



UNFORGETTABLE EXPERIENCES ENCOUNTERED BY GRADE SIX TEACHERS IN ORAL COMMUNICATION CLASSROOM DURING RECITATION

Analyn B. Gagarin¹

¹Student, Graduate School, Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra20815>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra20815

ABSTRACT

This phenomenological study investigated the unforgettable experiences encountered by Grade Six teachers during oral communication classroom recitations. Through qualitative research methods, the study explored the lived experiences of ten public elementary school teachers from selected schools in Davao City, each with over eight years of teaching experience and currently instructing English classes. Data were collected through in-depth interviews (IDI) and focus group discussions (FGD), transcribed, and analyzed to identify recurring themes. The analysis revealed three primary themes: empowerment through expression: Teachers observed that students who actively participated in recitations developed greater self-confidence and a stronger sense of agency, leading to more effective communication skills. creating a supportive environment: Educators emphasized the importance of fostering a classroom atmosphere characterized by mutual respect and encouragement, which significantly enhanced student engagement and willingness to participate. building confidence through preparation: Teachers noted that students who engaged in thorough preparation for recitations exhibited increased self-assurance, resulting in more articulate and confident verbal expressions. These findings underscore the critical role of supportive teaching strategies and classroom dynamics in enhancing students' oral communication skills. By implementing approaches that empower students, create nurturing environments, and emphasize the value of preparation, educators can significantly improve student engagement and proficiency in oral communication.

KEYWORDS- Oral Communication, Grade Six Teachers, Classroom Recitations, Teaching Experiences, Davao City

INTRODUCTION

A Speaking Community Knows That Learning and Knowledge Are Never Fixed, But Products of a World Under Ever-Changing and Multidirectional Pressure Is a Community That Can Attend Both to The Experiences of Its Students and To the Fact That to Speak Is to Change Experience. Speaking Is Forceful; Speaking Is Painful; Speaking Is Joyful; Speaking Is Necessary; Speaking Is Dangerous. The Experience of Oral Communication Is Rooted Deep in The Moment and Goes Beyond the Moment, Often Beyond Any Conventional Definition.

The English Language Is Considered as the Prima Lingua of The World and Has Been Tagged as A Primary Medium of Communication In Other Parts Of The Globe. Learning And Mastering This Language Offers A Person Countless Opportunity To Be Employed Because English Is Considered As Springboard In Achieving A Better Life. In A Global Context, It Will Be Easy To Express Opinions, Make Arguments, Offer Explanations, Transmit Information, And Make Impressions Upon Others If One Has A High Level Of Oral Communication Skill (Applebaum, 2018) And For This Reason, English Oral Communication Is The Most Widely Taught Subject At All Levels Of The Educational System. Students Need To Speak Well In Their Personal Lives, Future Workplaces, Social Interactions, And Political Endeavors (Austin, 2019).

In Canada, Their Elementary Curriculum Emphasized The Significance Of Language As A Tool Of Communication To Make Human interaction. Johnston (2018) defined language is the process or a set process used to ensure there is agreement between the sender and receiver for meanings assigned to the symbol and schema or combining them used for each communication. In the globalization era, Bailey, et. al., (2019) posited that English language as an important especially international communication to development education, economy, and politic. Many people spend time to study English language to use as an international communication.

Based on the study conducted by Aguinaldo (2022) in Manila, Philippines grade six oral communication skills is all about demonstrating complexity in original work. Learners at this grade level are expected to continue developing their English language arts skills to better articulate their thoughts effectively and showcase the speaking skills they've acquired during their time in elementary school. In Grade 6, your child should speak stronger arguments, more engaging stories, and present factual information with ease.

In Makati City, Philippines, according to Gepila (2018) in her study entitled "among the four macro skills" speaking is considered to be the hardest to teach and learn. It is very challenging for it is similar to teaching a child how to swim. A child who wants to learn how to swim must be exposed to various activities in swimming. Thus, several theories, principles, and practices must be taken into account. Likewise, for a child to successfully learn how to write, he must be exposed to different activities relating to writing. It is important to note that writing teachers must identify the context of learning: this includes culture, literature, and identity.



On the other hand, Baines (2019) expressed that English and Filipino are the two official languages of the Philippines declared by its institution to be used as the medium of instruction starting in the elementary level. As a result, most Filipino pupils can speak using these languages. It was in 2019 that the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) was established through Department Order no. 52. It was recommended by the Soriano to use both English and Filipino languages as mediums of instruction in both elementary and high school, depending on the subjects. For example, subjects like English Communication Arts, Mathematics, and Science would require the use of the English language. While for Filipino Communication Arts, Social Studies, and History subjects, the Filipino language will be used.

Seemingly, in Davao City Philippines, Suelto (2018) explained that understanding the English language writing is very beneficial. This helps students to express themselves effectively. In order for the students to become productive in different settings, they need to know the English language. English proficiency in the Philippines is, unfortunately, declining. A recent study shows that the Philippines is no longer considered to be the top one English-speaking countries. With this in mind, the Department of Education is trying to strengthen its effort in dealing with the said concern. This includes the consideration of many factors that affect the learners' proficiency.

