SPEAKING CONFIDENCE AMONG GE 2 COMPLETERS: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PROGRAM

Alayca J. Untong[1],
Laren Claire H. Dalumpines[1],
Jhon Michael Merka[1],
Ana Mae M. Monteza[2i]
[1]UM Digos College,
Philippines
[2]PhD, UM Digos College,
Philippines

Abstract:

This study focuses on students' speaking confidence and the lack thereof, which is one of the challenges that students encounter during class discussions. This occurrence motivated the researchers to determine the level of speaking confidence of GE2 completers at UM Digos College as the basis for the intervention program. Quantitative-descriptive research was carried out to determine the speaking confidence of UM Digos college students involving 383 randomly chosen students from 1st year to 4th year. Results revealed that UM Digos College students possess low speaking confidence. Moreover, statistical evidence showed a significant difference in year level, where first-year students significantly differ from third-year and fourth-year students since the first year has the lowest mean score. Thus, this research recommends implementing a program that addresses students' speaking challenges and provides intervention to improve their speaking confidence and participate in the classroom without hesitation.

Keywords: speaking confidence, GE 2 completers, intervention program

1. Introduction

Speaking is the highest target in the English language as it is the basis of communication that becomes a learning function (Parmawati, 2018). In fact, its usefulness in communicating and exchanging ideas orally (Bashir et al., 2011) is generally recognized as a significant process to maximize the use of language. However, in the sense of delivering speeches, it is believed that speaking becomes more meaningful and defined if done confidently (Roysmanto, 2018). Speaking confidence and the lack thereof now becomes a common issue and concern among students. This is due to several factors; one

---

[i]Correspondence: email anamae_monteza@umindanao.edu.ph, montezaanamae@gmail.com

highlighted is speaking anxiety (Marcus, 2017), which makes a person unwilling to take part in conversations using a certain language (Tsiplakides, 2009). It hampers the process of producing ideas effectively during oral recitations and class discussions (Adalikwu, 2012). Therefore, it is one factor that plays an important role in determining the learners' willingness to communicate (Utama et al., 2013 & Dornyei et al., as cited by Park & Lee).

As this study is rooted in the field of speech communication, it is anchored on the Linguistic Self Confidence of Clement (1986) and English Pronunciation Proficiency (Gagliardi, 2016). Clement viewed Linguistic Self-confidence as the self-assessment of communication skills and concurrently low anxiety levels when using a second language (Zoss, 2015). Moreover, Gagliardi (2016) found out in her study that pronunciation helps students develop confidence in speaking. These two notions are the framework for the researchers to determine and understand that pronunciation is one factor that affects students' speaking confidence. In addition, being intelligible in English pronunciation is essential for those who want to communicate using English (Yuzawa, 2017). There are three components to pronunciation (Foote et al., 2011), namely: comprehensibility, which refers to how easy or difficult it is for the listener to understand; intelligibility, the ability to be understood by a listener; accent, which refers to the variation in how the speaker and listener pronounce the words (Gagliardi, 2016). When considering speaking confidence, pronunciation is the one factor that contributes to a student's proficiency and confidence. Confidence relates to how the student is capable and how sure to answer (Maclellan, 2014). For example, most students in Indonesia are reluctant to use the English language (Astuti, 2018) because it makes them feel anxious and afraid to make mistakes (Mambot, et al., 2013). Additionally, due to low speaking confidence, many Japanese students frequently remain silent when given a chance to speak (Khairuddin, 2017). Furthermore, students pursuing a Bachelor's degree in the English Language Department in Hong Kong (Gan, 2012) are unable to pass the oral examination (Gurler, 2015) due to a lack of speaking skills.

