

Effectiveness of the Implementation of Oral Examination to the Communication Skills of College Students in One Academic Institution in the Philippines

Asia Pacific Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 6 No. 3, 31-40
August 2018
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com
CHED Recognized Journal
ASEAN Citation Index

April Rose P. Villaber¹ and Maria Victoria A. Gonzaga²

¹Department of Liberal Arts and Behavioral Sciences, Visayas State University, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines; ²Graduate School, Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception Baybay, Leyte, Incorporated, Philippines
aprovill09@gmail.com¹ and vkgonzaga14@yahoo.com²

Date Received: March 11, 2018; Date Revised: July 6, 2018

Abstract – The implementation of oral examination in tertiary level in most courses is an appropriate tool to determine the students' ability to communicate ideas in coherent and verbal sentences. This enhances the speakers' communicative competence and other conversational skills. Oral examination has been implemented in the College Department of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC) for the midterm and semi-final quarter. Thus, the study determined the level of implementation, the effectiveness of the oral examination to the communication skills, and the difficulties encountered during the implementation in the College Department of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines on the Academic Year 2016-2017. Two separate questionnaires were administered to randomly chosen 21 teachers and 379 college students. The level of the implementation of oral examination was effective to some students, except those who had problems in dealing with the oral examination. There was a significant difference among the level of effectiveness on the implementation of oral examination in terms of communication skills which implied that oral examination was an effective means of enhancing the speaking skills of some students but not on others. Further, there were difficulties encountered by the teachers and students during the implementation of oral examination.

Keywords – assessment, communication skills, effectiveness, implementation of oral examination

INTRODUCTION

Oral examination is an assessment used in many schools and institution to measure aspects of competence which are not tapped in written examinations. Oral examination provides the speakers an incentive to explore topics and give them the chance to interact one on one with examiners. Oral examination as an assessment tool enables the instructors to test the students on all five cognitive domains of Bloom's Taxonomy (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation) [1].

This study is anchored in the Proficiency-Based Education and Training or Proficiency-Based Learning by Maine Education Association (MEA). Proficiency-Based Education has the system of academic instruction, assessment, grading, and reporting that are based on students demonstrating that they have acquired the knowledge and skills they are expected to learn as they progress through their education. Students meet expected

standards and will receive additional instruction, practice time and academic support in helping them achieve proficiency [2]. The goal of proficiency-based education is to ensure that students master the competencies that are deemed to be essential to succeed in school, higher education, careers and adult life.

This approach can also provide teachers with more detailed and fine-grained information about student learning progress which can help them more precisely identify academic strengths and weaknesses, as well as the specific concepts and skills students have not yet mastered.

Through Proficiency-Based Education with interpersonal communication skills-based assessment, there will be mastery on the acquired knowledge and skills of the learners and uplifting of attitudes and behaviors. There is a widespread recognition that universities and colleges are now delivering higher education to diverse students' populations with very different needs and aspirations from the more traditional

cohorts of the past. Further, school institutions are fostering the development of graduate attributes or essential learning outcomes in addition to content knowledge and interdisciplinary expertise. This is to prepare students for a broad range of opportunities since the ability to communicate equipped with interpersonal and communication skills (written or oral) have been consistently considered as topmost key selection criteria and are factors for students' disposition to succeed in college, career and adult life.

Implementation of Oral Examination

Implementation of oral examination in an institution can pave ways for possibilities and benefits. This may be different from the typical written type of examination, but this can assess and measure real performance as whatever has been learned is put into action. Through oral examination, the students as speakers may stress the message and language and become more resourceful in answering questions.

The implementation of oral examination in a tertiary level in most courses is an appropriate tool to assess the students' knowledge and to determine their ability to communicate ideas in coherent and verbal sentences. This type of assessment is an area for the students, especially the non-English speakers, to enhance their communication skills using the English language. Teachers may also get a deepened view of the student's ability and could supply additional yet related questions and information. This also minimizes the luck factor and reduces biases among the students during the examination. In practice, oral examination is used not as a substitute but as a complement to written exams.

