



# PERCEIVED COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH OF THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEARNERS IN LA CONSOLACION COLLEGE OF IRIGA

Joyce Ann R. Ibarrientos

*School of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Saint Anthony,  
Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Philippines*

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20345719>

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the communicative competence in English of Senior High School learners at La Consolacion College of Iriga, focusing on grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies, as well as the factors affecting their communicative performance. A descriptive-evaluative research design was employed, utilizing a teacher-made assessment tool and survey questionnaire administered to selected learners. Communicative competence was measured in terms of grammar accuracy, appropriateness of language use, coherence of ideas, and use of communication strategies. Data were analyzed using weighted mean and interpreted through descriptive scales. Results revealed that learners demonstrated an overall proficient level of communicative competence (WM = 3.42), with sociolinguistic competence obtaining the highest mean, followed by grammatical competence. However, discourse and strategic competencies were rated fairly proficient, indicating challenges in organizing ideas, using cohesive devices, and managing communication breakdowns. Learners also acknowledged the presence of barriers affecting communication (WM = 3.58), particularly lack of awareness of appropriate language use in social contexts and speaking anxiety. Other contributing factors included difficulty in organizing ideas, limited communication strategies, classroom distractions, and low confidence. Based on these findings, a Pedagogical Intervention Package was developed to enhance discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic competencies through communicative activities, role-playing, discourse-building tasks, strategy drills, and supportive learning environments. The study concludes that while learners are generally proficient, communicative competence remains uneven across components and is influenced by both affective and contextual factors.

**Keywords:** *Communicative Competence, SHS Learners*

## INTRODUCTION

Communicative competence is a central goal in English language education, as it reflects learners' ability to use language accurately, appropriately, and effectively in different communicative contexts. It goes beyond grammatical knowledge and focuses on meaningful language use in real-life situations (Kiessling & Fabry, 2021). It is a multidimensional construct composed of linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, interactional, and strategic competencies that collectively support effective communication (Choi & Kang, 2024). These dimensions highlight that communicative competence involves both language knowledge and the ability to apply it appropriately in context (Ahmed & Pawar, 2018; Price et al., 2013).

Developing communicative competence requires sensitivity to cultural and contextual factors. Wilberschied (2015) emphasized that intercultural awareness is essential, as communication is shaped by cultural norms and expectations. Learners often show stronger performance in linguistic competence but weaker performance in sociolinguistic and pragmatic use, particularly in adjusting language to social situations (Terogo et al., 2018; Terogo et al., 2019). This indicates that grammatical knowledge alone is insufficient for effective communication without appropriate contextual application.

Instructional literature stresses that communicative competence is best developed through interactive, learner-centered, and authentic learning approaches. Task-based learning and communicative language teaching enhance fluency, confidence, and pragmatic ability by engaging learners in meaningful communication activities (Osorio & Insuasty, 2015; Aliazas & Velasco, 2023). The integration of authentic materials, technology, and intercultural exposure further strengthens learners' communicative skills by simulating real-world communication contexts (Yusupalieva, 2024). However, barriers such as anxiety, low confidence, limited vocabulary, and teacher-centered instruction continue to hinder communicative performance (Brown, 2007; Canja, 2024; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Existing studies show that communicative competence is influenced by instructional practices, learner characteristics, and environmental factors. Despite various pedagogical approaches, learners continue to exhibit uneven development, particularly in sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies. In the Philippine educational context, students still experience difficulties in using English effectively despite its use as a medium of instruction. However, there is limited research that provides a comprehensive assessment of all dimensions of communicative competence within a specific institution while also identifying influencing factors and using the results as a basis for intervention development. This study addresses this gap by examining the communicative competence of Senior High School learners at La Consolacion College of Iriga, identifying the factors affecting their performance, and proposing a school-based pedagogical intervention to enhance English communicative competence.

