

COMMUNICATIVE ORIENTATION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

Marie Ruffie Ceballos-Mier¹, Gem Aiah B. Blanco²

^{1,2} Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City Bukidnon, Philippines

*ruffieceballos@buku.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study explored on Communicative Orientation of English Language Classes employing the classroom discourse analysis in qualitative research design. The participants of the study are the first year Secondary Education-English students of Bukidnon State University, College of Education. The data gathering was facilitated through the use of Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme. The findings revealed that participant organization was mainly student to student in most of the activities with the same assigned task among learners; class management is apparently through discipline, functions, and discourse analysis with limited range of topics that are highly controlled by the teacher; students' mode of interaction was more on speaking; there is very minimal use of materials for classroom interaction. Further, the participants used L2 than L1; students were noted to have genuine requests and the giving of information were mostly relatively predictable; students' speeches were to a minimal extent due to the activity type used; the teacher and students showed very limited use of explicit code reaction to errors committed by students; expansion, commenting, and elaboration were found to be prevalent; students were found to have a higher frequency of discourse initiation during classroom interaction; relative restriction of linguistic form was rarely observed; and two other features surfaced which were not predetermined features are on code-switching and the use of fillers. The study revealed that the first-year BSE English students' speeches are in L2 and to a minimal extent depending on the activity type used by the teacher. Therefore, communicative events such as activity types have direct impact to the use of the different communicative features.

Keywords: *Communicative Competence, Communicative Events, Communicative Features, Communicative Language Teaching, Communicative Orientation*

INTRODUCTION

Language teaching has been the subject of common pedagogical changes and innovation in the development of language teaching ideologies. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), the history of language teaching has been characterized by a search for the most effective way in which students can learn a second or foreign language. Teaching English as a second language (L2) was once viewed as a process of mechanical habit formation through having students' correct sentences and not through making mistakes (Richards, 2006). With this process, students' errors are avoided through controlled

opportunities for production of both spoken and written, however, knowing what is involved in putting sentences together (grammatical competence) is only one part of what is meant by knowing a language, and it does not guarantee that if one can clearly understand the structure, then one can communicate effectively.

In the initiation of language researches, learning L2 can be viewed from different perspectives. Interactions of students and teachers, collaborative learning, and meaningful learning of the language are now given much importance. These techniques are viewed as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which was originally related to Chomsky's language theory in the 1960s and was conceptually based and laid by Halliday in the 1970s. CLT uses the communicative approach of teaching that focuses on meaning rather than on form. According to this approach, the goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972) referred to as "communicative competence."

Communicative competence (CC) emphasizes on one's ability to use and comprehend the language well in a culturally-appropriate manner and to extend interactions (Richards & Rodgers 2001). In a more elaborated manner, this means that an individual who can communicate competently does not only mean he/she can follow the rules, knows correct arrangements of words, and can speak but also can take up a message and understand the intent of the encoded message and decode it in his/her language without changing its meaning. Hymes' (1970) concept of developing communicative competence supports the principle of the Communicative Language teaching (CLT) approach. CLT, as a functional and communicative potential approach, focuses on language learning (Laksanasut, 2020). This approach was initiated in the intentions of language teaching paradigm shifts in the 1960s. This modern society at present needs language programs that many economic sectors demand, to develop and produce English-proficient workforces in this period of the global spread of English. This has become the reason for paradigm shifts. Moreover, the reformation of methodologies in teaching was considered with high priority as this demands more effective language teaching approaches from many different contexts.

The communicative approach to second language instruction such as in communicative language teaching emphasizes the need for more meaningful and natural use of target language. In the concept of CLT, teachers of the second language need not define it in general rather the lists of indicators of students' communicative behavior should be compiled and analyzed to come up with more effective strategies and activities in teaching and learning the target language. This analysis can be related to the idea of Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) used by Allen, Frolich, & Spada (1985) in identifying the differences of students' orientation through creating a scheme that looks into the different classroom events and activity types. The use of CLT in teaching language was found very important, interesting, and effective. One undeniable problem of implementing it in the context of the students at Bukidnon State University (BukSU) in general, based on the researcher's observation is that many of the learners still lack the confidence to use English. It has been a stigma among students that speaking English becomes a measure of intelligence, as observed by many language teachers. This mindset causes students to limit the use of the target language.

