INTRODUCTION

The educational system in the Philippines has adopted the twelve-year basic education to cope with the demands of the global market and to heed the call for globalization and ASEAN integration. Along with this adaptation are the major changes in the curriculum. The Department of Education was the first one to make refurbishment on their curriculum. Part of the salient shift was the offering the minor courses or subjects from the tertiary level to the senior high school. This has also made the Commission on Higher Education review the college curriculum to circumvent recurring of subjects or courses. This has been the cradle of the new general education core courses which are now introduced to the first graduates of the K-12 curriculum of the department of education. One of these new general education courses of the CMO 20 series of 2013 is Purposive Communication – an integration of English 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the old curricula.

This historical and radical change in the educational system has likewise led teachers and educators to assimilate to this by thinking of new teaching strategies and techniques that
suit the nature and demands of these new courses and the changing needs of the learners of this new curriculum.

As one of the new general education courses, Purposive communication deals with the four macro communication skills. It also enhances students’ skills in presenting ideas using multimedia to different audiences and for various purposes. Since the course is a conglomerate of English 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the old curricula and is engrossed with the four macro skills of communication, teachers of this course should contemplate on holistic, learner-centred and engaging approach in teaching the course that would lead the learners to possess an increased degree of autonomy and to show initiative learning process. Likewise, a holistic teaching strategy is imperative in teaching purposive communication as the macro skills are taught in myriad ways. Thus, choosing the right teaching strategy is very crucial in the teaching-learning process of this new general education subject.

In the 21st century English language classroom, the posited English Language teaching strategy by Hammer in 2007 called E.S.A. or Engage Study Activate has been considered effective and holistic, for it permeates all possible elements in the language teaching-learning process. Considering exposure, motivation and opportunities for language use, Harmer (2007) suggests that most teaching sequences need specific elements: engage, study and activate. Originally, ESA was postulated to augment what had been perceived and used to be an effective teaching strategy: PPP. Harmer (2001) observed that PPP does not work well when teaching more complex language problems beyond the sentence level or when teaching communicative skills and is not that engaging for its very simplistic features, thus, they proposed ESA.

Moreover, Harmer (2007) stresses that when learners are not emotionally engaged with what is going on, their learning becomes less effective, and speaking is not exempted. Rather it plays the most significant role. This concept of engaging the students is one of ESA’s main thrusts and strengths.

It is important to engage the students. This implies that the students should be interested in the subject, class, and

Harmer (2001) expressed that the probability of the learners' learning becomes much better if students do not take learning as mere compliance for they are in school but as their responsibility to be involved in what is going on to the point that they should be engaged and genuinely interested in the learning process.

Hence, the importance of a teaching strategy in teaching language cannot be discounted. Finding the best strategy is an enormous task for all language teachers, especially in the Philippine Educational setting, which has shifted its curriculum. There is no other way to prove whether a teaching strategy is effective than to conduct an in-depth investigation through research. Thus, this paper determines whether ESA is acceptable and effective in teaching the maiden Purposive Communication, which concentrates on the students’ communicative skills beyond the sentence level.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study presumed that using the ESA-EAP model is acceptable in teaching Purposive Communication and facilitating students’ learning. To solidify this research
Vygotsky believed that culture is the primary factor of intellectual progress. His theory of constructivism states that knowledge leads to further cognitive development and that individual growth cannot be comprehended without indicating the societal and cultural context. He focuses on the actual mechanism of development. Vygotsky’s version of constructivism is a substitute for Piaget’s as he argues that knowledge is the internalization of social activity and that no single nonconcrete principle can explain intellectual development (www.teach-nology.com).

According to Vygotsky, a child totally relies on other people during the early stages as the sociocultural environment preserves, presenting the child with various responsibilities and difficulties, engaging the child in his world (Turuk, 2008).

Specifically, these individuals might be the parents who guide the child on what he will do and will not do, introducing and influencing the child’s actions. This guidance of the parents who are influencers of the culture and channel through which the culture passes, are actualized basically through language.

Vygotsky refers to the phenomena mentioned above as the inter-psychological plane. He explains that this is the first stage where children become suitable to cultural and social customs by obtaining knowledge through acquaintances and interactions with different people. When children learn to assimilate and internalize this knowledge and add personal value to it, they can now transition to the second step, which is the intrapsychological plane. This transformation of the students from learning from the interaction within the society to personal values is not an imitation of the transition from social to personal. Moreover, Vygotsky claims that students are not imitating their teachers’ capabilities but applying what teachers teach them to transform and make changes within them during the appropriation process (Turuk, 2008).

