ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

# AFFECTIVE FACTORS ON THE STUDENT'S ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE SKILLS

**Rieca Joy O. Amarillo**
*Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines*

## ABSTRACT

*This study sought to investigate level of affective factors of the students in terms of written tasks of the SHS strands with regards to motivation, self-confidence and anxiety; the level of affective factors of the students in written language skills tasks in terms of vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality and the level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms fluency, accent, intonation, diction and delivery and its significant effect. The researcher utilized the adapted questionnaire and the rubric to gauge the Grade 11 SHS students' oral and written skills of Dr. Maria D. Pastrana National High School. Multiple regression was used as statistical tool. Hence, it was revealed that the level of affective factors in written and oral in terms of anxiety, students was moderately evident while in level of written and oral language skills were both satisfactory. It can be noted that the affective factors and the students' written and oral language skills have no significant effect in STEM and ABM but not in HUMSS and TVL. Further, the students' language performance is affected with the intrinsic and extrinsic stimuli that hinder them to achieve mastery; hence, to boost their performance, the teacher may encourage them to participate to overcome their feeling of uneasiness and provide a learning environment to create meaningful and authentic learning.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Affective Factors, Oral and Written Language Skills, SHS Strands*

## INTRODUCTION

Learners' affective factors are obviously of crucial importance in accounting for individual difference in learning outcomes. Whereas learners' beliefs about language learning are likely to be fairly stable, their affective states tend to be volatile, affecting not only overall progress but responses to a particular learning activity on a day-by-day and even moment-by-moment basis (Ellis, 1994 in Ni, 2012). On the other hand, oral and written language skills development of the learners can be attributed to these affective factors. Krashen argued that affective filter is a kind of psychological obstacle that prevents language learners from absorbing available comprehensible input completely. He looked affective factors functioning as a filter that reduces the amount of language input the learner is able to understand. It has a close relationship with the language learners' input and intake (Ni, 2012). It can be noted that affective factors include certain emotions, such as motivation, self-confidence, anxiety, and so on in the process of acquiring a second language. These negative emotions prevent efficient processing of the language input, and on the contrary, the positive emotions promote the efficiency of the process. when language learners with high motivation, self-confidence and a low level of anxiety, they have low filters and so receive and take plenty of input. Meanwhile, learners with low motivation, little self-confidence and a high level of anxiety have high filter and therefore obtain little input. Hence, Affective Filter Hypothesis shows that the emotional factors strongly affect the learners‟ input and how much input is converted into intake.

From the analysis of the affective factors such as students' motivation, self-confidence and anxiety have significant relationship to the development of the students' oral and written skills. This is congruence to Stephen Krashen (1982, 1985, 1988, 1991) negative emotions are formed through the passive moods, including low motivation, low self-esteem, and debilitating anxiety. Similarly, Rebecca Oxford (1996 in Lin 2008) also argues that affective side of the learners are probably one of the biggest influences on language success or failure.

Clearly, affective factors of the students and the language skills can be interconnected, hence, the researcher wanted to gauge the significant relationship of the affective factors in terms of the students' motivation, self-confidence and anxiety to the cognitive factors as in language learning in terms of oral and written language skills of the selected Grade 11 Senior High School of Dr. Maria D. Pastrana National High School.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The main purpose of this study was to determine the affective factors and the language skills of the students and its significant relationship.

Specifically, the study sought to answer to the following questions:

1. What is the level of affective factors of the students in terms of written tasks of the SHS strands with regards to:

1.1. Motivation;
1.2. Self-Confidence; and
1.3. Anxiety.

2. What is the level of affective factors of the students in terms of oral tasks of the SHS strands with regards to:

2.1 motivation;
2.2 self-confidence; and
2.3 anxiety.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. What is the Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to:

3.1 Vocabulary
3.2 Grammar
3.3 Content
3.4 Coherency
3.5 Quality

4. What is the Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms:

4.1 Fluency
4.2 Accent
4.3 Intonation
4.4 Diction
4.5 Delivery

5. Is there a Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Written Language Skills?

6. Is there a Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Oral Language Skills?

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Affective factors

The skills embedded on affective factors has been greatly supported by humanism. Wang (2005 cited in Farzana 2012) explains that humanism emphasizes the importance of the inner world of the human being and places the individual's thoughts, feelings and emotions at the forefront of all human developments. Affect is not one of the basic needs of human beings, but condition and premise of the other physical and psychological activities. The term "affective" has to do with aspects of our emotional being. Arnold (2013) agreed that affective factors are broadly considered as aspects of emotion, feeling, mood or attitude which condition behavior in language learning. Affective factors should not continue being considered the Cinderella of mental functions, since the "link what is important for us to the world of people, things, and happenings". Moreover, the affective side of the learner is probably one of the most important influences on language learning success or failure (Oxford 1990). The affective factors associated to L2 or foreign language learning are emotions, self-esteem, empathy, anxiety, attitude, and motivation. One of most general and logical factors that affects adults more than children during education is the notion of the knowledge which they have already accumulated. This can be seen to aid the speed of learning, as they are studying. Alternatively, habits of bad practice can also be learned in adulthood and methods and processes that have been learned in a now-dated curriculum can also be difficult to shake off for some young and adult learners. Furthermore, learners' affective factors are obviously of crucial importance in accounting for individual differences in learning outcomes. Whereas learners' beliefs about language learning are likely to be fairly stable their affective states tend to be volatile, affecting not only overall progress but responses to particular learning activities on a day-by-day and eve moment-by-moment basis. (Ellis, 1994 in Ni Hui 2012).

In addition, the affective factor is the factor that deals with the attitudes and values. It includes the nature of the behavior such as feelings, attitude, emotions, values and so on. Affective factors are one of the most important factors that can affect a students' speaking ability. The affective side of students possibly influences the success or failure of the language learning. Affective factors that also involve a persons' emotions, feelings and behavior. Some affective factors are closely related to second language acquisition (Oxford, 1990). Affective factors may include motivation, anxiety, and self-confidence. A variety of affective variables has been confirmed to be related to success in second language acquisition in research over the last decade but most of those studies examine the three categories: motivation, Self-confidence and anxiety (Krashen, 1982; Ni Hui 2012).

Moreover, Illyin, Sofi & Yunianti (2021) mentioned that teachers also need to know the affective factors that affects students' speaking ability so that they can handle these factors to help students improve their speaking ability. However, until now, there is rarely research that has been conducted about these fields and at this time there is rarely research that discusses affective factors that affect a students' speaking ability but rather examines speaking skills and its general factors.

In language teaching, Affective factors can be an emotion which refers to the learners' feelings, emotions, attitudes and so on. Alpert (1960 in Liu & Luo, 2021) pointed out that emotion is all the factors related to language teaching, which can affect students' learning attitude, may promote students' learning, stimulate students' initiative, and may also lead to negative learning emotions. Furthermore Arnold (1999 in Liu & Luo, 2021) classifies affective factors in foreign language teaching into two categories: one is learners' individual factors, including self-esteem, anxiety, inhibition, personality and motivation, and the other is emotional factors between learners, including empathy, classroom communication, cross cultural awareness. Further foreign researchers focus on affective factors and language learning. Krashen (1985 in Luo & Liu, 2021) regarded affective filtering as a key in second language acquisition. His "Affective Filtering Hypothesis" illustrated the relationship between language learners' motivation, self-confidence, anxiety and other affective factors and language learning. Krashen believed that motivation, self-confidence, anxiety are the main affective factors that affect language acquisition. Whether students' learning motivation and purposes are clear or not directly affects the learning effect. Rogers (1994 as cited in Liu & Luo, 2021) put forward the educational idea of student-centered theory, which holds that in the process of education, teachers should highlight the status and role of emotion and solve emotional problems, form a new teaching model and take emotion as the basic driving force of teaching activities. However, Brown (2009 in Liu & Luo, 2021) believed that effective factors play a decisive role in second language learning, and unsuccessful foreign language learning can be attributed to a variety of affective disorders.

### Motivation

Motivation is considered to be one of the most important factors, which affect the learners' language input and intake. H. Brown

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

(2001 in Ni 2012) defined motivation as the extent to which one make choices about goals to pursue and the effort one will devote to that pursuit. Howard Gardner in his theory of multiple intelligence, he explained motivation as combination of effort to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitude towards learning the language. Further, Jakobovits (1970 as cited in Ni Hui 2012) divided into four sets of factors: aptitude, intelligence, perseverance or motivation and other factors.

Motivation can affect students speaking ability because it will encourage students to pursue their goals in speaking ability. The higher the motivation of learners in learning the second language, the higher possibility of their success in mastering the second language. However, second language learners who have low motivation will have difficulty to achieve success from learning. So, motivation is one of the factors that plays a role in influencing the success of second language learning (Ni Hui, 2012; Tuan & Mai, 2015).

In addition, Luo & Liu (2021) stated that motivation can cause and maintain the activity of the individual, and make the activity toward a certain goal of the internal motivation. Motivation is very important factor in second language acquisition. Consequently, motivational theories focus on why a person chooses to engage or not to engage in specific activities (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Sanders & Sanders, 2016) which is central to measurement of academic confidence.

**Self-Confidence**

Self-confidence is also the component of affective factors that can influence students' speaking ability. If the students have high confidence, then they will have high score in speaking and vice versa (Ni Hui, 2012; Tuan & Mai, 2015). Meanwhile, Sanders & Sanders (2016) mentioned the efficacy beliefs relate to the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce outcomes of Bandura. In self-efficacy theory, the confidence is not just having the capability to do something. In this, expectancy beliefs are more possibility oriented. In contrast, efficacy beliefs are feelings about being able and prepared to do something through confidence in current ability. Eccles & Wigfield (2000 as cited in Sanders & Sanders, 2016) acknowledge that their notion of expectancy is more similar to efficacy beliefs than to outcome-expectancy theories.

Moreover, the concept of self-confidence is commonly used as self-assurance in one's personal judgment, ability, power, etc. One increases self-confidence form experiences of having mastered particular activities. It is a positive belief that in the future one can one can generally accomplish what one wishes to do. Self-confidence is not the same as self-esteem, which is an evaluation of one's own worth, whereas self-confidence is more specifically trust in one's ability to achieve some goal, which one meta-analysis suggested is similar to generalization of self-efficacy (Aventura et al, 2018).

In addition, self-confident learners dare to adventure, to take risk, and to communicate in second language more than the other learners, whereas who lacks self-confidence, will lose the chances to try their abilities as long as they are concerned about losing their face. On the other hand, they are often worried about the impression of classmates. So, when they encounter a situation that makes them uncomfortable, they obviously withdraw from the situation (Du, 2009 cited in Esmaeeli, 2021). Brown (2016) believed that successful learners should be willing to become 'gamblers' in the game of language. Whereas, anxious students often have negative self-awareness and underestimate their abilities compared to other students.

**Anxiety**

Anxiety factors category is fear of English as a subject, fear of public speaking, code-switching and transformation from Grammar Translation Method to Communicative Language Teaching (Farzana, 2012)

Anxiety is another affective factor that can influence students' speaking ability. One of the problems for students in learning the second language is that they get anxiety when they are told to speak in front of the class over speak with other people in English/ The lower the students' anxiety, then their speaking performance will be higher. While the higher of students' anxiety in speaking Englih, then their speaking performance will be lower (Ni Hui, 2012; Taun & Mai, 2015). Moreover, Luo & Liu (2021) mentioned that anxiety is that individuals worry that they cannot achieve a certain goal or cannot overcome obstacles, resulting in self-esteem and self-confidence frustration or increased sense of failure, guilt, the formation of a nervous psychological state. Proper anxiety can stimulate students' learning motivation, while excessive anxiety can lead to students' nervousness.

