Social Science and Humanities Journal
Everant Journal
https:https://sshjournal.com/
Impact Factor: 2024: 6.576
2023: 5.731
ISSN: 2456-2653
Volume 08 Issue 05 May 2024
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18535/sshj.v8i05.1117

# Second Language Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategies among College Students

**Maria Clarisa M. Agcaoili; Robin V. Guillermo, Ph.D.**

[1]Isabela College of Art & Technology, Inc.
[2]Isabela State University-Echague

*Received 07-05-2024*
*Revised 08-05-2024*
*Accepted 30-05-2024*
*Published 31-05-2024*



**Abstract:**

Students' speaking anxiety is a significant factor to second language speaking performance. The speaking skill is viewed as the most important skill to acquire in second language or foreign learning among the four key language skills. This study was aimed to determine the level of speaking anxiety and the speaking strategies used by undergraduate students at private college institutions at Cauayan, Isabela (Isabela College of Arts & Technology, Inc, Our Lady of the Pillar College-Cauayan and University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-Isabela). For this purpose, 325 first year college students who are enrolled in Purposive Communication subject for the first semester academic year 2023-2024 were the respondents. Two instruments are used to achieve the study's goals which were: Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire (FLCAS) developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) and Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Oxford. The result of FLCAS reveals that the level of speaking anxiety of the respondents is from low and mild low with a mean of 2.50-3.49. The result of SILL reveals most speaking strategies used by respondents are Memory and Cognitive in nature. Half of the time, they also use Compensation and Affective and the least they use are Metacognitive and Social strategies. Results also revealed that generally there is no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of the respondents when grouped according to their course and their sex. Generally, no difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents was found when grouped according to their course and their sex. Between the speaking anxiety level and speaking strategies of the respondents, most posted no relationship except for the Cognitive category of speaking strategies negatively correlated with the second language speaking anxiety levels in all categories. The performance of respondents from the private colleges of Cauayan City in their Purposive Communication subject is described as Good. There is a negative significant relationship between the respondents' second language speaking anxiety level on certain items in the different areas and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject while there is a positive significant relationship between several speaking strategies and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject.

## Introduction:

*The Problem and Its Background*

The speaking skill is viewed as the most important skill to acquire in second language or foreign learning among the four key language skills. Brown and Yuke (1983) said that "speaking is the skill that the students will be judged upon most in real life situations". The speaking skill is useful for learners when they have to settle down well in their professions. One who has a good talent in speaking can rule the whole world. Having good communication is the visa to get better employment

opportunities. In this global world, there is a need to impart our ideas and thought with the people who live around the world in order to fulfill our desires and deeds. This is a competitive world and every and each English language learner wants to improve his/her speaking skills to survive in the global market.

Students' speaking anxiety is a significant factor to second language speaking performance. Speech anxiety is best defined as the nervousness that a speaker feels before and/or during a presentation. Sweating palms, shaky voice, dry throat, difficulty breathing, and even memory loss are all common symptoms of anxiety. The symptoms an individual will feel are hard to predict (The Speech Communication Process, Florida State College at Jacksonville).

According to Juhana (2012), in speaking class, students' speaking anxiety tend to be triggered by some factors. In many cases, students may have a tension response which blocks their capacity to perform effectively in a foreign language class. When a student felt anxious to speak, it could influence their speaking performance in the class. Researchers and teachers generally believe that uneasiness is an important hindrance to be overcome in figuring out how to communicate in a language.

Horwitz et al. (1986) define foreign language anxiety as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process". Based on empirical data and anecdotal evidence, they proposed a theory on language learning anxiety. This foreign language anxiety theory has three interrelated components: communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety. Communication apprehension is defined by Horwitz et al. (1986) as "a type of shyness characterized by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people". Fear of negative evaluation refers to the "apprehension about others' evaluation, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively". Finally, test anxiety covers the tests and examinations of the language learning process and is defined as "a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure".

According to Crystal (2003), speaking is regarded the most important language skill to be mastered since English is in a powerful position as a medium for international communication and yet it is assumed to be the most stressful among the four language skills (Young, 1992; Hauck & Hurd, 2005; Liu, 2009; Öztürk & Gürbüz, 2014). As foreign language learners, anxiety, especially foreign language speaking anxiety, has a great importance on students' talents specifically when they need to express their knowledge about a specific subject. Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) in speaking skill is one element that many English as Foreign Language teachers (EFL teachers) do not focus much on.

According to O'Malley (1985), a broad definition of language acquisition tactics as "any combination of actions or actions taken by a student that will the procurement, storing, getting back, or applying of information", as defined by Griffiths (2008) learning techniques as "activities" students' deliberate selection for the in order to control their own language acquisition. In addition, according to Nunan (1999, p. 171), "learning tactics are the cerebral and the communication techniques that students employ to acquire and employ language."

In addition, Oxford (1990) defines learning strategies as steps used by the students to improve their own learning. These strategies are specified into six: 1) memory strategies (which relate to how students remember language); 2) cognitive strategies (which relate to how students think about their learning); 3) compensation strategies (which enable students to make up for limited knowledge); 4) metacognitive strategies (relating to how students manage their own learning); 5) affective strategies (relating to students' feelings); and 6) social strategies (which involve learning by interaction with others).

Brown (2004) has stated six components of speaking to be scored: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension and task. Harris (1974) suggested that speaking skill has five components: comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency. Tuan (2012) said that depending on the assessment purpose, speaking effectiveness can be evaluated based on content, organization, coherence, registration, vocabulary, and grammar. Despite dividing speaking skills into components with different names, all of the studies gave similar results. From the study of Harris (1974), Brown (2004) and Tuan (2012), it can be pointed out that eight components of speaking are very crucial, including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, task, coherence and content. Students can use these components to improve their speaking skills, thereby improving their speaking performance.

Every person has their own learning strategies to help them in acquiring knowledge. Every strategy should be neatly arranged in order to help students improve their skills. According to Reid (2005), learning strategy is a process of how the students manage learning. She continues that the students require a learning strategy to respond in an inefficient manner. Furthermore, strategies related to student's ability in applying a task. Thus, the knowledge of strategies determines success and failure in learning a task. Drawing upon those definitions about learning strategies, it can be pointed out that learning strategies are some techniques or devices that may be used by the students in acquiring their knowledge related to their study. Furthermore, learning strategies are compromised by clear operations and procedures, in which it will assist and help the students with their learning activities before, during, and after the teaching and learning process that happens formally in the classroom.

In the Philippine context, students claim that learning to speak is indeed a challenging and nervous-shaking process. English is valued as a second important language. Although English has been integrated as the medium of instruction in the Philippine educational system, speaking in English is still considered the most anxiety-provoking activity in class (Atas, 2015). English is still a medium where second language learners are very anxious about (Chiu et al., 2010). For them, using the L2 in their speaking most likely induces anxiety or any undesirable feelings (Salim et al., 2017). This scenario subsequently leads to more problems even outside the academic setting. Hence, educators are now faced with a challenge to establish a learning environment where students can utilize effective strategies as they express and speak their thoughts and ideas that would lead to better academic achievements. With this, conducting researches that deal with the relationship of speaking strategies and anxiety level could be a significant step to address the issue.

The Purposive Communication subject is important for developing effective communication skill, both professional and personal aspects. It can teach learners how to communicate their thoughts and ideas concisely, clearly and persuasively which is important for success in many fields. Therefore, it is important for learners to develop well their speaking skill.

In brief, a need for further investigation is encouraged to establish a clearer link between speaking strategies, speaking anxiety extent and performance in the Purposive Communication subject to provide solid empirical basis on their significance to L2 speaking.

With specificity to the context and locale of the study, studies about the relationship of speaking strategies and speaking anxiety levels are relatively scarce. Therefore, this research fills the gap in previous studies because it will investigate the interplay of speaking strategies and second language speaking anxiety of college students of Isabela College of Arts and Technology, Inc., Our lady of the Pillar College and University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-Isabela Campus all in Cauayan City. It is also hoped that the findings ofthis study would shed light on second language speaking anxiety and speaking strategies problems

and raise the awareness of language teachers, syllabus designers, and material developers to provide a reliable path towards a high quality of English teaching with a significant focus on the development of second language speaking.

*Statement of the Problem*

This study aims to provide significant evidence on the second language speaking anxiety and speaking strategies among students of private college institutions in Cauayan City, Isabela.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
a. Course;
b. Sex?
2. What is the level of second language speaking anxiety based on the following:
a. Communication apprehension;
b. Fear of negative evaluation; and
c. Test anxiety?
3. What are the speaking strategies of the respondents based on the following:
a. Memory;
b. Cognitive;
c. Compensation;
d. Metacognitive;
e. Affective; and
f. Social?
4. What is the difference on the speaking anxiety of the respondents based on their profile?
5. What is the difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents when they are grouped based on their profile?
6. What is the relationship between the second language speaking anxiety level and speaking strategies of the respondents?
7. What is the performance of the respondents in their Purposive Communication subject?
8. What is the relationship between the respondents' speaking anxiety and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject?
9. What is the relationship between the respondents' speaking strategies and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject?

**Body Text**

*Research Design*

This study employed a quantitative approach specifically the descriptive-correlational method by means of a survey to determine the level of speaking anxiety of students and the speaking strategies they use. Descriptive correlational research is a type of research design that tries to explain the relationship between two or more variables without making any claims about cause and effect. It includes collecting and analyzing data on at least two variables to see if there is a link between them.

*Research Locale*

The study was conducted in the different private college institutions at Cauayan City, Isabela, Philippines: Isabela College of Arts and Technology, Inc., located at National Highway, Tagaran, Cauayan City, Isabela; Our Lady of the Pillar College-Cauayan, located at San Fermin, Cauayan City, Isabela; and University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-Isabela, located at Minante Uno, Cauayan City, Isabela.