Vygotsky emphasized that children and adults play an essential role in children’s progress. Cole & Cole (2001), as cited by Verenikina (2010), mentioned that development, in this case, is co-created, which implies that both the teacher and the learner are considered essential factors in the learning of the child. The teacher's intrusion into children's education is obligatory. However, the excellence of the teacher-learner interaction is perceived as critical in that learning (Tharp & Gallimore, 1998, cited by Verenikina, 2010).

The theory accentuates the significance of what the student brings to any learning condition as an active meaning-fabricator and convergent thinker (Turuk, 2008). It recognizes the stirring landscape of the interaction between teachers, learners and responsibilities; and offers a sight of education as ascending from exchanges with others. Ellis (2000, as cited by Maturuk, 2008) states that Vygotsky’s theory presumes that learning happens not through interaction but in interaction. Learners primarily succeed in executing a new task with another individual’s assistance and then absorb it so they can execute it in their way. In this manner, social collaboration is encouraged to facilitate learning. According to Ellis, the theory further states that interactions that successfully facilitate learning are those in which the learners frame the innovative tasks (Turuk, 2008).
Driscoll (2000) explains that constructivist theory emphasizes that knowledge can only occur within the human mind and that this knowledge does not have to be similar in any real-world authenticity. Learners will continually try to create their mental prototype of the actual world from their discernments of that world. As they observe each new experience, learners will constantly progress their mental representations to mirror the new information and will, therefore, conceptualize their understanding of reality. Driscoll (2000) augments that constructivism learning theory is a philosophy which improves students’ rational and theoretical development. The fundamental concept within the constructivist learning theory is the role practices or connections with the attached condition play in student education. The constructivist learning theory contends that individuals produce knowledge and create meaning grounded upon their experiences.

The central constraint of education is that teachers cannot merely transfer knowledge to students; students must vigorously create knowledge in their minds. That is, they learn and renovate information, evaluate new information in contrast to old, and review rules when they are already obsolete. This constructivist understanding of education reflects the learner as an active agent in the process of knowledge acquisition and learning (Bada, 2015).

Thus, learning should be surmised as an active process. Teachers may impose information but not understand it, for it must come from within. Hence, a teacher plays the role of a facilitator whose main function is to assist students in becoming active contributors to their learning and make meaningful connections between prior knowledge, new knowledge, and the processes involved in learning.

Consequently, the philosophy of constructivism has scrapped the traditional concept of the teaching-learning process where a classroom is a place where the teacher is considered the all-knowing master or the expert who feeds the knowledge into passive students who wait like empty containers to be filled and has brought into existence the concept of teaching-learning process that promotes and upholds active involvement of the learners.

The philosophy of constructivism has given birth to the latest trend in education, the concept of Student-Centered Learning. Student-centred learning is a principle that has been recently employed in the teaching-learning process in which learners have the freedom to choose not only what to learn but also how to learn the topic that interests them (Rogers, 1983). This implies that the main function of the learning environment is to encourage and uphold learner responsibility and activity in contrast to the traditional principle, which emphasizes the monopoly of the instructor who has full control of the academic content Cannon, 2000). Furthermore, when classroom lessons are relevant to the lives, needs, and interests of the students and when they are actively involved in making, comprehending, and connecting to knowledge, the learning process becomes more meaningful and productive (McCombs & Whistler, 1997).

In addition, implementing student-centred instruction involves students in decision-making about how and what they learn and how that learning is evaluated. Instructors pay respect and embrace individual differences in learners’ backgrounds, interests, abilities, experiences and many more (McCombs & Whistler, 1997).

Likewise, in a student-centred classroom, the instructor’s role is to encourage the learners to do more on the discovery of learning and to learn from one another. The instructor
creates authentic, real-life tasks to encourage the learner to engage and participate (Weimer, 2002).

The ESA or Engage-Study-Activate is relevant to the philosophy of constructivism and the concept of Student-centered learning, which was postulated by Jeremy Harmer (2007). This was introduced to augment what had been perceived and used to be an effective teaching strategy: PPP, which stands for Present, Practice Produce. Harmer (2007) observed that PPP does not work well when teaching more complex language problems beyond the sentence level or communicative skills and is not that engaging for its simplistic features.

