

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

#### **A. Approach and Type of Research**

This study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational research design. The selection of this approach and research design is based on its suitability for the research objectives, namely to identify and measure the relationship between two predetermined variables. The quantitative approach was chosen because it allows researchers to operationalize psychological phenomena and subjective perceptions, in this case anxiety about speaking a foreign language and perceptions of oral communication ability, into numerical data that can be measured, calculated, and analyzed statistically. This approach provides a systematic and structured framework for testing relationships between variables based on objective empirical data. As emphasized by Creswell, (2014) quantitative research focuses on measuring variables and testing relationships between variables using statistical procedures, which allow for the generalization of findings from the sample to the population.

The main characteristics of the quantitative approach in this study include the use of standardized instruments in the form of questionnaires with clear measurement scales, data collection from a large number of respondents to enable statistical analysis, data analysis using appropriate statistical techniques to test research hypotheses, and presentation of results in the form of numbers, tables, and statistics that can be measured objectively. Correlational research was specifically chosen because it was appropriate for the research objective, which was to identify the existence, strength, and direction of the relationship between the variables of speech anxiety (independent variable) and perceived oral communication ability (dependent variable). Correlational research aims to reveal the degree of association between two or more variables without manipulating those variables. This is in line with this study, in which the researcher observed both variables as they

were in their natural setting without providing any specific intervention or treatment.

It is important to emphasize that this correlational study does not aim to prove a causal relationship between speaking anxiety and perceptions of oral communication skills. As explained by (Sugiyono, 2013), correlational research can only show that two variables are related, but cannot determine whether one variable causes a change in the other variable. The interpretation of the results of this study will focus on the identified relationship patterns, while remaining aware that other factors outside the scope of the study may also influence the relationship.

Thus, the combination of quantitative approaches and correlational research provides a strong methodological basis for answering research questions regarding the relationship between speaking anxiety and perceptions of oral communication skills among fourth-semester students in the English Language Education Study Program at UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu.

#### **B. Research Location and Time**

This study will be conducted at the English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Tadris, Fatmawati Sukarno State Islamic University Bengkulu. The selection of this location is based on methodological considerations that support the internal and external validity of the study. In terms of curriculum, the English Language Education Study Program focuses primarily on developing English oral communication skills, with core courses such as Speaking, Listening and Speaking, and Public Speaking. This academic context creates an environment in which the two research variables anxiety about speaking a foreign language and perceptions of oral communication skills arise naturally. Therefore, students' responses to the questionnaire will be based on authentic learning experiences, thereby increasing the ecological validity of the data.

This location also guarantees systematic access to the target research population, namely fourth-semester students who are homogeneous in terms of academic level, curriculum background, and exposure to language learning.

This homogeneity allows for the control of external confounding variables that could potentially affect the relationship between the two research variables. Data collection will utilize existing academic infrastructure, conducted offline in classrooms during lectures and online through the study program's official communication channels. This approach ensures a high level of participation while maintaining data validity because it is collected in the context where the research phenomenon actually occurs.

This research will be conducted in the odd semester of the 2026/2027 academic year, with several stages, namely preparation and licensing, testing the validity and reliability of instruments, collecting primary data, processing and analyzing data, and compiling the results of the report. The selection of the odd semester of the 2026/2027 academic year is based on the consideration that fourth-semester students during this period have passed the initial adaptation period and are actively involved in learning speaking skills, so that the research phenomenon can be observed more clearly. Research at this location and time is expected to produce findings that are not only methodologically valid but also contextually relevant to the development of the learning process in the English Language Education Study Program at UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu.

### **C. Research Design**

This study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational (ex post facto) design. Taherdoost, (2022) defines quantitative ex post facto as a method that uses numerical values from observations to explain and describe observed phenomena. This approach was chosen because it allows psychological variables, such as speech anxiety and perceived oral communication competence, to be measured as numerical data that can be analyzed statistically. Furthermore, Ghanad, (2023) explains that correlational research is an effort to identify relationships between variables, where changes in one variable are related to changes in another variable.

Ex post facto research is research conducted by examining events that have already occurred, then collecting and analyzing data to investigate

possible cause-and-effect relationships (Sugiyono, 2017). In this context, researchers do not manipulate independent variables, but rather measure these variables as they exist in the research subjects at the time of data collection. This design is appropriate because the two variables studied are psychological in nature and have been experienced by students in the context of natural learning in the classroom. The focus of this study is on measuring, statistically analyzing, and interpreting the relationship between the two variables.