With the globalization, it is a challenge for college graduates to be proficient in oral communication skills so that they could function effectively in the academic and professional setting. To prepare students for a broad range of employment opportunities, colleges and universities are also fostering the development of 'graduate attributes' or 'essential learning outcomes', in addition to content knowledge and disciplinary expertise [3].

This performance-based assessment promotes a wide range of responses and do not typically produce one single, correct answer; therefore, evaluation of student's performance is based on teacher's judgment, using the criteria specified for each task [4].

One of the benefits of this program is the enhancement of the students' communicative competence. This enhances the speakers' communicative competence which does not only include linguistic

competence but also a range of other conversational skills which are aid for interpersonal and intercultural communication. This is a much needed skill since the nature of the work in the Philippines and other foreign countries demand effective communication as number one quality employees should possess.

With this, several schools require students pursuing a bachelor's degree to finish a program by taking an oral examination or a combination of oral and written examinations to show how well a student understands the material studied in the program. Some medical trainings use oral examinations for their students to test knowledge and in building rapport in dealing with the patients. The Philippine Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology Diplomate [5] make use of oral examination together with written and practical assessment to evaluate the students' capability to manage a given hypothetical patient with an obstetrical or gynecological problem. Likewise, an oral examination is also required by the Philippine Adult Pulmonary Medicine Fellowship Training Core Curriculum for Training Institutions [6].

Oral Examination Stratagem

Communicating effectively in a language requires the speaker's good understanding of linguistic, sociolinguistic and socio-cultural aspects of that language. This understanding enables the speaker to use the appropriate language in the right context for the right purpose to be referred to as communicatively competent [7].

Developing oral communication skills lead to being communicative competent. Nonetheless, the mastery of skills requires more than the formal ability to present well and a range of formulaic expression.

One must learn and acquire understanding what to say and how to say it, either for conversation speech or formal discourse, be aware of the several elements of oral communication to be able to use at one's advantage [8]. Huang [9] contends the need for states to stress functional practice of the language with encouragement for self-motivation so that students will take advantage of every chance, both within and outside the classroom, to enhance their language skills, thus developing communicative competence.

Oral communication skills are the interpersonal and physical strategies needed by the students to interact confidently and effectively, and acquiring oral communication skills help students improve their academic performance, increase their employment options, enhance their subsequent professional

competence, and improve their own personal effectiveness [10].

Communication Skills

Communication skills point to improve abilities of students in language understanding and expressing ideas through the implementation of oral examination.

With the thrust on helping students improve communicative competence, there is a growing consensus that the development of communication skills encompassing academic literary and English language proficiency occurs most effectively in the context of disciplinary study and that communication skills need to be embedded in the curriculum; however, there is also recognition of the challenges of achieving it [11].

The enclosure of oral examination results to high motivation of students to learn speaking skills [12]. Further, this gives teachers more opportunities for students to speak English. Ongoing English language proficiency assessment like oral examination is required throughout the school year to ensure each language speaker will master the skills and knowledge based on his or her individual abilities [13]

Oral Examination in the College Department of FCIC

Oral examination has been implemented in the College Department of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC) for the midterm and semi-final quarter. The oral examination is administered by the instructor of the particular subject. This is to improve communication skills and develop the self-confidence of the students.

Several college students and teachers were interviewed informally as to their feedback on the implementation of the oral examination. They complimented on it as a helping means on building confidence while delivering the answer and strengthening ones speaking skills. However, they also cited problems and difficulties experienced by students and teachers during the oral examination. Though beneficial, but as observed some students were still fighting with mental block and language difficulty. Teachers on the other hand stated that it was time consuming.

