

The Correlation of Speaking Self-Efficacy, Speaking Proficiency and Gender in ESP Context

Mariana Ulfah Hoesny^{1*}, Punaji Setyosari², Henry Praherdhiono³, Nunung Suryati⁴

¹Politeknik Negeri Malang, Universitas Negeri Malang, Soekarno-Hatta 9 Malang, East Java-Indonesia

²⁻⁴Universitas Negeri Malang, Semarang 5 Malang East Java-Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Self-efficacy in language learning have been attracting interest recently. The construct is said to be a reliable predictor of language performance. This study is aimed at explaining the relationship of self-efficacy and speaking proficiency of male and females. It was administered to investigate whether self-efficacy correlates to speaking proficiency. In addition, the study seeks answer regarding the difference of self-efficacy and speaking proficiency of male and female students who were taking ESP. The study was a quantitative research with ex-post facto design. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and t-test were used to analyze the data collected from 92 subjects who were Diploma IV students. There were 17 females and 75 male students that were selected based on purposive sampling technique. They were second grade students which were in the third semester. The result of analysis presented that self-efficacy had significant correlation with speaking proficiency. on the other hand, self-efficacy of males and females were not significantly difference. The score of self-efficacy between males and females were only slightly different and categorized as medium. Furthermore, gender did not influence speaking as both males and females had medium level speaking proficiency. it can be wrapped up that self-efficacy predicts speaking proficiency, nevertheless gender does not link to self-efficacy and speaking.

Keywords: self-efficacy, speaking, gender, ESP

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is often used as a measurement of how well learners master a foreign language. ESL/EFL learners often evaluate their success in learning English through improvement made in speaking ability (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017; Aydoğan-Koral & Mirici, 2022). The teaching of speaking skill becomes essential since learners want to study speaking as it is used for communicative purpose (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006). As one of skills in language learning, speaking is said to be challenging. It is defined as the aural or oral skill that consists of systematic verbal utterance to convey meaning (Bailey, 2005). Therefore, many strategies are implemented to teach speaking which is targeted in improving learners speaking proficiency. A strategy that has been applied is hybrid-problem based learning which involved learners in a supportive environment and triggered students' motivation to speak (Kassem, 2018). The use of computer mediated practice to increase speaking proficiency and willingness to communicate was carried out as well. This technique in teaching speaking resulted higher score in speaking as well as reduced anxiety (Buckingham & Alpaslan, 2017). Manurung (2015) also stated that an environment that provide opportunities for learners to speak is also critical. It is due to the nature of speaking that requires practices which do not only strengthen the ability to speak, but also develop other factors associate with speaking.

As a complex skill speaking is affected by many factors such as performance conditions which associated with time pressure, planning, standard of performance and amount

of support (Panggabean, 2018). Factors such as school condition, family and society also contribute to speaking proficiency (Sartika & Amin, 2014). Thus, it can be said that factors regulate speaking proficiency can be divided into external and internal factors. External factors pertain with school condition, social factors and the teaching of speaking, while internal factors link to anxiety, motivation, self-confident and self-efficacy (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017) (Rokhman et al., 2021). The latter is referred to as affective factors.

Along with the development of humanistic psychology, affective factors are becoming more essential in language learning. Affective factors cover learners' individual factors which affect learner-learner and teacher-learner interconnection. Among these factors are self-esteem, inhibition, anxiety, personality, motivation, and attitude (Bao & Liu, 2021). In addition, gender is also found to affect

Corresponding Author: marianahoesny99@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1335-1622>

How to cite this article: Hoesny MU, Setyosari P, Praherdhiono H, Suryati N (2023). The Correlation of Speaking Self-Efficacy, Speaking Proficiency and Gender in ESP Context. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2023, 191-199

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

DOI: 10.47750/pegegog.13.02.23

Received : 17.06.2022

Accepted : 22.11.2022

Published: 01.03.2023

the acquisition of foreign language, specifically speaking. Gender is mentioned to have profound impact in language use (Maharani, 2020). It is added that such phenomenon is logical since both language and gender are the product of culture. Therefore, it is rational if those two aspects of culture affect one and another. A study conducted by (Cahyono & Rahayu, 2020) research on the role of motivation in the area of EFL (English as a foreign language) revealed that gender influence language in terms of writing. It presented that female students performed better in writing compared to their male counterparts. It was added that female students also have better motivation regarding language learning. In line with this, (Saldaria et al., 2019) also stated that female students outperformed male students in terms of speaking. The study showed that female had higher average in linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of speaking compared to males. However, another study conducted by Głowska (2014) argued the influence of gender differences in language learning. It said that gender did not play a major role in language learning, but should not be neglected in exploring dimension in second or foreign language learning.

