

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-POWERED LEARNING TOOLS AND ORAL ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF ESL LEARNERS AT ISABELA STATE UNIVERSITY: BASIS IN DESIGNING AI-BASED SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Lyka A. Idmilao, Allysa A. Manzano, Maria Lizabeth R. Jasa, Mary An G. Nartates, Faith A. Ramirez, Jennelyn L. Raymundo
Isabela State University

Article History:

Received: March 12, 2026

Revised: May 14, 2026

Accepted: May 30, 2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence,
English Second Language,
Oral Proficiency, Cognitive
Attitude, Affective
Attitude, Behavioral
Attitude

DOI:

10.65141/sjter.v3i1n16



Copyright © 2026 by the
author(s). This open-
access article is
distributed under the
Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0
International License.

Abstract

This study examined ESL learners' attitudes toward the use of AI-powered learning tools and their relationship with oral English proficiency at Isabela State University-Echague Campus. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed involving first-year to third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English students. Learners' attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools were measured across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains using a questionnaire. Oral English proficiency was assessed through an adapted IELTS Speaking Test focusing on fluency and interaction, vocabulary, spoken grammar, content and relevance, and pronunciation, intonation, and stress. Results revealed that learners generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools across all domains. Their oral English proficiency ranged from Good to Adequate, with strengths observed in content and relevance, vocabulary, and pronunciation, while fluency, interaction, and spoken grammar were comparatively weaker. Despite their positive attitudes, the results indicated no significant relationship between learners' attitudes toward AI tools and their actual oral English proficiency, suggesting that while learners have favorable attitudes towards AI tools, these alone are insufficient to improve oral English proficiency, highlighting the need for guided and task-based integration of AI tools in ESL speaking instruction.

INTRODUCTION

English language proficiency has become an essential skill in the 21st century, particularly in academic and professional domains where English serves as the primary medium of communication. Rao (2019) emphasizes that English plays a predominant role globally, as most academic resources and scholarly materials are written in English. In the Philippine higher education context, the development of communicative competence remains a priority, as students are expected to demonstrate proficiency across the macro skills of language, particularly speaking, to meet academic and workplace demands (Raymundo, 2023). With

rapid technological advancement, learners now have increased access to digital and online learning resources, making language learning more flexible and accessible. However, despite these opportunities, many ESL learners continue to struggle with oral proficiency.

Oral proficiency extends beyond the accurate production of grammatical structures; it encompasses the ability to organize ideas coherently, select contextually appropriate vocabulary, and deliver intelligible and meaningful speech (Nunan, 2003, as cited in Abdullaev & Zokirova, 2021). In Philippine ESL classrooms, limited exposure to authentic, interactive, and communicative speaking tasks has been identified as a major constraint on learners' spontaneous oral production (Eugenio & Raymundo, 2024). When learners are not regularly engaged in meaningful communicative situations, their development of fluency, discourse competence, and confidence in speaking is considerably hindered.

These instructional limitations are further compounded by persistent linguistic and affective challenges. ESL learners frequently struggle with inaccurate pronunciation, limited fluency, and restricted lexical range, all of which negatively affect oral communication performance (Kang, 2022). Moreover, affective factors such as speaking anxiety (Ansari, 2015), fear of making mistakes (Jacob & Greggo, 2001), and low self-confidence (Sakiroglu & Kaya, 2018) have been shown to exacerbate these difficulties. Supporting this view, Raymundo and Pike (2024) found that public speaking anxiety has a significant negative impact on students' oral language performance, highlighting the crucial role of emotional variables in shaping learners' speaking competence.

These challenges are particularly evident in the Philippine context, where a reported decline in oral proficiency among both students and teachers has contributed to communication barriers in academic and professional settings (Tima, 2018). Raymundo (2023) further emphasized that the limited integration of communicative and interactive assessment practices restricts learners' opportunities to engage in real-life oral communication, thereby affecting both fluency and accuracy. This situation underscores the urgent need for pedagogical innovations that address not only linguistic competence but also the affective dimensions of speaking.