*Respondents of the Study*

The participants of the study were the college students who have already taken up Purposive Communication subject on the first semester of SY 2023-2024 at Isabela College of Arts and Technology, Inc; Our Lady of the Pillar College-Cauayan; University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-Isabela Campus all in Cauayan City, Isabela, Philippines.

The researcher used stratified random sampling in selecting the respondents of the study. From the population size of 1,951, the sample size at 95% degree of confidence and 5% allowable error (Slovin's Formula) was determined. After getting the sample size of the respondents, they will be proportionally distributed to the different year levels using the proportionate allocation formula. As shown in Table 1, a total of 325 students served as the respondents of the study.

**Table 1. Respondents of the Study.**

| SCHOOL | COURSE & SECTION | NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS | SAMPLE SIZE |
|---|---|---|---|
| Our Lady of the Pillar College-Cauayan City | BSN 1-A | 46 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-B | 44 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-C | 47 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-D | 48 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-E | 46 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-F | 46 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-G | 46 | 8 |
| | BSN 1-H | 46 | 8 |
| | BSIT 1 | 39 | 6 |
| | BSCRIM 1-A | 36 | 6 |
| | BSCRIM 1-B | 37 | 6 |
| | BSED 1 | 54 | 9 |
| ***Total*** | | ***535*** | ***90*** |
| University of Perpetual Help System- Isabela | BAA 1 | 49 | 8 |
| | BEED 1 | 44 | 7 |
| | BS PHARMACY 1 | 25 | 4 |
| | BS ACCTY 1 | 47 | 8 |
| | BS HRM 1 | 17 | 3 |
| | BSIT-CE 1 | 41 | 7 |
| | BSED 1 | 26 | 4 |
| | HM 1 | 51 | 9 |
| | BSN 1-A | 42 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-B | 42 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-C | 41 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-D | 41 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-E | 41 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-F | 41 | 7 |
| | BSN 1-G | 41 | 7 |
| | BS TOURISM | 47 | 8 |
| | BS MED | 54 | 9 |
| ***Total*** | | ***690*** | ***116*** |
| Isabela College of Arts & Technology, Inc. | BSCRIM 1-A | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-B | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-C | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-D | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-E | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-F | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-G | 40 | 7 |
| | BSCRIM 1-H | 20 | 3 |
| | HM 1-A | 34 | 6 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | HM 1-B | 34 | 6 |
| | BSMT 1-A | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-B | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-C | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-D | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-E | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-F | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-G | 41 | 7 |
| | BSMT 1-H | 35 | 6 |
| ***Total*** | | ***690*** | ***119*** |
| ***Total of Respondents*** | | **1951** | |
| ***Total of Sample Size*** | | **325** | |

*Research Instruments*

There were two instruments used for the purposes of this study. The first questionnaire was the "Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire". Foreign language speaking anxiety questionnaire was designed by selecting 18 items from 33 items of FLCAS developed by Horwitz et al. (1986). After a detailed review of literature, these 18 items were decided to be directly related to foreign language speaking anxiety. The 18 items are classified into Communication Apprehension (1,4,7,8.13,14.15); Fear of Negative Evaluation (2.9,10,12,17); and Test Anxiety (3, 5,6,11,16,18).

The second instrument is adopted from the study of Guo (2022) The researcher designed the questionnaire based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Oxford. She tweaked the scale's items based on her years of oral English learning experience to ensure that it accurately reflected the students' usage of strategies during the oral English learning process. The 24 items are categorized into: Memory (1-4); Cognitive (5-8); Compensation (9-12); Metacognitive (13-16); Affective (17-20); and Social (21-24).

The survey questionnaire developed also had a first part which included information about the participants' profile. The second part consisted of 18 items on second language speaking anxiety with a 5 point Likert scale and 30 items on the strategies used by the students to learn to speak English with a 5 point Likert scale.

*Data Gathering Procedure*

The researcher sought the permission of the conduct of the research in the school from the Office of the President. Upon approval, the questionnaires were administered personally by the researcher. Afterwards, data from the questionnaire were tallied using Microsoft Excel and were treated through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for description and inference. Also, the researcher sought permission to gather the Purposive Communication grades of the respondents in the school from the Office of the President through the Office of the Registrar. Upon approval, their grades were treated with utmost confidentiality.

*Statistical Treatment of Data*

The data collected on the demographic profile of the respondents were analyzed as to frequency count and percentage. The weighted mean was used to determine the second language speaking anxiety and their speaking strategies. Pearson r was used to determine the significant relationship between the second language speaking anxiety and speaking strategies of the respondents T-test and one-way ANOVA were used where applicable to determine the significant difference in the second language speaking anxiety and speaking strategies of the respondents when grouped according to their profile.

**Results and Discussion:**

*Profile of Respondents*

Table 2 below shows the profile of the respondents in terms of course, sex and first language.

**Table 2. Profile of the Respondents.**

| **Profile** | **Frequency (n=325)** | **Percent (100.0)** |
|---|---|---|
| Course | | |
| BS Criminology | 64 | 19.7 |
| BSIT | 6 | 1.8 |
| BSEd | 13 | 4.0 |
| BSN | 112 | 34.5 |
| BS Pharmacy | 4 | 1.2 |
| BSIT-CE | 7 | 2.2 |
| BAA | 8 | 2.5 |
| BSHRM | 3 | .9 |
| BS MED | 9 | 2.8 |
| BS Tourism | 8 | 2.5 |
| BS HM | 21 | 6.5 |
| BS Accountancy | 8 | 2.5 |
| BEEd | 7 | 2.2 |
| BSMT | 55 | 16.9 |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 161 | 49.5 |
| Female | 164 | 50.5 |

In terms of course, the biggest group is from the BSN course with 112 respondents or 38.5% of the 325 total, followed by those from BS Criminology with 64 or 19.7%, BSMT with 55 or 16.9%, BSHM with 21 of 6.5% and BSEd with 13 or 4%. There are 9 or 2.85% from the BS MED, 8 or 2.5% each from the BAA, BS Tourism and BS Accountancy, 7 or 2.2% each from the BSIT-CE and BEEd, and 6 or 1.8% from the BSIT. The smallest groups are from the BS Pharmacy with 4 or 1.2% and the BSHRM which has the least number of respondents with only 3 or 0.9%. There is a big number of respondents from the Nursing program since two of the private colleges have big populations of students taking up this course. There is also a big number of Criminology and Marine Transportation students since one of the private colleges have these as its main program offerings. There is an almost equal number of respondents who are males with 161 or 49.5% and females with 164 or 50.5%.

*Second Language Speaking Anxiety of Respondents*

Table 3 shows the level of second language speaking anxiety of the respondents in terms of the three components. It can be said that language anxiety is a complicated psychological negative feeling, attitude, and belief of human beings that may be aroused in learners based on different issues when they learn or use a language (Hashemi & Abassi, 2013; Young 1991; Horwitz, et al., 1986; Horwitz, 2001; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994).

**Table 3. Level of Second Language Speaking Anxiety of the Respondents.**

| Statements | Mean | Descriptive Equivalent |
|---|---|---|
| **Communication Apprehension** | | |
| 1. I am never quite sure of myself when I am speaking in English. | 2.64 | Mild Low |
| 4. I get frightened when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. | 2.49 | Low |
| 7. I feel nervous while speaking English with native speakers. | 3.02 | Mild Low |
| 8. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. | 2.47 | Low |
| 13. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. | 2.95 | Mild Low |
| 14. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in English classes. | 2.78 | Mild Low |
| 15. I get nervous when I don't understand every word my English teacher says. | 2.66 | Mild Low |
| **Fear of Negative Evaluation** | | |
| 2. I am afraid of making mistakes in English classes. | 3.01 | Mild Low |
| 9. I don't feel confident when I speak English in classes. | 2.70 | Mild Low |
| 10. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. | 2.54 | Mild Low |
| 12. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. | 2.87 | Mild Low |
| 17. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. | 2.94 | Mild Low |
| **Test Anxiety** | | |
| 3. I tremble when I know that I am going to be called on in English classes. | 2.73 | Mild Low |
| 5. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes. | 3.00 | Mild Low |
| 6. I get embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes. | 2.68 | Mild Low |
| 11. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in English classes | 2.78 | Mild Low |
| 16. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English. | 2.68 | Mild Low |
| 18. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. | 3.04 | Mild Low |

*Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Low; 2.50-3.49 = Mild Low*

In Communication Apprehension, the means of 2.49 and 2.47 reveal that the respondents have a low level of anxiety in getting frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in English. On the other hand, the means ranging from 2.64 to 3.02 reveal that the respondents have a mild low level of anxiety in being never quite sure of themselves when they speak in English, feeling nervous while speaking English with native speakers, feeling very self-conscious about

speaking English in front of other students, getting nervous and confused when they are speaking in English classes, and getting nervous when they do not understand every word their English teacher says. Communication apprehension is defined by Horwitz et al. (1986) as "a type of shyness characterized by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people" (p. 127).

The mean range of 2.54 to 3.01 reveals a mild low level of second language anxiety in all the items under the Fear of Negative Evaluation component. Their anxiety is mildly low in being afraid of making mistakes in English classes, not feeling confident when they speak English in classes, being afraid that their English teacher is ready to correct every mistake they make, always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do, and being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English. Fear of negative evaluation refers to the "apprehension about others' evaluation, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128).

Similarly, the means from 2.68 to 3.04 indicate a mild low level of second language speaking in all the items in the Test Anxiety component. The respondents are mildly low in their in trembling when they know that they are going to be called on in English classes, starting to panic when they have to speak without preparation in English classes, getting embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes, feeling their heart pounding when they going to be called on in English classes, feeling overwhelmed by the number of rules they have to learn to speak English and getting nervous when the English teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance. Test anxiety covers the tests and examinations of the language learning process and defined as "a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure" (Horwitz et al., p. 128).