## Research Questions

This study aimed to examine the communicative competence of Senior High School learners in La Consolacion College of Iriga by assessing competence levels, identifying influencing factors, and proposing appropriate interventions for improvement.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the perceived level of communicative competence in English of the students in terms of:
  - a. Grammatical Competence
  - b. Socio-Linguistic Competence
  - c. Discourse Competence
  - d. Strategic Competence
2. What are the factors affecting the current level of communicative competence of the students?
3. What school-based English communicative competence enhancement activities may be designed based on the findings of the study?

## METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted to determine the communicative competence of Senior High School learners in English in terms of grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies, as well as the factors affecting these competencies. The respondents were Senior High School learners enrolled during School Year 2025–2026. All available learners from the identified grade levels and strands were included as respondents through total enumeration sampling to ensure complete representation of the population and to avoid selection bias. The sample consisted of learners with varying levels of English proficiency and classroom participation, allowing a more comprehensive assessment of communicative competence.

The researcher utilized a teacher-made assessment composed of performance-based tasks designed to measure the four components of communicative competence. For grammatical competence, learners wrote a 100–150-word essay based on a given prompt assessing grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary, and syntax. For sociolinguistic competence, learners responded to situational prompts requiring appropriate expressions for requests, apologies, refusals, and opinions in different social contexts. For discourse competence, learners delivered a one-minute oral presentation discussing their future goals and plans, focusing on coherence and organization of ideas.

For strategic competence, learners participated in a group debate activity on the topic “Should AI be used in making academic activities?” to assess their ability to manage communication breakdowns and use communication strategies. A scoring rubric was used to evaluate all outputs using a 5-point scale ranging from Not Proficient (1.00–1.80)

to Highly Proficient (4.21–5.00). The instrument was reviewed and revised to ensure clarity, appropriateness, and consistency of the items.

The researcher administered the assessment tools personally to the respondents during their available time to avoid disruption of classes. Clear instructions were provided before the administration of the tasks and questionnaires to ensure proper understanding of the activities. The confidentiality of responses was emphasized to encourage honest and accurate participation. All completed outputs were collected immediately after administration to ensure completeness of data and to maintain reliability of responses. The data gathered were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Weighted mean was used to determine the level of communicative competence of learners in the four competency areas.

Responses from the questionnaire on factors affecting communicative competence were also analyzed using weighted mean to identify the most significant influencing variables. The results were interpreted using a standardized Likert scale ranging from Not Proficient to Highly Proficient for performance data, and from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree for perception data. These statistical treatments provided a clear description of learners' communicative competence levels and the factors influencing their performance, serving as the basis for analysis and interpretation of findings.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the level of students' grammatical competence in English with weighted mean scores ranging from 3.39 to 3.67 and an overall mean of 3.46, interpreted as Proficient. The highest indicator is correct use of pronouns (3.67), followed by forming different sentence types (3.54) and correct use of articles (3.51). Applying appropriate verb tenses obtained 3.45, while subject–verb agreement, sentence construction, and word order all recorded 3.42. The lowest means (3.39) were observed in prepositions, sentence complexity, and minimal grammatical errors, interpreted as Fairly Proficient.

The results indicate that learners are stronger in basic grammatical structures such as pronoun usage and sentence formation. This supports Terogo et al. (2018; 2019), who found that learners generally demonstrate higher performance in linguistic competence, particularly in grammar and syntax. Bautista and Del Valle (2023) also noted that regular exposure to English and structured activities enhances grammatical competence, which explains the relatively higher performance in basic forms.

