Speaking Anxiety, Language Exposure, and Quality of Instruction as Determinants of Oral Fluency among First-Year College Students

[1]Bllzabeth Francee B. Labrador, LPT, MAEd, [2]Kriscentti Exzur P. Barcelona, PhD

[1]Institute of Social Sciences and Humanities

[2]Professor, Graduate School Department, Lourdes College, Inc., Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1304000049

Received: 09 April 2026; 14 April 2026; Published: 29 April 2026

ABSTRACT

In a globalized world, English speaking proficiency remains relevant, as it allows people to communicate effectively in various professional fields. However, a knowledge gap exists in the collective influence of speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction on oral fluency. This study aimed to determine the influence of the variables among 280 first-year college students at a city college in Misamis Oriental. The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula with a 5% margin of error. The study was anchored on FLA theory, which explained learners' emotional responses to second language use. A quantitative design was employed by collecting data using validated questionnaires and an oral fluency assessment rubric, which were subjected to CFA prior to use; a pilot test with 30 students confirmed acceptable to excellent reliability (Cronbach's α = 0.725–0.857). Descriptive statistics, CCA, and stepwise multiple regression analyses were employed. The results revealed that speaking anxiety had a significant negative influence on oral fluency, indicating that higher levels of anxiety are associated with lower speaking performance, while language exposure and quality of instruction did not show a significant effect. These findings emphasize the critical role of affective factors on oral fluency. The result indicates that oral fluency is a complex and multidimensional skill shaped by interaction of various factors. The study recommends instructional approaches that reduce speaking anxiety and promote supportive learning environments to enhance fluency, as well as further exploration of psychological and cognitive variables to better understand their combined impact on oral fluency.

Keywords: English speaking proficiency, oral fluency, speaking anxiety, foreign language anxiety, language exposure, quality of instruction, affective factors

INTRODUCTION

In the globalized world, it is no longer enough to master the English language to be able to perform well in school, work environment and other aspects of the world. The importance of oral fluency is stressed in many education systems since it assists students in expressing ideas in a coherent and comprehensible way, developing confidence, and being more active both in a school and a workplace (OECD, 2023; Pareja Roblin et al. 2021). The competitiveness of the Philippines is also supported by strong English-speaking skills as it allows the country to connect with the international opportunities (Datu & Sulindra, 2025).

Irrespective of its significance, oral fluency remains a challenge among the Filipino learners. It has been reported that English proficiency among students and graduates has reduced, indicating that it is still difficult to convey ideas easily and with confidence (Islam et al., 2022). In the classroom, teachers are still encouraging learners to engage in communicative activities, but most of them have low exposure to the English language, high speech anxiety, or lack of confidence in using the language. The problems influence their preparedness to academic work and potential careers in which they will have to use communication skills (Aashiq & Zahid, 2024; Olobia, 2023).

Previous studies like those of Theriana (2023), Sharma (2024), and Alvarez and Tamayo (2024) highlight language exposure's influence on fluency, the impact of speaking anxiety on confidence, and the need for quality training to enhance classroom communication. However, most studies examine these factors individually, leaving a knowledge gap in their interaction on oral fluency among first-year college students. This gap is

significant as college students face new academic challenges, higher expectations, and more speaking tasks affecting confidence and fluency (Permatasari & Wulandari, 2025; Briones et al., 2023). Better insight into these interactions can help educators and curriculum developers improve speaking skills through learning environments, aligning with Sustainable Development Goal 4 promoting effective teaching and supportive classroom environments (UNESCO, 2021).

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study assumed that speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction collectively influence the learners' oral fluency. This assumption is supported by the following theories: Krashen's Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), the Foreign Language Anxiety Theory (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986), Long's Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1983), and the Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978).