In response to these concerns, artificial intelligence (AI)-powered learning tools have emerged as a promising support for the development of oral proficiency. These tools provide instant, individualized feedback on pronunciation, fluency, and clarity, enabling learners to engage in repeated speaking practice at their own pace. Empirical studies indicate that AI-powered applications such as Rosetta Stone, ELSA Speak, and conversational AI platforms significantly enhance learners' speaking fluency, vocabulary development, and pronunciation accuracy (Al-Husban, 2025; Nguyen, 2023; Shofi & Ainiyah, 2024; Dandu et al., 2024; Sayed et al., 2024).

Beyond linguistic gains, AI-enhanced learning systems have also been found to reduce speaking anxiety by offering private, non-judgmental practice spaces that allow learners to build confidence gradually (Shishido, 2021). Given that anxiety negatively affects both test performance (Saet & Cabansag, 2024) and oral communication skills (Raymundo & Pike, 2024), the integration of AI-powered learning tools is particularly valuable. These platforms create low-pressure environments that support repeated, individualized practice while fostering learners' confidence and willingness to communicate.

Despite the growing body of research highlighting the effectiveness of AI-powered tools in improving speaking skills, most existing studies focus primarily on linguistic outcomes and provide limited insight into learners' attitudes toward the use of AI in language learning. In the Philippine context, there remains a notable lack of empirical research examining Filipino ESL learners' perceptions, attitudes, and acceptance of AI-powered learning tools for oral proficiency development. Understanding learners' perceived usefulness, ease of use, and satisfaction is critical, as attitudes significantly influence students' willingness to engage in technology-enhanced learning environments (Nuryakin et al., 2023).

Therefore, this study aims to investigate ESL learners' attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools and examine the relationship between these attitudes and learners' oral proficiency at Isabela State University-Echague Campus. By addressing both linguistic and affective dimensions of speaking, this research seeks to inform the development of AI-supported speaking activities that are responsive to learners' needs. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to more effective, learner-centered, and contextually grounded approaches to ESL instruction in higher education.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the ESL learners' cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes toward the use of AI-powered learning tools, as well as their level of oral English proficiency, measured through an adapted IELTS Speaking Test. The findings served as the basis for designing a module consisting of AI-based speaking activities targeting identified speaking competencies.

Respondents and Locale of the Study

The respondents of the study were ESL learners from Isabela State University-Echague Campus, specifically first- to third-year students enrolled in the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) major in English during the Academic Year 2025-2026. The study was conducted at the College of Education of Isabela State University-Echague Campus.

Sampling Method

Stratified random sampling was used to ensure proportional representation across year levels. From a population of 120 students, 92 respondents were selected based on a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error.

Research Instrument

The study employed two research instruments: a questionnaire and a structured interview. The questionnaire, adapted from Nguyen et al. (2024), consists of 23 items across three domains: cognitive (12 items), affective (7 items), and behavioral (4 items). Responses were recorded using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, allowing assessment of respondents' attitudes. The second instrument was an adapted IELTS Speaking Test administered through a structured interview, based on Qassrawi et al. (2024).

Data Gathering Procedures and Analysis

Data gathering was conducted following strict ethical considerations. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the concerned authorities, and informed consent was

secured from all respondents. The questionnaire to determine respondents' attitude toward the use of AI-powered learning tools was administered first, followed by the interview to assess their oral proficiency, and the structured interview for triangulation. Responses were recorded and rated using standardized rubrics. In the data analysis, descriptive statistics including frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means were used to describe the respondents' demographic profile, attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools, and level of oral proficiency. Pearson's *r* correlation was employed to determine the relationship between the attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools and the level of oral proficiency of the respondents. Qualitative data were thematically analyzed and triangulated with quantitative findings to strengthen interpretation.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were observed throughout the study. Participants were informed of the study's purpose, provided informed consent, and were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. All data were handled securely to protect participants from any risk or harm.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Attitudes of ESL Learners toward the Use of AI-powered Learning Tools

