Outcomes-Based Education: Practices in Teaching-Learning English and Training Needs of Higher Education Institutions

LEMUEL G. GUIGUE
lgguigue@universityofbohol.edu.ph
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7584-9680

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the teaching-learning practices in English in the six vital academic dimensions and the training needs in the Outcomes-Based Education paradigm of the English instructors in the four higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagbilaran City. It specifically seeks to answer the teaching-learning practices in the six major areas, namely formulation of learning outcomes, teaching-learning activities, assessment strategies, curriculum structure, curriculum mapping, and performance indicators. Moreover, it also determines the problems encountered by the English teachers in the six key dimensions and their training needs in the OBE teaching and learning of English. The study is quantitative-qualitative. The researcher makes use of a published tool and is modified. The research instrument then is pilot tested and subjected to reliability and validity test using Cronbach›s Alpha. He further interviews through an online platform to get the responses of the teachers. The study respondents were thirty-nine English teachers, including the program chairs and English department heads, both tenured and probationary.

The respondents highly practiced the six key dimensions in the teaching-learning practices of English, which means that the four HEIs adhered to the perspective and principles of the OBE paradigm. Notwithstanding the slight problems encountered in the assessment strategies and curriculum mapping, these problems did not significantly affect the teaching-learning

practices of English in the OBE paradigm. In conclusion, the practices as to the teaching-learning of English in the new framework adopted by the higher learning institutions in Tagbilaran City were already in-placed and well-established.

KEYWORDS: Outcomes-Based Education, Higher Education Institutions, Key Dimensions, Practices, Teaching-Learning English, Training Needs

INTRODUCTION

Many educationalists and experts contend that the school curricular reform, OBE, prepares the students to be effective, dynamic, productive, and successful in their chosen careers. This curricular innovation is results-oriented and focuses on the students' performance of a given task that reflects real-life situations (Macayan, 2017, pp.1-2). The teachers and school administration have to ensure that the teaching and learning process should revolve around the enduring learning outcomes of the students that they have to demonstrate at the end of the course to meet the broader goals of the program they take up. Yusoff (2014) mentioned that the key areas involved in the successful implementation of OBE are, but are not limited to, formulation of learning outcomes (institutional, program, courses, and intended), teaching-learning practices, assessment strategies, curriculum structure, performance indicators, and curriculum mapping. However, the paradigm change entailed the shifting of the teaching pedagogies, the types and methods of assessments, the formulation of learning outcomes, and the design of the curricula. With this educational revolution, many administrators and teachers find themselves challenged, especially the old-school teachers who see the comfort of their conventional way of teaching.

The implementation of Outcomes-Based Education is grounded by several principles and theories which the researcher had religiously presented and discussed.

First is the Bloom›s Mastery Learning Theory. This theory emphasizes that teachers should increase variations in their teaching pedagogies (strategies and methods) since learners are diverse and have different learning styles.

Bloom further suggested that educators must differentiate instruction to better address individual learning needs and categorize instructional methods that establish the level of performance that all students must demonstrate and master before succeeding to the next unit of learning. The challenge then is to find practical ways to carry out this using different strategies and methods. This theoretical framework has provided the teachers with ideas regarding the learning levels as reflected in the hierarchical ladder.

The second principle, which is Outcomes-Based Education, is anchored in Ralph Tyler's Curriculum Model. Ralph Tyler's Curriculum Model underpins the importance of learning outcomes that go beyond memorization and regurgitation. As a curricularist, Tyler saw the importance of the learners demonstrating knowledge and applying theoretical perspectives to practical situations. In his curriculum model, he cited four fundamental precepts for a curriculum to work. The procedure includes defining acceptable learning objectives, creating meaningful learning experiences, structuring learning experiences for a maximum cumulative effect, reviewing the curriculum, and reconsidering those components that did not show to be helpful. His influence all throughout the academic arena continues to provide impact on curriculum development.

Spady's Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) Concept. Dr. William Spady's concept of OBE is grounded on three basic assumptions, which state that all learners can learn and succeed, success breeds success, and learning institutions control the conditions of success. This notion means that OBE systems build everything on a clearly defined framework of exit outcomes, the beginning with an end in mind (backward design). Curriculum, instructional strategies, assessment, and performance standards are developed and implemented to facilitate the essential outcomes. These key dimensions are viewed as flexible means for accomplishing clearly defined learning ends. Hence, OBE focuses on increasing the students' learning, skills, attributes, and performance abilities, preparing them for work and life.

