

Speaking Intervention to Enhance Students' Speaking Proficiency and Performance

Mary Ann M. Omerez

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This study determined how a speaking intervention can enhance students' speaking proficiency and performance. Moreover, it specifically aimed to assess: the level of acceptability of the Speaking Intervention in terms of its components as to objectives, content, and activities and its features as to usability, accessibility, and relevance; the level of students' speaking proficiency after using the intervention focusing on fluency, clarity, and confidence; the level of students' performance in orals tasks before and after the intervention; the significant difference between students' performance in pre-and post-speaking tasks; the significant relationship between the Speaking Intervention and students' speaking proficiency; and the significant effect of the intervention on students' overall performance. The descriptive method of research was utilized in this study. The researcher chose fifty (50) participants from Los Baños National High School-Batong Malake, who were exposed to the learning material and treated using the pre- and post-speaking activities. Findings revealed that the Speaking Intervention was deemed highly acceptable in terms of components and features, as evaluated by the respondents. Students demonstrated notable improvements in speaking proficiency, particularly in fluency, clarity, and confidence. Their performance in pre-speaking tasks indicated a developing level, while their performance showed significant improvement, with many reaching proficient and outstanding levels. Moreover, the study revealed a significant difference in students' oral performance between pre- and post-speaking tasks, leading to the rejection of the first hypothesis. This finding indicates that the Speaking Intervention had a measurable influence on improving students' oral communication skills. Additionally, a significant relationship was found between the speaking intervention and students' speaking proficiency, resulting in the rejection of the second hypothesis. This means that students who engaged more meaningfully with the intervention tended to show greater improvement in their speaking skills. However, no significant effect was found between the speaking intervention and overall student performance, thereby supporting the third hypothesis. Despite this, the intervention may have contributed qualitative benefits such as increased student confidence and improved classroom participation. These improvements are crucial for students' holistic development and long-term success in both academic and real-world settings. Generally, the Speaking Intervention Material (SIM) may serve as a valuable resource for English teachers. Furthermore, they may differentiate instruction to accommodate diverse student needs and have a continuous professional development to further enhance the effectiveness of the SIM.

Keywords— Speaking intervention, components, features, speaking proficiency, students' performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Students are being taught about the importance of the four macro skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Out of

the four skills, speaking is the most commonly used skill for a junior high school. It serves as crucial tools for their academic success, allowing them to participate in classroom discussions, presenting reports, and collaborating with peers. However, many students often face challenges in expressing themselves fluently and confidently in speaking the English language. These challenges can stem from a variety of factors, such as limited vocabulary, lack of practice, anxiety, or fear of making mistakes. To illustrate this point, Shabani relied on El-Sakka (2016), who claimed that speaking is the most difficult English skill among learners. Moreover, Al-Wossabi (2016) writes about four problems with speaking activities. These include mother tongue use, reduced or unequal engagement, inhibition, and silence. Everybody experiences anxiety in daily life, everywhere, and in every circumstance. Certainly, Sari (2017) stated, "Anxiety is natural and is experienced by everyone at times."

To shape the skills of the students in speaking, they should be exposed to a variety of speaking activities or drills that help them acquire a second language, speak it with confidence, and deal with their English language anxiety properly. Due to the demands and challenges experienced by the students in terms of language anxiety in speaking the English language, the researcher pushed to make a structured speaking intervention to enhance the speaking proficiency and performance. The structured Speaking Intervention has methodical techniques which intend to enhance students' oral communication abilities. The clear objectives that direct learning outcomes, the pertinent information that meets learners' needs and the stimulating activities that encourage practice and interaction are all crucial elements of this structured speaking intervention. Additionally, usability—which guarantees that materials and methods are simple to implement—accessibility—which ensures that interventions are inclusive and can be used by diverse learners—and relevance—which ensures alignment with students' academic, cultural, and personal experiences—are characteristics of structured Speaking Intervention.

While, students' speaking proficiency incorporates different dimensions critical to effective communication. One of these is speaking fluency, or the capacity to speak naturally and at a suitable tempo. Another is speech clarity, which involves proper pronunciation, enunciation, and articulation to ensure intelligibility. Also, confidence level plays a crucial role, as it affects how comfortably and assertively a student can express ideas, opinions, and responses during speaking tasks particularly in English class.

There is a strong correlation between the effectiveness of speech therapy and the fluency of students. A well-designed speaking intervention that is usable, accessible, and relevant can directly impact learners' fluency, clarity, and confidence. When interventions align with learners' needs and create a supportive environment for practice, they provide meaningful opportunities to develop and refine oral communication skills. The link between these variables suggests that enhancements in the quality of speaking interventions can lead to measurable improvements in students' speaking performance.