With BukSU's goal for each graduate to be competent individuals for sustainable development, this study is interested in identifying students' communicative orientation of the first-year English students of the College of Education in their English class considering the different activities provided in the classroom. This study looks into how specific activities develop students' communication skills in learning English as the second language and functionally using it. With their interaction in every activity, different communicative features are presumed to be observed. Further, how the students and the teacher either use the language in a natural process or simply using it intentionally in activities involving learning the English language will also be uncovered. As future educators, the participants of this study are also expected to have the ability to articulate their thoughts using English and comprehend what they hear as they overcome challenges imposed in face-to-face communication especially that they will be teaching in the future.

With the advent of communicative language pedagogies, grounded knowledge of activities fosters communicative competence among learners. These essential factors greatly affect the researcher's goals to identify the communicative orientation of language teaching to better prepare teachers and students with the attainment there of.

METHODS

This study employed a Classroom Discourse Analysis in qualitative research design applying the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme of Allen, et al. (1984). Field notes and video recording are used a data-gathering technique. Classroom Discourse Analysis refers to a method that studies the language which students and teacher use for communication in a context. Its medium is through talking or conversation that most teaching takes place in a face-to-face classroom situation. Rumenapp (2016) highlights the following importance of Classroom Discourse Analysis: 1) it can be a tool for on-going teacher development as it helps in the understanding of student-teacher interaction in a classroom; 2) analyzing discourse can lead to a more dynamic view of identity, and 3) awareness of the role of language in positioning students may lead to change in pedagogy in teaching through analyzing classroom discourse.

The study was conducted at Bukidnon State University (BukSU) main campus. It is located in the capital city of the province of Bukidnon, Malaybalay. College of Education, as the flagship of BukSU, caters to students coming from the different parts of the province and even in the region. BukSU-College of Education is one of the largest teacher training institutions in the province and has proudly produced graduates who were among the top ten Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) placers. Its main objective for its learners is to be equipped with the knowledge and skills in teaching and be efficient future educators and professionals. BSE English as one of the programs of the college ensures the development of future English educators in their proficiency in oral and written communication and hardly trains them as effective language teachers in the future, where they are not only expected to be efficient in communication but also share their knowledge about the language and develop their future students' capacity to functionally use the language.

The main participants of the study are first-year college students of the College of Education (COE) with English as their major course in the secondary education program. The class is composed of 32 students (7 boys and 25 girls), and the subject under which the observation transpired was Purposive Communication during the first semester of the school year 2019-2020. Based on the researcher's observation, these students differ in their level of communicative competence as they differ in their orientation on the use of target language, information gap, sustained speech, reaction to code or message, incorporation of preceding utterances, discourse initiation and relative restriction of linguistic form. Qualitative perspectives and techniques were followed in the data collection. These included the natural recurring situation in-classroom observation and checklist for field notes and audio-video recording were utilized. The researcher personally observed the participants four times during their classes employing the Communicative Orientation of Language teaching COLT observation scheme. Transcribed observations were gradually analyzed and coded through a validated codebook, which indicators are also adapted from the COLT observation scheme of Allen et al. (1984).

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Communicative events and activity types in the English Language Classroom

Activities that develop communication play a key role in CLT as one of the methods to better promote training for students' communicative competence. With these activities come the different events that are evident in the classroom observation. Allen, et. Al (1984) state that these communicative events show how learners involved themselves in language learning whether in a group or as an individual, reflects the lesson content which involves the classroom management, topic range, and topic control, identify students' mode of communication either through reading, writing, listening, speaking, or viewing, and classify materials according to its type, source, and length of use. Activity type is one foretelling indicator of achieving classroom goals in terms of communicative teaching. Educators must plan out activities in classrooms to provide an immense communicative experience among students, as Gunduz (2004) mentions that Activity type is the first factor that predicts success in allowing students to communicate freely and achieve the goals of communicative teaching. Mantei and Kervin (2009) state that authentic activities are learning opportunities that teachers design and aim to facilitate students' participation in ordinary practices and events of a group. Therefore, Classroom activities should allow learners to meaningfully interact and develop their fluency in the use of language (Laksanasut, 2020). Below is a summary table on the activity types and the communicative events in an English Language Classroom.