Hence, the study benefited the school administration and staff in evaluating the implemented academic system of examination to refine and improve guidelines on its implementation, to the faculty in assessing the student’s performance and communicative skills, and to the

students in improving their communication skills and in valuing the method for their improvement.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study assessed the level of implementation of the oral examination in the college students and teachers of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception. Specifically, the study determined the level of implementation as perceived by the students and teachers, the significant difference between the teachers and students perception, the effectiveness of the oral examination to the communication skills as perceived by the students and teachers, and the difficulties encountered during the implementation of oral examination in the College Department of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines on the Academic Year 2016-2017.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a descriptive study conducted among the students and teachers in the College Department of Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception. This made use of a survey method to obtain information with concern to the level of implementation and its effectiveness to the students’ communication skills. Further, this described the characteristics that were present with respect to variables in the situations.

Sampling

Stratified sampling was used for 902 total population: 47 teachers and 855 college students. Slovin’s formula [14] was used in determining the sample size. The sample size was 400, with 21 teachers and 379 students having each department represented.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

Respondents	Group Size	Sample Size
A. Teachers	47	21
B. Students	855	379
Total	902	400

Instrumentation

The research instruments that were employed to collect data for this study were based from an independent study on the topic factors affecting students’ English speaking skills with the students of public school in the province of Punjab by Bashir, Azeem, and Dogar [15], with questions and modifications pattern from the study about factors affecting students’ speaking

performance at Le Thanh Hien High School by Nguyen Hoang Tuan and Tran Ngoc Mai in 2015 and the Teaching Strategies for Oral Communication. Likert scale was used to determine the level of implementation of oral examination, its effectiveness to the students' communication skills, and the difficulties encountered during the implementation.

Data Collection

The researchers sent a letter of communication to the office of the School Directress of FCIC and to the Department Head in the College Department of FCIC asking permission to conduct the survey.

Two separate questionnaires for teachers and students were used in this study. Each questionnaire had five parts to be filled in by the respondents in the presence of the researchers. Each part consisted of ten statements to be rated. The first part was the personal information about the respondents. The second part was on the level of implementation of the oral examination in college department with the rating scale of 4 as fully implemented, 3 as implemented, 2 as partially implemented, and 1 as not implemented. The third part was on the level of effectiveness of the implementation of oral examination to the communication skill of the students with the rating scale of 4 as highly effective, 3 as effective, 2 as less effective, and 1 as not effective. The fourth part was on the difficulties encountered by the students and teachers on the implementation of oral examination through indicators that were marked as fully agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The fifth part was on the comments from the students and teachers about the implementation of the oral examination. The data were collected from them upon appointment.

Data Analysis

Weighted mean was used to determine the level of implementation of the oral examination as perceived by the students and teachers, the level of effectiveness of the implementation to the communication skills, and the difficulties encountered by the students and teachers on the implementation of oral examination. The significant differences were determined by Chi-Square Test.

To describe the level of implementation of the oral examination as perceived by the students and teachers, these indicators of interpretation with the corresponding rating and weighted mean were used:

Rating	Weighted Mean Score	Interpretation	
		<u>Level of Implementation</u>	<u>Description</u>
4	3.25-4.00	Fully Implemented	The indicators are always met.
3	2.50-3.24	Implemented	The indicators are most often met.
2	1.75-2.49	Partially Implemented	The indicators are seldom met.
1	1.00-1.74	Not Implemented	The indicators are never met.

To describe the level of effectiveness of the implementation of oral examination to the communication skills, these indicators of interpretation with the corresponding rating and weighted mean score were used:

Rating	Weighted Mean Score	Interpretation	
		<u>Level of Effectiveness</u>	<u>Description</u>
4	3.25-4.00	Highly Effective	The indicators are always met.
3	2.50-3.24	Effective	The indicators are most often met.
2	1.75-2.49	Less Effective	The indicators are seldom met.
1	1.00-1.74	Not Effective	The indicators are never met.

