

# Language Exposure, Affective and Instructional Factors of Communicative Competence in Spoken English Among Filipino Senior High School Students

Krigher C. Simbulan  
Pangasinan State University  
[ksimbula\\_ms@psu.edu.ph](mailto:ksimbula_ms@psu.edu.ph)

Date Submitted:  
**April 4, 2026**

Date Accepted:  
**April 18, 2026**

Date Published:  
**April 22, 2026**

DOI:  
**10.5281/zenodo.19683387**

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the factors influencing the Communicative Competence in Spoken English (CCSE) among selected Filipino Senior High School students, focusing on language exposure, affective factors, and instructional support. Using a descriptive quantitative approach, data were collected from 52 students through a validated and highly reliable questionnaire (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.985$ ). Statistical tools such as frequency counts, weighted mean, and ranking were used to analyze the data. Results indicate that students experience limited exposure to English in both formal ( $M = 1.90$ ) and informal ( $M = 2.23$ ) contexts, suggesting few opportunities to actively use the language. Affective factors further shape their

performance, with students reporting low communicative confidence ( $M = 2.35$ ), moderate motivation ( $M = 2.91$ ), and moderate levels of language anxiety ( $M = 3.08$ ), with anxiety emerging as a key barrier. Instructional factors, including teaching competence ( $M = 3.02$ ) and learning materials ( $M = 2.93$ ), were rated as moderate, indicating that while support exists, it may not fully promote active communication. Overall, these factors reflect a moderate influence on CCSE ( $M = 2.63$ ). The findings suggest that improving students' Communicative Competence in Spoken English requires increased opportunities for meaningful language use and more supportive, low-anxiety classroom practices.

**Keywords:** *language exposure, affective factors, instructional factors spoken English, communicative competence*

## INTRODUCTION

Proficiency in English continues to influence students' access to educational, professional, and social opportunities, particularly in contexts where the language functions as both a subject and a medium of instruction. More importantly, English is no longer viewed solely as an academic requirement but as a practical tool for communication across cultures (al zoubi, 2018; nugroho, 2011). Its role as a lingua franca allows individuals from different linguistic backgrounds to interact effectively, making oral communication a central skill rather than a secondary outcome (tuan, 2017; rao, 2019). In response to this shift, English language teaching has moved beyond grammar-focused instruction toward the development of communicative competence, where learners are expected to use the language meaningfully in real-life contexts (králová, 2017; leong & ahmadi, 2017). Communicative competence in spoken English (ccse) refers to the integrated set of skills that enables learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in spoken interaction. Foundational models by canale and swain (1983), bachman (1990), and celce-murcia et

al. (1995) describe this competence as comprising linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and interactional components. These interconnected dimensions allow learners to move beyond accuracy and engage in purposeful communication across different contexts. In the Philippines, where English serves as a second language and remains widely used in education and professional domains, strengthening CCSE is closely linked to both academic success and broader socio-economic mobility (Terogo et al., 2018; Bolton, 2008). Despite sustained emphasis on English instruction, students' communicative competence in spoken English varies considerably. One contributing factor is language exposure. Learners who regularly encounter English through academic tasks, media, and social interaction are more likely to internalize its structures and use it with greater ease (Jenkins, 2014; Fraser, 2010). However, exposure alone does not guarantee participation. Affective factors—such as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety—also influence whether students are willing to engage in communication and how effectively they perform in speaking situations (Jin et al., 2017; Phon, 2017). At the same time, instructional factors, including teaching strategies, feedback, and classroom practices, shape the extent to which students are given meaningful opportunities to practice and refine their oral skills (Asuncion, 2010; Querol, 2010). Understanding how these factors interact is essential in explaining why some learners develop communicative competence more successfully than others. This study therefore examines language exposure, affective factors, and instructional practices to provide a more grounded explanation of students' oral English performance. By focusing on these dimensions, the research aims to inform classroom strategies that support meaningful language use and address ongoing concerns about declining English proficiency, as reflected in recent global English proficiency index rankings (Valderama, 2019).

## METHODS

### Research Design

This study used a descriptive quantitative design to examine the factors influencing Communicative Competence in Spoken English (CCSE) among Filipino Senior High School (SHS) students. This approach was selected to capture and measure existing conditions without manipulating variables, allowing the study to reflect how these factors operate in actual learning contexts. Descriptive research is particularly suited for this purpose, as it focuses on observing and documenting phenomena as they naturally occur (Bhattacharjee, 2012). The study focused on three key categories of factors associated with oral communicative competence: language exposure, affective factors, and instructional factors. Language exposure refers to how often and in what contexts students encounter and use English, both inside and outside the classroom. Affective factors include learners' motivation, confidence, and attitudes toward speaking English, which influence their willingness to participate in communication. Instructional factors, on the other hand, involve teaching strategies, classroom practices, and learning resources that shape students' opportunities to develop their speaking skills. Data were gathered using a validated survey instrument specifically designed to measure these dimensions. The responses were then analyzed using descriptive statistical tools, including frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means, to determine the level of each factor. Through this approach, the study provides a clearer picture of the conditions affecting students' spoken English competence and identifies areas where instructional support can be strengthened to improve communicative outcomes.

### Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in a secondary school offering Senior High School in Pangasinan, Philippines. The said locality was chosen since the said school performed poorly with an overall mean percentage score of 31.63 which is categorized as Low Proficient in three different skills namely Problem Solving, Information Literacy and Critical Thinking across eight (8) core subjects which includes Language and Communication during the most recent Basic Education Exit Assessment (BEEA).

*Participants of the Study Distribution of Participants n= 52*

Grade Level and Strand/ Track	<i>f</i>	%	Total number of students	% of participation
Grade 11 - General Academic Strand (GAS)	11	21.15	11	100
Grade 11 – Technical, Vocational and Livelihood (TVL)	11	21.15	12	91.67
Grade 12 - General Academic Strand (GAS)	14	26.92	16	87.5
Grade 12 – Technical, Vocational and Livelihood (TVL)	16	30.77	19	84.21
Total	52	100	58	89.66

The table presents the distribution of the participants in this study who were Grade 11 and 12 Senior High School students of General Academic Strand (GAS) and Technical- Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) Track in a certain school in Pangasinan, Philippines who took part in a structured speaking test and answered a survey Questionnaire about their profile according to selected variables. The participants were limited to the said strand and track since these are the only courses offered by said school. Sampling was not an issue in this study since total enumeration of participants was utilized. Furthermore, it shows the distribution of participants according to their Grade Level and Strand/ Track. It can be deduced that Grade 11 GAS and TVL students have an equal number of participants at 11 each with a mean of 21.15 respectively. Although one (1) student from the G11- TVL opted to not participate in the study for personal reasons. Meanwhile, 14 or 26.92 % of the total population are Grade 12- GAS students in which two (2) of the 16 total students did not participate as well in the study. And lastly, the highest number of participants of the study came from the G12- TVL students which are composed of 16 (30.77%) out of the total of 19 students which means that the other three (3) students did not take part of the study as well. Overall, the study utilized 52 out of the total number of 58 Senior High School students from the research site which is equivalent to 89.66 % of participation.

### **Instrumentation**

This study used a researcher-developed structured questionnaire to examine the factors influencing Communicative Competence in Spoken English (CCSE) among Filipino Senior High School (SHS) students. The instrument was grounded in existing literature and aligned with the objectives of the study, particularly focusing on language exposure, affective factors, and instructional support. The questionnaire consisted of three major sections. Part I: English Language Exposure measured students' exposure to English and was divided into formal and informal language exposure, covering classroom use, academic engagement, social interaction, and media or technology use. Part II: Affective Factors examined learners' perception of their oral English competence, motivation to study English, and language anxiety, capturing their self-assessment and emotional responses in using the language. Part III: Instructional Factors focused on teaching competence of English teachers and instructional materials, assessing classroom practices, interaction, feedback, and the availability and effectiveness of learning resources. All items in the questionnaire were measured using a 4-point Likert scale, interpreted as follows: for language exposure, 4 – Always, 3 – Often, 2 – Sometimes, and 1 – Never; and for affective and instructional factors, 4 – Strongly Agree, 3 – Moderately Agree, 2 – Fairly Agree, and 1 – Disagree. Prior to data collection, the instrument underwent content validation by a pool of experts in English language teaching who evaluated its clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives. Their suggestions were incorporated to refine the instrument. Furthermore, the questionnaire was pilot-tested among respondents with characteristics similar to the target population, and its internal consistency was established using Cronbach's alpha, confirming that the instrument reliably measured the intended constructs.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

The following steps were undertaken by the researcher in gathering and analyzing the data needed for the study:

*Step 1: Selection of Participants.* The participants of the study were selected through total enumeration. The chosen school was identified based on its relatively low performance in the most recent Basic Education Exit Assessment (BEEA), making it a relevant site for examining factors related to Communicative Competence in Spoken English.

*Step 2: Development of the Research Instrument.* A researcher-made questionnaire was developed based on the study's objectives and relevant literature and studies, focusing on language exposure, affective factors, and instructional factors.

*Step 3: Content Validation of the Instrument.* The instrument was subjected to content validation by a panel of three (3) experts in English Language Education, consisting of a Junior High School teacher, a Senior High School teacher, and a college professor. All validators are affiliated with the public education sector and hold doctoral degrees. They evaluated the instrument in terms of clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study variables.

*Step 4: Revision of the Instrument.* The researcher incorporated the recommendations and suggestions provided by the experts. Necessary revisions were made to address identified weaknesses, resulting in an improved and finalized version of the questionnaire.

*Step 5: Securing Permission to Conduct the Study.* Prior to data collection, the researcher formally requested permission to conduct the study by submitting a letter along with the necessary research documents to the Schools Division Office and the school principal.

*Step 6: Administration of the Instrument.* Upon approval, the questionnaire was administered to the participants. Out of 58 identified students, 52 participated in the study, with informed consent obtained from their parents or guardians. The remaining six (6) students opted not to participate. The respondents completed the survey questionnaire focusing on the factors affecting Communicative Competence in Spoken English.