Table 1. Summary Table of Communicative Events in the English Language Classroom

Session	Activity type	Participant Organization <i>whole class/group/group&individual</i>	Content <i>Management/Language/Other topics/Topic control</i>	Student Modality	Material <i>Type/length, purpose or source/use</i>
1	Others: Question & answer	T-S/class – same task – group	Discipline – function – limited range – by teacher	speaking	
	Discussion	T-S/class – same task – group	Discipline – form – limited range – by teacher	listening	Not observed
	Story telling	S-S/class – same task – individual	Procedure – function – broad range – by students	speaking	Not observed
2	Discussion	S-S/class – same task – group	Discipline – discourse – broad range – shared by T&S	speaking	Not observed
	Role-play	S-S/class – different task – group	Procedure – function – limited range – shared by T&S	speaking	Not observed
3	Ted Talk	S-S/class – same task – individual	Discipline – discourse – broad range – by students	speaking	Audio-visual – minimal – non-pedagogic – minimally controlled
	Discussion	T-S/class – same task – group	Discipline – discourse – limited range – by teacher	listening	
4	Discussion	T-S/class – same task – group	Discipline – function – narrow range – by teacher	listening	Not observed
	Others: Question & answer	S-S/class – same task – individual	Discipline – discourse – broad range – by teacher	speaking	Not observed
	Discussion	T-S/class – same task – individual	Discipline – discourse – limited range – by teacher	listening	Not observed

From the four observations, ten activity types surfaced (class discussion, role-play, storytelling, tedtalk, and question and answer), and the teacher used at least two to three activity types per meeting. The activity type was largely dependent on the topic and lesson for the day. A review of the previous lesson was done twice in introducing a new lesson among students. This was used as a springboard for the new lesson to be discussed.

The class discussion was used mostly in one hour during the classroom observation. Students use this activity type to express direct answers to a question with few words only. Depending on the exchange, the students' answers during the discussion allows for a longer language exchange. However, not all answers led to further discussion, as observed. Spada (1985) points out that teachers commonly use the discussion method in allowing students to pitch in their ideas on a topic.

A role-play was also observed in the class observation; this was used to allow students to use specific language functions in an actual context of communicative exchange. This allowed students to contextually use language functions and letting them explore language as a whole. Frohlich (1984) postulates that students' self-expression of the actual language use strengthens one's communicative skills and that students must be given chances to communicate following their context and level. This was seen through the richness of language use and exchange during the role play. The assumption of roles during this activity type using definite function adds to the claim by Frohlich (1984) that it strengthens language use.

Participant Organization as Communicative event in English Language Classroom

Another indicator that builds up the COLT scheme is on Participant Organization. This describes how students are organized as participants in classroom interactions. Mckay

(1994) emphasized that there are pieces of evidence that communicative patterns in language classrooms are affected by participant organization. This is how students are grouped and interact within the class. It can be gleaned that in four observations, student to student interaction is apparent, which is a positive characteristic of a language classroom, according to Krashen (1994). If the student to student interaction is evident, this means classroom competition and anxiety in language learning is low. If this is low, it will allow students to freely use the target language, which is the goal of CLT.

Moreover, the tasks given to the students were the same, which can be improved in a CLT classroom to cater to individual differences, and the different learning styles will be met. Varied classroom tasks are one success indicator, according to Kolb (1984), letting learners do different tasks, but with one objective can give way for maximum learning opportunities. The sameness of the task, in this case, is also due to standardized assessments in classroom activities, which the teacher likely was thinking of in planning the tasks for the class.

In participation, groupings and individualized activities were both used by the teacher during the observation (see table 1). This may be due to the evaluative aspects of language teaching that comes with mastery of language among students. Spada (1984) mentions how class size may affect participant organization. According to Toro, et.al (2018), group work, which highly involves student interaction, is one strategy of CLT which can improve students' communicative competence. Alfares (2012) also mentioned that group could encourage fluency in the language, which enables students to discuss issues or engage in activities that can push them to talk or share their thoughts. However, this goal of grouping students in activities only works when teachers also ensure that there is real interaction and collaboration happening in a group. In the case of the English class observed, class size was at thirty, and grouping students together may only be due to a specific learning objective. If a learning objective is achievable by making tasks individualized and class size and class time will suffice, then teachers most likely resort to using individual tasks as to participant organization.

Content as Communicative Event in English Language Classroom

The result of the study relating to content was focused on discipline, which in this case is the English language intertwined with the subject matter, which is purposive communication. Language proponents such as Frohm (2009) believes that using the target language most often results in strengthened language fluency over time. It is vital that teachers enforce content on the English language because it means many other things, for example, vocabulary learning in context.

For the second category for content, language focus is exemplified. Among the four sub-categories of language focus, two indicators surfaced through the classroom observation. These are language functions and discourse. Function targets the development of how language functions within the different contexts are used (Mohan and Slater 2005). Discourse, on the other hand, is the intended meaning in a given context. Halliday (2002) magnifies the importance of students knowing how language functions work. Halliday (2002) believes that as one's knowledge in language functions deepen, his/her ability to communicate fluently is also achieved. The other sessions also revealed that discourse is used as content in language learning (see table 1). The students were made to create their

version of TedTalk after being able to see what one is like and were given the liberty to choose which topic they are to present in class. After each student had delivered his/her speech, the class as a whole dissected the meaning and implications of the speech. Koteyko (2014) claims that one of the least learned aspects of language is pragmatics, specifically, discourse analysis among learners.