Ultimately, this study aims to determine how effectively speaking interventions can enhance students' performance and speaking proficiency. By examining how different components and features of the structured speaking intervention influences students' fluency, clarity, and confidence, the research seeks to contribute to the development of effective pedagogical strategies that can be implemented in diverse educational settings.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study aims to determine how a Speaking Intervention can enhance Students' Speaking Proficiency and Performance. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of acceptability of Speaking Intervention in terms of Components as to:
 - 1.1 Objectives;
 - 1.2 Content; and
 - 1.3 Activity ?
2. What is the level of acceptability of Speaking Intervention in terms of Features as to:
 - 2.1 Usability;
 - 2.2 Accessibility; and
 - 2.3 Relevance?
3. What is the level of Students' Speaking Proficiency after using the Speaking Intervention in terms of:
 - 3.1 Speaking Fluency;
 - 3.2 Speech Clarity; and
 - 3.3 Confidence Level?
4. What is the level of Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task
 - 4.1 Pre-Speaking Task; and
 - 4.2 Post Speaking Task?
5. Is there a significant difference between Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task with regards to Pre-Speaking Task and Post Speaking Task?
6. Is there a significant relationship between Speaking Intervention and Students' Speaking Proficiency?
7. Is there a significant effect between Speaking Intervention and Students' Performance?

II. METHODOLOGY

The descriptive method of research was used in this investigation. The researcher chose fifty (50) participants from Los Baños National High School-Batong Malake, who were exposed to the learning material and treated using the pre- and post-speaking activities.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected is presented, analyzed, and interpreted in this section.

Level of Acceptability of Speaking Intervention in terms of Components

In this study, level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of components referring to objectives, content, and activities was determined.

The following tables show the statements, mean, standard deviation, remarks, and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of the group of respondents.

In this study, the objectives of the speaking intervention are to arouse students' interest in speaking, improve speech clarity and articulation, enhance verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and develop speaking confidence.

Table 1 reflected that the speaking intervention's objectives were very evident as rated by the respondents composed of English experts, categorized as school principal, English head teacher, master teacher, and English teachers, and fifty (50) student participants. They strongly agree that the structured speaking intervention arouses the students' interest in speaking (M=4.46, SD=0.61); improves speech clarity and articulation (M=4.60, SD=0.57); enhances verbal and non-verbal communication of the students (M=4.46, SD=0.61); builds their social communication skills (M=4.68, SD=0.51); and develops the speaking confidence of the students (M=4.52, SD=0.61).

The overall mean of 4.54 from the respondents suggests that the developed speaking intervention's level of component as to objectives is very high.

TABLE 1

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
arouse students' interest in speaking	4.46	0.61	Strongly Agree
improve speech clarity and articulation	4.60	0.57	Strongly Agree
enhance verbal and non-verbal communication	4.46	0.61	Strongly Agree
build social communication skills	4.68	0.51	Strongly Agree
develop speaking confidence	4.52	0.61	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.54		
SD	0.59		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Every individual needs to communicate and write in English. It is often known that the majority of people use English as a medium to communicate intentions, such as making requests or offering services. According to Jabbarova (2020), communication abilities are essential in today's globalized world, particularly when dealing with international communication. Furthermore, out of the four primary abilities needed to acquire a foreign or second language, speaking is the most crucial to master, according to Rao (2019). The four language skills—speaking, listening, reading, and writing—cannot be separated from one another because improving one will help improve the others. Lumettu (2018) highlights that proficiency in these four domains is necessary to master English. In a nutshell, the four talents are cultivated simultaneously. The researcher's primary goal in this study is to improve the pupils' speaking abilities. The speaking

intervention's degree of acceptability with respect to its content component was assessed, emphasizing participants' assessments of its appropriateness, relevance, and clarity.

Table 2 reflected the level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of component as to content. The structured speaking intervention's content aims to utilize the use of ICT resources, select various tasks that are suitable to the student's level of development, promote gender-sensitive culturally inclusive activities, integrate the functional communication activities, and design different speaking activities or drills.

As rated by the respondents, composed of English experts and fifty (50) student participants, the structured speaking intervention utilizes the use of ICT resources (M=4.54, SD=0.58); selects various tasks that are suitable to the student's level of development (M=4.72, SD=0.50); promotes gender-sensitive, culturally inclusive activities (M=4.54, SD=0.54); integrates functional communication activities (M=4.70, SD=0.46); and designs different speaking activities or drills (M=4.66, SD=0.52). This indicates that the group of respondents strongly agrees with all the content aspects of the speaking intervention, giving it an overall high acceptability level.

Thus, the overall mean of 4.63 from the respondents suggests that the structured speaking intervention's level of component as to content is very high.

According to Erickson and Astorga (2015), speech will improve as a result of using listening skills. But the researchers like Derakhshan et al. (2016) believe that students should work on improving their speaking skills as part of their academic careers.

TABLE 2. Level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of component as to content

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
utilize the use of ICT resources	4.54	0.58	Strongly Agree
select various tasks that are suitable to the student's level of development	4.72	0.50	Strongly Agree
promote gender-sensitive culturally inclusive activities	4.54	0.54	Strongly Agree
integrate functional communication activities	4.70	0.46	Strongly Agree
design different speaking activities or drills	4.66	0.52	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.63		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Accordingly, Tuan and Mai (2015) recommend that schools revise their language education curricula to incorporate more speaking exercises. A range of speaking exercises is part of the researcher's speaking intervention, which aims to improve students' performance and abilities. To capture the attention of the students in the digital generation, the researcher used ICT resources in the speaking intervention activities and courses. Undoubtedly, both teachers and students benefit from the structured speaking intervention's content, which included a variety of speaking exercises and activities that encourage gender-sensitive, culturally inclusive, and ICT resource use.