*Step 7: Data Processing and Analysis.* After data collection, the responses were organized, encoded, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistical tools to determine the extent of the identified factors.

### **Statistical Treatment of Data**

The data gathered from the respondents using the validated and reliable research instrument were systematically organized, encoded, and analyzed in accordance with the specific objectives of the study. All responses were entered into the Microsoft Excel for accurate coding and statistical processing. To ensure the reliability of the instrument, a Cronbach's alpha test was conducted. The instrument yielded an overall reliability coefficient of  $\alpha = 0.985$ , indicating excellent internal consistency and confirming that the items consistently measured the intended constructs. Descriptive statistical tools were employed to analyze the data. Specifically, frequency counts were used to summarize the distribution of responses, while the weighted mean was utilized to determine the extent of the factors related to Communicative Competence in Spoken English (CCSE), namely: (a) language exposure, (b) affective factors, and (c) instructional factors. In addition, ranking was applied to identify the most and least prominent indicators within each category.

To interpret the computed mean scores, the following scale was used:

Scale	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26-4.00	Strongly Agree	SA
3	2.51-3.25	Moderately Agree	MA
2	1.76- 2.50	Fairly Agree	FA
1	1.00- 1.75	Disagree	D

### **Ethical Considerations**

This study strictly adhered to established ethical standards in the conduct of research involving human participants. Prior to data collection, formal permission was secured from the Schools Division Office and the school principal to conduct the study within the selected institution. Participation in the study was voluntary, and no student was compelled to take part. Informed consent was obtained from the participants and their parents or guardians, considering that the respondents were minors. The purpose of the study, procedures involved, and their rights as participants were clearly explained to ensure that they could make an informed decision regarding their participation. The researcher ensured the confidentiality and anonymity of all respondents. Participants were not required to disclose their names; instead, codes were used to protect their identities. All information gathered was treated with strict confidentiality and was used solely for academic and research purposes. Participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without any penalty or negative consequences. No form of deception was employed, and the data collection process posed minimal to no risk to the participants. Furthermore, all collected data were securely stored and handled responsibly. The results were reported in aggregate form to prevent the identification of individual respondents. Overall, the researcher upheld integrity, respect, and responsibility throughout the research process to ensure the protection and well-being of all participants.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following are the findings established by the research investigation.

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
1. I attend our English class regularly.	3.33	H	1
2. I read printed materials in English (textbooks/novels/ newspapers, etc).	2.48	M	2
3. I converse in English with my English teacher.	1.50	VL	6
4. I converse in English with my other teachers. (Science, Math, etc.)	1.21	VL	8
5. I use English in class recitation/activities during English subject.	2.40	L	3
6. I use English in class recitation/activities during other subjects. (Science, Math, etc.)	1.69	VL	5
7. I join clubs/organizations which help me be exposed to English.	1.37	VL	7
8. I write journals/diaries/ other compositions in English.	2.00	L	4
9. I attend seminar, trainings, conferences, and meetings where English is the medium of communication.	1.12	VL	9
Pooled Mean	1.90	L	

Legend:			
Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

Meanwhile, it can be deduced from Table 2 that SHS students have a low level of exposure to Informal English at a pooled mean of 2.23. This suggests that just they do not have sufficient time of using the English language even in informal situations since using English is not usually appreciated in this kind of environment.

This indication is supported by Jabeen (2013) where she stated that the first cause that makes it difficult for the students to speak English is that the environment does not support the students do so frequently. She also added that people usually think that English users just want to boast their skill in daily conversations. Since they do not want to be rejected by the people around them, they use their native

language in daily conversation which makes them unable to communicate in English fluently outside the class. The indicator “4. I listen to English music.” got the first rank at a mean of 3.38 (H). This suggests that most students are fond of listening to songs in the English language for various reasons. The high exposure to English music among Filipino youth may have also been brought by the fact that most teenagers are capable of listening to such songs since they are commonly played in various radio stations and are already present in the internet.

Similar results were obtained in the study of De Wilde, et al. (2020) in which it was found out that out of 867 students from various schools in Flanders, Netherlands, nearly all (97%) listen to English music on daily basis since a lot of the music played on local radio stations is English music so even those who do not purposely look for opportunities to listen to English music will hear a lot of English songs when tuning in to any radio station. Al Zoubi (2018) also found out similar results in his study which revealed that EFL students strongly believe that listening to English programs and songs helps them understand English language better at a mean of 4.30.

Meanwhile “3. I watch English movies or TV programs.” received a mean of Moderate at 3.08 which indicates that watching movies or TV programs in English is usually performed by the participants for entertainment or educational reasons. English videos are usually common in the country since English is considered as its L2 which means that movies/ videos in the English language are usually shown without having subtitles unlike in other countries. Similar findings were drawn in the study of Candilas (2016) in which it was revealed that most high school students watch English movies or TV programs at a mean of 3.69 (Great extent) and Al Zoubi (2018) where EFL students believe that watching English TV programs, videos, or movies facilitates English language acquisition at a mean of 3.91 (High).

