J-Shelves of Indragiri (JSI)
https://ejournal-fkip.unisi.ac.id/shelves
Email: jsipbifkipunisi@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61672/jsi.v8i2.3815

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

SPEAKING ANXIETY, SELF-PERCEIVED PRONUNCIATION, SPEECH RATE, AND ORAL ENGLISH PERFORMANCE AMONG GRADE 11 THAI EFL STUDENTS IN SATUN, THAILAND

Aja Narita Syafitri[1*], Selamat Husni Hasibuan[2]
[1,2]Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
Author (s) Email: [1]naritasyafitri@gmail.com, [2]selamathusni@umsu.ac.id

*Corresponding Author Email: naritasyafitri@gmail.com

Article Info

Article History
Received:18-09-2026
Revised:03-10-2026
Accepted:04-10-2026
Published:12-11-2026

Keywords
Speaking anxiety;
Pronunciation;
Speech rate;
Oral English performance;
Thai EFL students

Abstract

Speaking in English involves affective, perceptual, and linguistic dimensions that may be experienced differently by individual learners. This study aimed to describe speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance among Grade 11 Thai EFL students and to describe their observed oral performance in grammar, speech rate, and pronunciation. The study employed a quantitative descriptive design involving 25 students at private Islamic School in Satun, Thailand. All 25 students completed a 26-item questionnaire, while 10 students were selected purposively to participate in an "Introduce Myself" speaking task. Questionnaire validity was examined using corrected item-total correlation, and internal consistency was examined using Cronbach's Alpha. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the questionnaire responses and speaking-test performance. The validity analysis showed that 10 of the 26 questionnaire items met the predetermined criterion: five items for speaking anxiety, one for pronunciation, three for speech rate, and one for English performance. The original 26-item questionnaire produced a Cronbach's Alpha of .789, while the retained 10-item set produced a coefficient of .817. Preliminary descriptive means for the original questionnaire item groups were 3.22 for speaking anxiety, 3.39 for pronunciation, 3.12 for speech rate, and 2.44 for English performance; these values are interpreted cautiously because they included items subsequently identified as invalid. In the speaking test, speech rate obtained a mean of 3.30, while grammar and pronunciation each obtained a mean of 3.20. The mean final speaking score was 64.67. The findings provide context-specific descriptive information about the participating students' English-speaking experiences and oral performance. They should not be generalized to Thai students more broadly because of the limited sample, the smaller speaking-test group, and the measurement limitations identified in the study.

INTRODUCTION

English speaking plays an important role in second-language learning because learners are expected to use English to communicate ideas, respond to others, and participate in interaction rather than merely demonstrate their knowledge of language forms. In actual communication, learners have to formulate and produce language while responding to communicative demands in

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

real time. Bygate (2001) emphasizes the complexity of managing language knowledge during spontaneous speaking, while Kormos and Dénes (2004) show that the way learners produce speech contributes to how their fluency is perceived. Chalhoub-Deville and Wigglesworth (2005) further explain that judgments of speaking proficiency are closely related to the characteristics of learners' actual spoken performance. These perspectives show why English speaking needs to be examined through learners' ability to produce language in actual communication.

Once learners put their knowledge into spoken communication, the way they organize and deliver their speech begins to matter as much as what they know. Fluency, pronunciation, comprehensibility, grammar, and speech rate work together to shape how spoken English is produced and understood by listeners. Kormos and Dénes (2004) found that temporal characteristics of speech production are related to perceptions of L2 fluency, while Munro and Derwing (2001) demonstrated that speaking rate can influence perceptions of accentedness and comprehensibility. Together with Bygate's (2001) view that speakers must coordinate linguistic knowledge and communicative processing simultaneously, these findings suggest that oral English performance is better understood as several interconnected characteristics rather than as a single ability.

Yet performance rarely unfolds in an emotional vacuum. Speaking in a second language often requires learners to formulate ideas quickly, respond to others, and expose their language ability to evaluation. These conditions may influence how students participate in communication and how they perceive their own speaking ability. Woodrow (2006) found that speaking anxiety was associated with oral achievement, while MacIntyre (2007) showed that language anxiety can influence learners' willingness to initiate communication. MacIntyre (1999) further explained that anxiety can interfere with language learning and performance through cognitive and emotional processes. Learners also develop perceptions of their own competence, including how clearly, they pronounce words, how well they control their speech rate, and how they judge their general English ability. These perceptions may not always correspond directly to their actual performance.