The study assumed that speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction collectively impact learners' oral fluency, supported by Krashen's Input and Affective Filter Hypotheses, Foreign Language Anxiety Theory, Long's Interaction Hypothesis, and Sociocultural Theory. Krashen's Input Hypothesis highlights the need for meaningful, slightly challenging input to help students internalize language patterns and develop fluency, while Affective Filter Hypothesis explains how anxiety and confidence affect learners' ability to process input. Speaking anxiety, as detailed in Foreign Language Anxiety Theory, hinders participation and fluency by causing fear and avoidance when speaking. Long's Interaction Hypothesis stresses that fluency improves through communicative interaction and negotiation of meaning.

The independent variables–language exposure, anxiety in speaking, and instructional quality show interaction of in determining oral fluency of learners. They play part in the process of developing spoken communication: the input of language exposure is the necessity to acquire the structures of the language; the opportunity to interact, which results in language processing and performance, is provided by speaking anxiety, which, in turn, suppresses the process; and the scaffolding, feedback, and motivation to participate in speaking, which is offered through the good quality of instruction, are the prerequisites of the learner to take on the role of a confident participant of the speaking activity. Collectively, these theories emphasize the importance of addressing emotional barriers, providing rich and interactive language exposure, and delivering supportive instruction to enhance oral fluency among first-year college students. With this theoretical foundation, the variables support the idea that oral fluency results from a complex interaction of cognitive input, emotional preparedness, and instructional support. An understanding of these relationships can help explain why some learners achieve strong fluency while others do not and can offer valuable insights into the design of learning environments that promote effective and confident communication among learners.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine if language exposure, speaking anxiety, and quality of instruction influence the first-year college students' oral fluency at a city college in Misamis Oriental.

The researcher sought to seek the following questions as listed below:

What is the level of the participants' speaking anxiety in terms of:

1.1. Public Speaking Anxiety;

1.2. Lack of Self-Confidence in Speaking; and

1.4. Communication Apprehension?

What is the participants' extent of language exposure in terms of:

2.1. Frequency;

2.2. Duration;

2.3. Interaction Level; and

2.4. Mode (Auditory or Visual)?

What is the participants' assessment of the quality of instruction in terms of:

3.1. Instructional Clarity;

3.2. Motivation Strategies;

3.3. Formative Assessment Used; and

3.4. Feedback Quality?

What is the participants' level of oral fluency in terms of:

4.1. Speech Rate;

4.2. Pausing;

4.3. Smoothness of Delivery; and

4.4. Pronunciation?

Are the participants' speaking anxiety, language exposure, and assessment of quality of instruction significantly associate with their oral fluency?

Research Design

This study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine patterns and associations among variables without manipulation. Descriptive statistics, canonical correlation, and stepwise multiple regression analyses were employed to assess the patterns, associations, and relationships among variables. The data were gathered, analyzed and interpreted systematically to establish how language exposure, speaking anxiety, and quality of instruction affect oral fluency of students.

Participants And Sampling Procedure

The participants of this study consisted of 280 first-year college students enrolled in AY 2025-2026 at a city college in Misamis Oriental, regardless of programs. The participant number was identified using Taro Yamane formula. Total enumeration sampling was employed to obtain data collected by the whole group instead of choosing a subset of the whole group.

A pilot test was conducted among 30 students that were not included in the actual study participants through statistical treatments of Cronbach's alpha (α) and Krippendorff's alpha (α), which results indicated that all instruments demonstrated acceptable to excellent reliability, as evidenced by the Cronbach's alpha values for speaking anxiety (0.725 to 0.857), language exposure (0.721 to 0.933), quality of instruction (0.759 to 0.915). Also, Krippendorff's alpha values indicated a high level of inter-rater reliability for smoothness of delivery (0.7805), pausing (0.7981), speech rate (0.8433), and pronunciation (0.8393), thereby confirming that the instruments were deemed reliable and appropriate for use, and no further refinement was considered necessary prior to full survey implementation.

Moreover, to further validate the factor structures after observing unexpected response patterns and low correlations in the raw data, the instruments underwent CFA, which indicated moderate to strong relationships between the indicators and their latent variables. The results provided additional evidence of validity for th e constructs measured.

