E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 80-97
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Socio-Affective Strategies for Speaking Confidence in an Indonesian Secondary Classroom

Asri Ismawati[1], I Made Permadi Utama[2], Taufik Suadiyatno[3]
[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
e-mail: asrismawati12@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji penerapan strategi sosio-afektif untuk mendukung kepercayaan diri berbicara dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di sekolah menengah. Penelitian tindakan kelas dilaksanakan dalam dua siklus pada siswa kelas XI SMAN 1 Poto Tano melalui tahapan perencanaan, tindakan, observasi, dan refleksi. Bukti penelitian terdiri atas observasi kelas, angket kepercayaan diri, dan penilaian performa berbicara. Intervensi memadukan kegiatan kooperatif, dukungan teman sebaya, dan penguatan diri dalam aktivitas berbicara. Penelitian sumber melaporkan perkembangan positif pada partisipasi dan respons terkait kepercayaan diri, termasuk kesediaan yang lebih besar untuk mengambil kesempatan berbicara. Artikel ini menafsirkan temuan tersebut dengan tetap membedakan kepercayaan diri, partisipasi, kecemasan, self-efficacy, dan performa berbicara. Pembahasan diperdalam melalui literatur pembelajaran bahasa serta penelitian dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika mengenai speaking, anxiety, self-confidence, self-efficacy, dan pembelajaran kolaboratif. Temuan mendukung penggabungan dukungan emosional dengan tuntutan berbicara yang jelas, namun desain penelitian tindakan kelas tidak mengisolasi efek satu komponen strategi. Guru disarankan mengatur kesempatan berbicara secara merata, menggunakan umpan balik spesifik, dan menghubungkan latihan terbimbing dengan performa individual. Penelitian lanjutan perlu menilai keberlanjutan kepercayaan diri dan performa pada tugas yang baru atau tertunda.

Kata kunci: socio-affective strategies; speaking confidence; classroom action research; peer support; secondary English

Abstract

This study examined the implementation of socio-affective strategies to support speaking confidence in a secondary English classroom. The classroom action research was conducted in two cycles with Grade XI students at SMAN 1 Poto Tano through planning, action, observation,

and reflection. Evidence comprised classroom observations, confidence questionnaires, and speaking performance assessments. The intervention combined cooperative activity, peer support, and self-encouragement within speaking tasks. The source study reports favorable development in participation and confidence-related responses, including greater willingness to take speaking opportunities. The article interprets this trajectory while maintaining distinctions among confidence, participation, anxiety, self-efficacy, and assessed speaking performance. The discussion is strengthened through language-learning research and UNDIKMA English education scholarship on speaking, anxiety, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and collaborative instruction. The findings support combining emotional support with explicit speaking demands, but the classroom-action design does not isolate the effect of a single strategy component. Teachers are encouraged to distribute speaking opportunities equitably, provide specific feedback, and connect supported rehearsal with individual performance. Further research should examine whether confidence and performance persist on unfamiliar or delayed speaking tasks.
Keywords: socio-affective strategies; speaking confidence; classroom action research; peer support; secondary English

INTRODUCTION

Speaking in an EFL classroom is a linguistic, cognitive, social, and affective activity. Learners must plan a message, retrieve vocabulary, organize grammatical forms, articulate intelligibly, monitor the listener, and respond within limited time. These demands can make oral participation difficult even when learners understand the lesson. A student may possess relevant language knowledge but hesitate when speaking requires public performance, rapid processing, or exposure to evaluation. For this reason, speaking performance and learners' feelings or beliefs about speaking should be examined as related but distinct outcomes (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994).

Speaking confidence is especially sensitive to situation. A learner may participate confidently with a familiar peer but hesitate in front of the whole class; another may feel capable when the topic is familiar but uncertain during spontaneous interaction. Willingness to communicate similarly changes with interlocutor, task, and

perceived competence. Self-efficacy is narrower still because it concerns a learner's judgment of capability for a particular task. Treating confidence, anxiety, self-efficacy, and willingness to communicate as interchangeable would obscure the specific educational process being examined (MacIntyre et al., 1998; Multon et al., 1991; Pekrun, 2006).