Krashen stated that anxiety is one of the five factors of the Input Hypothesis that makes it deserved to more attention. It is clear, there is correlation between anxiety and learners' performance, but the most important consideration is that, to what extent it can be beneficial, and to what extent it can be destructive. Furthermore, anxiety is associated with feeling of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, comprehension or worry (Scovel, 1978, cited in Brown, 2016). In this respect, some learners have very poor performance on the target language, just because they have high degree of anxiety in the classrooms. In other words, they become anxious about being in situation requires the use of a second or foreign language. They have physical response such as sweating, increasing heart beats, and restlessness (Du, 2009 cited in Esmaeeli 2021).

Meanwhile, writing anxiety as specific aspect of second language learning has occupied a great body of research for the past few decades. Language research has showed the debilitating effect of writing anxiety on students' performance. Daly (1978 cited in Rezai & Jafari, 2014) found that anxious writers tend to produce messages of a lower quality with shorter and simpler structures. Using both writing quality and produced better quality compositions than their high anxious counterparts. Cheng (2002

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

in Rezai & Jafari, 2014) found that higher anxious writers tend to avoid taking writing courses and instead take majors scale.

**Language Learning**

In decades, a number of studies have focused on foreign language learning, with the emphasis often having been placed on language learning strategies (Wong & Nunan, 2011; Oxford, 2016). Several studies have confirmed that these strategies aid students in becoming more effective learners inside the classroom and foster mor efficient development of students' mastery of the target language after leaving school (Wong & Nunan, 2011). Moreover, in the second language learning, there are lot of methods and strategies can be used by language learners. A search of the literature revealed that the decision-making is being concern with the choosing the suitable learning methods and strategy lays within the language learner itself. Thus, involvement will lead to more effective learning, more motivated and purposefully learning (Dickinson, 1995; Little & Smith, 2008 cited in Mahendra & Triyono, 2013).

According to O' Malley and Chamot (1990 in Polatcan, 2021), language learning strategies are classified into three as cognitive, metacognitive, and social-affective strategies. According to Stern (1992 cited in Polatcan, 2021) there are five main language learning strategies as cognitive, communicational-experiential, interpersonal, and affective strategies. Oxford classifies language learning strategies into two as direct and indirect. According to this classification, direct strategies include strategies related to memory, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies while indirect strategies include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (Oxford, 1990 in Polatcan et.al., 2021). In addition, language learning strategies have recently gained importance as a result of the transition from teacher-focused approaches to those that are centered upon the learners' active role in the learning process, (Gocer 2017).

**Oral language skills**

Children's oral language and communication development begins well before they begin to speak. From birth they learn to attend to carers' voices. Next, they learn to participate in turn-taking, and initiate 'conversations' using coos and babble before they have the words to express specific meanings and put words together (Goldfield, 2017). Furthermore, Noam Chomsky' innatist theory which asserts that language is innate capacity and that a child's brain theory (Pinker, 1994 cited in Aljoundi, 2014). On the other hand, the cognitive theory by Jean Piaget (Wilburg, 2010) claims that language is just one aspect of a child's overall intellectual development. Sassonian (2009 in Aljoundi, 2014) asserts that language is symbolic representation which allows the children to abstract the world.

Moreover, Oral language skills are involved in virtually every aspect of a child's school day. From socializing with peers at drop-off, to understanding instructions from educators and participating in classroom activities, oral language skills are at the center of every interaction and profoundly impact success in school (Foorman et al., 2015; Ladd et al., 2012, Rubin et al., 2012).in addition, oral language is the system through which we use spoken words to express knowledge, ideas, and feelings. Developing EL's oral language, then means developing the skills and knowledge that go into listening and speaking-all of which have strong relationship to reading comprehension and to writing. Oral language is made up of at least five key components (Moats, 2010): phonological skills, pragmatics, syntax, morphological skills, and vocabulary (also referred as semantics). All of these components of oral language are necessary to communicate and learn through conversation and spoken interaction, but there are important distinctions among them that have implications for literacy instruction.

**Written language skills**

In the domain of second language (L2) learning, writing is considered to be complex process due to its difficulty in learning and developing the writing skills. In this so-called tedious process, it has been found that students encounter plenty of effects that can influence their writing (Midgette et. At., 2007; Noriah et. al., 2008; Schlig, 2006 cited in Kaazim, 2013). However, Fazdilah (2013) mentioned that poor writing performance is growing concern of both educators and students as the notion of such ability may jeopardize students' future career opportunities. Many factors have been attributed as a cause of students' inability to perform well in their writing without them knowing it specifically.

**Related Studies**

**Affective Factors**

Considering communicative competence one of the important skills that students have to master in learning the second language. However, most of their communication ability is low. It may be caused by several factors, one of those factors is affective factors (motivation, anxiety, and self-confidence). Illyin, Sofi & Yunianti (2021) in their study that the students' speaking ability is below average. It is proven by the scores of the students' speaking tests which are mostly below the minimal completeness criteria that is said by the school. Moreover, the result shows that among three affective factors, the most influential factor is self-confidence, and the second influential factor is motivation.

**Motivation**

Motivation is considered as the second most influential factor in speaking ability according to Illyin, Sofi & Yunianti (2021). It can also prove by the results of significant value in the motivation variable. In the regression test the significant value of variable motivation is 0.011 where that value is the second smallest value among the three variables (motivation, self-confidence and anxiety), because if the significant value is more less than 0.05 then the variable will be more influential. In this case it can be said that if the students' motivation of English is higher, then students' speaking abilities will also be high. But, if students' motivation of English is lower, then students' speaking abilities will also be below because motivation of students is one factors that influence students' speaking abilities. The result is

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

congruence to the theory which states that the higher motivation of learners in learning English, the higher possibility of their success mastering English. But learners who have low motivation will have difficulty to achieve success from learning Englis (Ni Hui, 2012).

**Self-Confidence**

According to Illyin, Sofi & Yunianti (2021) self-confidence is the most influential factor in speaking ability. Further, they have been proven through the results the significant value in the self-confidence variable. In the regression test the significant value of variable self-confidence is 0.007 where that value is the smallest value among the three variables, because if the significant value is more less than 0.05 then the variable will be more influential. In this case it can be said that if the students' self-confidence are higher, then students' speaking abilities will also be high. But, if students' self-confidence are lower, then students' speaking abilities will also be low because self-confidence of students is very influential toward students speaking abilities. Ni Hui (2012), in his previous study, argue that students with high self-confidence in learning English that they have competence to learn English well and as a result they will appear very active in class and their grades in English are high, and vice versa. Furthermore, Park & Lee (2005 in Illyin, Sofi & Yunianti, 2021) stated that the higher self-confidence of students in speaking English, the higher oral performance they showed.

Ballane (2019) in his research study explored students' and teachers' perceptions of self-confidence and their impact on academic performance. The research was guided by Weiner's attribution and Bandura's self-efficacy theories. The research revealed two student themes, first, developing academic performance and set for success while three themes for the teachers, first student academic performance, second creating positive space and last student confidence. Implications for social change include increased student success as they transition to college.

**Anxiety**

Meanwhile anxiety is proven not to influence the students' speaking ability. The findings show that the total significant value of motivation is 0.001, anxiety is 0.063. and self-confidence is 0.007. it shows that speaking ability is influenced by motivation and self-confidence, but the result of the regression test shows that anxiety does not influence students' speaking ability even though the data result of anxiety is appropriate with the theory of the research. Furthermore, Ni Hui (2012) mentioned that anxiety is also one of considerable impact on the students in English. It means if students have low anxiety, then their abilities in speaking English will be high. But if they have high anxiety then their abilities in speaking English will be low.

Consequently, the primary sources of writing anxiety is fear of teacher's negative comments (83%). Students' fear of the teacher's negative comment shows that students are not aware of the purpose of the writing skill. Actually, they do not write to reflect their own voices, rather, they write to teacher solely to get good mark and pass their exam. Furthermore Low-self-confidence in writing and linguistics difficulties were the next causes of writing anxiety with almost the same percentage (80% and 78%). It is not surprising for theses two items to have the same percentage as a correlation can be found between the two. Developing a good command of linguistic knowledge is a demanding and time-consuming task for EFL learners. It comprises as important aspect of writing skill without which significant improvement in writing cannot be achieved. Poor linguistic knowledge, consequently, results in low self-confidence and discourage to write (Rizaei & Jafari, 2014). Zhang (2011) which showed that linguistic difficulty was the major cause of anxiety among the Chines English major students. Further, fear of writing test with 76% was another highly ranked item selected by the students. Students, even those with good command od writing skill, often demonstrate some degree of anxiety as far as writing exams are concerned. Although some researchers suggest that some degree of anxiety is necessary to get the work done (Rizaei & Jafari, 2014).

**Language Learning**

Language is one attribute that sets humans apart from all other creatures and binds humans together across all geographic barriers. A word can cause to sink into the deepest despair or lift us to inspired action. Language can be the tool for great achievement in any discipline. Good understanding of the capabilities and needs of the individual child and a sound knowledge and belief in the goals of language acts programme are vital factors in successful individualization of instruction (Nath, 2010). Moreover, Polatcan et.al., (2021) cited that language learning strategies play very important roles in the understanding of language learning processes, as well as in the skills students develop in learning a foreign or second language. In their study, it was found that women from foreign students who learn Turkish as foreign language use language learning strategies more effectively than men, and the use of language learning strategies remains age increases. As a result, the lecturers were advised to guide students' language learning strategies and to use their language learning strategies in lessons.

**Oral Language Skills**

Oral language measures of decontextualized skill correlated within task, but not across tasks. Social differences were found for the prereading measures and for those oral language measures that correlated with the prereading measures. Social differences were not found on measure of ability to provide communicatively adequate definitions or for receptive vocabulary (Dickinson & Snow, 2017). However, Tarvaninen S., Stolt S., & Launonen K. (2019) cited that the most severe problems in language manifest as difficulties in comprehending oral language. These difficulties are persistent and expose individuals to several risk factors. There is a lack of intervention research in the area of oral language comprehension, and no reviews have focused solely on oral language comprehension interventions in young children.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Written Language Skills**

Cole & Feng (2015) cited that writing has always been seen as an important skill in English language acquisition. This importance is due to the fact that it reinforces grammatical structures and vocabulary that educators strive to teach their students. It is the area in which learners need to be offered adequate time to develop their writing skill, therefore more time should be devoted to it in classrooms containing ELLs so that they will be prepared to effectively communicate in real life as well as academic situations (Ismail, 2007 in Cole & Feng, 2015). Exposing them to the writing process itself through various venues is an excellent way to reach this goal. Additionally, writing skills can be developed when the learners' interests are acknowledged and when they are given frequent opportunities to actually practice writing (Ismail, 2007 in Cole & Feng, 2015). Furthermore, the main goal of ESL students is to learn to produce a well-though-out piece of writing, hence a specific writing program must be in place in order to meet the needs of these learners. Further, it was found that numerous researchers discovered the need for ESL students to be exposed to a variety of genres, strategies, and methods in order to succeed in writing English compositions.

The concepts presented in the study laid a ground for the students oral and written language skills development and the affective factors that hinder the students' language learning. Several experts have attested that language learning are affected by different factors (Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 1994 in Ni Hui 2012). Meanwhile, Stern (1992 in Polatcan, 2021) & O' Malley and Chamot (1990 in Polatcan, 2021) agreed that language learning is classified into main language learning as language learning strategies as cognitive, communicational, interpersonal and affective strategies. In addition, Wong and Nunan (2011; Oxford, 2016) and Dickinson & Littlle & Smith ( Cited in Mahendra & Triyono, 2013) cited that effective language learning need students involvement. In terms of affective factors this paper amplified the thoughts of Arnold (2013) that affective factors are broadly considered as aspects of emotion, feeling, mood or attitude which behavior in language learning. Furthermore, Alpert (1960 in Liu & Luo, 2021) pointed that emotion is all the factors related to language teaching, which can affect students' learning attitude may promote students' learning, stimulate students' initiative, and may also lead to negative emotions. Thoughts of Scorel in Brown (2016), Daly in Rezai & Jafari (2014) and Cheng in Rezai & Jafari (2014) were offered in this review are merely focus on affective factors which associated with feeling of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, comprehension and worry.

## METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design and statistical treatment used in this study. It also explains the respondents and sampling techniques used. Validation techniques for the instrument and data gathering complete the procedure utilized.

**Research Design**

The descriptive-quantitative method of research is used in this study. It is employed to gather information about the present existing condition of the study. The study is divided in two parts, the first part is through students' oral performance and written output with the aid of self-made performance rubrics to gauge the students' oral and written language skills and part 2 is administering the adapted checklist questionnaire to the students-respondents.

Data are gathered through validated adapted checklist questionnaire in gauging the affective factors of the students' motivation, self-confidence and anxiety while the students' oral and written language skills are measured through the self-made performance rubrics.

**Respondents of the Study**

The respondents of the study were the Grade 11 Senior High School from Dr. Maria D. Pastrana National High School in Mauban, Quezon, CALABARZON.

The respondents are chosen randomly since the study focused on the assessing the level of students' affective factors in terms of motivation, self-confidence and anxiety and the level of language skills in terms of oral and written language skills and their significant relationship. The Slovin's formula was used in determining the number of respondents which the total population of Grade 11 SHS students is 740, only 263 were the respondents of the study.

**Research Procedure**

The study was focused with assessing the level of students' affective factors in terms of motivation, self-confidence and anxiety and the level of language skills in terms of oral and written language skills and its significant relationship. Upon the validation of the adapted checklist questionnaire, the researcher secured first the approval letter before the conduct of the study. After securing the letters needed, permission from the research adviser was sought to administer the adapted checklist questionnaire to the students/respondents and assess the students' oral performance and written output with the aid of self-made performance rubrics to the selected students/respondents. An approval letter was also sent to the principal of the aforementioned school beforehand. Afterwards, transcription of the questionnaires and analysis of results of the study were done using the descriptive-quantitative method. The analysis and interpretation of the gathered data would follow.

**Statistical Treatment**

The data collected were tallied, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted. The percentage and weighted mean were used to assess the level of students' affective factors. Furthermore, percentage was utilized to gauge the oral and written language performance. Further, to determine the significant relationship of the affective factors and the language skills of the students, the Multiple regression were used. Further, the likert scale for analyzing the affective factors in terms of motivation, self-confidence and anxiety and assessing the student's written and oral language skills were used.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Written Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Motivation**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| I usually have no idea about the topic and what to write, in particular when I write English compositions under time constraints | 2.89 | 2.89 | 2.98 | 3.39 | 3.04 | Moderately Evident |
| While writing English compositions, I often encounter some linguistic difficulties, such as inadequate mastery of vocabulary, simple sentence structure, and grammatical errors that hinder me to write effectively. | 3.55 | 3.63 | 3.71 | 3.95 | 3.71 | Highly Evident |
| I'm afraid of negative evaluation of my English compositions from teacher and fellow students. | 3.45 | 3.55 | 3.62 | 3.95 | 3.64 | Highly Evident |
| Inability to thoughts and generate ideas in writing makes me feel unmotivated. | 3.00 | 3.16 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.17 | Moderately Evident |
| My poor grammar knowledge and insufficient writing practice leads me to stop writing. | 2.45 | 2.71 | 2.80 | 2.98 | 2.74 | Moderately Evident |
| Overall | 3.07 | 3.19 | 3.27 | 3.48 | 3.25 | Moderately Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 1 shows the level of affective factors in terms of written language tasks of the SHS strands with regards to motivation. It gleaned in table 1 that the student's motivation was *highly evident* when they often encounter some linguistic difficulties, such as inadequate mastery of vocabulary, simple sentence structure, and grammatical errors that hinders them to write effectively in times of writing English composition *(M = 3.71).* It is *highly evident* that the learners were afraid of negative evaluation of their English compositions from teacher and fellow students *(M = 3.64)*. It was *moderately evident* that the learners feel unmotivated due to inability to thoughts and generate ideas in writing *(M = 3.17).* It was *moderately evident* that in times of writing English composition they usually have no idea about the topic and what to write *(M = 3.04).* It was *moderately evident* that due to poor grammar knowledge insufficient writing practice leads the learners to stop writing *(M = 2.74).*

The overall mean of 3.25 indicates that in terms of written language the SHS' motivation was *moderately evident.* This means that factors such as poor grammar knowledge, inability to thought, inadequate mastery of vocabulary, lack of idea, and afraid of negative evaluation from peers makes them feel unmotivated in writing English composition.

According to Luo & Liu (2021), they stated that motivation can cause and maintain the activity of the individual and make the activity toward a certain goal of the internal motivation. Motivation is very important factor in second language acquisition. In addition, as cited by Sullivan (2011), English teachers must attend carefully and systematically to issues related to motivation because students who are motivated typically do not underachieve. It suggests that intrinsic motivation is a prerequisite for any kind of significant learning or achievement.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 2. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Written Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Self Confidence**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| I'm lack of writing practice inside and outside classroom. | 2.63 | 3.13 | 3.01 | 3.51 | **3.07** | Moderately Evident |
| I don't think I have a good command of composition techniques. For instance, I'm too much concerned about the forms and formats. | 3.24 | 3.39 | 3.30 | 3.58 | **3.38** | Moderately Evident |
| I don't think the teacher's' feedback on my English writing is sufficient and effective. | 2.24 | 2.84 | 3.17 | 3.33 | **2.90** | Moderately Evident |
| I'm much worried about writing English compositions in my English Translation Exams. | 3.21 | 3.53 | 3.50 | 3.93 | **3.54** | Highly Evident |
| I am afraid I might get negative evaluation in my writing from my teachers and fellow students. | 3.47 | 3.47 | 3.54 | 3.65 | **3.53** | Highly Evident |
| Overall | 2.96 | 3.27 | 3.30 | 3.60 | **3.28** | Moderately Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 2 presents the level of affective factors in terms of written language tasks of the SHS strands with regards to self-confidence. The learners showed a *highly evident* in worrying about writing English composition in their English Translation Exams *(M = 3.54).* It showed a *highly evident* that the learners were afraid to get negative evaluation in their writing from their teachers and fellow students *(M = 3.53).* They showed a *moderately evident* in the moment when they were too much concerned about the forms and formats because they think that they don't have a good command of composition techniques *(M = 3.38)*, lack of writing practice inside and outside classroom *(M = 3.07)* and don't think that the teacher's feedback on their English writing is sufficient and effective *(M = 2.90).*

In overall, the mean of 3.28 revealed that in terms of written language tasks, the affective factors made the SHS's self-confidence *moderately evident.* It means that factors such as worriedness in the feedbacks, negative evaluation, overthinking about lack of command in techniques in composition, lack of practice, and thinking that the teacher's feedback was not sufficient and effective makes the self-confidence of the learners low in their language tasks in writing.

As cited by Alpert (1960 in Liu & Luo, 2021) pointed that emotion is all the factors related to language teaching, which can affect students' learning attitude may promote students' learning, stimulate students' initiative, and may also lead to negative emotions.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 3. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Written Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Anxiety**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| My English writing skill stands still which makes me feel upset. | 3.03 | 3.34 | 3.34 | 3.53 | 3.31 | Moderately Evident |
| Lack of sufficient time for writing practice makes me feel anxious. | 3.97 | 3.55 | 3.44 | 3.39 | 3.59 | Highly Evident |
| I have high anxiety about receiving my teacher's corrective feedback on my composition. | 3.24 | 3.24 | 3.29 | 3.23 | 3.25 | Moderately Evident |
| While writing English compositions, I often encounter some linguistic difficulties, such as inadequate mastery of vocabulary, simple sentence structure, and grammatical errors that made me feel anxious. | 3.61 | 3.63 | 3.56 | 3.81 | 3.65 | Highly Evident |
| I don't think the teacher's' evaluation on my English writing is sufficient and effective to make me feel at ease. | 2.34 | 3.08 | 3.19 | 3.39 | 3.00 | Moderately Evident |
| Overall | 3.24 | 3.37 | 3.36 | 3.47 | **3.36** | Moderately Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 3 shows the level of affective factors in terms of written language tasks of the SHS strands with regards to anxiety. The learners showed a *highly evident* when they were writing English composition, they often encounter some linguistic difficulties, such as inadequate mastery of vocabulary, simple sentence structure, and grammatical errors that made them feel anxious *(M = 3.65)*. It was *highly evident* that due to lack of sufficient time for writing practice makes them feel anxious *(M = 3.59)*. It was *moderately evident* that in their English writing skill stands still which makes them feel upset *(M = 3.31),* they have high anxiety in receiving their teacher's corrective feedback in their composition *(M = 3.25),* and they don't think the teacher's evaluation on their English writing is sufficient and effective to make them feel at ease *(M = 3.00)*.

The overall mean which is 3.36 showed that in terms of written language tasks, the SHS's anxiety was *moderately evident* due to affective factors. It indicates affective factors such as feeling anxious, upset, unease in the feedbacks and worriedness in the evaluation of peers make them not good enough to write an English composition.

Thoughts of Scorel in Brown (2016), Daly in Rezai & Jafari (2014) and Cheng in Rezai & Jafari (2014) were offered in this review are merely focus on affective factors which associated with feeling of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, comprehension and worry. In addition, based on the study of Rezai & Jafari (2014), the primary source of writing anxiety is fear of teacher's negative comments (83%). Students' fear of the teacher's negative comment shows that students are not aware of the purpose of the writing skill. Actually, they do not write to reflect their own voices, rather, they write to teacher solely to get good mark and pass their exam.

In view of these findings and thoughts of Scorel in Brown (2016), the uneasiness, frustration, and self-doubt can hinder the learner's success in writing a composition in English. This makes the student's do not believe in their capability and stop them in achieving a certain goal.

**Level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands**

In this study, the level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands refers to Motivation, Self Confidence and Anxiety.

The level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands were revealed in the following table, which shows the statement, mean, and verbal interpretation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 4. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Motivation**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| I am capable of identifying my weaknesses and strengths in speaking tasks. | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.19 | 4.14 | Highly Evident |
| I prepare well before the speaking task. | 3.82 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 4.21 | 3.92 | Highly Evident |
| I feel motivated to speak if I have supportive and tolerant listeners. | 4.55 | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.26 | 4.40 | Most Highly Evident |
| Whenever we are provided ample time to prepare for our speaking tasks, we feel motivated. | 4.26 | 4.03 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | Highly Evident |
| I really enjoy getting my teacher's oral corrective feedback in class. | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.19 | 4.26 | Most Highly Evident |
| Overall | 4.22 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.18 | **4.16** | Highly Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 4 revealed the level of affective factors in terms of oral language tasks of the different strands with regards to motivation. In table 4, it was *most highly evident* that the learners feel motivated to speak if they have supportive and tolerant listeners *(M = 4.26),* and they really enjoy when they get their teacher's oral corrective feedback in class *(M = 4.26).* It was *highly evident* that the they are capable of identifying their weaknesses and strengths in speaking tasks *(M = 4.14),* whenever they are provided ample time to prepare for their speaking tasks, they feel motivated *(M = 4.09)* and they prepare well before the speaking task *(M = 3.92).*

The overall mean which is 4.16 indicates that the learners in terms of oral language tasks, the SHS learner's motivation was *highly evident* due to affective factors. This means that when the students have a supportive environment, a time for preparation, know their strengths and weakness motivates them to do well in oral language tasks.

