



## **The Influence of Oral Communication on the Learning Engagement of Students**

Hannah Claire M. Apat<sup>1</sup> & Kristine Joy M. Sarias<sup>2</sup> & Melanie T. Tomarong<sup>3</sup> & Jovenil R. Bacatan<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>Teacher Education, UM Peñaplata College, Island Garden City of Samal, Davao del Norte, Philippines

Correspondence: Jovenil R. Bacatan, UM Peñaplata College, Island Garden City of Samal, Davao del Norte, Philippines

Email: [jovenilbacatan@umindanao.edu.ph](mailto:jovenilbacatan@umindanao.edu.ph)

DOI: 10.53103/cjlls.v3i4.104

### **Abstract**

The study entitled “The Influence of Oral Communication to the Learning Engagement of the Students” aims to determine the significant influence of oral communication on the learning engagement of students in English. The researchers conducted a survey using a descriptive-correlational research design. The data were gathered from a sample size of 197 respondents using the validated modified questionnaire. The researchers interpreted the data using statistical tools such as Mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation and Simple Linear Regression. According to the findings, the level of oral communication of the students is good. The result indicated that oral communication significantly influenced the student's learning engagement. Furthermore, it showed that oral communication for the students should be interactive to boost their learning engagement. The researchers emphasized the need for future researchers to conduct other researches using learning engagement topics not included in the current study.

**Keywords:** Oral Communication, Learning Engagement, Affective Engagement, Behavioral Engagement, Cognitive Engagement

### **Background of the Study**

Learning engagement is a student's participation in their courses and all other areas of their educational program. It mirrors a learner's interactions and teamwork with teachers and fellow students. It is a crucial factor that contributes to academic success. When students are engaged in learning, they become more interested in the learning process, leading to increased knowledge acquisition and retention (Appleton et al., 2006.)

On the other hand, oral communication is verbally transmitting information and ideas from one individual or group to another (Swarthout, 2014.) Students with high levels of oral communication skills can effectively express their thoughts and ideas,

engage in meaningful conversations, and articulate their viewpoints confidently and clearly. Therefore, developing oral communication skills is crucial for students' preparation for academic and professional success.

In some international issues, Rabab'ah (2005) argues that lack of enough exposure to the target language can be one of the problems facing Arab learners of English; hence, the teaching context may not be conducive to developing oral communication skills, and learners face challenges in their speaking output. Unfortunately, there is a scarcity of literature that examines Palestinian English major students' oral communication problems in a university context. The present study bridges the gap in the literature by exploring Palestinian English major students' problems in developing oral communication to highlight these complexities and challenges from learners' and teachers' perspectives.

Though teaching English has been a part of the curriculum in the Philippine educational system, the language can yet be considered an automatic language for Filipinos. As a result, when students reach college, there still exists a wide range of difficulties in expressing themselves in English. The study surveyed 151 college students on how they perceive themselves as speakers of English as a second language. Results show that many conveyed the different aspects of oral communication, which they consider as problem areas. These areas of difficulty are rooted in their concepts of what must be the standards of English (Separa et al., 2015).

In this study, the researchers seek to identify the relationship between the students' learning engagement and oral communication at Nieves Villarica National High School. The results of this research can provide insights into effective teaching methods that improve oral communication skills and promote student engagement. Furthermore, the findings can also benefit students by providing them with a deeper understanding of the importance of learning engagement and how they can foster their oral communication skills.

Generally, the study aimed to determine the significant influence of oral communication to the learning engagement among Grade 12 students at Nieves Villarica National High School. Specifically, it seeks to address the questions as follows:

1. What is the level of oral communication of the students?
2. What is the level of learning engagement of the students in terms of?
  - 2.1 affective engagement;
  - 2.2 behavioral engagement; and
  - 2.3 cognitive engagement?
3. Is there a significant relationship between oral communication and learning engagement?
4. Is there a significant influence of student's oral communication on their learning engagement?

## **Literature Review**

### **Oral Communication**

Oral communication is conveying information or ideas by word of mouth in effective and appropriate ways in a given context (Beebe et al., 2002.) A study conducted at Saint Michael College of Caraga reveals the common problems in oral communication skills among high school students. The limited English usage in daily life contributed to these challenges, while the students' difficulties in oral communication were found to be weak and positively correlated with communication apprehension. By addressing these issues and implementing appropriate strategies, educators can support students in developing their oral communication skills and reducing their communication apprehension. (Chentez et al., 2019)

Another study related to oral communication by Gutiérrez Gutiérrez (2005) highlights the significance of feedback in enhancing oral communication skills. Whether it comes from instructors, peers, or self-assessment, feedback plays a crucial role in identifying areas for improvement, providing guidance, and promoting the development of adequate communication competence. By utilizing different types of feedback, individuals can refine their oral communication skills and become more proficient and confident communicators.