The social organization of instruction can change the conditions under which learners attempt speech. Cooperative preparation can provide planning time, peer modeling, clarification, and a less threatening first audience. These resources may help a hesitant learner enter the task, but group work does not automatically create equitable participation. A confident student can dominate while another contributes little. Effective cooperative speaking therefore requires structures that preserve individual responsibility and distribute opportunities to formulate and express ideas (Gillies, 2016; Fredricks et al., 2004).

Research conducted by English education scholars at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika (UNDIKMA) provides a particularly relevant local context. Farosy et al. (2019) reported a relationship among anxiety, learning motivation, and speaking skill in junior secondary learners. Sumarsono and Amin (2019) examined contextual teaching and self-confidence, finding descriptive improvement in confidence without a statistically significant effect. These studies show that affective factors are educationally important but do not always produce identical statistical patterns, especially when constructs, learners, and outcomes differ.

Other UNDIKMA studies reinforce the importance of linking affective conditions to concrete speaking opportunities. Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022) reported that board-game speaking activities were associated with improved confidence as well as speaking-related practice. Jupri et al. (2022) used a two-cycle classroom action design with Two Stay Two Stray and described improved speaking performance in a context where foreign-language anxiety was part of the instructional problem. Syarifuddin et al. (2022) likewise reported positive speaking outcomes from suggestopedia-based instruction. Taken together, the studies indicate that confidence can be supported

through task design, interaction, and repeated participation rather than through encouragement alone.

A close conceptual comparison is provided by Setianingsih et al. (2024), who investigated self-efficacy and speaking performance among senior high school students in Mataram and reported a strong positive relationship. Their finding strengthens the rationale for examining learners' beliefs about capability in local EFL contexts. However, self-efficacy should not be treated as identical to the broader speaking confidence addressed in the present study, and a correlational relationship does not establish that confidence or self-efficacy is the sole cause of speaking improvement. Construct-sensitive comparison is therefore essential.

The source study at SMAN 1 Poto Tano addressed a practical classroom problem: learners were reluctant to participate in English speaking activities, and the instructional challenge involved both the language demands of speaking and the social-emotional demands of performing in front of others. Socio-affective strategies were selected to make participation more manageable while preserving a meaningful speaking requirement. The intervention combined cooperative activity, peer support, and self-encouragement within an iterative classroom action process.

Accordingly, the study aimed to examine how socio-affective strategies were implemented, how learners' confidence-related responses and participation developed across the cycles, and how these observations should be interpreted alongside speaking performance. The present article retains the original classroom evidence while deepening its interpretation with relevant theory and local scholarship. It deliberately avoids converting favorable questionnaire or observation evidence into a claim of universal effectiveness or treating confidence as equivalent to proficiency.

METHOD

The research employed a two-cycle classroom action research design with Grade XI students at SMAN 1 Poto Tano. Each cycle followed the practical sequence of planning, action, observation, and reflection. The intervention was implemented as part of ordinary English speaking instruction rather than as a separate counseling or clinical

program. Cooperative activity, peer support, and self-encouragement were combined within speaking tasks, and instructional decisions could be refined between cycles in response to classroom evidence. This iterative orientation is consistent with the improvement-focused purpose of classroom action research (Burns, 2010).

Three forms of evidence were retained from the source study. Classroom observation records represented visible participation and interaction; learner questionnaires represented confidence-related perceptions or experiences; and speaking assessments represented performance on assigned oral tasks. These sources were interpreted separately because a student can report greater confidence without equivalent improvement in every linguistic component, while another student can perform accurately but still experience discomfort (Tahir, et.al, 2024). No composite score was created to merge confidence, participation, and speaking proficiency.

Analysis focused on the reported development across cycles and on the instructional conditions associated with that development. Observation and questionnaire evidence were used to identify changes in willingness to participate and perceived confidence, while speaking assessment was treated as a separate performance indicator. Because the source material did not report a design that isolated each strategy component, the article does not attribute the classroom trajectory to peer support, cooperative learning, or self-encouragement individually. It also does not invent significance tests, participant counts, or component scores that were not documented in the supplied article.

