



Barriers affecting the English language speaking fluency of Bachelor of Arts in Communication students

Joyce P. Sorveto¹, Timothy S. Ebenga¹, Joseph B. Quinto^{✉1}

¹Benguet State University, Benguet, Philippines

Article Info

Article History:

Received on 27 May 2025

Approved on 25 November 2025

Published on 30 November 2025

Keywords: English language speaking fluency; linguistic barriers; psychological barriers

Abstract

For communication students, effective speaking is a vital skill since it directly shapes how they convey ideas and engage diverse audiences in global contexts. While English serves as the language of international communication, barriers in language learning can hinder their ability to communicate clearly, confidently, and professionally across cultures. To that effect, the preparation for aspiring professionals in the field of media, public relations, advertising, and other related areas should commence promptly. With these considerations, the researchers opted to conduct a study that aims to identify the barriers affecting the English-speaking fluency of Bachelor of Arts in Communication (BACOM) students in one prime university in Cordillera Administrative Region in the Philippines. A quantitative-descriptive study was used with two hundred and seventy (274) randomly selected participants. The study revealed that BACOM students experienced linguistic barriers, specifically the inability to produce specific words to express their thoughts, as well as psychological barriers, particularly those associated with a lack of self-confidence which affects their English-speaking fluency. Moreover, there is no significant difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency according to sex or year level, implying that the students' sex and year level have no influence on their English language proficiency. Ultimately, this study provides recommendations for future research directions.

✉ Correspondence Address:
Betag, La Trinidad, Benguet, Philippines, 2601
E-mail: j.quinto@bsu.edu.ph

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has made English the world's most widely used language for communication. To that effect, English has become a major lingua franca in many developing and developed countries. In addition, it is implemented as an official and academic language in many countries (Crystal, 2003). Developing English-speaking skills is often challenging for Non-Native English Speakers (Adnan et al., 2017), making consistent practice and exposure crucial. This study demonstrates that intentional parental involvement—through structured routines, repeated language use, and supportive guidance—can significantly enhance children's English proficiency, confidence, and motivation by extending learning beyond the classroom (Chavez et al., 2025).

English has always been considered the language of international communication and has been widely used as a tool for communication in several areas, such as in the sciences, politics, and the media (Tunariu, 2021). Verbal communication is a core component of language education, as it involves actively constructing and conveying meaning through spoken words in classrooms and workplaces (Brink & Costigan, 2015). This study shows that self-doubt among Filipino senior high school speakers can significantly hinder message clarity and confidence, highlighting the need for supportive learning environments that foster emotional readiness and effective public speaking skills. (Berry et al., 2025; Palpanadan & Ahmad, 2018). Ultimately, verbal communication is essential to educational institutions' language courses (Brink & Costigan, 2015).

To a certain degree, a student's English-speaking fluency is important for their future profession. English speaking fluency is vital for Bachelor of Arts in Communication (BACOM) students since prospective careers in this field are in media, advertising, public relations, and related areas that necessitate fluency in the English language (Alyan, 2013). Speaking fluency in English is crucial for effectively expressing ideas and thoughts, particularly in professional and cross-cultural contexts. In the tourism industry, this fluency allows service providers to communicate clearly with international travelers, enhancing guest satisfaction, fostering cultural understanding, and supporting the global competitiveness of destinations (Españo et al., 2025).

Speaking the English language is difficult for most foreign language learners because learning to speak a foreign language takes more than just mastering its grammatical and semantic standards. In addition, Burnkart (1998) claims that language learners must have the areas of knowledge engaged in speaking, such as language mechanics (pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary), and stress using accurate words in the correct sequence with the correct pronunciation. Language learners must also acquire how native speakers use the language in the context of organized interpersonal exchange since being competent in speaking English is required for speakers to use the language effectively in various social situations (Parab, 2020).

Zhang (2009) argued that speaking is the most difficult skill for most English learners to acquire, and many still cannot communicate orally in English. One reason for this is the presence of errors, but this is a sign that there is an avenue to learn English better (Quinto, 2020). According to Ur (1996), there are other reasons that contribute to difficulties in speaking, including inhibition where students are worried about making mistakes, are frightened of being criticized, or are simply shy. Second, they do not have anything to say and students are disinclined to express themselves. Third, participation is inadequate or unequal because learners dominate; only one participant may talk at a time, whereas others say very little or nothing. Another problem that students encounter that hinders them from speaking in English is their lack of self-confidence. Speaking in front of others is one of the most prevalent fears students have as nervousness causes them to lose their thoughts and ideas or forget what to say (Baldwin, 2011). Finally, students' lack of strategic language learning behavior hinders their ability to acquire vocabulary, grammar, and other critical linguistic skills efficiently (Quinto & Cacanindin, 2024).