Surprisingly, the indicator “6. I speak English when I talk to a foreign speaker.” obtained a mean of 2.63 which is categorized as Moderate. This suggests that most of the participants often talk in English whenever they meet native speakers of the English language. They are forced to use the language because there is no other way to communicate with them. Tuan (2017) also reported comparable results in her study in which it was revealed that majority of 221 students also “speak English when talking to a native speaker” which obtained a 3.0 mean (High). She added that this situation becomes an opportunity for them to use their knowledge and competence in using the English language which they have learned formally and informally. By forcing themselves to speak in English, they are able to test how well they have really mastered the language.

The aforementioned results imply that listening to music and watching movies are the only common means of exposure of students to English since both are accessible and fit for their age. On the other hand, speaking English when talking to foreign speakers suggest that they only speak such language for them to be understood.

Meanwhile, the indicator “8. I learn new things about English through the internet/technology (social media posts, memes, etc.)” ranked 4th a mean of 2.46 which is equivalent to Low. This may signify that SHS students may be using internet or social media most of the time but they do not often use or see how English is used in these forms of media since most of their social media friends prefer using their L1. This finding is contradicted by Al Zoubi (2018) where he discovered that EFL students believe that using social media (Facebook, Whatsapp, Twitter, Instagram) facilitates their English language acquisition at a mean of 4.06 (High).

Meanwhile, “1. I converse with my classmates/ friends in English,” ranked 6th at a mean of 1.35 (VL) which implies that most SHS students do not talk with their friends or even classmates in English especially since there is no policy that prohibits them from doing so. This also indicates that using L1 is commonly used when engaging in common social interactions since it is found to be more comfortable for the users. Similar findings were drawn by Tuan (2017) where it was revealed that similar indicator obtained a mean of 1.59 which is also equivalent to Very Low and Al Zoubi (2018) in which it was found out that

EFL students believe that communicating in English outside the classroom makes English language acquisition easy at a mean of 3.38 (Moderate).

Furthermore, as expected “5. I speak English when I socialize/mingle with other people.” ranked 7th at a mean of 1.29 (VL) which indicates that SHS students do not usually use English when they interact with casual people (at malls, restaurants, colleagues, etc.). This may be because most of us believe that speaking English in these situations may intimidate other people. Similar result was obtained by Al Zoubi (2018) in which he found out that EFL students moderately believe that using English in real life situations increases their English fluency at a mean of 3.59.

And lastly, the indicator “I converse in English with my family at home” ranked 8th and last with a mean of 1.21 (VL). This indicates that participants are more comfortable using their L1 when they are communicating with their family members since English is usually used in formal settings like school and business but not at home. Similar results were investigated by Tuan (2017) in which it was found out that the very low language use of English at home ( $\bar{x}$ = 1.33 - never) means that the respondents do not use the language in communicating with their parents, siblings and other relatives. Even if their parents understand English, the respondents use the Kinh language (their L1) as they are able to express themselves more clearly and meaningfully. Besides, the parents, siblings and the respondents are more comfortable using their L1 than English in daily conversations inside the home.

### Affective Factors of OECC among Senior High School Students

On the other hand, in introducing the results of the Affective factors among the participants, Table 3 which is concerned with Perception about Current Level of English CCSE of SHS students; Table 4 which refers to the Motivation towards studying English; and Table 5 which is about the Language anxiety of SHS students are all utilized for a more detailed presentation and analyses of results.

Table 3. *Perception about Current Level of Communicative Competence in Spoken English among Senior High School Students, n= 52*

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
1. I am able to express myself well in English orally.	2.17	L	5.5
2. I can put words together to form a phrase or a sentence correctly.	2.35	L	2
3. I can understand English statements from other speakers.	3.46	H	1
4. I can talk in English about different topics without difficulty.	2.17	L	5.5
5. I am a competent English speaker.	2.10	L	8
6. My possession of English vocabulary is enough to speak English fluently.	2.21	L	4
7. My grammar knowledge is good enough to construct the sentences I want to say.	2.25	L	3
8. I can make presentation in English Language.	2.12	L	7
Pooled Mean	2.35	L	

Legend: Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

Table 3 reveals how low SHS students perceive their English competence is at a mean of 2.35. This implies that they do not have enough confidence in terms of how well they are in using English since most of them know their weaknesses in terms of using the said language. Jamila (2014) backed this up by stating that self-esteem becomes one of big challenges for students to deal with their speaking performance mostly

faced by students. Moreover, Hamad’s (2013) study revealed that self-assessment about college students’ speaking ability was generally negative and they expressed themselves as incompetent speakers.

Furthermore, it can be noted that “3. *I can understand English statements from other speakers.*” got the highest mean of 3.46 (H) but all the remaining indicators are categorized as Low. Both indicators “2. *I can put words together to form a phrase or a sentence correctly.*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.35) and “7. *My grammar knowledge is good enough to construct the sentences I want to say.*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.25) suggest that SHS students believe that they experience difficulties in terms of grammar since they cannot express their thoughts in the form of a sentence.

