

## **How Confident Are High Schoolers to Speak English: A Report On Speaking Self-Efficacy Survey**

**Muhammad Iklil Zaki**

Universitas Brawijaya

[iklilzaki@student.ub.ac.id](mailto:iklilzaki@student.ub.ac.id)

**Alies Poetri Lintang Sari**

Universitas Brawijaya

[alieslintang@ub.ac.id](mailto:alieslintang@ub.ac.id)

**Corresponding author:** [iklilzaki@student.ub.ac.id](mailto:iklilzaki@student.ub.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

Speaking in English is one of the toughest aspects to master in acquiring the English language. This is reflected in the broad job vacancies that require English as a mandatory skill. It means that it is important to equip students with adequate English skills. However, several reports have found that many students still lack confidence in speaking. On the other hand, a well-known theory suggests that one of the prominent factors influencing learning achievement is confidence, specifically called efficacy. Students' self-efficacy level seems to be one of the prominent factors that could influence their speaking achievement. As the pandemic has transformed the learning mode back into traditional face-to-face learning, this current study was conducted to investigate students' self-efficacy level in public speaking in the post-pandemic era. The study utilized a quantitative method and employed a questionnaire adapted from Paradewari's article. The questionnaire was converted into two types, online and offline conditions, and distributed to 204 students. An independent t-test method was used to compare whether there were differences in students' self-efficacy levels in public speaking between online and offline learning. The study revealed a significant difference in the overall students' self-efficacy level (as indicated by the T-Test Result score) and the factors influencing it. It also found that offline learning had a more positive effect on students' self-efficacy in public speaking compared to online learning.

**Keywords:** English education, pandemic, post-pandemic, self-efficacy, speaking

### **A. Introduction**

Learning a language encompasses plenty aspects, in learning English there are four main skills involved, such as listening, reading, writing, and speaking. However, when it comes to the realm of learning English, speaking seems to be a prominent indicator when evaluating an individual's level of proficiency in English. Without disregarding the significance of all aspects in language learning, it is imperative to acknowledge that the proficiency of speaking hits different, it is because the use of language in daily use is mostly the ability to speak (Syakur et al., 2020).

There are lots of definitions of speaking, according to some expertise such as Fulcher (2014) where he determines that the definition of speaking is an activity to communicate verbally. Similarly, Brown (2006) stated that speaking is a condition where someone could express their idea while utilizing their productive skill with their voice. Therefore, it can be concluded that most speaking terms are related to the condition where someone is able to deliver their idea. Since English has been used as the international language and determined as the lingua franca because of its ease of communication between people who are from different language backgrounds, hence it is very important to learn English.

In Indonesia, the importance of being able to communicate using English is clearly shown by the number of job vacancies which obligate the candidate to have an ability in English. English language proficiency has taken a crucial position in the area of professional development, such as what has been exemplified in the engineering career that being able to speak English fluently war affects their access to job chances both national and international (Shrestha et al., 2019). Hence, it is crucial to adequately equip learners with the necessary skills to proficiently engage in English language communication. Particularly the competence to speak in front of a mass audience, which is commonly known as public speaking skill.

In English, psychology factors also plays as the prominent role that influence the ability of speaking (Haidara, 2016). Moreover, her investigation also found that the most prominent factors that hinder students' reach to have a good speaking performance is the lack of confidence. One of the prominent pycological construct that has gained substantial attention in the field of education is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a belief of their capability to behave or execute a certain task (Bandura, 1977)b.

Lower efficacy level also showed different performance with the higher one. It is believed that students who have higher efficiency will perform better. A study conducted by Aregu, (2013) involved 128 participants, found that it is fact that by using a statistical approach named t-test the result shows that it is proven that a great speaking performance was influenced by speaking efficacy. Similar to a study conducted by Mahyuddin et al. (2006) in his study where 1,145 students from Malaysia were assessed with survey when the significance was assessed using correlational analysis when the strong positive correlation between self-efficacy and academic achievement in English.

