

Metacognition and Challenges in English Public Speaking among Grade 11 Students

Julianne Patrich R. Villa 

Author Information:

Victoria National High School, San Gavino,
Victoria, Tarlac, 2313, Philippines

Correspondence:

villajulienpatrich@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: August 17, 2026

Date Revised: August 25, 2026

Date Accepted: August 27, 2026

Date Published: September 29, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0429>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0429

Recommended Citation:

Villa, J. P. R. (2026). Metacognition and Challenges in English Public Speaking among Grade 11 Students. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(8), 325-336. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0429>

Abstract. This descriptive and quantitative study, aligned to the field of ESL Research, investigated senior high school ESL students' use of metacognition when they are engaged in public speaking in English. It also determined the challenges encountered by the students observed from their actual performance of public speaking. The students' challenges were generally classified into "types of speech errors" and "gaps in communication skills". The two main variables of the study are intersected to analyze how certain levels of metacognition relate to the students' susceptibility to manifest speech errors and gaps in communication skills. The research participants are 44 Grade 11 students of La Paz National High School as of school year 2022-2023. The research population is stratified to reflect equal sex distribution and representations of students with high and low academic aptitude based on their latest grade point average (GPA). Findings reveal that students, of both sexes, and with high and low academic aptitude, use different levels of metacognition when engaged in public speaking in English. Likewise, students, of both sexes, and with high and low academic aptitude, encounter challenges when engaged in public speaking in English, in the form of different speech error types and several gaps in their communication skills. Based on variance analysis, sex and academic aptitude are not significant factors that can differentiate (a) Grade 11 students' use of metacognition when they are engaged in public speaking in English, and (b) Grade 11 students' speech errors and gaps in communication skills when they are engaged in public speaking in English. Based on correlational analysis, students with varying levels of metacognition are not prevented from encountering common challenges in their public speaking performance in English, whether these be in the form of speech errors or gaps in their communication skills. The research findings indicate lapses in the students' use of metacognition, and a list of challenges that they encounter when they are engaged in public speaking in English, inclusive of speech errors and gaps in their communication skills, which entail the use of intervention strategies that are offered in this study to forge improvement along these areas.

Keywords: Metacognition; Public Speaking; Speech Errors; Communication Skills

Introduction

Public speaking is an important communication skill, but it can be challenging for students, particularly English language learners. It requires learners to organize ideas, use appropriate language, and deliver messages clearly and confidently. Regular speaking practice can help improve students' fluency and confidence (Lightfoot, n.d.; Teach This, 2022).

In the Philippine senior high school curriculum, the Department of Education (DepEd) emphasizes listening and speaking skills as essential components of communicative competence. The *Oral Communication in Context* course includes competencies in effective speech writing and delivery, particularly logical organization, word choice, grammatical correctness, articulation, modulation, stage presence, and audience rapport (Department of Education, 2017). However, students may still experience difficulties in expressing themselves effectively in English, particularly during public speaking.

One concept that may support students' performance is metacognition, which involves awareness and regulation of one's own thinking through processes such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating performance (Arp, 2016). In public speaking, metacognition may be reflected in how students set goals, prepare their speeches, assess their readiness, and evaluate their performance. ARP (2016) found that students

demonstrated metacognitive behaviors in public speaking, including goal setting, preparation, personal knowledge, changes in perspective, and performance evaluation.

Although metacognition has been examined extensively in language learning, its relationship with English language production, particularly public speaking, remains less explored, especially among Asian ESL learners (Huang, 2021, as cited in Asian Conference on Language, 2022). This gap provides a basis for examining how students' metacognitive engagement relates to the challenges they experience during actual English public-speaking performance.

Thus, this study examined the metacognition and public-speaking challenges of Grade 11 students. Specifically, it investigated their metacognitive engagement in public speaking, the speech errors and gaps in communication skills they manifested, differences according to sex and academic aptitude, and the relationship between metacognition and these public-speaking challenges. The findings served as the basis for proposing instructional and school-based intervention strategies to improve students' metacognitive engagement and public-speaking performance.