The study of Al Nakhala (2016) is one of many to have explored the speaking difficulties that English language students encounter. Similar to the findings of Zhang (2009), the study successfully connected the relationship between psychological barriers, their causes, and the degree of the students' speaking skills. Moreover, possible solutions to the psychological barriers that affected the English-speaking skills of the respondents were discussed in the study by Al Nakhala (2016).

Nunan (1991) argues that success in language learning is measured in terms of learners' ability to carry out a conversation with interlocutors in the target language. However, despite this growing popularity, sociolinguists and educationists have recently become concerned about the different barriers that affect students' language learning achievements (Andreou et al., 2017).

Although most of the students are aware of the basics of English, it has been observed that they do not participate in class discussions (Andreou et al., 2017). The study of Palpanadan and Ahmad (2018) have found that many students remain silent in the classrooms, especially in English courses. Barriers such as the influence of their mother tongue and the range of languages spoken by different students can affect their participation in conversations in English (Kumar, 2017). Hence, this study aims to identify the barriers affecting the English-speaking fluency of university students, specifically the Bachelor of Arts in Communication students.

Literature review

Fluency

Fluency, traditionally defined as a speaker's ability to respond intelligibly and seamlessly within the natural flow of conversation, encompasses the capacity to connect words and sentences smoothly, articulate sounds with appropriate emphasis and intonation, and perform these processes rapidly and without hesitation (Hedge, 2000; Johnson, 1979). Larsen-Freeman (2000) further operationalizes fluency through measurable indicators such as mean length of run, the number of syllables produced between pauses, and speech rate, or the number of syllables spoken per second, including pauses. Teachers and assessors typically examine how these linguistic features interact with the speaker's accuracy and delivery. Carter and McCarthy's (2006) notion of confluence extends this understanding by emphasizing the relational dimension of fluency: the ability to maintain conversational flow by skillfully linking one's remarks to those of others.

However, recent scholarship suggests that fluency cannot be divorced from broader socio-cultural dynamics, especially in contexts such as public speaking and political communication. Emerging findings indicate that perceived authenticity, emotional resonance, and cultural expectations significantly mediate public trust and electoral decision-making (Chavez et al., 2025). Within educational settings, fluency and confidence appear to develop through interrelated mechanisms. Practice provides repeated exposure that reduces anxiety; regulation enables speakers to manage nervousness and sustain performance under pressure; and consistency reinforces communicative skills and builds enduring confidence. (Quinto et al., 2025).

Barriers Affecting Speaking Fluency

There are several barriers affecting a student's fluency in speaking the English language. Wang (2013) reported that both linguistic barriers (pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary) and psychological barriers (anxiety and self-confidence) affect the speaking fluency of students learning the English language. Furthermore, Suryani et al. (2020) indicate that cognitive barriers, such as grammar, vocabulary, and subject knowledge, and affective barriers such as lack of self-confidence, and self-esteem, heavily affect the speaking competency of high school students.

From another perspective, several studies have presented similar theories on the factors affecting the speaking fluency of students as well as the problems students encounter when speaking. Factors affecting speaking fluency are divided and categorized into performance conditions, affective factors, listening skills, and feedback received during speaking tasks while speaking problems include student's inhibition, lack of motivation, non-participation, and use of mother-tongue (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017; Tuan & Mai, 2015). Alyan (2013) added how Palestinian English major students and teachers perceive oral communication problems. Similar to the study conducted by Wang (2013), Alyan (2013) was able to provide a summary of the linguistic barriers that affect the speaking competency of the students namely; pronunciation, exposure, extensive listening/reading, vocabulary, and First Language (L1) interference. Additionally, Alyan (2013) found that a lack of self-confidence was considered the only psychological barrier affecting the study subjects' English-speaking fluency.

Linguistic Barriers

Pronunciation plays a substantial role in speech clarity and comprehensibility (Goh, 2007). The difference in intonations and placements of stresses may produce different meanings and cause the listener to misunderstand or misinterpret what the speaker is trying to say (Wang, 2013). This could be attributed to the interference of the first language (L1) as accents, intonations, and placements of stresses could pose a challenge for speakers.