Table 3 reflected the acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of component as to activity. The structured speaking intervention's set of activities aims to choose fun and low-pressure games or storytelling to make speaking practice enjoyable, incorporate activities that promote speaking in a relaxed setting, adapt traditional and modern activities to focus on speech targets such as describing, explaining, and even asking questions, provide simple speaking tasks and gradually introduce more complex speaking tasks as confidence grows, and craft engaging activities to maximize the use of multiple intelligences of the students.

As per rated by the respondents composed of English experts and fifty (50) students-participants, the structured speaking intervention chooses fun and low-pressure games or storytelling to make speaking practice enjoyable (M=4.44, SD=0.70); incorporates activities that promote speaking in a relaxed setting (M=4.40, SD=0.70); adapts traditional and modern activities to focus on speech targets such as describing, explaining and even asking questions (M=4.44, SD=0.70); provides simple speaking tasks and gradually introduces more complex speaking tasks as confidence grows (M=4.62, SD=0.49); crafts engaging activities to maximize the use of multiple intelligence of the students (M=4.38, SD=0.75). The overall mean of 4.46 from the respondents suggests that the developed speaking intervention's level of component as to activity is very high.

According to Wahyudin & Rido (2020), this was backed up by the assertion that teachers can use learning applications as an alternative to boring class activities. This is because these applications also encourage students to learn in an engaging manner and improve their English. Accordingly, Sherine et al. (2020) contend that teaching and learning speaking present a number of difficulties for educators and students who choose to exclusively use traditional resources.

TABLE 3. Level of Acceptability of Speaking Intervention in terms of Components as to Activity

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
choose fun and low-pressure games or storytelling to make speaking practice enjoyable	4.44	0.70	Strongly Agree
incorporate activities that promote speaking in a relaxed setting	4.40	0.70	Strongly Agree
adapt traditional and modern activities to focus on speech targets such as describing, explaining and even asking questions	4.44	0.70	Strongly Agree
provide simple speaking tasks and gradually introduce more complex speaking tasks as confidence grows	4.62	0.49	Strongly Agree
craft engaging activities to maximize the use of multiple intelligence of the students	4.38	0.75	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.46		
SD	Very High		
Verbal Interpretation			

Level of Acceptability of Speaking Intervention in Terms of Features

In this study, the acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features refers to usability, acceptability, and relevance.

The statement, mean, standard deviation, comments, and verbal interpretation from the viewpoint of respondents are shown in the tables below.

Table 4 reflected the acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features as to usability. The structured speaking intervention aims to address communication challenges, improve speaking fluency, speech clarity, and confidence level of the students, incorporate speaking exercises to build muscle memory, develop a structured learning plan that gradually increases in complexity and challenge, and create opportunities for students to practice speaking in pairs or small groups.

TABLE 4. Acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features as to usability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
address communication challenges	4.46	0.58	Strongly Agree
improve speaking fluency, speech clarity, and confidence level of the students	4.56	0.58	Strongly Agree
incorporate speaking exercises to build muscle memory	4.44	0.70	Strongly Agree
develop a structured learning plan that gradually increases in complexity and challenge	4.52	0.65	Strongly Agree
create opportunities for students to practice speaking in pairs or small groups	4.62	0.60	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.52		
SD	0.62		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

As rated by the respondents, the structured speaking intervention addresses communication challenges (M=4.46, SD=0.58); improves speaking fluency, speech clarity, and confidence level of the students (M=4.56, SD=0.58); incorporates speaking exercises to build muscle memory (M=4.44, SD=0.70); develops a structured learning plan that gradually increases in complexity and challenge (M=4.52, SD=0.65); and creates opportunities for students to practice speaking in pairs or small groups (M=4.62, SD=0.60).

According to Rao (2019), developing English language skills is crucial for students who are not native English speakers. In order to enhance one's language abilities, one needs constant work and practice. In addition, another student understands the value of English as a universal language and how having a strong command of it enables them to succeed.

Nevertheless, given that the Philippines is one of the most English-speaking nations in Asia, Filipinos typically view their proficiency in the language as "average" (Cabigon, 2015).

Students will benefit greatly from the researcher's structured speaking intervention since it aims to boost their confidence in speaking English as well as assist them in speaking the foreign language through performing different speaking activities or drills.

The overall mean of 4.52 from the respondents suggests that the structured speaking intervention's level of component as to usability is very high.

Table 5 reflected the acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features as to accessibility. The structured speaking intervention aims to identify personalized,

achievable goals based on individual assessments; include criteria that allow for self-assessment and reflection; evaluate student progress and adapt the intervention as needed; build a welcoming and nonjudgmental environment where individuals feel comfortable practicing speech without fear of embarrassment or failure; and design in a way that engages students' attention and interests through games and various speaking activities.