Concerning affective factors, the role of self-efficacy cannot be ignored in language learning. This construct does not only impact academic achievement but also language performance. It is also confirmed that self-efficacy predicts language performance as reported by Wang & Sun (2020) that self-efficacy was connected with language performance, even though the results may vary among different studies depending on the context and co-variances. It was also asserted that self-efficacy had a strong interconnection with language performance as it influenced task accomplishment and the performance of various language skills (Raofi et al., 2012) (Anyadubalu, 2010) (Genç et al., 2016). Regarding the studies about self-efficacy and gender, its affiliation with speaking proficiency has not been investigated a lot. Therefore, this study intends to explore those three variables in a specific context like electronic engineering study program, in which English is a minor subject. It is expected that some discrepancies are found to enrich the knowledge on affective factors in English language teaching and learning. Thus, referring to the background research questions are formulated as follows;

1. Is there any relationship between students' self-efficacy and speaking proficiency?
2. Is there any difference in speaking self-efficacy and speaking proficiency between male and female students?

REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE

Self-efficacy: Definition and Sources

Self-efficacy is defined as a belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute a course of action require to manage pro-

spective situation (Albert Bandura, 1997). Flammer (2018) added that self-efficacy refers to the individual's capacity to produce important effects. Self-efficacy was affirmed to have influence on individual feelings, thoughts, motivation and behavior (Albert et al. Bandura, 1997). It was also asserted that individuals with high self-efficacy will take on difficult task, show more interest on task, and will recover quickly if they are disappointed. On the other hand, those with low self-efficacy tend to avoid difficult task, and cannot complete task because they don't believe on their skills and personal abilities (Albert et al. Bandura, 1997). Therefore, individual with high self-efficacy tend to have better achievement, including academic achievement. It is believed that those with high self-efficacy have more energy to accomplish tasks, thus better performance and achievement can be resulted (Agustiani et al., 2016).

Bandura (1977 in Shin, 2018) Myeong-Hee. (2018) stated that self-confidence, self-regulation efficacy, task difficulty preference and attribution are some factors connected to self-efficacy. Self-confidence in self-efficacy refers to a belief towards one's capability. While task difficulty preference can be viewed from kind of task selected by learners. Those with high self-efficacy tend to select more specific and challenging tasks compared to those with low self-efficacy. In addition, self-regulation efficacy represents to self-regulation. It is the foundation of human behavior which can be observed and assessed through performance with targeted criteria (Bandura, 1986; Zimmerman et al., 1992 in Shin, 2018) Myeong-Hee. (2018).

Self-efficacy is composed of four main sources of information, specifically enactive mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and physiological and affective state (Albert Bandura, 1997). Enactive mastery acts as capability indicator, whereas vicarious experience change efficacy through transmitting competence and comparison of other achievements. Verbal persuasion functions as a medium to strengthen one's belief that they have the capability to achieve targets. Finally, physiological and affective state are used by individuals to evaluate their capabilities. Specifically, it can be explained that mastery experience is demonstrated through authentic evidence regarding individuals' mastery in certain fields. Vicarious experience is a source of self-efficacy which is attained from observation towards successful individual in terms of performance. In other words, it is a contemplation on someone else's success. Whereas, verbal persuasion is gained from verbal input from other individuals which enact to encourage an individual's belief into his/her capability. The last source is physiological and affective state can be described by increasing heart rate and level of respiratory, perspiration and hand-shaking due to challenging or threatening situation (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Self-Efficacy and Achievement

Self-efficacy as a part of affective factors in performances and achievement has been proved to have positive correlation, both strong and weak. Thus, self-efficacy can be said as a reliable predictor of performance. Köseoglu, (2015) reported the result of study of academic achievement and self-efficacy. It was indicated that students who had high self-efficacy believed that intelligence can be transformed with efforts. Therefore, those with high self-efficacy encouraged more to perform better. In addition, self-efficacy also motivated the employment of metacognitive strategies. These strategies were beneficial in the improvement of performance and achievement. Hayat et al., (2020) this study aimed to investigate the mediating effects of metacognitive learning strategies and learning-related emotions in the relationship between academic self-efficacy with academic performance in medical students. Methods: The present study was carried out on 279 students of medicine studying at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. The students filled out three questionnaires: Academic emotions (AEQ and Ahmad (2013) also conducted research to learn about self-efficacy and its connection to performance as well as academic achievement. Hayat et al., (2020) this study aimed to investigate the mediating effects of metacognitive learning strategies and learning-related emotions in the relationship between academic self-efficacy with academic performance in medical students. Methods: The present study was carried out on 279 students of medicine studying at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. The students filled out three questionnaires: Academic emotions (AEQ stated that self-efficacy influenced emotion connected with learning, which finally impacted academic performance. Students with high self-efficacy believed in themselves when faced difficulties. They were observed as having more persistence, efforts and patience (Bandura, 1977) (Sadi O, 2013). Therefore, the possibility to gain better achievement is higher.