Content also contains the range of content discussed in class which appears to be a more limited range in the four sessions. It can be gleaned that a limited range of content in the four-session with corresponding episode or activity, which are question and answer, role play, and discussion, also the four sessions revealed a broad range of topics. The topic ranges do not solely vary on the subject matter, but the questions and answers of students as well can allow for a spectrum of topics. This was observed during the sessions when one student clarifies something as a result of an experience that is related to the content being discussed.

Topic control, as another category of content, points out that the topics were equally controlled by students and the teacher. In connection to the discussion above on content range, content range may be broad if students control the topic following their insights, questions, and observations outside the main content being learned in class. This shared control of the topic is one aspect that promotes high-class interaction, according to Laksanasut (2020).

Student Modality as a Communicative Event in English Language Classroom

Student modality, as defined by Allen, et. Al. (1983), are the students' various skills which may be involved in a classroom activity. Sadiku (2015) explained that each skill – listening, reading, speaking, writing, and viewing, is as important as the others and are the necessities in language learning. Their main purpose as being used in classroom activities should help meet the students' standards in gradually developing their communicative competence. Furthermore, teachers develop varied instructions and activities to ensure that students can learn in their preferred modality.

The study reveals that among the five macro skills of language, speaking, in general, was used as a mode of communication (see table 1). This may be because it was a purposive communication class that focuses on oral communication. Although the course syllabus revealed that students also had activities that involved other modalities, during the class observations, only speaking and listening were observed. This is also partly because the time of the observation fell on the dates where the skill to be learned was oral fluency.

Materials as a Communicative Event in English Language Classroom

Rich materials and resources for learning are as important as the content and pedagogy itself, as claimed by Kolb (1990) in teaching. However, during the four sessions observed, it was only in session three, where an educational material was used to facilitate learning and discussion. The material was identified as an audio-visual, minimal, non-pedagogic, and minimally controlled. The material used during this session was presented by the student through a power-point presentation that contains the components of the student's speech. It was only used to springboard the main task, which was to deliver a speech like that of a

TedTalk. The use of the PPT this way makes it non-pedagogic because it is from the student's end to facilitate the attainment of the main objective for that class.

Communicative Features in English Language Classroom

The second major component of COLT is the communicative features that refer to any distinctive characteristics in communication in a certain situation. Based on Allen's (1983) idea of COLT, this major component has corresponding categories and sub-categories: use of target language, information gap, sustained speech, reaction to code or message, incorporation of preceding utterances, discourse initiation, and relative restriction of linguistic form.

Use of Target as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

The use of target language feature covered two categories, L1 and L2. L1 refers to the use of the first language, which is Cebuano, and L2 refers to the use of the target language, which is English. The researcher included the use of code-switching and fillers since these two, as other use of language, were also observed in the class used both by the students and the teacher. The researcher found out that in the ten activity types during the four class observations, the students used the L2 compared to the L1, as can be seen by the frequency of use of the target language.

Table 2. Use of Target Language as Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>1. On Use of Language</i>		
1.1. First language (L1)	42	6.84%
1.2. Second language (L2)	512	83.38%
1.3. Others		
1.3.1. Code-switching	37	6.03%
1.3.2. Fillers	23	3.75%
TOTAL:	614	100%

The study reveals that among college students taking English classes, both the teacher and the students strive to communicate in the target language, which is English (see table 2). The subject in which the observation happened was in a Purposive Communication class, which requires students to use the target language during interaction and class discussions. Selinker (1997) claims that the more often one uses target language in communication, he/she will more likely develop fluency in the target language. The teacher is also obliged to use English as a medium of instruction as it is an English class.

The coded data also reveals other features and these are the use of code-switching and fillers in oral communication, which are basic characteristics of language learning from a first language to a second language, as claimed by Gonduz (2004). There are parts of the conversations where there are insertions of these Cebuano (L1) phrases in a language exchange that uses English as the target language. Some of these uttered lines are mostly in

English, but with insertions of words and lines like and ‘what was that again? hala nakalimut na sila, and mao nang giingun nga you learn now forget later. This goes the same to students who also uttered both L1 & L2 like: how we make our decisions sa atong life, choose the right path for us bitaw to, and at first... yeah kanang. These utterances are considered as code-switching in the context of a single conversation as defined by Poplack (1980) cited by Azlan and Narasuman (2012) when a speaker moves between two or more languages.

