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ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| Poor engagement in oral communication tasks in English classes among students across the globe is a problem. This study determined the significance of affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting as predictors of engagement in oral communication tasks. A multiple regression analysis was utilized, involving 303 samples through convenience sampling. It is concluded that affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting are significant predictors of engagement in oral communication tasks, with a 39.2 % combined degree of influence, supporting the Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Further, a quantitative research study that replicates the use of SDT may be pursued to support or deny the theory. Future research may also explore using other variables not covered in the study to account for the 60.8% variance in the criterion variable. Likewise, qualitative research may be conducted to explore possible themes that may be utilized as additional variables. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

The students’ poor engagement in oral communication tasks was one of the problems in English classes. English speaking in an academic setting was a challenging experience among Second and/or foreign-language students. Whenever they speak English, their first language interferes in the process (Yahaya et al., 2021).

In countries like Ethiopia and Sudan, the poor engagement problem in oral communication tasks among students was generally described as “laborious.”  It was evident by their insufficient performance and participation in oral communication tasks (Haile et al., 2024; Alsidding & Abdaldfi, 2020). As a specific example in the study of Ork et al. (2024), the poor engagement problem in oral communication tasks as a problem among Cambodian students’ speaking skills is classified as psychological.

 In the Philippines, the poor engagement problem in oral communication tasks studies hinted that there appeared to be a lingering problem in improving the speaking skills of most senior high school students in public and private institutions (Kilag et al., 2024; Manuel, 2022). Additionally, Soreño and Valle (2024) found that students’ apprehension and lack of motivation toward oral communication significantly affect their performance in engaging in speaking tasks. During cluster school meetings in Davao City, similar problems were re-echoed by many English teachers of Grade 11 students in public schools in the locality. They revealed that they shared a common problem with their students’ poor engagement in oral communication tasks.

 Consequently, poor engagement in oral communication tasks among senior high school students affected their learning experience, emotional states, and attitudes toward a speaking activity (Apat et al., 2023; Kiruthiga & Christopher, 2022; Gonzales, 2020). Further, it also affected their preparation for oral presentation assessments at the university level (Grieve et al., 2021). These effects trigger the urgency of this study. In addition to this urgency, it is the reality that research is scarce concerning this problem. Hence, this study was conducted.

* 1. **Significance of the Study**

 The study is primarily significant to senior high school students in public high schools in Marilog District, Davao City, as they may directly benefit from the findings of this study in improving their participation in oral communication tasks. Moreover, it may also be significant to English teachers, particularly those at the senior high school level. They may be provided with the necessary information to devise interventions to lower their students' affective filters and heighten their willingness to communicate in the classroom. Further, this study may be significant in achieving the Sustainable Development Goal on Quality Education. Conducting this study may help English teachers prepare their oral communication tasks effectively. Finally, this study may be significant to me as an English teacher in a public senior high school. It may allow the researcher to be more aware and proactive in helping students who struggle to communicate in English due to some affective factors.

**1.2 Statement of the Problem**

This study determined the significance of affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting as predictors of engagement in oral communication tasks. Specifically, it pursued the following objectives:

1. To determine the levels of affective filters in terms of self-motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety; willingness to communicate in a school setting in terms of communicating with teachers in English and communicating with classmates in English; and engagement in oral communication tasks in terms of demeanor, and type of tasks.

2. To determine the significance of the correlation between the affective filters and the willingness to communicate in a school setting, and the engagement in oral communication tasks.

3. To determine the significance of the individual and combined degree of influence of affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting on engagement in oral communication tasks.

**1.3 Null Hypotheses**

 The study was tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

*H01:* Affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting do not significantly correlate with engagement in oral communication tasks.

*H02*: Affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting do not significantly influence engagement in oral communication tasks.

**1.4 Theoretical Framework**

The study was grounded in the Self Determination Theory (SDT) (Ryan & Deci, 2019). The SDT suggests that humans have three basic psychological needs, namely autonomy (i.e., engaging in behavior with a full sense of volition), competence (i.e., the experience of mastery and efficacy), and relatedness (i.e., the need to feel connected to other people in a meaningful way) (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). According to the theory, these psychological needs are considered essential elements for an individual's adjustment, integrity, and growth (Ryan, 1995; Vansteenkiste et al., 2020).