Based on this design, the researcher's role is limited to observing, measuring through standardized instruments, and analyzing the statistical relationship between speaking anxiety and the perception of oral communication competence that has been attached to the research subjects. This design allows the research to answer the question: Is there a significant correlation between the level of speaking anxiety and the level of perceived oral communication competence in fourth-semester students of the English Education Study Program at UINFAS Bengkulu? Thus, this study is expected to provide an empirical description of the affective dynamics in English speaking learning and become the basis for developing a more psychologically sensitive pedagogical approach.

#### **D. Population and Sample**

##### **1. Population**

The population in this study was all fourth-semester English students at UIN Fatmawati Soekarno Bengkulu who were assumed to have passed the academic adaptation period in the first and second semesters and had acquired basic English language skills. At this level, the demand for active oral communication usually increases along with taking more complex speaking skills courses, so that the phenomena of speaking anxiety and variations in oral communication skills are considered to emerge more clearly. Stratton, (2023) states that the population is the entire group of subjects that is the main target of research to obtain representative and meaningful data.

Table 3. 1 Population of the Research

| Number | Class   | Men | Women | Total |
|--------|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| 1.     | 4A      | 2   | 15    | 17    |
| 2.     | 4B      | 2   | 15    | 17    |
| 3.     | 4C      | 4   | 13    | 17    |
| 4.     | 4D      | 5   | 11    | 16    |
| TOTAL  | 4 Class | 13  | 54    | 67    |

Uinfas Bengkulu, 2026

Based on the table above, the population in this study consisted of all fourth-semester English students at UIN Fatmawati Soekarno Bengkulu, spread across four classes, namely 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D. There are a total of 67 students, consisting of 13 males and 54 females. This number reflects the entire subject population targeted by the study, in accordance with the concept of population as a group of individuals with specific characteristics to be studied comprehensively in order to obtain representative data.

## 2. Sample

In research, a sample is a part of the population selected for study. According to Ahmed, (2024) a sample is a part or subset of the target population selected to be the object of observation in a study so that researchers can make conclusion or generalizations about that population. The technique used for sampling is purposive sampling, which is a technique for determining the sample based on certain consideration (Sugiyono, 2013). The sample was selected from fourth-semester students who were taking public speaking courses in the odd semester of the 2026/2027 academic year. This selection criterion was based on the consideration that public speaking courses directly require students to engage in formal speaking activities in front of an audience, so that symptoms of speaking anxiety and perception of oral communication competence are more observable and contextual.

Table 3. 2 Sample of the Research

| Number | Class   | Total |
|--------|---------|-------|
| 1.     | 4A      | 17    |
| 2.     | 4B      | 17    |
| 3.     | 4C      | 17    |
| 4.     | 4D      | 16    |
| TOTAL  | 4 Class | 67    |

Uinfas Bengkulu, 2026

Of the total population of 67 fourth-semester students, the research sample consisted of all students who were registered and actively attending public speaking courses. The final sample size will be adjusted according to the number of students who meet these criteria at the time of data collection. Sampling using this technique is expected to produce data that is more focused, contextual, and in line with the research objective of analyzing the correlation between speaking anxiety and perceptions of oral communication competence in a specific academic setting.

#### E. Operational Definition of Variables

Research variables are anything that researchers decide to study to get info about it and then draw conclusions (Sugiyono, 2013). Independent variables are variables that influence or cause changes or the emergence of dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2013). Meanwhile, a dependent variable is a variable that is influenced or is the result of the independent variable (Sugiyono, 2013). These variables have characteristics or values that become the focus of the researcher's attention in order to study them and draw conclusions. These variables are as follows:

##### 1. Speaking Anxiety (X)

Toyama & Yamazaki, (2021) state that speech anxiety is an emotional barrier that limits students' ability to process information and actively participate in oral communication. This barrier operates on a psychological level, often triggering a fight-or-flight response that diverts cognitive resources from language formation to stress management. As a result, anxious students may experience mental blocks, decreased verbal output, and avoidance of speaking situations, which ultimately hinders their language learning process and communicative abilities.

## **2. Perception of Oral Communication Skills (Y)**

Perceptions of oral communication skills refer to a person's subjective assessment of their ability to communicate effectively and appropriately through spoken language in various contexts. This is a psychological construct that reflects a person's self-confidence, self-efficacy, and self-assessment of their oral communication skills, rather than an objective measurement of actual performance.

## **F. Data Collection Technique**

This study uses a survey technique with a closed questionnaire as the main data collection tool. This technique was chosen because of its ability to collect data systematically and efficiently from a large number of respondents, as well as its suitability for correlational quantitative research aimed at identifying relationships between variables. Surveys enable the standardized measurement of self-perception-based psychological variables, which can then be converted into numerical data for statistical analysis (Sugiyono, 2013). The data collection process was carried out through a structured procedure in three main stages:

### **1. Adaptation and Development of the Initial Instrument**

The researcher drafted an initial questionnaire consisting of 100 items based on indicators from two main theories. For the speaking anxiety variable (X), the researcher adapted the theory from Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), known as the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), by developing 50 statement items. For the variable of perceived

oral communication competence (Y), the researcher adapted the theory from McCroskey and McCroskey (1988), known as the Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) Scale, by developing 50 statement items. These 100 items were intentionally developed in excess (over-sampling of items) with the aim of comprehensively covering all possible manifestations of both constructs, anticipating the elimination of items during validity testing so that sufficient items meeting statistical criteria would remain, and capturing specific contextual nuances within the academic environment of UINFAS Bengkulu.