In language learning, some studies have confirmed that self-efficacy can predict language performance, especially EFL/ESL. Afifah, (2019) presented her result of study regarding self-efficacy in learning English. The study employed two questionnaires to measure the level and source of self-efficacy. The findings showed that students had medium level of self-efficacy, which means they were in moderate state. In terms of self-efficacy sources, 29,7% came from vicarious experience, 26,4% came from physiological and emotional state, and 22,75% was from verbal persuasion. In association with speaking proficiency, self-efficacy was affirmed to have indirect influence which reinforced the level of mastery and self-confidence in speaking. It was asserted that students who had high self-efficacy could describe pictures in front of class well and did not demonstrate the act of being shy and anxious. Self-efficacy was identified to predict language performance specifically in speaking, writing, listening and reading as

mentioned by Canaran et al., (2020) Fitri (2019) Leeming (2017) Putra (2020). Even though self-efficacy is not the only affective factors regulate language learning, in this case English. The studies mentioned previously can be strong evidence that it is essential in learning English. To improve students' capability, some other factors such as classroom practice, teachers' role, learning strategies which impact the sources of self-efficacy must be considered as well (Meera & Jumana, 2015). Gender and Language Proficiency

The notion about gender differences in English language teaching has been widely accepted as referred to the difference of male and female communication. Research find evidences that the way males use language was distinct from females, for example (Hobbs, 2003) identifies that females use many politeness strategies when talking with their female peers. This fact is not found in males who talk in similar circumstances. These contrasts are also found in terms of passiveness, rules of politeness, conversational implicature, interpersonal exploration and non-verbal communication (Lakoff, 1976, Vanfossen, 2001 in (Mahmud, 2010). Furthermore, (Mahmud, 2010) added that males prefer expressing their opinion through speaking, while females prefer writing. The study presents that 90% females select writing as medium to communicate their opinion since they are shame, afraid, having less ability in English and not confidence to speak. Gender differences in English language learning also occur in terms of material selection, grouping in classroom setting, including aspects of language when it is used in classroom conversation (Emilia et al., 2017) (Mahmud, 2018) (Wahyuningsih, 2018) causing the pole inequality relations between men and women. Therefore, in this study wanted to dismantle the detail view of some theories, both social and feminist about gender relations in the family. Each of these theories (structural functional, conflict and feminist. Thus, a conclusion can be drawn that differences in language, particularly English, are exist among males and females. Distinctions may be present for some reasons such as females and males ways of communication, as well as characteristics shaped by culture, environment, roles and society (Eckert, 1998 in (Mahmud, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is quantitative with ex post facto design. Ex post facto is one of parts of experimental design. Specifically, ex post facto studies hypothesized connection between two variables. However, no special treatment is applied to the subjects (Porte, 2002). In other words, this study is started after the fact occurs without any intervention from the researcher. In reference to the design, correlational analysis and t-test analysis will be employed. The analysis is done to find out the difference level of speaking self-efficacy and speaking proficiency between

male and female students. In addition, it is aimed to find out the correlation of speaking self-efficacy, speaking proficiency and gender.

Population and Sample

The participants are 92 students of Diploma IV Electronic Engineering study program, in State Polytechnic of Malang. They were second grade students which were in third semester. They took English III subject which focused on speaking and writing. The materials taught were about procedures and describing electronic objects. In terms of gender, males outnumber females in most engineering study programs including in electronic study program, thus there are 17 females and 75 males. In reference to the participants, purposive sampling technique was used.

Instruments

The instruments used were speaking self-efficacy questionnaire which comprises of 23 questions. The questionnaire was compiled based on five aspects of speaking namely; fluency, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and comprehension.