However, the efforts of the Philippine education system are said to be insufficient to deal with the concern of Filipino students. Educators are also expected to become competitive in using the target language, for they are the ones interacting with the learners, which could be a way of honing the students' knowledge especially in communicating with the use of the English language. Exposing learners to different learning activities would help them reach the optimum level of their communicative ability in speaking even in and out of school time (Department of Education, 2020).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of affect has historically been defined in different ways in education and in other fields in the social sciences. When the term first began to appear in educational analysis and in many of the subsequent years up to and including, in part, the present-day affect has been used as a synonym for feelings. McLeod (2019), for instance, searches for an organizing theory for the emotional aspects of the speaking process be they speaking anxiety, emotional engagement, or motivation and advocates for metacognition, claiming that if students understand the "affective domain" of their own writing processes, they will be able to increase their agency via better self-management.

The dichotomy of the affective and the cognitive is not the dichotomy of the irrational and the rational, since "an affective state can be a very rational response to a situation". It distinguishes feelings from emotions, calling feelings "bodily sensations that are part of the affective experience" almost, but not quite, an inverse of the definition used by later affect theory scholars. It aims to map affect and cognition on to a grid of "intensity and stability" in order to understand the ways that students engage in the writing process. She seeks clean definitions to help writing instructors to work towards a better process orientation (Flower & Hayes, 2021).

Brand (2018) also argues for the inclusion of affect in our understanding of cognition, but for her, again, the word is synonymous with emotion: "in major psychosocial and human development theories, like those of Erik Erikson and Jean Piaget, affect is repeatedly implicated. I am referring to the emotions of apathy, anxiety, disequilibrium, alienation, despair, and commitment. Elsewhere in literacy education, affect has been used interchangeably with emotion to argue for the importance of considering said emotion, whether in teaching library research (Schroeder & Cahoy, 2020); intrinsic reading motivation in a social constructivist framework (Oldfeather & Dahl, 2024); holistic measurements of motivation and engagement in speaking or school based oral activities.

The affective domain (Alvermann & Guthrie, 2018) is used to mean "the domain of emotions," meant to imply that teachers should consider emotional factors in addition to, on top of, or as motivators of the cognitive. In their chapter centering affective lenses on literacy, Tracey & Morrow (2019) use affect and emotion interchangeably, answering the section-header question "What Are Emotions, Feelings, and Affects?" without alerting readers to any potential distinctions between the words: "the emotions drive feelings such as intellectual curiosity and compassion in the neo-cortex.

Communication skills are vital for a student's academic success and future career prospects. In today's challenging environment, students must not only possess academic expertise, but also the requisite skills to enhance their learning and employability prospects in the future (Dana, 2018). Communication is a dynamic process as it involves an interaction between two or more people i.e. the sender and the receiver. The main purpose of communication is to transmit thoughts and beliefs to another person. The major components of communication are verbal communication or oral communication and non-verbal communication

Research Questions

The general aim of this study was to determine the techniques employed by teachers in teaching oral communication to Grade Six students to help them overcome anxiety during oral recitations. Specifically, this study aimed to examine the following questions:

1. What are the unforgettable experiences encountered by the teachers in teaching oral communication classroom among grade six learners during recitation?
2. How do teachers resolve the speaking anxiety of learners in oral communication classroom during recitation?
3. What learning insights can be drawn to eliminate the anxiety of grade six learners during oral recitation?



METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a qualitative phenomenological design to explore the unforgettable experiences encountered by grade six teachers during oral communication recitations. This approach aimed to capture the essence of teachers' lived experiences by focusing on their personal perceptions and emotions associated with teaching oral communication.

Data collection involved semi-structured interviews, allowing participants to share their stories in their own words while providing the researcher with the flexibility to probe deeper into specific aspects of their experiences. This method facilitated a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and memorable moments teachers faced in the classroom. The analysis process entailed transcribing interviews, coding responses, and identifying emerging themes to construct a rich, detailed narrative of the teachers' experiences.

Research Participants

The participants in this study are ten (10) public elementary school teachers from selected schools in Davao City, all of whom are instructing elementary students for the 2024–2025 school year. With over eight years of classroom experience, the teachers are currently teaching English classes. Among the ten, five will participate in in-depth interviews (IDI), while the remaining five will join focus group discussions (FGD).

To ensure organized data collection, I will transcribe and analyze the responses from both the IDI and FGD. The criteria for participant inclusion are as follows: all participants must be public school grade 6 teachers with more than five years of teaching experience and have attended various seminars or workshops related to overcoming speaking anxiety during class recitations.

Research Instruments

In my study, a qualitative phenomenological design was employed to explore the challenges faced by teachers in teaching oral communication subjects. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, each lasting between 30 and 60 minutes, either in person or via video call. This format enabled the observation of participants' verbal and non-verbal cues in real-time, allowing for adaptive engagement as needed. The aim was to create a conversational flow that encouraged participants to speak openly while maintaining focus on the main research topics.

After each interview, the data were thoroughly analyzed to identify meaningful patterns and trends, involving categorization and the identification of recurring themes. The semi-structured interview format, combining the flexibility of open-ended questions with a structured agenda, facilitated the gathering of focused, qualitative insights (Schensul, et al., 2019).

These interviews served to explore how grade 6 teachers in selected public schools improved the quality of oral communication teaching and to describe their experiences, strategies, and outcomes during class observations in public elementary schools in Davao City. To ensure consistency across interviews, an interview guide with open-ended questions and topics was utilized, helping to structure the conversation while allowing for exploration and follow-up questions to clarify and expand on specific points.