E.S.A. is a teaching framework for engaging, studying and activating. They are stages executed in a language classroom to support students in learning effectively. The Three stages of E.S.A. are as follows.

Engage. This is when the teacher tries to arouse the students’ interest or motivation, including their emotions. The teacher provides activities and learning materials to engage the students. These activities and learning materials include games, stimulating pictures, telling dramatic stories, etc.

Study. Study activities are those where students are asked to focus on language aspects, such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary or the content of the lesson. The study stage lets students focus on the language aspects or contents of the lesson, including grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. In this stage, the teacher can explain the grammar of the new language or the lesson's content, ask students to practice the pronunciation of some words, practice using pronouns in sentences, or let students explain or discuss and share their ideas and thoughts. Susilo (2014) emphasized that in this stage, teacher talk is considered a different communicative interaction between teacher and students from the conventional way. The teacher talk here aims to transport the learning materials to the students, produce communicative collaboration, and develop the student’s language proficiency.

Activate. In this stage, the students perform exercises and/or activities created to assess students applying their learning, like using language as spontaneously and communicatively as possible. The main goal is not to focus on the language construction or practice of bits of grammar but to apply all that is suitable in a given condition or topic (Harmer, 2007).

Partin (2009) discovered that the ESA procedure increases small-group discussions and cooperative learning and offers to chat and socializing.

Leo (2006) added that students’ behaviour and actions in the learning environment also depend on the teachers’ awareness of their role as a motivator. As a teacher-motivator, he can motivate lazy, silent, self-doubting, and hopeless students to become more confident and hopeful progressively.

The use of ESA-EAP indeed needs the cooperation of both the teacher and students, which is needed to make the teaching-learning process effective and successful.

The perceived level of acceptability of ESA-EAP will be measured with a reliable, valid and tested instrument called TAM or Technology Acceptance Model. TAM by Davis (1989) is one of the most popular research models to predict users' use and acceptance of information systems and technology. There are two factors in this model, one is the perceived usefulness, and the other one is the perceived ease of use. Davis defines perceived usefulness as the end-
users personal chance that using a specific application system will improve his life or performance. On the other hand, perceived ease of use is defined as the degree to which the end-user supposes the target application system to be free from any effort. The other two factors of TAM are ‘behavioural intention to use and ‘actual usage’. The former measures the likelihood of the user using the application system, and the latter is determined by the first two factors – perceived usefulness and ease of use.

Researchers around the world have employed TAM to measure the acceptance of different types of application systems. Shafeek (2011) qtd in Surendran (2012) attempted to evaluate teachers' acceptance of e-Learning materials and procedures using TAM.

CHED Memorandum Order 20 s. 2013 is another basis for the conduct of this study. It is an order from the Commission of Higher Education, which gave birth to the new general education courses, to heed the call for the ongoing paradigm shift to learning competency-based standards in Philippine Higher Education. With this, a window revision of the current GE was created to expose undergraduate students to various domains of knowledge and ways of comprehending social and natural realities, developing intellectual competencies and civic capacities.

This chapter reviews the literature on the importance of teaching models and strategies. Likewise, this also reviews published and unpublished studies focusing on the acceptability of a teaching model and/or strategy like ESA.

Oladosu (2004) defined teaching as a process whose main objective is to provide productive learning in a way that is acceptable morally and pedagogically. In addition, teaching the involvement of the teacher, learner and the content – knowledge, facts, information, and skills to be transferred. Finally, it is a method that recognizes learners’ intellectual integrity and freedom of choice.

Consequently, teaching has been confronted with those aforementioned - learners’ cognitive integrity and freedom of choice. Perhaps another greatest challenge a teacher would take is getting his students’ interest to focus on the learning process and eventually learn sustainably. The essence of teaching is learning. And for learning to take place, there must be effective communication between the teacher and the learners. Thus, choosing the appropriate teaching strategy or model would help the teacher do his herculean task.

Schumaker and Deshler (2006) explain that an individual’s way of approaching a task, including how a person thinks and acts when planning, doing, and assessing performance on a task and its results, revolves around the so-called learning strategy. At the same time, teachers employ instructional strategies to help mold the learning environment and embody professional outsets of learning and the learner (Encyclopedia of education, 2002).