This finding is supported by Hamad (2013) when it was found out that university students think that their grammar knowledge is good enough to construct the sentences they want to say.

Meanwhile, three (3) of the four (4) lowest-ranked indicators are “*I am able to express myself well in English orally,*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.17) “*I can talk in English about different topics without difficulty,*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.17) and “*I am a competent English speaker,*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.10) all imply that students don’t trust their competence in using the English language during oral situations maybe because they know themselves that there are still areas to improve for them to confidently use the English language. This indication is parallel with the previous study conducted by Hamad (2013) in which it was found out that most university students believe that they cannot speak English fluently for they fear speaking the language in public.

On the other hand, the indicator “*I can make presentation in English Language*” ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.17) signifies that since students are not confident in their English competency, they also believe that they cannot make oral presentations in the language. Hamad (2013) supports this claim in her study by discovering that university students also believe that they find difficulties in making oral presentations in English.

Thus, it can be gleaned from Table 3 that students are confident in receptive use of English language in which they understand what others say even if it is in English, but they struggle with using the language directly in specific oral situations.

**Table 4** Motivation to study English among Senior High School Students n= 52

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
I study English because...			
1. I think it is important to me especially in my future work.	3.10	M	4
2. I believe speaking English competently will help me in higher academic achievement.	2.87	M	6
3. I want to meet and converse with other people.	2.56	M	7
4. I want to travel abroad.	3.17	M	3
5. I want to understand films, songs, articles in English.	3.19	M	2
6. I believe speaking English competently will open more job opportunities for me.	3.00	M	5
7. It is a requirement for me to graduate.	3.21	M	1

Legend: Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

Meanwhile, Table 4 indicates that SHS students are moderately motivated in studying the English language at a pooled mean of 2.91. No indicator got an equivalent mean of High which means that their motivation is not so noticeable. Contrary, seven indicators all received a mean equivalent to *Moderate* while the indicator “8. *I believe that an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English well.*” scored a mean of 2.19 (Low) which suggests that they are not motivated in studying English since they don’t believe in such notion. On the other hand, the indicator “7. *It is a requirement for me to graduate.*” received the

highest mean at 3.21. This implies that one of the main reasons why they only study English is that they want to graduate and passing English subject is a must for that. That presumes that their motivation is superficial.

Meanwhile, it can also be noted that the following indicators, although they are equivalent to a moderate level of motivation, are still found at the bottom of the rankings: “*I believe speaking English competently will help me in higher academic achievement,*” “*I want to meet and converse with other people,*” and “*I believe speaking English competently will open more job opportunities for me.*” This finding reveals that not all students are motivated in studying English since they do not fully believe they can use it in their future most especially in their education and work. Similar findings were investigated by Phon (2017) in which he discovered that most college students in Cambodia are motivated to study English for employment opportunities

Table 5 *Language Anxiety towards English among Senior High School Students n= 52*

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
1.I get nervous if have to speak English to someone.	3.12	M	4
2.I feel anxious when someone asked me something in English.	3.06	M	5
3.I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in my class or in public.	3.38	H	1
4.I get embarassed whenever I speak English incorrectly.	3.21	M	3
5.I fear to speak English because of being laughed at.	3.23	M	2
6.It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak English better than I do.	2.46	L	6
<b>Pooled Mean</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>M</b>	

Legend:			
Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

And lastly, it can be gleaned from Table 11 that SHS students’ anxiety towards using the English language is Moderate at a pooled mean of 3.08. This implies that not every one of the students act nervously when using English but it can also be noted that most of them also feel uneasy toward it since English is not common to them. This finding is supported by Ortega (2009) by stating that Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) occurs very often in the process of language learning since students cannot neglect the existence of being afraid and have a great tension when they think of foreign languages. The indicator “3. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in my class or in public.” received the highest mean of 3.38 (H) which means that most of the students become confused with the way they speak since they usually get nervous when speaking English in public or even in class.

The said finding was also echoed in the study of Hamad (2013) where it was discovered that Saudi Arabian university students strongly believe that they can speak fluently but I fear speaking English language in public at a mean of 1.99, the 2nd highest rank among ten indicators. It can also be noted that ranks two (2) and three (3) were respectively received by the indicators “4. I get embarrassed whenever I speak English incorrectly.” and “5. I fear to speak English because of being laughed at.” which both imply that most students are afraid to use English for the reason that they might be laughed at or embarrassed when they commit mistakes. Latha (2012) also reported comparable results in his study by stating that adults, unlike kids, tend to feel anxious whenever they make mistakes especially in public situation because it is related to an image and judgement from many people about their ability in performing their speaking.

Meanwhile, the indicator “6. It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak English better than I do.” got the lowest mean of 2.46 since most students are not bothered by some students’ competent level in English.

### Instructional Correlates of OECC among Senior High School Students

Meanwhile, in order to fully grasp the results of the factor Instructional correlates, both Tables 6 and 7 which refer to the Teaching Competence of English Teachers and Instructional Materials respectively are presented.