Items	Mean	Qualitative Description
Cognitive Attitudes		
1. Learning to speak with these applications widens my vocabulary range.	3.19	Agree
2. Learning to speak with these applications improves my pronunciation considerably.	3.15	Agree
3. Learning to speak with these applications minimizes my grammar mistakes.	3.14	Agree
4. Learning to speak with these applications improves my fluency.	3.11	Agree
5. These applications help me organize and develop ideas for my speech better.	3.26	Strongly Agree
6. Learning to speak with these applications enhances my learning autonomy.	3.11	Agree
7. These applications offer a wide range of topics and lessons for practicing speaking skills.	3.24	Agree
8. I believe that regular use of these applications improves my English-speaking skills.	3.20	Agree
9. I can use these applications to test my speaking competency easily.	3.04	Agree
10. These applications are user-friendly and provide clear instructions.	3.17	Agree
11. These applications are easy and convenient to use on different devices.	3.21	Agree
12. I don't have any difficulties in using these applications.	2.95	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.15	Agree
Affective Attitudes		
13. I feel more relaxed doing the speaking test with these apps.	2.89	Agree

14. I am curious and eager to commence utilizing these applications in my study time.	2.96	Agree
15. I enjoy practicing speaking with these apps because their content is individualized.	2.9	Agree
16. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because their contents are relevant and useful to course content.	3.09	Agree
17. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because I can receive unbiased automated feedback and instant results.	2.98	Agree
18. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because they offer several tasks to practice speaking skills.	3.04	Agree
19. I feel more confident in joining speaking activities in class after utilizing these applications.	2.8	Agree
Weighted Mean	2.72	Agree
Behavioral Attitudes		
20. I follow the given instructions to complete weekly tasks.	2.98	Agree
21. I would like to continue learning to speak with these applications.	3.09	Agree
22. I would like my teacher to integrate these applications into speaking activities in class.	2.72	Agree
23. I would like to introduce these applications to my friends.	3.11	Agree
Weighted Mean	2.98	Agree
Grand Mean	3.02	Agree

Table 1 presents the attitudes of ESL learners toward the use of AI-powered learning tools across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains. With a grand mean of 3.02 (*Agree*), the findings indicate that learners generally perceive AI-powered learning tools as beneficial for oral English practice. This suggests that learners recognize the instructional value, emotional support, and practical usefulness of AI-assisted tools in speaking practice, consistent with studies reporting positive learner acceptance of AI in speaking development (Nguyen et al., 2024; Cường, 2024).

Cognitive Attitude

Learners demonstrated positive cognitive attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools, with a weighted mean of 3.15 (*Agree*). The highest-rated indicators show that learners strongly value these tools for organizing and developing ideas for speech ($\bar{x} = 3.26$), accessing a wide range of speaking topics and lessons ($\bar{x} = 3.24$), and improving overall English-speaking skills through regular use ($\bar{x} = 3.20$). These results suggest that learners perceive AI tools as effective cognitive supports for planning, structuring, and practicing spoken language, supported by studies highlighting the role of AI feedback and conversational features in enhancing speaking performance (Divekar et al., 2022; Qiao & Zhao, 2023; Yuliawati & Suryadi, 2023). However, relatively lower mean scores were observed for having no difficulty using AI tools ($\bar{x} = 2.95$) and using them to test speaking competency ($\bar{x} = 3.04$). Although still interpreted as *Agree*, these results suggest that learners may encounter minor usability or technical challenges,

echoing findings that limitations in interface clarity and feedback accuracy may affect perceived ease of use (Alsanousi et al., 2023).

Affective Attitude

The affective attitude domain obtained a weighted mean of 2.72 (*Agree*), indicating generally positive emotional responses toward AI-powered learning tools. The highest-rated indicators reveal that learners particularly enjoy using AI tools because the content is relevant and useful to their course ($\bar{x} = 3.09$), offers several tasks for speaking practice ($\bar{x} = 3.04$), and provides instant feedback and results ($\bar{x} = 2.98$). These findings highlight the role of relevance, variety, and immediacy in sustaining learners' motivation and enjoyment during AI-assisted speaking practice (Teba, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2024). In contrast, lower mean scores were recorded for feeling more confident in joining classroom speaking activities ($\bar{x} = 2.80$) and feeling relaxed during speaking tests using the apps ($\bar{x} = 2.89$). These results suggest that while AI tools create a comfortable digital practice environment, the affective benefits may not fully transfer to face-to-face classroom speaking contexts, consistent with concerns noted in previous studies (Mudawy, 2025).