Another study by Tolentino et al. (2020) entitled "Proficiency and Confidence Levels of English Language Students in Relation to ASEAN Integration's Regional Lingua Franca," one area that needs to be improved in language acquisition, particularly in speaking, is students' confidence (Rickheit & Strohner, 2008). This supports the study conducted in the Philippines which the result shows that ESL students worry about how others perceive them, such as fear of negative evaluation (Mambot et al., 2013), and this leads them to suffer from low self-perception (Aquino et al., 2016). Thus, Filipino students find it difficult to converse efficiently in the language (Hutado & Padilla, 2000). This can also be supported by De la Cruz et al. (2016), who found out in their study that English majors at UM Digos College are anxious when speaking the language, for they fear being judged for committing mistakes grammatically. In addition, Arubo et al. (2018) also concluded in their study that 3rd year and 4th-year BEED students of UMDC are anxious when speaking, reading, and listening to a second language. University of Mindanao Digos College students need to enhance their skills, particularly in constructing sentences orally (Aquino et al. 2016), to perform best speaking fluently (Roysmanto, 2018).

The abovementioned studies determine the level of pronunciation skills and speaking confidence in communicating as individuals in their varied academic and professional endeavors. Therefore, this study will provide statistical data on students' speaking confidence who have undergone the *"Purposive Communication - GE2"* course. A contextualized pursuit in understanding the level of speaking confidence that is likely to be varied in the demographic profile of the respondents. Through collecting data on the level of speaking confidence among college students in terms of their pronunciation and linguistic self-confidence, the researchers can develop an intervention program that will benefit the institution to create program that can be applied in the curriculum development of English courses. Furthermore, this study will be the basis for the implementation of future plans and programs addressing speaking confidence among GE 2 completers.

2. Research Objectives

This research study aimed to determine students' level of speaking confidence. This study highlighted students' level of speaking confidence according to their demographic profile. Specifically, it aimed:

1. To determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
    1.1 sex;
    1.2 year level; and
    1.3 department.
2. To determine the level of speaking confidence among college students of UMDC.
3. To determine if a significant difference exists in the level of speaking confidence when described by profile.
4. To determine what plans and programs can be implemented based on the findings.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Respondents
The target respondents of this study were college students from 1st Year to 4th Year level enrolled in UM Digos College for the Academic Year of 2021 - 2022 from different departments. In calculating the sample size of the respondents, we have 3,147 entire populations, where we get to compute the sample size of each of the college departments using the standard margin of error and its confidence level. As we get to conduct the survey, we have 31 respondents from the Department of Accounting Education (DAE), 99 respondents from the Department of Criminal Justice Education (DCJE), 32 respondents from the Department of Arts and Sciences (DAS), 86 respondents from the Department of Business Administration (DBA), 26 respondents from the Department of Technical Programs (DTP), and 109 respondents from the Department of Teacher

Education (DTE), with a total number of 383 sample respondents out of the entire population.

3.2 Research Instrument

The instruments were composed of a two-part questionnaire. Part 1 dealt with the respondents' demographic profile regarding their sex, year level, and department. Part 2 dealt with the Level of Pronunciation and Linguistic Self-confidence among students. For pronunciation, it comprises eleven questions; for linguistic self-confidence, it comprises twelve questions (Zoss, 2015). Thus, the Range of Means was 0.79 based on the pilot test result.

In this study, the researchers used a 5-point Likert-type scale to interpret the students' responses to the level of speaking confidence. The scale below was used to analyze the data.

Table 1: Range of Means

Numerical Value	Range of Means	Descriptive Level	Descriptive Meaning
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Low	It indicates that students have very low confidence in speaking
4	3.40 – 4.19	Low	It indicates that students have low confidence in speaking
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	It indicates that students have moderate confidence in speaking
2	1.80 – 2.59	High	It indicates that students have high confidence in speaking
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very High	It indicates that students have very high confidence in speaking

3.3 Research Design and Procedure

This study involves the utilization of quantitative research methods in addressing survey questions. The methodology involves speaking confidence assessment among GE 2 completers. It can be achieved through a descriptive research method by using a survey research design, which entails gathering information in order to test hypotheses or provide answers to queries about the state of the study's subject at the time (Gay, 1992).

