E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 185-201
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

# Immediate Repetition, Speaking Performance, and Self-Efficacy in Vocational English Learning

Yaspin[1], I Made Permadi Utama[2], Sri Ariani[3]
[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
E-Mail: yaspinyaya@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji penerapan immediate repetition dalam pembelajaran berbicara bahasa Inggris kejuruan dan perkembangannya pada performa berbicara serta efikasi diri siswa kelas X AKL 1 SMKN 1 Dompu. Penelitian sumber menggunakan desain satu kelompok prates-pascates dengan tes berbicara dan angket efikasi diri sebagai dua ukuran hasil yang berbeda. Rata-rata performa berbicara meningkat dari 68,29 menjadi 75,63, sedangkan rata-rata efikasi diri meningkat dari 46,26 menjadi 53,97. Perubahan tersebut setara dengan kenaikan deskriptif 7,34 dan 7,71 poin pada skala yang tidak dapat dibandingkan secara langsung. Pembahasan menelaah immediate repetition sebagai kesempatan untuk mengurangi beban perencanaan pesan, memperbaiki performa pada percobaan berikutnya, dan membangun pengalaman keberhasilan yang dapat memengaruhi penilaian kemampuan diri. Temuan dibandingkan dengan penelitian task repetition dan studi dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNDIKMA tentang speaking, self-efficacy, confidence, anxiety, dan dukungan pembelajaran. Hasil menunjukkan perkembangan kelas yang positif, tetapi desain tanpa kelompok pembanding belum memisahkan pengaruh pengulangan dari keakraban tugas, umpan balik, dan latihan tambahan. Guru disarankan menghubungkan pengulangan dengan umpan balik spesifik dan tugas transfer yang dimodifikasi.

Kata kunci: immediate repetition; speaking performance; self-efficacy; vocational English; task repetition

Abstract

This study examined immediate repetition in vocational English speaking instruction and its development in students' speaking performance and self-efficacy in Class X AKL 1 at SMKN 1 Dompu. The source research used a one-group pretest-posttest design, with a speaking assessment and a self-efficacy questionnaire treated as separate outcome measures. The speaking mean increased from 68.29 to 75.63, whereas the self-efficacy mean increased from

46.26 to 53.97. These changes represent descriptive gains of 7.34 and 7.71 points on different scales and therefore should not be compared directly. The discussion interprets immediate repetition as an opportunity to reduce message-planning demands, revise performance on a subsequent attempt, and provide an interpretable experience of successful task completion. The findings are discussed alongside task-repetition research and publications by UNDIKMA English education scholars on speaking, self-efficacy, confidence, anxiety, and instructional support. The results indicate a favorable within-class trajectory, but the absence of an independent comparison group prevents the study from isolating repetition from task familiarity, feedback, and additional practice. Teachers should connect repetition with specific feedback and a modified transfer task.
Keywords: immediate repetition; speaking performance; self-efficacy; vocational English; task repetition

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking performance is a real-time achievement in which learners must formulate meaning, retrieve words, organize grammar, control pronunciation, and deliver a message while monitoring a listener's response. These operations compete for limited attention, particularly when a task is unfamiliar. Repetition can alter that attentional situation because a second attempt begins with some content, organization, and language already activated. The pedagogical value of immediate repetition therefore lies not in saying the same words twice, but in giving learners another opportunity to reconstruct a message under more manageable processing conditions (Bygate, 2001; de Jong & Perfetti, 2011).

Task-repetition research has repeatedly shown that subsequent performances can become more fluent or otherwise more efficient, although the pattern is not uniform across complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Ahmadian (2011) found that repeated task performance benefited complexity and fluency and investigated whether those gains extended to a new task. De Jong and Perfetti (2011) similarly demonstrated that repeated speaking practice can support proceduralization and oral fluency. These studies make an important distinction for classroom interpretation: improvement on a

repeated task is meaningful, but transfer to a different communicative demand requires additional evidence.