Motivation can affect students speaking ability because it will encourage students to pursue their goals in speaking ability. The higher the motivation of learners in learning the second language, the higher possibility of their success in mastering the second language. However, second language learners who have low motivation will have difficulty to achieve success from learning. So, motivation is one of the factors that plays a role in influencing the success of second language learning (Ni Hui, 2012; Tuan & Mai, 2015).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 5. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Self-Confidence**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| I don't feel good about getting my teacher's corrective feedback on my oral English errors. | 2.45 | 2.87 | 2.95 | 3.02 | 2.82 | Moderately Evident |
| When the teacher corrects my errors, it makes me embarrassed. | 2.82 | 2.71 | 2.87 | 2.86 | 2.82 | Moderately Evident |
| I'm afraid the other students will laugh at me when my teacher corrects my utterance errors. | 3.00 | 3.55 | 3.24 | 3.63 | 3.36 | Highly Evident |
| I am afraid of speaking right after the teacher corrects my error. | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.05 | 3.14 | 3.05 | Moderately Evident |
| Whenever I get my teacher's oral corrections, my fear of speaking increases. | 2.89 | 2.92 | 3.20 | 3.81 | 3.21 | Moderately Evident |
| Overall | 2.83 | 3.01 | 3.06 | 3.29 | **3.05** | Moderately Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 5 revealed the level of affective factors in terms of oral language tasks of the SHS strands with regards to self-confidence. It was *highly evident* that the learners were afraid that the others students will laugh at them when their teacher correct their utterance errors *(M = 3.36).* It was *moderately evident* that the learners fear of speaking increases whenever they get their teacher's oral corrections *(M = 3.21),* they are afraid of speaking right after the teacher corrects their error *(M = 3.05),* they don't feel good about getting their teacher's corrective feedback on their oral English errors *(M = 2.82),* and it makes them embarrassed when the teachers correct their errors *(M = 2.82)*.

The overall mean 3.05 indicates that in terms of oral language tasks, the SHS learner's self-confidence was *moderately evident* due to affective factors. It means that learners think that when they commit errors the peers around them will used it to shame them. In this instance, the learners lose their self-confidence to do better and speak confidently in front of the public. Ni Hui (2012), in his previous study, argue that students with high self-confidence in learning English that they have competence to learn English well and as a result they will appear very active in class and their grades in English are high, and vice versa.

Self-confident learners dare to adventure, to take risk, and to communicate in second language more than the other learners, whereas who lacks self-confidence, will lose the chances to try their abilities as long as they are concerned about losing their face. On the other hand, they are often worried about the impression of classmates. So, when they encounter a situation that makes them uncomfortable, they obviously withdraw from the situation (Du, 2009 cited in Esmaeeli, 2021).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 6. Level of Affective Factors in terms of Oral Language Tasks of the SHS Strands with regards to Anxiety**

| Statements | SHS Strands | | | | Average Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STEM | ABM | HUMSS | TVL | | |
| | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | $\bar{X}$ | | |
| I have high anxiety about receiving my teacher's oral corrective feedback. | 2.84 | 3.16 | 3.02 | 3.00 | 3.01 | Moderately Evident |
| My teacher's oral corrective feedback makes me feel anxious about learning English. | 2.58 | 2.84 | 3.14 | 3.44 | 3.00 | Moderately Evident |
| I'm generally nervous when I get my teacher's oral corrective feedback on my English errors or mistakes in front of my classmates. | 3.39 | 3.63 | 3.26 | 3.74 | 3.51 | Highly Evident |
| My teacher's oral corrective feedback makes me feel uncomfortable in speaking English. | 2.50 | 2.71 | 2.98 | 3.25 | 2.86 | Moderately Evident |
| I make a lot of pauses or use 'ah,' 'um,' etc. during our speaking activities. | 3.84 | 3.32 | 3.33 | 3.54 | 3.51 | Highly Evident |
| Overall | 3.03 | 3.13 | 3.15 | 3.39 | **3.18** | Moderately Evident |
| *Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Most Highly Evident; (3.40 – 4.19) – Highly Evident; (2.60 – 3.39) – Moderately Evident; (1.80 – 2.59) – Somewhat Evident; (1.00 – 1.79) – Not Evident* | | | | | | |

Table 6 revealed the level of affective factors in terms of oral language tasks of the SHS strands with regards to anxiety. It was *highly evident* that the learners generally nervous when they get their teacher's oral corrective feedback on their English errors or mistakes in front of their classmates *(M = 3.51)* and they make a lot of pauses or use 'ah', 'um', etc. during their speaking activities *(M = 3.51)*. It was *moderately evident* that they have high anxiety about receiving their teacher's oral corrective feedback (M = 3.01), their teacher's oral corrective feedback makes them feel anxious about learning English (M = 3.00), and their teacher's oral corrective feedback makes them feel uncomfortable in speaking English (M = 2.86).

The overall mean 3.18 indicates that in terms of oral language tasks the SHS learner's anxiety was moderately evident due to affective factors. This means that the affective factors such as feeling nervous, afraid of getting mistakes in front of class, anxiousness, uncomfortable and being upset when they got errors in speaking in front of class is reasonably evidence that can cause the anxiety to the students to speak in front of crowd. Due to anxiety to speak in front of the crowd makes the student's probability to achieve a certain goal may decrease. Ni Hui (2012) mentioned that anxiety is also one of considerable impact on the students in English. It means if students have low anxiety, then their abilities in speaking English will be high. But if they have high anxiety then their abilities in speaking English will be low.

Furthermore, anxiety is associated with feeling of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, comprehension or worry (Scovel, 1978, cited in Brown, 2016).

**Objective 3. What is the Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to: (1) Vocabulary; (2) Grammar; (3) Content; (4) Coherency; (5) Quality**

In this study, the level of students written language with regards to vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality were presented using tables. It includes the mean score per strand, standard deviation, and verbal interpretation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 7**
***Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to Vocabulary***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.11 | 0.64 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.47 | 0.55 | Very Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 3.02 | 0.69 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.77 | 0.80 | Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **3.09** | **0.67** | **Satisfactory** |

Legend: (*4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 7 shows the level of students written language skills with regards to vocabulary. In this table, ABM strand got the highest mean and had *very satisfactory* in written language skills with regards to vocabulary *(M = 3.11, SD = 0.55).* Followed by STEM strand that is in *Satisfactory* level (M = 3.11, SD = 0,64). Then, HUMSS strand that is in *Satisfactory* level (M = 3.02, SD = 0.69). The TVL strand got the lowest mean and is in *Satisfactory* level (M = 2.77, SD = 0.80).

The overall mean of 3.09 and standard deviation of 0.67 indicates that the students written language skills with regards to vocabulary was in *Satisfactory* level. This means that the learners had an adequate knowledge in vocabularies that they can used in writing an English composition.

This finding is in line with Gonzalez-Fernandez and Schmitt's (2017) claim that breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge do not grow in a parallel fashion, but are related and contribute to one another.

**Table 8**
***Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to Grammar***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.11 | 0.75 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.42 | 0.54 | Very Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.92 | 0.66 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.49 | 0.82 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.99** | **0.69** | **Satisfactory** |

Legend: (*4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 8 revealed the level of students written language skills with regards to grammar. It showed that the ABM strand got the highest mean with a *Very Satisfactory* level in students written language skills with regards to grammar *(M = 3.42, SD = 0.54).* The STEM strand got the second highest mean with a *Satisfactory* level *(M = 3.11, SD = 0,75).*Then, the HUMSS strand that is in *Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.92, SD = 0.66).* The TVL strand got the lowest mean that lies on the *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.49, SD = 0.82)*.

The overall mean was 2.99 and standard deviation of 0.69 which indicates that the level of students written language skills with regards to grammar is in *Satisfactory.* This means that the students had a satisfactory performance in using grammar when they are writing an English composition. The learners composition of written language had some limited syntax errors, minor errors that do not interfere with communication to readers.

According to Sioco & De Vera (2018), they stated in their studies that the great majority of the students (90.4 percent) were found to have "Average" grammatical competence in the area of subject-verb agreement. Only a few number of students (9.6 percent) have reached the level "Moving towards Mastery".

**Table 9**
***Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to Content***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.24 | 0.74 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.24 | 0.67 | Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 3.04 | 0.71 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.44 | 0.88 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.99** | **0.75** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 9 presents the level of students written language skills with regards to content. When it comes to content composition of the learners, ABM strand *(M = 3.24, SD = 0.67),* and STEM strand *(M = 3.24, SD = 0,74)* got the highest mean and is in *Satisfactory* level. The HUMSS strand got the third highest mean and is in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 3.04, SD = 0.71).* The TVL strand is in the lowest among the four strand that is in the *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.44, SD = 0.88).*

The four strands had an overall mean of 2.99 and standard deviation of 0,75 which indicates that the students written language skills with regards to content is in *Satisfactory* level. This means that the content of the learners when writing an English composition is sufficient to attain a certain objective. The learners writing had some occasional errors, easy to comprehend, and generally correct.

**Table 10**
***Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to Coherency***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.13 | 0.69 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.47 | 0.55 | Very Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.94 | 0.73 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.30 | 0.41 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.96** | **0.60** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 10 presents the level of students written language skills with regards to coherency. It presented that, ABM strand is in the *Very Satisfactory* level and got the highest mean among the four strands *(M = 3.47, SD = 0,55).* The STEM strand *(M = 3.13 , SD = 0.69)* and the HUMSS strand *(M = 2.94, SD = 0.73)* both are in the *Satisfactory* level. Among the four strands, TVL got the lowest mean and lies in *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.96, SD = 0.60).*

The average mean and standard deviation of all the four strands was 2.96 and 0.60, respectively. This indicates that the level of students written language skills with regards to coherency was *Satisfactory.* This means the written language skills of the learners is easily understand by the readers. The learners can explain a topic to the readers, and make them understand it.

As cited by Briesmaster & Etchegaray (2016), another factor which might have affected the students' performance in cohesion is their possible perceptions of their own writing performance. It can be inferred that writing was a challenging task for the subjects because of their lack of proficiency in the English language, and that their self-perception within this context is related to beliefs about self-efficacy.

**Table 11**
***Level of Students Written Language Skills with regards to Quality***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.21 | 0.73 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.21 | 0.66 | Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 3.11 | 0.71 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.46 | 0.82 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **3.00** | **0.73** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 11 shows the level of students written language skills with regards to quality. It showed that STEM strand (M = 3.21, SD = 0.73) and ABM strand (M = 3.21, SD = 0.66) both got the highest mean and is in the Satisfactory level in written language skills with regards to quality. The HUMSS strand lies in the Satisfactory level (M = 3.11, SD = 0,71). The TVL strand is in the Fairly Satisfactory level and got the lowest mean (M = 2.46, SD = 0.82).

The overall mean and standard deviation were 3.00 and 0.73, respectively. This indicates that with regards to quality of writing language skills of the students, they are on the Satisfactory level. This means that the writing style of learners conveys meaning adequately. The learners can write with some relevant details.

According to the study of Totto (2021), The students' academic achievement in the area of Reading and Writing is satisfactory. The attitude of the students towards reading and writing activities is favorable, which means a positive attitude. However, students' attitudes toward reading have a substantial impact on their reading performance, as well as their attitude toward writing has a substantial impact on their writing performance.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Objective 4. Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of: (1) Fluency; (2) Accent; (3) Intonation; (4) Diction; and (5) Delivery**

In this study, the level of students oral langu'age in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery were presented using tables. It includes the mean score per strand, standard deviation, and verbal interpretation.

**Table 12**

***Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of Fluency***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.03 | 0.67 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 2.95 | 0.65 | Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.64 | 0.58 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.58 | 0.92 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.80** | **0.71** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 12 reveals the level of students' oral language skills in terms of fluency. It revealed that STEM strand got the highest mean and is in the *Satisfactory* level in their oral language skills in terms of fluency *(M = 3.03, SD = 0.67).* The ABM strand got the second highest mean and is in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.95, SD = 0,65).* Then, the HUMSS strand is in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.64, SD = 0.58).* The TVL strand got the lowest mean and is in the *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.58, SD = 0.92).*

The overall mean and standard deviation were 2.80 and 0.7, respectively. This indicates that the level of students' oral language skills in terms of fluency was *Satisfactory.* This means that the learners can speak comfortable in front of the crowd. The learners as the speakers can read and understand the text. The message that the learners convey is understood by the audience. The learners can do a smooth and fluid speech. They have some few hesitations and a slight search for words.