TABLE 5. Acceptability level of Speaking Intervention in terms of Features as to Accessibility

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
identify personalized, achievable goals based on individual assessments	4.64	0.53	Strongly Agree
include criteria that allow for self-assessment and reflection	4.68	0.51	Strongly Agree
evaluate student progress and adapt the intervention as needed	4.44	0.58	Strongly Agree
build a welcoming and nonjudgmental environment where individuals feel comfortable practicing speech without fear of embarrassment or failure	4.72	0.50	Strongly Agree
design in a way that engage students' attention and interests through game and various speaking activities	4.58	0.61	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.61		
SD	0.55		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The structured speaking intervention identifies personalized, achievable goals based on individual assessments (M=4.64, SD=0.53); includes criteria that allow for self-assessment and reflection (M=4.68, SD=0.51); evaluates student progress and adapts the intervention as needed (M=4.44, SD=0.58); builds a welcoming and nonjudgmental environment where individuals feel comfortable practicing speech without fear of embarrassment or failure (M=4.72, SD=0.50); and designs in a way that engages students' attention and interests through games and various speaking activities (M=4.58, SD=0.61).

The overall mean of 4.61 from the respondents suggests that the developed speaking intervention's level of component as to usability is very high. As cited by Sosas (2021), technology can be used in conjunction with communicative teaching and learning methods to help students learn how to communicate effectively. It is hypothesized that employing strategies like emphasizing academic language, literacy, and vocabulary; offering opportunities for real-world language use; utilizing technology to improve language learning; and giving students explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction will improve students' English language proficiency (Cole & Feng, 2015).

Khanh (2021) came to the conclusion that while speaking is not a talent which students can master on their own at home, the development of technology can help students study independently outside of the classroom. Students can easily access the produced speaking intervention because the researcher has included some instructional videos that they can watch at home.

Table 6 reflected the acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features as to relevance. The

structured speaking intervention aims to organize content within the lesson relevant to students' interests to enhance engagement, implement constructive feedback sessions where students can receive input on their speaking skills in a positive and encouraging manner, boost self-confidence through various speaking activities or drills, develop social interaction of the students, and encourage effective communication.

As rated by the respondents, the structured speaking intervention organizes content within the lesson relevant to students' interests to enhance engagement (M=4.50, S=0.58); implements constructive feedback sessions where students can receive input on their speaking skills in a positive and encouraging manner (M=4.56, SD=0.58); boosts self-confidence through various speaking activities or drills (M=4.64, SD=0.53); develops social interaction of the students (M=4.58, SD=0.57); and encourages effective communication (M=4.64, SD=0.63).

TABLE 6. Acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of features as to relevance

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
organize content within the lesson relevant to students' interests to enhance engagement	4.50	0.58	Strongly Agree
implement constructive feedback sessions where students can receive input on their speaking skills in a positive and encouraging manner	4.56	0.58	Strongly Agree
boost self-confidence through various speaking activities or drills	4.64	0.53	Strongly Agree
develop social interaction of the students	4.58	0.57	Strongly Agree
encourage effective communication	4.64	0.63	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.58		
SD	0.58		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The overall mean of 4.58 from the respondents suggests that the developed speaking intervention's level of component as to relevance of information is very high.

According to Jabbarova (2020), communication skills are essential in our globalized society, particularly when it comes to international communication. Speaking skills are highly valued in today's classrooms (Eslit, 2019).

Therefore, Sommerauer and Müller (2018) concentrated on augmented learning environments that help to speed up language acquisition. Collaborative, reflective, and constructive feedback-based learning that is adhered to within the specified framework lowers students' anxiety levels and engages all students as active participants in the learning process. According to Annala et al. (2016) claimed that speaking skills are the most important skills that are required for communication.

The developed speaking intervention is highly relevant and valuable in today's educational landscape, as it plays a crucial role in preparing students to become globally competitive individuals who are ready to face real-world challenges. By incorporating a variety of structured speaking activities and interactive drills, the intervention not only enhances their communication skills but also significantly reduces their levels of speaking anxiety. This, in turn, fosters greater self-

confidence, encourages active participation, and promotes the development of essential soft skills such as critical thinking, collaboration, and adaptability. As students engage more frequently in these purposeful speaking exercises, they gradually build the fluency, clarity, and assertiveness required to express themselves effectively in diverse social, academic, and professional contexts across the globe.

Level of Students Speaking Skills after using the Speaking Intervention

In this study, the level of students speaking skills after using the structured speaking intervention refers to speaking fluency, speech clarity, and confidence level.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks, and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 7 reflected the level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speaking fluency.

The structured speaking intervention includes tongue twisters and repetition of challenging sounds/words, determines speaking pace, balances speed with clarity to encourage a smooth and natural flow of speech, focuses on clear articulation and correct pronunciation of words to enhance intelligibility and confidence, and incorporates emotional context to make intonation lessons more relatable.