*Grammatical Competence*

**Table 1.**  
**The Level of Communicative Competence in English of the Students in Terms of Grammatical Competence**

<b>Grammatical Competence</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Uses pronouns correctly and clearly.	3.67	Proficient	1
2. Forms affirmative, negative, and interrogative sentences correctly.	3.54	Proficient	2
3. Applies correct use of articles (a, an, the).	3.51	Proficient	3
4. Applies appropriate verb tenses accurately in speaking and writing.	3.45	Proficient	5
5. Uses correct subject–verb agreement consistently.	3.42	Proficient	7
6. Constructs grammatically correct sentences.	3.42	Proficient	7
7. Uses correct word order in sentences.	3.42	Proficient	7
8. Uses appropriate prepositions in context.	3.39	Fairly Proficient	10
9. Demonstrates control of simple and complex sentence structures.	3.39	Fairly Proficient	10
10. Produces language with minimal grammatical errors that do not affect meaning.	3.39	Fairly Proficient	10
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	

<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>
	4.21-5.00	Highly Proficient
	3.41-4.20	Proficient
	2.61-3.40	Fairly Proficient
	1.81-2.60	Less Proficient
	1.00-1.80	Not Proficient

However, weaker performance in prepositions, complex sentences, and error control reflects limitations in advanced grammatical use. Vu Van Tuan (2017) found similar difficulties in complex grammatical structures, while Richards and Rodgers (2014) explained that rule-focused instruction often leads to incomplete mastery, where learners perform well in basic grammar but struggle in flexible language use.

Overall, the findings show that students are proficient in basic grammar but still developing in more complex and contextual grammatical areas. This indicates the need for continued instructional support focusing on meaningful grammar use, sentence development, and error correction in authentic communication to strengthen overall grammatical competence.

*Sociolinguistic Competence*

**Table 2.**  
**The Level of Communicative Competence in English of the Students in Terms of Socio-Linguistic Competence**

<b>Sociolinguistic Competence</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Uses respectful language when expressing disagreement.	3.87	Proficient	1
2. Uses culturally appropriate expressions in different situations.	3.87	Proficient	1
3. Uses culturally appropriate expressions in different situations.	3.87	Proficient	1
4. Avoids language that may sound rude or inappropriate.	3.87	Proficient	1
5. Uses appropriate expressions in making requests.	3.84	Proficient	5
6. Uses polite expressions when communicating with teachers or authorities.	3.81	Proficient	6
7. Adjusts language according to the level of formality required.	3.81	Proficient	6
8. Demonstrates proper language when apologizing.	3.78	Proficient	8
9. Shows awareness of social roles in communication.	3.78	Proficient	8
10. Demonstrates sensitivity to the relationship between speaker and listener.	3.78	Proficient	8
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>	
	4.21-5.00	Highly Proficient	
	3.41-4.20	Proficient	
	2.61-3.40	Fairly Proficient	
	1.81-2.60	Less Proficient	
	1.00-1.80	Not Proficient	

As presented in Table 2, students' sociolinguistic competence is generally Proficient, with an overall mean of 3.83. The highest ratings (3.87) highlight students'

ability to use respectful and culturally appropriate language, while the lowest scores (3.78) are seen in apologizing, recognizing social roles, and showing sensitivity to speaker-listener relationships.

Students show stronger confidence in basic politeness than in complex, context-based interactions. As noted by Wilberschied (2015) and Choi and Kang (2024), effective communication requires adapting to context, which students handle at a general level. However, lower performance in nuanced areas supports Suratman et al. (2017) and Richards and Rodgers (2014), who note that limited authentic exposure hinders deeper pragmatic skills.

Table 3 shows that students' discourse competence has an overall mean of 3.19, described as Fairly Proficient. They perform best in maintaining unity of ideas (3.67) and organizing ideas logically, but show weaker performance in using transition words (2.81) and cohesive devices (2.31), which are rated Less Proficient.