Moreover, a study conducted by Mills et al. (2006), where 95 college students from USA assessed using questionnaires twice, the study showed there significant positive

relation between self-efficacy belief toward reading and listening achievement. Hence, from various research above related to the effect of self-efficacy toward speaking performance, particularly in public speaking, it is very important to know the level of students' speaking skill, which could be very beneficial for the teachers to improve student learning achievement. In the context of the level of self-efficacy toward public speaking there was a study conducted in 2017 by Paradewari, where she investigated the level of student self-efficacy toward public speaking. Similarly, in 2021 there is following research that has been conducted assessing the same area and context, however it is focusing on the level of self-efficacy during pandemic. Other research has found that the level of students' self-efficacy level during the pandemic, where their research revealed most of the students showed the positive response and they seemed to have sufficient efficacy during online learning (Ningias & Indriani, 2021).

Based on some prior research above, the researcher is interested in conducting research to find out (1) Whether the level of self-efficacy in the post-pandemic has similar or probably differ to pandemic era? (2) Which learning conditions are better in supporting students to gain confidence in speaking? This research invites high-schoolers students in 11th grades to participate in a survey. Regarding the prior study that investigated the level of students' self-efficacy in the level of university students, choosing the 11th graders is appropriate owing to the fact that 11th graders have cultivated both online and offline learning.

## **B. Research Methodology**

In this present study researchers use quantitative study based on the need of the research itself to investigate whether there is a difference towards student learning self-efficacy in the post pandemic era. 204 highschoolers have participated in the survey that collects the students' perspective on speaking self efficacy in online and offline settings. T-test analysis was implemented to see the difference between students' efficacy in speaking class in online and offline settings. Additionally, descriptive statistics was also implemented to see the trend of the students' anxiety level in both online and offline settings. Additionally, descriptive statistics was also implemented to see the trend of the students' anxiety level in both online and offline settings.

This research used an adapted questionnaire Paradewari (2017) that consists of a total of 20 questions each asking for students' experiences in speaking efficacy in both online and offline settings). The questionnaire consists of 3 dimensions that specifically measure students' awareness (5 questions), students' self-efficacy (5 questions) and self-efficacy influencing support factor (5 questions). The questionnaire that has been used is a type of likert scale questionnaire where it measures student perception, on this research researcher using four-point likert scale, where it reduces the mid option. The purpose of this reduction is to avoid a biased answe. Some individuals are not necessarily considered to choose an neutral option in a rating scale (Riker, 1944). Reducing the middle option purposed to avoid the undecided option. Middle option could have double meaning which could be understood as the option of undecided, neutral, or oven uncertain (Hadi, 1991). A pilot testing was conducted to evaluate whether the questionnaire is valid and reliable. As the pilot testing was conducted with 30 participants, means the value of the r table for respondents totaling 30 people is higher than 0,361. Since all of the items both online and offline show the result, which higher than 0,361 it means that all of the items are valid.

**Table 1**

*Validity test for online questionnaire*

Item	Significance	explanation
item 1	0,537	valid
item 2	0,595	valid
item 3	0,634	valid
item 4	0,782	valid
item 5	0,643	valid
item 6	0,659	valid
item 7	0,804	valid
item 8	0,688	valid
item 9	0,761	valid
item 10	0,752	valid
item 11	0,739	valid

item 12	0,827	valid
item 13	0,737	valid
item 14	0,703	valid
item 15	0,610	valid
item 16	0,401	valid
item 17	0,556	valid
item 18	0,745	valid
item 19	0,700	valid
item 20	0,666	valid

**Table 2**

*Validity test for offline questionnaire*

Item	Significance	explanation
item 1	0,533	valid
item 2	0,619	valid
item 3	0,605	valid
item 4	0,562	valid
item 5	0,581	valid
item 6	0,585	valid
item 7	0,629	valid
item 8	0,555	valid
item 9	0,723	valid
item 10	0,568	valid
item 11	0,785	valid
item 12	0,702	valid
item 13	0,587	valid

item 14	0,717	valid
item 15	0,733	valid
item 16	0,638	valid
item 17	0,644	valid
item 18	0,707	valid
item 19	0,630	valid
item 20	0,641	valid

**Table 3**  
*Reliability test of online questionnaire*

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,937	20

**Table 4**  
*Reliability test of offline questionnaire*

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,919	20

According to the Taber, (2018) the values of Cronbach alpha that indicate acceptable internal consistency are 0,7 and above. As the result of alpha Cronbach's both from online (0,937) and offline (0,919) questionnaires, means both questionnaires are reliable.