Data Analysis

The data analysis procedure involved conducting descriptive statistics to summarize levels of oral fluency, language exposure, speaking anxiety, and quality of instruction. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to validate the construct validity of the measured variables by retaining items with strong factor loadings to ensure an acceptable model fit. Canonical correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships among variables. Finally, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive effects of speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction on oral fluency, with speaking anxiety emerging as the only significant predictor. These statistical methods provided a comprehensive understanding of the relationships among key variables influencing oral fluency in first-year college students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1. What is the level of the participants' speaking anxiety in terms of:

Public Speaking Anxiety;

Lack of Self-Confidence in Speaking; and

Communication Apprehension?

Table 1 presents the summary of the participants' level of speaking anxiety across the identified determinants. The overall mean is M = 3.52 with a standard deviation of SD = 0.41, interpreted as High. This indicates that the participants generally demonstrate a partially strong level of speaking anxiety with partially manageable manifestations of frequent fear, discomfort, and self-doubt in participating in immediate oral communication. This implies that although learners are still able to communicate their ideas with minimal effectiveness, even when faced with internal barriers. In effect, this condition reflects that speaking anxiety is frequently present in various communication contexts but not fully developed, as emotional and psychological factors still influence performance. This finding is supported by Bielak, J. (2025), who emphasized that oral fluency can still be achieved at a functional level even when learners experience moderate anxiety and varying confidence levels.

Table 1 Summary Table of the Participants' Level of Speaking Anxiety

Oral Fluency	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
Public Speaking Anxiety	3.87	0.68	High
Lack of Self-confidence in Speaking	2.88	0.69	Moderate
Communication Apprehension	3.82	0.63	High
Overall	**3.52**	**0.41**	**High**

Legend : 4.51 – 5.00 (Very Good); 3.51 – 4.50 (Good); 2.51 – 3.50 (Moderate); 1.51 – 2.50 (Low); 1.00 – 1.50 (Very Low)

Problem 2. What is the participants' extent of language exposure in terms of:

Frequency;

Duration;

Interaction Level; and

Mode (Auditory or Visual)?

Table 2 consolidates the participants' extent of language exposure in terms of frequency, duration, interaction level, and mode. The overall mean is M = 3.38 with a standard deviation of SD = 0.51, interpreted as Moderate. This indicates that participants demonstrate a moderate level of engagement with the English language across different exposure dimensions. This implies that while learners encounter English in various ways, the overall

extent of their engagement is not consistently high. In effect, this condition reflects that exposure exists but may not be sufficient in depth and intensity to fully support strong language development. This finding is supported by Hummel (2021), who emphasized that effective language acquisition requires not only exposure but also sufficient time and meaningful interaction with the language.

Table 2 Summary Table of the Participants' Extent of Language Exposure

Language Exposure	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Frequency	3.63	0.70	High
Duration	3.06	0.64	Moderate
Interaction Level	2.96	0.74	Moderate
Mode (Auditory or Visual)	3.84	0.59	High
Overall	**3.38**	**0.51**	**Moderate**

Legend : 4.51 – 5.00 (Very Good); 3.51 – 4.50 (Good); 2.51 – 3.50 (Moderate); 1.51 – 2.50 (Low); 1.00 – 1.50 (Very Low)

Problem 3. What is the participants' assessment of the quality of instruction in terms of:

Instructional Clarity;

Motivation Strategies;

Formative Assessment Used; and

Feedback Quality?

Table 3 synthesizes the participants' assessment of the overall quality of instruction and its impact on language learning. The overall mean is M = 3.88 with a standard deviation of SD = 0.51, interpreted as Good. This indicates that participants generally perceive instructional practices as effective in supporting their oral fluency and language development.

This implies that key instructional components such as clarity, motivation, assessment, and feedback collectively contribute to learners' engagement and performance in speaking tasks. In effect, this condition reflects that quality instruction serves as a strong foundation in helping learners become more confident and active participants in communicative activities.