**Speaking Strategies of the Respondents**

Table 4 shows the speaking strategies employed by the respondents. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), speaking strategies are crucial because they help foreign language learners "in negotiating meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a second language learner and a speaker of the target language" (p.43).

**Table 4. Speaking Strategies of the Respondents.**

| **Statements** | **Mean** | **Descriptive Equivalent** |
|---|---|---|
| **Memory** | | |
| 1. I use new words to make sentences to help me remember. | 3.62 | Agree |
| 2. To help me remember new words, I imagine myself in situations related to them. | 3.77 | Agree |
| 3. I often review English texts and recite them. | 3.59 | Agree |
| 4. I learn new words by thinking about where I first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. | 3.73 | Agree |
| **Cognitive** | | |
| 5. I often practice English pronunciation. | 3.71 | Agree |
| 6. I make an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking. | 3.61 | Agree |
| 7. I often watch some English TV programs or movies. | 3.93 | Agree |
| 8. I make summaries of things I hear or read in English. | 3.54 | Agree |
| **Compensation** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. When I can't remember certain words, I use gestures to express them. | 3.61 | Agree |
| 10. I try to guess what people will say next in English. | 3.42 | Not Sure |
| 11. If I can't remember a word when speaking English, I will use synonyms to express it. | 3.57 | Agree |
| 12. When I don't know what word to use in English, I create one up. | 3.35 | Not Sure |
| **Metacognitive** | | |
| 13. I pay close attention when someone speaks English to me. | 3.74 | Agree |
| 14. I look for people who can talk to me in English. | 3.33 | Not Sure |
| 15. I practice oral English by all ways. | 3.44 | Not Sure |
| 16. I often think about how far I've come in my oral English studies. | 3.48 | Not Sure |
| **Affective** | | |
| 17. I encourage myself to speak English even if I am afraid of making mistakes | 3.86 | Agree |
| 18. I try to calm down when I feel scared of using English. | 3.74 | Agree |
| 19. I give myself a gift or a treat when I make progress in spoken English. | 3.06 | Not Sure |
| 20. I exchange my experience of speaking English with others. | 3.31 | Not Sure |
| **Social** | | |
| 21. When I speak English, I ask the teacher to point out my mistakes. | 3.46 | Not Sure |
| 22. If I don't understand what the other person is saying, I ask him to slow down or repeat it. | 3.83 | Agree |
| 23. I ask questions in English. | 3.45 | Not Sure |
| 24. I practice oral English with other students. | 3.47 | Not Sure |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Not Sure; 3.50-4.49 = Agree*

Under Memory strategies, the means from 3.53 to 3.57 indicate that the respondents "Agree" that they use new words to make sentences to help them remember, to help them remember new words, they imagine themselves in situations related to them, they often review English texts and recite them, and they learn new words by thinking about where they first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. Similarly, the respondents also agreed that they often practice English pronunciation, they make an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, they often watch some English TV programs or movies and they make summaries of things they hear or read in English as revealed by the mean range from 3.54 to 3.93 in the items in the Cognitive category of strategies.

In Compensation strategies, they "Agree" that when they cannot remember certain words, they use gestures to express them with a mean of 3.61 and when they cannot remember a word when speaking English, they will use synonyms to express it with a mean of 3.54. They are "Not Sure" using the strategies on trying to guess what people will say next in English and when not knowing what word to use in English, they create one up with respective means of 3.42 and 3.45. In Metacognitive strategies, they "Agree" that they pay close attention when someone speaks English to them with a mean of 3.74. However, they are "Not Sure" if they look for people who can talk to them in English, practice oral English by all ways, and if they often think about how far they have

come in their oral English studies with means ranging from 3.33 to 3.48.

They "Agree" that they encourage themselves to speak English even if they are afraid of making mistakes and they try to calm down when they feel scared of using English in terms of Affective strategies as indicated by the means of 3.86 and 3.74 respectively. But they are "Not Sure" if they give themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English and exchange their experience of speaking English with others with respective means of 3.06 and 3.31. Under Social strategies, they are "Not Sure" that when they speak English, they ask the teacher to point out their mistakes, if they ask questions in English and if they practice oral English with other students with means ranging from 3.45 to 3.47. But they agreed that if they do not understand what the other person is saying, they ask him to slow down or repeat it with a mean of 3.83.

*Difference in Second Language Speaking Anxiety Level of Respondents*

The difference in the second language speaking anxiety of the respondents when grouped according to their course is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Differences in the Second Language Speaking Anxiety of the Respondents when Grouped according to their Course.**

| Statements | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| **Communication Apprehension** | | |
| 1. I am never quite sure of myself when I am speaking in English. | 1.005 ns | .446 |
| 4. I get frightened when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. | 1.490 ns | .119 |
| 7. I feel nervous while speaking English with native speakers. | .590 ns | .862 |
| 8. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. | 1.034 ns | .418 |
| 13. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. | 1.622 ns | .078 |
| 14. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in English classes. | 1.969* | .023 |
| 15. I get nervous when I don't understand every word my English teacher says. | 1.185 ns | .289 |
| **Fear of Negative Evaluation** | | |
| 2. I am afraid of making mistakes in English classes. | 1.621 ns | .078 |
| 9. I don't feel confident when I speak English in classes. | 1.290 ns | .217 |
| 10. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. | .667 ns | .795 |
| 12. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. | 1.299 ns | .212 |
| 17. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. | 1.048 ns | .405 |
| **Test Anxiety** | | |
| 3. I tremble when I know that I am going to be called on in English classes. | .631 ns | .827 |
| 5. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes. | 1.157 ns | .310 |
| 6. I get embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes. | 1.017 ns | .434 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in English classes | 1.243 ns | .247 |
| 16. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English. | .912 ns | .541 |
| 18. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. | 1.930* | .026 |

*Legend: * = Significant; ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The F-values of 0.590 to 1.622 with p-values from 0.862 to 0.078 of all but one of the items in Communication Apprehension indicate no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of the respondents when they are categorized according to their course. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of the respondents when grouped according to course is accepted. This means that regardless their course they are comparable when it comes to being never quite sure of themselves when they are speaking in English, getting frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in English, feeling nervous while speaking English with native speakers, getting upset when they do not understand what the teacher is correcting, feeling very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students and getting nervous when they do not understand every word their English teacher says. However, the respondents differ according to their course in terms of getting nervous and confused when they are speaking in English classes as revealed by the F-value of 1.169 with a p-value of 0.023 which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis stating no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of the respondents when grouped according to their course.

In Fear of Negative Evaluation, the F-values from 0.667 to 1.621 with p-values ranging from 0.795 to 0.078 reveal no difference among the respondents by course in terms of all the items in this component. This indicates that they have speaking anxiety level in terms of being afraid of making mistakes in English classes, not feeling confident when they speak English in classes, being afraid that their English teacher is ready to correct every mistake they make, always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do, and being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English. Thus, the null hypothesis stating no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of respondents when categorized according to course is hereby accepted.

Furthermore, the F-value range from 0.631 to 1.243 with a p-value range from 0.827 to 0.247 indicates no difference among the respondents according to their course in all but one of the items in the Test Anxiety component. This shows that they have a comparable second language speaking anxiety level based on their course in trembling when they know that they are going to be called on in English classes, starting to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes, getting embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes, feeling their heart pounding when they are going to be called on in English classes, and feeling overwhelmed by the number of rules they have to learn to speak English. The null hypothesis stating no difference in the second language speaking anxiety level of the respondents when grouped according is therefore accepted. One item, however, has an F-value of 1.930 with p-value of 0.026 which is statistically significant. This implies that there is a difference among the respondents by course in terms of getting nervous when the English teacher asks questions they have not prepared in advance leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The difference in the speaking anxiety of the respondents when grouped according to sex is shown in Table 6

. **Table 6. Differences in the Speaking Anxiety of the Respondents when Grouped according to their Sex.**

| **Statements** | **Male** | | **Female** | | **t-value** | **p-value** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **DE** | **Mean** | **DE** | | |
| **Communication Apprehension** | | | | | | |
| 1. I am never quite sure of myself when I am speaking in English. | 2.59 | ML | 2.68 | ML | -1.101$^{ns}$ | .272 |
| 4. I get frightened when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. | 2.52 | ML | 2.46 | L | .601 $^{ns}$ | .548 |
| 7. I feel nervous while speaking English with native speakers. | 2.98 | ML | 3.05 | ML | -.576 $^{ns}$ | .565 |
| 8. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. | 2.47 | L | 2.47 | L | -.035 $^{ns}$ | .972 |
| 13. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. | 2.89 | ML | 3.01 | ML | -.975 $^{ns}$ | .330 |
| 14. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in English classes. | 2.85 | ML | 2.71 | ML | 1.187 $^{ns}$ | .236 |
| 15. I get nervous when I don't understand every word my English teacher says. | 2.72 | ML | 2.61 | ML | .961 $^{ns}$ | .337 |
| **Fear of Negative Evaluation** | | | | | | |
| 2. I am afraid of making mistakes in English classes. | 2.95 | ML | 3.07 | ML | -1.161 $^{ns}$ | .246 |
| 9. I don't feel confident when I speak English in classes. | 2.73 | ML | 2.67 | ML | .558 $^{ns}$ | .577 |
| 10. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. | 2.54 | ML | 2.54 | ML | -.071 $^{ns}$ | .943 |
| 12. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. | 2.85 | ML | 2.89 | ML | -.312 $^{ns}$ | .755 |
| 17. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. | 2.89 | ML | 3.01 | ML | -1.199 $^{ns}$ | .231 |
| **Test Anxiety** | | | | | | |
| 3. I tremble when I know that I am going to be called on in English classes. | 2.77 | ML | 2.69 | ML | .678 $^{ns}$ | .498 |
| 5. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes. | 3.01 | ML | 2.98 | ML | .321 $^{ns}$ | .749 |
| 6. I get embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes. | 2.67 | ML | 2.69 | ML | -.157 $^{ns}$ | .876 |
| 11. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in English classes | 2.82 | ML | 2.75 | ML | .616 $^{ns}$ | .538 |
| 16. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English. | 2.71 | ML | 2.66 | ML | .437 $^{ns}$ | .663 |
| 18. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. | 2.96 | ML | 3.11 | ML | -1.284 $^{ns}$ | .200 |

*Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Low (L); 2.50-3.49 = Mild Low (ML); ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The mean values from 2.47 to 2.89 rated as Low to Mild Low from the male respondents and the mean values from 2.46 to 3.05 also rated as Low to Mild Low from the female respondents are not significant. This is indicated by the t-values from -0.035 to 1.187 with p-values from 0.972 to 0.236. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the second language speaking anxiety of the male and female respondents is hereby accepted. This means that in terms of Communication Apprehension, male and female students from the private colleges in Cauayan City have are comparable in being never quite sure of themselves when they are speaking in English, getting frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in English, feeling nervous while speaking English with native speakers, getting upset when they do not understand what the teacher is correcting, feeling very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students, getting nervous and confused when they speaking in English classes and getting nervous when they do understand every word their English teacher says.

Also, the male and female respondents are comparable in being afraid of making mistakes in English classes, not feeling confident when they speak English in classes, being afraid that their English teacher is ready to correct every mistake they make, always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do, and being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English. This is shown by the means from 2.54 to 2.95 from males and 2.54 to 3.05 from females which are all rated as Mild Low for all these items in Fear of Negative Evaluation which are not significant as further revealed by the t-values from -0.071 to -1.199 with p-values from 0.943 to 0.231. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Furthermore, the mean values from 2.67 to 3.01 from the males and the mean values from 2.66 to 3.11 from the females all rated as Mild Low in the items under Test Anxiety are not significant as shown by the t-values from -0.157 to -1.284 with corresponding p-values from 0.867 to 0.200. Again, the null hypothesis stating a difference of second language speaking anxiety among males and females is accepted. Both males and females have the same level of anxiety in trembling when they know that are going to be called on in English classes, starting to panic when they have to speak without preparation in English classes, getting embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes, feeling their heart pounding when they are going to be called on in English classes, feeling overwhelmed by the number of rules they have to learn to speak English, and getting nervous when the English teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance.

In Communication Apprehension, the means from 2.00 to 3.00 described as “Mild Low” and “Low” by all first language groups for the item on not being never quite sure of themselves when they are speaking in English are not significant as shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.707 and p-value of 0.588. Also, the means from 2.00 to 3.00 described as “Mild Low” and “Low” by all groups for the item on getting frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in English are not significant as shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.598 and p-value of 0.665. The same is true for the means from all groups of 1.00 to 2.51 which are described as “Mild Low” to “Very Low”, 2.25 to 3.04 which are “Mild Low” and “Low”, 2.00 to 2.87 which are “Mild Low” and “Low” and 2.00 to 2.71 which are “Mild Low” and “Low” for the items on getting upset when they do not understand what the teacher is correcting, feeling very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students, getting nervous and confused when they are speaking in English classes, and getting nervous when they do not understand every word their English teacher says with corresponding correlation coefficients of 0.418 to 1.4498 and p-values of 0.202 to 0.796 are not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis stating that there is no difference in the speaking anxiety level of the respondents based on first language is hereby accepted. The first language groups have no difference in their speaking anxiety levels in the abovementioned items. The item on feeling

nervous while speaking English with native speakers, however, garnered means from 2.83 to 4.00 which are described as "Mild Low" and "High Anxiety" which are significant as revealed by the correlation coefficient of 2.541 and p-value of 0.040. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The first language groups have a difference in their speaking anxiety levels on this parameter in Communication Apprehension.

In Fear of Negative Evaluation, the mean ranges from 2.50 to 3.13, 1.50 to 2.84, 1.50 to 2.59, 2.50 to 3.00 and 2.25 to 3.00 described as "Mild Low" and "Low" with 0.613, 2.166, 0.610, 0.244, and 1.244 corresponding correlation coefficient and 0.654, 0.073, 0.655, 0.913, and 0.280 are not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that all first language groups have a comparable speaking anxiety level in terms of being afraid of making mistakes in English classes, no feeling confident when they speak English in classes, being afraid that their English teacher is ready to correct every mistake they make, always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do, and being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English.

Finally, in Test Anxiety, the mean ranges from 2.00 to 3.00, 2.00 to 3.13, 1.50 to 3.00, 1.50 to 2.93, 2.00 to 2.72 and 2.00 t0 3.24 described as "Mild Low" and "Low" with 1.442, 0.804, 0.732, 1.386, 0.395 and 1.731 corresponding correlation coefficients and 0.220, 0.523, 0.570, 0.239, 0.812, and 0.143 respective p-values are not significant. This again calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implies that regardless of their first language group, the respondents are comparable in their speaking anxiety levels in trembling when they know that they are going to be called on in English classes, starting to panic when they have to speak without preparation in English classes, getting embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes, feeling their heart pounding when they are going to be called on in English classes, feeling overwhelmed by the number of rules they have to learn to speak English and getting nervous when the English teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance.

*Difference in the Speaking Strategies of Respondents*

Table 8 shows the difference in the speaking strategies of respondents as per their course.

**Table 8. Differences in the Speaking Strategies of the Respondents when Grouped according to their Course.**

| **Statements** | **F-value** | **p-value** |
|---|---|---|
| **Memory** | | |
| 1. I use new words to make sentences to help me remember. | .812 $^{ns}$ | .647 |
| 2. To help me remember new words, I imagine myself in situations related to them. | .794 $^{ns}$ | .666 |
| 3. I often review English texts and recite them. | 1.191 $^{ns}$ | .284 |
| 4. I learn new words by thinking about where I first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. | .618 $^{ns}$ | .839 |
| **Cognitive** | | |
| 5. I often practice English pronunciation. | .610 $^{ns}$ | .846 |
| 6. I make an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking. | 1.417 $^{ns}$ | .150 |
| 7. I often watch some English TV programs or movies. | .637 $^{ns}$ | .823 |
| 8. I make summaries of things I hear or read in English. | 1.355 $^{ns}$ | .180 |
| **Compensation** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. When I can't remember certain words, I use gestures to express them. | 1.362 ns | .176 |
| 10. I try to guess what people will say next in English | .881 ns | .573 |
| 11. If I can't remember a word when speaking English, I will use synonyms to express it. | 1.339 ns | .189 |
| 12. When I don't know what word to use in English, I create one up. | 1.108 ns | .351 |
| **Metacognitive** | | |
| 13. I pay close attention when someone speaks English to me. | .803 ns | .657 |
| 14. I look for people who can talk to me in English. | .903 ns | .550 |
| 15. I practice oral English by all ways. | .784 ns | .677 |
| 16. I often think about how far I've come in my oral English studies. | .773 ns | .688 |
| **Affective** | | |
| 17. I encourage myself to speak English even if I am afraid of making mistakes. | .669 ns | .793 |
| 18. I try to calm down when I feel scared of using English. | 1.079 ns | .377 |
| 19. I give myself a gift or a treat when I make progress in spoken English. | .581 ns | .869 |
| 20. I exchange my experience of speaking English with others. | 1.400 ns | .158 |
| **Social** | | |
| 21. When I speak English, I ask the teacher to point out my mistakes. | 1.401 ns | .157 |
| 22. If I don't understand what the other person is saying, I ask him to slow down or repeat it. | 1.850* | .035 |
| 23. I ask questions in English. | 1.117 ns | .343 |
| 24. I practice oral English with other students. | 1.029 ns | .422 |

*Legend: * = Significant; ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The F-values from 0.618 to 1.191 with p-values from 0.839 to 0.284 for the Memory strategies as to courses of the respondents are not significant. This calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents based on their course. Therefore, the respondents regardless of their course comparably uses new words to make sentences to help me remember, imagine themselves in situations related to new words to help them remember them, often reviews English texts and recite them and learns new words by thinking about where they first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. Also, the F-values from 0.610 to 1.417 with p-values from 0.846 to 0.150 for the Cognitive Strategies based on the course of the respondents are not significant. This again calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Regardless of their course, the respondents have a comparable utilization of the specific speaking strategies in often practicing English pronunciation, making an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, often watching some English TV programs or movies, making summaries of things they hear or read in English.

Moreover, the F-values from 0.881 to 1.362 with p-values 0.573 to 1.362 for the Compensation strategies as to course are not significant which leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis stating no difference in speaking strategies as per the course of the respondents. This means that regardless of their course, they use gestures to express certain words when they cannot remember them, try to guess what people will say next in English, will use synonyms to express it if they cannot remember a word when speaking English, and when they do not know what word to use in

English, they create one up. Furthermore, the F-values from 0.773 to 0.903 with p-values from 0.657 to 0.550 for the Metacognitive strategies as to course are not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that all respondents in all courses have a comparable use of the specific strategies of paying close attention when someone speaks English to them, looking for people who can talk to them in English, practicing oral English by all ways and often thinking about how far they have come in their oral English studies. Similarly, the F-values from 0.581 to 1.400 with p-values from 0.869 to 0.158 for Affective strategies as to course are not significant. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the speaking strategies of respondents based on course. Whatever their course, they are the same in encouraging themselves to speak English even if they afraid of making mistakes, trying to calm down when they feel scared of using English, giving themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English, and exchanging their experience of speaking English with others.