## **C. Results and Discussion**

### **1. Results**

In the design of independent t-tests there are several prerequisite tests that must be met, namely normality tests and homogeneity tests. The aim of the normality test is to figure out whether the data that has been collected is distributed normally or not. It is crucial, especially the normality test is one of the tests that can be a predictor of research objectivity.

## Normality test

**Table 5**

*Normality test*

No	Students' group	N	Komogorov smirnov	Sig.	result
1	Online	204	0,048	.200*	Normal
2	offline	204	0,062	.055	Normal

Referring to the Table 5, using the kolmogorov-smirnov test the result Sig. which shows the number of 0,200 and 0,055, this number is higher than 0,05. According to the concept of normality test it means that the data was distributed normally which means that the data is eligible to then proceed to the independent t-test.

As the prerequisite test, named normality test has been conducted followed with the data that is showing where it was distributed normally, indicated that the investigation could be continued to the process of analyzing the data called independent t-test. In this research the researchers investigate in what extent that the different of learning mode influences students' self-efficacy in public speaking in the global, also then to make the discussion more comprehensive each dimension also such as the awareness, the self-efficacy in specific, also the factor that influence is also going to be discussed.

## Global self Efficacy score

**Table 7**

*Independent t-test result on global students' self efficacy*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Full	Equal variances assumed	5.885	.016	-2.073	406	.039
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.073	396.842	.039

From table 7 it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the level of global score of student self-efficacy in online and offline. Proven by the value of sig. (2

tailed) is 0.039 which according to the rule of t-test when the level of sig. (2 tailed) is lower than 0.05.

**Table 6**

*Global self-efficacy score*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Full	Offline	204	55.07	10.920	.765
	Online	204	52.99	9.370	.656

By comparing both questionnaires as can be seen in Table 6, it is revealed that there is a slight difference, the mean value of offline learning is 55.07 compared to the online mean value which is 52.99. As this study using Likert which respresed by the number of 1 to 4, a high value indicates the tendency of participants to choose an option with a value above 2 which refers to the option agree or strongly agree. Since the mean is the total score divided by the number of participants, the higher the average value, the greater the total value of the selected option, which indicates the higher the level of student efficacy in the offline condition.

### **Self Efficacy result based on Dimension**

To get the comprehend result researchers also conduct an independent t-test for several dimensions, namely student self-efficacy level in specific, student awareness, and self-efficacy influencing support.

## Self-awareness Speaking skills between online and offline

**Table 8**

*Awareness*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Awareness	Equal variances assumed	4.560	.033	2.531	406	.012
	Equal variances not assumed			2.531	397.452	.012

**Table 9**

*Student awareness about their self-efficacy*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Awareness	Offline	204	13.77	3.037	.213
	Online	204	13.06	2.620	.183

Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference between students' awareness of the level of efficacy in speaking as the sig. (2 tailed) 0.012. Furthermore, the descriptive statistic reported that students are having a higher self awareness in offline learning (M=13.77) compared to online learning setting (M = 13.06).

## Student self-efficacy level in specific t-test result

**Table 10**

*Student self-efficacy level in specific t-test result*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Self-efficacy in public speaking	Equal variances assumed	3.564	.060	1.103	406	.271
	Equal variances not assumed			1.103	398.672	.271

Different from the result of the awareness t-test, turns out the result for student self-efficacy level in public speaking has no significant difference. Proven by the result of sig. (2-tailed) which shows the result of 0,271. It means that there is no significant difference between student level of self-efficacy in speaking both online and offline.

**Table 11**

*Student self-efficacy in specific*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-efficacy in public speaking	Offline	204	24.71	4.976	.348
	Online	204	24.20	4.341	.304

However, there is still a similarities, in which the offline learning settings student self-efficacy is higher in offline still has the higher value (M= 22.71) compared to the online (M=24.20).

### Self-efficacy influencing support factor t-test result

**Table 12**

*Self-efficacy influencing support factor t-test result*

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Influencing support factor	Equal variances assumed	3.330	.069	2.450	406	.015
	Equal variances not assumed			2.450	401.615	.015

From table 5. As can see the value of sig. (2-tailed) was 0,015, the value is lower than 0,05, which means that there was a significant difference.