Brown (1986) mentioned that a filler word is a meaningless word, phrase, or sound that marks a pause or hesitation in speech. Krashen’s (1990) view on the use of fillers also indicates a lack of fluency among second-language speakers. However, Torkey (2006) proves in his study that fillers allow for a think time in putting together thoughts before communicating as found in the sample above, “ahm, if I would speak...” discloses that the filler functioned as a think time for the student to process his / her thoughts rather than a sign of language incompetence. This is because the filler was followed by an answer to the question raised by the teacher.

Information Gap as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Another communicative feature is the information gap. This feature refers to the extent to which the information requested and exchanged is unpredictable – meaning not known in advance (Allen et al., 1983). From the four sub-categories of information gap, result of the study shows that in requesting information, more of the coded feature is genuine-requests, and in giving information relatively predictable has a little higher frequency than the relatively unpredictable. Ismaili and Bajrami (2016) support that one of the features in language learning that promotes communicative competence is information gap activities. Also, they promote student-centered classrooms that may increase intrinsic motivation and inspire critical thinking, and increases students talking time (Jondeya, 2011). From the students’ group conversations, it can be understood that in requesting information, it is genuinely asked and is not anticipated ahead. This happened because, during their group practice for their presentation, students just share their thoughts naturally on how they will present their scene. However, each group was given a specific situation to present. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) aims that students and language learners can request and give accurate information in a communicative discourse. This is the main goal of CLT to allow for a free flow of ideas in communicating within the range of the topic (Richards, 2006)

Table 3. Information Gap as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>2. On Information Gap</i>		
2.1. Requesting information		
2.1.1. Pseudo-requests	38	24.84%
2.1.2. Genuine requests	52	33.99%
2.2. Giving information		
2.2.1. Relatively predictable	38	24.84%
2.2.2. Relatively unpredictable	25	16.33%
TOTAL:	153	100%

In giving or responding to information/request, most of the students' utterances were their answers from the review of the lesson activity in the class. The students answered the questions of the teacher and provide information, which the student already possesses from the previous discussions. These pieces of information are the expected answers to the questions. It can be presumed that the information was known already since the student was able to give out the proper term and answer after the teacher clarified the specific word.

Roehr (2007) measures language competence through one's ability to give out correct information in parallel to what is being requested. However, theories about the nature of communication emphasize that a high degree of unpredictability is a characteristic of natural language use (Bree & Candlin, 1980, Marrow, 1981; Widdowsosn, 1978; Canale, 1983). Although the data used may not be conclusive enough to indicate such in this communicative event maybe because of the nature of the activity, which is a review on the previous lesson, it is still worth noting that students in English classes possess this communicative feature.

Sustained Speech as Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Sustained speech as a communicative function is intended to calculate the degree to which speakers participate in speech or restrict their conversation to a minimum of one sentence, clause, or word (Allen et al., 1983). It is categorized as ultra-minimal, minimal, and sustained.

Table 4. Sustained Speech as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>3. Sustained Speech</i>		
3.1. Ultra-minimal	122	25.26%
3.2. Minimal	188	38.92%
3.3. Sustained speech	173	35.82%
TOTAL:	483	100%

Research indicates that in the four sessions observed, student’s responses are mostly minimal and not sustained speeches. This means that students’ interactions in oral exchanges using L1 and L2 are usually limited and not sustained. Minimal is characterized as a phrase or string of words delivered upon interaction. In general, the class observed presented the largest number of minimal utterances from the three categories and is followed by sustained. These minimal utterances, which are mostly observed, are answers to the information requested by the teacher and from the whole class. With sustained speech as the second-highest number, these are continued or follow-up information that the students and teacher shared. During the observation, there were instances that the teacher made most of the conversations, especially in giving of directives, in the review of previous lessons, and the execution of every activity. Although there might be more opportunities for conversations and the students were able to speak for as long as they wish, they usually chose to answer in a minimal possible way.

Explicit Code Reaction as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Even worth remembering is that the least observed communicative feature is on Explicit code reaction. This pertains to the teacher or student feedback, correction, or cues that would lead to the correctness of speech of the speaker, according to Allen (1984).