Student identities were not reproduced because aggregate classroom evidence was sufficient for the present article. The authorship order and correspondence information were retained from the supplied manuscript. No undocumented ethics approval number, consent procedure, or additional data-collection event was introduced during manuscript preparation. The expanded discussion is therefore an interpretation of the existing classroom study, with recommendations clearly distinguished from procedures that were actually documented.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The source study reports a favorable classroom trajectory across the two cycles. Learners became more willing to participate in speaking activities, and the instructional account describes greater use of opportunities to express ideas. Questionnaire evidence also indicated positive development in confidence-related responses. These findings support the conclusion that the classroom environment became more conducive to participation, but they should not be read as evidence that every student improved equally or that all dimensions of speaking proficiency changed to the same degree.

Table 1. Sources of evidence and interpretive boundaries in the classroom study

Evidence source	What the source study indicates	Interpretive boundary
Classroom observation	Learners showed greater participation and willingness to take speaking opportunities across the intervention.	Observable participation is not identical to confidence or language proficiency.
Confidence questionnaire	Responses developed favorably in relation to learners' perceived confidence during speaking activities.	Self-report describes perceptions and should not be treated as an objective speaking score.
Speaking assessment	Speaking performance was assessed separately from confidence-related evidence.	Task performance does not directly measure anxiety, confidence, or willingness to communicate.

Evidence source	What the source study indicates	Interpretive boundary
Cycle reflection	Instruction was reviewed and adjusted between classroom-action cycles.	Improvement reflects the evolving instructional package; the effect of one component cannot be isolated.

The table clarifies why triangulation strengthens the study without making the evidence interchangeable. Observation can show whether learners actually take turns, questionnaires can show how learners perceive their confidence, and speaking assessment can show the quality of an oral response. Agreement among these sources makes a favorable classroom interpretation more credible, yet each source answers a different question. Maintaining that distinction prevents the common error of describing increased participation as if it were automatically a measured gain in speaking accuracy or fluency.

The combined socio-affective package appears to have changed the immediate conditions under which learners attempted speaking. Peer preparation can reduce the social cost of making a first attempt because learners have time to formulate an idea, compare expressions, and ask for clarification before public performance. Self-encouragement can also direct attention toward manageable action rather than toward the possibility of failure. These mechanisms are plausible interpretations of the observed participation trajectory, but the study did not experimentally isolate them. The defensible claim is that the combined classroom arrangement was associated with favorable development during the action-research process.

This interpretation is consistent with local evidence while remaining careful about construct differences. Farosy et al. (2019) reported that anxiety and learning motivation were related to speaking skill among junior secondary learners in Mataram. Their work supports the broader proposition that speaking performance is connected with affective conditions, but it does not mean that anxiety and confidence are simply opposite scores. A learner can experience some anxiety and still participate

productively, while a learner who reports confidence may still have linguistic difficulties. The present findings are therefore better understood as changes in a classroom participation environment rather than proof that anxiety disappeared.

Sumarsono and Amin (2019) offer an important local contrast. Their contextual-teaching study reported improvement in students' self-confidence but did not find a statistically significant effect. That pattern is useful because it shows that a positive classroom trend and a strong inferential claim are not the same. In the present action research, the absence of an isolated experimental comparison similarly requires restraint. The study supports practical improvement within the participating class, but it does not establish that the same strategy package would produce an identical effect in every secondary classroom.

The findings also correspond with Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022), who used classroom action research to examine board-game speaking activities and reported improvement in confidence alongside speaking practice. The value of this comparison lies less in the game format itself than in the instructional operations it created: learners received repeated opportunities to speak, practice pronunciation and fluency, and receive correction within an engaging task. The present socio-affective intervention likewise appears most meaningful when described through the opportunities it created rather than through the strategy label alone.

Jupri et al. (2022) provide an especially relevant comparison because their Two Stay Two Stray study also used a two-cycle classroom action design and treated foreign-language anxiety as part of the speaking problem. Their classroom account described students who were initially uneasy and later became more willing to communicate as the collaborative activity was refined. The similarity supports the idea that participation can improve when learners receive structured interaction with peers. However, the specific technique, learners, assessment criteria, and classroom conditions differ, so the present findings should not be treated as a replication of their numerical results.

Syarifuddin et al. (2022) likewise reported positive speaking outcomes from suggestopedia-based instruction. Suggestopedia and socio-affective strategy instruction are not equivalent approaches, yet both emphasize the importance of the learning atmosphere and the learner's readiness to perform. This comparison reinforces a practical point: speaking development is not only a matter of assigning more oral tasks. The design of the environment can determine whether learners experience those tasks as manageable opportunities for communication or as repeated public tests of failure.