To determine the difficulties encountered by the students and teachers on the implementation of oral examination, these scale were used: 3.25-4.00 means that the teachers and students fully agree on encountering the indicators, 2.50-3.24 means that teachers and students agree on encountering the indicators, 1.75-2.49 means that teachers and students disagree on encountering the indicators, and 1.00-1.74 means that teachers and students strongly disagree.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data gathered were interpreted, analyzed, discussed, and organized in accordance to the statistical tool used to determine the significance of relationship between variables.

Table 2. Distribution of Responses on the Level of Implementation of Oral Examination as Perceived by the Teachers

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Teachers Response</i>	
	\bar{X}_w	<i>Level of Implementation</i>
1. I administer the oral examination in midterm.	3.57	FI
2. I administer the oral examination in semi-finals.	3.35	FI
3. I administer the oral examination in the scheduled date of exam.	2.95	I
4. I myself as a subject teacher administer the oral examination.	3.90	FI
5. I use a rubric/rating scale in administering the oral examination.	3.52	FI
6. I give my students time to prepare before they answer.	3.57	FI
7. I give my students unlimited time to deliver their answer.	2.70	I
8. I give constructive criticism while students are delivering their answer.	2.25	PI
9. I give constructive criticism to my students after they deliver their answer.	3.40	FI
10. I show and explain to my students the rating of their answer.	2.62	I
Average Weighted Mean	3.19	I

The level of implementation of oral examination in college department of FCIC as perceived by the teachers was measured using ten indicators. As shown in Table 2, the teachers perceived the level of implementation as Implemented with a weighted mean of 3.19. These results were attributed to the fact that 95 (46.12%) responses of the respondents rated 4 which means Fully Implemented and only 13 (6.31%) responses of the respondents gave a rating of 1 which means Not Implemented. Moreover, results showed that the respondents gave the highest rating to the indicator “I myself as a subject teacher administers the oral examination” with a weighted mean of 3.90 indicating Fully Implemented. The indicator giving constructive criticism to students while delivering the answer had the lowest weighted mean of 2.25 meaning Partially Implemented.

This signifies that the teachers personally conducted the oral examination. However, students expressed that teachers need to give constructive criticism for them to be able to improve their performance. Teachers also expressed to enhance the guidelines of the school to improve the implementation and to minimize problems.

This agrees to the Education Corner [16] as it suggested several strategies to the students and to the teachers on the preparation, delivery, and evaluation of oral examination that will likely ace the students’ performance. Likewise, it minimizes the luck factor and reduces biases among the students during the examination as pointed out by Shenwai and Patil [1].

Table 3. Distribution of Responses on the Level of Implementation of Oral Examination as Perceived by the Students

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Students Response</i>	
	\bar{X}_w	<i>Level of Implementation</i>
1. I take the oral examination in midterm.	3.42	FI
2. I take the oral examination in semi-finals.	3.34	FI
3. I take the oral examination in the scheduled date of exam.	2.95	I
4. I see my subject teacher administering the oral examination.	3.39	FI
5. I am shown a rubric/rating scale by my subject teacher to be used in administering the oral examination.	2.93	I
6. I am given time to prepare before I answer.	3.29	FI
7. I am given unlimited time to deliver my answer.	2.81	I
8. I am given constructive criticism by my teacher while I am delivering my answer.	2.63	I
9. I am given constructive criticism by my teacher after I deliver my answer.	2.80	I
10. I am shown and explained by my teacher as to the rating of my answer.	2.82	I
Average Weighted Mean	3.04	I

The level of implementation of oral examination in college department as perceived by the students was measured using ten indicators. As shown in Table 3, the students perceived the level of implementation as Implemented with a weighted mean of 3.04. This result was attributed to the fact that 1463 (38.77%) responses of the respondents rated 3 which means Implemented and 210 (5.56%) responses of the respondents gave the rating of 1 which means Not Implemented. Results showed that the respondents gave the highest rating to the indicator “I take the oral examination on midterm” with a mean of 3.42 indicating Fully Implemented. The indicator “I am given constructive criticism from my teacher while I am delivering my answer” had the lowest weighted mean of 2.63 that means Implemented.