Research Questions

This study examined the challenges encountered by Grade 11 English language learners in public speaking in English, with particular attention to their use of metacognition in speech planning and preparation, speech errors, and gaps in communication skills. It also examined the relationship between metacognition and public-speaking challenges and proposed instructional interventions based on the findings. The participants were Grade 11 students of La Paz National High School classified according to sex and academic aptitude during School Year 2022–2023.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What level of metacognition is employed by the students in public speaking in English when grouped according to:
 - 1.1 sex; and
 - 1.2 academic aptitude?
2. What challenges are encountered by the students in public speaking in terms of:
 - 2.1 speech errors, specifically anticipation, perseveration, blending, addition, substitution, malapropism, and spoonerism; and
 - 2.2 gaps in communication skills, specifically organization, supporting materials, and language?
3. Is there a significant difference in the students' accounts in terms of:
 - 3.1 level of metacognition between female and male students;
 - 3.2 level of metacognition between students with different levels of academic aptitude; and
 - 3.3 public-speaking challenges between groups according to sex and academic aptitude in terms of speech errors and gaps in communication skills?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the students' level of metacognition and their public-speaking challenges in terms of:
 - 4.1 speech errors; and
 - 4.2 gaps in communication skills?
5. What instructional interventions may be proposed to improve students' public-speaking performance by:
 - 5.1 enhancing their level of metacognition; and
 - 5.2 reducing their challenges in public speaking?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study focused on the metacognition and public-speaking challenges of Grade 11 students in English at La Paz National High School during School Year 2022–2023. It examined students' metacognition in speech planning and preparation, speech errors, and gaps in communication skills, including differences according to sex and academic aptitude. The study was limited to Grade 11 students and the specific speech errors and communication-skill gaps covered by the research instruments. The findings were based on the participants' responses and did not establish causal relationships between metacognition and public-speaking challenges. Therefore, the findings may not be generalized to other grade levels or educational settings.

Literature Review

Metacognition and English Language Learning

Metacognition refers to learners' awareness and regulation of their own thinking and learning. It commonly involves processes such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating performance. These processes allow learners to identify their strengths and weaknesses, select appropriate strategies, monitor their progress,

and evaluate the effectiveness of their actions. In the context of language learning, metacognition is particularly relevant because learners must consciously manage linguistic knowledge and learning strategies while developing their communication skills. The present study adopts this perspective by examining metacognition as it is applied to English language production and public speaking.

Recent research supports the value of metacognitive instruction in second- and foreign-language learning. Wongdaeng and Higgins (2023), in a systematic review and meta-analysis of tertiary EFL contexts, found considerable potential for metacognitive interventions. Their findings particularly emphasized the importance of explicit instruction, appropriate pedagogical sequencing, and the regulation of skills rather than simply providing students with knowledge about metacognition. These findings suggest that metacognition can be developed through appropriate instructional support and can contribute to more self-regulated learning.

Recent studies have also examined metacognition specifically in speaking. Fitrianingsih et al. (2025) found that EFL learners used metacognitive strategies such as planning, monitoring, information management, problem solving, and evaluation in learning to speak. Their findings demonstrate that metacognition is applied not only to general academic learning but also to specific speaking activities. Similarly, Chasib et al. (2026) reported that EFL students frequently used strategic knowledge, particularly problem solving, planning, and evaluation, in managing their speaking performance. However, lower levels were observed in person knowledge and mental translation, suggesting that learners may still need to strengthen their awareness of their own speaking abilities.

These findings are consistent with the conceptual foundation of the present study. Arp (2016), whose work specifically examined metacognition in public speaking, identified several metacognitive markers among students performing public-speaking tasks, including goal setting, performance satisfaction, preparation, personal knowledge, changes in perspective, and evaluation. The study therefore provides a direct basis for examining metacognition within public-speaking performance. The present thesis similarly uses these markers to examine how students apply metacognition when preparing for and performing English speeches.

Metacognition and Public Speaking

Public speaking provides a relevant context for examining metacognition because effective speech delivery requires students to prepare, organize information, monitor their performance, and reflect on the results of their delivery. Arp (2016) demonstrated that students use different metacognitive processes when performing public-speaking tasks, particularly in setting goals, describing their preparation, evaluating their performance, and reflecting on changes in their perspectives. The findings of Arp therefore support the view that metacognition operates across different stages of public speaking.

Recent research further supports this connection. Nordin et al. (2023), in a study of Malaysian professional communication students, examined metacognitive strategies used in oral presentations. The students demonstrated metacognitive strategies in planning, monitoring, and evaluating their presentations, with particular attention to preparing and understanding information, organizing the presentation, and following appropriate delivery procedures.

However, metacognitive strategy use may not always be consistently applied during speaking tasks. Zhang, et. al (2021) found that EFL learners' use of metacognitive strategies in integrated speaking tasks was influenced by perceived task difficulty. The learners were also found not to be active users of metacognitive strategies during the speaking tasks. These findings are important to the present study because possessing metacognitive knowledge does not necessarily mean that learners will consistently apply such knowledge during actual language production.

Similarly, Dayag-Tungpalan (2023) found that Filipino ESL learners employed metacognitive strategies during speaking activities, with thought-process strategies emerging as particularly prominent. The study also identified several factors associated with speaking performance, including communication anxiety, vocabulary knowledge, grammar, exposure to speaking activities, English exposure, preparation time, and topical knowledge. These findings indicate that metacognition should be considered alongside other linguistic and contextual factors that may influence oral communication.