Finally, the F-values from 1.209 to 1.401 with p-values from 0.422 to 0.157 for three Social strategies are not significant. This calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implies that whatever their course is, whatever their course is, they are the same in encouraging themselves to speak English even if they are afraid of making mistakes, trying to calm down when they feel scared of using English, giving themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English, and exchanging their experience of speaking English with others. There is one item, however that garnered an F-value of 1.850 with a p-value of 0.035 which is significant which calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis. The respondents differ based on course in the Social strategy that if they do not understand what the other person is saying, they ask him to slow down or repeat it.

The difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents based on sex is shown in Table 9.

**Table 9. Differences in the Speaking Strategies of the Respondents when Grouped according to their Sex.**

| Statements | Male | | Female | | t-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| **Memory** | | | | | | |
| 1. I use new words to make sentences to help me remember. | 3.59 | A | 3.65 | A | -.646 ns | .519 |
| 2. To help me remember new words, I imagine myself in situations related to them. | 3.76 | A | 3.78 | A | -.182 ns | .856 |
| 3. I often review English texts and recite them. | 3.54 | A | 3.63 | A | -.939 ns | .349 |
| 4. I learn new words by thinking about where I first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. | 3.67 | A | 3.79 | A | -1.438 ns | .151 |
| **Cognitive** | | | | | | |
| 5. I often practice English pronunciation. | 3.73 | A | 3.69 | A | .464 ns | .643 |
| 6. I make an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking. | 3.62 | A | 3.60 | A | .120 ns | .905 |
| 7. I often watch some English TV programs or movies. | 3.89 | A | 3.97 | A | -.776 ns | .438 |
| 8. I make summaries of things I hear or read in English. | 3.55 | A | 3.53 | A | .164 ns | .870 |
| **Compensation** | | | | | | |
| 9. When I can't remember certain words, I use gestures to express them. | 3.51 | A | 3.71 | A | -2.052* | .041 |
| 10. I try to guess what people will say next in English. | 3.37 | NS | 3.47 | NS | -.963 ns | .336 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. If I can't remember a word when speaking English, I will use synonyms to express it. | 3.53 | A | 3.60 | A | -.758 ns | .449 |
| 12. When I don't know what word to use in English, I create one up. | 3.35 | NS | 3.34 | NS | .059 ns | .953 |
| **Metacognitive** | | | | | | |
| 13. I pay close attention when someone speaks English to me. | 3.81 | A | 3.67 | A | 1.453 ns | .147 |
| 14. I look for people who can talk to me in English. | 3.30 | NS | 3.36 | NS | -.611 ns | .542 |
| 15. I practice oral English by all ways. | 3.47 | NS | 3.42 | NS | .438 ns | .662 |
| 16. I often think about how far I've come in my oral English studies. | 3.50 | A | 3.45 | NS | .470 ns | .639 |
| **Affective** | | | | | | |
| 17. I encourage myself to speak English even if I am afraid of making mistakes | 3.81 | A | 3.90 | A | -1.071 ns | .285 |
| 18. I try to calm down when I feel scared of using English. | 3.74 | A | 3.75 | A | -.049 ns | .961 |
| 19. I give myself a gift or a treat when I make progress in spoken English. | 3.11 | NS | 3.01 | NS | .982 ns | .327 |
| 20. I exchange my experience of speaking English with others. | 3.29 | NS | 3.33 | NS | -.408 ns | .684 |
| **Social** | | | | | | |
| 21. When I speak English, I ask the teacher to point out my mistakes. | 3.47 | NS | 3.44 | NS | .300 ns | .765 |
| 22. If I don't understand what the other person is saying, I ask him to slow down or repeat it. | 3.84 | A | 3.82 | A | .214 ns | .831 |
| 23. I ask questions in English. | 3.42 | NS | 3.47 | NS | -.467 ns | .641 |
| 24. I practice oral English with other students. | 3.40 | NS | 3.54 | A | -1.211 ns | .227 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Not Sure (NS); 3.50-4.49 = Agree (A); * = Significant; ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The means from 3.54 to 3.76 from the male respondents and the means from 3.63

to 3.79 from the female respondents which are all rated as "Agree" for the Memory strategies reveal no significant difference as evidenced by the t-values from -0.182 to -1.438 whose corresponding p-values are from 0.856 to 0.151. This calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis stating no difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents based on their sex. This implies that male and female respondents have a comparative use of the strategies in using new words to make sentences to help them remember, imagining myself in situations related to new words to help them remember them, often reviewing English texts and reciting them and learning new words by thinking about where they first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. Similarly, the means from 3.55 to 3.89 from the male respondents and the means from 3.53 to 3.97 which are all rated as "Agree" for the Cognitive strategies are not significantly difference as evidenced by the t-values from 0.120 to -0.776 whose corresponding p-values are from 0.438 to 0.905. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implies that male and female respondents have a comparative use of the strategies in often practicing English pronunciation, making an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, often watching some English TV programs or movies and making summaries of things they hear or read in English.

The means from 3.35 to 3.53 from the males and the means from 3.34 to 3.60 from the females for three Compensation strategies rated as "Not Sure" and "Agree" are not significant as shown by the t-values from 0.059 to -0.963 and p-values from 0.336 to 0.953. This of course leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis stating no difference in the speaking strategies of respondents as to sex. This means that whether male or female, the respondents are comparable in using the specific strategies of trying to guess what people will say next in English, using synonyms to express a word if they cannot remember a word when speaking English, and creating one up when they do not know what word to use in English. However, the mean of 3.51 of the males and the mean of 3.71 from the females rated as "Agree" with a t-value of -2.052 are significant at a p-value of 0.041. This rejects the null hypothesis. This implies that between males and females, there is a difference in using the compensation strategy of using gestures to express certain words when they cannot remember certain them. Furthermore, the means of 3.30 to 3.81 from the males and the means of 3.36 to 3.67 from the females for the Metacognitive strategies rated as "Agree" and "Not Sure" with t-values from -0.611 to 1.453 are not significant at p-values of 0.147 to 0.669. This again calls for the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that males and females have the same utilization of the strategies in paying close attention when someone speaks English to them, looking for people who can talk to me in English, practicing oral English by all ways and often thinking about how far they have come in their oral English studies.

Similarly, the means of 3.11 to 3.81 from the males and the means of 3.01 to 3.90 for the Affective strategies rated as "Not Sure" and "Agree" with t-values from -1.071 to 0.982 are not significant at p-values of 0.285 to 0.961. This accepts the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is a comparable usage males and females of the strategies in encouraging themselves to speak English even if they are afraid of making mistakes, trying to calm down when they feel scared of using English, giving themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English and exchanging their experience of speaking English with others. Lastly, the means of 3.40 to 3.84 from the males and the means of 3.44 to 3.82 from the females for the Social strategies rated as "Not Sure" and "Agree" with t-values from t -1.211 to 0.214 are not significant at p-values from 0.227 to 0.831. This means that the males and females are comparable in strategies in asking the teacher to point out their mistakes when they speak English, asking ask him to slow down or repeat it if they do not understand what the other person is saying, asking questions in English, and practicing oral English with other students.

On Memory strategies, the means from 3.75 to 4.50 and 3.00 to 4.00 described as "Not Sure", "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" with 0.670 and 1.139 corresponding f-values and 0.613 and 0.338 p-values are not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the speaking strategies based on their first language is accepted. This indicates that regardless of their first language, the respondents have a comparable use of the speaking strategies in imagining themselves in situations related to new words to help them remember them and learning new words by thinking about where they first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. On the other hand the mean ranges from 3.00 to 4.50 and 2.00 to 5.00 described from "Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" are significant as shown by 2.910 and 1.139 corresponding f-values and 0.022 and 0.037 respective p-values. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In terms of first language, the respondents differ in the utilization of the strategies on using new words to make sentences to help them remember and often reviewing English texts and recite them.

On Cognitive strategies, the mean ranges from 3.00 to 4.45, 3.00 to 5.00, 3.58 to 5.00, and 3.00 to 5.00 described as "Not Sure" to "Strongly Agree" with 1.827, 2.028, 1.073 and 2.389 corresponding f-values and 0.123, .090, 0.370and 0.051 respective p-values are not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Regardless of their first

language, the respondents are comparable in often practicing English pronunciation, making an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, often watching some English TV programs or movies and making summaries of things they hear or read in English.

On Compensation strategies, the mean ranges from 3.00 to 4.50, 2.00 to 4.50, 3.00 to 4.00 and 3.00 to 4.00 described as "Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" with 2.061, 1.457, 0.805 and 0.587 corresponding f-values, 0.086, 0.215, 0.523 and 0.672 respective p-values are not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is again acceptedt. This means that all first language groups have the same usage of using gestures to express certain words when they cannot remember them, trying to guess what people will say next in English, using synonyms to express a word if they cannot remember a word when speaking English, creating one up when they do not know what word to use in English.

On Metacognitive strategies, the mean ranges from 3.67 to 4.50, 3.00 to 5.00, and 2.00 to 4.50 described as "Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" with 0.586, 2.110, and1.398 corresponding f-values and 0.673, 0.079, and 0.234 respective p-values are not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. All first language groups have the same usage of the strategies on paying close attention when someone speaks English to them, looking for people who can talk to them in English, and often thinking about how far they have come in their oral English studies. However, the mean range from 2.00 to 5.00 described as "Disagree" to "Not Sure" with 2.900 f-value and 0.022 p-value is significant. This means that the respondents in terms of their first language differ in using the strategy on practicing oral English by all ways.