This guide made the process more systematic and comprehensive by defining the issues to be addressed in advance. The open-ended questions were designed to capture participants' perspectives in their own words, enabling them to steer the discussion as they saw fit (Patton, 1990, as cited in Soriano, 2019).

Data Analysis

I undertook qualitative data analysis as a process of organizing, structuring, and interpreting qualitative data to understand its meaning. Using qualitative methods, I examined the interviews to address the initial and follow-up research questions. Through content analysis of each interview, I identified themes. To address the third research question, I created a checklist and rubric to monitor students' progress and their growing enthusiasm for supporting effective speaking and writing in the classroom. Additionally, I explored the benefits and drawbacks of interactive slides in response to the final research question.

Qualitative data analysis began with organizing, reducing, and describing the collected data (Schwandt, 2001). Unlike quantitative analysis, there were no strict formulas for qualitative analysis. Marshall and Rossman (2006) highlighted that qualitative analysis did not follow a linear path and could be messy. However, adhering to good practices and procedures enhanced the credibility of my research. In this section, I explained the data analysis procedures and the steps I took to ensure that the study's results were credible, transferable, dependable, and authentic.

I guided the data analysis using the seven phases described by Giorgi (2006). Although the final step of Colaizzi's method, which involves returning results to the participants, is debated due to differing perspectives between researchers and participants, I still aimed to ensure that participants could recognize their own experiences in the study's findings.

Descriptive phenomenology, valuable in areas with limited existing research, was used in this study. Colaizzi's method offered a systematic approach, which may have been more accessible than Giorgi's "distilling" style.

I started by familiarizing myself with the data through extensive readings of the interviews to gain a comprehensive understanding. This involved reading each interview at least three times. Following Hatch's (2002) recommendations, I created summary sheets for each participant to provide a quick reference to the original data during analysis.



After the initial readings, I used typologies, as defined by Patton (1990) and recommended by Hatch (2002), to guide the analysis. Typologies, derived from theory, common sense, or research objectives, helped categorize the data. I applied the themes from the literature review as constructs for viewing the data.

With the data coded into five categories based on the literature, I read through it again while writing analytic memos to capture my thoughts and insights. During this stage, I interpreted the data to uncover significance and meaning in the teachers' instructional experiences by identifying salient themes, recurring ideas, and patterns of belief across the interviews.

As themes emerged, I began offering interpretations, linking themes and categories to provide context and create connections between the interviews. This process allowed me to analyze the data, derive importance, and offer interpretations based on educators' teaching experiences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outlined the implications and future directions of the study, shedding light on the broader significance of the research findings and how they can shape future practices and policies. By examining the key insights from the study, it highlighted how the challenges faced by elementary teachers in teaching reading comprehension, particularly for students learning English as an additional language, have real-world consequences on both teacher effectiveness and student outcomes.

Implications

The study on the experiences encountered by grade Six teachers in oral communication classrooms during recitation sheds light on various educational theories that have had significant implications for teaching practices. One of the theories that ties in with the findings of this study is Noam Chomsky's Universal Grammar theory. Chomsky proposed that humans are born with an innate ability to acquire language through an inherent cognitive structure.

In the context of this study, teachers who observed and facilitated student recitations could see how students' ability to construct sentences and express ideas, even with minimal exposure to formal grammar instruction, reflected the universal grammar mechanisms proposed by Chomsky. The study revealed that, despite varying levels of linguistic proficiency, students were able to use complex sentence structures and express abstract ideas, aligning with the idea that language acquisition is a natural and inherent process.

The teachers in the study also experienced moments where the universal grammar theory seemed to manifest in students' spontaneous language use during recitations. This was particularly noticeable when students demonstrated creativity in sentence construction or when they engaged in dialogues that involved multiple layers of meaning. Teachers observed that even students with limited vocabulary were capable of using grammatical structures accurately, suggesting that the innate cognitive mechanisms, as argued by Chomsky, might have played a role in this linguistic capability. However, the study also highlighted that while universal grammar facilitated language learning, it was not the sole factor contributing to students' language proficiency. The role of social interactions and learning environments was also crucial.

Self-determination theory (SDT), which emphasizes the importance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in fostering motivation, was another relevant framework in the study. The teachers found that students who were given opportunities to engage in recitation activities autonomously, without excessive external pressure or fear of judgment, were more motivated and confident in their speech. When students felt competent in their ability to speak, they became more engaged in the learning process. Teachers noted that students who had supportive classroom environments, where they could make mistakes without harsh criticism, were more likely to actively participate in recitation and improve their oral communication skills.

Moreover, the study revealed that students' sense of competence was heightened when they were able to see the immediate results of their efforts. Teachers witnessed a clear connection between providing positive reinforcement and the students' growing confidence and participation in recitation. Those students who were intrinsically motivated to improve their language skills through practice, rather than focusing on extrinsic rewards, showed a deeper understanding of oral communication. This finding aligned with self-determination theory's assertion that intrinsic motivation leads to better learning outcomes, as students were not just repeating phrases but internalizing the language through authentic engagement.