The score ranges from 0 which to 100 which represents completely uncertain and completely certain. Other instruments used were speaking test and speaking assessment rubric. Speaking test has six parts; reading text aloud, describing picture, responding to questions, responding to questions based on information provided, proposing a solution and describing an electronic object. This test refers to TOEIC Speaking Proficiency Test. Speaking assessment rubric also refers to TOEIC since this is the official test used in Politeknik Negeri Malang. It is divided into eight level with score ranges from 0 until 200. All instruments have undergone validation tests based on statistics and experts, specifically questionnaire of speaking self-efficacy has been validated by Nunung Suryati Ph. D, Hilda Cahyani Ph. D and Ardian Wahyu Setiawan, Ph.D. The questionnaire and speaking test were considered to be valid and reliable to be used in this study.

Measurement

The following is the questionnaire of speaking self-efficacy which was composed based on five aspects of speaking (Table 1).

Table 1: Speaking Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

NO	Statements	Score 0-100
1	Self Efficacy in Speaking Pronunciation I am able to spell words in English correctly	
2	I am able to say words in English with correct pronunciation	
3	When reading an English text aloud I am able to pronounce all words correctly	
4	I am able to read dialog in English with correct pronunciation and intonation	
5	I believe interlocutors understand what I say	
6	Grammar I am able to recognize parts of speech (adjective, noun, verb, adverb, etc.)	
7	I am able to recognize rules in English grammar (tenses, modals, clauses, plurals, etc.)	
8	I am able to use parts of speech and grammatical rules in English when I speak	
9	I am able to utter simple sentences with correct English grammar	
10	Saya mampu mengucapkan kalimat <i>complex</i> dan <i>compound</i> dengan benar ketika berbicara. I am able to utter complex and compound sentences correctly when I speak	
11	Vocabulary I know the meaning of vocabularies used in daily conversation of English	
12	I know the meaning of most vocabularies used when I read short text about general topic (300-350 words)	
13	I am able to explain the meaning of a word when I speak	
14	I am able to differentiate vocabularies that are used in daily conversation and in classroom presentation	
15	Fluency I am able to introduce myself in English fluently	
16	I am able to converse in English using general topic fluently	
17	I am able to explain simple topic in my field of study (electronics) in English when I speak	
18	I am able to express opinion, agreement and disagreement fluently when I speak English	
19	I am able to ask questions (yes or no and wh-questions) fluently	
20	Comprehension I understand simple conversation	
21	I understand questions that are asked when I speak	
22	I understand instruction which is given by my lecturers	
23	I understand the explanation of topic related with my field of study (electronic) in classroom presentation	

Data Analysis Technique

The data were collected using test and questionnaire. To measure speaking self-efficacy a questionnaire was used as presented in table 1. The data analysis was conducted using correlational and t-test to find out the correlation of self-efficacy and speaking proficiency, and to find out the differences of self-efficacy and speaking proficiency between gender. SPSS 2.0 was used to analyze the data which then resulted a normality and homogeneity test were also conducted as a prerequisite test before data analysis can be done. Normality test is said to fulfil the requirement if significance value gained is lower than 0,05 which means the data is normally distributed. While for homogeneity test the significance level must be higher than 0,05 which means the data is homogenous.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The following part presents the findings of the study (Table 2).

From table two it can be seen that the number of participants are 92, while the mean score of speaking performance is 99,1848. The mean score for self-efficacy is 275,5652. The highest score for speaking is 200 which belongs to level eight. Thus, students' speaking scores are categorized into level four or medium level. Whereas for self-efficacy, it can be concluded that most students are in the medium level (Table 3).

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The normality test for speaking proficiency and self efficacy data result presented that only self efficacy have a constant significance level by 0.113 at the 0.05 significance level (Table 3). It means that the data of students' self efficacy was normally distributed. For speaking performance have a constant significance level by 0.000 less than 0.05 significance level, it means

that the data of students' speaking performance was not normally distributed. This is due to extreme differences in speaking scores, however data can still be analyzed.

Table three shows the result of normality test of speaking performance and self-efficacy. Significance values obtained for speaking is 0.003, while the significance value for self-efficacy is 0.049 (Table 4 and 5).

Homogeneity test was conducted for speaking proficiency and self-efficacy data. The results of homogeneity test showed in Table 4 and 5. Based on the calculation of obtained significance (p-level) that was greater than 0.05, for speaking proficiency have a constant significance level by 0.538 and self efficacy have a constant significance level by 0.662 meaning the both data were not different or homogeneous (Table 6).

The data of speaking proficiency and self-efficacy were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation. Table six shows that the significance value obtained from the analysis was 0,000 which is lower than 0,05. It is concluded that the research hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, correlation between speaking performance and self-efficacy was exist (Table 7).