## **2. Logical Validation (Expert Judgment)**

Before the instrument was field-tested, the researcher conducted logical validation, also known as expert judgment. This validation aimed to ensure that each statement item was theoretically and conceptually aligned with the indicators to be measured, prior to the instrument's statistical testing. Logical validation was conducted by a single expert in the field a faculty member specializing in research methodology who is also an expert in the English language. This lecturer is responsible for assessing the alignment of each item with the theoretical indicators, compliance with instrument development guidelines, and the appropriateness of the measurement scale. Additionally, they evaluate the relevance of the statement content to the constructs of speaking anxiety and perceived oral communication competence, the clarity of the wording, and the contextual suitability for the characteristics of UINFAS Bengkulu students. The expert recommended which items should be retained, revised, or eliminated. Based on the expert's input, the researcher revised the items deemed less appropriate. The revised questionnaire draft was then deemed logically sound to proceed to the pilot testing phase.

## **3. Instrument Pilot Study**

The instrument, which had passed logical validation by expert and contained 100 items, was then pilot-tested on 20 fourth-semester students

who were not part of the target population. A sample size of 20 participants was necessary because the large number of items required sufficient data for statistical analysis. The pilot test was conducted in a single dedicated session lasting 60 minutes, with a brief break at the 30-minute mark to prevent respondent fatigue. The researcher was assisted by one person during the pilot test to provide technical clarification if any items were not understood by the respondents. The objectives of this pilot test were to assess the clarity of each item's wording from the respondents' perspective, identify ambiguous or difficult-to-understand items, measure the actual completion time, and collect preliminary data for statistical validity testing.

#### **4. Statistical Validation**

After the data from the pilot study was collected, the researchers conducted statistical validation using item validity tests. The technique used was Pearson's product-moment correlation between the score of each item and the total score of its variable. The analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. Based on the results of the validity test, out of the 100 items tested, 50 items were deemed valid because they met the criterion of calculated  $r > \text{table } r$  (0.468) at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and a  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ . These 50 valid items consist of 26 items for the speaking anxiety variable (X) and 24 items for the perceived oral communication competence variable (Y). Thus, all items declared valid will be used in the final questionnaire without further selection. This decision was made because all items are statistically valid and are considered capable of comprehensively measuring the targeted constructs.

#### **5. Finalization of the Instrument**

The researchers developed a final printed questionnaire consisting of three sections. Section A contains demographic data on the respondents, including gender and grade level. Section B contains 26 statements to

measure speaking anxiety (all valid items from variable X). Section C contains 24 statements to measure perceived oral communication competence (all valid items from variable Y). Thus, the total number of items in the final questionnaire is 50. This final questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale for Sections B and C, with a response range from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

## **6. Conducting the main survey**

The main survey was conducted offline during regular class hours within the English Language Education Study Program at UINFAS Bengkulu. Prior to the survey, the researcher submitted an official permission letter to the study program and coordinated with the course instructors to schedule the survey sessions. On the day of the survey, the researcher began with a 5-minute briefing session using the same standard script for all classes. During this briefing, the researcher explained the research objectives, data confidentiality guarantees, the voluntary nature of participation, the assurance that responses would not affect course grades, and the respondents' right to withdraw at any time without consequences. Afterward, respondents were asked to sign a separate informed consent form from the questionnaire to ensure anonymity. The final questionnaire, consisting of 50 items, was then distributed and completed independently by the respondents. The time required to complete the final questionnaire was approximately 30 to 40 minutes. The researcher and one assistant were present during the completion process to provide technical clarification without influencing the respondents' answers. Upon completion, the questionnaires were collected directly by the researcher in sealed envelopes.

## **7. Data management and documentation**

All data collected, both from the pilot study and the main survey, were managed according to a structured protocol. Paper questionnaires were stored in a locked cabinet and assigned unique identification codes

without including the respondents' names to ensure anonymity. Data entry was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 via a double-entry procedure, in which data was entered twice by different researchers to minimize input errors. After data entry was completed, a data cleaning process was conducted to check for outliers, inconsistencies, and invalid values. The cleaned dataset was stored on the researcher's password-protected personal computer and also backed up to cloud storage (Google Drive) equipped with two-factor authentication for additional security. Access to the data is restricted to the researcher and the supervising professor only. The entire procedure, from start to finish, is documented in detail in a research logbook for audit purposes and academic transparency.