**Table13**  
*Self-efficacy influencing support factor*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Full	Offline	204	55.07	10.920	.765
	Online	204	52.99	9.370	.656

Similar to the other dimension where offline learning setting has a higher (M=55.07) compared to the online (M=52.99). Means that students felt offline learning has supported them a lot compared to online learning.

## 2. Discussion

This research discusses whether there is a difference between student self-efficacy level in public speaking with the different conditions particularly to compare the level of student self-efficacy both in online and offline conditions. In the area of education, the term self-efficacy seems to be a prominent discussion where it is believed that the level of student self-efficacy has a crucial effect particularly in student learning achievement. There were 204 senior high school students participated in this research. From our findings it is indicated that there is a significant difference between student self-efficacy towards learning mode.

### Global self-efficacy score

Global self-efficacy refer to the level of student efficacy as a whole, represented the whole dimension as a unity, as shown in table 6. show that students tend to have lower self-efficacy in speaking during online. This condition may caused by the learning experience that the students have faced. The argument is strengthened by the fact, as the study from Zaman & Nashmena (2021) found that student satisfaction and self-confidence only occur when students have sufficient technology support which in this context is internet connection. However, in the process of online learning researchers found that one of the problems is the poor internet connection (Clarin & Baluyos, 2022). Therefore, it can be inferred that higher student self-efficacy in offline learning is influenced by sufficient, effective, and more motivated learning environments.

### **Student awareness about their self-efficacy level**

Awareness refer to the ability to self-assessment toward their own ability, where they were able to response with appropriate behaviour. Similar to what has been stated by Duval & Wicklund (1972) self-awareness is a condition where someone is able to control their emotion, thoughts and action and is also able to focus. In this context means, students awareness about their self-efficacy reflect their ability to ases their own potential such as confident to speak, and able to control such as their emotion and gesture, as the purpose to behave with appropriate response.

Table 8 showed that the mean score of student awareness in the offline mode is higher than the online mode. Means that students were having a good self-assessment toward their own abilities better in offline conditions. In offline learning they could control their emotions better and be able to understand the situation particularly related to the condition where they have to perform the speaking skill in public.

It is believed that one of the prominent factor that influenced studentns' speaking skill is the learning experience. There is a study that revealed that in the process to promote student awareness in speaking, teachers should provide adequate teaching and learning experience which promotes students to speak (Wael et al., 2018). Before pandemic, there was also research conducted that proven online learning has negative effects towards learning achievement. Study such as Alsaaty et al., (2016) found that (36,7% of the students disagree that they could achieve better in online learning compared to face-to-face learning. This number is higher compared to the students who agreed (28,6%) that online learning promote them to achieve a good result.

Similarly, Manurung et al. (2020) also found that online learning is not easy to conduct, many users report many learning encounters such as the internet connection and unstructured course material. Same finding also revealed by Singh et al. (2021) where it is found that offline learning is considered as more effective due to the less external distractions. The implementation of online learning has been found to have several negative effects on students' performance in achieving learning success.

### **Student self-efficacy level in specific**

In this dimension the evaluation of the student self-efficacy level in a more specific approach, reflected from the question for this dimension specifically assessing student self-efficacy in public speaking. From table 9 show that students' self-efficacy levels were higher in the offline condition. Infer that students are more comfortable when delivering their ideas

in an offline setting. Such as how much effort that they have pushed, the support from teacher or lecturer, and the atmosphere. Resulted that they level of self-efficacy is higher during the offline learning. Similar as mentioned by Bandura (1977) there are four crucial factors that influence self-efficacy : mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, emotion and psychological states.

Several report found that students' level of efficacy decreased during the pandemic. In the area such as emotions and psychological states. Study such as Ali (2021) found that that physiological factor such as emotions and stress level could affect tones of personal abilities, it seems has a correlation with toward this result of lower self efficacy in online learning, prior study such as Rachmah (2020) revealed students prefer offline learning due to the effectiveness, it is because students felt more focus, active and they could enjoy the material. Moreover, students prefer the offline because they argue that it was easy to communicate during the offline learning. Similar to the discussion before about student self-efficacy in general, most of the factors that influence student level of self-efficacy are the learning experience online.