### *Discourse Competence*

**Table 3.**  
**The Level of Communicative Competence in English of the Students in Terms of Discourse Competence**

<b>Discourse Competence</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Maintains unity of ideas within a topic.	3.67	Proficient	1
2. Organizes ideas logically with clear structure.	3.48	Proficient	2
3. Develops ideas with sufficient supporting details.	3.45	Proficient	3
4. Presents ideas in a clear and understandable sequence.	3.42	Proficient	4
5. Communicates messages in a coherent and well-structured manner.	3.33	Proficient	5
6. Ensures sentences are logically connected.	3.30	Proficient	6
7. Maintains consistency and clarity throughout communication.	3.21	Proficient	7
8. Presents information with clear introduction, body, and conclusion.	2.96	Fairly Proficient	8
9. Uses appropriate transition words to connect ideas.	2.81	Fairly Proficient	9

10. Uses cohesive devices effectively (e.g., however, therefore, because).	2.31	Less Proficient	10
<b>Average Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>Fairly Proficient</b>	
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>	
	4.21-5.00	Highly Proficient	
	3.41-4.20	Proficient	
	2.61-3.40	Fairly Proficient	
	1.81-2.60	Less Proficient	
	1.00-1.80	Not Proficient	

The results suggest that students can organize and develop ideas at a basic level, supporting Choi and Kang (2024) and Osorio and Insuasty (2015), who emphasize coherence through structured communication tasks. However, difficulties in cohesion and transitions reflect limited skill in connecting ideas, consistent with Richards and Rodgers and Suratman et al..

Collectively, students show developing discourse competence: strong in idea organization but weak in cohesion and extended communication.

Table 4 shows that students' strategic competence has an average mean of 3.19 (Fairly Proficient), with scores ranging from 3.27 to 3.48. They perform best in continuing communication despite limited knowledge (3.48), followed by self-correction and rephrasing (3.42), while the lowest is in sustaining interaction effectively (3.27).

The findings indicate that students rely more on persistence strategies, supporting Lanka (2017) and Choi and Kang (2024). However, weaker performance in interaction management aligns with Richards and Rodgers (2014) and Kadel (2018), who note limited use of advanced strategies.

Overall, students show developing strategic competence, strong in maintaining communication but weaker in managing interactions effectively.

### *Strategic Competence*

**Table 4.**  
**The Level of Communicative Competence in English of the Students in Terms of Strategic Competence**

<b>Strategic Competence</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Continues communication despite limited language knowledge.	3.48	Proficient	1
2. Self-corrects errors during speaking.	3.42	Proficient	2

3. Rephrases ideas to avoid communication breakdown.	3.42	Proficient	2
4. Uses gestures or non-verbal cues to support communication.	3.39	Fairly Proficient	4
5. Requests clarification when meaning is not understood.	3.36	Fairly Proficient	5.5
6. Asks for repetition when necessary.	3.36	Fairly Proficient	5.5
7. Uses paraphrasing when lacking specific vocabulary.	3.33	Fairly Proficient	7
8. Uses fillers or hesitation devices to maintain fluency.	3.33	Fairly Proficient	7
9. Adjusts language when the listener shows misunderstanding.	3.33	Fairly Proficient	7
10. Uses appropriate strategies to sustain interaction effectively.	3.27	Fairly Proficient	10
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>Fairly Proficient</b>	
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>	
	4.21-5.00	Highly Proficient	
	3.41-4.20	Proficient	
	2.61-3.40	Fairly Proficient	
	1.81-2.60	Less Proficient	
	1.00-1.80	Not Proficient	

Table 5 indicates that sociolinguistic competence has the highest rating (3.83, Proficient), followed by grammatical competence (3.46, Proficient), while discourse and strategic competence both register the lowest (3.19, Fairly Proficient). The overall mean of 3.42 reflects a Proficient level.

The pattern highlights students' greater ease in using appropriate and culturally sensitive language, as emphasized by Wilberschied (2015) and Choi and Kang (2024). Their stable performance in grammar corresponds with Terogo et al., while the lower results in discourse and strategic areas point to challenges in sustaining and managing communication, consistent with Richards and Rodgers (2014) and Lanka (2017).

Taken together, students demonstrate a solid but imbalanced communicative competence, with strengths in sociolinguistic and grammatical aspects and weaker performance in higher-level communication skills.