TABLE 7. Level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speaking fluency

English Experts...	Mean	SD	Remarks
Include tongue twisters and repetition of challenging sounds/words.	4.83	0.41	Strongly Agree
Determine speaking pace, balancing speed with clarity.	4.83	0.41	Strongly Agree
Encourage a smooth and natural flow of speech.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Focus on clear articulation and correct pronunciation of words to enhance intelligibility and confidence.	4.83	0.41	Strongly Agree
Incorporate emotional context to make intonation lessons more relatable.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.90		
SD	0.31		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

As rated by the respondents, composed of English experts and fifty (50) student participants, the structured speaking intervention evidently includes tongue twisters and repetition of challenging sounds/words (M=4.83, SD=0.41); determines speaking pace, balancing speed with clarity (M=4.83, SD=0.41); encourages a smooth and natural flow of speech (M=5:00, SD=0.00); focuses on clear articulation and correct pronunciation of words to enhance intelligibility and confidence (M=4.83, SD=0.41); and incorporates emotional context to make intonation lessons more relatable (M=5:00, SD=0.00).

The overall mean of 4.90 from the respondents suggests that the developed speaking intervention's acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speaking fluency is very high.

Shahini and Shahmirian (2017) identify fluency as a key trait of communicative competence.

Giving pupils frequent speaking assignments and a range of scenarios helps them become more fluent in speaking English. Multimedia technology has been found to have a considerable impact on student communication strategies and learning instructions (Mahdi, 2015c).

The researchers' speaking intervention included speaking drills and activities designed to improve students' speaking fluency. In addition, it is intended to help them practice pronouncing words correctly. These activities provide students with regular opportunities to articulate their thoughts clearly and coherently. Moreover, the intervention encourages active participation, helping learners become more comfortable and confident in expressing themselves in English.

Table 8 reflected the level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speaking clarity.

The structured speaking intervention selects strategies for organizing thoughts logically, encourages the use of clear, straightforward sentences, provides practice with sentence structures to improve grammatical correctness, evaluates how clearly and accurately a speaking activity is delivered, and summarizes the overall coordination of the speech mechanism.

TABLE 8. Level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speaking clarity

English Experts...	Mean	SD	Remarks
Select strategies for organizing thoughts logically.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Encourage the use of clear, straightforward sentences.	4.67	0.51	Strongly Agree
Provide practice with sentence structures to improve grammatical correctness.	4.83	0.40	Strongly Agree
Evaluate how clearly and accurately a speaking activity is delivered.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Summarize the overall coordination of the speech mechanism.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.90		
SD	0.31		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The structured speaking intervention clearly selects strategies for organizing thoughts logically (M=5:00, SD=0.00); encourages the use of clear, straightforward sentences (M=4.67, SD=0.51); provides practice with sentence structures to improve grammatical correctness (M=4.83, SD=0.40); evaluates how clearly and accurately a speaking activity is delivered; summarizes the overall coordination of the speech mechanism (M=5:00, SD=0.00); and summarizes the overall coordination of the speech mechanism (M=5:00, SD=0.00).

The overall mean of 4.90 from the respondents suggests that the structured speaking intervention's acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to speech clarity is very high.

Table 9 reflected the level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to confidence level.

The structured speaking intervention in terms of confidence level aims to use diverse activities like storytelling, debates, and presentations to keep students engaged and cater to different learning styles; encourage active participation in different speaking activities; incorporate pair and group work to foster collaboration; provide constructive feedback after doing the speaking activities or drills; and create a supportive atmosphere where students feel safe to express themselves without fear of judgment.

TABLE 9. Level of acceptability of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to confidence level

English Experts...	Mean	SD	Remarks
Use diverse activities like storytelling, debates, and presentations to keep students engaged and cater to different learning styles.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Encourage active participation in different speaking activities.	4.83	0.41	Strongly Agree
Incorporate pair and group work to foster collaboration.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Provide constructive feedback after doing the speaking activities or drills.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Create a supportive atmosphere where students feel safe to express themselves without fear of judgment.	5.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.97		
SD	0.18		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The structured speaking intervention manifestly uses diverse activities like storytelling, debates, and presentations to keep students engaged and cater to different learning styles (M=5:00; SD=0.00); selects strategies (M=4.83, SD=0.41); encourages active participation in different speaking activities; incorporates pair and group work to foster collaboration (M=5:00, SD=0.00); provides constructive feedback after doing the speaking activities or drills (M=5:00, SD=0.00); and creates a supportive atmosphere where students feel safe to express themselves without fear of judgment (M=5:00, SD=0.00).

The overall mean of 4.97 from the respondents suggests that the structured speaking intervention's acceptability level of speaking intervention in terms of the level of students speaking skills after using the speaking intervention as to confidence level is very high.

Giving a presentation in front of an audience is difficult since it calls for a lot of confidence. Self-confidence is a person's optimistic view that motivates him to overcome his surroundings or situations. It is crucial for effective communication, particularly when it comes to public speaking (Nadiah, 2019).

The structured speaking intervention proved to be an invaluable tool in significantly enhancing the students' confidence levels when it comes to speaking. Through the thoughtful and consistent incorporation of a wide variety of speaking drills and targeted exercises, students were given ample opportunities to practice and improve their oral communication skills in a supportive and non-threatening environment. One of the key elements contributing to this growth in confidence was the encouragement provided by the

teacher, who actively motivated students to participate in each activity and helped create a positive classroom atmosphere where mistakes were viewed as part of the learning process rather than as failures. Additionally, the use of collaborative learning strategies allowed students to engage with their peers, work in teams, and support one another, which further lessened their anxiety and made them feel more at ease while speaking. The provision of constructive and timely feedback also played a vital role, as it guided learners in identifying areas for improvement while also reinforcing their strengths. Most importantly, the intervention prioritized making students feel comfortable and respected in expressing themselves freely, thus creating a safe space for growth and self-expression. Altogether, these well-implemented strategies served as powerful catalysts in boosting the students' self-confidence, ultimately equipping them to communicate more effectively and with greater assurance in both academic and real-world contexts.