On Affective strategies, the means from 3.79 to 4.50, 3.75 to 4.00, 2.00 to 3.50 and 2.00 to 4.50 described as "Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" with 0.520, 0.477, 0.819, 1.256 corresponding f-values and 0.721, 0.753, 0.514 and 0.287 respective p-values are not significant. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted. This means that all first language groups have the same utilization of the strategies on encouraging themselves to speak English even if they are afraid of making mistakes, trying to calm down when they feel scared of using English, giving themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English, and exchanging their experience of speaking English with others.

Lastly, on Social strategies, the mean range from 2.00 to 4.50, 3.00 to 4.50, 3.00 to 4.00 and 3.00 to 4.00 described as "Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" with 1.391, 0.492, 0.430, and 0.971 corresponding f-values and 0.237, 0.742, 0.787 and 0.424 respective p-values are similarly not significant. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Regardless of their first language, the respondents have the same usage of the strategies on asking the teacher to point out their mistakes when they speak English, asking him to slow down or repeat it if they do not understand what the other person is saying, asking questions in English and practicing oral English with other students.

*Relationship between the Speaking Anxiety Level and Speaking Strategies of the Respondents*

The relationship between the speaking anxiety level and speaking strategies of respondents is shown in Table 11.

**Table 11. Relationship between the Speaking Anxiety Level and Speaking Strategies of the Respondents.**

| | **Communication Apprehension** | | **Fear of Negative Evaluation** | | **Test Anxiety** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Correlation Coefficient** | **p-value** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **p-value** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **p-value** |
| **Memory** | -.077 $^{ns}$ | .165 | -.043 $^{ns}$ | .444 | -.042 $^{ns}$ | .454 |
| **Cognitive** | -.147* | .008 | -.145* | .009 | -.131* | .018 |
| **Compensation** | -.011 $^{ns}$ | .849 | -.005 $^{ns}$ | .926 | -.005 $^{ns}$ | .923 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Metacognitive** | -.085 ns | .127 | -.085 ns | .128 | -.064 ns | .246 |
| **Affective** | -.023 ns | .673 | -.083 ns | .137 | -.054 ns | .333 |
| **Social** | -.031 ns | .574 | -.083 ns | .137 | -.070 ns | .206 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

It can be gleaned from the table that five of the six speaking strategy categories do not correlate with the categories of speaking anxiety. The correlation coefficients for Memory and Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety which are -0.077, -0.043 and -0.042 are not significant as shown by their respective p-values of 0.165, -0.044 and 0.454. The same is true with Compensation vis-à-vis the speaking anxiety categories with correlation coefficients of -0.011, -0.005 and -0.005 with p-values of 0.849, 0.926 and 0.923. So with Metacognitive whose correlation coefficients matched with the speaking anxiety categories are -0.085, -0.085 and -0.064 at 0.127, 0.128 and 0.246 p-values, Affective with correlation coefficients -0.023, -0.083 and -0.054 at 0.673, 0.137 and 0.333 p-values, and Social with correlation coefficients -0.031, -0.083 and -0.070 at 0.574, 0.137 and 0.206 p-values. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between the speaking strategies and the speaking anxiety levels of the respondents is hereby accepted.

Nevertheless, the Cognitive category of speaking strategies negatively correlated with the second language speaking anxiety levels in the categories of Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety. This is shown by the correlation coefficients of -0.147, -0.145 and -0.131 with corresponding p-values of 0.008, 0.009 and 0.018. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that as their use of the Cognitive speaking strategies on often practicing English pronunciation, making an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, often watching some English TV programs or movies, making summaries of things I hear or read in English increases, their second language speaking anxiety level in all three categories decreases.

*Purposive Communication Performance of Respondents*

Table 12 shows the performance of the respondents from the private colleges of Cauayan City in their Purposive Communication subject.

**Table 12. Performance of the Respondents in the Purposive Communication Subject.**

| **Performance** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
|---|---|---|
| Passed | 35 | 10.8 |
| Fair | 18 | 5.5 |
| Satisfactory | 102 | 31.4 |
| Good | 148 | 45.5 |
| Very Good | 22 | 6.8 |
| **Total** | **325** | **100.0** |

It can be gleaned from the table that 148 0r 45.5 % of the 325 total respondents had a Good performance in Purposive Communication. This is followed those who had a Satisfactory performance with 102 or 31.4 %, Passed with 35 or 10.8%, Very Good with 22 or 6.8%, and Fair with 18 or 5.5%. Generally, the performance in the said course of the respondents is on the average, not very high and not very low or somewhere in the middle.

*Relationship between Second Language Speaking Anxiety Level and Purposive Communication Performance*

The relationship between the respondents' second language speaking anxiety level and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject is shown in Table 13.

**Table 13. Relationship between the Respondents' Second Language Speaking Anxiety Level and their Performance in Purposive Communication Subject.**

| Statements | Correlation Coefficient | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| **Communication Apprehension** | | |
| 1. I am never quite sure of myself when I am speaking in English. | -.067 ns | .227 |
| 4. I get frightened when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. | -.205* | .001 |
| 7. I feel nervous while speaking English with native speakers. | -.086 ns | .123 |
| 8. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. | -.051 ns | .363 |
| 13. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. | -.097 ns | .080 |
| 14. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in English classes. | -.205* | .001 |
| 15. I get nervous when I don't understand every word my English teacher says. | -.112* | .044 |
| **Fear of Negative Evaluation** | | |
| 2. I am afraid of making mistakes in English classes. | -.065 ns | .242 |
| 9. I don't feel confident when I speak English in classes. | -.202* | .001 |
| 10. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. | -.171* | .002 |
| 12. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. | -.011 ns | .847 |
| 17. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. | -.037 ns | .504 |
| **Test Anxiety** | | |
| 3. I tremble when I know that I am going to be called on in English classes. | -.147* | .008 |
| 5. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes. | -.183* | .001 |
| 6. I get embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes. | -.079 ns | .155 |
| 11. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in English classes | -.154* | .005 |
| 16. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English. | -.118* | .034 |
| 18. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. | -.062 ns | .264 |

*Legend: * = Significant; ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The correlation coefficients ranging from -0.051 to -0.097 with p-values from 0.363 to 0.080 for four items in Communication Apprehension, namely the respondents' being never quite sure of themselves when they are speaking in English, feeling nervous while speaking English with native speakers, getting upset when they do not understand what the teacher is correcting and feeling very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students reveal no significant relationship with their performance in Purposive Communication. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between second language speaking anxiety and performance in Purposive Communication is accepted. On the other hand, three items garnered correlation coefficients of -0.112 to -0.205 and corresponding p-values of 0.044 to 0.001 which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a negative relationship of these three items with the Purposive Communication grade of the respondents. This means that as the respondents' getting frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in English, getting nervous and confused when they are speaking in English classes, and getting nervous when they do not understand every word their English teacher says increases, it follows that their performance in Purposive Communication decreases.

In Fear of Negative Evaluation, three items registered no significant correlation with the respondents' performance in Purposive Communication. They are being afraid of making mistakes in English classes, always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do, and being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English as indicated by the correlation coefficients which straddle between -0.011 to -0.65 and corresponding p-values from 0.847 to 0.242. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Two items, however, registered correlation coefficients of -0.202 and -0.171 which are significant as revealed by their respective p-values of 0.001 and 0.002. Again, the correlation is inverse. This means that as the respondents' always feeling that the other students speak English better than they do and their being afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak English increases, it follows that their performance in Purposive Communication decreases. This calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Another four items in Test Anxiety with correlation coefficients ranging from -0.118 to -0.183 are significant as indicated by the p-values from 0.034 to 0.001 which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is also a negative correlation, As there is an increase in the respondents' trembling when they know that they are going to be called on in English classes, starting to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English classes, feeling their heart pounding when they are going to be called on in English classes, and feeling overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English, there is a resultant decrease in their performance in Purposive Communication. The other two items on getting embarrassed to volunteer answers in English classes and getting nervous when the English teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance have respective correlation coefficients of -0.62 to -0.79 and corresponding p-values of 0.155 and 0.264 which are not significant leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

*Relationship between Speaking Strategies and Purposive Communication Performance*

Table 14 shows the relationship between the speaking strategies and Purposive Communication performance of the respondents.

**Table 14. Relationship between the Respondents' Speaking Strategies and their Performance in Purposive Communication Subject.**

| Statements | Correlation Coefficient | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| **Memory** | | |
| 1. I use new words to make sentences to help me remember. | .146* | .008 |
| 2. To help me remember new words, I imagine myself in situations related to them. | .114* | .039 |
| 3. I often review English texts and recite them. | .151* | .006 |
| 4. I learn new words by thinking about where I first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. | .188* | .001 |
| **Cognitive** | | |
| 5. I often practice English pronunciation. | .058 ns | .300 |
| 6. I make an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking. | .092 ns | .096 |
| 7. I often watch some English TV programs or movies. | .107 ns | .054 |
| 8. I make summaries of things I hear or read in English. | .079 ns | .154 |
| **Compensation** | | |
| 9. When I can't remember certain words, I use gestures to express them. | .228* | .001 |
| 10. I try to guess what people will say next in English | .093 ns | .096 |
| 11. If I can't remember a word when speaking English, I will use synonyms to express it. | .131* | .018 |
| 12. When I don't know what word to use in English, I create one up. | -.009 ns | .872 |
| **Metacognitive** | | |
| 13. I pay close attention when someone speaks English to me. | .156* | .005 |
| 14. I look for people who can talk to me in English. | .048 ns | .384 |
| 15. I practice oral English by all ways. | .053 ns | .344 |
| 16. I often think about how far I've come in my oral English studies. | .034 ns | .543 |
| **Affective** | | |
| 17. I encourage myself to speak English even if I am afraid of making mistakes | .213* | .001 |
| 18. I try to calm down when I feel scared of using English. | .091 ns | .103 |
| 19. I give myself a gift or a treat when I make progress in spoken English. | .080 ns | .149 |
| 20. I exchange my experience of speaking English with others. | .083 ns | .134 |
| **Social** | | |
| 21. When I speak English, I ask the teacher to point out my mistakes. | .007 ns | .907 |
| 22. If I don't understand what the other person is saying, I ask him to slow down or repeat it. | .040 ns | .476 |
| 23. I ask questions in English. | .077 ns | .168 |
| 24. I practice oral English with other students. | .011 ns | .839 |