Vocabulary refers to the ability of the speaker to generate particular words that will be able to express the speaker's thoughts. The speaker must devise his/her grammar and prepare the necessary vocabulary during the formulation of the speech (Lestari, 2017). Limited receptive vocabulary would prove to be challenging to put into active use in conversations as well as misuse (Wang, 2013). The proper use of vocabulary must be considered since the wrong use of words would certainly cause confusion.

Psychological Barriers

Suryani et al. (2020) and Wang (2013) emphasized that a psychological barrier that plays an important role in students' linguistic competency specifically includes their self-confidence. A lack of confidence inhibits students' speaking competency, especially when the speaker finds the audience unable to realize their speaking performance. This phenomenon is synonymous with self-esteem.

Likewise, self-confidence may be related to aspects such as shyness and anxiety. Shyness inhibits students' linguistic competency when they are asked to speak (i.e., in the form of speech, dialogue, or presentation) to several people, in the classroom, or crowds. This makes the speaker forget what they are about to say in front of their audience (Humaera, 2015). On the other hand, it is interesting to note that Arnold and Brown found (1999) that anxiety affects the students' speaking performance. It is an inhibiting factor that "most pervasively obstructs the learning process." It makes the speaker start worrying about the rightness of his/her ideas and the correctness of his/her grammar or pronunciation. As evidenced by Wang (2013), students that were made to do an impromptu speech often became "tongue-tied" or were at a loss for words. In this regard, the discussion on lack of self-confidence could not be entirely separated from shyness and anxiety. These two could be the outcomes of the lack of self-confidence or they may be the cause of the lack of self-confidence (Al Nakhala, 2016; Humaera, 2015).

With all these pieces of information in mind, the researchers aimed to answer the questions: (1) What is the level of agreement of BACOM students according to linguistic barriers and psychological barriers affecting their speaking fluency?; and (2) what is the difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to sex and year level?

METHODS

Research Design

The quantitative-descriptive research design was highly appropriate for this study as it allowed the researchers to systematically measure and analyze the extent to which BACOM students experience linguistic and psychological barriers to speaking fluency. Moreover, this design enabled the identification of significant differences in these barriers when grouped according to sex and year level, thereby providing objective and comparable data essential for addressing the research questions (Babbie, 2012; Jafarpanah & Rezaei, 2020; Meyers et al., 2006; Streefkerk, 2022).

Respondents

The study was conducted at a leading state university in the Cordillera Administrative Region, Philippines, with 270 Bachelor of Arts in Communication (BACOM) students from various year levels as participants. Stratified sampling was employed to ensure proportional representation of each year level—first year to fourth year—in the sample, allowing for fair comparison and accurate reflection of the entire BACOM population (Thomas, 2021). Participants were selected during their scheduled communication classes, where the researchers coordinated with instructors to administer the survey, ensuring that all strata were adequately represented based on enrollment distribution.

Instruments

The researchers developed a 14-item self-rating questionnaire grounded in the framework of Alyan (2013) to assess the linguistic and psychological barriers influencing students' English-speaking fluency. Each item was carefully constructed to reflect specific constructs under these two domains—linguistic barriers (e.g., limited vocabulary, pronunciation difficulty, grammar concerns) and psychological barriers (e.g., anxiety, lack of confidence, fear of judgment). To ensure content validity, the items were reviewed and validated by a language expert who evaluated their clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study's objectives. The instrument was then pilot-tested with 30

Development Communication students through Google Forms, and the resulting Cronbach's Alpha of 0.789 indicated acceptable internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire.

Treatment of data

Mean construct scores describe the level of agreement of BACOM students regarding linguistic and psychological barriers, whereas Kruskal–Wallis tests indicate whether the degree of agreement differs by sex or year level; significant results are followed by corrected pairwise comparisons and effect-size estimates to determine which groups differ and whether differences are practically meaningful.