The Indonesian vocational context makes that distinction especially relevant. Khosiyono (2021) examined task repetition among maritime vocational students and reported advantages for aspects of speaking performance in a quasi-experimental design, while also showing that not every component changed in the same way. Arredondo-Tapia and Garcia-Ponce (2021) likewise emphasized the interaction between task repetition and content familiarity. Together, these studies suggest that repetition should be analysed in relation to what remains constant, what changes, and which speaking dimension is being assessed.

The present study also includes self-efficacy as a separate outcome. Self-efficacy refers to learners' judgments of their capability to organize and perform actions required for a task (Bandura, 1997). It is not identical to speaking proficiency, confidence as a general personality description, or willingness to communicate. A learner may perform a familiar task successfully and consequently judge that task as manageable, yet remain uncertain about a new speaking situation. For this reason, a speaking score and a self-efficacy questionnaire should be interpreted in parallel without being merged into one index.

Research by English education scholars at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika (UNDIKMA) provides a directly relevant local conversation about speaking and learner belief. Sumarsono, Muliani, and Bagis (2020) examined Task-Based Language Teaching together with self-efficacy and found that self-efficacy was related to speaking performance, while the teaching-method-by-self-efficacy interaction was not significant. Setianingsih et al. (2024) also reported a significant relationship between senior-high-school learners' self-efficacy and speaking skills. These studies strengthen the rationale for examining both constructs while still requiring them to remain analytically distinct.

UNDIKMA research further shows that the conditions surrounding speaking can shape learners' participation and performance. Sandiarsa, Bagis, and Sumarsono (2021)

described speaking anxiety during rapid shifts in learning conditions, and Sumarsono, Haryadi, and Bagis (2021) similarly identified anxiety, confidence, fear of mistakes, vocabulary limitations, and lack of practice as important concerns in blended speaking contexts. Jupri et al. (2022) demonstrated how a structured cooperative routine can increase speaking opportunities while addressing foreign-language anxiety. These findings suggest that any improvement during repetition should be interpreted within the social and instructional conditions in which the repeat occurs.

Other local studies point to the importance of repeated, meaningful opportunities to speak. Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022) found that board-game-based speaking practice supported speaking development and phonological awareness, while Hanan and Budiarti (2019) reported improvement in motivation and speaking competence through Think-Pair-Share. Sumarsono and Amin (2019) examined contextualized English learning in relation to self-confidence and showed that improvement in confidence does not automatically imply a statistically decisive treatment effect. This local evidence supports an instructional emphasis on manageable performance opportunities rather than a simple assumption that more confident learners necessarily become more proficient.

The two supervisors named in the present article also represent a useful contextual link to vocational and professional speaking. Ariani and Tawali (2021) documented practical difficulties encountered by UNDIKMA students in an online Speaking for Professional Context course. Although the setting differs from SMKN 1 Dompu, their work reinforces the importance of instructional conditions, task clarity, and access to practice. The current study adds a low-resource routine—immediate repetition—to this broader discussion of how speaking opportunities can be structured so that learners can attempt, review, and improve a message.

The source study at SMKN 1 Dompu used a one-group pretest-posttest design to examine immediate repetition in Class X AKL 1. It reported a speaking mean increase from 68.29 to 75.63 and a self-efficacy mean increase from 46.26 to 53.97. The central interpretive problem is therefore not whether the two means moved upward; that

pattern is clearly reported. The more important questions are what immediate repetition plausibly changed in the learning situation, how the two outcome measures should be distinguished, and what further evidence would be required to claim transfer or a causal effect.

Accordingly, this article examines three connected issues. First, it describes the reported development in speaking performance and self-efficacy without comparing raw changes across different scales. Second, it interprets immediate repetition through research on task familiarity, processing demands, feedback, and task-specific belief. Third, it positions the findings within UNDIKMA scholarship on speaking, self-efficacy, confidence, and anxiety. This approach preserves the classroom value of the source study while keeping its claims proportionate to a one-group design.