Table 6 *Teaching Competence of English Teachers n= 52*

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
My English teachers...			
1. ONLY use English in teaching.	3.31	H	2.5
2. mandate us to use ONLY English to express our ideas during class. (Filipino and Mother tongue are not allowed)	2.48	L	11
3. let us have various speaking activities like role-play, interview, etc. in class.	2.83	M	9
4. give everyone a turn to speak so that he can check students’ understanding.	3.02	M	6
5. adopt a friendly, non-authoritarian manner	3.17	M	5
6. present lessons in an interesting way.	3.31	H	2.5
7. link concepts back to students’ experiences.	2.69	M	10
8. supplement the students’ textbook with authentic materials (video clips, printed materials, etc.)	2.98	M	7
9. give opportunities for collaborative work.	2.90	M	8
10. approach students with good humor and encouraging remarks.	3.33	H	1
11. give feedbacks (praises, suggestions, etc.) on how I can be better in speaking English	3.25	M	4
Pooled Mean	3.02	M	

Legend:

Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

It can be gleaned from Table 6 that the English teachers’ teaching competence is viewed by the students at a moderate level of agreement with a weighted mean of 3.02. This indicates that students perceive their teachers’ strategies and attitude towards teaching them satisfactory but can still be improved. Similar finding was revealed on Al Zoubi’s (2018) study where it was found out that EFL students moderately believe that applying variety of techniques in the classroom by the teacher increases language acquisition. Specifically, the students strongly believe that their English teachers are competent in terms of “10. *approaching students with good humor and encouraging remarks.*” which ranked first at 3.33 mean (H). This means that according to the students, their English teachers have a positive personality as a teacher which makes the students feel more comfortable in learning. Moreover, the students strongly believe as well that their teachers “6. *present lessons in an interesting way.*” and “1. *ONLY use English in teaching.*” which were tied in the second spot at a mean of 2.5. The former indicator suggests that students find their English teachers’ way of delivering their lessons fascinating since they use materials and methodologies that catch the attention of the students. Nguyen, et al. (2014) also believe in the said finding since they also discovered in their study that most students believe that teaching methods encourage them to learn English if these are presented in an interesting manner.

Meanwhile, the latter indicates that their English teachers always use English in teaching the subject which suggests that they are doing what they are supposed to do in order to instill the value of practice

among the learners. The said finding was also echoed in the study of Hamad (2013) where she discovered that instructors only use English language to communicate with their students inside their class at a mean of 2.50. On the other hand, the following indicators got the three lowest ranks respectively but with a mean equivalent to Moderate: “3. *let us have various speaking activities like role-play, interview, etc. in class*” ( $\bar{x}=2.83$ ) and “7. *link concepts back to students’ experiences.*” ( $\bar{x}=2.69$ ) suggest that according to a number of students, their English teachers do not always let them perform various activities in which they can practice the art of speaking. Hamad (2013) also reported similar results in her study where she discovered that instructors do not always make their students do role-play to practice speaking skills.

Meanwhile, the last ranked was obtained by “2. *mandate us to use **ONLY** English to express our ideas during class.*” ( $\bar{x}=2.48$ ) which signifies that their teachers also allow them to use Filipino or their Mother tongue during their English class. The finding implies a low level of language policy observed in the school. This indication is parallel with the previous study conducted by Hamad (2013) in which it was discovered that instructors let their students use Arabic language to express their answers in their English class.

Table 7 Instructional Materials in English n= 52

Items	Mean	DE	Rank
1. I own an English textbook in each grade level I have been part of.	3.13	M	1
2. The student: book ratio is 1:1 each grade level I have been part of.	3.08	M	3
3. The textbooks contain numerous speaking exercises.	3.10	M	2
4. The speaking exercises in the books strengthen my English-speaking skills.	2.83	M	4
5. Technology is integrated in the instructional materials used.	2.75	M	7
6. Other instructional materials like video clips, printed materials are also used in our English class.	2.81	M	5
7. There were many speaking exercises in our books to be practiced even outside the class.	2.79	M	6
Pooled Mean	2.93	M	

Legend: Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

Table 7 shows a moderate level of satisfaction of students toward the instructional materials they use in English at a pooled mean of 2.93; although no indicator even got a mean equivalent to High which reflects that they are fully contented with their IMs. The said finding was also echoed in Hamad’s (2013) study where she discovered that instructional materials used by university students were perceived not enough to develop English speaking proficiency. The indicators “1. *I own an English textbook in each grade level I have been part of.*” and “2. *The student: book ratio is 1:1 each grade level I have been part of.*” respectively got the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> rank at a mean of 3.13 and 3.08 (M) which implies that majority of them own an English textbook but not all every school year. Both imply that the education sector is doing their best to assure that every learner has a book to be used in learning the subject but despite this effort, not everyone still own a book and needs to share with his classmates. The said finding was also echoed in the study of Hamad (2013) where she reported that majority of the students in a university have textbooks in their listening and speaking skills class.