Behavioral Attitude

Learners also exhibited positive behavioral attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools, as reflected by a weighted mean of 2.98 (*Agree*). The highest-rated indicators indicate strong behavioral intention, particularly in introducing the applications to friends ($\bar{x} = 3.11$), continuing to use the tools for learning to speak ($\bar{x} = 3.09$), and following given instructions to complete tasks ($\bar{x} = 2.98$). These findings suggest learners' readiness to sustain AI tool usage and share them with peers, aligning with studies on positive behavioral intention toward AI-assisted learning (Cường, 2024; Alsaawi et al., 2025). However, the lowest mean was observed for teachers' integration of AI-powered learning tools into classroom speaking activities ($\bar{x} = 2.72$). This indicates that learners may prefer using AI tools independently or as supplementary resources rather than as part of formal classroom instruction, supporting earlier findings that learners often view AI as a support tool rather than a primary teaching method (Khairuddin et al., 2024).

Table 2. Level of Oral Proficiency

Dimensions	Mean	Qualitative Description
1. Fluency and Interaction	1.94	Good
2. Vocabulary	2.54	Adequate
3. Spoken Grammar	2.46	Good
4. Content and Relevance	2.99	Adequate
5. Pronunciation, Intonation, and Stress	2.52	Adequate

Table 2 presents the level of oral proficiency of English major students across five domains: fluency and interaction, vocabulary, spoken grammar, content and relevance, and pronunciation, intonation, and stress. Overall, the results show a combination of *Good* and *Adequate* performance, indicating that the students possess a functional yet developing level of oral proficiency in English.

Fluency and Interaction

Fluency and Interaction obtained the lowest mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.94$), which is qualitatively described as *Good*, indicating that respondents' oral production is characterized by interruptions in speech flow, such as pauses, hesitations, and self-repairs. These features

reflect limited automaticity in real-time language use, where meaning is conveyed but interaction lacks smoothness. Zhong and Ismail (2024) provide empirical evidence that fluency-related variables, particularly pauses and self-repair frequency, are salient indicators differentiating learners' oral performance across proficiency levels. Their findings show that speakers at lower proficiency levels exhibit more disrupted fluency patterns, situating the respondents' performance within a developmental stage of interactional competence.

Vocabulary

The vocabulary registered an *Adequate* mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.54$), indicating that respondents possess sufficient lexical resources to sustain spoken communication and express ideas with clarity. This level of performance suggests that vocabulary knowledge supports message delivery even when other aspects of oral production are still developing. Wang-Taylor (2022) demonstrated a significant relationship between L2 vocabulary size and academic speaking performance, showing that learners with larger vocabulary repertoires produce more coherent and sustained spoken output. This positions vocabulary as a stabilizing component of the respondents' oral proficiency, enabling effective communication despite limitations in fluency or grammatical accuracy.

Spoken Grammar

Spoken Grammar obtained a *Good* rating ($\bar{x} = 2.46$), indicating emerging but inconsistent grammatical control during oral production. This suggests that while respondents possess foundational grammatical knowledge, accuracy is vulnerable under the time pressure of spontaneous speech. Zhong and Ismail (2024) reported that grammatical and syntactic accuracy declines as cognitive demands increase during oral tasks, particularly among learners at lower proficiency levels. Their analysis highlights that grammatical errors in speech often stem from processing constraints rather than a lack of rule knowledge, aligning with the respondents' observed grammatical performance.

Content and Relevance

Content and relevance yielded the highest mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.99$), classified as *Adequate*, indicating that respondents can organize ideas logically, maintain topical focus, and produce coherent spoken responses. This suggests relatively strong discourse-level control compared to form-focused aspects of speaking. Tsunemoto and Trofimovich (2024) established that coherence is a primary determinant of comprehensibility in L2 academic speaking, with logically connected ideas significantly enhancing listener understanding. Complementing this, Portugal-Toro et al. (2025) identified cognitive organization as a central mechanism underlying effective oral communication.