*Legend: * = Significant; ns = Not Significant at 0.05 level*

It can be gleaned from the table that all the Memory strategies positively correlate with Purposive Communication performance. The correlation coefficients from 0.114 to 0.183 are all statistically significant as shown by their corresponding p-values from 0.039 to 0.001. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that the speaking strategies of the respondents of the respondents have no

relationship to their performance in Purposive Communication is hereby rejected. This implies that as the private college students' using of new words to make sentences to help them remember, imagining themselves situations related to them to help them remember new words, often reviewing English texts and recite them, learning new words by thinking about where they first saw them on the page, on the board, or on a street sign increases, their performance in Purposive Communication also increases. However, all the strategies in the Cognitive category do not correlate to their performance in Purposive Communication. Their strategies of practicing English pronunciation, making an effort to converse with those who are fluent in English-speaking, often watching some English TV programs or movies, and making summaries of things they hear or read in English do not have a relationship with their performance in Purposive Communication as shown by the correlation coefficients from 0.057 to 0.107 and corresponding p-values from 0.300 to 0.054. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Furthermore, two Compensation strategies correlate to the respondents' Purposive Communication performance. Their strategies in using gestures to express words when they cannot remember certain them and using synonyms to express a word if they cannot remember it when speaking English garnered respective positive correlation coefficients of 0.228 and 0.131 which are statistically significant at corresponding respective p-values of 0.001 and 0.018. This then leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The two other strategies of trying to guess what people will say next in English and creating a word up when they do not know what one to use in English with respective correlation coefficients of 0.093 to -0.009 with p-values of 0.096 and 0.872 which are not significant. This led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis stating that there is a relationship between speaking strategies and Purposive Communication performance. Under the Metacognitive strategies, one posted a positive correlation with Purposive Communication performance which is shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.156 and p-value of 0.005. This calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that as the respondents' paying close attention when someone speaks English to them increases, their performance in Purposive Communication increases. The other three strategies under this same category did not post statistically significant correlation as shown by the coefficients from 0.034 to 0.53 with p-values of 0.543 to 0.344. This means that the null hypothesis has to be accepted. The specific Metacognitive strategies of looking for people who can talk to them in English, practicing oral English by all ways and often thinking about how far they have come in their oral English studies do not have a relationship with the respondents' performance in Purposive Communication.

Similarly, one strategy in the Affective category also posted a positive correlation with Purposive Communication performance which is shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.213 and p-value of 0.001 which is statistically significant. As their use of the strategy on encouraging themselves to speak English even if they are afraid of making mistakes increase, their performance in Purposive Communication also decreases. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The rest of the Affective strategies did not post a correlation though. Their correlation coefficients from 0.080 to 0.091 are not significant at 0.149 to 0.103 p-values. This implies that their strategies in trying to calm down when they feel scared of using English, giving themselves a gift or a treat when they make progress in spoken English, and exchanging their experience of speaking English with others have no relationship with their Purposive Communication performance. Finaly, all Social strategies do not correlate with the respondents' Purposive Communication performance. The correlation coefficients from 0.007 to 0.077 are not statistically significant at 0.907 to 0.168 p-values. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no relationship between speaking strategies and Purposive Communication performance is to be rejected. This further means that the speaking strategies of asking the teacher to point out their mistakes when they speak English, asking him to slow down or repeat it if they do not

understand what the other person is saying, asking questions in English and practicing oral English with other students have nothing to do with their performance in Purposive Communication.

**Conclusions:**

Based on the abovementioned finding, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The profile of the respondents reveals a diverse representation of courses, gender and first language emphasizing the need to account for these demographic variables when analyzing and interpreting the study's findings.
2. The low to mild low second language speaking anxiety level or the respondents means that they have been familiar to using English as a second language in their classrooms and this familiarity has decrease anxiety levels.
3. The respondents use all of the speaking strategies but Compensation and Affective are the least. They frequently use Memory and Cognitive ones. Thus, they rely mostly on mental strategies to improve their speaking skills in a second language.
4. There is generally no difference in the second language speaking of the respondents when grouped according to their course and sex. This implies that across groups under these variables, the low to mild low level is generally experienced by all.
5. There is generally no difference in the speaking strategies of the respondents when grouped according to their course and sex. This implies that across groups under these variables, the same speaking strategies are generally utilized to aid in and improve speaking.
6. There is a negative relationship between the Cognitive strategies and all the areas of speaking anxiety. This means that among the strategies, they are the ones that help the most in lowering speaking anxiety.
7. The performance of the respondents in Purposive Communication subject is Good. Private college students are on the average as to competencies in writing, speaking, and presenting to different audiences and for various purposes.
8. There is a negative relationship between certain items in second language speaking anxiety level and their performance in the Purposive Communication subject. When anxiety attacks, performance in communication as a result decreases.
9. There is a positive relationship between several speaking strategies and performance in Purposive Communication. This indicates that conscious speaking strategy use will enhance one's communicative performance.

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher hereby recommends the following:

1. Teachers are encouraged to maintain a conducive learning environment to further lower the speaking anxiety level of the students in Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety.
2. Teachers are advised to encourage students to develop and enhance their speaking strategies. Students are also advised to be conscious of speaking strategy utilization.
3. Teachers are encouraged to plan a localized intervention program to lower the speaking anxiety level of students as well as an intervention program to enhance and develop their speaking strategies.
4. Teachers who teach Purposive Communication subjects are encouraged to maintain a stress-free learning environment to not increase and lower the level of speaking anxiety of the students. Likewise, they are encouraged to have a speaking skills activities that will develop and enhance students' speaking strategies.
5. Future researchers are highly encouraged to administer the same research in government schools for more further inquiry.

6. Language teachers, syllabus designers, and material developers are suggested to be aware of the existence of second language speaking anxiety and speaking strategies to come up intervention program to decrease the level of speaking anxiety and develop and enhance the speaking strategy of students.
7. Researchers are highly encouraged to administer the same research in other schools for more conclusive results.

**References:**

1. Ahmad Al-Khotaba, H. H. et. al. (2020). Foreign language speaking anxiety: A psycholinguistic barrier affecting speaking achievement of Saudi EFL learners. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 10.
2. Alih, N. A. C. et al. (2023). Cycle of Fear of Learning a Foreign Language: Does
3. Anzanni, S., & Dewi, D. N. (2023). The Correlation between Vocational Students' Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Performances in Learning English. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 10(2), 1849-1862.
4. Aziz, A. A., & Kashinathan, S. (2021). ESL learners' challenges in speaking English in Malaysian classroom. Development, 10(2), 983-991
5. Bakar, N. A. et al. (2013). Enhancing ESL learners speaking skills through asynchronous online discussion forum. Asian Social Science, 9(9), 224.
6. Basalama, N., Bay, I. W., & Abubakar, A. (2020). Student's learning strategies in English speaking class. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, *1*(1), 27-39.
7. Bashori, M. et. al. (2022). Web-based language learning and speaking anxiety. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 35(5-6), 1058-1089.
8. Bordios, R. et. al. (2022). Level of Anxiety in Speaking English Among College Students. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 4(1), 52-63.
9. Botes, E. et. al. (2020). The foreign language classroom anxiety scale and academic achievement: An overview of the prevailing literature and a meta-analysis. Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning, 2(1), 26-56.
10. Bradasawi, K.J.I. et al (2020). THE SOURCES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPEAKING ANXIETY AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFICIENCY LEVELS AND DEGREE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPEAKING ANXIETY
11. Çağatay, S. (2015). Examining EFL students' foreign language speaking anxiety: The case at a Turkish state university. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199, 648-656.
12. Dang, V. T., & Nguyen, T. (2022). Foreign Language Reading Anxiety and Its Correlation with Reading Test Scores. In International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education Technology (pp. 168-181). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
13. Daud, A. et. al. (2019). Factors contributing to speaking anxiety: A case study of pre-service English teachers. Journal of Educational Sciences, 3(3), 412-422.
14. Dev, S., & Qiqieh, S. (2016). The relationship between English language proficiency, academic achievement and self-esteem of non-native-English-speaking students. International Education Studies, 9(5), 147-155.
15. Egbe, C. I. et. al. (2023). Cognitive behavioural play therapy for social anxiety disorders (SADS) in children with speech impairments. Journal of Rational-EJ1231642