From table seven it can be seen that the mean score of male students' self-efficacy is 275,08. The mean score for female students' self-efficacy is 277,71. It can be concluded for self-efficacy, that both male and female students are in the medium level (Table 8).

From table eight it can be seen that the mean score of male students speaking proficiency is 98. The mean score for female students speaking proficiency is 104,41. It can be concluded for speaking proficiency, that females speaking proficiency are higher than male students.

Table nine shows the result of t-test analysis on speaking proficiency of male and female students. The significance

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Speaking	92	99,1848	20,75865	60,00	165,00
Self-Efficacy	92	275,5652	41,00745	198,00	376,00

Table 3: Test of Normality

	<i>Kolmogorov-Smirnova</i>			<i>Shapiro-Wilk</i>		
	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Speaking	,138	92	,000	,956	92	,003
Self-efficacy	,084	92	,113	,973	92	,049

Table 4: The Homogeneity Test Result of Speaking Proficiency

<i>Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances</i>		
<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
0,381	90	0,252

Table 5: The Homogeneity Test Result of Self-Efficacy

<i>Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances</i>		
<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
0,192	90	0,662

value gained was 0,252 which means there is no significance difference between male and females' speaking proficiency. It is concluded from the value 0,252 which is higher than 0,05 (Table 10).

Table ten shows the result of independent sample t-test analysis for score of self-efficacy of males and females. It shows that the score of females are higher than males, however the differences in score of self-efficacy between gender was not statistically significant. The significance value gained was 0,813 which was higher than 0,05.

DISCUSSION

The major question investigated in this study was whether or not students who had higher self-efficacy also had better speaking proficiency. The result of data analysis showed

that there was a positive significant correlation between self-efficacy and speaking performance. It means that the higher self-efficacy the better speaking proficiency. It can be implied also that self-efficacy can be used to predict speaking proficiency. The finding of this study asserted that affective factors play important role in encouraging students' achievement. In terms of speaking proficiency, affective factors which connect to fear of making mistakes, lack of confidence and motivation cause low participation in speaking class (Ariyanti, 2016). The three factors mentioned lead to being shy and feeling of nervousness that limit students to speaking activities in the classroom. Rokhman et al., (2021) also reported the pivotal roles of affective factors toward speaking proficiency, especially self-efficacy. His study stated that self-efficacy contributed

Table 6: The Result of Correlation Analysis

		Speaking	Self-efficacy
Speaking	Pearson Correlation	1	,444**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	92	92
Self-efficacy	Pearson Correlation	,444**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	92	92

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Self-Efficacy Data

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-efficacy	Males	75	275,0800	40,73871	4,70410
	Females	17	277,7059	43,38601	10,52265

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Proficiency Data

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking	Males	75	98,0000	20,10110	2,32107
	Females	17	104,4118	23,37750	5,66988

Table 9: The Result of Independent Samples Test for Speaking Proficiency

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of The Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Speaking Equal variances assumed	,381	,538	-1,152	90	,252	-6,41176	5,56621	-17,47000	4,64647
Equal variances not assumed			-1,047	21,680	,307	-6,41176	6,12657	-19,12837	6,30484

Table 10: The Result of Independent Samples Test for Self-Efficacy

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of The Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Self-efficacy Equal variances assumed	,192	,662	-,237	90	,813	-2,62588	11,07300	-24,62433	19,37257
Equal variances not assumed			-,228	22,837	,822	-2,62588	11,52626	-26,47920	21,22743

as much as 32% which was much higher compared to anxiety and personality. The latter contributed 18,9% and 10,2% which was lower than the contribution of self-efficacy.

Further study conducted by Illyin et al., (2019) affirmed the role of self-confidence and motivation as two affective factors which influence speaking proficiency. Self-confidence is a factor of self-efficacy as it is defined as one's believe towards one's capability to organize and conduct a series of tasks to manage prospective situation (Albert et.al Bandura, 1997). The study of Illyin et al., (2019) gained significance value as much as 0,007 for self-confidence which means it significantly affected speaking proficiency. In line with this, Ni, (2012) also stated that students with low self-confidence tend to be shy and afraid to express their opinion orally. On the other hand, those with high self-confidence feel to be more encouraged to strive and not easily gave up. Therefore, it implies that students with high self-efficacy can manage to reduce fear of making mistakes, nervousness and shyness mainly in speaking, since they believe in their capability to accomplish tasks. This results in better speaking proficiency.