Pronunciation, Intonation, and Stress

Pronunciation, intonation, and stress obtained an *Adequate* mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.52$), indicating that respondents' speech is generally intelligible but marked by inconsistencies in prosodic control. This suggests developing awareness of suprasegmental features that support meaning in spoken interaction. Uzun (2024) showed that EFL learners experience differential difficulty in processing intonation and word stress, with intonation patterns often perceived more accurately than stress placement. These findings underscore that intelligibility can be maintained even when prosodic control is incomplete, situating the respondents' pronunciation performance within an emerging stage of prosodic competence.

Table 3. Relationship Between Respondents' Attitudes Towards the Use of AI-powered Learning Tools and their Oral Proficiency

Items	Oral Proficiency	
	r-value	p-value
Cognitive Attitudes		
1. Learning to speak in these applications widens my vocabulary range.	0.04	0.67
2. Learning to speak with these applications improves my pronunciation considerably.	0.03	0.71
3. Learning to speak with these applications minimizes my grammar mistakes.	-0.08	0.41
4. Learning to speak with these applications improves my fluency.	-0.16	0.10
5. These applications help me organize and develop ideas for my speech better.	0.10	0.28
6. Learning to speak with these applications enhances my learning autonomy.	0.01	0.98
7. These applications offer a wide range of topics and lessons for practicing speaking skills.	0.05	0.57
8. I believe that regular use of these applications improves my English speaking skills.	-0.12	0.23
9. I can use these applications to test my Speaking competency easily.	-0.04	0.70
10. These applications are user-friendly and provide clear instructions.	-0.06	0.53
11. These applications are easy and convenient to use on different devices.	0.06	0.50
12. I don't have any difficulties in using these applications.	-0.13	0.18
Affective Attitudes		
13. I feel more relaxed doing the speaking test with these apps.	0.02	0.80
14. I am curious and eager to commence utilizing these applications in my study time.	-0.02	0.83
15. I enjoy practicing speaking with these apps because their content is individualized.	-0.03	0.74
16. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because their contents are relevant and useful to course content.	0.01	0.95
17. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because I can receive unbiased automated feedback and instant results.	0.12	0.19
18. I enjoy learning to speak with these applications because they offer several tasks to practice speaking skills.	0.03	0.73
19. I feel more confident in joining speaking activities in class after utilizing these applications.	-0.03	0.78
Behavioral Attitudes		
20. I follow the given instructions to complete weekly tasks.	0.12	0.20
21. I would like to continue learning to speak with these applications.	0.01	0.97

22. I would like my teacher to integrate these applications into speaking activities in class.	0.08	0.39
23. I would like to introduce these applications to my friends.	0.02	0.80

Table 3 presents the relationship between students' attitudes toward the use of AI-powered learning tools and their oral English proficiency across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains. Overall, the results reveal weak and statistically insignificant correlations, indicating that although learners generally hold positive perceptions, emotions, and intentions toward AI-based speaking tools, these attitudes do not necessarily translate to better oral English proficiency.

Cognitive Attitude

Learners' cognitive attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools show no significant relationship with oral English proficiency. The correlation coefficients are weak ($r = -0.16$ to 0.23), with p -values ranging from 0.19 to 0.98 , all exceeding the 0.05 level of significance. Despite learners' positive perceptions of the usefulness and ease of AI-powered learning tools, these cognitive evaluations do not result in observable gains in speaking performance. This finding is consistent with Al Arif et al. (2022), who reported that positive attitudes or satisfaction with AI tools do not necessarily lead to language improvement, as oral proficiency development relies more on meaningful communicative practice and feedback.

Affective Attitude

Similarly, affective attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools exhibit no significant relationship with oral English proficiency. The correlations are weak ($r = -0.03$ to 0.12), with p -values ranging from 0.19 to 0.95 , all exceeding the 0.05 level of significance. Although learners may experience enjoyment, motivation, and reduced anxiety while using AI tools, these affective responses do not directly translate into improved speaking performance. This finding aligns with Ali et al. (2025), who reported statistically insignificant relationships between students' satisfaction with AI language applications and English improvement.