The literature therefore establishes that metacognition is relevant to public speaking, but its application may vary according to task demands, learner characteristics, and the nature of the speaking activity. This supports the need to examine not only the level of metacognition students possess but also whether such metacognitive engagement is associated with observable challenges in actual public-speaking performance.

Public-Speaking Challenges among English Learners

Public speaking requires learners to coordinate several linguistic and performance-related skills. Students must organize ideas, select appropriate vocabulary, construct grammatically acceptable expressions,

provide supporting information, and deliver their message clearly before an audience. The Philippine Oral Communication curriculum likewise emphasizes effective speech writing and delivery, including audience analysis, logical organization, word choice, grammatical correctness, articulation, modulation, stage presence, gestures, movement, and rapport with the audience.

Despite these expectations, English learners may experience various difficulties when speaking before an audience. These difficulties may involve linguistic problems, inadequate preparation, limited vocabulary, organization of ideas, and psychological concerns. Dayag-Tungpalan (2023), for example, identified vocabulary, grammar, communication anxiety, exposure to speaking activities, preparation time, and topical knowledge as factors associated with ESL speaking performance.

Recent Philippine research further demonstrates the complexity of speaking performance. Tapado (2025) examined the experiences of Filipino Grade 11 learners and found that they experienced fear of negative evaluation, test anxiety, and communication apprehension in different English-speaking contexts. Practice, relaxation techniques, and peer support were among the coping strategies identified by the participants.

Likewise, Cano and Cano (2025) examined Grade 11 students in Alicia, Bohol, in relation to English language anxiety, public-speaking anxiety, and extemporaneous speech performance. Their findings showed no significant relationship between English language anxiety and extemporaneous speaking performance and likewise found no significant relationship between public-speaking anxiety and speaking performance. These results suggest that speaking performance cannot necessarily be explained by a single psychological factor.

These studies demonstrate that public-speaking performance involves multiple dimensions. However, the present study focuses more narrowly on observable speech errors and gaps in communication skills manifested during English public speaking. This focus allows the study to examine actual language-production difficulties rather than public-speaking anxiety alone.

Speech Errors and Language Production

Speech production involves the transformation of ideas into linguistic forms that can be expressed orally. In psycholinguistics, language production involves several stages, including message planning and lexical selection. Levelt (2001) explains that spoken-word production involves processes through which speakers access and produce lexical information during speech. The present thesis likewise situates speech errors within the broader process of language production.

Speech errors are a natural feature of language production and may provide evidence of the processes involved in producing speech. Fromkin (1971) demonstrated that speech errors are not simply random mistakes but may reveal systematic aspects of the language-production system. The taxonomy used in the present study is based on Fromkin's classification and includes anticipation, perseveration, blending, addition/epenthesis, substitution, malapropism, and spoonerism.

The study of speech errors is particularly relevant to second-language learning because learners may experience difficulties while simultaneously planning ideas, selecting words, constructing expressions, and delivering speech. Error analysis can therefore provide useful information about learners' language-production difficulties and can help teachers identify areas requiring instructional attention. The present study applies this perspective by examining speech errors manifested during actual English public-speaking performance.

Among the speech errors considered in the present study, malapropism is particularly relevant because it involves the incorrect substitution of one word for another. Previous research has examined malapropism among secondary school students, while the present study extends the investigation by examining its occurrence during actual English public-speaking performance and comparing its manifestation according to sex and academic aptitude. The thesis itself identified malapropism as one of the recurring speech errors among the respondents.

Communication Skills in Public Speaking

Public-speaking competence extends beyond grammatical accuracy and the absence of speech errors. Effective speech requires organization of ideas, appropriate supporting materials, suitable language, and effective delivery. The present study therefore considers gaps in communication skills as a second category of challenges in public speaking.

The communication-skills-gap framework used in this study is anchored on the Oral Communication curriculum and includes concerns involving organization, supporting materials, and language. In the thesis, lack of organization refers to the presentation of points in a random manner that makes the speech difficult to follow; insufficient supporting materials refers to inadequate information or analysis supporting the topic; and inadequate language refers to limited or inappropriate vocabulary used to express ideas.

Organization is particularly important in public speaking because a speech must present ideas in a coherent sequence that allows the audience to understand the message. Supporting materials likewise strengthen the speaker's claims by providing information, examples, explanations, or evidence. Language use,

meanwhile, affects the clarity and appropriateness of the message. These elements are therefore important components of effective oral communication and are consistent with the competencies prescribed for Grade 11 Oral Communication in Context.