## METHOD

The source research employed a pre-experimental one-group pretest-posttest design in Class X AKL 1 at SMKN 1 Dompu. The same class provided the initial and later measures, and immediate repetition was implemented within the speaking instruction documented in the study. Because no independently assigned comparison group was included, the design was suited to describing a within-class trajectory but did not provide a counterfactual estimate of what would have happened under an alternative speaking routine.

Two instruments represented different constructs. The speaking assessment provided evidence of oral task performance, whereas the self-efficacy questionnaire represented learners' judgments of their capability in relation to speaking. The article retained the reported means exactly as supplied by the source: 68.29 and 75.63 for speaking, and 46.26 and 53.97 for self-efficacy. No standardized index was created to combine the two measures, because their score ranges and meanings are different.

The analysis was descriptive and interpretive. The pre-post differences were calculated directly from the source means, producing a 7.34-point increase for speaking and a 7.71-point increase for self-efficacy. These differences were used to describe

direction and amount of change on each original scale. No unreported significance test, effect size, standard deviation, item-level result, or learner-level correlation was generated from the summary values.

The expanded discussion compared the source findings with research on immediate and repeated task performance, fluency development, self-efficacy, feedback, and speaking-related affect. Particular attention was given to UNDIKMA publications issued no later than 2024 so that the article could be situated within the institution's established English-education scholarship. The comparison focused on mechanisms and measurement rather than assuming that similar positive findings represented identical interventions.

The manuscript reports aggregate results and does not reproduce student names or other personal identifiers. Authorship follows the student and the two supervisors identified in the source file. No undocumented ethical approval number, additional data-collection event, or new intervention procedure was introduced. Suggested transfer tasks, delayed assessments, and feedback routines are presented as implications for future teaching and research rather than as procedures already completed in the original study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The source reports a speaking mean of 68.29 before immediate-repetition instruction and 75.63 afterward. The descriptive difference is 7.34 points. On the self-efficacy questionnaire, the mean increased from 46.26 to 53.97, a difference of 7.71 points. Both outcomes therefore moved in a favorable direction, but their numerical changes refer to different instruments and cannot be treated as equivalent quantities of learning. Table 1 summarizes the reported evidence and the appropriate interpretive boundary.

Table 1. Reported speaking and self-efficacy outcomes

| Outcome | Pretest mean | Posttest mean | Change | Interpretive boundary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Speaking performance | 68.29 | 75.63 | +7.34 | Descriptive change on the source speaking assessment; component-level change was not reported. |
| Self-efficacy | 46.26 | 53.97 | +7.71 | Descriptive change on the questionnaire scale; not directly comparable with speaking-score units. |

The speaking result is educationally encouraging because learners completed the later assessment with a higher class mean. Yet a total score does not identify whether the main change occurred in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, organization, or another criterion. Task-repetition studies caution against assuming uniform development across speaking dimensions. Ahmadian (2011) reported different patterns for complexity, accuracy, and fluency, and Khosiyono (2021) likewise found that vocational learners did not improve identically across all dimensions. The present 7.34-point gain should therefore be interpreted as improvement on the source speaking measure rather than evidence that every aspect of oral proficiency increased equally.

Immediate repetition can plausibly support performance by changing what learners must process during the second attempt. On the first performance, students must decide what to say and how to say it at nearly the same time. During a repeat, some conceptual content and sequencing have already been established, which can release attention for lexical retrieval, grammatical reformulation, pronunciation, or delivery. Bygate (2001) describes this value of task repetition as an opportunity to restructure earlier language, while de Jong and Perfetti (2011) show how repeated oral practice can contribute to fluency development and proceduralization.

This mechanism should not be confused with mechanical memorization. A second attempt becomes pedagogically useful when learners retain responsibility for communicating meaning and are able to revise part of the earlier performance. Reproducing a teacher-provided script may produce smoother delivery without demonstrating the same type of language construction. The critical classroom question is therefore what changes between attempts: wording, organization, clarity, accuracy, or simply speed. A well-designed repetition routine makes at least one of these targets visible to the learner.