Behavioral Attitude

Students' behavioral attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools also show no significant relationship with oral English proficiency. The correlation coefficients remain weak ($r = 0.01$ to 0.23), with p -values ranging from 0.20 to 0.97 , all exceeding the 0.05 level of significance. While learners demonstrate willingness and intention to use AI-based speaking tools, such behavioral engagement does not necessarily result in measurable proficiency gains. This supports Wei's (2023) finding that AI tools primarily enhance learner engagement and motivation rather than directly improving language performance, underscoring the need for guided and communicative use of AI in speaking instruction.

Overall, the findings indicate that while ESL learners demonstrate generally positive cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools, these attitudes do not significantly predict oral English proficiency. This suggests that satisfaction, familiarity, and willingness to use AI-assisted language applications may enhance learner engagement but are insufficient to produce measurable gains in speaking performance on their own. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating that positive perceptions of AI tools do not necessarily translate into improved language proficiency (Ali et al., 2025). Rather, these results highlight the need for AI-powered learning tools to be intentionally embedded in structured, interactive, and pedagogically guided instructional designs, positioning AI as an

active learning partner rather than a passive supplementary resource (Shoeibi et al., 2023).

AI-based Speaking Activities

The AI-based speaking activities in the module developed are based on the two lowest domains of oral proficiency and the lowest domain in the attitudes of the ESL learners towards the use of AI-powered learning tools. As shown in Table 2, fluency, interaction, and spoken grammar are rated *Good*, which indicates the weakest domains in their oral proficiency. Also, among the domains in their attitude, the affective domain received the lowest mean (2.72), suggesting that they still feel less emotionally engaged with using certain features of AI tools. These now provide the targeted competencies in the output created.

The module designed is entitled *AI-Enhanced Oral Communication: Developing Fluency, Accuracy, and Interactive Speaking Skills*, which consists of three units targeting different domains. Specifically, Units 1, *Developing Oral Fluency and Interactive Communication Skills*, and 2, *Building Structure and Accuracy in Academic Speaking*, of the module feature task-based AI-assisted speaking activities designed to improve the learners' skills in fluency and interaction, and spoken grammar, respectively. While in Unit 3, *AI-Powered Personalization, Confidence Building, and Speaking Improvement*, which focuses on the seven indicators of the affective domain, see Table 1. The unit includes task-based AI-assisted speaking activities designed to provide a variety of speaking tasks, encouraging learners to interact with and explore AI tools more actively, thereby addressing their affective engagement.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

This study examined the attitudes of first- to third-year English major ESL learners at Isabela State University toward the use of AI-powered learning tools and their relationship with oral English proficiency. The findings indicate that learners generally hold positive cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes toward AI tools, recognizing their usefulness, ease of use, and motivational value as supplemental resources for speaking practice. However, while learners demonstrated strengths in organizing ideas and selecting appropriate vocabulary, weaknesses were observed in fluency and grammatical accuracy. Despite favorable attitudes, no significant relationship was found between learners' attitudes toward AI-powered learning tools and their oral English proficiency. This suggests that positive perceptions and satisfaction with AI tools alone do not necessarily lead to improved oral English performance. While learners view AI tools as effective and enjoyable, improvement in oral proficiency requires more than exposure or acceptance; it necessitates guided, structured, and pedagogically grounded integration of AI tools into speaking instruction. AI-powered learning tools must therefore be intentionally embedded in meaningful speaking tasks that target fluency and interaction, and spoken grammar accuracy, rather than focusing solely on user experience. In response to these findings, a module consisting of AI-based speaking activities was designed to address the specific speaking competencies identified in this study. Future research may employ experimental and/or longitudinal designs to examine the effects of guided AI-assisted speaking tasks on oral English proficiency. Further studies may also explore how the quality, frequency, and depth of AI tool usage influence ESL learners' speaking development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to express their sincere appreciation to everyone who played a vital role in the completion of this study. Foremost, they extend their deepest gratitude to Dr. Jennelyn Lacar-Raymundo, their Research Adviser, for her unwavering

guidance, expertise, and invaluable suggestions throughout the research process. The researchers also convey their heartfelt thanks to the Panel of Examiners, Mr. Randy Acoba and Ms. Joy Mary Paddayuman, for their insightful comments and constructive recommendations that greatly improved the quality of this work. Special thanks are likewise extended to Dr. Marinel P. Dayawon, Dean of the College of Education, for her support and permission to conduct this research. The researchers also sincerely thank the respondents of this study for their time, cooperation, and honest participation, without which this research would not have been possible. The researchers are profoundly grateful to their parents, siblings, friends, and relatives for their constant encouragement, understanding, and moral support. Above all, the researchers give thanks to the Almighty God for His wisdom, strength, and blessings that made this academic endeavor possible. This work is humbly dedicated to all who contributed to its success.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