Grammar also affects the students' speaking performance. Cited by Dako et al (2020) as stated by Haryanto, et al (2017), students' problem in speaking skills relates to grammar. Lacking grammar concept generates them unable to speak or reply to the teacher in English.

**Table 13**

***Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of Accent***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.08 | 0.77 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.37 | 0.62 | Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.86 | 0.74 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.33 | 1.01 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.91** | **0.79** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 13 shows the level of students' oral language skills in terms of accent. It showed that the ABM strand is the strand that had the highest mean and is in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 3.37, SD = 0.62).* The STEM strand got the second highest mean and lies in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 3.08, SD = 0.77).* The HUMSS strand is in the *Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.86, SD = 0,74).* The TVL strand got the lowest mean and is in the *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.33, SD = 1.01).*

The overall mean and standard deviation were 2.91 and 0.79, respectively. This indicates that the students oral language skills in terms of accent is in *Satisfactory* level. This means that the learners have a good accent in speaking. The learners have good effort in accent.

**Table 14**

***Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of Intonation***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.29 | 0.68 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.50 | 0.60 | Very Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.96 | 0.71 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.56 | 1.04 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **3.08** | **0.76** | **Satisfactory** |

Legend: (*4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 13 shows the level of students' oral language skills in terms of intonation. It showed that the ABM strand got the highest mean and is in Very Satisfactory level in students oral language skills in terms of intonation (M = 3.50, SD = 0.60). Two strands were in the Satisfactory level, the STEM (M = 3.29, SD = 0.68) and the HUMSS (M = 2.96, SD = 0,71). The TVL strand had the lowest mean among the four strands and lies in the Fairly Satisfactory level (M = 2.56, SD = 1.04).

The overall mean and standard deviation were 3.08 and 0.76, respectively. This indicates that the students' oral language skills in terms of intonation is in Satisfactory level. This means that leaners were aware in the rise and fall of their voice in speaking. Learners had a minor discrepancy in the intonation control.

**Table 15**
***Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of Diction***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.03 | 0.74 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.50 | 0.55 | Very Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.85 | 0.68 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.26 | 0.74 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **2.91** | **0.68** | **Satisfactory** |

Legend: (*4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 15 shows the level of students' oral language skills in terms of diction. It showed that the ABM strand had the highest mean and in the *Very Satisfactory* level in terms of Diction *(M = 3.50, SD = 0.55).* Two strands were in the *Satisfactory* level, the STEM *(M = 3.03, SD = 0.74)* and HUMSS *(M = 2.85, SD = 0.68)*. The strand that got the lowest mean was the TVL and is in the *Fairly Satisfactory* level *(M = 2.26, SD = 0.76).*

The overall mean 2.91 and standard deviation 0.68 indicates that the level of students' oral language skills in terms of diction is in *Satisfactory*. This means that the learners had an adequate choice of words that had a significant effect on the quality of their speech. There's a minimal error choice of words. The words are understood by the audience.

**Table 16**
***Level of Students Oral Language Skills in terms of Delivery***

| STRANDS | Mean | SD | Verbal Interpretation* |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 3.10 | 0.75 | Satisfactory |
| ABM | 3.28 | 0.67 | Satisfactory |
| HUMSS | 2.99 | 0.99 | Satisfactory |
| TVL | 2.81 | 1.12 | Satisfactory |
| **Average** | **3.05** | **0.88** | **Satisfactory** |

*Legend: (4.20 – 5.-00) – Outstanding; (3.40 – 4.19) – Very Satisfactory; (2.60 – 3.39) Satisfactory; (1.80 – 2.59) –Fairly Satisfactory; (1.00 – 1.79) – Did not meet expectations*

Table 16 reveals the level of students' oral language skills in terms of delivery. It revealed that all of the strands were in the *Satisfactory* level. The ABM strand got the highest mean among the four strands *(M = 3.28, SD = 0,67).* STEM strand got the second highest mean *(M = 3.10, SD = 0.75).* HUMSS strand got the third highest mean *(M = 2.99, SD = 0.99)*. The TVL strand had the lowest mean *(M = 2.81, SD = 1.12).*

The overall mean and standard deviation were 3.05 and 0.88, respectively. This indicates that the students oral language skills in terms of delivery is in *Satisfactory* level. This means that the learners had a good delivery of the contexts in speaking. The learners were prepared and delivered the words with eye contact.

**Objective 5. Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Written Language Skills**

In this study, the results of there a significant effect of affective factors on the students' written language were presented in the table. This contains the strands, affective factors, written language skills, coefficients, t-value, p- value and analysis.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

**Table 17**
***Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Written Language Skills***

| Strands | Affective Factors | Students' Written Language Skills | Coefficient | t-value | p-value | Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STEM** | Motivation | Vocabulary | -0.1140 | -0.7805 | 0.4402 | Insignificant |
| | | Grammar | -0.3447 | -2.1071 | 0.0421* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1607 | -2.1269 | 0.0404* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.4083 | -2.8229 | 0.0077* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.2782 | -1.7202 | 0.0940 | Insignificant |
| | Self Confidence | Vocabulary | -0.2450 | -2.0126 | 0.0517 | Insignificant |
| | | Grammar | -0.3593 | -2.5896 | 0.0138* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1337 | -2.9124 | 0.0061* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.4186 | -3.4715 | 0.0014* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.4062 | -3.1232 | 0.0035* | Significant |
| | Anxiety | Vocabulary | -0.3134 | -2.7728 | 0.0087* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.3278 | -2.4102 | 0.0212* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1185 | -4.1515 | 0.0002* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3792 | -3.1758 | 0.0031* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.4692 | -3.9507 | 0.0003* | Significant |
| ABM*** | Motivation | Vocabulary | 0.0000 | -3.5272 | 0.0012* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.3237 | -2.7473 | 0.0093* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1401 | -3.1812 | 0.0030* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3225 | -2.7054 | 0.0104* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.3067 | -2.0818 | 0.0445* | Significant |
| | Self Confidence | Vocabulary | 0.0000 | -3.1223 | 0.0035* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.3179 | -2.9716 | 0.0053* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1319 | -2.8527 | 0.0071* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3519 | -3.3439 | 0.0019* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.4186 | -3.3325 | 0.0020* | Significant |
| | Anxiety | Vocabulary | -0.1538 | -1.3839 | 0.1749 | Insignificant |
| | | Grammar | -0.1920 | -1.7720 | 0.0849 | Insignificant |
| | | Content | 0.1272 | -2.5622 | 0.0147* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.1701 | -1.5400 | 0.1323 | Insignificant |
| | | Quality | -0.2144 | -1.6336 | 0.1111 | Insignificant |
| HUMSS**** | Motivation | Vocabulary | -0.2419 | -3.4635 | 0.0007* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.2201 | -3.4011 | 0.0009* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.0702 | -3.1984 | 0.0017* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3883 | -5.7625 | 0.0000* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.2853 | -4.1739 | 0.0001* | Significant |
| | Self Confidence | Vocabulary | -0.2540 | -3.7957 | 0.0002* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.2197 | -3.5251 | 0.0006* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.0680 | -3.0768 | 0.0025* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3696 | -5.6561 | 0.0000* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.2514 | -3.7641 | 0.0003* | Significant |
| | Anxiety | Vocabulary | -0.2803 | -3.8512 | 0.0002* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.2698 | -4.0270 | 0.0001* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.0745 | -2.7887 | 0.0061* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3289 | -4.4453 | 0.0000* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.2663 | -3.6510 | 0.0004* | Significant |
| TVL***** | Motivation | Vocabulary | -0.4033 | -2.9449 | 0.0047* | Significant |
| | | Grammar | -0.4393 | -3.1425 | 0.0027* | Significant |
| | | Content | 0.1529 | -2.7244 | 0.0086* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.1926 | -1.4134 | 0.1632 | Insignificant |
| | | Quality | -0.3667 | -2.5587 | 0.0133* | Significant |
| | Self Confidence | Vocabulary | -0.2064 | -1.3250 | 0.1906 | Insignificant |

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Grammar | -0.3058 | -1.9387 | 0.0577 | Insignificant |
| | | Content | 0.1672 | -2.2866 | 0.0261* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3364 | -2.3707 | 0.0213* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.1300 | -0.8029 | 0.42558 | Insignificant |
| | Anxiety | Vocabulary | -0.1579 | -1.1251 | 0.2655 | Insignificant |
| | | Grammar | -0.2666 | -1.8806 | 0.0653 | Insignificant |
| | | Content | 0.1443 | -3.1690 | 0.0025* | Significant |
| | | Coherency | -0.3117 | -2.4574 | 0.0172* | Significant |
| | | Quality | -0.2256 | -1.5792 | 0.1200 | Insignificant |

**Reject the null hypothesis, Ho, if p< 0.05. Level of Significance = 0.05. **n = 38. ***n=38. ****n = 133. *****n=57*

Table 17 shows the significant effect of affective factors on the students' written language skills. Table 17 is subdivided into 4 different strands showing the correlation of the affective factors and students' written language skills.

The variable of affective factors *motivation* of STEM strand students had a negative correlation to students' written language skills in terms of vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.1140),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.3447),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.4083),* and quality *(coefficient = 0.2782).* On the other hand, only content *(coefficient = 0.1607)* had a positive correlation to students' motivation. The grammar *(p = 0.0421, n = 38, t = -2.1071),* content *(p = 0.0404, n = 38, t = -2.1269),* and coherency *(p = 0.0077, n = 38, t = -2.8229)* predictor variables are statistically significant. However, vocabulary *(p = 0.4402, n = 38, t = -0.7805)* and quality *(p = 0.0940, n = 38, t = -1.7202)* are insignificant as its p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the values of affective factor *(motivation)* increase as the values of the written language skills *(vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality)* decrease, however, as the motivation increases, the content of writing composition also increases. This means that motivation had a significant effect on the written language skills such as grammar, content and coherency.

In the affective factor *(motivation)* of ABM strand students, it had no correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = 0.000)*, it had a positive correlation to content *(coefficient = 0.1401)*, and it had a negative correlation to grammar *(-0.3237),* coherency *(-0.3225),* and quality *(-0.3067)*. All the students' written language skills: vocabulary *(p = 0.0012, n = 38, t = -3.5272)*, grammar *(p = 0.0093, n = 38, t = -2.7473),* content *(p = 0.0030, n = 38, t = -3.1812),* coherency *(p = 0.0104, n = 38, t = -2.7054),* and quality *(p = 0.0445, n = 38, t = -2.0818)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the value motivation increase, the value of content goes in other way(decrease), while as the value of motivation increases the values of grammar, coherency, and quality decreases. This means that ABM students' motivation had a significant effect on vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

Motivation as affective factor in students of HUMSS strand had a positive correlation to the students written language skills in terms of content*(coefficient = 0.0702),* while it had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.2419),* grammar *(-0.2201),*coherency *(coefficient = -0.3883),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.2853)*. All the students' written language skills such as vocabulary *(p = 0.0007, n = 133, t = -3.4635)*, grammar *(p = 0.0009, n = 133, t = -3.4011),* content *(p = 0.0017, n = 133, t = -3.1984),* coherency *(p = 0.0000, n = 133, t = -5.7625),* and quality *(p = 0.0001, n = 133, t = -4.1739)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that the motivation as affective factors as it increases its value, writing a content as a language skills of the HUMSS students increases, while as the value of motivation increases, the values in vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality decreases. The students' motivation as affective factor had a significant effect on students' written language skills in terms of vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

The TVL strand students' motivation as affective factors had a positive correlation to students' written language skills in terms of content *(coefficient = 0.1443),* while it had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.1579),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.2666),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.3117),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.2256).* The written language skills of students in terms of content*(p = 0.0025, n = 57, t = -3.1690),* and coherency *(p = 0.0172, n = 57, t = -2.4574)* are significant p<0.05), while vocabulary *(p = 0.2655, n = 57, t = -1.1251),* grammar *(p = 0.0653, n = 57, t = -1.8806),* and quality *(p = 0.1200, n = 57, t = -1.5792)* are insignificant*(p>0.05)* as it compared to the significance level.