Feedback can determine whether repetition becomes purposeful revision rather than simple rehearsal. Hattie and Timperley (2007) argue that effective feedback helps learners understand current performance and identify a next step. In an immediate-repetition sequence, that next step can be deliberately small: clarify one missing stage in a procedure, correct one recurring form, improve a transition, or slow down an unintelligible segment. The second attempt then provides an immediate opportunity to act on feedback rather than merely receive it.

The vocational context gives this feedback cycle a concrete communicative purpose. Procedure-oriented speaking tasks require a listener to understand sequence, reference, and the relationship among steps. A repeat can help a learner notice that a stage was omitted or a connection was ambiguous. However, the present source does not report component-level speaking scores, so it would be inappropriate to claim that

sequencing, fluency, or pronunciation specifically produced the overall increase. Those are plausible instructional mechanisms that future analytic scoring could examine.

The self-efficacy result offers a different but complementary perspective. The questionnaire mean rose from 46.26 to 53.97, indicating that learners reported stronger capability beliefs on the source instrument after the instructional period. Bandura (1997) identifies mastery experiences as a powerful source of efficacy belief. In a speaking class, an improved second attempt can provide a concrete mastery experience because the learner can compare what was difficult initially with what became more manageable after practice.

Local research supports the educational relevance of this relationship while also showing why the constructs must remain separate. Sumarsono et al. (2020) found that self-efficacy influenced speaking performance in a Task-Based Language Teaching context, but they did not reduce self-efficacy to a speaking score. Setianingsih et al. (2024) similarly reported a significant relationship between self-efficacy and senior-high-school students' speaking skills. These studies make the parallel movement in the present source theoretically plausible, but they do not establish that the 7.71-point questionnaire gain caused the 7.34-point speaking gain.

Indeed, the raw magnitudes of the two changes should not be ranked. A 7.71-point change on a questionnaire and a 7.34-point change on a speaking assessment are expressed in different units and may have different score ranges, reliability, and sensitivity. The fact that the questionnaire difference is numerically larger by 0.37 does not mean that self-efficacy developed more than speaking. A defensible interpretation is simply that both reported means increased in the same direction during the study.

The distinction between self-efficacy and general confidence also matters. Sumarsono and Amin (2019) investigated self-confidence in English learning and found improvement without a decisive treatment effect. Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022) reported that varied board-game speaking activities supported confidence and speaking-related development. These studies suggest that repeated opportunities can create a more manageable learning experience, but self-efficacy is most informative

when it is linked to a particular capability judgement—for example, whether a learner believes they can explain a procedure clearly—rather than a global statement that the learner is simply confident.

Speaking anxiety provides another reason why a second attempt may feel different from the first. Horwitz et al. (1986) conceptualized foreign-language classroom anxiety as a situation-specific affective response, and MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) showed that anxiety can influence cognitive processing during second-language performance. Learners who already know the task may face less uncertainty on the second attempt. However, immediate repetition should not be presented as an anxiety treatment unless anxiety was directly measured. In this study, self-efficacy and speaking were the documented outcomes.

UNDIKMA scholarship makes this contextual caution especially relevant. Sandiarsa et al. (2021) reported substantial speaking anxiety during rapid changes in learning conditions, while Sumarsono et al. (2021) identified lack of confidence, fear of mistakes, vocabulary limitations, proficiency, and limited practice among contributors to speaking anxiety in blended learning. Jupri et al. (2022) also addressed foreign-language anxiety within a structured cooperative speaking intervention. The common implication is that performance emerges from the interaction between task demands and classroom conditions rather than from one psychological variable in isolation.

Ariani and Tawali (2021) documented difficulties in a Speaking for Professional Context course during online learning, including challenges related to materials, task procedures, access, and learning facilities. Although their setting differs from the present vocational-school classroom, the study reinforces a useful principle: opportunities to speak are only educationally meaningful when learners understand the task and have workable conditions for completing it. Immediate repetition may be low-cost, but its instructional value still depends on task clarity and guidance.