The transition of the curricular paradigm has brought about significant challenges to many of the tertiary education levels in the country. Rajaee, Junaidi, et al. (2013) cited that the broad definition of outcomes-based Education itself was the main problem in the effective implementation of OBE. The OBE concept does not provide a specific procedure or singular idea for achieving the outcomes, which determines how to implement

the OBE curricula. The issues and problems are further extended on the construction of learning outcomes for courses and programs. Henceforth, Rajaee, Junaidi, et al. (2013) suggested that the cyclic continual improvement of the OBE paradigm should include meaningful teaching and learning pedagogies, delivery, and assessment methods. Akhmadeeva, Hindy, and Sparrey (2013) also found similar challenges in implementing OBE in the classroom. According to them, teaching practices and evaluation, student motivation, class size, and expectations of learners' characteristics and reality revealed to be the most discussed challenges in carrying out the OBE curriculum. They even further pointed out that the self-reported characteristics of the instructors and the perceived role of the teachers in the OBE classroom often contradicted the OBE model of learning (pp.2-3).

Tan, Chong, et al. (2018), with their study on nursing competencies under the OBE tenet, mentioned that there were positive effects on the learning competencies of the nursing students who underwent OBE interventions. They also cited the improvement of knowledge, attitudes, and skills with the implementation of the OBE in the program. More specifically, nursing students expressed satisfaction in the development of their higher-order thinking skills and abilities. This result of the study was also attested based on the study findings of Custodio, Espita, and Siy (2017). They found out that both faculty and students in the Level III PACUCOA programs of the University of Perpetual Help, Las Piñas Campus declared that OBE facilitated the improvement, enhancement, and acquisition of learning content knowledge, problem-solving skills, and critical thinking.

In the study conducted by de Guzman et al. (2017) on understanding the essence of OBE and its implementation, results revealed that faculty members manifest a great extent of understanding of the OBE. It is primarily on the active participation of students in the learning activities; yet, they manifested moderate understanding in the area of teaching-learning situations and planning activities that focused on the learner's demonstration of knowledge and practical skills. Hence, the researchers recommended focusing the training and workshop on the preparation of syllabi.

Custodio, Espita, and Siy (2017), with their research that focused on the implementation of Outcomes-Based Education, showed a significant degree of difference between the faculty and students in terms of the

attainment and relevance of the intended student outcomes, instructional process, and assessment.

The findings in Ortega and de la Cruz's (2016) study on the attitude of educators towards the Outcomes-Based Education approach in English as the second language learning showed that the respondents had a positive attitude towards OBE. Such finding is in the context of knowledge, belief, feeling, acceptance level, and readiness to handle and facilitate an English Second Language class. They further cited that educators were more likely to be optimistic, positive, and open to educational changes. Most of the respondents believed that OBE allowed them to be more flexible in employing various teaching methods in an ESL class.

In addition, Laguador and Dotong (2014) found a wide range of knowledge and practice on OBE implementation among LPU engineering faculty members. Still, only a moderate degree of awareness on the suitable assessment method to be applied. The study also disclosed that the faculty members who had a high level of knowledge and understanding of the implementation of OBE also had a higher possibility to contribute to the achievement of the goals and objectives of OBE through deliberate practice.

Borsoto, Santorce, and Lescano (2014), in their research on the OBE implementation status and usefulness, concluded that the OBE was implemented in terms of practice and environment as far as the students' perception was concerned. The students also believed that OBE was helpful in terms of academics, attitudes, and instructions. Finally, the researchers recommended that there must be seminar workshops, the intensive orientation of syllabi and assessment procedure, and trainings to enhance and improve the knowledge and skills of the teachers, which consequently become beneficial to the students' end.

These theoretical frameworks offer significant insights into the different areas that need to be looked into in the implementation of OBE, including the aforementioned key dimensions and the problems to address whatever concerns regarding OBE implementation may arise.

The primordial thrust of this present research undertaking is to identify the teaching-learning practices in English in the six key academic dimensions and the training needs in the Outcomes-Based Education paradigm of the English instructors in the four higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagbilaran City, Academic Year 2019-2020, with the end view of proposing an improvement program.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following sub-problems:

1. What are the teaching-learning practices in English of the respondents in the six key dimensions:
    1.1. formulation of learning outcomes;
    1.2. teaching-learning activities;
    1.3. assessment strategies;
    1.4. curriculum structure;
    1.5. curriculum mapping; and,
    1.6. performance indicators?
2. What are the problems encountered by the respondents in the teaching-learning of English in the six key dimensions?
3. Is there a significant degree of correlation between the teaching-learning practices of the respondents and the problems encountered in the six key dimensions?

METHODOLOGY

This research focused on the teachers handling English courses, subject area coordinators, and program chairs, both tenured and probationary in the four higher education institutions (HEIs) in Tagbilaran City. These respondents come from the two colleges, namely the College of Teacher Education and the College of Liberal Arts. The HEIs include two private universities, one state university, and one private college. In addition, the study deals with the OBE teaching-learning practices in English, which were gauged in six key areas: formulation of learning outcomes, teaching-learning activities, assessment strategies, curriculum structure, curriculum mapping, and performance indicators. They should have been presently working in these four higher learning institutions. This study further delves into the problems encountered and the training needs of the teachers relative to the OBE paradigm in the four tertiary education level institutions. The study revolves around the practices in teaching-learning English, problems encountered and training needs in the context of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE).