The researchers strictly observed four steps for gathering data to determine the sources of speaking confidence among all college students from different departments. First, the researchers asked for authorization from the Vice President – Branch Operation of UM Digos to allow them to conduct a study. The researchers sought permission to write a letter stating the intentions of assessing the technological acceptance of college students among the selected respondents. The second was the administration and retrieval of the instruments. After the approval, the researchers conducted the survey using Google Forms for the respondents. The third was the tabulation of the responses of the respondents. After the data was collected from the online survey, the questionnaire with answers was given to the statistician subjected to the tabulation of the responses. The fourth was the analysis and interpretation of the data. After tabulation, the data were

analyzed and interpreted using the mean, frequency, standard deviation, Bonferonni, ANOVA, and independent sample t-test.

The tool used in fulfilling this study is an online platform, specifically Google Forms, which serves as a survey questionnaire among the target respondents. Furthermore, it uses the statistical tool Stratified Random Sampling to tabulate responses identified as select people to serve as a sample of the population's makeup (Creswell, 2012, p. 142).

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Demographics of the Respondents

Table 2 shows the respondents' profiles regarding Sex, year level, and department. The table signifies that most respondents who participated in the data gathering were female. Whereas for year level, most of the respondents who participated were third-year students. Lastly, for the department, DTE has the highest frequency.

Table 2: Characteristics of the Respondents

Profile Variables	f	%
Sex		
Female	243	60.13
Male	140	34.65
Year Level		
1st year	32	7.92
2nd year	90	22.28
3rd year	166	41.09
4th year	95	23.52
Department		
1	31	7.67
2	32	7.92
3	86	21.29
4	99	24.51
5	109	26.98
6	26	6.43
Total	**383**	**100**

4.2 Level of Speaking Confidence Among GE2 Completers

Table 3 shows the level of speaking confidence of GE 2 Completers in UMDC. Based on the result, the speaking confidence has a mean score of 3.51 (SD=0.431), which indicates that students have low confidence according to the Range of Means. This means that the students of UM Digos College need to develop more of their speaking confidence. Thus, the students must practice using a second language in academics and careers.

This is supported by the study of Arubo, Macabodbod, and Rabadon (2018) entitled "Second Language Anxiety and Academic Performance of 3rd Year and 4th Year BEED Students of UM Digos College" The researchers concluded that there is a high level of second language anxiety in terms of speaking. This implies that 3rd-year and 4th-year

BEED students of UMDC are anxious when they are speaking a second language. In addition, MCain (2012) stated in his study that students who are feeling shy, uncomfortable, and afraid of speaking in front of others are the students who are afraid to be judged when they commit a mistake in speaking a second language.

According to Clement, Dörnyei, and Noels (1994), communicative self-confidence is a factor in developing students' willingness to communicate. If the student trusts in his language knowledge, he may feel more confident to engage in communicative acts and be more willing to initiate communication (Silva, 2019). Also, in the findings of the work of Cao and Philip (2006 cited in Silva, 2019), the willingness to communicate at L2 levels depends on the group size, the level of self-confidence, the degree of acquaintance with other participants' interaction, and interlocutors' interaction.