16. El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2016). Self-Regulated Strategy Instruction for Developing Speaking Proficiency and Reducing Speaking Anxiety of Egyptian University Students. English Language Teaching, 9(12), 22-33. Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 41(1), 24-44. *European Journal of Educational Research*, v8 n4 p999-1011
17. Galti, A. M. (2016). Awareness of students' on the use of affective strategy and their level of speaking anxiety. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development, 3(3), 319-322.Gender Matter?.
18. Gürman-Kahraman, F. (2013). The effect of socio-affective language learning strategies and emotional intelligence training on English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' foreign language anxiety in speaking classes (Doctoral dissertation, Bilkent Universitesi (Turkey)).
19. Horverak, M. O. et al. (2022). Systematic Work with Speaking Skills and Motivation in Second Language Classes. IAFOR Journal of Education, 10(1), 33-52.
20. Houn, T., & Em, S. (2022). COMMON FACTORS AFFECTING GRADE-12 STUDENTS'SPEAKING FLUENCY: A SURVEY OF CAMBODIAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. Jurnal As-Salam, 6(1), 11-24.
21. Hwa, S. P., & Peck, W. K. (2017). Gender differences in speaking anxiety among English as a second language learners in a Malaysian tertiary context. International Journal for Studies on Children, Women, Elderly and Disabled, 2(6), 108-117.
22. Ismael, S. M. (2023). Analyzing the Influence of English Vocabulary Learning Strategies on English Language Learners. International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS), 8(1).
23. John, E. et. al. (2021). Language learning strategies used by form 4 ESL learners to develop speaking skills. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 11(6), 1547-1562.
24. Kalra, R., & Siribud, S. (2020). Public Speaking Anxiety in the Thai EFL Context. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 13(1), 195–209. Retrieved from https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/237845
25. Karatas, H. et.al (2016). An Investigation into University Students Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 232, 382-388.
26. Kathirvel, K., & Hashim, H. (2020). The use of audio-visual materials as strategies to enhance speaking skills among ESL young learners. Creative Education, 11(12), 2599.
27. LEARNING, I. S. R. (2021). MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION. Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 18(1), 29-64.
28. Loureiro, M., et al. (2020). Differences of gender in oral and written communication apprehension of university students. Education Sciences, 10(12), 379.
29. Mabuan, R. A. (2017). DEVELOPING ESL/EFL LEARNERS'PUBLIC SPEAKING SKILLS THROUGH PECHA KUCHA PRESENTATIONS. English Review: Journal of English Education, 6(1), 1-10.
30. Mahmud, Y. S. (2018). Tracing back the issue of speaking anxiety among EFL learners: From possible causes to practical implications. Journal of English Language Studies, 3(2), 125-138.
31. Mede, E., & Karaırmak, Ö. (2017). The predictor roles of speaking anxiety and English self efficacy on foreign language

speaking anxiety. Journal of Teacher Education and Educators, 6(1), 117-131.

32. Miskam, N. N., & Saidalvi, A. (2018). Investigating English language speaking anxiety among Malaysian undergraduate learners. Asian Social Science, 15(1), 1.
33. Mohtasham, L., & Farnia, M. (2017). English speaking anxiety: A study of the effect of gender on Iranian EFL university students' perceptions. International journal of research in English education, 2(4), 66-79.
34. Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. The modern language journal, 90(2), 151-168.
35. Navas, Elena A. (2008). The State of Language and Culture of the Gaddangs of Angadanan, Isabela. REL Journal of PNU Isabela Campus, 2 (1), pp. 112-132.
36. Nazarov, R. (2023). ENHANCING STUDENTS'SPEAKING SKILLS WITH LANGUAGE GAMES. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).
37. O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Oflaz and Adnan (2019) The Effects oł Anxiety, Shyness and Language Learning Strategies on Speaking Skills and Academic Achievement
39. Öz, G., & Şahinkarakaş, Ş. (2023). The Relationship Between Turkish EFL Learners' Academic Resilience and English Language Achievement. The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 23(1).
40. Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2013). The impact of gender on foreign language speaking anxiety and motivation. Procedia-social and behavioral Sciences, 70, 654-665.
41. Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2014). Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university. Journal of language and Linguistic Studies, 10(1), 1-17.
42. Paneerselvam, A., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Learners' Challenges and English educators' approaches in teaching speaking skills in an ESL classroom: a literature review. Creative Education, 10(13), 3299-3305.
43. Pham, A. T. et. al. (2021). THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDENTS'SELF-CONFIDENCE AND THEIR ENGLISH-SPEAKING PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS AT A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY IN VIETNAM. European Journal of Education Studies, 8(9).
44. Piniel, K., & Zólyomi, A. (2022). Gender differences in foreign language classroom anxiety: Results of a meta-analysis. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 12(2), 173-203.
45. Piniel, K., & Zólyomi, A. (2022). Gender differences in foreign language classroom anxiety: Results of a meta-analysis. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 12(2), 173-203.
46. Plantika, S., & Adnan, A. (2021). The correlation between students' speaking anxiety and their speaking ability. Journal of English Language Teaching, 10(1), 121-128.
47. Prabawa, W. P. (2016). Speaking strategies used by Indonesian tertiary students. English Review: Journal of English Education, 4(2), 231-242.
48. Rajendran, T., & Yunus, M. M. (2021). A systematic literature review on the use of mobile-assisted language Learning (MALL) for enhancing speaking skills among ESL and EFL learners. International Journal of Academic Research in

Progressive Education and Development, 10(1), 586-609.

49. Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ), 2(2), 6-18.
50. Romero, Y., & Manjarres, M. P. (2017). How does the first language have an influence on language learning? A case study in an English ESL classroom. English Language Teaching, 10(7), 123-139.
51. Salehi, H., et al. (2015). Relationship between EFL learners' autonomy and speaking strategies they use in conversation classes. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6(2), 37-43.
52. Samad, A. et. al. (2023). An Investigation into the Factors Contributing to English Writing Anxiety among Undergraduate ESL Students of KUST: A Mixed Method Approach. Journal of Social Sciences Review, 3(1), 290-301.
53. Santhanasamy, C., & Yunus, M. M. (2022). A Systematic Review of Flipped Learning Approach in Improving Speaking Skills. European Journal of Educational Research, 11(1), 127-139.
54. Saputra, D.et. al. (2023). ANXIETY IN SPEAKING ENGLISH; STUDENT'S ATTITUDE AND THE ROLE OF GENDER. Paedagoria: Jurnal Kajian, Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kependidikan, 14(1), 78-83.
55. Saputra, J. B. (2018). An analysis of students' speaking anxiety toward their speaking skill. Premise: Journal of English Education, 7(1), 111-123.
56. SELVI, A. (2023). STUDENTS'ANXIETY FACTORS IN SPEAKING ENGLISH (A Case Study at the 9th Grade of SMP N 1 Bukit Kemuning) in the Academic Year of 2021/2022 (Doctoral dissertation, UIN RADEN INTAN LAMPUNG).
57. Siahpoosh, H. et. al. (2022). Gender difference in foreign language speaking anxiety and enjoyment in online classes: The case study of Azari-Persian bilingual context. International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods, 10(2), 1512-1520.
58. Sinadia, A. R., & Ngingi, Y. A. (2023). Exploring the Sources of Speaking English Anxiety Experienced by Vocational Senior High School Students. Journal on Education, 5(4), 14067-14077.
59. Sparks, R. L., & Alamer, A. (2022). Long-term impacts of L1 language skills on L2 anxiety: The mediating role of language aptitude and L2 achievement. Language teaching research, 13621688221104392.
60. Sukmana, N., Koamriah, A., Bazarov, B., Patra, I., Hashim Alghazali, T. A., Ali Hussein Al-Khafaji, F., & Farhangi, F. (2023). Examining the Effects of Cue Cards on EFL Learners' Speaking Fluency, Accuracy, and Speaking Anxiety. Education Research International, 2023.
61. Sulistyowati, T. (2023). Factors Causing English Speaking Anxiety (ESA) in EFL Context: A Case Study among Post-Graduate Students in Indonesia. Applied Research on English Education (AREE), 1(1), 37-47.
62. Syafitri, N., & Maneba, S. (2023). A Mixed Method Study of Teachers' Strategies in Reducing Students' Anxiety levels. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 10(2), 2122-2129.
63. Syafutri, T., & Saputra, A. (2021). The first language interference toward students' English speaking as foreign language. Linguists: Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching, 7(1), 39-51
64. Tekşan, K. et. al. (2019). The examination of the relationship between the speech anxiety and speaking skill attitudes of middle school students and the opinions of teachers on speech anxiety. Journal of

Language and Linguistic Studies, 15(4), 1395-1412.

65. Toubot, A. M., & Seng, G. H. (2018). Examining levels and factors of speaking anxiety among EFL Libyan English undergraduate students. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7(5), 47-56.
66. Tsai, C. C. (2018). The effects of communication strategy training on EFL speaking anxiety and speaking strategy among the community college adult learners in Taiwan. In International Forum of Teaching and Studies (Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 3-19). American Scholars Press, Inc..
67. Untong, A. J., Dalumpines, L. C. H., Merka, J. M., & Monteza, A. M. M. (2023). SPEAKING CONFIDENCE AMONG GE 2 COMPLETERS: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PROGRAM. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *10*(8).
68. Vlčková, K., & Völkle, M. (2013). Classification theories of foreign language learning strategies: an exploratory analysis. Studia paedagogica, 18(4), 93-113.
69. Waluyo, B., & Bakoko, R. (2022). Effects of affective variables and willingness to communicate on students' English-speaking performance in Thailand. Studies in English Language and Education, 9(1), 45-61.
70. Wang, J. et. al. (2020) Alexa as coach: Leveraging smart speakers to build social agents that reduce public speaking anxiety. In Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1-13).
71. Wijaya, K. F. (2023). Strategies to Overcome Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety in Indonesian EFL Learning Contexts. LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 26(1), 214-227.
72. Yalçın, Ö., & İnceçay, V. (2014). Foreign language speaking anxiety: The case of spontaneous speaking activities. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116, 2620-2624.
73. Zhang, S. (2023). Speaking Anxiety Lower-Level Learners Experienced in Transitional Higher Education in China: The Case Study of Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. In Handbook of Research on Developments and Future Trends in Transnational Higher Education (pp. 39-65). IGI Global.
74. Zulfikar, Z. (2022). REDUCING EFL LEARNERS'SPEAKING ANXIETY THROUGH SELECTIVE ERROR CORRECTION AND GROUP-WORK STRATEGIES. ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context, 7(1), 69-88.