Self-efficacy as important aspect in academic setting has been reported by some studies such as Los, (2014), Musa, (2020), Rahil Bin Mahyuddin, (2006). High correlation between self-efficacy and academic achievement can be seen through students' GPA which was also connected with the use of self-regulated strategy both cognitively and meta cognitively (Los, 2014)(Musa, 2020). The enhancement of learning outcomes caused by self-efficacy was assumed as the effect of students' positive perceptions towards themselves (Rahil Bin Mahyuddin, 2006).

The means score of speaking proficiency between male and female students show there was a difference, however it was not significant. Both male and female students had medium level in speaking proficiency. Erdiana et al., (2019) found that females had higher scores in all aspects of speaking compared to males, nevertheless the difference was not vital. The study also emphasized that females actually did not perform better because in fact males showed to be more confident, enthusiastic and active even though they had problems during the speaking activity. The difference was only found in scores in which females got slightly higher. Another study conducted by Namaziandost et al., (2019) reported that regarding speaking, females exceeded males in the aspect of fluency, while males did better in accuracy. Thus, it can be assumed that both gender had similar ability in speaking but in different aspect.

Regarding differences in terms of language, specifically speaking of males and females, Głowska (2014) revealed that other factors must be taken into account. Such factors like education system and foreign language tests which might match females' linguistic preferences may pose advantages for females. It was also added that males' culture put little attention to express personal opinion which caused them

to withdraw from activities presenting their thoughts both in oral and written. On the other hand, females' culture tended to be more cooperative and submissive which was assumed to result more effective and efficient learning. The study conducted by (Nurfitriya, 2017) descriptive analysis. The population of this research was the fifth semester students of English Study Programme of IAIN Palangka Raya 2016 period which consisted of 20 students who have took three sequel classes of speaking I, II, and III. The researcher used purposive sampling. To collected the data in this research, the researcher used class performance and documentation in form audio and visual. The result showed that (1 corroborated that both males and females influenced by their basic gender characteristic in language performance. Thus, both gender performed equally in speaking.

Differences of males and females in terms of language were not connected with achievement and proficiency. It was more related with interests and preferences which was revealed by Abdorahimzadeh, (2014). The study was done to investigate gender differences in reading comprehension. It indicated that gender had difference reading performance but it was not statistically significant. Gender demonstrated no significant differences in terms of attitude towards language learning. Correspondingly, it suggested that the language performance of males and females was not diverse (Huang, 2021)

In terms of self-efficacy, females had higher scores compared to their males' counterpart. Nevertheless, the result of t-test analysis indicated that it was not significantly different. Thus, it can be explained that self-efficacy was not influenced by gender differences. It is in line with Bandura (1997) who stated that self-efficacy was formed on the basis of four sources that was enactive mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and physiological and affective state. Enactive mastery experience acts as ability indicator, while vicarious experience changes efficacy by transmitting competence and comparison of others' achievement. mastery experience originates from individual's mastery of certain field. In addition, vicarious experience comes from observation towards other individuals who gain success in performance. Verbal persuasion was obtained from verbal input of individuals who gave reinforcement during the achievement of certain goals. Finally, physiological and affective state represents physical and emotional condition which characterized by increasing heart-beat and respiratory rate, increased perspiration and trembling hands due to challenging or threatening situation (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Referring to the theory, it can be concluded that gender did not link to self-efficacy directly, in fact vicarious experience tend to contribute more to the level of self-efficacy (Afifah, 2019).

In line with the result of study, Leeming, (2017) said that differences in self-efficacy were predicted by English ability,

extroversion and gender. However, English ability posed major role in predicting self-efficacy. This is approved by (Bandura, 1977) who claimed that the greatest source of self-efficacy was prior success in similar task. It implies that students who have been successful in doing tasks would be likely to have better self-efficacy.

CONCLUSION

This study revealed that there was significant correlation between self-efficacy and speaking proficiency. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in speaking proficiency and self-efficacy of male and female students. More specifically, females had higher speaking proficiency and self-efficacy but it was not significant based on statistical analysis. Therefore, it is suggested that the teaching of speaking should pay attention to the aspect of self-efficacy and gender. Growing students' self-efficacy can be done along with the implementation of speaking activities in the classroom as have been demonstrated by some studies mentioned in this study. Moreover, speaking activities applied in classroom should comply with both gender. It is due to males and females have different characteristics that should be considered to make the teaching of speaking encouraging for both gender.