### **Self-efficacy influencing support factor**

In the dimension of influencing factor researchers assess what students felt when they were delivering the idea, the questions were from question number 15 to 20 for each question mode. From Table 13 it can be concluded that students in the offline learning process feel that they get more support. As mentioned in Bandura (1977) influencing factors in the area of self-efficacy are mastery experience, emotional state, verbal or social persuasion, and vicarious experience.

First, the area of mastery experience where it is related to someone's personal experience where they were able to successfully perform. Previous studies such as Fitriani et al. (2020) found that students felt that online learning does not support them to enhance their speaking ability. Proven by the questionnaire where it is asking whether online has supported student speaking ability, from 20 questions 14 items are filled with disagree statements. Similarly, during online learning, students tend to have lack of confidence, also they seem more individual which influences their communication (Singh et al., 2021). The other research such as Fauziyah et al. (2023) also found that compared to the online learning students tend to prefer to speak during the offline learning. From several studies above

proven that online learning tends to tackle students to have a mastery experience, where they are able to successfully speak.

Second, from the aspect of emotional state, it is believed that students' self-efficacy level is also influenced by the emotional state. Beside its impact on student learning and performance, online learning has a negative impact on student emotional states (Mendoza et al., 2021). The other research also conducted by Son et al. (2020) where it is proven that the pandemic has significantly affected student emotion, particularly in higher education the lockdown and the stay-at-home orders have given negative impact toward student emotion and mental health. It is related to the question where it is asking whether students felt delighted after delivering their ideas in speaking, the higher number of mean in the dimension of influencing factor means the higher joy and delight that they have gained after conducting speaking.

Third, verbal or social persuasion, persuasion is a kind of communication strategy where the goal is to delight the parties involved (Bayou & Panitz, 2011). When someone is able to persuade the participant it will increase his belief in their capabilities (Vaezi & Fallah, 2011). Persuasion such as gesture and facial expression, belief has a positive impact to strengthen our ideas. Studies such as Clarke et al. (2019) have found that gesture helps the entrepreneur to communicate with their potential customers where it could enhance the perception. Positive persuasion such as a gesture has a positive impact. Back with the discussion of the influencing factor toward students' self efficacy level, where the means of self-efficacy influencing support factor is higher, means that students are able to use their gesture and facial expression more in the offline condition. The limitation of using facial and gesture related to the limitation of communication using online, online communication requires an extra supporting device and facility, such as the stable connection. While on the other side, several studies also found that there are lots of students report that they have found many encounters such as the internet connection (Manurung et al., 2020).

Lastly, the lower level of student self-efficacy factor related to the influence factor seemed similar. Most of the investigation results where comparing offline and online learning experience resulted in online learning being proven less successful compared to the offline learning strategies. An investigation such as Singh et al. (2021) shows that students are prefer the offline learning since they are able to focus active and they felt that it was more enjoyable compare to the online learning.

#### D. Conclusion and Suggestion

In conclusion, this study is aimed to investigate the level of student self-efficacy in a different learning environment, by comparing the result with independent t-test approaches to find out whether there is a significant difference and which learning environment that has a higher level of students' self-efficacy in public speaking. It is found that there is a consistent result where there is a significant difference between online and offline learning, where offline learning offers greater benefit compared to online learning in the context of supporting students' self-efficacy in public speaking.

These findings also emphasize the importance of considering the learning environment when designing educational strategies aimed at improving students' speaking confidence. While online learning offers numerous advantages, including flexibility and accessibility, it may not provide the same level of support for developing speaking confidence as traditional, offline learning environments. However, it is crucial to note that these findings do not diminish the value of online learning. Instead, it highlights areas for potential improvement and adaptation. Future research could focus on identifying specific aspects of offline learning that boost students' speaking confidence and exploring ways to incorporate these elements into online learning environments.