#### **G. Research Instrument**

This study used questionnaires as the main data collection tool. The measurement tools used were not developed by the researchers themselves, but adopted two psychometric scales that have been tested for validity and reliability internationally, and have been widely used in similar research contexts. Therefore, all questions on speaking anxiety and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC) did not need to be validated again. The use of these standard measuring instruments aims to ensure the accuracy of variable measurement and facilitate comparison of results with previous studies. The two measuring instruments are described as follows:

##### **1. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)**

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLACS) developed by Elaine K. Horwitz, Michael B. Horwitz, and Joann Cope (1986) is the most popular instrument used to measure student anxiety in learning foreign languages. The following is a complete guide on how to use and calculate FLACS score.

##### **a. Understanding the FLACS structure**

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLACS) consists of 33 statements covering three main components of language anxiety, namely Communication Apprehension, such as fear of

communicating with others; Test Anxiety, such as fear of failure in test evaluations; and Fear of Negative Evaluation, such as fear of being looked down upon or corrected by teachers and friends.

**b. Likert scale format**

Respondents were asked to answer each statement using a 5-point Likert scale with the following response options: 1 Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral, 4 Agree (A), and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

**c. Scoring Procedure**

In FLACS, there are positive statements that indicate anxiety and negative/reverse statements that indicate self-confidence. Researchers must be careful in assigning points:

1) Standard Statement (Anxiety)

- a) Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 2, and Strongly Disagree = 1
- b) Example item: “I tremble when I know that I will be called upon to speak in English class.”

2) Reverse Scoring

- a) Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 4, and Strongly Disagree = 5
- b) Item numbers: 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 28, and 32
- c) Example item: “I feel comfortable speaking in English class.”

**b. Score Categories**

After all points are added up, the total score will range from 33 to 165. The higher the score, the higher the student's anxiety level. Based on Oetting's criteria in related studies, anxiety levels are usually divided as follows:

Table 3. 3 Score Categories

| Number | Score Range | Anxiety Level |
|--------|-------------|---------------|
|--------|-------------|---------------|

|    |           |                |
|----|-----------|----------------|
| 1. | >124      | Very Anxious   |
| 2. | 108 – 124 | Anxious        |
| 3. | 87 – 107  | Mildly Anxious |
| 4. | 70 – 86   | Relaxed        |
| 5. | <70       | Very Relaxed   |

Sources: Oetting's Scale (Oetting, 1983)

## 2. Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) Scale

The Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) scale developed by McCroskey and Richmond, often associated with the publication McCroskey & McCroskey (1988), is used to measure how competent a person perceives themselves to be in various communication situations. Unlike FLACS, which uses a Likert scale (1-5), SPCC uses percentages to provide a more detailed picture of respondents' self-confidence.

### a. SPCC Scale Structure

Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) consists of 12 statements covering a combination of 4 communication contexts, namely public speaking, meetings, small groups, and face-to-face/two people (dyad), and 3 types of interlocutors, namely strangers, acquaintances, and friends.

### b. How to fill it out

Respondents are asked to give a score between 0 and 100 for each statement, where 0 = Completely Incompetent and 100 = Competent.

### c. How to calculate the score

The SPCC score is divided into several sub-scores to see in which areas a person feels most or least competent:

- 1) Context Subscores

To calculate this, add up the points for the following numbers and divide by 3:

- a) Public Speaking:  $(\text{Items } 1+8+12) \div 3$
- b) Meetings:  $(\text{Items } 3+6+10) \div 3$
- c) Group:  $(\text{Items } 4+9+11) \div 3$
- d) Dyad (Face-to-Face):  $(\text{Items } 2 +5+7) \div 3$

2) Receiver Subscores

Add up the points for the following numbers and divide by 4:

- a) Stranger:  $(\text{Item } 1+4+7+10) \div 4$
  - b) Acquaintance:  $(\text{Item } 2+6+9+12) \div 4$
  - c) Friends:  $(\text{Item } 3+5+8+11) \div 4$
- 3) SPCC Total Score

To obtain an overall communication competency score:  
Add the three sub-scores for each conversation partner (Stranger + Acquaintance + Friend) and divide by 3.

4) Score Interpretation

The final result will be in the range of 0-100. Here are the general norms for interpreting the total score:

- a) Score  $> 82$ : High perceived communication competency.
- b) Score  $68$ : Low perceived communication competency.
- c) Score  $68-82$ : Moderate/Average communication competency.

**d. SPCC Instrument (12 statements):**

- 1) Speaking in public (presentation) in front of a group of strangers.
- 2) Face-to-face conversation (two people) with an acquaintance.
- 3) Speaking in a meeting with a group of friends.
- 4) Speaking in a small group of strangers.