While a study by Luz (2015) also shows that teacher-student interactions influence student oral communication development. Positive teacher-student relationships, effective feedback, modeling, and scaffolding all play critical roles in supporting students' growth in oral communication skills. By fostering supportive environments, providing constructive feedback, modeling effective communication behaviors, and implementing scaffolding techniques, teachers can contribute significantly to their students' oral communication development.

Moreover, it is necessary to provide students with ample practice opportunities. Students need regular opportunities to engage in oral communication tasks to hone their skills. Classroom activities encouraging speaking, such as group work, pair discussions, and oral presentations, allow students to practice their communication skills in a supportive environment. The more they practice, the more they can refine their speaking abilities (Monsalve & Correal, 2006.)

### **Learning Engagement**

Learning engagement is the degree to which students are interested and involved in learning (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012.) Active learning strategies, such as problem-solving activities, group work, and hands-on experiences, can promote student engagement. Active learning approaches shift the focus from passive reception to active involvement,

encouraging students to construct knowledge, apply concepts, and engage in critical thinking (Bonwell & Eison, 1991.)

The teacher-student relationships, instructional practices, and classroom climate are factors in a classroom environment that affects student engagement. A positive and supportive environment promotes student motivation and active participation, leading to increased engagement and improved academic performance (Vanner et al., 2020.) A similar study by Varga (2017) revealed that positive student-teacher relationships are vital to fostering student engagement and academic success. Supportive and caring relationships create a sense of belonging and trust, leading to increased motivation, participation, and commitment to learning.

Another correlated study by Juvonen et al. (2012) exposes that peer interaction enhances student motivation, social connection, and active participation in the learning process, leading to improved engagement and academic outcomes. When students engage in collaborative learning activities and interact with their peers, they become more motivated to participate actively in the learning process. In addition, peer interaction allows students to share ideas, exchange perspectives, and engage in meaningful discussions, which can increase their intrinsic motivation to learn.

Furthermore, a study interconnected to learning engagement by Carstens et al. (2021) explored the relationship between technology and student engagement. They found that technology has the potential to impact student engagement significantly. Technology-mediated learning experiences provide personalized and interactive learning opportunities that capture students' interest and actively involve them in learning.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Design**

This study was done with a descriptive-correlational research design. The researchers want to determine the relationship between oral communication and learning engagement. Correlational research is a non-experimental quantitative design in which the researcher applies correlational statistics to measure and describe the degree of association among variables or sets of scores (Creswell, 2012). Therefore, this design is the most compatible for this study since it measures the relationship between oral communication and the students' learning engagement.

### **Research Respondents**

The Grade 12 students enrolled in ABM, HUMSS, and STEM Strand at Nieves Villarica National High School were the respondents to this research study. The researchers utilized stratified random sampling, a valuable method for data collection if

the population is heterogeneous (Singh & Masuku, 2014). Furthermore, the researchers employed the lottery method to ensure that any individual had an equal chance of being chosen from the population. Below is the table showing the total population and the determined sample size of the study respondents.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents

<b>Strand</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Sample</b>
ABM	86	43
HUMSS	229	112
STEM	86	42
TOTAL	401	197

### **Research Instrument**

The researchers used two (2) instruments to gather the data for this study. To determine the oral communication of Grade 12 students, the researchers utilized and adopted the questionnaire by Idrus et al. (2011) entitled “Oral Communication Ability in English: An Essential Skill For Engineering Graduates.”

On the other hand, to determine the level of learning engagement of Grade 12 students, the researchers utilized and adopted the questionnaire by Hart et al. (2011) entitled “Students Engagement in School Questionnaire (SESQ).” The scales below were employed to measure the oral communication and student learning engagement, respectively:

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Descriptive Equivalent</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High	This indicates that the speaker’s oral communication is excellent.
3.40 – 4.19	High	This indicates that the speaker’s oral communication is very good.
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This indicates that the speaker’s oral communication is good.
1.80 – 2.59	Low	This indicates that the speaker’s oral communication is poor.
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	This indicates that the speaker’s oral communication is very poor.
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Descriptive Equivalent</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High	This indicates that the level of learning engagement of the student in English is always manifested.