Social constructivism, as proposed by Lev Vygotsky, further helped explain the dynamics of language learning observed in the study. Vygotsky emphasized the importance of social interactions and collaborative learning in cognitive development. During recitation activities, teachers noticed that students often relied on peer interactions to scaffold their learning. For instance, when students engaged in group discussions or helped each other with pronunciation or vocabulary, it reflected Vygotsky's idea that learning is a socially mediated process. Teachers also noted that when students were encouraged to share their ideas with others, they were able to negotiate meaning and clarify misunderstandings, which led to deeper language acquisition.

Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) was particularly relevant in this study. Teachers found that by providing just enough support during recitations, they were able to help students progress beyond their current level of competence. Through guidance and encouragement, teachers were able to push students into their ZPD, where they could perform tasks, they could not accomplish independently but could achieve with assistance. This process allowed for the development of higher-level language skills, as students were able to construct more complex responses and use language more effectively in various contexts.

The teachers also realized that the classroom environment, guided by social constructivism, played a significant role in the success of recitation activities. When students were provided with opportunities to collaborate and engage in discussions, they not



only learned from their peers but also developed critical thinking skills. Vygotsky's emphasis on the role of language in cognitive development was evident as teachers observed that students' language skills grew stronger as they engaged in dialogue and reflected on their understanding. In this sense, recitation became more than a test of individual performance; it became an interactive process that promoted shared meaning-making.

Finally, the study highlighted the complex interplay of these theories universal grammar, self-determination, and social constructivism in shaping the learning experiences of both teachers and students. Teachers observed that the application of these theories in the classroom allowed for a more holistic approach to oral communication education. The integration of Chomsky's theory provided an understanding of innate language capabilities, while Vygotsky's social constructivism emphasized the importance of interaction and collaboration. Meanwhile, SDT highlighted the importance of fostering intrinsic motivation. Together, these frameworks helped teachers understand the diverse factors that contribute to student success in oral communication recitation activities, allowing for more effective teaching strategies.

Future Directions

In reflecting on the future directions of the study on the experiences encountered by grade six teachers in oral communication classrooms during recitation, one important area of exploration would have been the integration of technology into the classroom. Previous studies had already suggested that digital tools could enhance engagement and support language learning, but the study could have expanded on how these tools affected recitations. Researchers could have explored whether tools such as speech recognition software, virtual platforms for recitation, or apps designed to assist with language fluency influenced student participation. By focusing on the impact of technology, future research would have provided insights into how modern educational tools could potentially improve both the effectiveness of recitation activities and the students' enthusiasm toward language use.

Another potential future direction would have been to investigate the long-term effects of oral communication practices on students' academic performance. Although the study primarily examined the teachers' experiences within a single academic year, a longitudinal study could have provided a deeper understanding of how early recitation experiences shaped students' later academic and communication skills. By tracking a cohort of students from Grade Six into subsequent years, researchers could have assessed whether the oral communication skills developed during recitations positively impacted students' performance in other areas of learning, such as writing or reading comprehension, or even their ability to articulate ideas in more complex academic settings.

Furthermore, future research could have broadened the scope by examining the role of cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom. The study, which focused primarily on general teaching strategies, could have been extended to explore how teachers adapted their approaches to recitation for students from different linguistic backgrounds. Many classrooms consist of students with varying levels of proficiency in the language of instruction, and it would have been insightful to see how teachers customized their recitation strategies to address these needs. Investigating how teachers approached multilingual learners during recitations would have provided valuable data on effective practices for fostering inclusive oral communication in diverse classrooms.

Additionally, a deeper exploration into the varied teaching styles and experiences of teachers would have been another valuable future direction for the study. The research could have examined how teachers with different levels of experience or teaching philosophies approached recitation. For example, comparing the experiences of novice teachers versus more seasoned educators could have revealed whether more experienced teachers applied different strategies for managing recitation activities or how they might have supported students with more sophisticated teaching techniques. Understanding how different levels of expertise impacted student engagement and success could have contributed to the development of more targeted professional development programs for teachers in the area of oral communication.

The study could have also benefited from a closer look at the role of peer interactions in enhancing oral communication skills. While Vygotsky's theory of social constructivism was touched upon, future research could have focused more explicitly on the impact of peer feedback during recitation. Examining how students helped each other improve their speech, shared language strategies, or worked collaboratively in group settings could have revealed more about the power of peer-to-peer learning. Peer feedback might have contributed to greater self-confidence and allowed students to practice language in a supportive environment, which could lead to improved overall communication skills.

Lastly, future studies could have delved into the emotional and social factors that influenced students' performance during recitation. The study noted that motivation and self-determination played a significant role, but there was room to explore how students' emotional states, such as anxiety or fear of judgment, impacted their ability to participate. Research could have investigated how teachers could have implemented strategies to create a supportive and anxiety-free environment, encouraging students to take risks and speak more freely.

REFERENCES

1. Abduraman & Rizzi (2020). *Exploring the causes of English language anxiety among postgraduate students of university of balochistan, Pakistan. International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 99-105. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n2p99>
2. Adams, B. A. (2020). *Students 'Self-Concept, Knowledge of Verbal Reasoning Skill and Learning Readiness as Correlate of Achievement in Civic in Senior Secondary Schools in Osun State, Nigeria. Psychology*, 7(1), 50-56.
3. Aghajani, M., & Amanzadeh, H. (2019). *The effect of anxiety on speaking ability: an experimental study on EFL learners. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(7), 154-164.