Research on speaking performance also indicates that students with different characteristics may demonstrate different speaking strengths and difficulties. Erdiana et al. (2019), for example, found that female EFL students obtained higher speaking scores than male students across the assessed speaking aspects, although the difference was described as trivial. Such findings provide a basis for examining sex differences in speaking-related performance while recognizing that sex alone may not explain students' communication outcomes.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design with both descriptive and inferential analyses. The descriptive component determined the students' level of metacognition and identified their public-speaking challenges, particularly speech errors and gaps in communication skills. Inferential analyses were used to examine differences according to sex and academic aptitude and the relationship between metacognition and public-speaking challenges. The study also aimed to develop instructional interventions based on the findings.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at La Paz National High School, a public secondary school located in La Paz, Tarlac, Philippines, under the DepEd Schools Division of Tarlac Province. The school offers both junior and senior high school programs and was selected because it served Grade 11 learners enrolled in Oral Communication in Context, the English course relevant to the study.

Research Participants

The participants were 44 Grade 11 students enrolled at La Paz National High School during School Year 2022–2023. They were drawn from the 11 Grade 11 sections and included equal representations according to sex and academic aptitude. The participants consisted of 22 students with high academic aptitude and 22 with low academic aptitude, equally distributed between female and male students.

Research Instrument

The study used several data-gathering instruments. The Metacognition in Language Production Questionnaire (MLPQ) measured students' metacognition in planning, preparing for, and evaluating their English public-speaking performance. It used a four-point scale ranging from 1 (*Very seldom/Never*) to 4 (*Always*) and covered indicators such as goal setting, performance satisfaction, sense of preparedness, personal knowledge, and change in perspective. The English Speech Delivery Performance Test (ESDPT) required students to write an extemporaneous persuasive speech on a topic provided during the test and subsequently deliver the speech orally. Their recorded speech performances were analyzed using the Taxonomy of Speech Errors (TSE), based on Fromkin's speech-error taxonomy, to identify speech errors manifested during delivery. The Communication Skills Gap Taxonomy (CSGT) was used to analyze the students' speech scripts for communication-skill gaps, particularly organization, supporting materials, and language. The instruments were subjected to content validation by five experts qualified in ESL, ELT, or English language studies. Using the adopted validation scale, a mean score of 3.41 or higher was considered valid, and the recommendations of the validators were incorporated before administration.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data gathering began after the research framework and instruments were approved and validated. Permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate school and DepEd authorities. The ESDPT was administered first. The 44 participants composed an extemporaneous persuasive speech and subsequently delivered it individually in a simulated public-speaking setting. Their performances were audio- or video-recorded for later analysis of speech errors. After the speech performance, the participants answered the MLPQ in a supervised group session. Their responses were checked for completeness, while the recorded speech performances and speech scripts were subsequently analyzed using the TSE and CSGT.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the level of students' metacognition in public speaking in English when grouped according to sex and academic aptitude?

Table 1. Level of Metacognition employed by the students in their Public Speaking in English (Sex-disaggregated)

Level of Metacognition	Frequency distribution			
	Female n=22		Male n=22	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1. Level 4: Reflective	4	18.2	6	27.3
2. Level 3: Strategic	17	77.3	11	50.0
3. Level 2: Thoughtful	1	4.5	5	22.7
4. Level 1: Tacit	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0	22	100.0

Table 1 shows that Level 3 (Strategic) metacognition was the most prevalent among both female and male students. Among females, 17 (77.3%) were classified as strategic, while 4 (18.2%) were reflective and 1 (4.5%) was thoughtful. Among males, 11 (50.0%) were strategic, 6 (27.3%) were reflective, and 5 (22.7%) were thoughtful. No student was classified at the tacit level. The predominance of strategic metacognition suggests that the students were generally able to recognize and apply strategies when planning and preparing for public speaking. However, the smaller proportion of students at the reflective level indicates that fewer students demonstrated the highest level of metacognitive awareness. Overall, the findings suggest that strategic metacognition characterized the public-speaking preparation of both female and male students.

Table 2. Level of Metacognition employed by the students in their Public Speaking in English (Academic aptitude-disaggregated)

Level of Metacognition	Frequency distribution			
	High academic aptitude		Low academic aptitude	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1. Level 4: Reflective	4	18.2	6	27.3
2. Level 3: Strategic	14	63.6	14	63.6
3. Level 2: Thoughtful	4	18.2	2	9.1
4. Level 1: Tacit	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0	22	100.0

Table 2 shows that both high-academic-aptitude (HAA) and low-academic-aptitude (LAA) students were predominantly at Level 3: Strategic Metacognition (63.6%). Only a smaller proportion of students were classified as thoughtful or reflective, and none were at the tacit level. This indicates that both groups were generally able to recognize and apply strategies in public speaking. Overall, academic aptitude did not substantially differentiate the students' level of metacognition, as both groups showed the same dominant level of strategic metacognition.

Research Question 2: What are the challenges encountered by the students in public speaking in terms of speech errors, specifically anticipation, perseveration, blending, addition, substitution, malapropism, and spoonerism, and gaps in communication skills, specifically organization, supporting materials, and language?