One limitation of the study is the nature of the data on practices, which is only based on the respondents' self-report. Practices have to be observable and should be concretely observable. However, in this study, the data are based only on the self-report of the respondents. No validation nor documentary analysis to validate the respondents' self-report is done.

The study is correlational quantitative-qualitative. The researcher used a published tool of de Guzman, Edaño, and Umayan (2017) and Britton, Letassy, Medina, and Er (2008) and is modified. The research instrument then is pilot tested and subjected to reliability and validity test using Cronbach's Alpha. He further conducted interviews through an online platform to get the responses of the teachers. The conduct of the interview was to supplement the quantitative data. The questions focused on the best practices and the problems encountered in the six key dimensions considered in this study and their explanation. The researcher emailed the questions to the respondents. The questions also include the training needs they perceived needed.

The researcher prepared the consenting forms for the research respondents to fill out during their participation in the study. The researcher explained to the respondents that their participation is voluntary and not grounded on obligation nor force. If they feel their rights are violated along the way, they have the freedom to stop at any point. He ensures the respondents that ethical standards and confidentiality shall be observed and practiced. The researcher leaves his contact details for the respondents to communicate when questions arise.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Practices in the OBE-Based Formulation of Learning Outcomes. All four HEIs practiced adopting the program learning outcomes provided by CHED. This practice is shown by the mean response of 4.00, the highest so far, and this cuts across HEIs. However, the HEIs also enriched the CHED suggested outcomes. HEIs A, B, and C maintained that although they adopted CHED outcomes, they enhanced them as shown by the mean response 3.67, 4.00, and 3.57, respectively. HEI D, with its mean response of 2.78, also claimed they often did it. The enrichment of learning outcomes done by these HEIs was premised on the institution's vision-mission and core values statements (3.56). This result shows that the HEIs complied with what was suggested as outcomes but enriched them. It appears that they enhanced CHED outcomes by formulating different program outcomes or objectives that satisfied the framework proposed by Benjamin Bloom and are reflective of the trademark of their institutions. The result also suggests that these HEIs already had a certain extent of knowledge when it comes to formulating learning outcomes. Teachers A,

who had similar ideas with Teachers C, F, and H, responded:

"Learning outcomes as provided by CHED are only minimum learning competencies. The HEIs must exercise academic freedom by enriching their curricular offerings."

This result revealed similarity with the study of de Guzman et al. (2017), wherein both school administrators and faculty members had a great extent of knowledge in formulating learning outcomes.

The HEIs ensured that they formulate learning outcomes in the psychomotor domain (3.91) and cognitive domain (3.55). Although always done but with lesser means is the formulation of learning outcomes for the affective domain (3.37). This relatively lesser mean likely suggests the teachers' difficulty in formulating learning outcomes in the affective domain. Teachers B, one of the three teachers together with Teachers D and F, had this to say:

"One of the challenges we face in the OBE is on how to write learning objectives in the affective domain. It is hard since we do not know how to measure them in the context of OBE, unlike cognitive and psychomotor."

Practices in OBE-Based Teaching-Learning Activities. Findings revealed responses on the practices of the HEIs in the teaching-learning activities. Result discloses that in the context of OBE, HEIs ensured that students are given opportunities to participate in the learning process, as shown in the mean response of 4.00 across the four HEIs. HEIs A, B, C, and D were also mindful that the teaching-learning activities must be aligned with the intended learning outcomes or the daily lesson plan's behavioral/learning objectives (3.61), emphasizing knowledge, concepts (4.00), skills, and competencies (3.59). According to Teachers B, who had similar responses to that of Teachers E and I, said:

"It does not follow that principles and theories will no longer be taught in the OBE classroom. It is still important to teach the students these concepts since these are still believed to be the foundation for demonstrating learning. However, teaching concepts and principles vary and must always articulate the learning objectives to be achieved."

These findings imply that the HEIs adhered to the basic principle of OBE teaching that learners are now active participants in the acquisition of learning, and the teaching-learning process must revolve around what is essential. It further appears that the HEIs still believed that a learner could only demonstrate understanding when he is equipped with theoretical knowledge.

Teaching and learning in an OBE classroom entail shifting from a conventional way of delivering instruction to student-centered. This finding had been recognized by HEIs A, B, and C, scoring mean responses of 3.33, 3.63, and 3.43, respectively. The three HEIs further pointed out that, although student-centered, they must still observe the alignment of teaching methods or pedagogies (3.33, 3.63, 3.43) and the assessment methods with the learning activities (3.83, 4.00, 3.57). This result shows that the HEIs always ensure and practice the alignment of strategies and assessment to the teaching-learning activities. HEI D, however, expressed lesser mean responses on the student-centered delivery, teaching pedagogies, and assessment methods in the OBE principle (2.89, 3.00, 2.89, respectively). This result suggests that HEI D still had difficulty designing and delivering teaching-learning activities under the OBE principle. Teacher G also affirmed this result and mentioned that:

"It is not easy for us to shift directly to OBE as it was introduced to us because we are used to the old way of teaching, teacher-talk instruction."