The second rank was obtained by the indicator “3. *The textbooks contain numerous speaking exercises.*” at a mean of 3.10 (M). This suggests that a number of speaking exercises are present in the

books being used by the students in which they can perform to develop their English-speaking skills. On the other hand, indicator “7. *There were many speaking exercises in our books to be practiced even outside the class.*” was found to be at rank 6<sup>th</sup> at a mean of 2.79 (M) which is in contrary with indicator #3. This signifies that even if there are numerous speaking exercises in the learners’ material, these exercises often require to be practiced only inside the classroom; hence, exposure to the language is limited. Similar finding was reported by Hamad (2013) where she found out that majority of university students perceive that there are limited speaking exercises in their book to be practiced inside and outside the class. Al Zoubi (2018) backed this up when he discovered in his study that EFL students in Jordan moderately believe that practicing English language outside the classroom in many contexts improves their English language level at a mean of 3.64.

On the other hand, the indicator “4. *The speaking exercises in the books strengthen my English-speaking skills.*” ranked 4<sup>th</sup> at a mean of 2.83 which suggests that students do not fully believe that the speaking exercises present in their books develop their English-speaking skills. The aforementioned finding is in agreement with the study of Hamad (2013) where she discovered that most university students do not think that the exercises in their textbooks enhance their speaking skills. Meanwhile, the indicator “5. *Technology is integrated in the instructional materials used.*” got the lowest mean of 2.75 which implies that there is a need for more frequent use of technology in the instructional materials since *millennials* nowadays are more fascinated to learn when technology is integrated to lessons.

Table 8 *Summary of Extent of Factors of Communicative Competence in Spoken English among Senior High School students n= 52*

Variables	Mean	DE	Rank
Formal Language Exposure	1.90	L	7
Informal Language Exposure	2.23	L	6
Perception about current level of competence	2.35	L	5
Motivation	2.91	M	4
Language Anxiety towards English	3.08	M	1
Teaching Competence of English Teachers	3.02	M	2
Instructional Materials	2.93	M	3
Weighted Mean	2.63	M	

**Legend:**

Scale Values	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent	DE
4	3.26- 4.00	High	(H)
3	2.51- 3.25	Moderate	(M)
2	1.76- 2.50	Low	(L)
1	1.00- 1.75	Very Low	(VL)

It can be observed from Table 8 that the factors associated with Communicative Competence in Spoken English have a weighted mean of 2.63 which is equivalent to Moderate.

*Language Anxiety* got the highest mean of 3.08 (M) which suggests that most SHS students feel uneasiness and nervousness when learning or using the English language. *Teaching Competence of English Teachers* being at the second rank with a mean of 3.02 (M) suggests that most students perceived the teaching strategies and methodologies utilized by their English teachers as acceptable but still have room for improvement. The third rank was obtained by *Instructional Materials* at a mean of 2.93 (M) which implies that most students find their IMs moderately effective in improving their English competence. On contrary, the three remaining factors only got a mean equivalent to Low. For instance, *Perception about current level of competence* ranked fifth and had a mean of 2.35. This signifies that most students had low confidence in terms of their current status of English proficiency. Moreover, both *Informal* and *Formal*

*Language Exposure* got the two lowest means of 2.23 and 1.90 respectively which reveals the low degree of contact that the learners have with the English language in formal and informal settings.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. *Senior High School students have limited English language exposure.* Both formal ( $M = 1.90$ ) and informal ( $M = 2.23$ ) language exposure were found to be low, indicating that students have minimal opportunities to use English in both academic and everyday contexts. While students regularly attend English classes, active use of English—such as speaking with teachers, peers, or participating in language-related activities—is very limited.
2. *Students demonstrate low self-perceived Communicative Competence in Spoken English (CCSE).* The respondents generally rated their communicative competence as low ( $M = 2.35$ ), suggesting a lack of confidence in their ability to express themselves in English despite being able to understand spoken input. This reflects a gap between receptive and productive language skills.
3. *Motivation to learn English is only moderate and largely extrinsic.* Students showed a moderate level of motivation ( $M = 2.91$ ), with primary reasons centered on academic requirements (e.g., graduation) rather than intrinsic or long-term communicative goals. This indicates that motivation may not be strong enough to sustain active language use.
4. *Language anxiety is a dominant affective factor.* Among all variables, language anxiety ranked highest ( $M = 3.08$ ), indicating that many students experience nervousness, fear of making mistakes, and embarrassment when speaking English. This significantly hinders their willingness to communicate.
5. *Instructional factors are moderately supportive but insufficient.* Both teaching competence ( $M = 3.02$ ) and instructional materials ( $M = 2.93$ ) were rated as moderate. While teachers are perceived as supportive and competent, opportunities for meaningful speaking practice and strict English language use policies are limited. Similarly, instructional materials are available but not maximized for developing oral communication skills.
6. *Overall, factors affecting CCSE are at a moderate level.* The overall weighted mean ( $M = 2.63$ ) indicates that while some support mechanisms exist, they are not strong enough to significantly enhance students' Communicative Competence in Spoken English. The combined effect of low exposure, low confidence, moderate motivation, and high anxiety contributes to limited communicative performance.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Given the low level of both formal and informal English language exposure, it may be beneficial for schools and teachers to provide more opportunities for students to encounter and use English in meaningful contexts. Previous studies suggest that increased exposure—both inside and outside the classroom—can support the development of communicative competence.
2. Considering the low level of students perceived oral English competence, instructional practices that gradually build confidence in speaking may be explored. Providing structured speaking tasks and supportive feedback may help learners become more comfortable in expressing themselves in English.
3. Since students demonstrated moderate motivation, largely driven by external factors, strategies that connect English learning to students' personal interests and future goals may be considered. Research indicates that enhancing intrinsic motivation can contribute to more sustained engagement in language learning.
4. In view of the moderate level of language anxiety among students, creating a supportive and less intimidating classroom environment may help reduce apprehension in using English. Literature suggests that minimizing fear of errors and encouraging participation can positively influence students' willingness