A further local comparison comes from Setianingsih et al. (2024), who reported a strong positive relationship between self-efficacy and speaking performance among senior high school learners. Their finding suggests that judgments of capability are closely associated with speaking in a comparable regional context. Nevertheless, self-efficacy is task-focused and conceptually more precise than general confidence. The present article therefore uses their finding to support attention to learner belief while avoiding the stronger claim that the confidence questionnaire in the source study measured exactly the same construct.

The role of pronunciation illustrates why confidence and performance should remain distinct. Nugraha et al. (2022) documented segmental pronunciation difficulties among English language education students and noted that pronunciation errors can undermine learners' confidence to pronounce other words. A hesitant learner may therefore need both affective support and concrete language assistance. Encouragement without correction leaves the pronunciation problem unresolved, while correction delivered in a threatening way can reduce willingness to continue. Effective socio-affective teaching must connect emotional safety with informative language feedback.

Feedback is consequently central to the interpretation of the intervention. Specific feedback can identify what was understood, what needs revision, and what the learner should attempt next. This makes improvement visible and can produce evidence for realistic confidence. Generic praise may feel supportive but does not necessarily

help a student understand how to communicate more effectively. Formative-assessment research similarly emphasizes feedback that closes the gap between current performance and the learning goal (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

The teacher's response to errors also shapes the social meaning of speaking. Immediate correction of every form may interrupt communication and make hesitant learners focus on avoiding mistakes, whereas ignoring all errors can leave them without useful guidance. A proportionate response can acknowledge the intended message, identify one or two priority problems, and provide another opportunity to speak. This arrangement preserves communicative purpose while showing that error is part of learning rather than a public verdict on ability.

Peer support should be judged by what it allows each learner to do. A pair may complete an activity successfully while one learner contributes nearly all of the language. If the instructional goal includes confidence and independent speaking, the teacher needs to observe who initiates, who responds after prompting, who asks for clarification, and who completes an utterance without another learner taking over. Cooperative learning research consistently emphasizes individual accountability within group work (Gillies, 2016).

A useful participation structure is therefore one in which support precedes, rather than replaces, individual contribution. Learners can first prepare ideas with a partner, then each produce a short response, and finally respond to a follow-up question. The present study does not document this exact sequence as an additional treatment; it is an implication derived from the reported difficulty with speaking confidence. The principle is to use social support as scaffolding toward participation instead of allowing group work to hide continuing silence.

The action-research design strengthens the article as an account of responsive teaching. Reflection after the first cycle allows the teacher to adjust task difficulty, instructions, timing, grouping, or feedback in response to what happened. Improvement in the second cycle can therefore represent a better fit between the classroom

arrangement and learners' needs. At the same time, this flexibility limits single-cause attribution because the intervention is not a fixed treatment whose components remain unchanged. The practical unit of explanation is the evolving instructional process (Burns, 2010).

This distinction is particularly important when confidence improves across repeated tasks. Repetition itself can make a topic, format, or audience more familiar. A learner may speak more readily on the second occasion because the content is known, because the peer relationship has become comfortable, because feedback clarified expectations, or because confidence has genuinely generalized. The source evidence supports improvement in the practiced classroom context, but stronger evidence for durable confidence would require unfamiliar topics, different partners, or delayed assessments.

Task difficulty also affects the meaning of a confidence response. A learner may report high confidence after completing a heavily supported pair task but lower confidence before an individual presentation. Neither response is necessarily inaccurate; each refers to a different demand. Future work should therefore link confidence questions to specific tasks and record the amount of support available. Task-specific measurement would make it easier to determine whether confidence grows as assistance is gradually reduced (Multon et al., 1991; Bandura, 1997).

Willingness to communicate provides another useful lens. MacIntyre et al. (1998) describe communication readiness as situational rather than fixed. In the present context, a learner's willingness to speak can change with partner, topic, perceived competence, and expected evaluation. The reported increase in participation is therefore educationally meaningful even if it is not treated as a permanent personality change. Teachers can expand this willingness by varying partners and speaking contexts gradually so that successful participation is not limited to one familiar arrangement.