The present result can also be compared with Indonesian task-repetition evidence outside UNDIKMA. Khosiyono (2021) examined repetitive speaking practice in a maritime vocational school and used a comparison-group design, allowing a stronger

test of task-repetition effects than the current one-group study. The findings were positive for some speaking dimensions but not for all. This difference in research design is important: it supports task repetition as a plausible explanation for development while reminding readers that the present study cannot attribute its pre-post change exclusively to repetition.

Task familiarity is one of the main alternative explanations. Arredondo-Tapia and Garcia-Ponce (2021) emphasize that content familiarity interacts with repetition in shaping fluency and accuracy. When learners repeat the same content, they may perform better because fewer conceptual decisions are required. That advantage is valuable for practice, but it also means that success on the repeated task does not automatically predict success when the topic, audience, or communicative problem changes.

The transfer question is therefore central. Ahmadian (2011) explicitly investigated whether benefits from repeated performance extended to a new task and found that transfer was not uniform across all performance dimensions. For the present study, a practical transfer task could retain the same language function while changing one meaningful element. If learners first explain one procedure, the follow-up might require explaining a different procedure with similar organizational demands. Such a task would show whether learners can reuse a speaking resource rather than only reproduce a familiar performance.

Delayed performance would add another layer of evidence. Immediate post-instruction improvement may reflect temporarily activated language, recent feedback, or memory for a practiced sequence. A later task can help distinguish that immediate advantage from more durable accessibility. De Jong and Perfetti (2011) connect fluency development with proceduralization, which implies that stable improvement should become increasingly available without recreating the exact original performance conditions. The source data do not include such a delayed measure, so retention remains an open question.

Repeated speaking also has a participation dimension. Hanan and Budiarti (2019) showed that Think-Pair-Share could improve motivation and speaking competence by creating structured opportunities to contribute. Hidayatullah and Haerazi (2022) similarly emphasized repeated oral practice through board games. Immediate repetition is different from those cooperative formats, but it shares one important function: it increases the number of purposeful occasions on which a learner produces English. Teachers should ensure that those additional occasions belong to each learner rather than being absorbed by a more proficient partner.

A useful classroom sequence can therefore include four stages: an initial performance, focused feedback or self-noticing, immediate repetition, and a related transfer task. The first attempt establishes a genuine communicative problem. Feedback identifies one manageable target. The repeat allows the learner to implement a change while the message is still familiar. The transfer task then changes the content or situation enough to require reconstruction. This sequence preserves the benefit of familiarity without allowing familiarity to become the only evidence of success.

Self-efficacy can be incorporated into the same sequence without replacing performance assessment. Before a task, learners can judge how capable they feel of completing it; after the first and second attempts, they can briefly reassess that judgement and identify what changed. Such data would allow researchers to examine calibration between perceived capability and actual performance. The current source reports class means only, so it cannot establish whether students who gained most in speaking were the same students who gained most in self-efficacy.

That missing learner-level relationship is important. Parallel class means can rise even when different subgroups are responsible for each change. Some learners may improve strongly in speaking with little change in self-efficacy, while others may feel more capable before their assessed performance changes substantially. Future analysis should therefore retain individual trajectories and, where appropriate, examine the association between change scores rather than assuming that group-level parallelism represents a direct psychological mechanism.

Assessment design should also clarify what the speaking score represents. If the rubric includes fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension, reporting component means would reveal where repetition appears most useful. If the task is a procedure text, organization and intelligibility may be particularly important. Transparent criteria also strengthen self-efficacy interpretation because learners can judge capability against observable task demands rather than an undefined idea of being 'good at speaking' (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

The one-group design remains the main methodological limitation. Improvements may reflect repetition, ordinary instruction, teacher feedback, increasing familiarity with the assessment, or other experiences occurring between the two measurement points. This does not invalidate the observed means; it limits attribution. A comparison group receiving equal practice time but a different repetition arrangement would provide stronger evidence about the specific contribution of immediate repetition.