 In this study, the affective filters indicated motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety (Lemana et al., 2023) stand for the competence idea as presented in the theory. The willingness to communicate indicated by students’ willingness to communicate in a school setting with their classmates and teachers in English (Baghei, 2013) stands for the idea of autonomy as asserted in the theory. Finally, engagement in oral communication tasks indicated by demeanor and type of tasks (Toyoshima, 2023) stands for the individual's adjustment mentioned in the theory. This study is delimited only to autonomy, competence, and individual adjustment; thus, relatedness is excluded.

**1.5 Conceptual Framework**

 The conceptual framework of this study was underpinned by the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) introduced in 1985 by Ryan and Deci (2019). The SDT's Competence was inclined to the variables of affective filters. Autonomy supports the willingness to communicate in a school setting. Individual adjustment represented the students' engagement in oral communication tasks.

The illustration below presents the variables and their relationship.



*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of the Study*

2. methodology

**2.1 Research Design**

This study utilized a predictive research design using multiple-linear regression analysis. Multiple linear regression analysis is a statistical tool utilized to know the relationship between numerous independent predictors and a single dependent outcome variable (Marill, 2004). This research design provided an appropriate method for analyzing data and drawing conclusions from the relationships of the variables to determine their influence on students' engagement in oral communication tasks.

**2.2 Locale of the Study**

This study was conducted in a cluster of four public senior high schools in Marilog District, Davao City. This locale was chosen because the selected schools strongly conveyed their intention of enhancing their students’ engagement in oral communication tasks in their English classes.

**2.3 Sample and Sampling Technique**

 The respondents of this study were Grade 11 high school students in public schools. Using a convenience sampling technique, 303 out of 404 of the total population responded positively. This number constitutes 70% of the total population. The criteria used in the selection include all those who enrolled in Grade 11 in the school year 2024-2025, those who are 16 to 18 years old and above at the time of administering the survey questionnaire, and those who voluntarily participated in the study regardless of their number of absences and/or skipped classes in English 11. The exclusion criteria were those respondents who did not submit their Informed Consent and Assent and those who were absent on the day of conducting the survey.

**2.4 Research Instrument**

The research instrument was a survey questionnaire composed of three parts. Each part of the questionnaire was adapted and modified. It includes 35 items. Part 1 of the questionnaire tackled the respondents’ level of affective filters in the areas of self-motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety using the questionnaire created by Lemana et al. (2023). It contained five (5) items in each area with a total of 15 indicators.

Part 2 covered the respondents' level of willingness to communicate in a school setting in terms of communicating with teachers and students in English, based on Baghei’s (2013) willingness to communicate in a foreign language scale (WTC-FLS). It contained ten (10) items in the context of a school setting.

Part 3 determined the respondents’ level of engagement in oral communication tasks according to demeanor and type of tasks. This is based on the qualitative indicators formulated by Toyoshima (2023). It contained 10 items in the context of a school setting.

The adapted and modified questionnaires were validated by three experts in the fields of language education and psychology. Two experts are from the Holy Cross of Davao College (HCDC). Another expert outside HCDC was sought. After their validation, two items in the Level of Engagement part were added. Some items in other parts were also edited and revised for clarity.

Moreover, the survey questionnaires underwent reliability testing through pilot testing conducted on 30 Grade 11 students in one of the public high schools in Davao City. The results were examined using Cronbach's α coefficient. The reliability analysis of the "Affective Filters," "Willingness to Communicate in School Setting," and "Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks" scales based on 30 valid cases with no exclusions indicates a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.923, 0.917, and 0.928, respectively. These values suggest an excellent level of internal consistency, demonstrating that all 35 scale items are highly reliable in measuring the construct of those three domains.