4. Aguinaldo, J. (2022). *Love and resistance: Out of the closet into the Stonewall era*. W.W. Norton & Co.
5. Allen, et. al. (2018). *Parental socialization of child and adolescent physical activity: a meta-analysis*.
6. Alshare, S. & Hindi, R.T. (2019). *Riverdale* [TV series]. Berlanti Productions; Archie Comics Publications; CBS Television Studios; Warner Bros. Television; Canada Film Capital.
7. Alvermann, D. E., & Guthrie, J. T. (2018). Themes and directions of the National Reading Research Center. *Perspectives in Reading Research*, 1, 1-11.
8. Applebaum, B. (2018). *Good liberal intentions are not enough! Racism, intentions and moral responsibility*. *Journal of Moral Education*, 26(4), 409-421.
9. Atkinson, E. & DePalma, R. (2009). *Un-believing the matrix: Queering consensual heteronormativity*. *Gender and Education*, 21(1), 17-29.
10. Arimah, B. (2021). *Slums as Expressions of Social Exclusion: Explaining the Prevalence of Slums in African Countries*. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Cohesion and Development, Paris, 20-21 January 2011*, 1-16.
11. Austin, J. L. (2019). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
12. Bailey, F., Barbato, R., RuPaul, Corfe, S. (2019-present). *RuPaul's drag race* [TV series]. World of Wonder Productions.
13. Baines, L., & Kunkel, A. J. (2019). *Going Bohemian: How to teach writing like you mean it*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
14. Balaman, S. (2018). *Digital storytelling: A multimodal narrative writing genre*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(3), 202-212.
15. Bazerman, C. (2018). *What do sociocultural studies of writing tell us about learning to write?* In MacArthur, C., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J., eds. *Handbook of writing research: Second edition*, 11-23. The Guilford Press.
16. Beasley (2018). *Communicating for results: A guide for business and the professions*. Cengage Learning.
17. Belmont Report (1979). *Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>
18. Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (2021). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
19. Blackburn, M.V. (2020). *Disrupting the (hetero) normative: Exploring literacy performances and identity work with queer youth*. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(4), 312-324.
20. Blount, B. G. (2018). *Language, Culture, and Society: A Book of Readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press [expanded re-issue of the 1974 book].
21. Bouwer, R., & Koster, M. (2019). *Bringing writing research into the classroom. The effectiveness of tekster, a newly developed writing program for elementary students* (Unpublished dissertation). Utrecht University, Utrecht.
22. Braaksma, M. A. H., Rijlaarsdam, G., van den Bergh, H., & van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M. (2018). *Observational learning and its effects on the orchestration of writing processes*. *Cognition and Instruction*, (1), 1.
23. Brand, A. G. (2018). *The why of cognition: Emotion and the writing process*. *College Composition and Communication*, 38(4), 436-443.
24. Brunet, J. (2019). *School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence*. *Review of educational research*, 74(1), 59-109.
25. Burnett, C., Merchant, G., Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (2019). *The (im)materiality of literacy: the significance of subjectivity to new literacies research*. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 35(1), 90-103.
26. Cabigon, F. (2018). *The Bitter laughter. When parody is a moral and affective priming in political persuasion*. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7.
27. Carducci, J.C. (2019). *How youth get engaged: grounded-theory research on motivational development in organized youth programs*. *Developmental psychology*, 47(1), 259.
28. Caruso, R. M., et. al. (2019). *Identifying Pathways Between Socioeconomic Status and Language Development*. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, (0).
29. Case, K.A. & Hemmings, A. (2019). *Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum*. *Urban Education*, 40(6), 606-626.
30. Castro, G.F. (2016, August 3). *Can we get home in one piece please*. *Glass Poetry*. <http://www.glass-poetry.com/journal/pulse/castro-home.html>
31. Chall, J. S. (2019). *Stages of reading development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
32. Chan, C.D. & Howard, L.C. (2020). *When queerness meets intersectional thinking: Revolutionizing parallels, histories, and contestations*. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(3), 346-366, DOI: 10.1080/00918369.2018.1530882
33. Chin, G. V. (2021). *Co-constructing a community of creative writers. Exploring second language creative writing: Beyond Babel*, 119-139.
34. Clandinin, D. J., Pushor, D., & Orr, A. M. (2018). *Navigating sites for narrative inquiry*. *Journal of teacher education*, 58(1), 21-35.
35. Congress of the Philippines (2012). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/15th_Congress_of_the_Philippines
36. Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2019). *Narrative inquiry*. *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*, 3, 477-487.
37. Conroy, C. (2018). *Peers as an Academic Resource: An Investigation of an Afterschool Program to Socialize At-risk Students with Disabilities into Greater Academic Engagement*.
38. Creswell, J. (2019). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE. Cross, N., Howard, K., & Pearson, C. (2013). *Culture: The missing link to learning*. *Leadership*, 42(4), 36-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.07.015>
39. Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2018). *The reflective educator's guide to professional development: Coaching inquiry-oriented learning communities*. Corwin Press.
40. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research (3rd ed.)*. Sage Publications, Inc.
41. Department of Education (2019). *In linguistics and the philosophy of language, It is an utterance that has performative function in language and communication*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech_act
42. Department of Education (2020). *an utterance considered as an action, particularly with regard to its intention, purpose, or effect*. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/speech-act>
43. Department of Education (2021). *The perlocutionary act is the act of trying to bring about a certain change in the addressee (e.g. making him/her believe something)* <http://www2.let.uu.nl/uil-ots/lexicon/zoek.pl?lemma=Speech+act>