Level of Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task

TABLE 10. Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task with regards to Pre-Speaking Task

Score	Pre-Speaking Task		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
25 – 30	4	8%	Outstanding
19 – 24	15	30%	Very Satisfactory
13 – 18	18	36%	Satisfactory
7 – 12	11	22%	Fairly Satisfactory
0 – 6	2	4%	Did not meet Expectation
Total	50		
Weighted Mean	16.20		
SD	5.20		
Verbal Interpretation	Satisfactory		

Table 10 reflected the level of students' English language using the speaking intervention in terms of the pre-speaking task. During the pre-speaking task, out of the fifty (50) student participants, Outstanding (f=4, 8%); Very Satisfactory (f=15, 30%); Satisfactory (f=18, 36%); Fairly Satisfactory (f=11, 22%); and Did not meet Expectation (f=2, 4%). This simply indicates that during the pre-speaking task, only nineteen (19) students performed the pre-speaking task very satisfactorily and outstandingly. This pushed the researcher to craft a

speaking intervention to enhance students' speaking proficiency and performance.

On the other hand, Table 11 reflected the level of students' English language using the speaking intervention in terms of the post-speaking task.

During the post-speaking task, out of the fifty (50) student participants, Outstanding (f=25, 50.00); Very Satisfactory (f=19, 38.00); Satisfactory (f=6, 12.00); Fairly Satisfactory (f=0, 0.00); and Did not meet Expectation (f=0, 0.00). This simply indicates that during the post-speaking task, fifty (50) participants performed the post-speaking task as satisfactory, very satisfactory, and outstanding. No students scored in the lower ranges of 7-12 or 0-6, indicating that all participants met at least a "satisfactory" level.

TABLE 11. Level of students' English language using the speaking intervention in terms of the post-speaking task

Score	Pre-Speaking Task		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
25 – 30	25	50%	Outstanding
19 – 24	19	38%	Very Satisfactory
13 – 18	6	12%	Satisfactory
7 – 12	0	0%	Fairly Satisfactory
0 – 6	0	0%	Did not meet Expectation
Total	50		
Weighted Mean	23.30		
SD	4.37		
Verbal Interpretation	Very Satisfactory		

This indicates that the structured speaking intervention has statistically significant and substantial improvement from pre-test to post-test. Likewise, the overall assessment based on the data shows that the intervention was successful, as a majority of the students reached either "Outstanding" or "Very Satisfactory" proficiency in English-speaking tasks.

Significant Difference between Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task with regards to Pre-Speaking Task and Post Speaking Task

To test the significant difference between the performance on the pre-speaking task and the post-speaking task, they were treated statistically using T-test Tools using the test of difference.

TABLE 12

Students' Performance	Performance		Mean Difference	Computed t-value	df	Critical t-value	Analysis
	M	SD					
Pre-speaking task	16.20	5.20	7.10	20.75	49	1.68	Significant
Post-speaking task	23.30	4.37					

Legend: *Significant at 0.05

Table 12 shows the significant difference between Students' Performance in terms of Oral Task with regards to Pre-Speaking Task and Post Speaking Task.

From the findings above, we can infer that at the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "There is a significant difference between the English Speaking Challenge of the students after having the Speaking Intervention to Enhance Students' Proficiency and Performance as to pre-speaking task and post-speaking task" is accepted, which indicates that there is no significant difference between them.

However, the mean score of the pre-speaking task is 16.20, while the mean score of the post-speaking task is 23.30. This shows an increase of 7.10 points on average, indicating that students performed better after the speaking intervention. The t-value of 20.75 with degrees of freedom (df) of 49 indicates that the difference between the pre- and post-intervention scores is statistically significant. The p-value (0.0000) is less than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that the difference between the pre- and post-speaking task performances is statistically significant. This suggests that the

speaking intervention had a positive effect on improving students' English-speaking performance. From the results, we can conclude that there is a significant difference in the students' performance scores between the pre-speaking and post-speaking tasks. The increase in the mean score after the intervention indicates that the Speaking Intervention to Enhance Students' Proficiency and Performance was effective in improving their speaking abilities. The statistically

significant p-value further supports the conclusion that the observed improvement was not due to random chance but rather due to the intervention itself.

Significant Relationship between Speaking Intervention and Students' Speaking Proficiency

Table 13 shows the significant relationship between Speaking Intervention and Students' Speaking Proficiency.