This result of the study was strengthened by the research findings of de Guzman et al. (2017). It also revealed teachers' moderate understanding of teaching-learning situations and planning activities focused on the learners' demonstration of knowledge practical skills. Borsoto (2013) then suggested then to provide possible solutions and actions to enhance the implementation by attending seminars and training that would provide appropriate knowledge and skills.

Practices in OBE-Based Assessment Strategies. Results disclosed that all four HEIs ensured that assessment types and methods were aligned with the teaching methods. This is shown in the mean response of 4.00, which cuts across the four HEIs. Apart from aligning the assessment with the teaching methods, the four HEIs also acknowledged that the assessment procedure and tools must align with the intended learning

outcomes or the daily lesson plan's learning objectives. These findings are shown in the mean responses of 3.83, 4.00, 3.86, and 3.78, respectively. These assessment methods and tools, as reflected in their responses, must gauge students' knowledge by providing them different assessment means to develop cognitive domain (3.87) as well as their skills and competencies by providing them opportunities to demonstrate learning (3.87).

This was also emphasized by Teacher A, who had more or less similar responses with that of Teachers B, E, F, and H, who disclosed that:

«OBE encourages us to think of authentic assessments for the students to show whether they acquire learning or otherwise. But, we need to bear in mind that these authentic assessments must reflect the learning objectives. They should go together. One cannot give an MCQ test when the objective requires students to perform a task.»

The findings revealed that the HEIs believed it would be easy for them to determine whether or not learning took place when assessments measure the competencies expected of the students to acquire and demonstrate. The results also suggest that the HEIs were already well-informed of the alignment in assessing students' learning in an OBE classroom. According to Caguimbal (2013), well-defined assessment criteria ensured clarity between the assessors and the learners on carrying out the assessment.

Even though it is always done but obtained lower mean response of 3.33, 3.50, and 3.29, all three HEIs A, B, and C found difficulty in using different assessment tools to evaluate students› progress and learning. HEI D found this with more difficulty, as shown in its mean response of 3.22, the lowest rating given. The response only indicates that the HEIs lack knowledge and still struggle with designing assessment tools in the OBE assessment strategies. Teachers C, together with Teachers D and I, who had similar responses, reiterated that:

"My problem is that I have tendencies to keep on repeating the similar way of assessing students' learning, for example, letting them role-play. It is hard for me to think of other ways. It is a challenge for me up to this time."

This result coincided with the research finding of Akhmadeeva, Hindy, and Sparrey (2013), which disclosed that teaching practice and evaluation of students' learning, among others, became the most discussed challenges in the OBE implementation. Nonetheless, de Guzman et al. (2017) opposed the findings as mentioned earlier. Their research showed that the faculty members reported having a great extent of knowledge of the Outcomes-Based Education mainly on the use of the different techniques to assess students' learning.

Practices in Structuring OBE-Based Curriculum. Results showed that all four HEIs underscored the importance of implementing the learning plan to engage the learners in the teaching and learning process. They also pointed out that implementing the learning plan means implementing the curriculum content to attain the learning outcomes. These responses are shown in the composite means of 4.00, which run across the four HEIs and 3.67, respectively. When carried out, the HEIs believed this would facilitate students' learning to enhance knowledge and skills into a high level of performance (3.94).

The findings illustrated the religiousness of teachers in utilizing the syllabus or learning plans to carry out the desired learning objectives. The findings also tell that the teachers' belief in the constant use or implementation of the learning plans and curriculum content would enable them to produce the ideal graduates of the program and of the institutions. Laguador and Dotong (2014) explained that faculty members with a high level of knowledge and understanding on the implementation of OBE also had a higher possibility to contribute to the realization of the objectives of OBE through practice.

Before implementing the learning plan and the curriculum content as a whole, the HEIs recognized that they must first be restructured by considering the school's philosophy or mantra, as shown in the mean responses of 3.50, 4.00, 3.43, and 3.33, respectively. As stated by Teacher A, with similar ideas of Teacher H:

> "We are given the academic freedom. Entailed with it is for the school to develop its ideal graduate. To realize this, the school must begin with the end in mind. What graduate would I want to produce in my school? This is where all schools differ."

The statement above only shows that the HEIs were geared towards achieving and realizing the institution's vision and mission and producing ideal graduates anchored on the school's philosophy as reflected in the school's curriculum structure. It appears that the best practice of the respondents in this key dimension is planning for students' engagement. Planning begins at designing the learning plans where students are given chances to demonstrate practical knowledge. Spady also emphasizes the significant role of the students in their acquisition of learning, thus planning is essential so that every student has the opportunity to be an active learner.

Practices in OBE-Based Curriculum Mapping. All four HEIs A, B, C, and D ensured that skills and competencies match the course learning outcomes as shown in the mean response of 4.00, the highest rating which cuts across the four HEIs. They further stressed that the formulation of these course learning outcomes must be aligned with the program and institutional learning outcomes. This response obtained mean responses of 3.50, 3.75, 3.57, and 3.44, respectively. This finding was claimed by Teachers A, B, E, F, and H in their responses as to the alignment of the learning outcomes to the assessment methods.