Data collection procedure

This research strictly adhered to ethical research protocols (Kaewkungwal & Adams, 2019). A formal request letter and an informed consent statement were attached to the Google Form survey and presented to the respondents before their participation. The researchers coordinated with course instructors from the Bachelor of Arts in Communication program to distribute the Google Form link to all identified students across year levels through their official class group chats and institutional email accounts. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that they could withdraw at any time without penalty (Coutinho dos Santos, 2022). Data collection was conducted over a two-week period to allow ample time for responses, and only those who gave their consent were included in the study. The researchers ensured that all collected data were treated with confidentiality, stored securely, and used solely for academic purposes.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Level of agreement of BACOM students according to linguistic and psychological barriers affecting their speaking fluency

Linguistic barrier

Table 1 shows the level of agreement of the respondents to the linguistic barriers affecting their speaking fluency. It can be gleaned from the table that the grand mean of the level of agreement of BACOM students to linguistic barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency is 2.76. The result indicates that the respondents agreed that linguistic barriers affect their English-speaking fluency. Item 3 which is “Sometimes I use up to three or four words as a substitute for a specific word I cannot recall or express” has the highest mean of 3.12 while item 1 which is “I do not know how to use stress and intonation patterns or pronounce certain words, so I keep quiet” with a mean of 2.66 and item 4 which is ‘I lack vocabulary in English’ with 2.58 garnered the lowest.

Table 1. Level of agreement of BA COM students to linguistic barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency

Linguistic Barriers	Mean	DE
1. I do not know how to use stress and intonation patterns or pronounce certain words, so I keep quiet.	2.66	Agree
2. I face problems in pronouncing consonants and vowels, e.g., consonant clusters, rhythm, stress, and intonation.	2.70	Agree
3. Sometimes I use up to three or four words as a substitute for a specific word I cannot recall or express (e.g., sketch, drawing in a book).	3.12	Agree
4. I lack vocabulary in English.	2.58	Agree
5. I read papers/articles in English.	2.66	Agree
6. I listen to English YouTube streams, podcasts etc.	2.72	Agree
7. I prefer to watch English movies and TV programs to enhance my vocabulary and speaking skills.	2.89	Agree
Grand Mean	2.76	Agree

Students agreed that they use a group of words to substitute for an idea/word they cannot recall (item 3). This item had the highest mean out of all the items at 3.12. This signifies that the students lack the ability to produce particular words to express thoughts (Wang, 2013). However, this result can be interestingly coupled with the results of item 4: “I lack vocabulary in English.” As shown by the mean level of agreement, the mean of the 4th item has the lowest among the 7 items under linguistic barriers. This means that the students do not necessarily lack the term or idea they want to express because most of them have already encountered the term or idea. They just have trouble recalling items. Furthermore, the pronunciation of certain words in addition to the usage of stress and intonation patterns as reasons for keeping quiet (item 1) is among the items with the lowest mean at 2.66. This result could be compared to the result in table 1 with the respondents who agree not to speak due to their inability to pronounce all words, thereby affecting their self-confidence. Gilbert (2009) pointed out that students always experience, to some degree, the inability to pronounce certain words. This barrier hinders students from speaking and voicing out their opinions or answers (Alyan, 2013). Finally, the last three items: item 5 which is “I read papers/articles in English;” item 6 which is “I listen to English YouTube streams, podcasts etc.,” and item 7 which is “I prefer to watch English movies and TV programs to enhance my vocabulary and speaking skills” answered the preferences of the respondents with regard to the tools used to help in enhancing their English-speaking fluency. Despite the small differences in the level of agreement, it can be observed that the preferred tools or materials that students most often used to improve their English-speaking fluency are audiovisual tools like watching streams and movies. This result is similar with Khan et al. (2019) who stated that majority of their respondents were visual learners.

Table 2 shows that audio visual tools are followed by auditory tools such as listening to English podcasts and streams which are similar to the study of Khan et al. (2019). Visual tools such as reading newspapers and magazines ranked the least favorite of the respondents as tools to help improve their English-speaking fluency. Similarly, the research of Khan et al. (2019) showed that visual tools were least preferred to be used for improving one’s English-speaking fluency.

Psychological barrier

Table 2 displays a grand mean equivalent to “Agree” with regard to the effects of psychological barriers on the respondents’ English-speaking fluency. This indicates that the respondents agreed to have experienced some form of psychological barrier, especially the ones relating to lack of confidence. As shown in the table, items pertaining to the students’ level of self-confidence, specifically items 6 and 7 have a relatively higher mean value (2.8 and 2.91, respectively) than the average mean score (2.76) for the level of agreement relating to psychological barriers. This implies that more students agreed that they do not have enough confidence to talk in front of an audience (i.e., classrooms) despite knowing correct answers for fear of not being able to express themselves in the way they want to. As evidenced by the lower mean value of items 2 and 3, more students disagreed that they do not speak up because they are afraid to make mistakes or because they are not confident that they are not good speaker for not knowing the correct pronunciation of words.