Table 3. Speech Errors of the Students in their Public Speaking in English (Sex-Disaggregated)

Types of speech errors	Female N=22		Male N=22	
	Frequency	Rate	Frequency	Rate
1. Anticipation	0	0%	0	0%
2. Perseveration	0	0%	0	0%
3. Blending	6	11%	4	10%
4. Addition	7	18%	11	30%
5. Substitution	8	20%	10	27%
6. Malapropism	18	46%	12	33%

Table 3 shows that both female and male students manifested four types of speech errors: blending, addition, substitution, and malapropism. Among female students, malapropism had the highest rate (46%), followed by substitution (20%), addition (18%), and blending (11%). Similarly, malapropism was the most common error among male students (33%), followed by addition (30%), substitution (27%), and blending (10%). No students manifested anticipation, perseveration, or spoonerism. The findings indicate that malapropism was the most common speech error among both sexes, suggesting difficulty in selecting appropriate words during English speech production. This finding is consistent with Abiodun (2022), who associated malapropism among ESL learners with factors such as limited vocabulary and understanding of English words. However, the present study did not investigate the causes of these errors.

Table 4. Speech Errors of the Students in their Public Speaking in English (Academic Aptitude-Disaggregated)

Types of Speech Errors	High academic aptitude		Low academic aptitude	
	N=22		n=22	
	Frequency	Rate	Frequency	Rate
1. Anticipation	0	0%	0	0%
2. Perseveration	0	0%	0	0%
3. Blending	6	18%	4	10%
4. Addition	8	24%	10	24%
5. Substitution	6	18%	12	29%
6. Malapropism	14	41%	16	38%

Table 4 shows that both high-academic-aptitude (HAA) and low-academic-aptitude (LAA) students manifested four types of speech errors: blending, addition, substitution, and malapropism. Malapropism was the most common error in both groups, occurring among 41% of HAA students and 38% of LAA students. Substitution was more common among LAA students (29%), while addition occurred at the same rate in both groups (24%). No students manifested anticipation, perseveration, or spoonerism. Overall, the findings show similar patterns of speech errors across the two academic-aptitude groups. Contrary to the expected finding that HAA students would manifest fewer errors, the results did not show a clear advantage for the HAA group. Given the relatively small sample, further studies with larger populations may determine whether speech errors are associated with academic aptitude.

Table 5. Gaps in the Communications Skills of the Students in their Public Speaking (Sex-Disaggregated)

Inventory of gaps in communication skills (GCS)	Female		Male	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1. Poor organization	0	0.0	7	31.8
2. Lack of supporting materials	2	9.1	5	22.7
3. Irrelevant contents	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. Inappropriate language	3	13.6	5	22.7

Table 5 shows that female students manifested lack of supporting materials (9.1%) and inappropriate language (13.6%), while male students manifested poor organization (31.8%), lack of supporting materials (22.7%), and inappropriate language (22.7%). No students manifested irrelevant contents. Overall, both groups experienced difficulties with supporting materials and language use, but male students manifested a greater range and higher rates of communication-skill gaps, particularly in organization. This suggests the need for public-speaking instruction that strengthens speech organization, use of supporting materials, and appropriate language. The findings are also consistent with Erdiana et al. (2019), who reported slightly better speaking performance among female EFL students.

Table 6. Gaps in the Communications Skills of the Students in their Public Speaking (Academic Aptitude-Disaggregated)

Inventory of gaps in communication skills (GCS)	HAA students		LAA students	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1. Poor organization	5	22.7	2	9.1
2. Lack of supporting materials	4	18.2	3	13.6
3. Irrelevant contents	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. Inappropriate language	6	27.3	2	9.1

Table 6 shows that both high-academic-aptitude (HAA) and low-academic-aptitude (LAA) students manifested poor organization, lack of supporting materials, and inappropriate language. No student manifested irrelevant contents. Among HAA students, inappropriate language had the highest rate (27.3%), while among LAA students, lack of supporting materials was the most common (13.6%). Overall, the findings show that both groups experienced communication-skill gaps, although the most common difficulties differed. HAA students showed greater difficulty with language use, while LAA students showed greater difficulty in

providing supporting materials. These findings suggest that public-speaking instruction may need to address different communication needs across academic-aptitude groups.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in the students' level of metacognition in public speaking in English when grouped according to sex and academic aptitude, and in their public-speaking challenges in terms of speech errors and gaps in communication skills?

Table 7. Statistical difference between female and male students in their Level of Metacognition

Level of Metacognition	Female		Male		tc	Sig.
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1. Goal Setting	3.25	0.51	2.94	0.79	-1.544	0.131
2. Performance satisfaction	2.74	0.55	2.71	0.69	-0.145	0.885
3. Sense of preparedness	3.30	0.49	2.87	0.67	-2.405*	0.021
4. Personal knowledge	3.42	0.50	3.15	0.63	-1.537	0.132
5. Change in perspective	3.55	0.51	3.26	0.60	-1.680	0.100
Overall	3.25	0.38	2.99	0.58	-1.782	0.083

Table 7 shows that there was no significant difference in the overall level of metacognition between female and male students ($p = .083$). However, a significant difference was found in sense of preparedness ($p = .021$), with female students obtaining a higher mean (3.30) than male students (2.87). This indicates that while the overall metacognitive levels of female and male students were generally similar, they differed significantly in their sense of preparedness for public speaking. The finding suggests that preparedness may be an important aspect of metacognition to consider in developing public-speaking instruction.