It appears that the HEIs were already aware to observe alignment in the formulation and achievement of learning outcomes and competencies. It likely suggests that their English curricula were already in place and mapped according to the context of OBE.

HEIs A, B, and C claimed to have come up with different methods of assessment that run parallel with the skills, competencies, and performance tasks developed in the course content. However, they rated this indicator as the lowest with mean responses of 3.33, 3.25, and 3.29, respectively. HEI D, with its mean response of 3.22, also claimed they often did it. This relatively lesser mean likely suggests the teachers' difficulty designing different assessment methods to map in the English curricula.

This finding was well-supported by de Guzman et al. (2017) when their study also disclosed that faculty members had a moderate extent of knowledge on the construction of learning objectives and mapping of the different colleges in their university.

Practices in the OBE Formulation of Performance Indicators. The findings showed responses on the practices of the HEIs in the formulation of performance indicators. Results reveal that the four HEIs always practiced the documentation of the students' learning progress as proof

of evidence. This shows in the mean response of 4.00, which runs across the four HEIs. They also noted the importance of a thorough and vivid description of expected result/s (3.33) so that they can define selected performance measures (3.50) and select the right measurement/s for each learning outcome. The HEIs B, C, and D always practiced these findings with mean responses of 3.38, 3.29, and 3.33, respectively, and HEI A, which was often practiced as shown in the mean response of 3.17.

Teacher C, who also shared similar ideas with Teachers G and H, also attested that:

> "As teachers, we must determine what to achieve and how to achieve [instructional goals]. That is why it is important to set goals. The grading system must also run in accord with the OBE. All performances, both product-based and process-based, must be well documented to give feedback to the students regarding their learning process."

The findings appear to suggest that the HEIs were guided on the importance of planning before delivering and recording. According to W. Spady, in an OBE classroom, planning is crucial to achieving goals and objectives. In addition, the recording of the performance is reflected in the teachers' class records. It seems like the HEIs were very particular in planning to produce desired and competent products.

It can be gleaned that all four HEIs agreed to practice the definition of composite indices, which refer to the organizational resources and capabilities of the school. This is shown in the mean responses of 3.17, 3.13, 3.14, and 3.22, respectively. The result implies moderate involvement of the teachers in the definition of composite indices. This is understandable since the teachers were not so much concerned with the resources and capabilities but the curriculum. As Teacher A, who echoed ideas similar to that of Teachers D, F, and I stressed:

> "We are all supported by the administration to whatever we request like seminars. This is one factor of the many that make the OBE implementation successful. We even have consultants to check our output."

Problems Encountered in the Formulation of Learning Outcomes.

This present study also delved into the problems encountered as to the practices in the teaching and learning of English under the Outcomes-Based Education framework in the six key dimensions. This part would also validate the teaching-learning practices in general while providing the researcher premise on the training needs of the teacher-respondents.

Results revealed that the HEIs found no problem at formulating learning outcomes in the psychomotor domain with a mean response of 1.00 that cuts across the four HEIs and the cognitive domain with mean responses of 1.17, 1.00, 1.00, and 1.11 from HEIs A, B, C, and D, respectively. Teachers B, D, and F already claimed such a result, as presented in the preceding discussion. Likewise, Teacher A, in consonance with the idea of Teachers C, G, and H, supported that:

"It is not quite difficult for us to construct learning objectives in the cognitive and psychomotor domains since these are already present in the conventional way of lesson planning. Besides, psychomotor generally seems to be the performance tasks in the OBE framework."

In crafting or formulating the learning outcomes, the HEIs also ensured that these outcomes would translate into long-term outcomes that transpire students' future life roles (1.00) and be aligned with the school's vision-mission (1.32). The result suggests that the HEIs had already understood the OBE in terms of formulating learning outcomes and that these outcomes must be demonstrated and utilized by the learners in their future fields.

Even though rated as not a problem by the four HEIs, the formulation of learning outcomes in the affective domain has a higher composite mean response of 1.19 compared to the cognitive and psychomotor domains. This result likely suggests the teachers' difficulty constructing affective learning objectives in the OBE-based formulation of learning outcomes. This result had been reiterated already by Teachers B, D, and F in the preceding discussion.

Problems in the Designing of OBE-Based Teaching-Learning Activities. Findings presented the problems in the designing of OBE-based teaching and learning activities. Results disclose that all four HEIs did not find ensuring learning opportunities for students a problem. This result is shown in the mean response of 1.00 across the four HEIs. The four HEIs also did not experience problems identifying teaching and learning activities (1.26) and their alignment with the intended learning outcomes (1.33).

They ensured that these teaching and learning activities developed the knowledge skills, competencies, values, concepts, and attributes (1.26). These findings affirmed that these HEIs have already understood how the teaching-learning activities are designed and aligned to achieve learning outcomes. Teacher C, who had similar ideas to Teacher E, the respondent mentioned that:

"I gradually understand how the OBE instruction works. Little by little, I know for sure that I will be able to plan teaching and learning activities without difficulty at all."