Table 5. Reaction to Code or Message

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>4. Reaction to Code or Message</i>		
4.1. Explicit code reaction	7	100%
4.2. Others	0	0%
TOTAL	7	100%

Based on the result presented in table 5 there were only seven occurrences of this type of communicative feature in all four class observations. This communicative feature is on feedback or redirection to an error or mistake done by one of the interlocutors. This feedback aims to redirect the speaker into using the correct form of the uttered error. Spada (1985) believed that the explicit code reaction allows immediate feedback among errors done by L2 learners. As these language errors occur, students’ structural framework of the language develops. If errors are not corrected, these would likely be thought of as correct utterances by the students, which is why immediate and explicit feedback should be done by teachers or language facilitators in cases where these are observed.

An example utterance which falls on the correction of use of word was when the student used the auxiliary verb ‘are’ to show an action done the other night, as in “*just last night, April and I are about to go home,*” and even before the student can finish the sentence, the teacher and the other students said, “*were.*” This auxiliary verb was said after a phrase containing a grammatical error by the teacher and the students, and the student immediately corrected his/her speech. Allen et al. (1984) points out that reaction to code or message as a communicative feature should allow students to communicate with proper feedback and

correction to make the utterance accurate, but not to the point that the speaker’s affective filter will be heightened.

Incorporation of Preceding Utterances as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom.

The fifth communicative feature of part B of COLT is the Incorporation of preceding utterances as the fifth communicative feature of part B of COLT refers to the different ways that participants may react to each other’s contributions in the conversation. In a certain conversation, there may be different reactions. These could be a comment or reaction or clarification, elaboration, or expansion.

Table 6. Incorporation of Preceding Utterances as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>5. Incorporation of Preceding Utterances</i>		
5.1.No incorporation	0	0%
5.2.Repetition	33	12.84%
5.3.Paraphrase	26	10.12%
5.4.Comment	75	29.18%
5.5.Expansion	91	35.41%
5.6.Elaboration	32	12.45%
TOTAL:	257	100%

Among the six sub-categories that were all observed, the most prevalent sub-category is expansion. This communicative feature deals with an extension of a specified context during communicative exchanges. The least observed is paraphrasing, which was observed 26 times only in an average time frame of four hours in all four class observations. The most common activity type used during the time of the class observations was discussion. The discussions that are done between the teacher and the students centered on one topic, which was about speech communications and other things attached to this activity. As presumed, students who were called gave out specific answers to a given content, which can be categorized as expansion, thus, getting the highest occurrence among five sub-categories of incorporation of preceding utterances.

Discourse Initiation as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

Discourse Initiation presents the equality in discourse roles and rights in which the speaker may or may not only respond to elicitations but also spontaneously initiate a talk. The two categories of this feature are: students as the initiator while the teacher is the responder, and students as the responder while the teacher is the initiator. In the usual language classes, the classroom environment appears to be opposite in the outside environment where natural or spontaneous interaction happens. Table 7 below presents the result of students’ discourse initiation in English language class.

Table 7. Discourse Initiation as a Communicative Feature

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>6. Discourse Initiation</i>		
6.1.Student(s) as the initiator	61	56.48%
6.2.Student(s) as the responder	47	43.52%
TOTAL:	108	100%

The study revealed that students as initiators got a higher percentage. This shows that students are capable of discourse initiation in a communicative exchange. Spada (1984) believes that active language learners are much ready for serious communicative tasks than those passive ones. Passive learners are those who only respond rather than initiate conversations or discourses. Encouraging students to initiate interaction is a major goal for CLT because it does not limit the student’s responses and allow L2 learners to express themselves through communicating in the target language. In CLT’s framework, the preciseness and accuracy are only secondary to fluency. Fluency is measured by one’s ability to get ideas across and to allow oneself to communicate without anxiety or fear.

Relative Restriction of Linguistic Form as a Communicative Feature in English Language Classroom

The last communicative feature of COLT is the Relative restriction of Linguistic Form. This feature explains the use of a wide variety of linguistic forms to express the meaning that the speaker wishes to convey. This feature has three sub-categories: the restricted use, limited restriction, and unrestricted use.