***2.4.1 On Affective Filters.*** This part of the questionnaire was designed to measure students' level of affective filters. The items focused on the students' self-confidence, motivation, and anxiety. Students rated their level with various statements using a five-point Likert scale, with scores later interpreted using the following scale:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ranges | Description | Interpretation |
| 4.20 - 5.00 | Very High | Affective filters are excellent.  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 | High | Affective filters are very good |
| 2.60 - 3.39 | Moderate | Affective filters are good |
| 1.80 - 2.59 | Low | Affective filters are poor. |
| 1.00 – 1.79 | Very Low | Affective filters are very poor. |

***2.4.2 On Willingness to Communicate.*** This part of the questionnaire was designed to measure students' willingness to communicate in a classroom setting. The items focused on the student's willingness to communicate with classmates and the student's willingness to communicate with teachers. Students rated their level with various statements using a five-point Likert scale, with scores later interpreted using the following scale:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range of Means** | **Description Level** | **Interpretation** |
| 4.20 - 5.00 | Very High  | The willingness to communicate in a school setting is extremely strong. |
| 3.40 - 4.19 | High  | The willingness to communicate in a school setting is very strong.  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 | Moderate | The willingness to communicate in a school setting is strong. |
| 1.80 - 2.59 | Low  | The willingness to communicate in a school setting is weak. |
| 1.00 – 1.79 | Very Low  | The willingness to communicate in a school setting is very weak.  |

***2.4.3 On Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks.*** This part of the questionnaire was designed to measure students’ level of engagement in oral communication tasks. The items focused on the students’ demeanor and the type of tasks. Students rated their level with various statements using a five-point Likert scale, with scores later interpreted using the following scale:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range of Means** | **Description Level** | **Interpretation** |
| 4.20 - 5.00 | Very High  | Engagement in oral communication tasks is excellent. |
| 3.40 - 4.19 | High  | Engagement in oral communication tasks is very good. |
| 2.60 - 3.39 | Moderate | Engagement in oral communication tasks is good. |
| 1.80 - 2.59 | Low  | Engagement in oral communication tasks is poor. |
| 1.00 – 1.79 | Very Low  | Engagement in oral communication tasks is very poor. |

***2.4.4 Measurement of the Strength of Correlation***. This study utilized the standard scheme to determine the strength and significance of the correlation. The following scheme is used for the r-value.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Computed *r* |  |
| +/- 1.00 | Perfect correlation |
| Between +/- 0.75 - +/-0.99 | High correlation |
| Between  +/- 0.51- +/-0.74 | Moderately high correlation |
| Between +/- 0.31- +/- 0.50  | Moderately low correlation |
| Between +/-0.01 -+/- 0.30 | Low correlation |
| 0.00 | No correlation  |

**2.5 Data Gathering Procedures**

 The procedures for gathering data started with getting the approval and permission of the adviser, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Research Ethics Committee, the Schools Division Superintendent, and the principals of the four public high schools to administer the questionnaire. Then, the researcher coordinated with the head and/or coordinator of the English Department to schedule the surveys. The informed consents and informed assents were distributed to all respondents and/or their guardians one week before the date of the survey, and then they were collected back on the following days. The survey questionnaire forms were printed out for paper-pencil surveying, and they were administered based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria of respondents and those who voluntarily agreed to take part in the study. Then, the filled-out survey questionnaires were gathered for tabulating, computing, and analysis.

**2.6 Data Analysis**

The data were coded before loading them into SPSS 25 for analysis. Then, the data were analyzed for parametric statistical computation and interpretation using the appropriate statistical tools. These included the Weighted Mean, Standard Deviation, and Pearson - r, which were used to determine and analyze the respondents' levels of affective filters, willingness to communicate in a school setting, and engagement in oral communication tasks. The study determined the significant relationship between the level of affective filters, level of willingness to communicate in a school setting, and level of engagement in oral communication tasks using multiple linear regression analysis. The same tool was used to determine the degree of influence of affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting on engagement in oral communication tasks.

3. results and discussion

**3.1 Descriptive Analysis**

Table 1 is the descriptive table. It contains the variables of the study, namely affective filters, willingness to communicate in a school setting, and engagement in oral communication tasks. Also contained in the table are the indicators, the number of samples, the standard deviation, the mean, and the corresponding descriptive level.