As the paradigm shifted from input- or content-based to output-based, so did the teachers' strategies in delivering the lesson. The four HEIs found slight seriousness in the problems they encountered in providing instructions through a student-centered approach and the alignment of these student-centered strategies with the course learning outcomes as reflected in the mean responses of 2.17, 2.13, 2.00, and 2.11. All four of them also found facilitation of learning activities, diverse and environment slightly serious as shown in their mean responses of 2.00, 2.13, 1.86, and 2.22, respectively. HEIs A, B, and D claimed that they found slight seriousness about the problems on motivation for students' understanding for outcomes' achievement (1.83, 2.00, and 1.89). On the other hand, HEI C maintained that this indicator was not a problem (1.43). The findings were also attested by Teacher A, who shared the same ideas with Teachers D, F, G, and I opined that:

"I have been used to teaching traditionally for so long. I am still adjusting to the OBE style and with the new set of students every semester. I need to be flexible. But honestly, there are times that I go back to the traditional way of teaching, especially when I am running out of strategies."

This result only says that the teachers still had difficulty in the teaching and learning activities. In reiteration, one reason they identified was using the conventional delivery of classroom instruction for the longest time. They were used to teaching the students wherein they talked much while students only listened. It also appears that the teachers had not been able to assimilate the teaching-learning process in the OBE paradigm fully. It was also challenging for them to identify different strategies which allow students to demonstrate learning. Akhmadeeva, Hindy, and Sparrey (2013) cited that many old-school teachers still believe that their way of teaching is still relevant, effective, and appropriate to the type of learners in this 21st century, whereas the new breed of educators hurdle on the

articulation and alignment of designed activities and performance tasks – both product-based and procedure-based (p.3).

Problems in Crafting OBE-Based Assessment Strategies. Results revealed that across the four HEIs, assessment of student's performance based on the intended learning outcomes was not a problem at all. This is shown in the composite mean response of 1.33. HEIs A, C, and D had no problems in aligning assessment procedure and tools with the intended learning outcomes, as reflected in the mean responses of 1.17, 1.43, and 1.56, respectively. However, HEI B found this activity slightly a problem. HEIs A and C had no problems with the alignment of assessment types with the teaching methods (1.17 and 1.57), yet HEIs B and D had a slight problem in this sub-area.

This result was supported by Teacher A, who shared similar ideas with Teachers D and E, stating that:

"We need to be careful with how we test the acquisition of learning of our students. And with this concept comes the strategy that we also need to consider. These areas must go together. They are indispensable."

In addition, all four HEIs claimed that the development and usage of rubrics to assess the attainment of institutional, program, course, and intended learning outcomes and usage of different assessment tools were no problems anymore. These responses were shown in the composite mean responses of 2.11 and 2.15, respectively. While HEI A responded that assessing students› knowledge, skills, competencies, values, and attributes to develop the cognitive domain, learning, and collaborative activities was no longer a problem. It is shown in its mean response of 1.67, HEIs B, C, and D found this area slightly a problem as reflected in the mean responses of 2.00, 1.86, and 2.00, respectively. The findings reveal that the HEIs, which assessed slightly serious to the sub-areas mentioned earlier of the assessment strategies, had difficulty developing and using various assessment tools to gauge students› knowledge, skills, values, and competencies.

Problems in Structuring the OBE-Based Curriculum. It can be gleaned that all four HEIs maintained that they had no problems implementing the curriculum content (1.23) and learning plan (1.38) to attain program learning outcomes. They claimed that when curriculum content and learning plans were carried out successfully, it would facilitate students' learning to enhance their knowledge and skills (1.29). This result shows that the four HEIs had no problems in these specific sub-areas of the

curriculum structure. It also shows that the teachers significantly practiced the implementation of curriculum content, learning plans, and facilitation of students' knowledge and skills. These contentions were already supported by Teachers C, D, and E, claiming that they kept reviewing their syllabus and making it their guide in their daily classroom instruction.

On the other hand, the delivery of the written curriculum was found to be the slight problem of HEIs B, C, and D as shown in the mean response of 2.00; however, HEI A maintained that this sub-area of the curriculum structure was not a problem anymore as reflected in its mean response of 1.67. Furthermore, HEIs A, B, and D claimed that restructuring the curriculum content based on the school's philosophy was slightly a problem, as reflected in their mean responses of 1.83, 1.75, and 1.78, respectively. HEI C did not find this area a problem, as shown in its mean response of 1.71. The result likely indicates that the HEIs had difficulty delivering the curriculum, which speaks on the student-centered strategies of the teachers. One reason that led to this problem is that the teachers used the traditional way of teaching. This finding was already maintained by Teachers A, D, F, G, and I claim that they were teaching in the traditional way for a long time, and they needed to adjust upon the introduction of the OBE. It was a challenge for them to shift from one conventional framework to the other.