The local work of Qomariyah and Utama (2021) also illustrates how classroom design can shape an affective response. Their problem-based learning study reported

increased English learning interest as students discussed problems and developed ideas collaboratively. Interest is not confidence, but the study demonstrates that affective engagement can be influenced by the organization of learning activity. For the present study, the comparable lesson is that confidence should be discussed in relation to what students are actually asked to do, with whom, and under what feedback conditions.

Sumarsono et al. (2022) further showed that learning conditions can produce mixed affective responses. In their study of remote learning, students experienced both motivating and demotivating conditions, including problems with interaction and access as well as opportunities for independence. Although the present research was not conducted remotely, the comparison is useful because it shows that motivation and confidence are shaped by the learning environment rather than functioning as fixed properties carried unchanged from one context to another.

Socio-affective support should therefore not be interpreted as the removal of challenge. A speaking classroom must still require learners to communicate meaning, organize language, and respond to other people. The pedagogical objective is to remove unnecessary interpersonal threat while preserving productive difficulty. Learners can be given preparation time and respectful feedback while still being expected to complete a communicative task. Emotional safety and academic challenge are complementary rather than opposing goals (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Pekrun, 2006).

Confidence-building is most educationally useful when it is calibrated to evidence of competence. A learner who successfully completes a short turn can be shown exactly what worked and then given a slightly more demanding follow-up. This creates a sequence in which confidence is supported by successful action, not merely by reassurance. Bandura's (1997) account of self-efficacy similarly emphasizes mastery experiences as an important source of capability beliefs. Although the source study measured confidence rather than formal self-efficacy, the principle helps explain why supported success can be more useful than indiscriminate praise.

The distinction between confidence and proficiency also protects assessment validity. Teachers may understandably notice that a previously silent learner begins to volunteer, but a speaking rubric should still evaluate relevant performance dimensions such as comprehensibility, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, or task fulfillment according to the intended objective. A confident delivery should not automatically receive a high linguistic score, just as a hesitant delivery should not erase accurate language. Keeping the measures separate allows meaningful improvement in each dimension to be recognized.

Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022) make this distinction especially visible because their speaking study linked confidence with phonological awareness, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy. Their findings suggest that affective and linguistic development can occur together when learners receive repeated, structured speaking practice. The implication for the present study is not to add unmeasured pronunciation gains, but to recommend that future cycles record which speaking components improve alongside confidence so that the mechanism of change is clearer.

The distribution of opportunities is another essential outcome. A class can sound more active because a small number of confident learners speak frequently. Observation should therefore consider not only total participation but also who participates. Recording individual turns, prompted responses, clarification requests, and completed contributions can reveal whether previously hesitant learners are gaining access to meaningful speaking practice. Such information would make later reflection more precise and support inclusive classroom decision-making (Fredricks et al., 2004).

Gradual withdrawal of support can provide evidence of independence. A learner may first rehearse with a partner, later use brief notes, and eventually respond without those supports. The pace should depend on demonstrated performance rather than on a predetermined schedule. Success with reduced support would provide stronger evidence that confidence and speaking capability extend beyond the original scaffold. This progression is a practical recommendation derived from the present findings, not an additional result claimed for the completed study.

The study also has implications for teacher language and questioning. Supportive questioning can give learners time to think, clarify what is being asked, and break a difficult response into manageable parts. However, questions should not be simplified so extensively that learners no longer need to formulate meaningful English. The teacher's task is to create an entry point into the speaking demand and then extend the response. This balance turns interaction into structured practice rather than either interrogation or passive reassurance.

An important limitation is that the available article source does not provide detailed learner-level trajectories or component-level speaking scores. It therefore cannot show whether improvement was concentrated among initially hesitant learners, whether specific pronunciation or fluency criteria changed most, or whether all learners moved in the same direction. These gaps should remain visible rather than being filled with estimated data. Future studies can strengthen the evidence by reporting individual or subgroup patterns while preserving participant confidentiality.

A second limitation concerns generalization. The study was conducted in a particular Grade XI classroom at SMAN 1 Poto Tano, and the intervention was adjusted through an action-research process. The results are therefore most useful as a contextualized account of how socio-affective principles can be embedded in speaking instruction. Transfer to another school should preserve the underlying functions—manageable participation, peer support, individual responsibility, and specific feedback—while adapting task content and classroom organization to local conditions.