This finding is supported by Meganathan (2024), who emphasized that well-structured instruction enhances learner participation, confidence, and overall communication skills.

Table 3 Summary Table of the Participants' Assessment of the Quality of Instruction

Quality of Instruction	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Instructional Clarity	3.93	0.59	Good
Motivation Strategies	3.86	0.58	Good
Formative Assessment	3.72	0.57	Good
Feedback Quality	4.02	0.59	Good
Overall	**3.88**	**0.51**	**Good**

Legend : 4.51 – 5.00 (Very Good); 3.51 – 4.50 (Good); 2.51 – 3.50 (Moderate); 1.51 – 2.50 (Low); 1.00 – 1.50 (Very Low)

Problem 4. What is the participants' level of oral fluency in terms of:

4.1. Speech Rate;

4.2. Pausing;

4.3. Smoothness of Delivery; and

4.4. Pronunciation?

Table 4 summarizes the frequency distribution of the participants' level of oral fluency. The overall mean is M = 12.86 with a standard deviation of SD = 3.55, interpreted as Moderate. This indicates that participants generally demonstrate an average level of oral fluency when performing speaking tasks. This implies that learners are able to communicate their ideas with a reasonable level of effectiveness, but not consistently at a highly fluent level. In effect, this condition reflects that while learners can sustain communication, there are still noticeable challenges that may affect clarity, flow, and confidence during speaking activities. This finding is supported by Yenkimaleki and Van Heuven (2023), who emphasized that moderate fluency is often characterized by developing control over speech, where learners can communicate but still experience interruptions and inconsistencies.

Table 4 Frequency Distribution of the Participants' Level of Oral Fluency

Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
18.01 – 20.00	Very High	19	6.79
14.01 – 18.00	High	89	31.79
10.01 – 14.00	Moderate	101	36.07
6.01 – 10.00	Low	58	20.71
1.00 – 6.00	Very Low	13	4.64
Total		**280**	**100**
Mean		**12.86**	
SD		**3.55**	
Interpretation		**Moderate**	

Problem 5. Are the participants' speaking anxiety, language exposure, and assessment of quality of instruction significantly associate with their oral fluency?

H_{01}: Speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction do not significantly influence the participants' oral fluency.

H_{02}: Speaking anxiety does not significantly influence the participants' oral fluency.

H_{03}: Language exposure does not significantly influence the participants' oral fluency.

H_{04}: Quality of instruction does not significantly influence the participants' oral fluency.

Table 5 presents the canonical correlation analysis between speaking anxiety and oral fluency. The result revealed a non-significant canonical correlation between speaking anxiety and oral fluency, f (12, 723) = 1.352, p = 0.184, rc = 0.17, rc^2 = 0.03. This result indicates that only 3% of the variance in oral fluency is associated with speaking anxiety. The result suggests that speaking anxiety does not demonstrate a meaningful relationship with students' oral fluency in this sample. Among the speaking anxiety indicators, public speaking anxiety (loading = 0.12) shows a small contribution, while lack of self-confidence in speaking (loading = -0.10) and communication apprehension (loading = -0.01) show very weak contributions to the canonical variate. These values indicate minimal shared variance between the anxiety indicators and the fluency construct. On close examination, public speaking anxiety exhibits the highest (loading = 0.12) among indicators in the fluency relationship but only at a minimal level. This is considered as reflects an unreliable tendency, not a meaningful effect, and suggests that it does not significantly influence students' oral fluency, leading to the non-rejection of

H_{02}. This result suggests that speaking anxiety may not be a primary determinant of oral fluency, contrary to widely held assumptions in language learning. While anxiety is often considered a barrier to effective speech production, the findings indicate that its direct influence on fluency is minimal, which highlights the need to reconsider the weight given to affective factors in explaining speaking proficiency.