Table 2. Level of agreement of BACOM students to psychological barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency

Psychological Barriers	Mean	DE
1. I do not participate or speak because I think that the way I use unfamiliar words is incorrect.	2.73	Agree
2. I do not know the right pronunciation for all words, and that makes me upset because I feel that I am not a good speaker.	2.72	Agree
3. I don’t talk in English because I am afraid to make mistakes.	2.63	Agree
4. I do not feel the confidence to stand and talk because I do not have the linguistic competence, so I feel that I am going to be criticized or going to be ridiculed.	2.78	Agree

5. I have some inhibitions about how to articulate words, so, I prefer to be on the silent side because I do not want to sound not proficient in the language in front of my classmates or in front of the teacher.	2.74	Agree
6. I do not have enough confidence to talk in front of people because I do not trust my knowledge and my language skills, so it is difficult to talk in English and express myself.	2.80	Agree
7. Sometimes, I feel shy to speak and give my opinions to others even if I know the correct answer.	2.91	Agree
Grand Mean	2.76	Agree

The contrast between the two highest means, items 6 and 7, and lowest means, items 2 and 3, is further discussed by Humaera (2015) when self-confidence hinders the second language (L2) learners' English-speaking fluency, or when students forget what they are about to say when asked to speak in front of people. It causes the speakers to begin questioning the validity of their own opinions and the accuracy of their grammar and pronunciation. Wang (2013) highlighted that students who were required to give an impromptu speech frequently were "tongue-tied" or had trouble speaking. These are pieces of evidence that show how psychological barriers such as lack of self-confidence impede the learning process and acquisition of second language (Arnold & Brown, 1999; Suryani et al., 2020).

Based on the results, BACOM students generally agreed that both linguistic and psychological barriers affect their English-speaking fluency, with a grand mean of 2.76 for each category. Linguistically, students often use multiple substitute words when they cannot recall specific terms, indicating difficulty in word retrieval rather than a lack of vocabulary, while pronunciation and stress/intonation issues also contributed to their reluctance to speak. Psychologically, lack of self-confidence and fear of expressing themselves in front of others were the most significant barriers, even when students knew the correct answers. Students' high speaking anxiety, often rooted in fear of negative evaluation, limited exposure, and low confidence in language proficiency, highlights the need for instructional approaches that go beyond mere linguistic training. Thus, improving speaking fluency among communication students necessitates targeted interventions such as interactive and practice-based activities that simultaneously enhance vocabulary recall and build confidence, ultimately reducing anxiety and fostering more effective English communication (Quinto et al., 2025).

The difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to sex and year level

Sex

Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference in the level of agreement to the linguistic and psychological barriers with respect to the respondents' sex (p-value = 0.207). Both male and female students agreed to having experienced some degree of both linguistic and psychological barriers with regard to their English-speaking fluency. This means that both males and females do not have differences in their level of agreement about the overall barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency.

Table 3. Difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to sex

Sex	Barriers	Mean	DE	p-value	Pairwise
Male	Level of Agreement to Linguistic Barriers	2.67	Agree	0.207	-
Female		2.76	Agree		-
Male	Level of Agreement to Psychological Barriers	2.66	Agree	0.247	-
Female		2.71	Agree		-
Male	Overall Agreement to Barriers	2.67	Agree	0.207	-

Female	2.76	Agree	-
--------	------	-------	---

The findings are similar with the results of Ella and Dapudong (2016) who concluded that sex had no significant difference to the barriers affecting the English-speaking fluency of the BACOM students. However, the findings of Rudd and Honkiss (2019) reported that female students have ostensibly outperformed the male students with regard to their English-proficiency scores. Nevertheless, sex is not a factor when it comes to English proficiency in this particular research.

Year level

Table 4 presents that there is a significant difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the linguistic barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to year level with (p-value = 0.002). This difference in the level of agreement is attributed only to the preferred tools for further developing the students' English-speaking fluency (i.e., audiovisual, auditory, and visual). On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the psychological barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to year level (p-value = 0.200).