- 5) Face-to-face conversation (two people) with a friend.
- 6) Speaking in a meeting with a group of acquaintances.
- 7) Face-to-face conversation (two people) with a stranger.
- 8) Public speaking (presentation) in front of a group of friends.
- 9) Speaking in a small group of acquaintances.
- 10) Speaking in a meeting with a group of strangers.
- 11) Speaking in a small group of friends.
- 12) Speaking in public (presentation) in front of a group of acquaintances.

## H. Data Analysis Techniques

This study aims to examine the relationship between the variables of speaking anxiety (X) and perceived oral communication competence (Y) among fourth-semester students of the English Education Study Program at UINFAS Bengkulu. Data analysis was conducted quantitatively using an inferential statistical approach with IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. The analysis process was carried out in three systematic stages as follows:

### 1. Validity of the test

Before conducting the study, the researchers first assessed the validity of the instrument. According to Ansari & Khan, (2023), validity is the extent to which a test measures what it is intended to measure. In addition, the researchers also analyzed the data using statistical software such as SPSS version 25. The following are the results of the data analysis from the instrument validity test.

Table 3. 4 Instrument Validity

| Variable                | Item | r<br>Table | r<br>count | Result  |
|-------------------------|------|------------|------------|---------|
| <i>Speaking Anxiety</i> | P1   | 0,468      | 0,696      | Valid   |
|                         | P2   | 0,468      | 0,760      | Valid   |
|                         | P3   | 0,468      | 0,121      | Invalid |

|  |     |       |       |         |
|--|-----|-------|-------|---------|
|  | P4  | 0,468 | 0,545 | Valid   |
|  | P5  | 0,468 | 0,345 | Unvalid |
|  | P6  | 0,468 | 0,069 | Unvalid |
|  | P7  | 0,468 | 0,480 | Valid   |
|  | P8  | 0,468 | 0,530 | Valid   |
|  | P9  | 0,468 | 0,166 | Unvalid |
|  | P10 | 0,468 | 0,512 | Valid   |
|  | P11 | 0,468 | 0,636 | Valid   |
|  | P12 | 0,468 | 0,120 | Unvalid |
|  | P13 | 0,468 | 0,622 | Valid   |
|  | P14 | 0,468 | 0,535 | Valid   |
|  | P15 | 0,468 | 0,783 | Valid   |
|  | P16 | 0,468 | 0,498 | Valid   |
|  | P17 | 0,468 | 0,423 | Unvalid |
|  | P18 | 0,468 | 0,446 | Unvalid |
|  | P19 | 0,468 | 0,350 | Unvalid |
|  | P20 | 0,468 | 0,535 | Valid   |
|  | P21 | 0,468 | 0,098 | Unvalid |
|  | P22 | 0,468 | 0,453 | Unvalid |
|  | P23 | 0,468 | 0,601 | Valid   |
|  | P24 | 0,468 | 0,085 | Unvalid |
|  | P25 | 0,468 | 0,698 | Valid   |
|  | P26 | 0,468 | 0,404 | Unvalid |
|  | P27 | 0,468 | 0,246 | Unvalid |
|  | P28 | 0,468 | 0,174 | Unvalid |
|  | P29 | 0,468 | 0,142 | Unvalid |
|  | P30 | 0,468 | 0,451 | Unvalid |
|  | P31 | 0,468 | 0,568 | Valid   |
|  | P32 | 0,468 | 0,142 | Unvalid |
|  | P33 | 0,468 | 0,521 | Valid   |

|  |     |       |       |         |
|--|-----|-------|-------|---------|
|  | P34 | 0,468 | 0,536 | Valid   |
|  | P35 | 0,468 | 0,414 | Unvalid |
|  | P36 | 0,468 | 0,105 | Unvalid |
|  | P37 | 0,468 | 0,632 | Valid   |
|  | P38 | 0,468 | 0,612 | Valid   |
|  | P39 | 0,468 | 0,623 | Valid   |
|  | P40 | 0,468 | 0,345 | Unvalid |
|  | P41 | 0,468 | 0,228 | Unvalid |
|  | P42 | 0,468 | 0,694 | Valid   |
|  | P43 | 0,468 | 0,602 | Valid   |
|  | P44 | 0,468 | 0,399 | Unvalid |
|  | P45 | 0,468 | 0,076 | Unvalid |
|  | P46 | 0,468 | 0,339 | Unvalid |
|  | P47 | 0,468 | 0,614 | Valid   |
|  | P48 | 0,468 | 0,670 | Valid   |
|  | P49 | 0,468 | 0,684 | Valid   |
|  | P50 | 0,468 | 0,493 | Valid   |
|  | P51 | 0,468 | 0,493 | Valid   |
|  | P52 | 0,468 | 0,482 | Valid   |
|  | P53 | 0,468 | 0,337 | Unvalid |
|  | P54 | 0,468 | 0,079 | Unvalid |
|  | P55 | 0,468 | 0,412 | Unvalid |
|  | P56 | 0,468 | 0,019 | Unvalid |
|  | P57 | 0,468 | 0,586 | Valid   |
|  | P58 | 0,468 | 0,177 | Unvalid |
|  | P59 | 0,468 | 0,329 | Unvalid |
|  | P60 | 0,468 | 0,729 | Valid   |
|  | P61 | 0,468 | 0,717 | Valid   |
|  | P62 | 0,468 | 0,620 | Valid   |
|  | P63 | 0,468 | 0,482 | Valid   |

