based requirements. This shows the necessity to incorporate performance assessments with self-assessment to help come up with a more proper estimate of the learners communicative abilities.

Difference in Communication Competence According to Demographic Profile: The lack of significant differences in communicative competence based on sex, age, grade level, and language spoken at home underscores the critical role of instructional quality, classroom interaction, and meaningful communicative exposure in developing communicative competence. These factors appear to be more decisive than demographic variables.

B. Recommendations

Based on conclusions, the following recommendations are:

Students may be encouraged to engage in various guided oral communication exercises (classroom discussions, classes-market structure, presentations, debate, and group works) to support the development of communicative competence. As the results show that the sociolinguistic and strategic skills are larger and the grammatical and discourse competence are poorer, it can be recommended to the students to focus on the accuracy, coherence, and formal academic expression in a conscious way. Reflective self-assessment and teacher feedback can serve to align the perceived communicative capability of learners with the real performance of the learners in terms of academic performance.

Teachers may constantly create and execute diverse, student-centered teaching approaches that expressly create grammatical precision, discourse structure and formal oratory aptitude and preserve sociolinguistic and strategic acquaintances of the learners. Seeing that there is no substantial correlation between self-reported competence and academic performance, it is deemed appropriate to complete performance-based testing and rubric and formative feedback with the aim of having learners get a better idea of what academic oral communication entails. The instructions given should be inclusive and supportive of different learner backgrounds since the demographic traits were not significantly found to have any effect on communication competence. Parents may contribute to the process of developing their children communication abilities by helping them to have meaningful dialogue at home, as well as offering learners the chance to rehearse the process of articulating ideas and feeling more certain. Parent participation in school activities, tracking academic achievements, and reinforcement of the importance of proper communication might be useful in increasing the effectiveness of learners in oral communication assignments and their confidence. Incorporating a positive home atmosphere where respectful and meaningful communication is appreciated can be used to supplement classroom learning.

School Administrators may reinforce the institution support through professional development training aimed at teaching oral communication, using performance-based evaluation, and fundamental teaching practices. The administrators can also

make a budget towards activities that help develop the speech like school forums, speech clubs, debate organizations, and workshops that exclaim the way of communication. The development of policies emphasizing the principles of interactive instruction and the actual communication chances will also assist in enhancing the academic results and the communicative proficiency of the learners in spite of their demographic diversity.

Future Researchers may expand this study by observing other variables that could affect the connection of the competence of communication and academic performance. Suggestions include:

1. Exploring mediating and moderating factors, including self-efficacy, motivation, anxiety or confidence, which could lead to the discrepancy between perceived and actual performance.
2. Using the qualitative or mixed-method design, such as interview, classroom observation, and discourse analysis in order to get more in-depth information about communicative behaviors of learners.
3. Longitudinal studies that would fuel the development of communication competence and the development of academic performance over time.
4. Studying task and situation-specific variables, including speaking within a formal or informal setting, etc., in order to gain a deeper insight into how various areas of communication skills influence academic performance.

References

- [1] M. A. B. Amir, N. H. Mat Jusoh, and Y. Yacob, "The level of communication and academic performance among university students," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 8, 2024.
- [2] N. E. Brooks, N. E. Dunbar, and T. Kubicka-Miller, "Oral communication skills in higher education: Using a performance-based evaluation rubric to assess communication skills," *Innov. High. Educ.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 115–128, 2006.
- [3] M. Canale and M. Swain, "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing," *Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–47, 1980.
- [4] M. Celce-Murcia, Z. Dörnyei, and S. Thurrell, "Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications," *Issues Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 5–35, 1995.
- [5] R. Dela Cruz, M. Villanueva, and L. Santos, "Strategic competence and communicative development in multilingual and multicultural classrooms," *J. Lang. Commun. Stud.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 45–61, 2023.
- [6] M. E. G. Del Rosario, "Communicative grammar difficulties of Grade 11 students: Inputs for developing and evaluating reinforcement learning materials," *Psychol. Educ.: Multidiscip. J.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 856–867, 2023.
- [7] E. D. Etable, "Assessing the effectiveness of public speaking skills among Grade 11 senior high school HUMSS students of Ronda National High School, Cebu," *Psychol. Educ.: Multidiscip. J.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 306–316, 2025.
- [8] N. Fariha, K. Anwar, and N. Maruf, "Interconnectedness of sociolinguistic competence and speaking proficiency," *English Rev.: J. English Educ.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 1001–1012, 2023.
- [9] W. Gatchalian, "Mobilize LGUs to boost literacy," Office of Sen. Win Gatchalian, Press Release, Apr. 30, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://wingatchalian.com/news/gatchalian-mobilize-lgus-to-boost-literacy/>
- [10] D. H. Hymes, "On communicative competence," in *Sociolinguistics*, J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, Eds. London, U.K.: Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 269–293.