A teaching method, model and or strategy may be considered effective if learning has taken place. Zhou (2011) stresses that a learner can be considered learning when there is an observable change in the behaviour of the learner resulting from what has been imparted and experienced. This denotes that behaviour change, including knowledge and attitude, is the ultimate purpose of the learning process, which entails that the change that can be derived from the learning process is not a solo endeavour of the teacher and the students but also with the
influence of a good teaching method which may have an immense contribution in the learning process.

Consequently, teachers must look for creative and effective ways to teach language and increase students’ level of motivation to learn and appreciate the language (Hussin, Maarof, and D’Cruz, 2001). Students become energized, excited, and emotionally engaged if they experience a heightened emotionally driven environment that pulls their interest towards the subject. This increase in emotional arousal augments students’ attention, leading to easier information absorption (Dornyei, 2000). Gardner (2007) adds that both motivation and emotion are vital agents in the formation of language patterns in the learner’s mind.

The learning environment, along with teachers’ pedagogical skills, is important for quality education (Johnson, 2007 qtd. in Jalbani, 2014).

According to Alton-Lee (2004) qtd in Jalbani (2014), teachers should align their professional experiences with their teaching practices and pedagogies to benefit their students.

It is important to engage the students. This denotes that students’ interest should be pulled toward the subject, the class, and language development and encouraged to enjoy learning (Robertson and Acklam, 2000).

Park (2003) found out in his research that students seem to understand more, learn more, remember more and enjoy more and become more capable of recognizing the importance and relevance of what they have learned if they are actively engaged compared to students who are the passive receiver of what teachers teach them.

Thus, a teacher should always bring his myriad classroom activities to help students get involved and participate so that learning would eventually occur.

3. Methodology
3.1. Method used.

This study is quantitative research employing descriptive-correlational techniques to determine the acceptability of the ESA-EAP teaching model. This kind of research work needs extra specifications on statistics and data gathering. The research method used has significance in the research methodology because the data imperative for completion of this work are all concise and the capacity to discuss it with the survey.

3.2. Respondents

The primary respondents of this study were the selected members of the faculty and students of Cebu Technological University-Tuburan Campus, Cebu, who were teaching and learning Purposive Communication. The teacher respondents were chosen according to their subject loads. Only three teachers handling Purposive Communication are chosen randomly using the fishbowl technique. The student respondents were chosen per class randomly. Thus, there were three teacher respondents and three classes of student respondents.

3.3. Instrument

The study utilized the standard survey questionnaire based on TAM and adapted from the study of Donkor (2011) as the main instrument for data collection.

3.4. Data Gathering Procedure
To gather data, a letter of consent from the concerned personnel of the school was sent. After the letters were approved, the researcher made an appointment with the administrators to actual conduct the questionnaire. The researcher secured a master list of the faculty members to identify the students that provided the data needed.

Before conducting the survey, the researcher met with the teacher participants to orient them on their roles in the research process. They were also informed on the teaching model's basics; likewise, they were told what selected activities to measure students’ performance. They were also asked to choose one class randomly.

During the survey, the researcher explained to the respondents the purpose of the study. The investigator also told the respondents to ask questions or clarifications during the survey. After answering the questionnaire, the researcher collected, tallied, analyzed and interpreted the data.

4. RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Students’ Academic Performance for Competency 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 below</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score: 17.60 Standard Deviation: 2.0588948817573

It is indicated in the table above that out of 86 student-respondents who were able to perform the task given, 56 of them or 65.12% of them, demonstrated an excellent performance which means that more than half were able to follow the necessary instructions fully and were able to meet fully the criteria set on the given task with a minor error committed. There were 26 student respondents who demonstrated a very satisfactory performance and only 4 demonstrated a satisfactory performance. These data indicate a great disparity of the student-respondents who demonstrated an excellent performance over those who demonstrated very satisfactory and satisfactory performance combined which suggests that the use of the ESA-EAP in deemed effective in the teaching and developing the first competency. In fact, the average score of the student-respondents as indicated is 17.60 which is in between the range of excellent and very satisfactory; likewise, the standard deviation indicated means that the scores obtain by the student-respondents do not go far from one another which means that their pacing towards learning and developing the competency is almost the same.