Table 4. Difference in the level of agreement of BA Comm students in the barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to year level

Year Level	Barriers	Mean	DE	P-value	Pairwise
1st Year	Level of Agreement to Linguistic Barriers	2.91	Agree	0.002	a
2nd Year		2.69	Agree		b
3rd Year		2.67	Agree		b
4th Year		2.76	Agree		ab
1st Year	Level of Agreement to Psychological Barriers	2.66	Agree	0.200	-
2nd Year		2.71	Agree		-
3rd Year		2.93	Agree		-
4th Year		2.87	Agree		-
1st Year	Overall Level of Agreement to Barriers	2.77	Agree	0.368	-
2nd Year		2.69	Agree		-
3rd Year		2.81	Agree		-
4th Year		2.79	Agree		-

Furthermore, the level of agreement to the linguistic barriers of the 2nd and 3rd year BACOM students are identical in characteristics as defined by the pairwise value 'b.' On the other hand, the pairwise value of 'ab' suggests that the 4th year students have characteristics identical to that of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year students. Finally, the year level with no similar pairwise values are considered to have no similar characteristics. Nonetheless, the difference in characteristics can only be attributed to the preferred tools for further developing the students' English-speaking fluency. Particularly, the 1st year students had their preferences on reading newspapers, watching television, and listening to podcasts. This implies that they do not have similar preferences as the 2nd and 3rd year students.

Generally, there is no significant difference in the level of agreement of BACOM students in the barriers affecting their speaking fluency according to year level (p-value = 0.368). This means that all of them experienced the same level when it comes to linguistic and psychological barriers. The findings of Ella and Dapudong (2016) are consistent with the results of this study whereby they concluded that both age and year level of the students do not influence their English language proficiency. On the contrary, very few studies relating the year level to psychological barriers affecting their English-speaking fluency have been conducted, and even fewer have been published. Studies by Alyan (2013) and Humaera (2015) have discussed the psychological barriers affecting the English-speaking fluency of students in general without comparing the year level or the time spent

by the students learning the English language, that is why their studies recommended that age be taken into consideration in future studies.

The findings indicate that sex does not significantly influence BACOM students' level of agreement regarding linguistic or psychological barriers to English-speaking fluency, as both male and female students reported similar experiences. While there was a significant difference in linguistic barriers according to year level, this difference was attributed only to students' preferences for tools such as audiovisual, auditory, and visual materials, with 1st year students showing distinct preferences compared to other year levels. Overall, no significant differences were observed in psychological barriers or in the combined level of agreement across year levels, suggesting that all students, regardless of sex or year, experience similar challenges in speaking English. These findings align in emphasizing that improving English-speaking fluency requires addressing both linguistic and psychological dimensions of learning. By integrating experiential and engaging approaches—such as public speaking activities supported by audiovisual tools and reflective practice—educators can help students build confidence, regulate anxiety, and develop cognitive, creative, and communicative skills essential for fluent and effective expression (Quinto et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

In the light of the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn. On one hand, the study reveals that the respondents have linguistic barriers which affect their English-speaking fluency, especially the lack of ability to produce particular words to express their thoughts. Moreover, the respondents have encountered some form of psychological barriers, especially the ones associated with a lack of self-confidence. On the other hand, the study reveals that there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of the overall barriers with their English-speaking fluency. In particular, the 4th year, 3rd year, and 2nd year students do not necessarily have a higher level of English-speaking fluency than the 1st year students just because they are older or have more experience.

Anchored on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are forwarded. Through a speaking test, future researchers could assess students' English-speaking fluency, focusing on linguistic and psychological competence. Future researchers could also explore other respondents from other universities with the same degree or communication degree programs. Next, future research would benefit from including an increase of variables to effectively find specific correlations between the factors affecting the respondents' speaking fluency. Finally, further studies could create a tool for the speaking fluency of the respondents to minimize subjective basis or scale as they self-evaluate their speaking fluency.

FUNDING STATEMENT

The author did not receive any financial support to complete this article.

REFERENCES

- Adnan, Y. M., Daud, M. N., Alias, A., & Razali, M. N. (2017). Importance of soft skills for graduates in the real estate programmes in Malaysia. *Journal of Surveying, Construction and Property*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.22452/jscp.vol3no2.4>
- Alyan, A. (2013). Oral communication problems encountering English major students: Perspectives of learners and teachers in Palestinian EFL University context. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(3), 226–238. https://awej.org/images/AllIssues/Volume4/Volume4Number3Sept2013/19.pdf?fbclid=IwAR07NK6IG7UP1RuYWMjKbGpfbmMAvJCn0Z0NN5Bk7LASr2WyVHK_kbhzfJwAr
- Al Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and difficulties of speaking that encounter English language students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5(12), 96–101.
- Andreou, G., Vlachos, F., & Andreou, E. (2005). Affecting factors in second language learning. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 34(5), 429–438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-005-6202-0>
- Arnold, J., & H.D., B. (1999). *Affect in language learning* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Babbie, E. R. (2012). *The practice of social research* (13th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.