It shows that the indicator “I am given constructive

criticism by my teacher while I am delivering my answer” with the lowest mean is consistent with the teachers’ result. This indicated that both teachers and students felt the same need and importance of giving constructive criticisms. The respondents expressed that they be guided how to express their ideas. This is in agreement to Rahman [8] which states the importance of acquiring what to say and how to say it to be able to use at one’s advantage.

Nonetheless, the indicator “I am shown a rubric/rating scale by my subject teacher to be used in administering the oral examination” is different with the teachers’ result. This showed that most of the students were not shown and explained about the rubrics and its content even if the teachers used it during the examination. This perception is supported by Abu Al-Enein [17] who contends that there are difficulties encountered during oral assessment from students’ and instructors’ perspectives.

Table 4. Significant Difference on the Teachers and Students Perception to the Implementation of Oral Examination

Respondents	Extent of Implementation				Computed X ² Value	p-Value	Description	
	4	3	2	1				Total
Teachers	95	68	30	13	206	11.60	0.0086	Highly Significant
Student	1331	1463	770	210	3774			
Total	1426	1531	800	223	3980			

Table 4 presents the variable on the significant difference of the teachers and students perception on the implementation of oral examination.

As shown in the table, the probability level or the p-value is 0.0086, which is lesser than 0.05 significant level. This implies that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perception on the implementation of oral examination in the college department of FCIC.

More of the teachers’ responses (95 out of 210 or 45%) indicate that oral examination is fully implemented. Thus, this is significantly different from the proportion of students’ responses (1331 out of 3980 or 35%) with the same level of implementation.

This may suggest that the teachers were fully aware of the implementation of oral examination to the students with regards to its purpose, mechanics, and guidelines while on the students’ part, only some were aware on the

implementation purposes, thus mostly see the implementation of oral examination merely as a requirement, specifically as a periodical examination for compliance.

Further, though teachers conducted the oral examination in their respective class, it was observed that there was a failure on the giving of constructive criticisms after the conduct of the oral examination and on the showing of the scoring rubrics or rating scale sheet indicating the performance rate to the students, in which the students expressed as their need to know and evaluate their own performance and to be guided for improvement.

Communication skills are the improved abilities of students in language understanding and expressing ideas through the implementation of oral examination.

As shown in Table 5, both the teachers and students perceived the implementation of oral examination as effective in communication skills. Teachers’ responses had an average weighted mean of 2.89 while the students’ responses had an average weighted mean of 3.10. The result shows that teachers and students had different observation on the effectiveness of the implementation of oral examination to the communication skills.

This signifies that students felt more its effectiveness in their communication skills than the teacher’s observation as students observed improvement in their mastery of speaking skills being given the chance to speak the English language.

Teachers indicated a highest weighted mean of 3.19 to the indicator “My students have shown effort in speaking the English language” and the lowest weighted mean of 2.62 to the indicator “My students have corrected their grammatical structure in the sentence”. Students’ responses indicated a highest weighted mean of 3.26 to the indicator “I have the chance to practice speaking the English language” and a lowest weighted mean of 2.99 to the indicator “I have corrected my grammatical structure in the sentence”.

Teachers gave remark on the effort of the students in speaking while students made use of the chance given to practice speaking the language. However, both agreed on observing students’ ungrammatical structure in the sentence.