Moreover, these data implied that the use of the ESA-EAP model had helped in the facilitation of students learning, especially in the communication processes across contexts. Likewise, these data implied that the model helped the student respondents understand the role of the communication participants by anticipating commendable ways to overcome barriers in communication. This result is supported by Adunola (2011) when he indicated that to bring the desired changes in students, teaching methods used by educators should be appropriate for the subject matter. Hence, ESA-EAP is an appropriate teaching model that could develop students’ competency in explaining communication processes across contexts.
The table above indicates that out of 86 student respondents, there were 57 obtained scores of 43 and above, 66.28% of the total number of respondents. This means that more than half were able to have an excellent performance in the task given, which further means the majority were fully able to follow the necessary instructions and meet the criteria set from the task given with minor errors committed. There were also 24 who performed very satisfactorily by obtaining a score of 34-42 points, which means that these student-respondents could follow necessary instructions and meet the criteria set but committed one to two major errors in performing the task. Five student respondents only comprised 5.81% of the total number of respondents, who had a satisfactory performance, meaning that necessary instructions were followed. Criteria were met, but three to four major errors were committed.

Furthermore, it is indicated in the table that the student-respondents obtained an average score of 42.406, which falls under a very satisfactory performance. The majority obtained scores ranging from 43-50, but the average score suggests that respondents’ scores do not go far from the boundaries between the two score ranges of 43-50 and 34-42, which is also evident in the indicated standard deviation of 4.95. This further means that the majority belong to the 43-50 range, but the majority obtain scores nearer to 43 points. The 24 who belong to the 33-42 range obtain scores in between the range resulting in the indicated average.

Moreover, these data implied that ESA-EAP contributed very satisfactorily to developing the second competency. This enabled the student respondents to describe the role of cultural and global issues in achieving effective communication by acceptably demonstrating different communication principles. Zeeb (2014) said that aligning teaching methods and strategies with students’ needs and preferred learning influences students’ academic attainments. Hence, ESA-EAP is aligned with students’ needs and preferred learning.
18-20 which is verbally described as excellent, and 19 out of 86 or 22.10% obtained scores ranging from 10-13 which is verbally described as satisfactory. This means that more student respondents could follow the instructions and meet the criteria set with one to two major errors committed than those who could fully follow the necessary instructions and fully meet the criteria with minor errors committed. Moreover, it can also be observed that a greater number of student respondents performed satisfactorily than those who performed excellently.

Nevertheless, the student-respondents still obtained an overall VERY SATISFACTORY performance with an average weighted mean score of 15.59. At the same time, the indicated standard deviation means that the scores obtained do not have huge disparity, which further means that the student-respondents are on the same pace towards learning and developing competency, which is a good indicator that the intervention used is effective.

These quantitative data implied that the ESA-EAP model is still a contributing factor in attaining this satisfactory performance despite the challenges in learning the lesson and performing the task given. Moreover, when students are more engaged and involved in the class using ESA-EAP, they will still appreciate the learning process despite the challenges they will meet along the way. Dornyei (2000) said that students who experience heightened emotional interest are pulled toward a subject because they are energized, excited, and emotionally engaged by the material. This increased emotional arousal heightens a student's attention, making it easier to encode more information. ESA-EAP is a teaching model that promotes student engagement and involvement that triggers interest and passion towards learning, resulting in a satisfactory performance by the students despite impending challenges.

Table 4
Students’ Academic Performance for Competency 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43-50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73.26</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 43.755 Standard Deviation: 3.920536408813

The table above illustrates that there were 63 out of 86, or 73.26%, student respondents obtained scores ranging from 43-50, which is verbally described as excellent, while there 21 or 21.42%, obtained scores ranging from 34-42, which is verbally described as very satisfactory; and only two (2) or 2.32% obtained scores ranging from 25-33 which is verbally described as satisfactory; and no one obtained scores below 24. It can be observed that there is a great difference in the number between those who had an excellent performance and those who had a very satisfactory performance and even when they are combined. This means that an impressive number of respondents could fully follow all the necessary instructions and fully meet the criteria for performing the assigned task. In fact, the average performance is 43.755, which belongs to an excellent performance.

These indicated quantitative data implied that ESA-EAP has immensely contributed to promoting students’ awareness and sensitivity in communicating culturally and cross-culturally, as the groups demonstrated very satisfactory performance. Park (2003) said that students who actively engage with what they are studying tend to understand more, learn more,
remember more, enjoy it more and be more able to appreciate the relevance of what they have learned than students who passively receive what we teach them. Hence, student respondents were able to perform satisfactorily for ESA-EAP promotes students’ engagement and involvement, letting the students be the centre of learning and enabling them to enjoy the learning process resulting in more learning.