DISCLOSURE OF AI ASSISTANCE

This section provides a transparent account of any artificial intelligence (AI) tools used during the conduct of the study or the preparation of the manuscript. ChatGPT and Grammarly were used solely to assist in paraphrasing selected portions of the text to enhance clarity and coherence and to support grammatical accuracy. The use of this tool was strictly limited to language refinement purposes and did not contribute to the research design, data collection, data analysis, or interpretation of results. All intellectual content and final decisions remain the responsibility of the researchers.

REFERENCES

- Abdullaev, Z. K., & Zokirova, M. R. (2021). Speaking and speaking proficiency. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 1(8), 355-361. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5759350>
- Al Arif, T. Z. Z., Hidayati, & Kurniawan, D. (2022). EFL university students' attitudes towards ICT use for English language learning. *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies*, 1(5), Article 36. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejlang.2022.1.5.36>
- Al-husban, N. (2025). The impact of AI-assisted language learning tools on augmenting university EFL students' speaking skills in Jordan. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 8(1).
- Ali, Z., Bhar, S. K., Majid, S. N. A., & Masturi, S. Z. (2025). Exploring Student Beliefs: Does Interaction with AI Language Tools Correlate with Perceived English Learning Improvements? *Education Sciences*, 15(5), 522. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050522>
- Alsaawi, A., Almoaily, M., Almulhim, F., Alahmadi, N., & Alshenqeeti, H. (2025). Attitudes to the use of artificial intelligence in language learning. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.376344>
- Alsanousi, B., Albeshar, A. S., Do, H., & Ludi, S. (2023). Investigating the user experience and evaluating usability issues in AI-enabled learning mobile apps: An analysis of user

- reviews. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2023.0140602>
- Ansari, M. S. (2015). Speaking anxiety in ESL/EFL classrooms: A Holistic approach and practical study. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2, 38-46.
- Cường, T. H. (2024). Using AI for Students' Attitudes to Improve their Speaking Skills at a University. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(4), 557-562. <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049x.2024.4.4.3070>
- Dandu, G., Charyulu, G. M., & KSNVL, L. (2024). AI-Driven Language Learning: The Impact of Rosetta Stone on ESL Students' Speaking Proficiency and Self-Control. *Rupkatha Journal*, 16(4), 2.
- Divekar, R. R., Drozdal, J., Chabot, S., Zhou, Y., Su, H., Chen, Y., Zhu, H., Hendler, J. A., & Braasch, J. (2021). Foreign language acquisition via artificial intelligence and extended reality: design and evaluation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2332-2360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1879162>
- Eugenio, J. L., & Raymundo, J. L. (2024). Language functions in ESL classrooms: Basis for the enhancement of English conversational skills of junior high school students. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 7(7), 107-116. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.7.11>
- Jacob, E. J., & Greggo, J. W. (2001). Using counselor training and collaborative programming strategies in working with international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 73-88.
- Kang, Hanna. (2022). Effects of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and native speaker interlocutors on ESL learners' speaking ability and affective aspects. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 25(2), 9-43.
- Khairuddin, Z., Shahabani, N. S., Ahmad, S. N., Ahmad, A. R., & Zamri, N. A. (2024). Students' perceptions on the artificial intelligence (AI) tools as academic support. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 9(11), e003087. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v9i11.3087>
- Mudawy, A. M. A. (2025). Exploring EFL learners' perceptions on the use of AI-Powered Conversational Tools to improve speaking fluency: a case study at Majmaah University. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i1.7774>
- Nguyen, T. T. H. (2023). The effect of using Elsa Speak app for first-semester students' English-speaking proficiency. *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(6), 2644-2655. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v5i6.5976>
- Nguyễn , X. H., Lê , T. T., Đỗ , Đ. K., Hoàng , Q. N., & Nguyễn , T. T. H. (2024). STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD UTILIZING AI-BASED TECHNOLOGIES TO IMPROVE THEIR SPEAKING PROFICIENCY. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 21(5), 957. [https://doi.org/10.54607/hcmue.js.21.5.4270\(2024\)](https://doi.org/10.54607/hcmue.js.21.5.4270(2024))
- Nuryakin, N., Rakotoarizaka, N. L. P., & Musa, H. G. (2023). The effect of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use on student satisfaction: The mediating role of attitude to use online learning. *Asia Pacific Management and Business Application*, 11(3), 323-336. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.apmba.2023.011.03.5>