3.40 – 4.19	High	This indicates that the level of learning engagement of the student in English is oftentimes manifested.
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This indicates that the level of learning engagement of the student in English is sometimes manifested.
1.80 – 2.59	Low	This indicates that the level of learning engagement of the student in English is seldom manifested.
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	This indicates that the level of learning engagement of the student in English is never manifested.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Level of Oral Communication of the Students**

Students' oral communication level refers to their proficiency and competence in effectively expressing themselves through spoken language. It encompasses their ability to articulate thoughts, ideas, and information clearly, fluently, and coherently. A high level of oral communication indicates that students can communicate effectively and confidently in spoken English.

The table below shows the level of oral communication of the 197 Grade 12 students. It revealed that oral communication obtained a mean of 3.43 and a standard deviation of .61 with a high descriptive equivalent. It implies that the student's oral communication is very good. Therefore, the students can communicate very well in English. According to Airasian (2001), when students demonstrate a high level of oral communication skills, they possess the necessary language competencies to communicate effectively in spoken English. A similar study by Dunbar (2016) supports that a high mean score on oral communication assessments indicates strong competence in oral communication skills.

Table 2: Level of oral communication

Statements	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I do a good job of participating in class discussions conducted fully in English.	.77	3.67	High
2. I am good at learning speaking skills.	.81	3.66	High
3. I can speak English easily when I should.	.83	3.48	High
4. I always think I am good at speaking in English.	.85	3.35	Moderate
5. I feel confident about my ability to speak clearly.	.85	3.47	High
6. I can motivate myself to speak in English.	.86	3.68	High
7. I can speak fully in English well with my English lecturers.	.91	3.21	Moderate
8. I am good at communicating with the international students and lecturers.	.93	3.15	Moderate
9. I can learn and use new English words in my conversation easily.	.80	3.40	High
10. My speaking ability does not worry me.	.96	3.34	Moderate
11. I am able to keep speaking in English even when my friends tease me.	.87	3.40	High
12. When I decide to say something in English, I go ahead and do it.	.92	3.57	High
13. It is easy for me to concentrate while speaking in English with others.	.84	3.23	Moderate
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>High</b>

Note: N = 197, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

Based on the data presented, most indicators were rated high, but some were rated moderate. The following statements are the five indicators that obtain low mean ratings. First, *I always thought I was good at speaking in English* got a mean rating of 3.35 and a standard deviation of .85 with a moderate descriptive equivalent, which means that the student's oral communication is good; Second, *I can speak English fully well with my English lecturers* got a mean rating of 3.21 and a standard deviation of .91 with a moderate descriptive equivalent, which means that the student's oral communication is

good. Third, *I am good at communicating with international students, and lecturers* got a mean rating of 3.15 and a standard deviation of .93 with a moderate descriptive equivalent, which means that the student's oral communication is good. Fourth, *My speaking ability does not worry me* got a mean rating of 3.34 and a standard deviation of .96 with a moderate descriptive equivalent, which means that the student's oral communication is good. Fifth, *It is easy for me to concentrate while speaking in English with others* obtained a mean rating of 3.23 and a standard deviation of .92 with a moderate descriptive equivalent, which means that the student's oral communication is good. These indicators highlighted the need for increased focus and attention to acquiring oral communication skills fully.

The result showed that there are three most effective actions to improve the level of oral communication of the students in English. The following are presented from the highest to the lowest mean: (1) *I can motivate myself to speak in English* got a mean score of 3.68 with a standard deviation of .86, described as high. It indicates that the Grade 12 students can improve their oral communication by motivating themselves to speak in English. According to Ihsan (2016), motivation is like fuel enabling the mind to exert effort to understand the language in learning English. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009) believe motivation is a driving force that propels learners' efforts, engagement, and language learning outcomes. (2) *I did an excellent job participating in class discussions conducted entirely in English* and obtained a mean score with a standard deviation of .77, described as high. It indicates that Grade 12 students can improve their oral communication by actively participating in any English class. A study conducted by Delaney (2012) stated that students who participated often appeared to acquire the English language quickly. In addition, Lyster and Ranta (1997), when students actively engage in communicative tasks and receive appropriate feedback, their uptake of target language forms can be enhanced, potentially leading to faster language acquisition. (3) *I am good at learning speaking skills*, generating a mean score of 3.66 with a standard deviation of .81, described as high. These Grade 12 students can improve their oral communication by learning speaking skills. Speaking skills are one of the essential abilities to be developed and improved to communicate in English effectively (Leong and Ahmadi, 2017.) It was supported by the study of Brown (2016) emphasizes that speaking is a productive skill that allows learners to express themselves, interact with others, and negotiate meaning in real-life situations.