- Baldwin, C. (2011). How to overcome shyness during an oral presentation. http://www.ehow.com/how_7852354_overcome-shyness-during-oral-presentation.html
- Berry, E. B., Chavez, J. V., Gumpal, B. R., Lopez, K. R., Quinto, J. B., Moreno, S. O., Montero, J. M., Grefalde, J. Q., Verano, R. R. T., & Abdurasul, S. M. (2025). A qualitative study on the effects of self-doubt on public speaking and audience reception among senior high school students. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(8), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3840>
- Brink, K. E., & Costigan, R. D. (2015). Oral communication skills: Are the priorities of the workplace and AACSB-accredited business programs aligned? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2), 205-221. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2013.0044>
- Burnkart, G.S. (1998). Spoken language: What it is and how to teach it? Center for Applied Linguistics, 1-31. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED433722.pdf>
- Chavez, J. V., Quinto, J. B., Eustaquio, M. T. L., Alzate, L. J. A., Gumpal, B. R., Tandoc, Jr., J. P., Abdurasul, S. M., Usman, H. B., Miranda, C. D., & Panugot, E. B. (2025). Audience's mentality on confidence towards public speakers during political campaigns. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(11), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i11.3844>
- Chavez, J. V., Quinto, J. B., Samilo, P. J. E., Cabiles, N. V. A., Cuilan, J. T., Miralles, A. C., Suazo, M. L. S. A., Salvaleon, R. G., Samarca, & A. Y., Cruz, J. L. (2025). Intentional learning styles and practices of parents towards their children: Strengthening discipline for language learning. *Environment and Social Psychology* 10(8), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3830>
- Clark, H., & Clark, E. (1977). *Language and psychology: an introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Coutinho dos Santos, J. (2022). Improving speaking fluency through 4/3/2 technique and self-assessment. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 26(4). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26102a1>
- Diane Larsen-Freeman. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 189 pp. *Journal of English Studies (Logroño)*, 3, 277. <https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.83>
- Ella, R. B., & Dapudong, R. C. (2014). Oral communication achievement of the Bachelor of Arts students major in English at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Thailand. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3(4), 209-222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i4/1252>
- Español, A. C., Adalia, H. G., Quinto, J. B., Cuilan, J. T., Garil, B. A., Ramos, A. L., Chavez, J. V., & Lulu, F. M. (2025). English language confidence and self-presentation: Assessing employability appeal to hiring managers in the tourism industry. *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 7(7)839-852. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.8636>
- Gilbert, J. B. (2008). *Teaching pronunciation: using the prosody pyramid*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, R. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Speaking* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Ltd. <https://vulms.vu.edu.pk/Courses/ENG514/Downloads/Rebecca%20Hughes.Teaching%20and%20Researching%20Speaking.pdf?msclkid=d4a4039dc6b311ec8027f190811a570b>
- Humaera, I. (2015). Inhibition in speaking performance. *Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 1(1), 31-50. <https://ejournal.iainke ndari.ac.id/index.php/langkawi/article/view/37910.31332/lkw.v1i1.379>
- Jafarpanah, M., & Rezaei, B. (2020). Association between organizational citizenship behavior and patient safety culture from nurses' perspectives: a descriptive correlational study. *BMC Nursing*, 19(1), 1-8. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12912-020-00416-y>
- Johnson. (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jordan, G. (2022). SLA part 6: Pienemann's processability theory. What do you think you're doing? <https://applingtesol.wordpress.com/2018/09/20/sla-part-5-pienemanns-processability-theory/>
- Kader, M. a. R. A., Aziz, N. a. A., & Dangi, M. R. M. (2020). Mediating effects of English proficiency on the association between religiosity commitment, study habits, self-study concept, and perceived stress. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(5), 219–232. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8521>
- Khan, S. A., Arif, A. H., & Yousuf, M. I. (2019). A study of relationship between learning preferences and academic achievement. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 41(1), 17–32. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1217902>
- Kishore, Kishore, K. (2021). The importance of oral communication. Harappa. <https://harappa.education/harappa-diaries/oral-communication-examples-types-and-process/#:~:text=It's%20the%20most%20secure%20form,others%20react%20to%20your%20words>
- Leaño, A. J., Rabi, N., & Piragasam, G. (2019). Speaking difficulties of Philippine indigenous learners in English semantics. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*, 8(2), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.37134/saecj>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1993). Techniques and principles in language teaching. 2nd Lewis, M & Hill, J. . English Language Teaching. London: Heinemann. London: Prentice Hall.
- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34>
- Lestari, S. (2017). Exploring the factors affecting students' English speaking fluency. Ar-Raniry State Islamic University [Master's Thesis]. <https://repository.ar-raniry.ac.id/id/eprint/2974/1/SELVIA%20LESTARI.pdf#:~:text=A%20study%20has%20been%20carried%20out%20on%20what,motivation%2C%20and%20good%20support%20from%20their%20friends.%20?msclkid=a98c5d11c6b311ecb79bf6e81bcdcf2>
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). Speaking: From intention to articulation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6393.001.0001>
- Margaret Estes Library. (n.d.). Quantitative research and analysis: Quantitative methods overview. LeTourneau University. <https://lib-guides.letu.edu/quantresearch>
- McCarthy, M. (2006). Explorations in corpus linguistics (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2006). Applied multivariate research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Morales, A. A. T., López, L. A. D., & Valdez, M. H. (2017). Analysis of factors that affect the oral communication of Students from the third-year afternoon shift, at the Miguel de Cervantes High School, in Managua during the second semester 2017. Facultad de Educacion e Idiomas Departamento de Ingles - core. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/154178304.pdf>
- Nguyen, H. T., & Tran, N. M. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance at Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 8–23. <http://www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Factors-Affecting-Students%E2%80%99Speaking.pdf>
- Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers. New York: Prentice Hall International, Ltd
- Palpanadan, S. T., & Ahmad, I. (2018). Factors affecting English oral communication among Malaysian civil engineering graduates: An exploratory analysis. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9(11), 608–618. https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJCIET/VOLUME_9_ISSUE_11/IJC_IET_09_11_059.pdf
- Parab. (2020). The effectiveness of various methods & approaches to improve speaking competence accurately and fluently of EFL learner. *Gap Bodhi Taru a Global Journal of Humanities*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.47968/5857>
- Quinto, J. B., Sildon, G. A., Dalocdoc, V. B., Cabrera, F. D. N., Alones, J. P., Samilo, P. J. E., Cabiles, N. V. A., & Chavez, J. V. (2025). Analysis of constant participation in public speaking and debate can conquer fear and gain confidence. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(6), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i6.3456>