Table 3: Itemized Means

Item	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
My English Pronunciation is correct most of the time.	3.33	0.76
I can understand native English speakers when they speak.	3.81	0.72
Native English speakers can understand me when I speak.	3.70	0.73
When I have problems speaking in English it is because of a pronunciation problem.	3.43	0.94
When I have problems speaking in English it is because of a language problem like grammar or vocabulary.	3.86	0.82
My writing in English is better than my speaking in English.	3.96	0.89
I speak to someone in English outside the classroom everyday.	2.80	0.95
I speak English at work.	2.92	0.91
It is difficult to find people to speak English with.	3.17	0.98
I would like to have close relationships with native English speakers if I could.	3.96	0.92
In the future, I will need to speak English for work or educational opportunities.	4.36	0.76
I am happy with my English pronunciation	3.63	0.89
I feel confident and relaxed when I do things like order food in a restaurant or speak to a sales clerk in English.	3.37	0.91
I feel nervous every time I speak with native English speaker.	3.75	0.91
I feel embarrassed when people cannot understand me.	3.63	0.96
I am more comfortable spending time with people who have an accent than with native English-speakers.	3.16	0.92
I do not want to talk with native speakers because my English pronunciation is not good enough.	3.10	0.93
I feel I can't participate in the community (For example, volunteer, attend neighborhood meetings, participate in politics, go to parties in my neighborhood) because my English pronunciation isn't good enough.	2.97	1.05
I would like to pronounce English like a native speaker.	3.91	0.85
Native English speakers don't like accents.	3.03	0.76
I am sometimes discriminated against because of my accent.	3.10	0.99
Americans will respect me more if I pronounce English well.	3.30	0.97
I would have more job and school opportunities if my English pronunciation was better.	3.82	0.89
Overall	3.51	.43

4.3 Significant Difference in the Level of Speaking Confidence among GE2 Completers as analyzed by Sex

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference when analyzed according to the gender of college student's level of speaking confidence, p<0.05. Hence, this result fails to reject the null hypothesis. This is supported by the study of Gorjian et al. (2011), which focuses on the effect of oral summaries of short stories on male/female learners' speaking proficiency and shows that there is no significant relationship found between gender and speaking skills.

Table 4: Level of Speaking Confidence when Analyzed According to Sex

Grouping Variable	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Female	3.518	0.42	0.577	381	0.564
Male	3.491	0.45			

The same with the study of Gurler (2015), the results revealed that there is no significant difference in speaking achievement according to gender. Furthermore, as presented in the table above, females have a mean score of 3.518 (SD=0.42) than males who have 3.491 (SD=0.45). This indicates that most females agree that they have more problems with speaking confidence than males, which can be supported by the study of Ozturk &Gurbuz (2013), indicating that female students experience a higher level of speaking anxiety than male students. This finding supports the study conducted by Balemir (2009), who found out that female students are more anxious while speaking English, and they are more worried about speaking English in the classroom.

4.4 Significant Difference in the Level of Speaking Confidence among GE2 Completers as Analyzed by Year Level

Table 5 shows a significant difference in the student's level of speaking skills in terms of year level since the p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance (p=0.021*). Based on the post hoc test, 1st year significantly differs from 3rd and 4th-year students.

Table 5: Summary of ANOVA on the Level of
Speaking Skills when Analyzed According to Year Level

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall	Between Groups	1.795	3	.598	3.280	.021
	Within Groups	69.154	379	.182		
	Total	70.950	382			

*p<0.05

Based on Table 5.1, it was observed that there is statistical evidence showing a significant difference between 3rd year and 1st year since their p-value is 0.023. It was concluded that the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that the 3rd year students of UM Digos College have more speaking confidence compared to 1st year students. This is also true because they are at the entry level and adapting to UM Digos College's environment.

Table 5.1: Multiple Comparison Using Bonferroni for the Level
of Speaking Skills When Analyzed According to Year Level

(I) level		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1st year	2nd year	.23720	.08792	.065	-.0097	.4841
	3rd year	.25607*	.08247	.023	.0245	.4877
	4th year	.22990	.08731	.076	-.0153	.4751
2nd year	1st year	-.23720	.08792	.065	-.4841	.0097
	3rd year	.01887	.05592	.990	-.1382	.1759
	4th year	-.00730	.06283	1.000	-.1837	.1691
3rd year	**1st year**	**-.25607***	.08247	.023	-.4877	-.0245
	2nd year	-.01887	.05592	.990	-.1759	.1382
	4th year	-.02617	.05495	.973	-.1805	.1281
4th year	1st year	-.22990	.08731	.076	-.4751	.0153
	2nd year	.00730	.06283	1.000	-.1691	.1837
	3rd year	.02617	.05495	.973	-.1281	.1805