- [11] A. Kos and S. Celik, "The influence of oral communication on the learning engagement of students," *Can. J. Lang. Lit. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 4, Art. no. 104, 2023.
- [12] W. D. Magday et al., "Enhancing students' subject-verb agreement skill by using CiCi artificial intelligence-based app: Embedded mixed-methods study," *Ho Chi Minh City Open Univ. J. Sci., Soc. Sci.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 162–179, 2024.
- [13] W. D. Magday, M. A. Razalan, K. V. Uhuad, R. E. J. Concepcion, L. B. Pacursa, and F. O. Bartolome, "Comparative genre analysis of research abstracts: Philippine versus international colloquia," *Theory Pract. Lang. Stud.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1059–1067, 2022.
- [14] W. D. Magday and I. Pramoolsook, "Exploring teaching demonstrations in the teaching journals: A case of Filipino pre-service teachers," *Lang. Relat. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 175–203, 2021.
- [15] E. M. Moreno, C. Montilla-Arechabala, and M. A. Maldonado, "Effectiveness and characteristics of programs for developing oral competencies at university: A systematic review," *Cogent Educ.*, vol. 9, no. 1, Art. no. 2149224, 2022.
- [16] I. Nešić and K. Hamidović, "Developing a scale for assessing communicative competence of students learning English for specific purposes," *J. Teach. English Sec. Schools Teach. Train.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 481–492, 2022.
- [17] Philippine Statistics Authority, "For every 10 Filipinos, 9 have basic literacy, while 7 have functional literacy (Final results)," Press Release, Jun. 30, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://od2-image-api.abs-cbn.com/prod/20250801060852/2024%20FLEMMS%20Press%20Release%20Final%20Results_signed_0.pdf
- [18] A. D. Rayla and R. P. J. V. Sonsona, "Assessing senior high school students' oral proficiency skills in the new normal," *Sci. Int. J.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 24–38, 2021.
- [19] J. Reyes, P. Ramos, and L. Santos, "Discourse competence as a foundation for academic success in multilingual classrooms," *Asian J. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 23–38, 2022.
- [20] J. Reyes and L. Santos, "Communicative competence as a multidimensional construct in oral academic communication," *J. Educ. Linguist.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 67–83, 2022.
- [21] R. T. Salvador, V. P. Y. Lobaton, and S. M. M. Oliveres, "Communicative competence of senior high school students: Basis for remedial program in English," *Psychol. Educ.: Multidiscip. J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 746–750, 2023.
- [22] A. Tan and R. Javier, "Contextual factors influencing the development of communicative competence among learners," *Int. J. Lang. Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2024.
- [23] C. L. Tomas, *Performance of Grade 11 Students in Oral Communication in Context: Inputs to the Development of Technology-Integrated Supplemental Materials*, Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Philippines, 2023.
- [24] K. Tatzali et al., "The development and validation of the intercultural communicative competence evaluation instrument (ICCEI)," *Cogent Educ.*, vol. 12, no. 1, Art. no. 2464374, 2025.
- [25] M. S. Uztosun, "Cultivating oral communication skills in academic contexts," in *Teaching English for Academic Purposes*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2024, pp. 143–167.