This indicates that written language skills in terms of content and students' motivation(increases) had same direction(increases), while vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality goes in another way(decreases). The TVL students' motivation as affective factor had significant effect on students' written language skills in terms of content and coherency, while it has no significant effect on vocabulary, grammar and quality.

In the affective factor *(self-confidence)* of STEM strand students, it had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.2450),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.3593),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.4186),* and quality *(coefficient = 0.4062).* Students' written language skills in terms of content*(coefficient = 0.1337)* had a

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

positive correlation to students' self-confidence. The written language skills such as grammar *(p = 0.0138, n = 38, t = -2.5896),* content *(p = 0.0061, n = 38, t = -2.9124),* coherency *(p = 0.0014, n = 38, t = -3.4715),* and quality *(p = 0.0035, n = 38, t = 3.1232)* are significant*(p<0.05)*, while vocabulary *(p = 0.0517, n = 38, t = -2.0126)* is insignificant*(p>0.05)* as it compared to the significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the value of students' self-confidence increase, the values of the dependent variables *(vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality)* decrease. While, as self-confidence increases, the written language skill in content also increases. This means that self-confidence had a significant effect on grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

In the affective factor *(self-confidence)* of students of ABM strand, it had no correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = 0.000)*, it had a positive correlation to content *(coefficient = 0.1319)*, and it had a negative correlation to grammar *(coefficient = 0.3179),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.3519),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.4186)*. All the students' written language skills such as vocabulary *(p = 0.0035, n = 38, t = -3.1223)*, grammar *(p = 0.0053, n = 38, t = -2.9716),* content *(p = 0.0071, n = 38, t = -2.8527),* coherency *(p = 0.0019, n = 38, t = -3.3439),* and quality *(p = 0.0020, n = 38, t = -3.3325)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the value self-confidence increase, the value of content goes in other way(decrease), while as the value of motivation increases the values of grammar, coherency, and quality decreases. This means that ABM students' self-confidence had a significant effect on vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

The affective factor*(self-confidence)* in students of HUMSS strand had a positive correlation to the students written language skills in terms of content *(coefficient = 0.0680),* while it had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.2540),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.2197),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.3696),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.2514)*. All the students' written language skills such as vocabulary *(p = 0.0002, n = 133, t = -3.7957)*, grammar *(p = 0.0006, n = 133, t = -3.5251),* content *(p = 0.0025, n = 133, t = -3.0768),* coherency *(p = 0.0000, n = 133, t = -5.6561),* and quality *(p = 0.0003, n = 133, t = -3.7641)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that self-confidence of the students in HUMSS strand had a significant effect in their written language skills in terms of vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

The self-confidence of TVL strand students had a positive correlation to students' content*(coefficient = 0.1672)* in written language skills, while a negative correlation to students' vocabulary*(coefficient = -0.2064)*, grammar*(coefficient = -0.3058)*, coherency*(coefficient = -0.3364)*, and quality*(coefficient = -0.1300)*.The student's written language skills in terms of content*(p=0.0261, n=57, t=-1.3250)* and coherency*(p=0.0213, n=57, t= -2.3707)* are significant(p<0.05), while vocabulary*(p=0.1906, n=57, t=-1.3250),* grammar*(p=0.0577, n=57, t=-1.9387),* and quality*(p=0.4255, n=57, t=-0.8029)* are insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the values of the self-confidence of TVL strand students increases the values of content as written language skills also increases, while vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality as written language skills tends to decrease. There is a significant effect on students' self-confidence as affective factor on the students' written language skills in terms of content and coherency.

In the affective factor *(anxiety)* of STEM strand stdudents, it had a positive correlation to content*(coefficient = 0.1185)* and negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.3134),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.3278),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.3792),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.4692).* Vocabulary *(p = 0.0087, n = 38, t = -2.7728),* grammar *(p = 0.0212, n = 38, t = -2.4102),* content *(p = 0.0002, n = 38, t = -4.1515),* coherency *(p = 0.0031, n = 38, t = 3.1758),* and quality *(p = 0.0003, n = 38, t = -3.9507)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the value of students' anxiety increase, the values of the dependent variables *(vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality)* decrease. While, as self-confidence increases, the written language skill in content also increases. This means that students' anxiety had a significant effect on vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

In the affective factor *(anxiety)* of ABM strand students, it had a positive correlation to content as students' written language skills *(coefficient = 0.1272)*, and had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.1538),* grammar *(coefficient = -0.1920),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.1701),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.2144).* The students' written language skills in terms of content *(p = 0.0147, n = 38, t = -2.5622)* is statistically significant*(p<0.05)* as it compare to significance level of 0.05. The language skills such as vocabulary *(p = 0.1749, n = 38, t = -1.3839),* grammar *(p = 0.0849, n = 38, t = -0.1920)*, coherency *(p = 0.1323, n = 38, t = -1.5400),* and quality *(p = 1111, n = 38, t = -1.6336)* were statistically insignificant*(p>0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as values of anxiety as affective factor increases, content in writing an English composition as language skills also increases. In contrast to that, as the values of anxiety as affective factor increases the values of vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality as language skills decreases. This means that there is a significant effect of anxiety as affective factor to the written language skills in terms of content. The anxiety as affective factors in students of ABM strand had no significant effect on vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality as their written language skills.

Students' anxiety as affective factor of HUMSS strand had a positive correlation to the students written language skills in

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

terms of content*(coefficient = 0.0745),* while it had a negative correlation to vocabulary *(coefficient = -0.2803),* grammar *(-0.2698),* coherency *(coefficient = -0.3289),* and quality *(coefficient = -0.2663)*. All the students' written language skills such as vocabulary *(p = 0.0002, n = 133, t = -3.8512)*, grammar *(p = 0.0001, n = 133, t = -4.0270),* content *(p = 0.0061, n = 133, t = -2.7887),* coherency *(p = 0.0000, n = 133, t = -4.4453),* and quality *(p = 0.0004, n = 133, t = -3.6510)* are significant*(p<0.05)* as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that written language skills in terms content and students' anxiety had the same direction*(increases)* when its values plotted in a graph. This means there's a significant effect of affective factor*(anxiety)* on the students' written language skills in terms of vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality.

Anxiety of TVL students as an affective factor had a positive correlation to students' content*(coefficient = 0.1443)* in written language skills, while a negative correlation to students' vocabulary*(coefficient = -0.1579)*, grammar*(coefficient = -0.2666)*, coherency*(coefficient = -0.3117)*, and quality*(coefficient = -0.2256)*.The student's written language skills in terms of content*(p=0.0025, n=57, t=-3.1690)* and coherency*(p=0.0172, n=57, t= -2.4574)* are significant(p<0.05), while vocabulary*(p=0.2655, n=57, t=-1.1251),* grammar*(p=0.0653, n=57, t=-1.8806),* and quality*(p=0.1200, n=57, t=-1.5792)* are insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that the direction of the line of students' anxiety as affective factor and written language skills in terms of content were the same(increases). However, the direction of the values of students' anxiety as affective factors(increases) are different to the direction(decreases) of vocabulary, grammar, coherency and quality.

Writing anxiety as specific aspect of second language learning has occupied a great body of research for the past few decades. Language research has showed the debilitating effect of writing anxiety on students' performance. Daly (1978 cited in Rezai & Jafari, 2014) found that anxious writers tend to produce messages of a lower quality with shorter and simpler structures. Using both writing quality and produced better quality compositions than their high anxious counterparts. Cheng (2002 in Rezai & Jafari, 2014) found that higher anxious writers tend to avoid taking writing courses and instead take majors scale.

**Objective 6. Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Oral Language Skills**

In this study, the results of there a significant effect of affective factors on the students' oral language were presented in the table. This contains the strands, affective factors, written language skills, coefficients, t-value, p- value and analysis.

**Table 18**

***Significant Effect of Affective Factors on the Students' Oral Language Skills***

| Strands | Affective Factors | Students' Oral Language Skills | Coefficient | t-value | p-value | Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STEM** | Motivation | Fluency | -0.24413 | -1.64638 | 0.10839 | Insignificant |
| | | Accent | -0.49169 | -3.11021 | 0.00365* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.15287 | -1.49341 | 0.14404 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.26419 | -1.59963 | 0.11842 | Insignificant |
| | | Delivery | -0.20084 | -1.44037 | 0.15840 | Insignificant |
| | Self Confidence | Fluency | -0.29551 | -2.37098 | 0.02321* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.62751 | -5.47259 | 0.00000* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.13004 | -2.03189 | 0.04960* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.40217 | -3.02290 | 0.00459* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.17803 | -1.46633 | 0.15124 | Insignificant |
| | Anxiety | Fluency | -0.33814 | -2.88697 | 0.00654* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.49127 | -3.88959 | 0.00042* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.12948 | -1.44043 | 0.15839 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.43130 | -3.44122 | 0.00148* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.34794 | -3.26866 | 0.00238* | Significant |
| ABM*** | Motivation | Fluency | 0.00000 | -2.32605 | 0.02576* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.27113 | -1.91327 | 0.06369 | Insignificant |
| | | Intonation | 0.13462 | -1.99300 | 0.05388 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.18244 | -1.43268 | 0.16058 | Insignificant |
| | | Delivery | -0.21408 | -1.88864 | 0.06702 | Insignificant |
| | Self Confidence | Fluency | 0.00000 | -2.86649 | 0.00689* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.21097 | -1.59282 | 0.11994 | Insignificant |

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Intonation | 0.12250 | -2.23102 | 0.03200* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.20953 | -1.81474 | 0.07790 | Insignificant |
| | | Delivery | -0.24933 | -2.46147 | 0.01876* | Significant |
| | Anxiety | Fluency | -0.29127 | -2.32737 | 0.02568* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.29557 | -2.46312 | 0.01869* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.12254 | -0.83265 | 0.41053 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.21631 | -1.99655 | 0.05348 | Insignificant |
| | | Delivery | -0.22168 | -2.28946 | 0.02802* | Significant |
| HUMSS**** | Motivation | Fluency | -0.34902 | -4.45896 | 0.00002* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.36857 | -5.31039 | 0.00000* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.06869 | -4.07548 | 0.00008* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.26288 | -3.99673 | 0.00011* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.31651 | -4.22622 | 0.00004* | Significant |
| | Self Confidence | Fluency | -0.28892 | -3.74566 | 0.00027* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.28957 | -4.16918 | 0.00006* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.06714 | -3.63608 | 0.00040* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.21752 | -3.36884 | 0.00099* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.22502 | -3.01703 | 0.00307* | Significant |
| | Anxiety | Fluency | -0.29549 | -3.49561 | 0.00065* | Significant |
| | | Accent | -0.26401 | -3.42302 | 0.00083* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.07351 | -3.42069 | 0.00083* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.27641 | -3.99392 | 0.00011* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.26297 | -3.25476 | 0.00144* | Significant |
| TVL***** | Motivation | Fluency | -0.27599 | -1.66491 | 0.10162 | Insignificant |
| | | Accent | -0.47732 | -2.70166 | 0.00916* | Significant |
| | | Intonation | 0.18380 | -2.42228 | 0.01875* | Significant |
| | | Diction | -0.30565 | -2.34314 | 0.02277* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.41452 | -2.77091 | 0.00761* | Significant |
| | Self Confidence | Fluency | -0.14526 | -0.80079 | 0.42670 | Insignificant |
| | | Accent | -0.29817 | -1.50676 | 0.13759 | Insignificant |
| | | Intonation | 0.20166 | -1.81975 | 0.07424 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.23700 | -1.65284 | 0.10406 | Insignificant |
| | | Delivery | -0.31346 | -1.88596 | 0.06459 | Insignificant |
| | Anxiety | Fluency | -0.25226 | -1.57562 | 0.12085 | Insignificant |
| | | Accent | -0.30968 | -1.75688 | 0.08450 | Insignificant |
| | | Intonation | 0.18288 | -1.43543 | 0.15683 | Insignificant |
| | | Diction | -0.28302 | -2.24363 | 0.02890* | Significant |
| | | Delivery | -0.23380 | -1.55265 | 0.12624 | Insignificant |

**Reject the null hypothesis, Ho, if p< 0.05. Level of Significance = 0.05. **n = 38. ***n=38. ****n = 133. *****n=57*

Table 18 shows the significant effect of affective factors on the students' oral language skills. It showed the relationship in affective factors and oral language skills of four strands.