The result is relevant to the study of Torrero, et al. (2021), which observed the findings of their study that first-year students have the lowest mean score as they were not exposed to an environment that used English as their medium in their previous school. So, they feel afraid to commit mistakes in speaking. In connection with this is the Affective filter hypothesis of Krashen (1982) (as cited in De Bot et al., 2005), which states that students who have a high affective filter (lack of confidence) will have difficulty expressing their ideas and perform in front of their classmates and teacher inside the classroom. However, Srivastava (2013) explained that there is a relationship between year level and speaking confidence; they found in their study that students at higher levels had high self-confidence, and students at lower levels had low self-confidence. Furthermore, Al-Hebaish (2012) stated that increased language ability and a desire to communicate might result from strong self-confidence, which may also lead to improved academic performance. As confidence levels increase, academic performance improves, and academic achievement suffers as a result of low self-confidence in students (Fook et al., 2011).

4.5 Significant Difference in the Level of Speaking Confidence among GE2 Completers as Analyzed by Department

Table 6 revealed a p-value of 0.339 which is more than a 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it shows that students' speaking skill levels do not differ according to the department.

In comparison with the study "Correlation between Self-confidence and Speaking Skill of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Preparatory Students" by Gurler (2015), findings about self-confidence have no significant relationship with the department. However, participants from the ELT department have a higher speaking skills grade than those who are not willing to communicate and lack self-confidence (McIntyre, 2004). This is supported by the study of Sar, Avcu, and

Isiklar(2010), that this correlation means individuals compose confidence to have effective communication skills in speaking.

Table 6: Summary ANOVA on the Level of Speaking
skills when analyzed according to department

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Total	95.610	382			
Overall	Between Groups	1.056	5	.211	1.140	.339
	Within Groups	69.893	377	.185		
	Total	70.950	382			

5. Intervention and Concluding Remarks

5.1 Intervention

As soon as researchers fulfilled the process of data gathering procedure, collation, interpretation, and drawing of conclusions, the researchers came up with the following recommendations. First, the School Administration. The UM Digos College must implement an intervention program specifically entitled, "Intervention Program: Developmental Means for Speaking Communication of GE 2 (Purposive Communication) Learners," which highlights the development of speaking confidence, particularly observing appropriate activities, training and seminars/webinars which involve the integration of learning how to speak the language confidently, especially in the field of General Education, as well as provide utmost support for the learning of the students.

Finally, the Teachers/Learning Facilitators. Teachers should monitor the progress of students who have undergone an intervention program; uphold students along their learning in this area. They should provide a warm learning environment that supports students to boost their confidence in speaking while using the English language. Furthermore, learning facilitators should also train students' exposure aside from developing their speaking competence.

Figure 3: Proposed Capability Intervention Activity Design

I. Title	Study Output: Developmental Means for Speaking Communication of GE 2 (Purposive Communication) Learners
II. Date and Venue	March 10- 25, 2023/ UMDC Gymnasium
III. Participants	Teachers, GE 2 Completers, Focal Persons
IV. Rationale	Lack of confidence in speaking can be a major issue inside the classroom. It prevents the students from expressing their ideas and communicating effectively. On the other hand, the ability to speak fluently and effectively is essential in communicating and exchanging ideas or opinions orally (Bashir et al., 2011). The research findings show that GE2 completers of UMDC have low speaking confidence. The researchers proposed an intervention program to develop the speaking skills of students and thus enrich their speaking confidence. The goal is to teach communicative strategies and proper pronunciation of words as they will go into thorough training and

	activities that will help them to be effective speakers. When these are taught, the students will achieve speaking confidence (Gagliardi, 2016).
V. Objectives	The activity aims to: 1. Communicate in English fluently and accurately. 2. Recognize that communicative competence needs an understanding of speech context, speech style, speech act, and communicative strategy. 3. Proficiently delivers various speeches using the principles of effective speech delivery.
VI. Budgetary Requirements	The budget will be dependent on the allocation from UMDC. The institution may ensure budget allocation to the Resource Speakers` Honorarium and Materials and Logistics for the Seminar.