Table 5. Distribution of Responses on the Effectiveness of the Implementation of Oral Examination in Communication Skills

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Teachers Students</i>			
	<i>WM</i>	<i>LE</i>	<i>WE</i>	<i>LE</i>
1. My students comprehensively convey message on their own. I can comprehensively convey message on my own.	3.00	E		
			3.06	E
2. My students clarify the explanation of their answer and their point of view. I clarify the explanation of my answer and my point of view.	2.90	E		
			3.06	E
3. My students have corrected their grammatical structure in the sentence. I have corrected my grammatical structure in the sentence.	2.62	E		
			2.99	E
4. My students have improved their pronunciation, enunciation and stressing of the word/s. I have improved my pronunciation, enunciation and stressing of the word/s.	2.76	E		
			3.13	E
5. My students appropriately use non-verbal cues like body language and facial expression. I am able to use nonverbal cues like body language and facial expression.	2.71	E		
			3.01	E
6. My students have the opportunity to use formal academic word. I have the opportunity to use formal academic words.	2.86	E		
			3.09	E
7. My students have improved their vocabulary, word meaning and association. I have improved my vocabulary, word meaning and association.	2.86	E		
			3.09	E
8.. My students have shown effort in speaking the English language. I have the chance to practice speaking the English language	3.19	E		
			3.26	E
9. My students have improved and mastered their speaking skills. I improve and master my speaking skills.	2.95	E		
			3.21	E
10. My students have improved and mastered their listening skills. I improve and master my listening skills.	3.00	E		
			3.14	E
Average Weighted Mean	2.89	E	3.10	E

The result implies that teachers gave the students the opportunity to master the language as they observed the students' willingness and motivation to speak. This is supported by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, School of Education [18] that an effective professional educator believes in the students' interest and ability to learn.

Table 6. Distribution of Responses on the Difficulties Encountered on the Implementation of Oral Examination as Perceived by the Teachers

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>WM</i>	<i>VI</i>
1. My students lack knowledge and understanding on the topic leading to mental block.	2.95	Agree
2. My students use incorrect vocabulary and terms leading to usage of dialect or unfamiliar terms.	3.14	Agree
3. My students have inadequate understanding of grammar and structure.	2.81	Agree
4. My students have inaccurate intonations and word stress creating confusions in understanding.	2.90	Agree
5. My students experience communication anxiety like shyness causing hesitation on the examination.	3.05	Agree
6. My students lack proper practice of speaking English leading to discomfort in speaking the language.	2.95	Agree
7. My class has insufficient contact hours for oral examination which lead to extension of class schedules.	3.19	Agree
8. My students experience insufficient or no appropriate instructions given during the examination.	2.33	Agree
9. My students have the fear to communicate due to physical disabilities like hearing problems or speech difficulties.	2.24	Agree
10. My students have the fear to communicate due to teacher's criticism and corrections on the answer.	2.43	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.80	Agree

The difficulties encountered by the teachers and students in the implementation of oral examination in the college department of FCIC were measured using ten indicators.

Teachers agreed on encountering these indicators during the oral examination with a weighted mean of 2.80. Although all indicators have a description of Agree meaning all these are encountered by the teachers during the oral examination, they all differ as to their weighted mean.

Results showed that respondents gave the highest rating to the indicator “My class has insufficient contact hours for examination which lead to extension of class schedules” with a weighted mean of 3.19 indicating Agree. The indicator “My students have the fear to communicate due to physical disabilities like hearing problems or speech difficulties” had the lowest weighted mean of 2.24 meaning Agree.

Further, teachers agreed on encountering three difficulties among the indicators which they mostly encountered during the implementation of oral examination. These indicators had shown high weighted mean. These difficulties were on the students used of incorrect vocabulary and terms leading to usage of dialect or unfamiliar terms with a weighted mean of 3.14, the students experiencing communication anxiety like shyness causing hesitation on the examination with a weighted mean of 3.05, and the insufficient contact hours for oral examination which led to extension of class schedules with a weighted mean of 3.19.

These imply that difficulties encountered affect the effectiveness of the implementation of oral examination. Likewise, these affect the students’ motivation and performance during the assessment.

With these, teachers should employ several strategies to make oral examination successful through activities that exercise and would cater students’ speaking skills because Leichsenring [19] stated that the lack of presentation skills is believed to be another most important factor that causes difficulty in oral presentation.