The STEM strand students' affective factor such as motivation had a positive correlation on students' oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient = 0.15287)*, while it had a negative correlation on fluency *(coefficient = -0.24413),* accent *(coefficient = -0.49169),* diction*(coefficient = -0.26149),* and delivery*(coefficient = -0.20084).* The student's oral language skills in terms of fluency*(p=0.10839, n=38, t=-1.64638),* intonation*(p=0.14404, n=38, t=--1.49341),*diction*(p=0.11842, n=38, t=-1.59963),* and delivery*(p=0.15840, n=38, t=-1.44037)* are insignificant(p>0.05), however, accent*(p=0.00365, n=38, t=-3.11021)* is statistically significant(p<0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that in the scatter plot, the scores of affective factor *(motivation)* and oral language skills*(intonation)* shows a linear relationship in a positive correlation graph. Affective factor*(motivation)* is related to oral language skills *(fluency, accent, diction, and delivery)* but moves in different directions from one another. As the motivation scores increases, the oral language skills decrease. This implied that motivation had a significant effect on the students' oral language skills in terms of intonation, and no significant effect on the remaining four oral language skills (fluency, accent, diction, delivery).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

In affective factor*(motivation)* of ABM strand students, it had no correlation with oral language skills in terms of fluency*(coefficient=0.0000),* while it had a positive correlation with intonation*(coefficient=0.13462)* as oral language skills, and had a negative correlation with oral language skills in terms of accent *(coefficient = -0.27113)*, diction*(coefficient=-0.18244),*and delivery*(coefficient=-0.21408)*. The oral language skills of students in terms of fluency*(p=0.02576, n=38, t=-2.32605)* is significant(p<0.05), while accent*(p=0.06369, n=38, t=-1.91327),* intonation*(p=0.05388, n=38, t=-1.99300),* diction*(p=0.16058, n=38, t=-1.43268)* and delivery*(p=0.06702, n=38, t=-1.88864)* are insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that affective factor(motivation) and fluency is not related, the direction of intonation(increases) is the same to the direction of affective factor(motivation)(increases) when put in the scatter plot. The affective factor(motivation) increased in position while the points of oral language skills (accent, diction, and delivery decreased, as it goes in different directions. The motivation of the students had a significant effect on their fluency in public speaking, while it had no significant effect on accent, intonation, diction, and delivery.

The HUMSS strand students' motivation had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient=0.06869)*, while it had a negative correlation with fluency *(coefficient=-0.34902),* accent *(coefficient=-0.36857),* diction *(coefficient=-0.21752)* and delivery *(coefficient=-0.22502).* The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.00002, n=133, t=-4.45896)*, accent *(p=0.00000, n=133, t=-5.31039)*, intonation *(p=0.00008, n=133, t=-4.07548),* diction *(p=0.00011, n=133, t=-3.99673)*, and delivery *(p=0.00004, n=133, t=-4.22622)* are all significant(p<0.05) as it compared to used level of significance.

This indicates that student's motivation as affective factor had same direction (increasing) with intonation, while it is increasing, the oral language in terms of fluency, accent, diction, and delivery had different direction (decreasing). This affective factor(motivation) had a significant effect on oral language skills of the students in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery.

The TVL strand students' motivation as affective factor had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient=0.18380)*, however, it had a negative correlation with fluency *(coefficient=-0.27599)*, accent *(coefficient=0.47732)*, diction *(coefficient=-0.30565)* and delivery *(coefficient=-0.41452)*. The students' oral language skills in terms of accent *(p=0.00916, n=57, t=-1.66491),* intonation *(p=0.01875, n=57, t=-2.42228),* diction *(p=0.02277, n=57, t=-2.34314)*, and delivery *(p=0.00761, n=57, t=-2.77091)* are significant(p<0.05), while fluency *(p=0.10162, n=57, t=-1.66491)* is insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to the significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that as the values of affective factor *(motivation)* increase as the values of the oral language skills *(fluency, accent, diction, and delivery)* decrease, however, as the motivation increases, the intonation in oral language skills also increases. This means that motivation had a significant effect on the oral language skills in terms of accent, intonation, diction, and delivery, however, it had no significant effect on fluency of the student's oral language skills.

Motivation can affect students speaking ability because it will encourage students to pursue their goals in speaking ability. The higher the motivation of learners in learning the second language, the higher possibility of their success in mastering the second language. However, second language learners who have low motivation will have difficulty to achieve success from learning. So, motivation is one of the factors that plays a role in influencing the success of second language learning (Ni Hui, 2012; Tuan & Mai, 2015).

Self-confidence of students in STEM strand had a positive correlation on students' oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient = 0.13004)*, while it had a negative correlation on fluency*(coefficient = -0.29551),* accent*(coefficient = -0.62751),* diction*(coefficient = -0.40217),* and delivery*(coefficient = -0.17803).* The student's oral language skills in terms of fluency*(p=0.02321, n=38, t=-2.37098),* accent*(p=0.00000, n=38, t=--5.47259),*intonation*(p=0.04960, n=38, t=-2.03189),* and diction*(p=0.00459, n=38, t=-3.02290)* are significant(p<0.05), however, delivery*(p=0.15124, n=38, t=-1.46633)* is statistically insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that when the scores were plot the affective factor*(self-confidence)* and oral language skill*(intonation)* have the same direction (both increases), while in fluency, accent, diction, and delivery goes in different directions(increase-decrease). Self-confidence had a significant effect on fluency, accent, intonation, and diction, while no significant effect on delivery.

The ABM strand students' self-confidence had no relation with oral language skills in terms of fluency*(coefficient=0.00000)*, it had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation*(coefficient=0.12250),* and negative correlation with oral language skills in terms of accent*(coefficient=-0.21097),* diction*(coefficient=-0.20953)*, and delivery*(coefficient=-0.24933)*. The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.00689, n=38, t=-2.86649)*, intonation *(p=0.03200, n=38, t=-2.23102)*, and delivery *(p=0.01876, n=38, t=--2.46147)* are significant(p<0.05), while accent *(p=0.11994, n=38, t=-1.59282)* and diction *(p=0.07790, n=38, t=-1.81474)* are insignificant(p>0.05) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that student's self-confidence had no relation with oral language skills in terms of fluency. The data in self-confidence increases and the data of oral language skills in terms of intonation increases. However, as the data of self-confidence

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

moves in increasing direction, the data from oral language in terms of accent, diction, and delivery moves in decreasing direction. The ABM strand students' self-confidence had a significant effect on their oral language skills in terms of fluency, intonation, and delivery.

Self-confidence of the HUMSS strand students had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient = 0.06714)*, however, it had a negative correlation with oral language skills in terms of fluency *(coefficient=-0.28892)*, accent *(coefficient=-0.28957)*, diction *(coefficient=-0.21752)*, and delivery *(coefficient=-0.22502)*. The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.00027, n=133, t=-3.74566)*, accent *(p=0.00006, n=133, t=-4.16918)*, intonation *(p=0.00040, n=133, t=-3.63608),* diction *(p=0.00099, n=133, t=-3.36884)*, and delivery *(p=0.00307, n=133, t=-3.01703)* are all significant($p<0.05$) as it compared to used level of significance.

This indicates that student's self-confidence as affective factor had same direction (increasing) with intonation, while it is increasing, the oral language in terms of fluency, accent, diction, and delivery had different direction (decreasing). This affective factor(motivation) had a significant effect on oral language skills of the students in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery.

Self-confidence as an affective factor of TVL strand students had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient=0.20166)*, while it had a negative relation with fluency *(coefficient=-0.14526),* accent *(coefficient=-0.29817),* diction *(coefficient=-0.23700)* and delivery *(coefficient=-0.31346)*. The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.42670, n=57, t=-0.80079),* accent *(p=0.13759, n=57, t=-1.50676),* intonation *(p=0.07424, n=57, t=-1.81975),* diction *(p=0.10406, n=57, t=-1.65284)*, and delivery *(p=0.06459, n=57, t=-1.88596)* are all insignificant($p>0.05$) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that TVL strand student's self-confidence as affective factor had same direction (increasing) with intonation, while it is increasing, the oral language in terms of fluency, accent, diction, and delivery had different direction (decreasing). This affective factor(motivation) had a no significant effect on oral language skills of the students in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery.

Self-confidence is also the component of affective factors that can influence students' speaking ability. If the students have high confidence, then they will have high score in speaking and vice versa (Ni Hui, 2012; Tuan & Mai, 2015). Meanwhile, Sanders & Sanders (2016) mentioned the efficacy beliefs relate to the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce outcomes of Bandura. In self-efficacy theory, the confidence is not just having the capability to do something. In this, expectancy beliefs are more possibility oriented. In contrast, efficacy beliefs are feelings about being able and prepared to do something through confidence in current ability. Eccles & Wigfield (2000 as cited in Sanders & Sanders, 2016) acknowledge that their notion of expectancy is more similar to efficacy beliefs than to outcome-expectancy theories.

The affective factor *(anxiety)* of STEM strand students had a positive correlation on students' oral language skills in terms of intonation*(coefficient=0.12948)*, while it had a negative correlation on fluency*(coefficient=-0.33814),* accent*(coefficient=-0.49127),* diction*(coefficient=-0.43130),* and delivery*(coefficient=-0.34794)*. The student's oral language skills in terms of fluency*(p=0.00654, n=38, t=-2.88697),* accent*(p=0.00042, n=38, t=-3.88959),*diction*(p=0.00148, n=38, t=-3.44122),* and delivery*(p=0.00238, n=38, t=-3.26866)* are significant($p<0.05$), however, intonation*(p=0.15839, n=38, t=-1.44043)* is statistically insignificant($p>0.05$) as it compared to significance level of 0.05.

This indicates that the direction of the linear regression of affective factor*(anxiety)* and oral language skill*(intonation)* was the same (both increases), while it is in contrast(increase-decrease) to the direction of the four oral language skills (fluency, accent, diction, and delivery). Anxiety as an affective factor had a significant effect on oral language skills in terms of fluency, accent, diction, and delivery, while it had no significant effect on intonation.

Anxiety as the affective factor of ABM strand students had a positive correlation with oral language skills in The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.00002, n=133, t=-4.45896)*, accent *(p=0.00000, n=133, t=-5.31039)*, intonation *(p=0.00008, n=133, t=-4.07548),* diction *(p=0.00011, n=133, t=-3.99673)*, and delivery *(p=0.00004, n=133, t=-4.22622)* are all significant($p<0.05$) as it compared to used level of significance. terms of intonation *(coefficient=0.12254)*, while it had negative correlation with fluency *(coefficient=-0.29127),* accent *(coefficient=-0.29557),* diction *(coefficient=-0.21631)* and delivery *(coefficient=-0.22168).* The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.02568, n=38, t=-2.32737),* accent *(p=0.01869, n=38, t=-2.46312),* delivery *(p=0.02802, n=38, t=-2.28946)* are significant($p<0.05$), while intonation *(p=0.41053, n=38, t=-0.83265),* and diction *(p=0.05348, n=38, t=-1.99655)* are insignificant($p>0.05$) as it compared to the level of significance(0.05).