42. Derrick & Ecclestone (2018). *Making the Grade: assessment and achievement in adult literacy, numeracy and language*, in Lavender, Derrick and Brookes, *Testing, Testing*, 123, NIACE 2004
43. Dobbs, J., & Arnold, D. H. (2019). *Relationship between preschool teachers' reports of children's behavior and their behavior toward those children*. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24, 95-105.
44. Duberman, M. B. (2019). *Stonewall: The definitive story of the LGBTQ rights uprising that changed America (First revis Plume trade paperback ed.)*. Plume, an imprint of Penguin Random House LLC.
45. Dutro, E. (2019). *Writing wounded: Trauma, testimony, and critical witness in literacy classrooms*. *English Education*, 43(2), 193-211.
46. Ehret, C. (2018). *Propositions from affect theory for feeling literacy through the event*. In *Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy*. Routledge Handbooks Online. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315110592-34>
47. El Enein, J. (2019). *Out of the closet and into the network: Sexual orientation and the computerized classroom*. *Computers and Composition*, 14(2), p. 207-216.
48. Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., Moody, S. W., & Schumm, J. S. (2020). *A meta-analytic review of the effect of instructional grouping format on the reading outcomes of students with disabilities*. In R. Gersten, E. Schiller, J. S. Schumm, & S. Vaughn (Eds.), *Issues and research in special education*, 105-135. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
49. Emert, T. (2018). *'The Transpoemations Project': digital storytelling, contemporary poetry, and refugee boys*. *Intercultural Education*, 24(4), 355-365.
50. Ewing, E.L. (2020, July 2). *I'm a Black scholar who studies race. Here's why I capitalize 'White.'* <https://zora.medium.com/im-a-black-scholar-who-studies-race-here-s-why-i-capitalize-white-f94883aa2dd3>
51. Farley, N. & Leonardi, B. (2021). *Beyond bathroom bills and the gender identity debate: Complicating the policy conversation about supporting trans students in schools*. *Educational Policy*, 35(2), 274-303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820986770>
52. Feagans, L., & Appelbaum, M. I. (2020). *Validation of language subtypes in learning disabled children*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(5), 358-364.
53. Fidalgo, R., Torrance, M., & García, J.-N. (2018). *The long-term effects of strategy-focussed writing instruction for grade six students*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 672-693.
54. Flower, L. & Hayes, J.R. (2021). *A cognitive process theory of writing*. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
55. Gafaran, J. (2018). *Code-switching as a conversational strategy*. In P. Auer and L. Wei (eds).
56. Gardiner, M. (2018) *Education in Rural Areas. Issues in Education Policy No. 4, Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD)*. http://www.cepd.org.za/files/CEPD_Issues_in_education_Education_in_rural_areas.pdf
57. Gee, J. P. (2019). *The new literacy studies: From 'socially situated' to the work*. *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*, 2, 177-194.
58. Gepila, A.L. (2018). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine Publishing Company.
59. Gibson, R.W. (2019). *Online fan fiction, global identities, and imagination*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 397-425.
60. Giorgi, A. (2006). *n book: The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research In Psychology (pp.176-192) Edition: 2nd Chapter: 11 Publisher: Sage Editors: Willig and Rogers*
61. Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2019). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
62. Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). *Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space*. *Reading research quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164.
63. Haddix, M. (2021). *African American boys writing beyond school walls*. In D. Alvermann & K. Hinchman (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives: Bridging the everyday/academic divide (3rd ed., pp. 112- 131)*. New York: Routledge.
64. Hammarstedt, M., & Karan, V. S. (2019). *Vilken effekt har lärande genom observation på elevers narrativa skrivande i årskurs 5? En studie av skrivprodukter och skrivprocesser [What effect does learning by observation have on narrative writing in students in school year 5?]*. (Master thesis). Department of Logopedics, Phoniatrics and Audiology, Lund University, Lund.
65. Hanlen (2019). *Doing homework together: The relation between parenting strategies, child engagement, and achievement*. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 48, 103-113.
66. Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2018). *Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 2, 295.
67. Hart, K. (2022). *A thread that is intended to be gentle on the latest M/M discourse: So, I am a transmasculine person who [Twitter thread]*. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/KayelsNotHere/status/1487833231911182338>
68. Harter, S. (2018). *Reflectance Motivation Reconsidered. Toward a Developmental Model*. *Early Human Development*, 21, 34-64. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000271574>
69. Hillocks, G., Jr. (2018). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. National Conference on Research in English, Urbana, IL: Eric Clearinghouse on Reading Communication Skills.
70. Hoeh, M. K. (2019). *Motivation for achievement: Possibilities for teaching and learning*. Routledge.
71. Holman Jones, S. (2018). *Living bodies of thought: The "critical" in critical autoethnography*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 22(4), 228-237.
72. hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
73. Howell, J. (2019). *Developing oral communication skills in English through sitcoms (The Big Bang theory) (Doctoral dissertation, Tartu Ülikooli Narva Kolledž)*
74. Johansson, V. (2019). *Developmental aspects of text production in writing and speech*. (Thesis). Department of Linguistics and Phonetics, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, Lund.
75. Johnston, S. (2018). *Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4*. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1-48.
76. Kanaris, A. (2019). *Gendered journeys: Children's writing and the construction of gender*. *Language and Education*, 13(4), 254-268.
77. Keith, & Ehly, S. (2018). *Peer-assisted learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
78. Kellinger, J. J., & Davis, D. E. (2019). *Encounter stories*. In *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education (pp. 75-85)*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
79. Kindy, K. (2022). *GOP lawmakers push historic wave of bills targeting rights of LGBTQ teens, children and their families*. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/25/lgbtq-rights-gop-bills-dontsaygay/?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcarta-intr%2F3668115%2F623defb63e6ed13ade3b9cb7%2F59726699ade4e21a847c8e0f%2F32%2F72%2F623defb63e6ed13ade3b9cb7