SUGGESTION

In exploring students' self-efficacy in speaking proficiency, questionnaire was developed based on five aspects of speaking that is pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. It is expected that the questionnaire can contribute to the research of speaking self-efficacy since it was developed particularly for speaking English. Future research is expected to explore the role of self-efficacy and gender in English especially in other skills such as reading, listening and writing. Qualitative method can also be used to investigate self-efficacy and its role in ESL/EFL more profoundly.

LIMITATION

The limitation of this research is it only examines based on quantitative analysis. Moreover, the number of participants were limited due to Covid-19 pandemic spread in the beginning of this research.

REFERENCES

- Abdolahimzadeh, S. (2014). Gender differences and EFL reading comprehension: Revisiting topic interest and test performance. *System*, 42(1), 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.11.008>
- Affiah, F. N. (2019). *Students' Self-Efficacy In Learning English* (Issue September, pp. 0–9).
- Agustiani, H., Cahyadi, S., & Musa, M. (2016). Self-efficacy and Self-Regulated Learning as Predictors of Students Academic Performance. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 9(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874350101609010001>
- Ahmad, A. et. a. (2013). Effects of Self-Efficacy on Students' Academic Performance. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 2(1), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v2i1.3740>
- Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self Efficacy, Anxiety and Performance in the English Language among Middle-School Students in English Language Program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 39, 1043–1048.
- Ariyanti, A. (2016). Psychological Factors Affecting EFL Students' Speaking Performance. *ASIAN TEFL Journal of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.21462/asianteftl.v1i1.14>
- Aydoğan- Koral, M. & Mirici, İ. H. (2021). Analysis of speaking skills in high school English language curricula and coursebooks in Turkey. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science (IJETS)*, 1(3), 61–77.
- Bailey, K. . (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking* (1st Editio). McGraw-Hill.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Bandura A. Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.*
- Bandura, Albert. (1997). *Self-Efficacy The Exercise of Control.* WH Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, Albert et.al. (1997). *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies.* Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EVER.2017.7935960>
- Bao, Y., & Liu, S. (2021). The Influence of Affective Factors in Second Language Acquisition on Foreign Language Teaching. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 09(03), 463–470. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2021.93030>
- Buckingham, L., & Alpaslan, R. S. (2017). Promoting speaking proficiency and willingness to communicate in Turkish young learners of English through asynchronous computer-mediated practice. *System*, 65, 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.016>
- Cahyono, B.Y., & Widiati, U. (2006). The Teaching of Speaking in the Indonesian Context: The State of The Art. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 34(2), 4. <https://doi.org/10.17977/jip.v13i3.40>
- Cahyono, Bambang Yudi, & Rahayu, T. (2020). EFL Students' Motivation in Writing, Writing Proficiency, and Gender. *Teflin Journal*, 31(2), 162–180. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i2/162-180>
- Canaran, Ö., Bayram, İ., Doğan, M., & Baturay, M. H. (2020). Causal Relationship Among the Sources of Anxiety, Self-Efficacy, and Proficiency in L2 Listening. *International Journal of Listening*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2020.1793676>
- Emilia, E., Moecharam, N. Y., & Syifa, I. L. (2017). Gender in EFL classroom: Transitivity analysis in English textbook for Indonesian students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 206–214. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6877>
- Erdiana, N., Bahri, S., & Akhmal, C. N. (2019). Male vs. female EFL students: Who is better in speaking skill? *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i1.13024>
- Fitri, D. R. et. al. (2019). The Correlation between Reading Self-Efficacy and Reading Comprehension. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 26(3), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11273-020-09706-3><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2017.09.008><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.117919><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2020.103116><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2010.12.004><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2010.12.004>
- Flammer, A. (2018). Self-Efficacy. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (Issue December 2001). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/01726-5>