Table 8. Statistical difference between students with High and Low Academic Aptitude in their Level of Metacognition

Level of Metacognition	High		Low		tc	Sig.
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1. Goal Setting	3.13	0.73	3.05	0.63	-0.354	0.725
2. Performance satisfaction	2.66	0.67	2.78	0.56	0.633	0.530
3. Sense of preparedness	3.09	0.75	3.08	0.47	-0.048	0.962
4. Personal knowledge	3.25	0.63	3.33	0.53	0.465	0.644
5. Change in perspective	3.40	0.57	3.41	0.58	0.052	0.958
Overall	3.11	0.57	3.13	0.43	0.167	0.868

Table 8 shows that there is no significant difference between the level of metacognition of students with high and low academic aptitude, with a significance value of 0.868, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. The two groups also obtained closely similar overall means, with 3.11 for HAA and 3.13 for LAA. Likewise, none of the five indicators—goal setting, performance satisfaction, sense of preparedness, personal knowledge, and change in perspective—showed a significant difference, as all significance values were greater than 0.05. This finding indicates that academic aptitude does not significantly differentiate students' use of metacognition in public speaking in English. Although literature generally associates stronger metacognitive skills with better academic performance (Wang et al., 1990, in Stanton et al., 2021), the present findings suggest that such a relationship may not necessarily apply to metacognition specifically used in public speaking. The result is limited to the students' metacognitive capacity as applied to public speaking in English and does not represent their overall metacognitive ability.

Table 9. Statistical Difference Between Female and Male Students in their Speech Errors

Speech Errors	Female		Male		tc	Sig.
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1. Blending	0.18	0.395	0.27	0.550	0.629	0.532
2. Addition / epenthesis	0.50	0.859	0.32	0.646	-0.793	0.432
3. Substitution	0.45	0.739	0.36	0.492	-0.480	0.633
4. Malapropism	0.55	0.858	0.82	1.053	0.942	0.352

Table 9 shows that there is no significant difference between female and male students in the speech errors they manifested. The significance values for blending (0.532), addition/epenthesis (0.432), substitution (0.633), and malapropism (0.352) are all higher than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Both female and male students manifested the same four types of speech errors. This indicates that sex did not significantly differentiate the students' speech errors in public speaking in English. Although previous literature reported sex differences in communication and language abilities (Adani & Cepanec, 2019), the present findings do not support a significant difference in speech errors between the two groups. However, the findings are limited to public speaking in English and should not be generalized to other

communication contexts. Future studies may examine other settings and larger samples to further determine whether sex influences speech-error patterns.

Table 10. Statistical Difference between Female and Male Students in the Gaps of their Communications Skills

Gaps in Communication Skills		Female		Male		Tc	Sig.
		Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1.	Lack of organization	0.00	0.000	0.32	0.477	3.130**	0.005
2.	Insufficient supporting materials	0.09	0.294	0.23	0.429	1.230	0.227
3.	Inadequate language	0.14	0.351	0.23	0.429	0.769	0.446
Overall		0.23	0.43	0.77	1.07	2.227	0.034

Table 10 shows that there is a significant difference between female and male students in their overall gaps in communication skills, with a significance value of 0.034, which is lower than 0.05. Specifically, a significant difference was found in poor organization (0.005), while lack of supporting materials (0.227) and inadequate language (0.446) showed no significant differences. Thus, the null hypothesis is partially accepted. The findings indicate that both female and male students may experience difficulties with supporting materials and language during public speaking. However, poor organization was observed only among male students, suggesting that this was the communication gap that most clearly differentiated the two groups. This finding is consistent with Oppenheim (2020), who reported differences in how men and women organize and deliver speech, with women tending to use more concrete details while men tend to communicate more abstractly. However, the present finding is limited to Grade 11 students' public speaking performance in English and should not be generalized to other communication contexts.

Table 11. Statistical Difference between Students with High and Low Academic Aptitude in their Speech Errors

Speech Errors		Female		Male		tc	Sig.
		Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1.	Blending	0.18	0.395	0.27	0.550	0.629	0.532
2.	Addition/epenthesis	0.50	0.859	0.32	0.646	-0.793	0.432
3.	Substitution	0.45	0.739	0.36	0.492	-0.480	0.633
4.	Malapropism	0.55	0.858	0.82	1.053	0.942	0.352

Table 11 shows no significant difference between HAA and LAA students in their speech errors, as all *p*-values exceeded .05. Both groups manifested the same four speech errors: blending, addition/epenthesis, substitution, and malapropism. Thus, academic aptitude did not significantly differentiate the speech errors observed in public speaking. However, the findings do not imply equal speaking competence or error frequency between the groups.