79. Kinloch, V. F. (2020). *Poetry, literacy, and creativity: Fostering effective learning strategies in an urban classroom*. *English Education*, 37(2), 96-114.
80. Knight, W. B. (2020). *Looking B(l)ack: Examining the monstrous history of Black oppression through racist imagery and artifacts*. *Monsters, Monstrosities, and the Monstrous in Culture and Society*, 77.
81. Koven, M. (2018). *Interviewing: Practice, ideology, genre, and intertextuality*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 43, 499-520.
82. Lammers, J. & Marsh, V.L. (2018). "A writer more than ... a child": A longitudinal study examining adolescent writer identity. *Written Communication*, 35(1), 89-114.
83. Lewis, C., & Del Valle, A. (2019). *Literacy and identity*. *Handbook of adolescent literacy research*, 307-322.
84. Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2020). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
85. Lovaas, K.E., Elia, J.P., & Yep, G.A. (2018). *Shifting ground(s): Surveying the contested terrain in LGBT studies and queer theory*. In *LGBT studies and queer theory: New conflicts, collaborations, and contested terrain*, 1-18. Harrington Park Press.
86. MacWhinney, B. (2020). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk (3rd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
87. Magnusson, E., & Nauclér, K. (2020). *SL40: läsförståelse: meningar [SL40: Reading comprehension: Sentences] (2nd ed.)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.
88. Malvern, D. B., Richards, J., Chipere, N., & Durán, P. (2019). *Lexical diversity and language development: Quantification and assessment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
89. Martínez, A. Y. (2018). A plea for critical race theory counterstory: Stock story versus counterstory dialogues concerning Alejandra's "fit" in the academy. *Composition Studies*, 42(2), 33-45.
90. Mashburn, S. O. (2018). *English Language Teachers 'Attitudes to the Promotion of the Standard Nigerian English: A Survey from a Nigerian City (Pp. 268-283)*.
91. McCutchen, D. (2020). *From novice to expert: Implications of language skills and writing-relevant knowledge for memory during the development of writing skill*. *Journal of Writing Research*, 3, 51-68.
92. McKeachie, W. J., & Svinicki, M. (2018). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers (12th ed.)*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
93. McLeod, S. (2019). *Some thoughts about feelings: The affective domain and the writing process*. *College Composition and Communication*, 38(4), 426-435.
94. Mertens, D. M. (2020). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods (pp.2 & 88-189)*. Thousand Oaks, London, Sage Press.
95. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
96. Mockler, N. (2018). *When "research ethics" become "everyday ethics": The intersection of inquiry and practice in practitioner research*. *Educational Action Research*, 22(2), 146-158.
97. Morgan, S. (2020). *Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners*. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 2(6), 22-30.
98. Morozova, J. (2018). *Student engagement and its relationship with early high school dropout*. *Journal of adolescence*, 32(3), 651-670.
99. Muhammad, K.L. (2021). *Engaging students at school and with learning: A relevant construct for all students*. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 365-368.
100. Munohsamy, et. al. (2018). *The effects of school bonding on high school seniors 'academic achievement*. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 90(4), 467-480.
101. Muysken, P. (2020). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
102. Myhill, D. (2019). *Becoming a designer: Trajectories of linguistic development*. In R. Beard, D. Myhill, M. Nystrand, & J. Riley (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of writing development (pp. 402-414)*. London: SAGE Publications.
103. National Reading Panel (2020). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read: Reports of the Subgroups*. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/product/247>
104. Neuman, W.L. (2019) *Social research methods qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 4th Edition, Allyn & Bacon, Needham Heights.
105. Newton, R. R., & Rudestam, K. E. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide of content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
106. Ni, G.L. (2019). *Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach*. *Tesol Quarterly*, 39(3), 379-397.
107. Nordqvist Palviainen, A. (2021). *Speech about speech: A developmental study on form and function of direct and indirect speech*. (Thesis). EBSCOhost.
108. Nurdaya, S. T. (2020). *New Lamps for Old: The Gulf Leadership Communication Framework*. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 2329488416687055.
109. O'Connor, E., & McCartney, K. (2019). *Examining teacher-child relationships and achievement as part of an ecological model of development*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44, 340-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831207302172>
110. Oldfeather, P. & Dahl, K. (2024). *Toward a social constructivist reconceptualization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning*. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26(2), 139-159.
111. Özüdogru, G., & Çakir, H. (2020). *An investigation of the effects of digital storytelling activities on engagement and writing self-efficacy*. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 13(1), 105-116.
112. Patton, M. (2005). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials*. Glendale, CA: Pyczak Publishing.
113. Peirce, K. (Director). (2019). *Boys don't cry [Film]*. Fox Searchlight Pictures; The Independent Film Channel Productions; Killer Films; Hart Sharp Entertainment.
114. Phillips, N. C., & Lund, V.K. (2019). *Sustaining affective resonance: Co-constructing care in a school-based digital design studio*. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(4), 1532-1543.
115. Raedts, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., van Waes, L., & Daems, F. (2020). *Observational learning through video-based models: Impact on students' accuracy of self-efficacy beliefs, task knowledge and writing performances*. In G. Rijlaarsdam (Series Ed.), & P. Boscolo & S. Hidi (Vol. Eds.), *Studies in writing, Volume 19: Writing and motivation (pp. 219-238)*. Oxford: Elsevier.
116. Rajoo, S. (2020). *Affective economies*. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117-139. (2004a). *Declarations of whiteness: The non-performativity of anti-racism borderlands*, 3(2).