- Genç, G., Kuluşaklı, E., & Aydin, S. (2016). Exploring Prospective EFL Teachers' Perceived Self-Efficacy and Beliefs on English Language Learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.4>
- Glówka, D. (2014). The Impact of Gender on Attainment in Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(4), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.t.2014.4.4.3>
- Hayat, A. A., Shateri, K., Amini, M., & Shokrpour, N. (2020). Relationships between Academic Self-Efficacy, Learning-Related Emotions, and Metacognitive Learning Strategies with Academic Performance in Medical Students: A Structural Equation Model. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-01995-9>
- Hobbs, P. (2003). The Medium is the Message: Politeness Strategies in Men's and Women's Voice Mail Messages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 243–262.
- Huang, J. (2021). Differences in the Performance of Female and Male Students: A Case Study of Second Language Learning. *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Education, Language and Art (ICELA 2021)*, 637(Icela 2021), 502–505. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220131.091>
- Illyin, I., Hanifah, G. N., & Yunianti, S. (2019). The Affective Factors Influencing Students' Speaking Ability. *UAD TEFL International Conference*, 2, 146. <https://doi.org/10.12928/utic.v2.5749.2019>
- Kassem, M. A. M. (2018). Improving EFL Students' Speaking Proficiency and Motivation: A Hybrid Problem-based Learning Approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(7), 848. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0807.17>
- Köseoglu, Y. (2015). Self-Efficacy and Academic Achievement – A Case From Turkey. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(29), 131–141.
- Leeming, P. (2017). A Longitudinal Investigation into English Speaking Self-Efficacy in a Japanese Language Classroom. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0035-x>
- Leong, L.-M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34>
- Los, R. E. B. (2014). The Effects of Self-Regulation and Self-Efficacy on Academic Outcome [University of South Dakota]. In *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (Issue May). <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1562521977?accountid=50152>
- Maharani, A. A. P. (2020). AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTIC STUDY : LANGUAGE AND GENDER IN EFL CLASSROOM. *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, 10(1).
- Mahmud, M. (2010). LANGUAGE AND GENDER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING. *TEFLIN Journal*, 21(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i2/172-185>
- Mahmud, M. (2018). LANGUAGE AND GENDER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING. *TEFLIN*, August 2010. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i2/172-185>
- Manurung, K. (2015). Improving the Speaking Skill Using Reading Contextual Internet-based Instructional Materials in an EFL Class in Indonesia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.442>
- Meera, K. P., & Jumana, M. K. (2015). Self-Efficacy and Academic Performance in English. *Research in Pedagogy*, 5(2), 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.17810/2015.13>
- Musa, M. (2020). Academic Self-Efficacy and Academic Performance among University Undergraduate Students: An Antecedent to Academic Success. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(3), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3756004>
- Namazandost, E., Abedi, P., & Nasri, M. (2019). The Role of Gender in the Accuracy and Fluency of Iranian Upper-intermediate EFL Learners' L2 Oral Productions. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(3), 1–14. <https://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR>
- Ni, H. (2012). The Effects of Affective Factors in SLA and Pedagogical Implications. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(7), 1508–1513. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1508-1513>
- Nurfitri. (2017). *Speaking Competence Based on Gender toward Fifth Semester Students of English Education Study Programme at IAIN Palangkaraya*. IAIN Palangkaraya.
- Panggabean, E. (2018). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance At Smk Bukit Cahaya Sidikalang. *Majalah Ilmiah Politeknik Mandiri Bina Prestasi*, 2, 61–69.
- Porte, G. K. (2002). *Appraising Research in Second Language Learning: a practical approach to critical analysis of quantitative research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Putra, I. D. G. R. D. et al. (2020). The Predicting Power of Self Efficacy on Students' Argumentative Writing Quality. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(2), 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.10.463>
- Rahil Bin Mahyuddin, E. a. (2006). The Relationship Between Students' Self Efficacy And Their English Language Achievement. *Jurnal Pendidik Dan Pendidikan*, Jil.21(1996), 61–71.
- Raofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-Efficacy in Second/ Foreign Language Learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60>
- Rokhman, N. M., Latief, M. A., & Suryati, N. (2021). Learners' Anxiety, Self-Efficacy, and Personality as Predictors of Learners' Speaking Performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 103–108.
- Sadi O, U. M. (2013). The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy, Self-Regulated Learning Strategies And Achievement: A Path Model. *Baltic Science Edu*, 12(1), 21–33.
- Saldaria, E., Ariawan, V. A. N., & Cahyani, I. (2019). Speaking Skill of Elementary Students Reviewed by Gender. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, 7(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v7i1.20363>
- Sartika, S., & Amin, M. (2014). What Contributes to Students' Success in Learning to Speak English. *JEELS*, 1(1), 31–45. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/91293-EN-what-contributes-to-students-success-in.pdf>
- Shin, M.-H. (2018). Effects of Project-based Learning on Students' Motivation and Self-efficacy. *English Teaching*, 73(1), 95–115. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.73.1.201803.95>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of Self-Efficacy : Four Professional Development Formats and Their Relationship to Self-Efficacy and Implementation of a New Teaching Strategy. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(2), 228–245. <https://doi.org/10.1086/605771>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). Men and Women Differences in Using Language: A Case Study of Students at Stain Kudus. *Edulite*, 3(1), 79–90.
- Wang, C., & Sun, T. (2020). Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Language Proficiency: A Meta-Analysis. *System*, 95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102366>