Table 5
Students’ Academic Performance for Competency 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 90.511 Standard Deviation: 5.6993353060962

It is indicated in the table that 68 out of 86 or 79.07% of the student-respondents obtained scores ranging from 85-100, which is verbally described as excellent, and 18 out of 86 or 20.93% obtained scores ranging from 67-84, which is described as very satisfactory. No one obtained scores below 67. It can be observed that the scores obtained by the student-respondents are higher, with the majority having an excellent performance which is very evident in the average score of 90.11. This means that most students could fully follow and fully meet the criteria in performing the given task, and only a few could commit one (1) to two major errors. The indicated standard deviation of 5.6993353060962 also suggests that the student-respondents do not have a huge disparity in their pacing towards their performances.

This implied that ESA-EAP contributed to facilitating students’ learning towards using appropriate terms, expressions and images for communication. Tynjala (1998) indicated that a student-centred learning environment produces higher-level learning outcomes more efficiently than a traditional teacher-centred classroom. This means that the beyond-average performance demonstrated by the students was the outcome of a student-centred approach to teaching, which is evidently reflected in the ESA-EAP model.

Table 6
Students’ Overall Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42-48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.16</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 41.97 Standard Deviation: 2.4288568488513

The table shows the overall performance of the 86 student respondents. It is indicated that 44 out of 86 student respondents, or 51.16% obtained average scores ranging from 42-48, which is verbally described as excellent. Likewise, there were 42 out of 86 or 48.84 obtained average scores ranging from 33-41, which is verbally described as very satisfactory. It is further
indicated that no one obtained scores below 33, student-respondents obtained an overall score of 41.97, which can be rounded off to 42, which is under the excellent category. In addition, the indicated standard deviation of 2.4288568488513 means that the overall level of performance of the student-respondents does not have a huge disparity despite their specialization and preferences.

These overall statistical data imply that using ESA-EAP is a major contributing factor that made these performances attained by guiding the instructor in making the classroom student-centred. Weimer (2002) said that the role of the instructor in student-centred classrooms is to encourage learners to do more discovery learning and to learn from each other; the instructor focuses on constructing authentic, real-life tasks that motivate learner involvement and participation.

Moreover, these data imply that using ESA-EAP in teaching Purposive Communication mitigates the issues of preferences and specialization in learning as it promotes an equal chance of learning among the students, which is also the trust of a student-centred classroom where no students should be left behind.

Table 7
Perceived level of acceptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Acceptability</th>
<th>Student Respondents</th>
<th>Teacher Respondents</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Verbal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Usefulness</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention to use</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Usage</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Weighted Mean</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 3.25-4.00 (very acceptable), 2.50-3.24 (acceptable), 1.75-2.49 (fairly acceptable) 1.00-1.74 (not acceptable)

Perceived Usefulness.

This aspect of acceptability got a very acceptable rating with a combined weighted of 3.37 from both student and teacher respondents. This means that both respondent groups have seen the significance of the teaching model in enhancing learning and the teaching process, which was evident in the performances of the student respondents. This result implied that the ESA-EAP model is useful in students’ academic development and teachers’ quest to facilitate learning, which is also proven in the study of Ilinawati (2016), where it was found that ESA succeeded in improving the teaching of speaking, which eventually change the learning behaviour of the students. Likewise, the study of Khoshsima and Shokri (2017) investigated the perception of the teachers on ESA in boosting the speaking ability of EFL learners and it was found that teachers hold a positive perception of implementing ESA elements in their classroom settings as an instructional approach in boosting the speaking ability of EFL learners.
This boils down to saying that ESA-EAP contributes greatly to students' academic development.

Perceived ease of use

This aspect of acceptability got a weighted mean of 2.91 from the student respondents, which is verbally described as acceptable, while teacher respondents rate it with a weighted mean of 3.33, which is very acceptable. This means that the teacher respondents have more confidence and a firmer belief that the ESA-EAP model is easy and acceptable to be used in enhancing the teaching and learning process. In contrast, student respondents generally believe that the ESA-EAP model is easy and acceptable to be used in enhancing the teaching and learning process. Moreover, the two respondent groups have different perceptions of this aspect apparently because the teacher is the primary user of the model in facilitating learning of the students and sees ESA-EAP as a tool in teaching that makes the delivery of the lesson easier compared to how the students perceived it. One contributing factor that leads students to rating this aspect as acceptable and not very acceptable is their perception of the subject and the fact that learning is fun but not easy.