Table 5 Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Speaking Anxiety and Oral Fluency

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(12, 723)	P
Speaking Anxiety		0.17	0.03	1.352	0.184
Public Speaking Anxiety	0.12				
Self-confidence in Speaking	-0.10				
Communication Apprehension	-0.01				
Oral Fluency					
Speech Rate	0.11				
Pausing	-0.00				
Smoothness of Delivery	0.03				
Pronunciation	0.05				

Table 6 presents the canonical correlation analysis between Language Exposure and Oral Fluency. The result revealed a non-significant canonical correlation between Language Exposure and Oral Fluency, F(16, 832) = 1.111, p = 0.339, Rc = 0.19, Rc^2 = 0.04. The result indicates that only 4% of the variance in Oral Fluency is associated with Language Exposure. The value indicates a weak relationship between the two variable sets. The low magnitude of canonical correlation suggests that variations in language exposure are not strongly associated with variations in oral fluency performance, which implies that learners with greater exposure to the language do not necessarily demonstrate higher levels of fluency, and those with less exposure are not consistently less fluent. This finding challenges the assumption of Dewi and Wilany (2022) that increased exposure alone directly leads to improved speaking performance. The overall pattern of weak and inconsistent loadings across both variables suggest that language exposure does not function as a strong or direct predictor of oral fluency among participants, leading to the non-rejection of H_{03}.

Table 6 Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Language Exposure and Oral Fluency

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(16, 832)	P
Language Exposure		0.19	0.04	1.111	0.339
Frequency of Exposure	-0.07				
Duration of Exposure	-0.06				
Interaction Level	0.08				
Mode of Exposure	-0.10				
Oral Fluency					
Speech Rate	-0.16				
Pausing	-0.10				
Smoothness of Delivery	0.08				
Pronunciation	-0.03				

Table 7 presents the canonical correlation analysis between Quality of Instruction and Oral Fluency. The result revealed a non-significant canonical correlation between Quality of Instruction and Oral Fluency, F(16, 832) = 0.563, p = 0.912, Rc = 0.13, Rc^2 = 0.02. The value indicates that only 2 percent of the variance in Oral Fluency is associated with Quality of Instruction. The result indicates a very weak relationship between the two sets of variables. The very low magnitude of the canonical correlation implies that variations in instructional quality are not associated with corresponding variations in students' oral fluency performance, which suggests that learners exposed to higher levels of instructional quality do not necessarily exhibit better fluency, and those with lower perceived instructional quality are not consistently less fluent. This challenges the assumption that improvements in instructional quality directly translate into enhanced speaking performance (Fadila &Trisno, 2025). In a closer

examination of the canonical loadings, it further supports this conclusion. Overall, the pattern of results, characterized by weak canonical correlation, negligible shared variance, and small, inconsistent loadings suggests that quality of instruction, as measured in this study, does not exert a strong or direct influence on students' oral fluency, leading to the non-rejection of H_{04}.

Table 7 Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Quality of Instruction and Oral Fluency

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(16, 832)	P
Quality of Instruction		0.13	0.02	0.563	0.912
Instructional Clarity	-0.08				
Motivation Strategies	-0.09				
Formative Assessment Used	-0.07				
Feedback Quality	-0.12				
Oral Fluency					
Speech Rate	-0.10				
Pausing	-0.03				
Smoothness of Delivery	0.07				
Pronunciation	-0.07				

Although the study was grounded by established theoretical frameworks such as Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis, Long's Interaction Hypothesis, and Krashen's Input Hypothesis, the weak and non-significant relationships observed in the canonical correlation analyses indicate that the expected associations among the variables may not strongly manifest in the present study. This suggests that theoretical assumptions may not fully capture the dynamics of the variables within the sample. With this, the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed as a complementary and exploratory approach to identify which individual variables, if any, demonstrate predictive value on oral fluency.

Tables 8 and 9 present the stepwise multiple regression analysis examining the influence of speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction on oral fluency. The stepwise multiple regression was conducted to determine the most appropriate predictive model by identifying which variables significantly contribute to oral fluency and removing those that do not. This approach helps in isolating the strongest predictor and provides a clearer understanding of how each variable influences the dependent variable.