|  |     |       |       |         |
|--|-----|-------|-------|---------|
|  | P64 | 0,468 | 0,605 | Valid   |
|  | P65 | 0,468 | 0,328 | Unvalid |
|  | P66 | 0,468 | 0,131 | Unvalid |
|  | P67 | 0,468 | 0,167 | Unvalid |
|  | P68 | 0,468 | 0,033 | Unvalid |
|  | P69 | 0,468 | 0,637 | Valid   |
|  | P70 | 0,468 | 0,386 | Unvalid |
|  | P71 | 0,468 | 0,603 | Valid   |
|  | P72 | 0,468 | 0,410 | Unvalid |
|  | P73 | 0,468 | 0,521 | Valid   |
|  | P74 | 0,468 | 0,246 | Unvalid |
|  | P75 | 0,468 | 0,593 | Valid   |
|  | P76 | 0,468 | 0,168 | Unvalid |
|  | P77 | 0,468 | 0,032 | Unvalid |
|  | P78 | 0,468 | 0,225 | Unvalid |
|  | P79 | 0,468 | 0,249 | Unvalid |
|  | P80 | 0,468 | 0,578 | Valid   |
|  | P81 | 0,468 | 0,587 | Valid   |
|  | P82 | 0,468 | 0,527 | Valid   |
|  | P83 | 0,468 | 0,349 | Unvalid |
|  | P84 | 0,468 | 0,450 | Unvalid |
|  | P85 | 0,468 | 0,490 | Valid   |
|  | P86 | 0,468 | 0,381 | Unvalid |
|  | P87 | 0,468 | 0,614 | Valid   |
|  | P88 | 0,468 | 0,321 | Unvalid |
|  | P89 | 0,468 | 0,774 | Valid   |
|  | P90 | 0,468 | 0,401 | Unvalid |
|  | P91 | 0,468 | 0,577 | Valid   |
|  | P92 | 0,468 | 0,520 | Valid   |
|  | P93 | 0,468 | 0,653 | Valid   |

|  |      |       |       |         |
|--|------|-------|-------|---------|
|  | P94  | 0,468 | 0,381 | Unvalid |
|  | P95  | 0,468 | 0,383 | Unvalid |
|  | P96  | 0,468 | 0,514 | Valid   |
|  | P97  | 0,468 | 0,474 | Valid   |
|  | P98  | 0,468 | 0,349 | Unvalid |
|  | P99  | 0,468 | 0,138 | Unvalid |
|  | P100 | 0,468 | 0,520 | Valid   |

In this validity test, the researcher used 100 statements with predetermined indicators, and the instrument was tested at Prof. Dr. Hazairin, SH University (UNIHAZ Bengkulu), which holds an accreditation level equivalent to that of the main research site, namely Fatmawati Sukarno State Islamic University of Bengkulu (UINFAS Bengkulu). This pilot study involved 20 students as test subjects for the questionnaire. After the pilot study was completed, the researcher analyzed the validity of each statement. The analysis revealed that 50 of the 100 statements tested were deemed valid based on the following indicators:

Table 3. 5 Indicators of Validity Test

| No | Statement                                                                 | Indicator                  |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | I feel nervous when I have to start a conversation in English in class    | Communication Apprehension |
| 2. | My heart races when the professor asks me to speak English off the cuff   | Communication Apprehension |
| 3. | I feel anxious when I have to speak English without any prior preparation | Communication Apprehension |