Nevertheless, rating this aspect as acceptable still implies that the ESA-EAP model makes learning and teaching easy and smooth, promoting student engagement and involvement, which makes learning easier. It further implies that ESA-EAP as a teaching model develops students’ self-esteem and confidence as it encourages student engagement and provides a friendly and facilitative learning environment making learning and teaching easier and smoother. Methodist University (2020) explained that a facilitative learning environment has a facilitative teacher that implements appropriate instructional strategies, resulting in a positive classroom learning environment. Consequently, in this environment, learning is an active process, the teacher is the facilitator, and students are invited to learn. Hence, ESA-EAP makes learning and teaching easy by letting the teachers become the facilitator of learning and letting the students realize that learning is an active process.

Behavioural Intention to Use

This aspect of acceptability measures the likelihood of the respondents using the technology, which is the ESA-EAP model. It is shown in the table that student respondents rated this as acceptable, which means that they will probably use the model as they believe that ESA-EAP is easy and acceptable to be used in enhancing the teaching and learning process. The teacher respondents, on the other hand, rated this aspect as very acceptable, which means that it is more probable for them to use the model as they were very confident and have a firm belief that the ESA-EAP model is easy and acceptable to be used in enhancing teaching and learning process.

This implies that ESA-EAP is highly practicable in teaching Purposive Communication. This is parallel to the study of Khoshsima and Shokri (2017) investigated the perception of the teachers on ESA in boosting the speaking ability of EFL learners, and it was found out that teachers hold a positive perception of implementing ESA elements in their classroom settings as an instructional approach in boosting the speaking ability of EFL learners.

Actual Usage
This aspect of the technology acceptance model is determined by the first two aspects – the perceived usefulness and ease of use. So, when respondents perceived the technology as useful in enhancing their performance and free from too much effort, there was a greater chance of using the technology. As shown in the table, both teacher and student respondents rated this aspect as very acceptable, which means there is a greater chance that the teaching model will be used. They confidently and firmly believed that the ESA-EAP model is easy and acceptable for enhancing teaching-learning. This implies that both respondents will actually use ESA-EAP for it enhances both teaching and learning performances in a facilitative manner.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>T Stat</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Teacher and Student Perception</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.3223</td>
<td>0.7480</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Level of Significance α 0.05 |

The table above indicates that using an unpaired T-test, the two-tailed P values of the overall sources of difference are greater than the specified alpha level of significance of 0.05. This means that the hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant mean difference between teachers’ and students’ perceptions of the acceptability of ESA-EAP in the teaching of Purposive Communication. This finding reveals that both teacher and student respondents viewed ESA-EAP similarly as a very acceptable teaching model in teaching and learning Purposive Communication. Both group respondents believe that the model was useful and made the teaching and learning process easy. This further reveals that both respondents would use the model in teaching and learning Purposive Communication.

Moreover, the standard deviation of 0.227 suggests that the responses of both teacher and student respondents are closer, meaning that their perception of ESA-EAP’s acceptability is almost the same.

Twomey (1989) explained that a productive, constructivist classroom consists of learner-centred and active instruction. In such a classroom, the teacher provides students with experiences that allow them to hypothesize, predict, manipulate objects, pose questions, research, investigate, imagine, and invent. The teacher's role is to facilitate this process. Accordingly, this implies that the ESA-EAP model was able to effectively let both teachers and students play their roles seeing the model’s acceptability similarly.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Relationship</th>
<th>r value</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Perception and Students’ Performance</td>
<td>0.1722</td>
<td>0.1128</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Level of Significance α 0.05 |
Researchers measured the relationship between student respondents' perception of the acceptability of the ESA-EAP model and their performance in teaching and learning of Purposive Communication. The P-value was 0.1128, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This supports the null hypothesis, meaning that the chance of a type I error, rejecting the null hypothesis, is too high. A higher P-value supports the null hypothesis.

The interpretation is non-significant, accepting the null hypothesis because a non-significant result cannot prove that the null hypothesis is correct. Only the null assumption cannot be rejected but accepted.

Researchers found that the academic performance of the student respondents is not directly influenced or affected by how they perceived the acceptability of the teaching model used. These findings are consistent with the study of Orong et al. (2013), which also found that teaching strategies used by instructors have no significant relationship to student academic performance.