Table 8 Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Anxiety, Language Exposure, and Quality of Instructions on Oral Fluency Model 1

Model	Predictor	Unstandardized Coefficients		B	95% CI		t	P
		B	SE		Lower	Upper		
Model 1	Constant	15.73	2.31		11.19	20.27	6.817*	<.001
	Speaking Anxiety	-1.40	0.53	-0.161	-2.43	-0.36	-2.653*	0.008
	Quality of Instruction	0.42	0.50	0.059	-0.57	1.40	0.835	0.404
	Language Exposure	0.13	0.50	0.019	-0.85	1.11	-1.233	0.793
Model 1 Summary R = 0.163 R^2 = 0.027 Adjusted R^2 = 0.016 F(3,276) = 2.51 p = 0.059								
Note. B = unstandardized beta coefficient, SE = standard error, β = standardized beta coefficient, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = t statistic, p = probability value. *Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.								

Model Equation: O = 0.49Q – 1.35S + 15.85

Legend: O = Oral Fluency, S = Speaking Anxiety, Q = Quality of Instruction

Following the stepwise procedure, Model 2 as presented in Table 25, was generated after removing the non-significant variable which is language exposure. This resulted in a statistically significant model, F(2, 277) = 3.75, p = 0.025, with $R = 0.162$, $R^2 = 0.026$, and Adjusted $R^2 = 0.019$, which suggests that the revised model explains about 2.6% of the variance in oral fluency, leaving 97.4% of the variability attributed to other factors. This implies that although the model has reached statistical significance, its predictive strength remains limited. Therefore, this condition reflects those other unmeasured variables in the model such as vocabulary knowledge, speaking practice, and confidence may play a larger role in determining oral fluency.

Table 25 Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Speaking Anxiety and Quality of Instructions on Oral Fluency

Model 2

Model	Predictor	Unstandardized Coefficients		B	95% CI		t	P
		B	SE		Lower	Upper		
Model 2	Constant	15.85	2.26		11.41	20.29	7.02	<.001
	Speaking Anxiety	-1.35	0.52	-0.159	-2.41	-0.35	-2.64	0.009
	Quality of Instruction	0.49	0.42	0.069	-0.35	1.32	1.15	0.252
Model 2 Summary R = 0.162 R^2 = 0.026 Adjusted R^2 = 0.019 F(2,277) = 3.75* p = 0.025								
Note. B = unstandardized beta coefficient, SE = standard error, β = standardized beta coefficient, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = t statistic, p = probability value. *Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.								

Model Equation: O = 0.49Q – 1.35S + 15.85

Legend: O = Oral Fluency, S = Speaking Anxiety, Q = Quality of Instruction

Based on the results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis, the overall initial model in Table 8 failed to reach significance, leading to the non-rejection of H_{01}, indicating that the predictors collectively do not significantly influence oral fluency. Moreover, although the revised model in Table 9 achieved statistical significance after removing language exposure, the explained variance remained minimal, emphasizing the limited predictive strength of the model. The exclusion of language exposure further supports the non-rejection of H_{03}, indicating that it does not significantly influence oral fluency.

Overall, the findings reveal that speaking anxiety remains the most consistent and influential predictor of oral fluency among the variables tested. In terms of teaching implication, this suggests that language instruction may place greater emphasis on addressing affective factors, particularly reducing speaking anxiety through supportive classroom environments, guided speaking practice, and confidence-building activities. At the same time, exposure and instructional quality may be strengthened by incorporating more interactive and output-based tasks to ensure that learners actively use the language rather than passively encounter it. Moreover, the stepwise multiple regression employed in this study is used as a complementary and exploratory tool. Given its data-driven nature, the results should be interpreted with caution and not as definitive evidence of causal relationships, but rather as indicative of patterns that require further validation through theory-driven analyses.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study determined the influence of language exposure, speaking anxiety, and quality of instruction influence the first-year college students' oral fluency. Particularly, determined the level of the participants' speaking anxiety in terms of public speaking anxiety, duration, lack of self-confidence in speaking, and communication apprehension; the participants' extent of language exposure in terms of frequency; duration; interaction level, and mode (auditory or visual); participants' assessment of the quality of instruction in terms of instructional

clarity, motivation strategies, formative assessment used, and feedback quality; and participants' level of oral fluency in terms of speech rate, pausing, smoothness of delivery, and pronunciation; and if speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction significantly influence the participants' oral fluency.