TABLE 13. Significant relationship between Speaking Intervention and Students' Speaking Proficiency

Speaking Intervention			Students' Speaking Proficiency		
			Speaking Fluency	Speech Clarity	Confidence Level
Components	Objectives	r-value	0.081	0.177	0.015
		p-value	0.574	0.218	0.920
		N	50	50	50
		Analysis	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
	Content	r-value	0.189	0.033	0.059
		p-value	0.189	0.817	0.683
		N	50	50	50
		Analysis	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
	Activity	r-value	0.266	0.309	0.303
p-value		0.062	0.029	0.032	
N		50	50	50	
Analysis		Not Sig	Sig	Sig	
Features	Usability	r-value	0.273	0.448	0.059
		p-value	0.055	0.001	0.684
		N	50	50	50
		Analysis	Sig	Sig	Not Sig
	Accessibility	r-value	0.658	0.231	0.212
		p-value	0.000	0.107	0.140
		N	50	50	50
		Analysis	Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
	Relevance	r-value	0.339	0.083	0.250
p-value		0.016	0.568	0.080	
N		50	50	50	
Analysis		Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	

From the findings above, we can infer that at the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant relationship between the speaking intervention and students' speaking skills, is rejected for some components. This indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between certain aspects of the speaking intervention (such as activities, usability, and accessibility) and specific speaking skills (such as fluency, speech clarity, and confidence).

The correlation results for the "Objectives" component show that no significant relationships were found for speaking fluency ($r = 0.081$, $p = 0.574$), speech clarity ($r = 0.177$, $p = 0.218$), and confidence level ($r = 0.015$, $p = 0.920$). These are classified as not significant (Not Sig).

The "Content" component revealed a significant relationship with speech clarity ($r = 0.033$, $p = 0.817$), but no significant correlations were found for speaking fluency ($r = 0.189$, $p = 0.189$) or confidence level ($r = 0.059$, $p = 0.683$).

No significant relationships were found for the "Activity" component with speaking fluency ($r = 0.266$, $p = 0.062$), speech clarity ($r = 0.309$, $p = 0.029$), or confidence level ($r = 0.303$, $p = 0.032$).

The "Usability" component also did not show significant relationships with any of the speaking skills: speaking fluency

($r = 0.273$, $p = 0.055$), speech clarity ($r = 0.448$, $p = 0.001$), or confidence level ($r = 0.059$, $p = 0.684$).

The "Accessibility" component was found to have a significant relationship with speaking fluency ($r = 0.658$, $p = 0.000$). But no significant relationships were found with speech clarity ($r = 0.083$, $p = 0.568$) or confidence level ($r = 0.2112$, $p = 0.140$). The "Relevance" component did not show any significant relationships with speaking fluency ($r = 0.339$, $p = 0.016$), speech clarity ($r = 0.083$, $p = 0.568$), or confidence level ($r = 0.250$, $p = 0.080$).

To conclude, the findings of this study reveal that there is a significant relationship between certain aspects of the evaluation criteria and students' speaking performance. Specifically, speech clarity was found to be significantly associated with the quality of content delivered by the students. This suggests that students who presented clearer speech tended to also exhibit stronger content development, indicating a close link between articulation and the effectiveness of message delivery.

In contrast, speaking fluency demonstrated a significant correlation with the dimension of acceptability. This implies that the more fluent the students were in their speech, the more acceptable their performance was perceived to be, possibly due to the natural and confident manner in which they

communicated their ideas. The fluidity of speech appears to play a crucial role in how well the message is received by the audience.

However, it is important to note that other components of the assessment—namely activity, usability, and relevance—did not show statistically significant correlations with the students’ speaking skills. This lack of significant association may suggest that while these elements contribute to the overall evaluation framework, they may not directly influence or reflect the core speaking competencies measured in this study. Further research is essential to gain a deeper understanding of the nuanced roles that various components play in the context of speaking performance evaluation. While current studies highlight the significance of core factors such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and discourse management, there remains a need to explore how these elements interact within different contexts and among diverse learner populations.

Table 14 shows the significant effect between Speaking Intervention and Students’ Speaking Proficiency.

TABLE 14. Significant Effect between Speaking Intervention and Students’ Performance in terms of Post Speaking Task

Speaking Intervention			Students’ Performance in terms of Post Speaking Task
Components	Objectives	t-value p-value N Analysis	0.426 0.672 50 Not Sig
	Content	t-value p-value N Analysis	0.308 0.759 50 Not Sig
	Activity	t-value p-value N Analysis	0.448 0.656 50 Not Sig
Features	Usability	t-value p-value N Analysis	0.563 0.576 50 Not Sig
	Accessibility	t-value p-value N Analysis	0.612 0.544 50 Not Sig
	Relevance	t-value p-value N Analysis	1.274 0.209 50 Not Sig

Critical t-value=1.68

The analysis examined the relationship between various components of the speaking intervention and students’ performance during the post-speaking task. The Pearson correlation coefficients (t-values) and p-values were used to determine the strength and significance of these relationships based on a sample size of 50 participants.

The analysis of the correlation between the components of the speaking intervention such as objectives, content, activity, usability, accessibility, and relevance; and students’ performance in the post-speaking task revealed no statistically significant relationships. All the computed p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that the correlations observed were not statistically meaningful. Specifically, the

correlation between objectives and performance was $t = 0.426$ ($p = 0.672$), content $t = 0.308$ ($p = 0.759$), and activity $t = 0.448$ ($p = 0.656$). Similarly, usability showed $t = 0.563$ ($p = 0.576$), accessibility $t = 0.612$ ($p = 0.544$), and relevance $t = 1.274$ ($p = 0.209$), with the latter value exceeding the valid range for Pearson’s r , suggesting a possible calculation or reporting error. Overall, these findings suggest that none of the measured components of the speaking intervention had a statistically significant impact on students’ performance in the post-speaking task.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a significant difference between students’ performance in terms of oral tasks with regards to pre-speaking tasks and post-speaking tasks which marks the first hypothesis rejected.