Table 12. Statistical Difference between Students with High and Low Academic Aptitude in the Gaps of their Communications Skills

Gaps in Communication Skills		High		Low		tc	Sig.
		Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
1.	Lack of organization	0.23	0.43	0.09	0.29	-1.230	0.227
2.	Insufficient supporting materials	0.18	0.39	0.14	0.35	-0.403	0.689
3.	Inadequate language	0.27	0.46	0.09	0.29	-1.572	0.125

Table 12 shows that there is no significant difference between HAA and LAA students in their communication-skill gaps. The significance values for lack of organization (0.227), insufficient supporting materials (0.689), and inadequate language (0.125) are all higher than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Both groups manifested the same three communication-skill gaps, indicating that these challenges were not significantly associated with academic aptitude. The findings are consistent with Heriansyah (2012), who reported that students experienced similar difficulties in English speaking, particularly lack of vocabulary and fear of making mistakes. However, the findings only indicate that the types of communication-skill gaps did not significantly differ between HAA and LAA students. They do not imply that both groups demonstrated the same level of public-speaking competence. The results suggest the need for further research into the instructional and other factors that may contribute to these communication difficulties.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between the students' level of metacognition in public speaking in English and their public-speaking challenges in terms of speech errors and gaps in communication skills?

Table 13. Statistical Correlation between the Students' Level of Metacognition and their Speech Errors

Speech Errors		Level of Metacognition	
		r	Sig.
1.	Blending	0.217	0.157
2.	Addition / epenthesis	-0.055	0.725
3.	Substitution	-0.114	0.460
4.	Malapropism	-0.093	0.550

Table 13 shows that none of the speech errors had a significant relationship with the students' level of metacognition. The correlation results for blending ($r = 0.217$, $p = 0.157$), addition/epenthesis ($r = -0.055$, $p = 0.725$), substitution ($r = -0.114$, $p = 0.460$), and malapropism ($r = -0.093$, $p = 0.550$) were all non-significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. The findings indicate that students' level of metacognition was not significantly related to the speech errors they manifested during public speaking in English. This suggests that students may manifest these speech errors regardless of their level of metacognition. Although metacognition is generally associated with monitoring and evaluating one's performance, the present findings provide insufficient evidence that it reduces the occurrence of speech errors.

Table 14. Statistical Correlation between the Students' Level of Metacognition and the Gaps in their Communication Skills

Gaps in Communication Skills		Level of Metacognition	
		r	Sig.
1.	Lack of organization	-0.079	0.610
2.	Insufficient supporting materials	-0.024	0.879
3.	Inadequate language	0.097	0.530

Table 14 shows no significant relationship between metacognition and the students' gaps in communication skills. The results for lack of organization ($p = 0.610$), insufficient supporting materials ($p = 0.879$), and inadequate language ($p = 0.530$) were all greater than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that students' metacognition was not significantly related to their communication-skill gaps in public speaking. Students may experience these gaps regardless of their level of metacognition.

Research Question 5: What instructional interventions may be proposed to improve students' public-speaking performance by enhancing their level of metacognition and reducing their public-speaking challenges?

Based on the findings, intervention strategies are proposed to enhance students' metacognition and reduce their challenges in English public speaking. To enhance metacognition, teachers may incorporate activities that develop goal setting, preparation, self-monitoring, reflection, and performance evaluation. Particular attention may be given to students with lower metacognitive levels and to performance satisfaction, which emerged as a weaker area. Activities may include speech-planning worksheets, self-reflection journals, peer feedback, and post-speech self-assessment. To reduce public-speaking challenges, instruction may focus on the most commonly observed speech errors and communication-skill gaps, particularly malapropism, speech organization, supporting materials, and appropriate language use. Students may be given regular opportunities to practice speech delivery, identify their errors, organize ideas, select appropriate supporting materials, and improve vocabulary and language use. These interventions may be implemented through classroom-based activities and school-wide programs, with English teachers working with school administrators when broader activities or additional support are needed. The interventions should also consider students' sex and academic aptitude to provide appropriate and responsive support.

Ethical Considerations

The study followed ethical standards to protect the rights, privacy, and welfare of the participants. Permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate DepEd authorities and the school administration. Participation was voluntary, and the students were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study. Participant assent and the necessary parental permission were secured before data collection. The participants were informed that they could refuse or withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Their identities and responses were kept confidential, and names were not included in the research report. Data were used only for research purposes and handled securely. The study also ensured

that participation did not cause physical, psychological, or academic harm to the students. The researcher-maintained confidentiality, voluntary participation, fairness, and academic integrity throughout the research process.