This study employed a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design to examine the relationships, associations, and patterns between language exposure, speaking anxiety, quality of instruction, and oral fluency among 280 first-year college students at city college in Misamis Oriental, during Academic Year 2025 -2026. Data collection involved structured and modified questionnaires with 110 items, and scaled instruments such as Likert scales and oral assessment rubrics, which were established by use of Cronbach's Alpha and McDonald's Omega coefficients. Canonical correlation analyses were used to examine the relationships between sets of the individual independent variables and oral fluency, while stepwise multiple regression analysis was utilized to identify the individual predictors of oral fluency and determine the most appropriate predictive model.

The following are the major results of the study:

1. 1.Overall, the participants showed a High level of speaking anxiety, particularly in public speaking and spontaneous communication contexts.
2. Generally, the participants demonstrated a Moderate level of language exposure in terms of duration and interaction, and a High level in terms of frequency and mode.
3. In general, the participants demonstrated a Good level of perceived quality of instruction across instructional clarity, motivation strategies, formative assessment, and feedback quality.
4. Overall, the participants demonstrated a Moderate level of oral fluency performance in terms of speech rate, pausing, and smoothness of delivery, and a High level in pronunciation
5. Although the stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed as an exploratory tool, the result showed that speaking anxiety, language exposure, and quality of instruction do not significantly predict oral fluency in the overall model. However, the revised model resulted in significance after removing language exposure due to weak contribution.
6. Results revealed that speaking anxiety significantly and negatively predicts oral fluency in both models, while the other variables did not significantly predict it.

CONCLUSION

The study emphasizes that oral fluency is a complex and multidimensional skill shaped by the interaction of cognitive, emotional, and social factors rather than a single dominant variable. The findings highlight that while speaking anxiety has a measurable influence on fluency, its effect remains limited, and neither language exposure nor instructional quality directly predicts fluency outcomes. This indicates that oral fluency cannot be fully explained by isolated variables but rather emerges from the dynamic interplay of multiple processes that influence how learners produce and manage spoken language. The conclusions partially confirm the significant influence of affective factors, particularly speaking anxiety, on oral fluency development. This is consistent with established theoretical perspectives of Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis and Horwitz's Foreign Language Anxiety theory, which emphasize the role of emotional state among learners in second language use and acquisition, and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Long's Interaction Hypothesis, which highlight the importance of learner readiness through scaffolded interaction. Overall, the results corroborate the view that affective and interactive dimensions play important roles in enhancing oral fluency, highlighting the need for pedagogical approaches that integrate affective support with meaningful communicative practice to sustain learner engagement and reduce the impact of affective factors in speaking activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

That English language instructors and curriculum developers may:

1.1. intensify the incorporation more frequent and meaningful exposure to authentic and diverse linguistic input through multimedia, conversation clubs, and interactive activities to enhance students' oral fluency.

1.2. explore strategies to implement that reduce speaking anxiety, such as creating a supportive classroom environment, providing gradual exposure to speaking tasks, and incorporating stress-reduction techniques.

That students may:

2.1. actively participate in speaking activities such as classroom discussions, presentations, and peer interactions.

2.2. practice and expose themselves to real-life communication situations that can help improve oral fluency regardless of anxiety levels.

2.3. engage regularly in listening and speaking activities outside the classroom, such as participating in conversation clubs, language exchange programs, or consuming English media, to increase exposure and improve fluency.

2.4. seek constructive feedback from teachers and peers to identify areas for improvement and to monitor progress in pronunciation, coherence, and overall fluency.

That Future Researchers may:

3.1. explore additional psychological, cognitive, and instructional variables, such as motivation, self-efficacy, and prior language experience, to better understand their collective impact on oral fluency.