|     |                                                                                                    |                                |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 4.  | I have trouble finding the right words when speaking English                                       | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 5.  | I feel panicked when I have to express my opinion in English in class                              | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 6.  | I'd rather stay silent than speak English in class because I feel incapable                        | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 7.  | I feel my hands shake when I'm asked to come to the front of the class for an English presentation | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 8.  | I feel anxious when I have to answer the professor's questions in English                          | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 9.  | I avoid situations that require me to speak English in class                                       | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 10. | I feel my voice tremble when speaking English in public                                            | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 11. | I feel like my tongue is tied (it's hard to move) when I have to speak English suddenly            | Communication<br>Apprehension  |
| 12. | I'm worried my classmates will laugh at me when I speak English                                    | Fear of Negative<br>Evaluation |
| 13. | I'm worried my professor will think I'm stupid because of the mistakes I make when speaking        | Fear of Negative<br>Evaluation |
| 14. | I'm afraid the professor will grade me lower because of my limited English speaking skills         | Fear of Negative<br>Evaluation |

|     |                                                                                                    |                             |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 15. | I feel that the professor will get angry if I can't answer the question in English                 | Fear of Negative Evaluation |
| 16. | I'm worried my classmates will talk about my speaking weaknesses behind my back                    | Fear of Negative Evaluation |
| 17. | I'm afraid the professor will compare my speaking skills to those of other students who are better | Fear of Negative Evaluation |
| 18. | I feel very nervous when taking the English speaking exam                                          | Test Anxiety                |
| 19. | I'm worried I'll get a bad grade on the speaking exam                                              | Test Anxiety                |
| 20. | During the speaking exam, I suddenly forgot the words I had actually memorized                     | Test Anxiety                |
| 21. | I felt dizzy and nervous a few days before the speaking exam took place                            | Test Anxiety                |
| 22. | I'm afraid I won't be able to answer the professor's questions during the speaking exam            | Test Anxiety                |
| 23. | I have trouble sleeping the night before my English speaking exam                                  | Test Anxiety                |
| 24. | My palms get sweaty while waiting for my turn during the speaking exam                             | Test Anxiety                |
| 25. | I feel that the speaking exam doesn't reflect my true ability because of my nervousness            | Test Anxiety                |
| 26. | I always compare my speaking scores with my friends' after the exam                                | Test Anxiety                |

|     |                                                                                                              |                        |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 27. | I am able to give presentations in English to people I don't know very well                                  | Public – Stranger      |
| 28. | I feel confident when I have to speak in public in English, even if the audience consists of strangers       | Public – Stranger      |
| 29. | Giving presentations in English in front of the class is something I'm good at                               | Public – Acquaintance  |
| 30. | I can speak in public in English quite well when my audience consists of close friends                       | Public – Friend        |
| 31. | I am able to speak in public in English without feeling awkward when I am with close friends                 | Public – Friend        |
| 32. | I can convey my ideas clearly during an English presentation in front of my classmates                       | Public – Friend        |
| 33. | I am able to express my opinions in English at meetings attended by many people I don't know                 | Meeting – Stranger     |
| 34. | Speaking in large meetings with foreign participants in English is no problem for me                         | Meeting – Stranger     |
| 35. | I can contribute to large class discussions in English                                                       | Meeting – Acquaintance |
| 36. | I feel confident participating actively in campus organization meetings conducted in English with my friends | Meeting – Friend       |

|     |                                                                                           |                      |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 37. | My ability to speak in English-language organizational meetings is quite good             | Meeting – Friend     |
| 38. | I can hold a conversation in English with a small group of people I haven't met before    | Group – Stranger     |
| 39. | Speaking in an English language study group with my classmates is easy                    | Group – Acquaintance |
| 40. | My ability to participate in small-group discussions in English in class is quite good    | Group – Acquaintance |
| 41. | I am able to express my ideas in small-group discussions in class without feeling awkward | Group – Acquaintance |
| 42. | I feel confident during group discussions in English with my classmates                   | Group – Friend       |
| 43. | Having small-group discussions with close friends in English is fun for me                | Group – Friend       |
| 44. | I can speak one-on-one in English with foreign tourists without feeling nervous           | Dyad – Stranger      |
| 45. | I feel confident when introducing myself to international students in English             | Dyad – Stranger      |
| 46. | I can conduct an interview in English with someone I don't know                           | Dyad – Stranger      |
| 47. | I am proficient in conversational English with my academic advisor                        | Dyad – Acquaintance  |

|     |                                                                                     |                     |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 48. | I am able to answer the professor's questions in English effectively                | Dyad – Acquaintance |
| 49. | I can chat in English with close friends about a variety of topics                  | Dyad – Friend       |
| 50. | Talking to classmates in English about collage assignments is a normal thing for me | Dyad – Friend       |

## 2. Reliability of the test

According to William, (2024) Reliability refers to the consistency and stability of the results obtained from a study. A study is considered reliable if it produces consistent results under the same conditions and over time. After testing the questionnaire statements, there were statements that met the validity criteria; therefore, after the validity test the next step is the reliability test. Reliability is measured using Cronbach's Alpha; if the Cronbach's Alpha value is greater than the r-table value, then the variable can be said to be reliable.