Problems in Curriculum Mapping. The responses revealed that the four HEIs had no problems matching the skills and competencies with the course learning outcomes showing mean responses of 1.33, 1.25, 1.29, and 1.44, respectively. This finding indicates that the HEIs had significantly acquired knowledge and skills in selecting appropriate course and program outcomes that reflect and align with the learning objectives. Teachers B, E, F, and G cited that:

"The competencies provided by CHED and the enrichment we made in our English curriculum are very vital in the formulation of learning outcomes. These competencies are the basis for us to come up with well-defined and well-aligned outcomes. Through this alignment, we are guided in the development of our instructional plan. However, we also believe that we must revisit our English curriculum every now and then."

HEIs A, B, C, and D all agreed that student-centered pedagogies were their moderately serious problems, as shown in their mean responses of 2.50, 2.50, 2.57, and 2.56, respectively. This was already claimed by Teachers A, D, F, G, and I add that their exposure to traditional teaching

for the longest time made them difficult to transition from content-based to outcomes-based. All four HEIs also agreed that designing the English syllabi based on the CHED competencies, guidelines, and policies (1.99) and the inclusion of relevant, appropriate and current English courses contents (2.11) were slightly their problems.

Moreover, HEIs B, C, and D maintained that balance of time allotment and course activities (2.38, 2.29, 2.00) together with the matching of the methods of assessment vis-á-vis the skills, competencies, and performance tasks (2.38, 2.14, 2.22) were also the slight problems of the HEIs as mentioned earlier. Nonetheless, HEI A maintained that the balance of time allotment and course activities together with the matching of methods of assessment against the skills, competencies, and performance tasks were moderately serious, as shown in the mean responses of 2.83 and 2.50, respectively. Finally, HEIs B, C, and D were found to have slight serious problems on the matching of skills, values, and competencies with the ability of the learners (2.13, 2.00, 2.00, respectively). In contrast, HEI A had no problem in this specific sub-area of curriculum mapping. The findings appear that the HEIs had problems in curriculum mapping that they need to address. The findings suggest that the curriculum mapping was not yet totally in place and needed to be reviewed. Teachers C, who shared ideas similar to that of Teachers D, E, F, H, and I expressed that:

"I was confused and about to give up during the restructuring of the English curriculum following the OBE framework. Some of us were murmuring and called our colleagues from other schools for help. But the problem was, although we considered the CHED mandates, the mapping differs from one school to the other."

Problems Encountered as to Performance Indicators. The four HEIs unarguably maintained that the definition of selected performance measures (1.36) and students' learning progress (1.00) was considered not a problem. This result only shows that the HEIs had already identified and established different performance measures they utilized in the teaching-learning process and the proper recording of the students' learning process in undertaking these performance measures. This was already supported by Teachers C, G, and H, claiming the importance of achieving the goals, the grading system that satisfied the CHED requirements, and the recording of product- and process-based outputs in OBE. In addition, HEIs A and B maintained that setting the targets and thresholds was no longer a problem to them, as shown in the mean responses of 1.50 and 1.25,

respectively. However, HEIs C and D expressed that this specific sub-area of the performance indicators was slightly a problem, as indicated in their mean responses of 1.86 and 2.00, respectively.

HEIs A, B, C, and D also claimed that they had slight problems with the description of expected, intended result/s as manifested in their mean responses of 2.33, 1.88, 1.86, and 2.33, respectively. HEIs B, C, and D also maintained that they had slight difficulty knowing alternative measures posting mean responses of 1.88, 2.00, and 2.10, respectively. In contrast, HEI A expressed no problem at all in this sub-area (1.67). Moreover, HEIs C and D claimed that they had slight problems with the selection of the right measurement/s (2.00), while HEIs A and B had no problems at all (1.67 and 1.63). The result suggests that the HEIs that rated these specific sub-areas of the performance indicators had difficulty planning, designing, and selecting performance indicators. This finding also implies the difficulty of the teachers in these particular sub-areas. Teachers B, F, H, and I already expressed their difficulty in planning and designing authentic assessments, which was also supported by Teachers C, D, and I reiterating similar ideas on the repetitive utilization of assessments due to new paradigm adjustments.

Table 1. Correlation between Teaching-Learning Practices and Problems Encountered

Variable	Mean	r-Value	r-Critical Value @ 0.05, 28 df	Result	Decision
Teaching-Learning Practices	3.59				
		0.3736	0.361	Significant	Reject H_0
Problems Encountered	1.63				

There is a significant degree of correlation between the teaching-learning practices and the problems encountered. The correlation is established when the teacher-respondents rated the teaching-learning practices always or highly practiced (HP), and the problems encountered are not a problem (NP) in general. In other words, the teaching-learning practices and the problems encountered were both directly correlated or related to each other. Therefore, it suggests that when OBE practices in teaching-learning English are always or highly practiced, there are no problems encountered in teaching-learning English under the OBE principle.