Table 10: Relationship between Teacher’s Perceived Acceptability and Students’ Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Relationship</th>
<th>r value</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' Perception and Students' Performance</td>
<td>0.4655</td>
<td>0.6917</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the relationship between teacher respondents' perception of the acceptability of the ESA-EAP model and their performance in teaching and learning of Purposive Communication is not significant. The P-value is 0.6917, which is higher than 0.05 level of significance. This means that the chance of a type I error, rejecting the null hypothesis, is too high. The larger the P-value, the more it supports the null hypothesis. Hence, the interpretation is non-significant, accepting the null hypothesis since a non-significant result cannot prove that the null hypothesis is correct. Only the null assumption cannot be rejected but accepted.

These findings reveal that academic performance is independent of the teachers' perceptions of the acceptability of a teaching model or strategy. Academic performance could be affected by several factors. Masud et al. (2019) revealed that socioeconomic status, student temperament and motivation, and peer and parental support influence academic performance. In addition, Abaidoo (2018) noticed that student factors that contribute to an improvement in academic performance include; regular studying, self-motivation, punctuality and regular class attendance, hard work and interest in a subject. This implies that in most studies conducted. It was not revealed yet that teachers’ perception towards the acceptability of a teaching model affects or influences academic performance.

5. CONCLUSION
Based on the findings of the study, ESA-EAP is a teaching model that upholds student-centred learning as it enhances the teaching and learning process in a facilitative manner. Thus, ESA-EAP is very acceptable in Teaching Purposeful Communication.
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Appendices
Appendix 1

Questionnaire

(For Teachers)

Directions. Please put a check on the spaces provided which correspond to your response to each item. This survey questionnaire has two parts – first part is on the acceptability and second part is on the problems encountered. Please be guided on the scoring procedures below. There is no right or wrong answer to this survey questionnaire. This just aims to assess the acceptability of ESA-EAP teaching model in teaching Purposive communication. Your honest responses will be of great help to the improvement of the teaching-learning experience in Purposive Communication.

Part 1. Acceptability of ESA-EAP

Scoring Procedure:

Acceptability
4 - very acceptable
3 – acceptable
2 – fairly acceptable
1 – not acceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability</th>
<th>Perceived Usefulness</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Perceived Usefulness</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The use of ESA-EAP improves students’ acquisition of basic and practical knowledge and skills in communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The use of ESA-EAP enhance students’ effectiveness in communicating in various functional and multicultural settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The use of ESA-EAP upholds and promotes student-centered learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find the use of ESA-EAP useful and effective in teaching the knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Using ESA-EAP in teaching Purposive Communication is easy for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find my students at ease in learning lessons and acquiring skills in communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The use of ESA-EAP makes the teaching-learning experience easy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Behavioral intention to Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I intend to use ESA-EAP regularly in teaching practical knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Actual usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I use ESA-EAP regularly in teaching practical knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Problems Encountered

1. What are the problems you encountered in using ESA-EAP model in teaching Purposive Communication? Please include the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching model in answering this question.

Appendix 2

Questionnaire
(For Students)

Directions. Please put a check on the spaces provided which correspond to your response to each item. This survey questionnaire has two parts – first part is on the acceptability and second part is on the problems encountered. Please be guided on the scoring procedures below. There is no right or wrong answer to this survey questionnaire. This just aims to assess the acceptability of ESA-EAP teaching model in teaching Purposive communication. Your honest responses will be of great help to the improvement of the teaching-learning experience in Purposive Communication.

Part 1. Acceptability of ESA-EAP

Scoring Procedure:
Acceptability
4 - very acceptable
3 – acceptable
2 – fairly acceptable
1 – not acceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability</th>
<th>I. Perceived Usefulness</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The use of ESA-EAP improves my acquisition of basic and practical knowledge and skills in communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The use of ESA-EAP enhance my effectiveness in communicating in various functional and multicultural settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The use of ESA-EAP upholds and promotes student-centered learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I find the use of ESA-EAP useful and effective in learning the knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Using ESA-EAP in learning Purposive Communication is easy for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I find myself at ease in learning lessons and acquiring skills in communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The use of ESA-EAP makes the teaching-learning experience easy.

III. Behavioral intention to Use

9. I intend that teachers use ESA-EAP regularly in teaching practical knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.

IV. Actual usage

10. I prefer that ESA-EAP be regularly used by teachers in teaching practical knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication.

Part II. Problems Encountered

1. What are the problems you encountered when your teacher used ESA-EAP model in teaching the practical knowledge and skills in Purposive Communication? Please include the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching model in answering this question.