Overall, the local UNDIKMA literature strengthens rather than replaces the evidence from the source study. Farosy et al. (2019), Sumarsono and Amin (2019), Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022), Jupri et al. (2022), Syarifuddin et al. (2022), Nugraha et al. (2022), and Setianingsih et al. (2024) collectively show that speaking development in Indonesian EFL settings is closely connected with anxiety, confidence, self-efficacy, pronunciation difficulty, task structure, and interaction. The present article contributes a focused classroom-action account in which cooperative support and self-encouragement were integrated to increase learners' access to speaking opportunities.

The most defensible pedagogical conclusion is therefore not that one socio-affective technique universally causes confidence. Rather, confidence can be supported when speaking tasks create attainable but meaningful demands, peers assist without replacing individual responsibility, teachers respond constructively to errors, and learners experience repeated evidence that they can complete progressively more independent oral work. This interpretation respects the design's limits while making the study useful for classroom practice.

CONCLUSION

The two-cycle classroom action study reports favorable development in confidence-related responses and participation during socio-affective speaking instruction at SMAN 1 Poto Tano. Cooperative activity, peer support, and self-encouragement functioned as a combined instructional arrangement rather than isolated treatments. The findings support linking emotional support with clear speaking demands and specific feedback, while confidence, anxiety, self-efficacy, participation, and speaking proficiency should remain distinct. Teachers should provide equitable speaking turns and gradually reduce support as learners become more independent. Future research should document learner-level speaking development and examine whether confidence and performance persist across unfamiliar audiences, topics, and delayed tasks.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Burns, A. (2010). Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners. Routledge.

Farosy, A. H., Sumarsono, D., & Sumarni, B. (2019). The correlation between students' anxiety and learning motivation towards students' speaking skill. Cordova Journal

Language and Culture Studies, 9(1), 146-156. https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v9i1.1815

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59-109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39-54. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hidayatullah, H., & Haerazi, H. (2022). Exploring the use of various board games to enhance speaking skills viewed from students' phonology awareness. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 1(2), 93-102. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i2.614

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125-132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Jupri, J., Mismardiana, Muslim, & Haerazi, H. (2022). Teaching English using Two Stay Two Stray in improving students' English speaking skills integrated with foreign language anxiety. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 2(1), 33-42. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v2i1.719

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. Language Learning, 44(2), 283-305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 82(4), 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38(1), 30-38. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.38.1.30

Nugraha, S. V., Irawan, L. A., Haerazi, & Frank, T. O. (2022). Segmental aspects of pronunciation errors produced by ELE students in classroom settings. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 2(2), 88-98. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v2i2.759

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. Educational Psychology Review, 18(4), 315-341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

Qomariyah, S. S., & Utama, I. M. P. (2021). Problem-based learning on students' English learning interests. International Journal of Language Teaching and Education, 5(2), 55-61. https://doi.org/10.22437/ijolte.v5i2.15881

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Setianingsih, T., Nafisah, B. Z., Sumarni, B., & Kamarudin, K. (2024). Investigating EFL students' speaking skills viewed from self-efficacy: Instructional experiences learned from seniors high schools. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 4(4), 883-894. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i4.2249

Sumarsono, D., & Amin, S. (2019). Contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) approach towards students' self confidence in learning English: Does it have any effect? Cordova Journal Language and Culture Studies, 9(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v9i2.1576

Sumarsono, D., Suadiyatno, T., & Bagis, A. K. (2022). Remote learning in the crisis of Covid-19: Motivating or demotivating the EFL students to learn? Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 9(1), 61-71. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v9i1.5257

Syarifuddin, M., Muhlisin, M., & Thinh, V. T. (2022). Suggestopedia-based language learning to enhance students' speaking skills viewed from teachers' educational background. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 2(1), 12-22. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v2i1.709

Tahir, S. Z. B., Sakkir, G., & Iye, R. (2024). Buru Language Learning Management Model in Ecotourism-Based Embedded-Multilingual: Teachers' Need Analysis. Idarah (Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kependidikan), 8(1), 15-30.

Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011-2019). Language Teaching, 53(4), 491-523. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208