A second limitation concerns generalization from one classroom and one instructional context. The source concerns Class X AKL 1 at SMKN 1 Dompu. Vocational students may respond differently depending on program specialization, prior proficiency, speaking-task relevance, and classroom norms. Zein et al. (2020) emphasize the contextual diversity of English education in Indonesia. The present article therefore treats the study as locally useful evidence rather than a universal estimate of the effectiveness of immediate repetition.

Despite these limitations, the study has practical value because immediate repetition is feasible in settings with limited technological resources. It does not require a specialized platform, and it can be embedded in ordinary pair, individual, or teacher-guided speaking activities. The key is to ensure that repetition involves meaningful reconstruction and targeted feedback. When used in this way, it can provide learners with a visible before-and-after experience that is relevant both to performance and to task-specific beliefs about capability.

The most defensible interpretation of the findings is therefore a combined but differentiated one. The higher speaking mean indicates better performance on the

source assessment after the instructional period. The higher self-efficacy mean indicates a more favorable pattern of capability judgement on the source questionnaire. Task-repetition theory and local UNDIKMA research provide plausible explanations for why these outcomes can develop together. Nevertheless, transfer, retention, component-level speaking change, and the learner-level relation between performance and self-efficacy remain empirical questions for a stronger follow-up design.

## CONCLUSION

The source reports a speaking mean increase from 68.29 to 75.63 and a self-efficacy increase from 46.26 to 53.97. These outcomes represent different constructs and should remain analytically separate. Immediate repetition offers a practical opportunity for learners to revise a familiar speaking task and experience manageable success, but the one-group design does not isolate its causal effect. Teachers should combine repetition with specific feedback and a modified transfer task. Future research should add comparison conditions, component-level speaking scores, learner-level self-efficacy trajectories, and delayed performance on unfamiliar but comparable tasks.

## REFERENCES

Ahmadian, M. J. (2011). The effect of 'massed' task repetitions on complexity, accuracy and fluency: Does it transfer to a new task? The Language Learning Journal, 39(3), 269–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2010.545239

Ariani, S., & Tawali, T. (2021). Problems of online learning during Covid-19 pandemic in Speaking for Professional Context class. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 8(1), 32–37. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v8i1.3783

Arredondo-Tapia, D. I., & Garcia-Ponce, E. E. (2021). Role of task repetition and content familiarity in EFL students' fluency and accuracy in narrative tasks: A case study. Journal of Language and Education, 7(2), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11202

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

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing (pp. 23–48). Longman.

de Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. Language Learning, 61(2), 533–568. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00620.x

Hanan, A., & Budiarti, H. A. (2019). Improving students' motivation and speaking competence by using Think-Pair-Share strategy. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 6(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v6i1.2349

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

Khosiyono, B. H. C. (2021). The effect of task tepetition on complexity, accuracy, and fluency of Indonesian maritime vocational school students' speaking performance. EDULANGUE, 4(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v4i1.3105

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., Clément, R., Dörnyei, 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

Sandiarsa, K. D., Bagis, A. K., & Sumarsono, D. (2021). The rapid learning shift in the time of Covid-19: Exploring the EFL learners' speaking anxiety. Cordova Journal, 11(2), 154–172. https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v11i2.4553

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

Suadiyatno, T., Firman, E., Hanan, A., & Sumarsono, D. (2020). Examining the effect of contextual teaching-learning and anxiety towards students' speaking skills. Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(1), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i1.2266

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

Sumarsono, D., Haryadi, H., & Bagis, A. K. (2021). When blended learning is forced in the amid of Covid-19: What happen on EFL learners' speaking anxiety? JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 9(3), 305–315. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v9i3.3906

Sumarsono, D., Muliani, M., & Bagis, A. K. (2020). The forecasting power of Task-Based Language Teaching and self-efficacy on students' speaking performance. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(4), 412–421. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2848

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