CONCLUSIONS

The practices of teaching-learning English among the teachers handling English courses in the four HEIs in Tagbilaran City adhered to the perspective and principle of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE). This was attested as the six key dimensions, namely formulation of learning outcomes, teaching-learning activities, assessment strategies, curriculum structure, curriculum mapping, and performance indicators, were always or highly practiced by the teachers. Although they still encountered slight problems, especially in the key areas of assessment strategies and curriculum mapping, these problems did not significantly affect the teaching-learning of English in the OBE paradigm. Thus they also concluded that series of training was only slightly needed. This statement can be drawn from the fact that there are no problems that significantly affect the practices of teaching and learning English in the OBE paradigm. In addition, it can also be said that the practices as to the teaching-learning of English in the new framework adopted in the higher learning institutions of Tagbilaran City were already in place and well-established. Dr. William Spady's OBE concept stated that the success of the OBE implementation lies in developing and building outcomes in a clearly defined paradigm wherein curriculum, instructional pedagogies, assessment, and performance standards are viewed as avenues to develop the desired learners. Tyler's Curriculum Model stated that learners should exhibit knowledge and skills from what they learn. It can only be realized when the formulation of learning outcomes, teaching-learning activities, assessment strategies, curriculum structure, curriculum mapping, and performance indicators are already strengthened and well-designed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher offers the following relevant recommendations.

1. Provide seminars and workshops that strengthen the skills of the teachers in the aspect of teaching and assessment strategies and curriculum mapping.
2. Revisit the English curricula for enrichment, especially in the areas of assessment strategies and curriculum mapping.
3. Conduct a tracer study that would gauge the employability of the

graduates of OBE to see the effectiveness of the new paradigm. This must also include the graduates' competencies in English communication.

4. Conduct a study on OBE, especially in the formulation of indicators to measure outcomes, especially for future researchers.
5. Implement the proposed improvement program to calibrate the practices in teaching and learning English in the OBE framework.

REFERENCES CITED

Akhmadeeva, L., Hindy, M. & Sparrey, C.J. (2013). Overcoming Obstacles to Implementing an Outcomes-Based Education Model: Traditional versus Transformational OBE. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/37HfJvM.

Borsoto, L. Santorce, M.J. and Lescano, J. (2014). Status and Implementation of Outcomes-Based Education in the Engineering Department of the Asian University. Asian Journal of Management Science and Economics.

Boudersa, N. (2016). The Importance of Teachers' Training Programs and Professional Development in the Algerian Educational Context: Toward Informed and Effective Teaching Practices. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/34pND6z.

Britton, M., Letassy, N., Medina, M.S. and Er, N. (2008). A Curriculum Review and Mapping Process Supported by Electronic Database System. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/3fYJspR.

Caguimbal, D.A., Delacion, D.C., Medina, A.O., Mendoza, M.S., Mendoza, R.J.M., Sanchez, M.M. (2013). Level of Awareness of the Maritime Students on the Outcomes-Based Education, Educational Research International.

Custodio, P.C., Espita, G.N. & Siy, L.C. (2017). The Implementation of Outcomes-Based Education: The Case of the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas Campus. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/3lVvU2n.

De Guzman, M.F.D., Edaño, D.C. & Umayan, Z.D. (2017). Understanding the Essence of the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and Knowledge of its Implementation in a Technological University of the Philippines. College of Teacher Education and Graduate School: Ramon Magsaysay Technological University, Zambales, Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol.5, No.4. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/2X4i6UD.

Forehand, M. (2010). Bloom's taxonomy. *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*, *41*(4), 47-56. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/32gTCMO.

Laguador, J.M. and Dotong, C.I (2014). Knowledge versus Practice on the Outcomes-Based Education Implementation of the Engineering Faculty Members in LPU. International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development. Vol.3, No.1.

Macayan, J.V. (2017). Implementing Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) Framework: Implications of Students' Performance. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/2QKKjyR.

Ortega, R.A.A. and Dela Cruz, R.A.O. (2016). Educators' Attitude towards Outcomes-Based Educational Approach in English Second Language Learning. American Journal of Educational Research. Vol.4, Science and Education Publishing.

Pillai, D.S. (2012). The Importance of Teacher Training in Professional Colleges. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/2OSuELn.

Rajaee, N., Junaidi, E., Taib, S.N.L., Salleh, S.F. & Munot, M.A. (2013). Issues and Challenges in Implementing Outcome Based Education in Engineering Education. International Journal for Innovation Education and Research. Retrieved from https://ijier.net.

Spady, W. (1994). Outcomes-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers. Arlington, VA.: American Association of School Administrators.

Tan, K., Chong, M. C., Subramaniam, P., & Wong, L. P. (2018). The effectiveness of outcome based education on the competencies of nursing students: A systematic review. *Nurse education today*, *64*, 180-189. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/32WLHAG.

Tyler, R. (1994). Ralph Tyler: Foundations of Educational Technologies. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/2qLYRn9

Yusoff, Mohamed Nadzri Mohd. (2014). Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) Module: Introduction to Learning Outcomes.