### **Level of Learning Engagement of the Students**

Students' level of learning engagement refers to their active participation and involvement in the learning process, specifically in terms of affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement. When actively engaged in their learning, students are more likely to acquire knowledge, develop critical thinking skills, and become independent learners.



Table 3: Level of learning engagement

Indicators	SD	M	Descriptive Level
<i>Affective Engagement</i>	.55	4.27	Very High
<i>Behavioral Engagement</i>	.47	3.79	High
<i>Cognitive Engagement</i>	.55	3.97	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	.40	4.01	High

Note: N = 197, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

The table shows the level of learning engagement of 197 Grade 12 students. It revealed that students' learning engagement generated an overall mean rating of 4.01 with a standard deviation of .40, described as high. Therefore, it implies that the level of learning engagement among Grade 12 students is often manifested. Students could learn English in affective, behavioral, or cognitive engagement. Moreover, Wang and Holcombe (2010) revealed that students' perceptions of the classroom environment and their achievement goals significantly influenced their level of engagement in the learning process. Students who experienced a positive and supportive classroom environment were more likely to exhibit higher levels of affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement (Wang & Eccles, 2012)

Based on the table above, Affective Engagement got a mean rating of 4.27 with a standard deviation of .55, described as very high, which means that the student's level of learning engagement is always manifested; Behavioral Engagement got a mean rating of 3.79 with a standard deviation of .47, described as high, which means that the students level of learning engagement is often manifested; Cognitive Engagement got a mean rating of 3.97 with a standard deviation of .55 described as high, which means that the students level of learning engagement is often manifested.

Affective engagement got the highest mean score, meaning the students are most interested in learning with a learning environment, materials, and strategies that align with their desires. Students' affective engagement is how they feel about their school, classroom, teachers, and peers (Jimerson, 2003). In addition, the learning environment, including classroom climate, peer relationships, and school culture, significantly influences students' affective engagement (Hughes et al., 2008).

Cognitive engagement got the next highest mean score, meaning the students are more interested in learning when given tasks requiring planning and self-regulation—the student's willingness to invest and exert effort in learning (Blumenfeld et al., 2006). A study by Schunk and Meece (2006) states that cognitively engaged students are more likely to achieve better academic performance and retain knowledge over time.

Behavioral engagement got the last rank mean score, meaning the students are least interested in learning when asked to participate in class. Therefore, the participation and involvement of students in extracurricular and academic activities is a critical component of behavioral engagement (da Rocha Seixas et al., 2016). In addition, the

research conducted by Fredricks et al. (2011) indicated that students who engaged in extracurricular activities, such as sports, clubs, or arts, exhibited higher levels of behavioral engagement in school and demonstrated positive academic and social outcomes.

The findings highlight the significance of affective, cognitive, and behavioral engagement in English language acquisition. Students' interests, emotions, motivation, cognitive investment, self-regulation, and active participation are essential in their engagement and language learning outcomes.

### **Significance of the Relationship between Oral Communication and Learning Engagement**

The test of the correlation between oral communication and learning engagement is shown in Table 4. The data reveal an overall computed r-value of .394 with a p-value of less than 0.05; the confidence level set for this study was  $p < .05$ . Therefore, the overall result depicted a significant relationship between variables. This result rejected the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between oral communication and learning engagement. A study by Chism and Tomaswick (2018) emphasized the importance of promoting effective oral communication to enhance student engagement and overall academic performance.

Table 4: Significance of the relationship between oral communication and learning engagement

<b>Oral Communication</b>	<b>Learning Engagement</b>			
	Affective Engagement	Behavioral Engagement	Cognitive Engagement	<i>Overall</i>
<i>Overall</i>	.263* (.000)	.342* (.000)	.315* (.000)	<b>.394*</b> <b>(.000)</b>

*\*p < .05 – Significant*

Moreover, this was supported by the study of Frymier and Houser (2016) explored the impact of oral communication activities on student learning engagement. It shows a great positive relationship between oral communication and learning engagement. The researchers concluded that incorporating oral communication activities in the classroom can enhance student engagement and promote deeper learning.