Table 8. Relative Restriction of Linguistic Form as a Communicative Feature

Indicators (parameters with their categories and sub-categories)	<i>f</i>	%
<i>7. Relative Restriction of Linguistic Form</i>		
7.1.Restricted use	37	29.6%
7.2.Limited restriction	37	29.6%
7.3.Unrestricted use	51	40.8%
TOTAL:	125	100%

The result of the study reveals that students’ communicative use of the target language is somehow unrestricted. However, restricted and limited use of the target language does not lag far behind as a communicative feature. This leads back to what Allen (1985) suggested that teachers’ preparation and the instructional plan has to include opportunities for students to use language without limit and restrictions but adhering to language appropriateness and form. Unrestricted use of linguistic forms suggests that the environment where the students are in promotes a healthy exchange of conversation among

second language learners. Spada (1985) suggests that language experts must only facilitate the exchange without having to limit the opportunities for conversations and language use.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the study:

1. On communicative events:
 - a. Because participant organization is mainly student to student and has utilized both individual and group work, hence, English classrooms implored cooperative teaching strategies in the class activities;
 - b. If the content was mainly on discipline, function, discourse, and teacher controlled which were all in a limited range, then the teacher adhered to the required content for the subject taught;
 - c. If student modality focused on speaking, thus, CLT's goals were met but the three other macro skills were disregarded during observation; and
 - d. If materials are minimally used, therefore, the production of materials for English classes was not observed.
2. On communicative features
 - a. Since students used L2 more than L1 in all activity types, therefore students are more comfortable in using the target language in most cases in their classes;
 - b. Because students generally used information gaps, then it follows that requesting and giving of information in the classroom were considered regardless of the activities;
 - c. Since students have manifested minimal and sustained speech, then it can be concluded that students engage in extended interactions in the different classroom activities;
 - d. students' reaction to code or message were found as low, therefore attention to the correctness or incorrectness of the words or sentences were not given much priority inside the classroom;
 - e. In the incorporation of preceding utterances, expansion, commenting, and elaboration are manifested; thus, students tend to react to other students' or the teacher's contribution in speech acts.
 - f. In terms of discourse initiation, students mostly initiate in talks; therefore, students are active speakers, and the objective of the subject purposive communication was followed.
 - g. Since the relative restriction of linguistic form was rarely observed in the students' conversations, it can be assumed that in class discussions, students were not encouraged to use language freely.

Recommendations

1. Language teachers must put much thought and planning in designing the lessons which will emphasize the goals of CLT, which is to give ample avenue for students to communicate.

2. Language teachers must see to it that communicative competence must be developed among students keeping in mind communicative features as part of skills to be developed.
3. English language curriculum must plan out activities that would encourage students to communicate more openly.
4. Schools must reinforce teachers' knowledge and competence in developing lessons and activities through seminars and workshops.
5. Further studies may be conducted on this aspect, investigating mainly on communicative features applied among different learners with different planned activities to evaluate how language teachers can optimize classroom time for higher interaction among students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher would like to express her profound gratitude and appreciation to the following people who are in one way or another, had helped in the realization of this research endeavor.

1. Dr. Oscar B. Cabañez, president, Bukidnon State University and Dr. Estela C. Itaas, former Vice President for Academic Affairs of Bukidnon State University, for supporting all academic pursuits of the researcher;
2. Dr. Hazel Jean M. Abejuela, Vice President for Academic Affairs of Bukidnon State University, Program Director, Chairman of the thesis committee and Professor, for her expertise in teaching and assistance in the crafting and accomplishment of this paper;
3. Ms. Gem Aiah B. Blanco, the researcher's thesis adviser and motivator, for her academic intellect, constant encouragement and patience in giving comments, suggestions, and providing input as great help for the success of this endeavor;
4. Prof. Lina C. Hidalgo, member of the panel of experts, for her valuable time and suggestions for the improvement of this study and Ms. Ann Sheila C. Del Rosario, member, professor, code book validator and inter-coder, for her consistent support and motivation to the researcher, and for providing enough idea for the completion of this work;
5. Dr. Beverly G. Taga, secretary, for patiently recording the minutes during thesis presentation, and Ms. Katherine B. Akut, inter-coder, for her effort in coding the data;
6. Dr. Elle Christine D. Melendez, Dr. Rizza R. Consad, Dr. Maribel G. Valdez, Dr. Edna T. Maganding, Ms. Amor M. Clarido, Ms. Salome L. Escalona, Ms. Grenna Marie Joy P. Simene, Mr. Derren Gaylo, and Ms. Lora E. Añar, the researcher's professors, for their guide, input, and encouragement;
7. Dr. Mercidita S. Villamayor, Dean of the College of Education, for her untiring support and encouragement;
8. To the COE faculty especially the BSE program faculty, for the good relationship, guidance and motivation to the researcher as their colleague; to Ms. Desiree A. Barroso, BSE program Chair of the College of Education, for keeping the researcher motivated and challenged to finish this work; to Ma'am Catherine D. Libertad and Ma'am Daisy C. Mugot, two of the researcher's favorite college instructors and now colleagues, for the love, encouragement, and guidance;

9. To Ms. Katrina Faith M. Melig for her willingness to welcome the researcher during the observation in her class and to the BSE-English first students for their participation of this study;
10. To the researcher's family, friends, and relatives, both Ceballos and Mier family, especially Carl and Clyde – the life of the researcher, for their unconditional understanding and untiring support to lighten up the pressure;
11. Above all, to the Almighty Father, the source of all wisdom and strength, who provides the researcher with knowledge and courage to pursue this piece of work, to Him alone, the researcher gives honor and glory!