#### References

- Ali, S. (2021). E-learners' self-efficacy for online courses: self-efficacy for its use as a predictor for academic self-efficacy. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 7(2), 87–104.
- Alsaaty, F., Carter, E., Abrahams, D., & Alshameri, F. (2016). Traditional versus online learning in institutions of higher education: minority business students' perceptions. *Business and Management Research*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v5n2p31>
- Aregu, B. B. (2013). Self-efficacy, self-esteem and gender as determinants of performance in speaking tasks. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 5(6), 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.5897/JMCS2013.0366>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bayou, M. E., & Panitz, E. (2011). Definition and content of persuasion in accounting. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 9(3), 44. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v9i3.6034>
- Brown, H. D. (2006). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices* (Nachdr.). Longman.
- Clarín, A. S., & Baluyos, E. L. (2022). Challenges encountered in the implementation of online distance learning. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.eduline591>
- Clarke, J. S., Cornelissen, J. P., & Healey, M. P. (2019). Actions speak louder than words: how figurative language and gesturing in entrepreneurial pitches influences investment

- judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(2), 335–360. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.1008>
- Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A Theory of Objective Self Awareness*. Academic Press.
- Fauziyah, H., Gozali, A., & Degeng, P. D. D. (2023). Teacher's perspective towards efl students' speaking performance in post covid-19 pandemic era. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 11(2), 338–346. <https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v11i2.7497>
- Fitriani, Y., Bandung, M., & Kadri, M. K. (2020). Students' perspective of online learning on speaking class during covid-19 pandemic. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v7i1.946>
- Fulcher, G. (2014). *Testing Second Language Speaking* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315837376>
- Hadi, S. (1991). *Analisis butir untuk instrumen angket, tes dan skala nilai dengan basica*. Andi Offset.
- Haidara, Y. (2016). psychological factor affecting english speaking performance for the english learners in indonesia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 1501–1505.
- Mahyuddin, R., Elias, H., Loh, S., Cheong, M., Muhamad, N., Noordin, M., & Abdullah. (2006). The relationship between students' self efficacy and their English language achievement. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education*, 21, 61-71..
- Manurung, G. N., Manurung, K., Mertosono, S. R., & Kamaruddin, A. (2020). Perceptions of efl learners in the implementation of blended learning post-natural disaster at a university in indonesia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(8), 959. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1008.15>
- Mendoza, D., Cejas, M., Rivas, G., & Varguillas, C. (2021). Anxiety as a prevailing factor of performance of university mathematics students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Education and Science Journal*, 23(2), 94–113. <https://doi.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2021-2-94-113>
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02266.x>
- Ningias, R. A., & Indriani, L. (2021). EFL Students' perspectives on their self-efficacy in speaking during online learning process. *English Learning Innovation*, 2(1), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v2i1.14965>
- Paradewari, D. S. (2017). Investigating students' self-efficacy of public speaking. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 5. <https://www.ijern.com/October-2017.php>
- Rachmah, N. (2020). Effectiveness of online vs offline classes for efl classroom: a study case in a higher education. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL)*, 3, 19. <https://doi.org/10.20527/jetall.v3i1.7703>
- Riker, B. L. (1944). A comparison of methods used in attitude research. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 39, 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061663>
- Shrestha, R. N., Awasthi, J. R., & Pahari, B. R. (2019). Impact of english language proficiency on the quality of job execution of engineers in and outside nepal: a study at a glance. *Journal of the Institute of Engineering*, 15(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jie.v15i1.27742>
- Singh, P., Sinha, R., Koay, W. L., Teoh, K. B., Nayak, P., Lim, C. H., Dubey, A. K., Das, A., Faturrahman, I., & Aryani, D. N. (2021). A comparative study on effectiveness of online and offline learning in higher education. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality in Asia Pasific*, 4(3), Article 3. <https://dx.doi.org/10.32535/ijthap.v4i3.1212>

- Son, C., Hegde, S., Smith, A., Wang, X., & Sasangohar, F. (2020). Effects of covid-19 on college students' mental health in the united states: interview survey study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(9), e21279. <https://doi.org/10.2196/21279>
- Syakur, Abd., Sugirin, S., Margana, M., Junining, E., & Sabat, Y. (2020). Improving english language speaking skills using “absyak” on-line learning model for second semester in higher education. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 3(2), 684–694. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v3i2.897>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Vaezi, S., & Fallah, N. (2011). The relationship between self-efficacy and stress among iranian efl teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.1168-1174>
- Wael, A., Asnur, M. N. A., & Ibrahim, I. (2018). Exploring students' learning strategies in speaking performance. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v2i1.5238>
- Zaman, S., & Nashmena, H. (2021). Impact of online education on student's satisfaction and self- confidence on learning during covid -19 in pakistan heeba nashmena. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 4, 287–298.