**Table 1. Descriptive Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Indicators** | **N** | **SD** | **Mean** | **Descriptive Level** |
| Affective Filters | Self-Motivation |  | 0.78 | 3.64 | High |
| 1. Self-Confidence
 |  | 0.76 | 3.09 | Moderate  |
| 1. Anxiety
 |  | 0.66 | 3.07 | Moderate |
| **Overall** |  | **303** | **0.59** | **3.27** | **Moderate** |
| Willingness to Communicate in a School Setting | Communicating with Teachers in English |  | 0.69 | 3.27 | Moderate |
| 1. Communicating with Classmates in English
 |  | 0.75 | 3.35 | Moderate |
| **Overall** |  | **303** | **0.68** | **3.31** | **Moderate** |
| Engagement in Oral Communication Task | Demeanor |  | 1.03 | 3.58 | High  |
| 1. Type of Task
 |  | 0.74 | 3.55 | High |
| **Overall** |  | **303** | **0.79** | **3.57** | **High** |

Specifically, Table 1 shows that the affective filters variable obtained a mean of 3.27, which is described as moderate. The weighted mean indicates that the affective filters are good. Two out of its three indicators obtained means are moderate, while the other one is high. Furthermore, the willingness to communicate in a school setting variable obtained a mean of 3.31, which is described as moderate. It indicates that the willingness to communicate in a school setting is strong. All its indicators obtained respective means, which are described as moderate. Finally, the engagement in oral communication tasks variable garnered a mean score of 3.57, which is described as high. It indicates that the engagement in oral communication tasks is very good. All its indicators obtained a mean which means high.

**3.2 Correlation Analysis**

Table 2 is the correlation table. It contains the predictive variables, namely, affective filters, willingness to communicate in a school setting, and the criterion variable engagement in oral communication tasks. Also contained in the table are the r-value, p-value, the decision of the hypothesis, and the corresponding interpretation.

**Table 2. Correlation Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks |
| r-Value | p-Value | **Decision on** Ho | **Interpretation** |
| Affective Filters | .678 | .000 | Reject | Significant |
| Willingness to Communicate in School Setting | .503 | .000 | Reject | Significant |

Table 2 specifically shows that the correlation between affective filters and engagement in oral communication tasks yielded a p-value of .000, which is less than 0.05 degree of confidence. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that the correlation between these variables is significant. Likewise, their correlation obtained an r-value of .678, indicating a moderately high strength.

Moreover, the correlation analysis between willingness to communicate in a school setting obtained a p-value of .000, which is less than 0.05 alpha. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It also indicates that the correlation between the two variables is significant. The r-value of .503 indicates a moderately high strength of correlation.

These findings suggest that as the respondents’ affective filters are lowered, it increases their engagement in oral communication tasks. Moreover, as the respondents’ willingness to communicate in a school setting heightens, it also increases their engagement in oral communication tasks.

**3.3 Regression Analysis**

Table 3 is the regression table. It contains predictors, namely, affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting. It also contains the criterion variable, which is engagement in oral communication tasks. Finally, it contains the coefficients β, t-value, p-value, the decision on hypotheses, and the corresponding interpretation.

**Table 3. Regression Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks |
|  |  | **Unstandardized****Coefficients** | **Standardized Coefficients** |  |  |  |
|  | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **t** | **Sig.** | **Decision on H0** | **Interpretation** |
| Constant | .917 | .207 |  | 4.420 | .000 |  |  |
| Affective Fillers | .214 | .082 | .160 | 2.610 | .010 | Reject | Significant |
| Willingness to Communicate in School Setting | .590 | .071 | .507 | 8.278 | .000 | Reject | Significant |

R=.626;  R2=.392;  F-value = 96.802;  p-value =.000

 Table 3 specifically shows that the affective filters variable obtained an unstandardized beta coefficient of .214, indicating that it has a 21.4% degree of influence on engagement in oral communication tasks with a p-value of .010, less than the 0.05 degree of confidence; the hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that the 21.4% influence of affective filters on engagement in oral communication tasks is significant. It implies that for every .214-unit change in affective filters, there is a corresponding unit change in engagement in oral communication tasks.