Learning engagement in terms of affective engagement, behavioral engagement, and cognitive engagement is evidenced by the r-value of .263, .342, and .315, respectively, and p-values less than 0.05 significance level. In addition, all indicators are significantly correlated to the overall oral communication of the students. It means that when students' oral communication increases, the learning engagement increases or vice versa. As cited in the study by Lucanus (2017), oral communication is related to learning

engagement since it is vital for a student's academic success and future career prospects.

It was supported by the study conducted by Fredricks et al. (2004) revealed that when students actively participate in oral communication activities, such as class discussions, presentations, and collaborative projects, their overall learning engagement increases. In addition, higher levels of engagement positively influence the development of oral communication skills. Furthermore, it highlights the reciprocal relationship between oral communication and learning engagement, suggesting that improving one area contributes to enhancing the other.

### **Regression Analysis of the Influence of Oral Communication on Learning Engagement**

Table 5 shows the regression model indicating the influence of oral communication on the learning engagement of the students. It specifically shows an R square value of .156 which means that the learning engagement of the students is influenced by oral communication by 15.6 percent. This also indicates that the remaining 84.4 percent influence on learning engagement can be attributed to other factors not covered in this study. Lastly, obtaining the constant value of 3.108 and a coefficient of 0.263, it can be denoted that the learning engagement of students can be attained with the equation  $Learning\ Engagement = 0.263 (Oral\ Communication) + 3.108$ .

Based on the findings, it is concluded that the oral communication and learning engagement of students are manifested all the time; and that for every unit change in the oral communication there is a corresponding effect on the learning engagement. It was mentioned in the study of Palermo (2019) that oral communication proficiency significantly influenced the learning engagement of students in learning English. It was also emphasized in the study of Hefel (2022) that active participation in student-led discussion impacted students' engagement. Students were more engaged during the discussions through talking and asking questions (Dykstra-Steinbrenner & Watson (2015).

Table 5: Regression analysis of oral communication influence on learning engagement

Independent Variable	Learning Engagement		
	B	t	Sig.
Constant	3.108	20.354	.000
Oral Communication	.263	5.993	.000*
<i>R</i>	.394		
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.156		
F	35.912		
p	.000*		

\* $p < .05$  – Significant

### Conclusion

Based on the findings above, the following conclusions were drawn:

The overall oral communication level of the students was high which means that their oral communication is very good, however, in the statement “*I am good at communicating with international students and lecturers got the lowest mean score*”, which means that the students have difficulty communicating with international students and lecturers. It implies that the students may need help with cross-cultural communication or more confidence in communicating effectively in English with individuals from different backgrounds. It could be accredited to factors such as limited exposure to international settings, unfamiliarity with foreign accents or cultural norms, or a lack of practice in conversations with individuals from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

On the other hand, the overall learning engagement of the students was high which means that their learning engagement is manifested oftentimes, on the other side; the students' slightest interest in learning through behavioral engagement suggests that they may exhibit a lower level of active participation, involvement, and hands-on learning experiences. The students' lower interest in this aspect may indicate a preference for more passive learning approaches or a lack of motivation to actively engage in hands-on learning experiences.

Moreover, regardless of the difficulty stated above, the relationship between oral communication and learning engagement is reciprocal. Not only does improved oral communication contribute to increased engagement, but higher levels of engagement also facilitate the development of better oral communication skills.

Lastly, oral communication influences the learning engagement of the students. It is concluded that the oral communication of the students is very good and the learning engagement of students is manifested all the time; and that for every unit change in the

oral communication there is a corresponding effect on the learning engagement.