117. Reuterskiöld, C., Hansson, K., & Sahlén, B. (2019). Narrative skills in Swedish children with language impairment. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 44(6), 733–744.
118. Reyes, G. T. (2019). Finding the poetic high: Building a spoken word poetry community and culture of creative, caring, and critical intellectuals. *Multicultural Education*, 14(2), 10-15.
119. Rice, J.E. (2018). The new “new”: Making a case for critical affect studies. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 94(2), 200-212.
120. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190>
121. Rogers, J., Franke, M., Yun, J. E. E., Ishimoto, M., Diera, C., ... & Brenes, T. (2020). Teaching and learning in the age of Trump: Increasing stress and hostility in America's high schools. UCLA IDEA.
122. Rowsell, J. (2020). “How emotional do I make it?” Making a stance in multimodal composition. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 63(5).
123. Rudestam, K. E. & Newton, R. R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide of content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
124. Rusli, R., Yunus, M., & Hashim, H. (2018). Low Speaking Proficiency among the Malaysian Undergraduates: Why and How? e-Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities, 23-24 April 2018, 678-689. http://conference.kuis.edu.my/pasak3/images/eprosiding1/PASAK3_2220.pdf
125. Sadovi, F.N. (2018). The Student Engagement in Schools Questionnaire (SESQ) and the Teacher Engagement Report Form-New (TERF-N). Examining the Preliminary Evidence. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 15, 67-79.
126. Sahlén, B., Hansson, K., Ibertsson, T., & Reuterskiöld, C. (2018). Reading in children of primary school age - A comparative study of children with hearing impairment and children with specific language impairment. *Acta Neuropsychologica*, 4, 393.
127. Saunders, J. M. (2019). Where writing happens: Elevating student writing and developing voice through digital storytelling. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, 3(1), 8.
128. Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., and LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential Ethnographic Methods*. In J.J. Schensul and M.D. LeCompte, Eds. *The Ethnographer's Toolkit*. Baltimore, MD: Altamira Press of Rowan and Littlefield.
129. Schroeder, R., & Cahoy, E. S. (2020). Valuing information literacy: Affective learning and the ACRL standards. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 10(2), 127-146.
130. Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
131. Sedgwick, E. K., & Frank, A. (2018). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Duke University Press.
132. Segrist, D.J. & Jupp, S.D. (2020). Class is a joke! Humor as a pedagogical tool in the teaching of Psychology. *Psychology Teacher Network: American Psychology Association*, 25(3), 14-15.
133. Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press
134. Smagorinsky, P., & Daigle, E. A. (2021). The role of affect in students' writing for school. *Handbook of writing: A mosaic of perspectives and views*, 293-307.
135. Soriano, S. M. (2019). The correlation between general self-confidence and academic achievement in the oral presentation course. *Theory and Practice in language Studies*, 2(1), 60.
136. Split, et. al. (2018). *Beyond ABC: investigating current rationales and systems for the teaching of early reading to young learners of English* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).
137. Suelto, D. V. M. (2018). *Test for reception of grammar, version 2. Swedish version*. Stockholm: Pearson Education.
138. Tapiero, H. and Tew, K. D. (2018) Trace Elements in Human Physiology and Pathology: Zinc and Metallothioneins. *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, 57, 399-411. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0753-3322\(03\)00081-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0753-3322(03)00081-7)
139. Tracey, D.H., & Morrow, L.M. (2019). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models*. New York: Guilford Press.
140. Tuan, R. S. & Mai, J.D. (2018). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives: Choosing and Using Books for the Classroom*, 6(3), ix-xi.
141. Widdowson, H. G. (2019). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
142. Woodfield, C. L. (2018). *Blazing trails, being us: A narrative inquiry with five high school students with autism who type to communicate* (Order No. 10126782). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Syracuse University. (1816204715).
143. Wu, et. al. (2020). Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making: Implications for theory, practice, and public policy. *Psychological science in the public interest*, 7(1), 1-44.
144. Yule, G. (2021). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://www.scrip.org/reference/ReferencesPapers?ReferenceID=1411437>