*Summary of the Level of Communicative Competence*

**Table 5.**  
**Summary of the Level of Communicative Competence in English of the Students**

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Socio-Linguistic Competence	3.83	Proficient	1
Grammatical Competence	3.46	Proficient	2
Discourse Competence	3.19	Fairly Proficient	3
Strategic Competence	3.19	Fairly Proficient	3
<b>Over-all Average Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>	
	4.21-5.00	Highly Proficient	
	3.41-4.20	Proficient	
	2.61-3.40	Fairly Proficient	
	1.81-2.60	Less Proficient	
	1.00-1.80	Not Proficient	

Table 6 presents that the factors affecting communicative competence have an overall mean of 3.58 (Agree), with scores from 3.24 to 4.09. The most influential factor is lack of awareness of appropriate language use (4.09), followed by speaking anxiety (3.78). Difficulties in organizing ideas and limited communication strategies (3.72) also rank high, while vocabulary, grammar, practice opportunities, and teacher feedback receive lower, Neutral ratings.

The pattern points to sociolinguistic awareness and affective factors as key influences. This supports Wilberschied (2015) on the role of context, and Brown and Canja on anxiety affecting performance. Weaknesses in organization and strategy use align with Richards and Rodgers (2014) and Lanka (2017).

Overall, communicative competence is shaped more by contextual, emotional, and strategic factors than by grammar alone, highlighting the need for interactive practice and supportive learning environments.

*Factors Affecting the Current Level of Communicative Competence*

**Table 6.**  
**Factors Affecting the Current Level of Communicative Competence of the Students**

Factors Affecting the Current Level of Communicative Competence	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Lack of awareness of appropriate language use in	4.09	Agree	1

	different social situations affects my communicative competence.			
2.	Fear and anxiety when speaking in English hinder the development of my communicative competence.	3.78	Agree	2
3.	Difficulty in organizing my ideas logically is a hindering factor in my communication skills.	3.72	Agree	3.5
4.	Lack of communication strategies (such as paraphrasing or asking for clarification) hinders my ability to continue conversations.	3.72	Agree	3.5
5.	Classroom distractions and environmental noise hinder my ability to communicate effectively.	3.67	Agree	5
6.	Lack of confidence in speaking English affects my communicative performance.	3.60	Agree	6
7.	Insufficient vocabulary is one of the hindering factors affecting my ability to express ideas clearly.	3.36	Neutral	7
8.	Limited knowledge of English grammar is one of the hindering factors affecting my communicative competence.	3.33	Neutral	8
9.	Limited opportunities to practice English in class are hindering factors in improving my communication skills.	3.24	Neutral	9.5
10.	Limited feedback from teachers is a hindering factor in improving my communicative competence.	3.24	Neutral	9.5

<b>Overall Mean</b>	3.58	Agree
---------------------	------	-------

<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree
	3.41-4.20	Agree
	2.61-3.40	Neutral
	1.81-2.60	Disagree

1.00-1.80

Strongly Disagree

## Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The level of Communicative Competence in English of the students reflects that learners are generally proficient in grammatical and socio-linguistic skills but still demonstrate limitations in discourse organization and strategic competence that affect the coherence and sustainability of communication.
2. The factors affecting the current level of Communicative Competence of the students show that communicative performance is largely influenced by affective and contextual variables such as anxiety, confidence, and awareness of appropriate language use rather than only linguistic knowledge.
3. The Pedagogical Intervention Package underscores the need for a structured and context-based instructional program that strengthens weaker areas through interactive tasks, discourse development activities, and communication strategy training within a supportive learning environment.

## Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. English teachers should enhance instruction by integrating activities that strengthen discourse and strategic competence such as guided paragraph writing, sequencing tasks, storytelling, conversation repair drills, and structured speaking exercises to improve learners' ability to organize ideas and manage communication breakdowns.
2. Classroom practices should prioritize reducing communication anxiety and building learner confidence through supportive and interactive strategies such as pair work, group discussions, role-playing, and gradual speaking tasks in a low-pressure learning environment.
3. The school should implement a structured Pedagogical Intervention Package that combines discourse development, communication strategy training, and sociolinguistic awareness activities supported by regular feedback and authentic communication tasks to enhance overall communicative competence.

## Compliance With Ethical Standards

The study followed ethical research standards by securing proper permission and obtaining informed consent from the institution and respondents. Respondents were fully informed about the study and participated voluntarily, with the option to withdraw anytime. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly maintained. Data handling complied with the

Data Privacy Act, ensuring that all information was securely stored and used only for academic purposes. The researcher also confirmed no conflict of interest and ensured proper citation to avoid plagiarism, with objective interpretation of results. AI tools were also utilized to assist in language editing, and the findings of the study were used exclusively for research purposes.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. T. S., & Pawar, S. V. (2018). Communicative competence in English as a foreign language: Its meaning and the pedagogical considerations for its development. *The Creative Launcher*, 2(4), 301–312.
- Aliazas, K. J. C., & Velasco, C. Q. (2023). Communicative language teaching for an enhanced speaking competence of Grade 11 students in Sta. Lucia National High School. *International Journal of Social Sciences in Humanities and Modern Research*, 2(6). <https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshmr.2023.v2i6n14>
- Bautista, R. B. A., & Del Valle, J. M. (2023). Communicative competence and oral language usage of Filipino learners in English. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.53378/352957>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Canja, S. G. E. (2024). Speaking competence of Grade 11 students in using English as a second language. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 9(9), 2162–2187. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24SEP702>
- Choi, W. Y., & Kang, M.-K. (2024). The development and validation of English communicative competence model for high school students in Korea. *English Teaching*, 79(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.79.1.202403.3>
- Kadel, S. (2018). Learning strategies and their impact on communicative competence: A classroom-based perspective. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Management Research*, 3(5), 22–30.
- Kiessling, C., & Fabry, G. (2021). What is communicative competence and how can it be acquired? *GMS Journal for Medical Education*, 38(1), Doc12. <https://doi.org/10.3205/zma001399>
- Lanka, M. G. (2017). A critical review on the meaning, types and importance of strategic competence in the foreign language context: Focus on communicative English lessons. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 31, 15–27.
- Osorio, J., & Insuasty, O. (2015). Improving 10th graders' English communicative competence through the implementation of the task-based learning approach. *Redalyc Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1692/169246288007>
- Price, K., Kalnins, I., & Lindstrøm, C. (2013). Communicative competence in the field of augmentative and alternative communication: A review and critique. *Journal of AAC*, 29(3), 154–163.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Suratman, S., Ernawati, D., & Ramli, R. (2017). Students' communicative competence: A descriptive study in English education program. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 7(2), 49–56.
- Terogo, I. J. R., Elimino, C. A. C., Tallo, J. P. M., Sacal, J. A., & Balahadia, C. M. J. E. (2018). Linguistic and sociolinguistic competence of Senior High School students. *RMR Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj1806.01.03>
- Vu, V. T. (2017). Communicative competence of the fourth year students: Basis for proposed English language program. *English Language Teaching*, 10(7), 104–121. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n7p104>
- Wilberschied, L. F. (2015). Intercultural communicative competence: Literature review. *Cultural Encounters, Conflicts, and Resolutions*, 2(1), Article 4.
- Yusupalieva, S. (2024). Developing students' communicative competence using authentic materials with information technologies. *International Journal of Instructional Technology in Education and Management*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.62157/ijjetom.v2i2.62>

**APA Citation:**

Ibarrientos, J. A. R. (2026). PERCEIVED COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH OF THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEARNERS IN LA CONSOLACION COLLEGE OF IRIGA. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(5), 2227–2240. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20345719>

*joyceaibarrientos@gmail.com*