In addition, the willingness to communicate in a school setting obtained an unstandardized beta coefficient of .590, indicating that it has a 59% degree of influence on engagement in oral communication tasks, with a p-value of .000, which is less than 0.05 degree of confidence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This data indicates that 59% of the willingness to communicate in a school setting is significant in terms of engagement in oral communication tasks. It implies that for every .590 unit change in willingness to communicate in a school setting, there is a corresponding unit change in engagement in oral communication tasks.

 Both predictive variables, affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting, obtained an R2 of .392. It indicates that together, it obtained a combined degree of confidence of 39.2% and a combined degree of influence on engagement in oral communication tasks. With a p-value of .000, that 39.2% influence is significant. Finally, the table shows the regression formula for engagement in oral communication tasks: EOCT= .214 AF + .590 WTC + .917.

**3.4 Summary of Findings**

1. The affective filters are good, the willingness to communicate in a school setting is strong, and the engagement in oral communication tasks is very good.
2. The affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting to engagement in oral communication tasks are significantly correlated at a moderately high degree.
3. The affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting, with a 39.2 % combined degree of influence, are significant predictors of engagement in oral communication tasks.

**3.5 DISCUSSIONS**

**3.5.1 Descriptive Analysis**

*Good Affective Filters*

 *On Self-Confidence.* The results suggest that the majority of Grade 11 students have a good level of self-confidence, especially when they put their ideas into speaking English in short statements. The good level of the respondents’ self-confidence confirms similar results among college students in the study of Briones et al. (2023) when they expressed themselves in simple sentences in English. In contrast, Dadulla (2023) revealed the low self-confidence of private high school students in a province in the Philippines. The study shows that their low self-confidence was caused by seeing themselves as not good at their speaking skills, which affected their speech delivery.

 *On Anxiety.* In the current study, the majority of Grade 11 students feel anxious when their English teacher asks them to answer questions in front of the whole class. This situation takes a toll on them as the activity not only asks them to answer a question in English, but they do it when they are in front of the class. This finding affirms the findings of the study conducted among high school students in one of the public high schools in the Philippines, where the majority of the respondents showed increased anxiety when they stood in front of the class during their oral recitation (Acibar &Monding, 2020). However, these findings are in contrast to the findings of a qualitative study among selected grade 10 students of a national high school in one of the cities in the Philippines. They perceived themselves as being comfortable in speaking English (Cañete & Ibojo, 2023).

 *On Self-Motivation.* Surprisingly, the majority of Grade 11 students perceive themselves to be often motivated when speaking in English in the classroom as they want to learn to speak in English well, for it will be helpful for their future job. These findings confirm the findings of Alieto and Torres (2019), who referred to these motivations as "instrumental" as they found that their high school student-respondents express high motivation to speak in English as it will help them find a job, earn more money, and achieve future endeavors. On the other hand, Leyaley (2023) had a contrasting finding among pre-service Filipino teachers as they exhibited passiveness over speaking English in the classroom due to their lack of motivation.

*Strong Willingness to Communicate in a School Setting*

 *On Willingness to Communicate in English with Classmates.* The finding shows that the majority of Grade 11 students have a strong willingness to communicate in English with their classmates. This finding is confirmed in the study of NaPiórKowsKa and Barrios (2024), which revealed that Polish and Spanish high school students expressed a moderate level of speaking in English with each other. It is indicative of being English as a second language (ESL) learners, similar to Filipino students. On the contrary, English as a foreign language ( EFL)  students in a university in Indonesia displayed a low willingness to communicate in English with their classmates for discussions and interpersonal conversations (Burhanuddin et al., 2022).

 *On Willingness to Communicate in English with Teachers.* The finding shows that the majority of **G**rade 11 students have a strong willingness to communicate in English with their teachers. This finding confirms the conclusion of Darasawang and Reinders (2021) that students who view English as a foreign language find that the role of English is only confined to classroom activities like role-playing and the teacher asking English questions. Meanwhile, these findings contrast with the conclusion of Jahedi and Lilliati (2020), who recapitulated that ESL students with high English proficiency will not find it hard to communicate with their teachers in English. Interestingly, a sample of Filipino high school students exhibit a high willingness to communicate in English with their teachers if they use their way of using English (Fontillas et al., 2022).