- Pike, C., & Raymundo, J. L. (2024). Public speaking classroom anxiety and oral language performance of senior high school students. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 7(7), 143-151. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijlt.2024.7.7.15>
- Portugal-Toro, A., García-Peñalvo, F. J., Ruiz, L. a. B., & Esparza, A. V. (2025). Cognitive and affective processes in second language oral communication: a mixed methods research. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1571099>
- Qiao, H., & Zhao, A. (2023f). Artificial intelligence-based language learning: illuminating the impact on speaking skills and self-regulation in Chinese EFL context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1255594. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1255594>
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, 4(1), 65-79.
- Raymundo, J. L. (2023). Exploring the practices on macro skills integrated assessment in Philippine higher education context: Basis in designing a language training program. *International Journal of Language Education*, 7(3), 429-446. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i3.24252>
- Saet, P., & Cabansag, J. (2024). Language performance in English and test anxiety among pre-service education students. *Isabela State University Linker: Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Allied Health*, 1(1), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.65141/jessah.v1i1.n6>
- Shishido M. (2021) Developing and Evaluating the e-learning Material for Speaking Practice With the Latest AI Technology ISSN: 2189-1036 - The IAFOR International Conference on Education - Hawaii 2021 Official Conference Proceedings (pp. 55-68) <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2189-1036.2021.5>
- Şakiroğlu, H., & Kaya, H. (2018). The student perspectives of common problems while gaining English speaking and listening skills and their proposed solutions to improve skills autonomously. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(3), 94-109.
- Sayed, B.T., Bani Younes, Z.B., Alkhayyat, A. *et al*. To be with artificial intelligence in oral test or not to be: a probe into the traces of success in speaking skill, psychological well-being, autonomy, and academic buoyancy. *Lang Test Asia* 14, 49 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00321-0>
- Shoeibi, N., Sánchez, R. T., & Garcia-Penalvo, F. J. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of human-centered AI systems in education. *AI Systems in Education*, 155-186.
- Shofi, A. T., & Ainiyah, M. (2024). Enhancing English oral communication skills through the use of artificial intelligence. *Indonesian Journal of Language and Education*, 6(3), 35-52.
- Teba, S. C. (2022). Using duolingo to improve Beninese secretarial advanced learners' oral communication skills. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v9no1a25>
- Tima, R. (2018, February 21). English Proficiency of Pinoy Students, teachers lagging - survey. GMA News. Retrieved from <http://www.gmanetwork.com>
- Tsunemoto, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2024). Coherence and comprehensibility in second language speakers' academic speaking performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 46(3), 795-817. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263124000305>

- Uzun, T. (2024). Perception of prosodic speech features: Final intonation and word stress for EFL learners. *Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(2), 212–223. <https://doi.org/10.37999/udekad.1449612>
- Wang-Taylor, Y., & Clenton, J. (2022). Exploring the relationship between L2 vocabulary size and academic speaking. *System*, 107, 102822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102822>
- Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1261955>.
- Yuliawati, N. L., & Suryadi, S. (2023). Students' perceptions on the use of ELSA Speak Application to improve English speaking skills. *TELL-US JOURNAL*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i4.7649>
- Zhong, J., Ismail, L., & Ahmad, N. K. (2024). Linguistic Features of Different Proficiency Learners' Oral Performance in a Project-Based Learning Context. *Arab World English Journal*, 15(3): 347-363. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no3.21>