This indicates that anxiety as affective factor increased, the students' oral language skill in terms of intonation also increased, while the affective factor increases, the oral language skills in terms of fluency, accent, diction and delivery decreases. The affective factor*(anxiety)* had a significant effect on the oral language skills of the students in terms fluency, accent, and delivery. In contrast, the anxiety as affective factor had no significant effect on the oral language skills of the students in terms of intonation and diction.

In terms of anxiety as affective factor of HUMSS strand students, it had a positive correlation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient = 0.07351)*, however, it had a negative

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

correlation with oral language skills in terms of fluency *(coefficient=-0.29549)*, accent *(coefficient=-0.26401)*, diction *(coefficient=-0.27641)*, and delivery *(coefficient=-0.26297)*. The oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.00065, n=133, t=-3.49561)*, accent *(p=0.00083, n=133, t=-3.42302)*, intonation *(p=0.00083, n=133, t=-3.42069),* diction *(p=0.00011, n=133, t=-3.99392)*, and delivery *(p=0.00144, n=133, t=-3.25476)* are all significant($p<0.05$) as it compared to used level of significance.

This indicates that student's self-confidence as affective factor had same direction (increasing) with intonation, while it is increasing, the oral language in terms of fluency, accent, diction, and delivery had different direction (decreasing). This affective factor(motivation) had a significant effect on oral language skills of the students in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery.

The affective factor*(anxiety)* of TVL strand students had a positive relation with oral language skills in terms of intonation *(coefficient=0.18288)*, while it had a negative correlation with oral language skills in terms of fluency *(coefficient=-0.25226)*, accent *(coefficient=-0.30968),* diction *(coefficient=-0.28302),* and delivery *(coefficient=-0.23380)*.The TVL strand students' oral language skills in terms of fluency *(p=0.12085, n=57, t=-1.57562),* accent *(p=0.08450, n=57, t=-1.75688),* intonation *(p=0.15683, n=57, t=-1.43543),* and delivery *(p=0.12624, n=57, t=-1.55265)* are insignificant($p>0.05$). On the other hand, students' oral language skills in terms of intonation *(p=0.02890, n=57, t=-2.24363)* is significant($p<0.05$) as it compared to level of significance of 0.05.

This indicates that the direction of the linear regression of affective factor*(anxiety)* and oral language skill*(intonation)* was the same (both increases), while it is in contrast(increase-decrease) to the direction of the four oral language skills (fluency, accent, diction, and delivery). Anxiety as an affective factor had no significant effect on oral language skills in terms of fluency, accent, and delivery, while it had significant effect on diction.

Anxiety is another affective factor that can influence students' speaking ability. One of the problems for students in learning the second language is that they get anxiety when they are told to speak in front of the class over speak with other people in English/ The lower the students' anxiety, then their speaking performance will be higher. While the higher of students' anxiety in speaking Englih, then their speaking performance will be lower (Ni Hui, 2012; Taun & Mai, 2015).

## CONCLUSION

This study's main goal is to ascertain if the affective factors such as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety had a significant effect on the students' written language skills in terms of vocabulary, grammar, content, coherency, and quality. In addition it aimed to determine if the affective factor had a significant effect on the oral language skills in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery. Based on the gathered findings, students' motivation had no significant effect the vocabulary and quality skills in writing, in STEM strand, and coherency skills in TVL strand. In writing skills of the students, they often encounter some linguistic difficulties, such as adequate mastery of vocabulary, simple sentence structure, and grammatical errors that hinders them to write effectively. Students were afraid of criticism from their peers like teachers and classmates. The reasons why they feel unmotivated is due to inability to thoughts and generate ideas.

In students' written language skills, self-confidence had no effect on vocabulary in STEM and TVL strand students, in grammar, and coherency skills for TVL students. Student's low of self-confidence makes them worried about writing English composition during their English translation exam. They were afraid that they might get a negative evaluation in their writing from the teacher and fellow students.

The anxiety as an affective factor had no significant effect on the students written language skills in terms of vocabulary, grammar, coherency, and quality. Due to anxiety, students during writing English composition, they encounter difficulties in sentence structure. They feel anxious when they have grammatical errors and inadequate mastery of vocabulary. Due to lack of sufficient time for writing practice, it makes them feel anxious.

In students' oral language skills, the affective factor motivation had significant effect on the fluency skills, intonation skills, diction skills, and delivery skills. Students feel motivated to speak when they have supportive and tolerant listeners. They enjoy getting their teacher's oral corrective feedback in class. Due to motivation, students were capable of identifying their own weaknesses and strengths in speaking tasks. Students feel motivated when they were given an ample time to prepare for their speaking tasks.

Students lose confidence in speaking because they were afraid that the other students will laugh at them when their teachers correct their error. Self-confidence had no significant effect in the delivery skills of the students in oral language tasks for STEM strand, accent skills, and diction skills for ABM strand, and in oral language skills in terms of fluency, accent, intonation, diction, and delivery for TVL strand.

Students' anxiety had no significant effect on intonation skills in STEM strand, intonation skills, and diction skills in ABM strand, and fluency skills, accent skills, intonation skills, and delivery skills in TVL strand. Students feel generally nervous and anxious when they get a feedback from their teachers on their English errors in front of their classmates. Due to anxiety students make a lot of pauses or use 'ah', 'umm', etc. during their speaking activities.

In addition, the researcher concluded that when students received corrective feedback from their peers they feel anxious and unmotivated. Students think that they will commit same mistake again if their peers give a negative comment on their errors and mistakes during their writing and oral tasks.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed the significant effect of affective factors in written and oral language skills of the students. Thus, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. Since the students were on the satisfactory level in written language skills, the teachers should motivate the students to read more English books to have an adequate mastery of the vocabularies. Moreover, the teacher should encourage the students to practice their writing skills by reading simple articles every day.
2. The teacher should give corrective feedback in the students works in away where the students don't feel that they will be judge by others.
3. The teacher should give time and help the students to practice writing and help the students to know more about grammar.
4. To boost the confidence of the students, they should be given a time and practice to have a good command of composition techniques. The students should be guided in proper forms and formats.
5. Students should be given feedback that makes them comfortable and don't be afraid in the given feedbacks.
6. To avoid students' feeling such as anxious and upset, the teacher should tell students that being corrected will help them in improving their writing skills.
7. In enhancing the students' oral language skills, the students should be motivated by means of having a support from teachers and peers. To boosts their self-confidence, the teachers must tell the students to not be afraid in speaking in front and the experience that they will gain can be used as stepping stone for the future endeavors in their life.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher would like to give her sincerest gratitude to the following persons who exerted efforts to make this study a success:

**LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY - STA. CRUZ CAMPUS**, for giving her the chance to finish her Master's Degree.

**HON. MARIO R. BRIONES, EdD.,** University President of LSPU, without his persistent help, the goal of this study would not have been realized.

**ENGR. LUIS MANUEL R. ALVAREZ,** Campus Director for his untiring support to the GSAR students.

**ROSARIO G. CATAPANG, PhD.,** Associate Dean of the College of Teacher Education, for her hardworking assets.

**AILEEN M. DARAN, EdD.,** the researcher's adviser whose constructive in terms of advice, guidance, and support for the improvement of this study.

**VILMA M. GERONIMO, PhD**. the researcher's technical editor, for sharing her expertise in the technical aspect;

**NIMFA G. DIMACULANGAN, PhD.,** the researcher's subject specialist for sharing her expertise in the field of research;

**MERILYN P. JUACALLA, EdD.,** internal statistician, for his generosity in interpreting the data and for objective analysis thereof;

**FLORHAIDA V. PAMATMAT, EdD.,** for sharing her expertise in the aspect of the research;

**MAIDA O. SARMIENTO, EdD.,** for sharing his proficiency in the language aspect of the research;

**JULIE ROSE P. MENDOZA, PhD.,** for giving constant reminders and advice regarding GSAR announcements and updates;

**EVELYN B. NAPIZA, Registrar III.,** for support and persistent help with this study;

**JOSEPHINE G. VILLAVERDE and MA. CHRISTINA R. BELI, PhD., MARIA L. FAJARDO,** for extending a hand to help the researcher in making appropriate corrections in validating research questionnaires;

**MARIO A GUEVARRA, PRINCIPAL III of DR. MARIA D. PASTRANA NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL** for the support and allowing the researcher to properly conduct and administer the study;

**JOHN PHILIP F. REVUELTA and MELOJEAN L. ROYERAS**, for their encouragement and invaluable assistance to make this research meaningful;

**GRADE 11 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SUBJECT TEACHERS** (21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World), for their valuable assistance and participation in collecting data and evaluating the language skills of the respondents.

**GRADE 11 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OF DR. MARIA D. PASTRANA NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL,** for sharing their valuable time and effort to answer the questionnaire and comply to the activities given by the subject teachers that is needed in this study.

## REFERENCES

1. *Arnold (2013) Meaningful Action: Earl Stevick's influence on language teaching. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/20469539/Meaningful_action_Earl_Stevicks_influence_on_language_teaching*
2. *Brown, D. (2006). Principle of Language Learning and Teaching. (5th ed). New York: Longman*
3. *Dickinson, D. & Snow, C. (2017). Interrelationship among Prereading and Oral language Skills in Kindergartens from Social Classes. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/abs/pii/08852006890010x*
4. *Du, X. (2009), The Affective Filter in Second Language Teaching. Asian Social Science, 5(8), 162-165*
5. *Farzana (2012). Affective Factors in English Language Teaching for Professional. DOI: 10.12928/utic.v2.5749.2019. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/5765028/AFFECTIVE_FACTORS_IN_ENGLISH_LANGUAGE_TEACHING_FOR_PROFESSIONALS Accessed on Feb. 17, 2023*
6. *Gallardo (2018). The Effect of Level of Self Confidence to the Academic Performance of Senior High School Students of Bagong Silang II National High School for the School Year 2017-2018 Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/35948768/THE_EFFECT_OF_LEVEL_OF_SELF_CONFIDENCE_TO_THE_ACADEMIC_PER*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 7| July 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

*FORMANCE_OF_SENIOR_HIGH_SCHOOL_STUDENTS_OF_BAGONG_SILANG_II_NATIONAL_HIGH_SCHOOL*

7. *Golfeld et.,al (2017). Oral Language-A Foundation for Learning. Affilitian: Murdoch Children Research Institute*
8. *Habok, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The Effect of Language Learning Strategies on Proficiency, Attitudes and School Achievement. Vol 8, 2017. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358. Retrieved from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2017/full*
9. *Illyin, I., Sofi G., &Yunianti S., (2021). The affective Factors Influencing Students' speaking ability. DOI:10.12928/utc.v2.5749.2019 Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350008760_The_affective_factors_influencing_students'_speaking_ability*
10. *Jafarib, M. (2019). Investigating the Levels, Types, and Causes of Writing Anxiety among Iranian EFL Students: A Mixed Method Design. English Department, Hafez Institute of Higher Education, 71344, Iran Language Learning and Learner Psychology*
11. *Khalifa et.al., (2014). Language Acquisition Theories. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.1.1381.1607.*
12. *Liu C. & Luo (2021). Impact of Affective Factors on Senior High School Students with Low English Reading Ability Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p91*
13. *Polatcan, F. et al., (2021) An Analysis of Relevant Studies on Language Learning Strategies in Teaching Turkish as Foreign Language. Sinop University, Turkey. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6897-8932*
14. *Shadiev, R. (2019). Review of Studies on Technology-Enhanced Language Learning and Teaching. School of Education Science, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097. China*
15. *Tarvaninen S., Stolt S., & Launonen K. (2019). Oral Language Comprehension Interventions in 1-8-year-old Children with Language disorders or Difficulties: A Systematic Scoping Review. Autism and Developmental Langauge Impairments. DOI: 10.117/2396941520946999 Retrieved from: https://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/b1f62928-342b-3ba0-a974-02f5d62aca3e/*
16. *Cole, J., & Feng, J., (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED556123.pdf*