REFERENCES

- Allen, P., Frohlich, M., & Spada, N. (1983, 1984). The Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching: An Observation Scheme. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED275155.pdf>.
- Allen, P., Frohlich, M., & Spada, N. (1983, 1984). Differences in the Communicative Orientation of L2 Classrooms
- Alfares, N. (2012). Benefits and Difficulties of Learning in Group Work in EFL Classes in Saudi Arabia
- Azlan, N & Narasuman. S. (2012). The Role of Code-Switching as a Communicative Tool in an ESL Teacher Education Classroom
- Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*
- Brown, R. (1986). Assessment of Techniques for measuring Contrast Sensitivity in Children <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-1313.1986.tb01138.x>
- Cunningsworth, A. (1984). Evaluating and selecting EFL Teaching materials in London: Heinemann.
- Denkci-Akkas, F. & Coker, B. (2016). The use of communicative approach in 9th grade EFL classes. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 71-90 [10.14689/ejer.2016.65.05](https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.05)
- El Karfa (2019). The Communicative Orientation of English Language Teaching Classrooms in Moroccan Secondary Schools
- Flyman-Mattson, A. (1999). Students' communicative behavior in a foreign language classroom
- Freeman, D.L. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language teaching* (2nd edition). Oxford University Press.
- Frohm, T. A. (2009). Does more target language use by the teacher encourage more target language use by the students?

- Gunduz, M. (2004). Communicative Orientation in the Language Class and the Effect of Activity Types on Interaction
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1970). Language structure and language function. In J. LYONS (ed.) *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On Communicative Competence*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Ismaili, M. & Bajrami, L (2016). Information Gap Activities to Enhance Speaking Skills of Elementary Level Students
- Jondeya, R. (2011). The Effectiveness of Using Information Gap on Developing Speaking Skills for the Eighth Graders in Gaza Governorate Schools
- Kamhi, A. & Catts, H. (2008). The language basis of reading: Implications of classification and treatment of children with reading disabilities. In Bulter, K.& Silliman, E. (Eds.) *Speaking, Reading, and Writing in Children with Language and Learning Disabilities: New Paradigms in Research and Practice*
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience As The Source Of Learning And Development*
- Koteyko, N. (2014). *Perspectives on Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis*
- Krashen, S. (1990). *Second Language Acquisition: Theory Applications and some Conjectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press published in 2013
- Laksanasut, S, (2020). *Bilingual Education in Thailand: Background, Implementation, Limitation, and Case Study*
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lou, A. (2019). *Discourse Analysis: a step by step guide with examples*
<https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/discourse-analysis/>
- Mantei, Jessica & Kervin, Lisa K. (2009). "Authentic" learning experiences: what does this mean and where is the literacy learning? University of Wollongong.
- Mckay, S.L. (1994). "Developing ESL Writing Materials." *System*. 22, 2 (1994) 195-204.
- Mohan, Bernard & Slater, Tammy (2005). A functional perspective on the critical 'theory/practice' relation in teaching language and science
- Morrow, K. (1981). *English Language Teaching: A Historical Overview & Current Trends*
- Nurpahmi, S. (2015). Improving Listening Skill by Activating Students' Prior Knowledge
- Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espa ol": toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7/8): 581-618.
- Richards, Jack (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Rogers, C. R. (1986). Development of the person-centered approach
- Rost, M. (1994). The Teaching of Listening. Edited by R. Carter & D. Nunan: The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
- Rumenapp, J. (2016). Analyzing discourse analysis: Teachers' views of classroom discourse and student identity
- Sadiku, L.M. (2015). The Importance of Four Skills Reading, Speaking, Writing, Listening in a Lesson Hour. European Journal of Language and Literature.
- Selinker, L. (1997). Rediscovering Interlanguage. London: Longman.
- Torky, S. (2006). The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students
- Toro, V., Pinza, E., Camacho-Minuche, G., & Paredes, F. (2018). The Use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach to Improve Students' Oral Skills
- Widdowson, H.G. (2007). Discourse Analysis. Oxford Introduction to Language Study