As for the students’ perception on the difficulties encountered during the oral examination, they agreed on encountering these indicators with a weighted mean of 2.76.

Although all indicators have a description of Agree meaning all these are encountered by the teachers during the oral examination, they all differ as to their weighted

mean.

Table 7. Distribution of Responses on the Difficulties Encountered on the Implementation of Oral Examination as Perceived by the Students

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Students Responses</i>	
	<i>Weighted Mean</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
1. I lack knowledge and understanding on the topic leading to mental block.	2.90	Agree
2. I use incorrect vocabulary and terms leading to usage of dialect or unfamiliar terms.	2.83	Agree
3. I have inadequate understanding of grammar and structure	2.73	Agree
4. I have inaccurate intonations and word stress creating confusions in understanding.	2.71	Agree
5. I experience communication anxiety like shyness causing hesitation on the examination	2.96	Agree
6. I lack proper practice of speaking English leading to discomfort in speaking the language.	2.80	Agree
7. I have limited time with a lot of questions that lessen my motivation to answer well in English.	2.80	Agree
8. I experience insufficient or no appropriate instruction given during the examination.	2.61	Agree
9. I have the fear to communicate due to physical disabilities like hearing problems or speech difficulties.	2.57	Agree
10. I have the fear to communicate due to teacher’s criticism and corrections on the answer.	2.71	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.76	Agree

Results showed that the respondents gave the highest rating to the indicator “I experience communication anxiety like shyness causing hesitation on the examination” with a weighted mean of 2.96 indicating Agree. The lowest weighted mean of 2.57 indicating Agree was on the indicator “I have the fear to communicate due to physical disabilities like hearing problems or speech difficulties”.

The students also agreed on encountering three difficulties among the indicators. These indicators showed high weighted mean.

These difficulties encountered by the students were

on the lacking of knowledge and understanding on the topic leading to mental block with a weighted mean of 2.90, the used of incorrect vocabulary and terms leading to usage of dialect or unfamiliar terms with a weighted mean of 2.83, and on the students experiencing communication anxiety like shyness causing hesitation on the examination with a weighted mean of 2.96.

These imply that difficulties encountered affects the effectiveness of the oral examination implementation to the students' performance.

With these, students should employ their own oral communication stratagem for the improvement of their communication skills, and also could improve other aspects like their self-esteem and academic performance because Griffith Institute for Higher Education [10] stressed that interpersonal and physical strategies help students improve their academic performance, increase employment options, enhance subsequent professional competence and improve their own personal effectiveness.

Likewise, Saleh [7] pointed out that developing oral communication skills lead to being communicative competent.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

These findings implied that the level of implementation of the oral examination in the college department of FCIC as perceived by the teachers and students was described as implemented. There was a significant difference between the teachers' and students' perception on the implementation of oral examination. Most of the students perceived the implementation of the oral examination in the college department of FCIC as effective in terms of their communication skills in relation to the theory of the Proficiency-Based Education and Training by Maine Education Association (MEA) which contends that having the system of academic instruction and assessment would help them achieve mastery on the acquired knowledge and proficiency of skills in uplifting their communication skills, attitudes and behaviors.

The difficulties encountered in the implementation of oral examination in the college department were the insufficient contact hours of class with large number of students for oral examination which led to extension of class schedules taking more meetings than the scheduled dates, the use of incorrect vocabulary and terms that led to usage of dialect or unfamiliar terms, the lack of knowledge and understanding on the topic which led to

mental block, and having the fear and anxiety to communicate due to physical disabilities like hearing problems and speech difficulties that caused hesitation on the students during the oral examination.

It was recommended that there should be a discussion of the rationale and guidelines on the implementation of oral examination to the teachers a week before the semester and to the students during the first meeting of the class for awareness and understanding of the purpose.