3.2. conduct studies with larger and more diverse samples across different educational contexts to validate and extend current findings.

3.3. use mixed-methods designs, including qualitative approaches, to investigate learners' perceptions, attitudes, and internal processes related to speaking and fluency development.

REFERENCES

1. Aashiq, I., & Zahid, Z. (2024). Analysis of self-confidence and lack of exposure on English speaking skills of EFL learners: a study at BS level. Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 8(2), 809 -820. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024(8-II)64
2. Alvarez, C. L., Tamayo, M. R., & Coutinho dos Santos, J. (2024). Factors influencing the development of speaking skills among Ecuadorian EFL learners: teachers' perspectives. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14(2), 319-331. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i2.74889
3. Bielak, J. (2025). To what extent are foreign language anxiety and foreign language enjoyment related to L2 fluency? An investigation of task-specific emotions and breakdown and speed fluency in an oral task. Language Teaching Research, 29(3), 911-941. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221079319
4. Briones, M. S., Villegas, K., Maroto, P. A., Lleve, J., & Sevillano, J. A. (2023). English only please? Students' views of their self-confidence in spoken English in a Philippine state university. Journal of Language and Pragmatics Studies, 2(2), 112-119. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58881/jlps.v2i2.24
5. Datu, Y. A., & Sulindra, E. (2025). Are vocational high school students ready for global competitiveness?: self-perception on their English proficiency. Social Science and Humanities Journal, 9(1), 6383-6394. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18535/sshj.v9i01.1562
6. Dewi, D. S., & Wilany, E. (2022). Factors affecting speaking performance. Langua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education, 5(2), 112-122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7145570
7. Fadila, W., & Trisno, E. (2025). Enhancing speaking skills through performance assessment: A study in junior high school. AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 17(1), 1550-1562. DOI: 10.35445/alishlah.v17i1.6255
8. Hummel, K. M. (2021). Introducing second language acquisition: perspectives and practices.
9. Islam, W., Ahmad, S., & Islam, M. D. (2022). Investigating the problems faced by the university EFL learners in speaking English language. International Journal of TESOL & Education, 2(2), 47-65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.22223

10. Olobia, L. P. (2023). Readiness in communicating in English as a second language. Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 14(3). DOI: 10.37237/140308
11. Meganathan, P. M. (2024). Enhancing student engagement and active learning through student presentation-based effective teaching (SPET) method among Malaysian undergraduate students. Lim Hock Ann, AP. Dr.
12. Pareja Roblin, N., Van Dorresteijn, C., Voogt, J., Cornelissen, F., & Volman, M. (2021). Online onderwijs op de uva tijdens covid-19: didactische strategieën om sociale en cognitieve processen te ondersteunen. onderzoeksteam 'online onderwijs tijdens Covid-19'. Universiteit van Amsterdam.
13. Permatasari, N. P. I., & Wulandari, C. I. S. A. (2025). English speaking fluency and confidence for global competitive work: the highlight of authentic role-play activity for university students. Jurnal Multidisiplin Sahombu, 5(02), 400-411. DOI: 10.58471/jms.v5i02
14. OECD. (2023). Teaching for the future: global competences in education. OECD Publishing. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/d6b3d234-en.
15. Sharma, L. R. (2024). Exploring the landscape of challenges and opportunities in teaching speaking skills. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 4(3), 74 -78. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2024.4.3.2745
16. Theriana, A. (2023). Understanding the strategies employed by EFL learners to overcome speaking anxiety in the classroom. NextGen Education Review Journal, 1(2), 33 -44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58660/nextgen.v1i2.38
17. UNESCO. (2021). Wide education inequalities. UNESCO: Paris, France.
18. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process. Harvard University Press.
19. Yenkimaleki, M., & Van Heuven, V. J. (2023). Effect of pedagogic intervention in enhancing speech fluency by EFL students: A longitudinal study. Language Teaching Research, 13621688231205017.