*Very Good Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks*

 *On Demeanor.* The finding shows that the majority of Grade 11 students engage very well in oral communication tasks in terms of their demeanor towards English. Valdez and Lopez (2023) had the same finding that their students-respondents show a positive attitude toward using English in the classroom due to their interest in learning English as much as they can. In contrast, ESL students in Iraqi private universities displayed a negative attitude toward participating in English communication activities because they perceived that they were being forced to teach it (Ahmed et al., 2021).

*On Type of Tasks.* The result shows that the majority of Grade 11 students have very good engagement in oral communication tasks in terms of types of tasks if they are allowed to select the tasks and choose the topics and if the topics are easy and relevant to their interests. This finding is in support of Ondes et al. (2023), who divulges that when English teachers allow their students to work with their peers and facilitate various speaking activities that coincide with their interests, their students are even more engaged. Meanwhile, the findings of a study conducted in Saudi Arabia indicate that students are not highly engaged in communicating in English in the classroom, as the tasks are not "personally relevant, familiar, and interesting" (Benyo & Kumar, 2023).

**3.5.2 Inferential Analysis**

*Moderately High Correlation Between Affective Filters and Willingness to Communicate in a School Setting, and Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks*

 The study found a significant, moderately high correlation between the affective filters and engagement in oral communication tasks. This finding confirms the study results of Lemana et al. (2023), who discovered a positive yet moderate correlation between the two variables. Among the three domains of the affective filters, they found that students' motivation is associated with their participation in oral communication activities. However, Campozano et al.'s finding (2022) is in contrast with the results, as they discovered that anxiety and self-confidence did not have a strong correlation to the performance of oral production, albeit in different contexts.

Meanwhile, the current study also found that there is a substantial positive correlation between Willingness to Communicate in School Setting and Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks. This positive correlation supported the study of Qu (2023), who revealed that there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between Willingness to Communicate (WTC) and active speaking engagement. In contrast, a study, although in a different context, shows that there existed a positive yet insignificant correlation between WTC and impulsive EFL learners’ oral communication strategies (Salehi & Nosratinia, 2022).

*Significant Influence of Affective Filters and Willingness to Communicate in a School Setting on Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks*

The study found that there is a significant influence of the Affective Filters and Willingness to Communicate in a School Setting on Engagement in Oral Communication Tasks. This finding indicates that students' affective filters and willingness to communicate are influential in terms of how they affect the outcome of their engagement in oral communication tasks. This finding supports the studies of Burton and Dichoso (2024), Leeming et al. (2024), and Schmitt (2020). The studies revealed that students' self-motivation is influential on their speaking tasks when practicing fluency and pronunciation and that students' WTC directly predicts the amount of spoken production on a task with a moderate and significant effect size where the "influence" is measured by the predictability of the variable of an outcome; that a classroom environment that will promote collaboration fosters students' stronger willingness to communicate on speaking tasks, respectively.

On the other hand, this finding contradicts Waluyo and Bakoko (2022), who claimed that only one domain of affective filter on motivation has a significant influence on students' speaking performance. They also conclude that the WTC does not significantly influence students' participation in speaking activities. The interpretation of "influence" is based on the correlation and predictability of the two variables with speaking performance using hierarchical regression.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results, it is concluded that affective filters and willingness to communicate in a school setting are significant predictors of engagement in oral communication tasks among Grade 11 students, with a 39.2 % combined degree of influence. This conclusion affirms the theory of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), stating that two of its three humans’ basic psychological needs, namely autonomy (engaging in behavior with a full sense of volition) and competence (the experience of mastery and efficacy), are considered essential elements for an individual's adjustment.

Ethical approval

The purpose of this section was to guarantee scientific integrity and protect human participants from all forms of harm. This study was guided by the mandates of the Department of Science of Technology- Philippine Health Research Ethics Board (DOST-PHREB) on universal ethical principles of respecting the rights of the respondents/participants, and the CMO 15, s.2019 that required the researcher to follow the ethical standards in conducting this research according to the standard of the DOST. Moreover, the researcher ensured compliance with the SMILE requirement to provide mitigation strategies to address the possible psychological or emotional risks (confusion) and to acquire informed consent and assent from the respondents and/or their parents/guardians.
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