Furthermore, teachers should use standardized rubrics by subject area for oral examination in the college department which should be shown and explained to the students few days before the oral examination schedule to let them focus on certain areas and be prepared for the examination. Likewise, this rubric should also be shown after the oral examination with the rating and feedback to boost students' confidence. A proposed standardized rubrics was formulated for the teachers to use during the conduct of the oral examination.

Also, the students should be given more enrichment activities prior to the oral examination schedule to exercise their public speaking abilities and enrich communication skills. They should be asked with varied questions to explore oral communication strategies which they could employ to give more answers and give motivation. Their performance as well should be assessed through constructive criticism to improve their communication skills.

Lastly, the conduct of the oral examination should be continued to enhance students' communication skills and improve speaking performance. The said oral examination should be evaluated every two years.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shenwai, M. R. and Patil, K.B. (2013). Introduction of structured oral examination as a novel assessment tool to first year medical students in physiology. *Journal of Clinic & Diagnostic Research*. 7(11). ISSN: 0973-709X
- [2] Maine Department of Education (2015). What is proficiency-based education? Retrieved 10 May 2016 from <http://www.maine.gov/doe/proficiency-based.html>
- [3] Oliver, B. (2015). Assuring graduate capabilities. Retrieved 13 June 2016, from <https://goo.gl/5mqyT8>
- [4] Colorin Colorado. (2017). Performance-based assessments for English language learners. U.S.A.: WETA Public Broadcasting. Retrieved 20 January 2017 from <https://goo.gl/QagXjQ>
- [5] Philippine Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology Diplomate. (2016). Retrieved 12 June 2016, from <http://pogsinc.org/files/reqs-part2.pdf>
- [6] Fernandez, L. C. MD. FPCCP., (2013). Guidelines on the implementation of the Philippine adult pulmonary

medicine fellowship training core curriculum for training institutions. Retrieved 11 June 2016, from <https://goo.gl/qaF55U>

- [7] Saleh, S. E. (2013). Understanding communicative competence. *University Bulletin*, 3(15), pp. 102-103. Retrieved 25 March 2016 from <https://goo.gl/hkN7DY>
- [8] Rahman, M. M. (2010). Teaching oral communication skills: A task-based approach. Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. Indian School of Mines University, Dhanbad. 9(1)
- [9] Huang, C-P. (2010). Exploring factors affecting the use of oral communication strategies. Department of Applied Foreign Languages, Lunghwa University of Science and Technology
- [10] Griffith Institute for Higher Education (2010). Oral communication toolkit. Retrieved 13 August 2016, from <https://goo.gl/YAJZ6G>
- [11] Arkoudis, S. (2014). Integrating English language communication skills into disciplinary curricula: Options and strategies. Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne. Retrieved 13 June 2016 from <https://goo.gl/ydDxj4>
- [12] Tuan, N. H. and Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking performance at Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*. 3(2), ISSN: 2311-6080
- [13] Alberta Education (2012). Language proficiency assessment. Retrieved 10 April 2016 from <https://goo.gl/H4pfD1>
- [14] Ellen, S. (2016). Slovin's formula sampling. Retrieved 26 June 2016 from <https://goo.gl/mUJx6V>
- [15] Bashir, M., Azeem, M., and Dogar, A. H. (2011). Factors affecting students' speaking skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/PBpg7i>
- [16] Education Corner. (2013). Oral test preparation tips. Retrieved 15 June 2016, from <https://goo.gl/8ZCY3o>
- [17] Abu Al-Enein, A. H. (2011). Difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations during class at Al-Aqsa University. Phd Thesis, Gaza, Islamic University of Gaza
- [18] University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, School of Education. (2017). The dispositions of the effective educator. Retrieved 13 January 2017 from <https://goo.gl/RuzGc5>
- [19] Leichsenring, A. (2010). What do first year Japanese EFL students learn by preparing and presenting a group work oriented oral presentations? Institute of Education Sciences, ED 537529. Retrieved 09 January 2017, from <http://eric.edu.gov/>

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>)