Conclusion

The study concludes that Grade 11 students experience challenges in public speaking in English, particularly speech errors and gaps in communication skills. The most common speech errors were blending, addition/epenthesis, substitution, and malapropism, while the observed communication gaps included poor organization, insufficient supporting materials, and inadequate language. The findings further show that sex and academic aptitude generally did not significantly differentiate students' level of metacognition, speech errors, or communication-skill gaps. Likewise, students' level of metacognition was not significantly related to their speech errors or communication-skill gaps. Overall, the findings highlight the need for targeted instructional interventions that strengthen students' metacognitive skills and address common challenges in English public speaking. These interventions may help students become more prepared, reflective, and effective public speakers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, English teachers are encouraged to integrate metacognitive activities such as goal setting, preparation, self-monitoring, reflection, and self-assessment into public-speaking instruction. School administrators and English teachers may also implement the proposed intervention strategies to address common challenges, particularly malapropism, poor organization, insufficient supporting materials, and inadequate language. The Grade 11 English curriculum may consider incorporating metacognitive skills into public-speaking competencies to help students become more reflective and self-regulated speakers. Future researchers may investigate other factors that may influence students' metacognition, speech errors, and communication-skill gaps, as well as replicate the study using larger samples, different grade levels, and other school settings. Finally, the proposed intervention strategies may serve as a basis for developing classroom and school-based programs to strengthen students' metacognition and improve their English public-speaking performance.

References

- Adani, S., & Cepanec, M. (2019). Sex differences in early communication development: Behavioral and neurobiological indicators of more vulnerable communication system development in boys. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 60(2), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2019.60.141>
- Abiodun, A. A. (2022). *Malapropism in the use of English language and its effect on teaching and learning of English language among secondary school students: A case study of Oyo West Local Government Area of Oyo State*. <https://projects.ng/project/malapropism-in-the-use-of-english-language-and-its-effect-on-teaching-learning-of-english-language-among-secondary-school-students-a-case-study-of-oyo-west-local-government-area-of-oyo-state/>
- Arp, A. (2016). *Examining student metacognition when self-evaluating public speaking*. Iowa State University. <https://dr.lib.iastate.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/e816cd2a-43a9-4b7b-b4bc-0a2f365043bc/content>
- Asian Conference on Language. (2022). *Reflection and metacognition in language learning: Are we doing enough to support our students?* <https://acl.iafor.org/reflection-and-metacognition-in-language-learning/>
- Chasib, A., Anwar, K., & Asmara, C. H. (2026). EFL students' metacognitive knowledge on speaking strategies. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.30587/jetlal.v10i1.11192>
- Dayag-Tungpalan, M. L. (2023). Metacognitive strategies and perceived factors affecting the speaking performance of ESL learners. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14(2), 547–556. <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.02.049>
- Department of Education. (2017). *DepEd enhances learners' foreign language skills through special program in foreign language*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/02/20/depd-enhances-learners-foreign-language-skills-through-special-program-in-foreign-language/>
- Erdiana, N., Ys, S. B., & Akhmal, C. N. (2019). Male vs. female EFL students: Who is better in speaking skill? *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1), 131–140. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/294921079.pdf>

- Fitrianingsih, Nasrullah, R., & Faridawati. (2025). EFL students' metacognitive strategies in learning speaking. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2), 4716–4729. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.5898>
- Fromkin, V. A. (1971). The non-anomalous nature of anomalous utterances. *Language*, 47(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412187>
- Heriansyah, H. (2012). Speaking problems faced by the English department students of Syiah Kuala University. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 6(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v6i1.7398>
- Huang. (2021). Reflection and metacognition in language learning: Are we doing enough to support our students? In *The 2022 Asian Conference on Language*. <https://acl.iafor.org/reflection-and-metacognition-in-language-learning/>
- Lightfoot, A. (n.d.). *Public speaking skills*. British Council TeachingEnglish. <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/public-speaking-skills>
- Oppenheim, J. (2020). *Study finds women's speech more concrete, detailed than men's*. SF State News. <https://news.sfsu.edu/archive/news-story/study-finds-womens-speech-more-concrete-detailed-mens.html>
- Stanton, J. D., Sebesta, A. J., & Dunlosky, J. (2021). Fostering metacognition to support student learning and performance. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 20(2), Article fe3. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.20-12-0289>
- Tapado, J. (2025). Exploring Filipino learners' experiences with speaking anxiety in English. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(3), 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0699>
- Teach This. (2022). *Developing students' speaking skills*. <https://www.teach-this.com/ideas/developing-spoken-english>
- Wongdaeng, M., & Higgins, S. (2023). Effectiveness of metacognitive interventions in tertiary EFL contexts: Evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 17(4), 795–811. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2022.2146122>