Also, the statistical analysis of pre- and post-speaking task results revealed a substantial difference in scores, indicating that the structured speaking intervention positively impacted students’ speaking proficiency and performance.

Furthermore, there is a significant relationship between speaking intervention and students’ speaking proficiency which marks the second hypothesis rejected. The findings of the study revealed a statistically significant relationship between the speaking intervention and the performance of the students.

There is no significant effect between speaking intervention and students’ performance which marks the third hypothesis accepted. However, despite the lack of statistical significance, the structured speaking intervention may still have provided qualitative benefits, such as increased confidence or classroom engagement.

The following are some of the recommendations presented in this study based on the findings and discussion.

Based on the evaluation made by the English experts as respondents, the structured speaking intervention is highly recommended to be used by the students as their learning resource material in enhancing their speaking proficiency and performance.

Also, the structured Speaking Intervention Material (SIM) may be used by the English teachers as a learning resource material to enhance students’ proficiency and performance. They are encouraged to incorporate the said material regularly into their lessons or discussions. Additionally, they may differentiate instruction to accommodate diverse student needs and proficiency levels, ensuring all students have equal opportunities to speak. They may also have a continuous professional development in communicative language teaching strategies to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Meanwhile, the school administrators may strengthen their collaboration with their English teachers to monitor the effectiveness of the structured speaking intervention.

In addition, community members, particularly the parents and guardians of the students, may foster an English-speaking environment at home and in social settings to reinforce classroom learning.

Lastly, the future researchers may use this study to improve this learning resource and develop other material for

the students who demonstrate challenges in speaking the English language. They may conduct the same studies but with larger sample sizes and longer intervention periods to explore long-term effects on the speaking proficiency and performance of the students.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Al-Wossabi, S. (2016). The effectiveness of a task-based learning (TBL) approach in developing speaking skills among Saudi university students. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 9(4), 105-113.
- [2]. Annala, H., Sietske, F., Marianna, L., Danilo, M., Joseph, M., Jennifer, K., & Jordie, O. (2016). Building an international, cross-disciplinary, collaborative on-line English course focusing on advanced listening and speaking skills and cross-cultural communication. *International Journal*, 10(2), 3–7.
- [3]. Cabigon, M., (2015) State of English in PH: Should we be concerned?. *Inquirer.net*. retrieved February 17, 2018 from <http://opinion.inquirer.net/90293/state-of-english-in-ph-should-we-be-concerned>.
- [4]. Cole, J., & Feng, J. (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. Online Submission.
- [5]. Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL Learner’s speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v6n2p177>
- [6]. El-Sakka, S. M. (2016) Self-regulated Strategy Instruction for Developing Speaking Proficiency and Reducing Speaking Anxiety of Egyptian University Students. *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 9(12). 22-33
- [7]. Erickson D. & Astorga, C. (2015). The relationship between listening proficiency and speaking improvement in higher education: Considerations in assessing speaking and listening. *Higher learning research commissions*, 5 (2) p. 63-78.
- [8]. Jabbarova, A. (2020). Learning a foreign language in non-language institutions: the formation of professional foreign language competence. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 1(1), 42-46.
- [9]. Khanh, C. G. (2021). The effect of ICT on Learners’ speaking skills Development. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(1), 22–29.
- [10]. Lumettu, A., & Runtuwene, T. L. (2018). Developing the Students’ English Speaking Ability Through Impromptu Speaking Method. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 953, No. 1, p. 012035). IOP Publishing.
- [11]. Mahdi, D. (2015a). Strategies and techniques for fostering oral communication confidence in EFL students. *Arab World English Journal*, 6(2), 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol6no2.13>
- [12]. Nadiyah, N. (2019). The students’ self-confidence in public speaking. *Elite Journal*, 1(1), 1-12.
- [13]. Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, 2(2), 6-18.
- [14]. Sari, D. (2017). Speaking anxiety as a factor in studying EFL. *English education Journal*
- [15]. (Eej), 8(2), 177–186.
- [16]. Shahini, G., & Shahamirian, F. (2017). Improving English speaking fluency: The role of six factors. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 100-104.
- [17]. Sherine, A., et al. (2020). Improving Second Language Speaking and Pronunciation Through Smartphones. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i11.13891>. 14 (11).
- [18]. Sommerauer, P., & Müller, O. (2018). Augmented reality for teaching and learning—a literature review on theoretical and empirical foundations [Conference session]. 26th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS), Portsmouth, UK.
- [19]. Sosas, R. V. (2021). Technology in teaching speaking and its effects to students learning English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 958–970. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.66>
- [20]. Wahyudin, A. Y. & Rido. A. (2020). Perceptuals learning styles preferences of international master’s students in Malaysia. *BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(1), 95-103.