Figure 4: Program Matrix

Day 1		
Time	**Topic/Activities**	**Responsible Person**
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Pronunciation Skills (IPA)	Instructor and Participants
9:30– 10: 30 AM	Prosodic features of speech: - Pause - Stress - Tempo - Pitch - Volume	Instructor and Participants

Day 2		
Time	**Topic/Activities**	**Responsible Person**
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Readers' Theatre Presentation	Participants

Day 3		
Time	**Topic/Activities**	**Responsible Person**
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Communicative Strategies: - Nomination - Restriction - Turn-taking - Topic control	Instructor and Participants
9:30 – 10: 30 AM	Communicative Strategies: - Topic shifting - Repair - Termination	Instructor and Participants

Day 4		
Time	**Topic/Activities**	**Responsible Person**
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Conversation and Dialogue	Instructor and Participants

Day 5

Time	Topic/Activities	Responsible Person
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Uses principles of effective speech focusing on: - Articulation - Word choice - Grammatical correctness - Stage Presence, Facial Expressions, Gestures, and Movements	Instructor and Participants
9:30 – 10: 30 AM	Impromptu Speech	Instructor and Participants

Day 6

Time	Topic/Activities	Responsible Person
8:00 – 8:30 AM	Attendance/Registration	Event Committee
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Public Speaking	Participants

5.2 Concluding Remark

Based upon the research objectives, it has been concluded that there is a significant difference in the level of their speaking confidence when analyzed according to the year level. The 1st Year Students of the Department of Teacher Education (DTE) and Department of Accounting Education (DAE) have low speaking confidence compared to other levels and the other departments, which have moderate speaking confidence. However, the institution's goal is to develop their students' speaking competence by boosting their pronunciation of words and confidence to speak up. Thus, they need to undergo an intervention program, specifically entitled "Intervention Program: Developmental Means for Speaking Communication of GE2 (Purposive Communication) Learners," to address the problem.

Acknowledgement

Conflict of Interest Statement

There are no conflicts of interest in this work, according to the authors. The obtained data has been objectively evaluated to help its purpose; thus, the researchers can assure that there is no personal motivation for completing this quest. Most notably, this effort is motivated by the researchers' desire to suggest an intervention program to improve the students' speaking confidence.

About the Authors

The authors are students under the Department of Teacher Education of the University of Mindanao Digos College. They have specialized English language as their field of expertise. Also, the co-author of this undertaking is the department chair of the aforementioned department specializing in Applied Linguistics in her PhD study focusing on the Sociolinguistic field.

References

Ali, M., & Khowaja, M. A. (2015). Linguistic Self-Confidence: A Perception of Pakistani University Students in English as a Foreign Language Setting. *Grassroots*, *49*(1).

Al-Hebaish, S. M. (2012). The correlation between general self-confidence and academic achievement in the oral presentation course. Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 2(1).

Ananda, R. (2017). *The Correlation between Students' Self Esteem and Students' Speaking Skills of the Second Year Student at SMA Negeri 2 Bantaeng* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar).

Aquino, A. P., Bacaoco, A., Manigo, A. R. (2016). Levels Of Communicative Competence Among Fourth Year College Students of UMBC: Basis for Enhancement Program. UM Digos College Learning Information Center.

Aries, R. (2020). The Impact of Phonemic Awareness in Pronunciation and Language Development in English Language Learners. The Graduate Program of Greensboro College. Published; ProQuest 28258703.

Arubo, L., Macabodbod, R., Rabadon, A. (2018). Second Language Anxiety and Academic Performance of 3rd year and 4th year BEED students of UM Digos College. UM Digos Learning Information Center.