- Quinto, J. B. (2020). Corrective feedback in oral communication. *Journal of International Education*, 2(1), 1-19. https://www.jiesuwon.com/_files/ugd/2e610a_45db014d096e4a209ac133e5e9bf7477.pdf
- Quinto, J. B., & Cacanindin, M. R. (2024). Pinoy TELLS: The typology of English language learning strategies. *Advanced Education*, 12(25), 106-124. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.309352>
- Rudd, M., & Honkiss, L. (2019). Analysing the correlation between English proficiency and academic performance among Thai university students. *Athens Journal of Education*, 7(1), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.7-1-6>
- Schütz, R. E. (2019). Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. <https://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash-english.html>
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Streefkerk, R. (2022, November 24). Qualitative vs. Quantitative Research | Differences, Examples & Methods. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-quantitative-research/>
- Suryani, I., Suarnajaya, W., & Pratiwi, A. (2020). Investigating the inhibiting factors in speaking English faced by senior high school students in Singaraja. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(1), 48–58. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1249909>
- Tadesse, M. A. (n.d.). Factors that affect student's interpersonal communication skills in english language and literature regular students at Kabridahar University. *Indian Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(1). <https://www.asianresassoc.org/journals/index.php/ijll/article/view/83>
- Thomas, L. (2021). How to use stratified sampling. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/stratified-sampling/>
- Tuan, N. H., & Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking performance at Le Thanh Hien high school. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 8-23.
- Tunariu, M. (2021). Student blog – Why is it important to speak English? Malta University Language School – Learn English in Malta. <https://www.universitylanguageschool.com/student-blog-why-is-it-important-to-speak-english/#:%7E:text=English%20is%20the%20language%20of,first%20of%20all%2C%20our%20career.>
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 111. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p110>
- Zhang, S. (2009). The role of input, interaction, and output in the development of oral fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 91–100. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1083691>