Table 3. 6 Test Instrument Reliability Criteria

| No | Cronbach's Alpha | Reliability Level |
|----|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | 0,00 – 0,20      | Lack of Reliabel  |
| 2. | 0,20 – 0,40      | Somewhat Reliabel |
| 3. | 0,40 – 0,60      | Fairly Reliabel   |
| 4. | 0,60 – 0,80      | Reliabel          |
| 5. | 0,80 – 1,00      | Highly Reliabel   |

Source: Nuzulia, 2019

The researcher analyzed reliability values using SPSS version 25. This reliability test was conducted to determine whether the research instrument produced consistent results. The calculations used the Cronbach's alpha method, which measures the extent to which the items

in the instrument are related to one another. The calculation results show the reliability coefficient values (Cronbach's alpha) as follows:

Table 3. 7 Instrument Reliability

| Reliability Statistics |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | N of Items |
| 0.963                  | 50         |

In this reliability test, the researcher used 50 statements with predefined indicators, and the instrument was tested at Prof. Dr. Hazairin, SH University Bengkulu (UNIHAZ Bengkulu), which of course has the same accreditation as the university that will be the main research location, namely Fatmawati Sukarno State Islamic University Bengkulu (UINFAS Bengkulu). This trial involved 20 students as subjects for testing the instrument. After the trial was completed, the researcher analyzed the data by calculating the test results to determine reliability. After processing the questionnaire reliability data, the reliability test coefficient was 0.963, which, based on the category above that an item is considered highly reliable if it reaches a value of 0,600 or higher (Setyaedhi, 2024), indicates that this test can be assumed to have a good level of reliability.

Before conducting hypothesis testing, prerequisite tests are first carried out to ensure that the data meets the assumptions required in parametric correlation analysis. Prerequisite tests include:

**a. Normality Test**

According to Manik et al., (2023), a Normality Test is an examination conducted to assess the distribution of data within a dataset or variable, whether that data distribution is normal or not. This test is performed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test at a significance level

of  $\alpha = 0,05$ . Data are considered normally distributed if the significance value (p-value)  $> 0,05$ .

#### **b. Linearity Test**

Susanto & Badrun Taman, (2025) state that a linearity test is conducted to determine whether there is a linear relationship between the dependent variable and each independent variable to be tested. Used to test the correlation between variables X and Y. Testing is conducted through a Linearity Test using the ANOVA method in simple regression analysis. The correlation is considered linear if the Deviation from Linearity significance value is  $> 0.05$ . If the data does not meet the requirements of normality or linearity, non-parametric analysis will be used.

### **3. Hypothesis Testing**

If the Pearson correlation coefficient is positive by comparing the r table and r count, if the r count is greater than the r table, then there is a positive and significant relationship between Speaking Anxiety and SPCC.

### **4. Interpretation of Results**

In this study, the direction of the relationship between variable X (Speaking Anxiety) dan variable Y (Perceived oral communication competence) can be identified through two possible directions, namely:

#### **a. Positive Correlation**

According to Susanto & Badrun Taman, (2025), a positive correlation is a change in one variable that is followed by a change in the other variable in the same direction. In other words, if the value of variable X (Speaking Anxiety) increases, then the value of variable Y (Perceived Oral Communication Competence) will also increase. Conversely, if X decreases, Y will also decrease. This relationship indicates that the two variables move in the same direction and consistently. A positive correlation is indicated by a correlation coefficient with a positive sign (+).

#### **b. Negative Correlation**

According to Susanto & Badrun Taman, (2025), a negative correlation is a change in one variable that follows the other variable

regularly but in the opposite direction. In other words, if the value of variable X (Speaking Anxiety) increases, the value of variable Y (Perceived Oral Communication Competence) will decrease. Conversely, if X decreases, Y will increase. This relationship indicates that the two variables move in opposite directions. A negative correlation is indicated by a correlation coefficient with a negative sign (-).

The strength of the relationship is interpreted based on the correlation coefficient (r) value with reference to the criteria of Schober et al. (2018).

Table 3. 8 Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient

| No. | Coefficient value range (r) | Interpretation of relationship strength |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1.  | 0.00 – 0.10                 | Negligible Correlation                  |
| 2.  | 0.10 - 0.39                 | Weak Correlation                        |
| 3.  | 0.40 – 0.69                 | Moderate Correlation                    |
| 4.  | 0.70 – 0.89                 | Strong Correlation                      |
| 5.  | 0.90 – 1.00                 | Very Strong Correlation                 |

Source: Schober et al., 2018

The significance of the relationship was tested at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level. The alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted if the significance value ( $p$ )  $< 0.05$ , indicating that the relationship found was statistically significant. All analysis results were presented descriptively and inferentially in the form of tables and narratives to facilitate comprehensive discussion.