Astuti, N. W. Y. (2018). Assessing Students' Belief of Learning English as a Foreign Language through. *Asian EFL Journal*, *20*(7).

Betonio, N., Dela Cruz, J., Villanueva, C. (2016). The Level of English Language Anxiety of the English Major Students in UM Digos College. UM Digos College Learning Information Center.

De Bot, K. (2015). A history of applied linguistics: From 1980 to the present. Routledge.

De Vera, J. S., & De Vera, P. V. (2018). Oral Communication Skills in English among Grade 11 Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) Students. *Online Submission*, *14*(5), 30-52.

Erdiana, N., Bahri, S., & Akhmal, C. N. (2019). Male vs. female EFL students: Who is better in speaking skills? Studies in English Language and Education, 6(1), 131-140.

Florez, M. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED435204

Gagliardi, M. R. (2016). Speaking And Pronunciation Confidence of Middle School ESL Students at Various Proficiency Levels. Retrieved from

https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5128&context=hse_all

Gurler, I. (2015). Correlation between self-confidence and speaking skill of English language teaching and English language and literature preparatory students. Curr Res Soc Sci, 1(2), 14-19.

Hernández-Chérrez, E., Hidalgo-Camacho, C., & Escobar-Llanganate, P. (2021). Communication Games: Their Contribution to Developing Speaking Skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(4), 643-658.

Khairuddin, Z. (2017). The Influence of MUET Score and First Language towards English as a Second (ESL) Learners' Self-Confidence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(3), 150-157.

Koosha, B., Ketabi, S., & Kassaian, Z. (2011). The Effects of Self-esteem, Age and Gender on the Speaking Skills of Intermediate University EFL Learners. Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 1(10).

Mutaqin, Y. A. F. (2017). *An Analysis of The Problems Faced by Students in Learning Speaking at The Tenth Grade of SMA Islam Batu* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Muhammadiyah Malang).

Parmawati, A. (2018). Using Analytic Teams Technique To Improve Students'speaking Skill. *Edulitics (Education, Literature, and Linguistics) Journal*, *3*(2), 21-25.

Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2013). The impact of gender on foreign language speaking anxiety and motivation. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 654-665.

Roysmanto, R. (2018). A Correlation Between Self-Confidence and The Students'speaking Skill. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, *1*(1), 1–8.

Şar, A. H., Avcu, R., & Işıklar, A. (2010). Analyzing undergraduate students' self-confidence levels in terms of some variables. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *5*, 1205-1209.

Sibaja, K. M. (2019). The Development of English Pronunciation Proficiency of Second Year English Students. *Universidad de Costa Rica*

Silva, M. M. C. R. D. (2019). *Willingness to communicate: The desire to speak in the English classroom* (Doctoral dissertation).

Srivastava, S. K. (2013). To Study the Effect of Academic Achievement on the Level of Self Confidence. Journal of Psychosocial Research, 8(1).

Torrero, C. A. T., Frago, J. B., & Velez, M. C. N. (2021). Speech Wheel: An Intervention in Reducing Speaking Aporia of Freshmen English Major Students. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, *2*(1), 112-119.

Tridinanti, G. (2018). The correlation between speaking anxiety, self-confidence, and speaking achievement of Undergraduate EFL students of a private university in Palembang. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201652.pdf

Tsiplakides, I., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Education Studies*, *2*(4), 39-44.

Utami, R. P., & Astuti, U. P. (2021). EFL Teachers' Problems and Solutions in Teaching English to Students with Intellectual and Developmental Disability. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 173-188.

Yuh, A. H., & Kaewurai, W. (2021). An Investigation of Thai Students' English-speaking Problems and Needs and the Implementation Collaborative and Communicative Approaches to Enhance Students' English-speaking Skills. *The Golden Teak: Humanity and Social Science Journal*, *27*(2), 91-107.