to communicate.

5. Although instructional factors were rated as moderate, teachers may further explore communicative and learner-centered approaches that provide more opportunities for oral interaction. Incorporating varied speaking activities may help strengthen students' communicative competence over time.
6. Given that instructional materials were perceived as moderately effective, the integration of more interactive and context-based materials may be considered. Studies suggest that materials that promote active language use can enhance speaking skills development.
7. Future studies may consider examining additional variables or employing different research designs to further explore factors influencing Communicative Competence in Spoken English. Expanding the sample or including other educational contexts may also provide broader insights.

## References

- Al Zoubi, Samer Mahmoud. "The impact of exposure to English language on language acquisition." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* 5.4 (2018): 151-162.
- Asuncion, Z. S. (2010). *Filipino college freshman students' oral compensatory strategies*. Philippine ESL Journal, 5, 2-21.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices*. University of South Florida.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*
- Canale, M. (1983). *From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy*. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). London, England: Longman.
- Candilas, Kurt S. "Language exposures: Determinants of English speaking proficiency." *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature-JOELL* 3.3 (2016): 52-60.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Zoltan Dörnyei, and Sarah Thurrell. "Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications." *Issues in Applied linguistics* 6.2 (1995): 5-35.
- De Wilde, Vanessa, Marc Brysbaert, and June Eyckmans. "Learning English through out-of-school exposure. Which levels of language proficiency are attained and which types of input are important?" *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 23.1 (2020): 171-185.
- Fraser, Susan. *Different Courses, Different Outcomes? A comparative study of Communicative Competence in English Language learners following 'Academic' and 'International Understanding' courses at High Schools in Japan*. Diss. Durham University, 2010.
- Hamad, Mona M. "Factors Negatively Affect Speaking Skills at Saudi Colleges for Girls in the South." *English Language Teaching* 6.12 (2013): 87-97.
- Jabeen, Ismat, and Raja Nasim Akhtar. "Implementing sociocultural approach in teaching English as a second language in Pakistan: Challenges and remedies." *Journal of Education and Practice* 4.9 (2013).
- Jamila, Mariam. "Lack of Confidence--A Psychological Factor Affecting Spoken English of University Level Adult Learners in Bangladesh." *Language in India* 14.10 (2014).
- Jenkins, Jennifer. *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge, 2014.
- Jin, Yinxing, Kees de Bot, and Merel Keijzer. "Affective and situational correlates of foreign language proficiency: A study of Chinese university learners of English and Japanese." *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 7.1 (2017): 105-125.
- Králová, Zdeňka. *Developing communicative competence and the role of course books*. [online]. Brno, 2017 [cit. 2020-03-03]. Available from: &lt; <https://theses.cz/id/ahwy2m/>&gt; Master's thesis. Masaryk University, Faculty of Education.
- Leong, Lai Mei, and Seyedeh Masoumeh Ahmadi. "AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING LEARNERS' ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL." (2017): 34-41.
- Nugroho, Iwan Cahyo. *A Descriptive Study on Difficulties in Writing Recount Text Faced by the Second Year student at SMA Muhammadiyah Gemolong in 2010-2011 Academic year*. Diss. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, 2011.

- 
- Ortega-Dela Cruz, Ruth A. "Influence of Student English Utility and Teacher Efficacy on English Proficiency of High School Students." *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*. 2016
- Phon, Sokwin. "Factors affecting the English language proficiency of students majoring in English at a rural university in Cambodia." *UC Occasional Paper Series* 1.1 (2017): 69-92.
- Querol, M. B. (2010). *College students' use of affective and social language learning strategies: A classroom-based research*. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 5, 22-39.
- Rao, Parupalli Srinivas. "The Importance of Speaking Skills in English Classrooms." *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*. (2019): 6-18.
- Terogo, Ionell Jay Riantoco, et al. "Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Competence of Senior High School Students." *Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 6.1 (2018).
- Tuan, Vu Van. "Communicative Competence of the Fourth Year Students: Basis for Proposed English Language Program." *English Language Teaching* 10.7 (2017): 104-122.
- Valderama, T. C. (2019, November 18). *Pinoy's English proficiency declines sharply*.