### References

- Airasian, P. W. (2001). *Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications*. McGraw-Hill, PO Box 548, Blacklick, OH 43003.
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). *Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument*. *Journal of school psychology, 44*(5), 427-445
- Beebe, S. A., Beebe, S. J., Redmond, M. V., Geerinck, T., & Salem-Wiseman, L. (2002). *Interpersonal communication: Relating to others* (p. 432). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blumenfeld, P. C., Kempler, T. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). *Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments* (pp. 475-488). na..
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. ERIC Digest.
- Brown, H. D. (2016). *Principles of language learning and teaching*.
- Carstens, K. J., Mallon, J. M., Bataineh, M., & Al-Bataineh, A. (2021). *Effects of technology on student learning*. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 20*(1), 105-113.
- Chentez, K. J. R., Felicilda Jr, J. V., Felisilda, A. R., & Tabañag, R. E. (2019). *Common problems in oral communication skills among high school students*. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal (Teacher Education Journal), 1*(1), 1-1.
- Chism, R. L., & Tomaswick, L. (2018). *Oral communication as a learning tool*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- da Rocha Seixas, L., Gomes, A. S., & de Melo Filho, I. J. (2016). *Effectiveness of gamification in the engagement of students*. *Computers in Human Behavior, 58*, 48-63.
- Delaney, T. (2012). *Quality and quantity of oral participation and English proficiency gains*. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(4), 467-482.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (Vol. 36). *Multilingual Matters*..
- Dunbar, N. E., Brooks, C. F., & Kubicka-Miller, T. (2006). *Oral communication skills in higher education: Using a performance-based evaluation rubric to assess communication skills*. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*, 115-128.
- Dykstra Steinbrenner, J. R., & Watson, L. R. (2015). Student engagement in the classroom: The impact of classroom, teacher, and student factors. *Journal of Autism and developmental Disorders, 45*, 2392-2410.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). *School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence*. *Review of educational research, 74*(1), 59-

109.

- Fredricks, J., McColskey, W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., & Mooney, K. (2011). *Measuring Student Engagement in Upper Elementary through High School: A Description of 21 Instruments*. Issues & Answers. REL 2011-No. 098. Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2016). *The role of oral participation in student engagement*. *Communication Education*, 65(1), 83-104.
- Gutiérrez Gutiérrez, D. (2005). Developing oral skills through communicative and interactive tasks. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (6), 83-96.
- Hart, S. R., Stewart, K., & Jimerson, S. R. (2011). *The student engagement in schools questionnaire (SESQ) and the teacher engagement report form-new (TERF-N): Examining the preliminary evidence*. *Contemporary School Psychology: Formerly "The California School Psychologist"*, 15(1), 67-79.
- Hefel, S. (2022). *Impact of student-led discussions on student engagement and involvement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina).
- Hughes, J. N., Luo, W., Kwok, O. M., & Loyd, L. K. (2008). *Teacher-student support, effortful engagement, and achievement: A 3-year longitudinal study*. *Journal of educational psychology*, 100(1), 1.
- Ihsan, M. D. (2016). *Students' motivation in speaking English*. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 1(1), 111-147.
- Jimerson, S. R., Campos, E., & Greif, J. L. (2003). *Toward an understanding of definitions and measures of school engagement and related terms*. *The California School Psychologist*, 8, 7-27.
- Juvonen, J., Espinoza, G., & Knifsend, C. (2012). *The role of peer relationships in student academic and extracurricular engagement*. *Handbook of research on student engagement*, 387-401.
- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). *An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill*.
- Lucanus, A. (2017). Oral communication skills are important for students. Retrieved on March, 27, 2020.
- Luz, F. S. D. R. D. (2015). *The relationship between teachers and students in the classroom: Communicative language teaching approach and cooperative learning strategy to improve learning* (Master's thesis).
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms*. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Monsalve, S., & Correal, A. (2006). *Children's Oral Communication in English Class Activities: An Exploratory Study*. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (7), 131-146.

- Palmero, G. M. (2019). Oral Communication Proficiency And Learning Engagement Of Grade 11 Students In English. *Global Scientific Journals (GSJ)*, 7(8), 383–488.
- Rabab'ah, G. (2005). *Compensatory strategies used by learners of Arabic as a second Language*. Grazer linguistische Studien, (63).
- Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (2006). *Self-efficacy development in adolescence*. Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents, 5(1), 71-96.
- Separ, L. A. C., Generales, L. J., & Medina, R. J. S. (2015). *Self-assessment on the oral communication of Filipino college students*. *Advanced Science Letters*, 21(7), 2312-2314.
- Singh, A. S., & Masuku, M. B. (2014). *Sampling techniques & determination of sample size in applied statistics research: An overview*. *International Journal of economics, commerce and management*, 2(11), 1-22.
- Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). *Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience*. *Handbook of research on student engagement*, 21-44.
- Swarthout, D. (2014). *Academy lessons*. Retrieved from Study.com:  
<http://study.com/academy/lesson/oral-communication-definition-types-advantages.html>
- Vanner, C., Quenneville, Z., Baerstoen, V., Tsangari, V., Arsenault-Carter, T., Doan, T., ... & Chomiak, K. (2022). *The Importance of Student-Teacher Relationships*. *Classroom Practice in 2022*.
- Varga, M. (2017). *The effects of teacher-student relationships on the academic engagement of students*.