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

This connection between emotion, self-perception, and speaking performance becomes especially relevant among Thai students learning English. Several studies have documented anxiety and communication apprehension among Thai learners when they are expected to use English in classroom interactions. Esteban and Pratumtone (2024) observed communication apprehension among Thai students when they were required to respond or communicate in English, while Poolperm and Boonmoh (2024) found differences in students' speaking anxiety between onsite and online classrooms. At the same time, difficulties in English speaking are not purely emotional. Speech rate and pronunciation can also influence how understandable students' spoken English is. Therefore, Thai students' speaking experiences need to be viewed through both emotional and linguistic dimensions.

Existing studies, however, have generally approached these aspects from separate perspectives. Poolperm and Boonmoh (2024) focused on anxiety across different classroom modes, Muengnakin and Narathakoon (2025) examined communication apprehension and speaking anxiety among Thai high school students, and Thorpe et al. (2025) examined language anxiety together with accentedness, comprehensibility, and speech rate across communication tasks. These studies demonstrate the importance of both affective and speech-related aspects, but there remains a need for a descriptive picture that considers students' self-reported speaking experiences together with their directly assessed oral performance. The present study addresses this need by examining speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance through a questionnaire and describing students' grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate through a direct speaking task.

Building on this gap, the present study aims to describe the levels of Thai students' speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance, as well as their oral English performance in grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate. By combining questionnaire data with direct speaking-test data, the study provides a more complete descriptive picture of the emotional, perceptual, and linguistic dimensions involved in Thai students'

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

English speaking.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speaking Anxiety

Speaking anxiety has long occupied an important place in second-language research because speaking requires learners to produce language in real time while managing linguistic, cognitive, and social demands. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) conceptualized foreign language anxiety as a situation-specific phenomenon involving communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test-related pressure. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) further argued that anxiety can interfere with the cognitive processing required for language learning and production. Cheng, Horwitz, and Schallert (1999) demonstrated that anxiety can differ according to language skill, indicating that speaking anxiety is not necessarily the same as anxiety experienced in other language activities. Woodrow (2006) subsequently showed the importance of speaking anxiety in relation to oral achievement.

The understanding of speaking anxiety has gradually moved from a general psychological condition toward a more contextual perspective. MacIntyre (2007) argued that willingness to communicate can change according to immediate psychological and situational conditions. This perspective is relevant to EFL classrooms because students may feel differently when speaking individually, speaking in front of classmates, answering teachers, or completing an assessment task. Recent research also supports the importance of context. Kalra and Siribud (2020) similarly reported considerable public speaking anxiety among Thai EFL learners, associated with fear of negative evaluation and limited opportunities for speaking practice. Poolperm and Boonmoh (2024) found differences in Thai students' anxiety between onsite and online classrooms, while Thorpe et al. (2025) showed that the relationship between language anxiety and speech-related characteristics can differ across communication tasks. A recent meta-analysis by Teimouri, Goetze, and Plonsky (2019) further confirmed a consistent negative relationship between language anxiety and second-language

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

achievement across a large body of studies, reinforcing the relevance of examining speaking anxiety in the present study. Therefore, speaking anxiety in the present study is understood as an affective experience that may become visible when learners are required to use English orally.

Fear of negative evaluation is another important aspect of speaking anxiety. Horwitz et al. (1986) placed fear of negative evaluation at the center of foreign language anxiety, while MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) explained how anxiety may interfere with the processing required for language production. Woodrow (2006) similarly connected speaking anxiety with oral achievement. More recent Thai research has provided evidence of communication apprehension in classroom speaking situations. Esteban and Pratumtone (2024) reported communication apprehension among Thai students when responding to teachers or speaking English in class, while Muengnakin and Narathakoon (2025) found speaking anxiety among Thai high school students. These findings indicate that speaking anxiety is influenced by the communicative environment and remains relevant to Thai EFL learners.

English Oral Performance

English oral performance is a multidimensional construct because successful speaking requires learners to coordinate several linguistic and communicative resources at the same time. Bygate (2001) described speaking as involving the management of knowledge and processing during real-time communication, while Kormos and Dénes (2004) demonstrated that measurable temporal characteristics can be used to examine L2 fluency. de Jong (2023) further conceptualized L2 speaking proficiency as a multidimensional construct involving linguistic and strategic competencies. The present study follows this multidimensional perspective by examining both students' self-perceptions through a questionnaire and their observed performance through a direct speaking task.

Pronunciation is an important component of oral English performance because speakers need to produce language clearly enough for listeners to understand their intended messages. Jenkins (2000) questioned an exclusive focus

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

on native-speaker pronunciation and emphasized intelligibility in international English communication. Derwing and Munro (2005) similarly argued that pronunciation instruction should prioritize features that influence communication rather than simply eliminating every feature associated with a foreign accent. Munro and Derwing (1999) also distinguished pronunciation-related perceptions from actual intelligibility. Reviewing 25 years of research building on this line of work, Levis (2020) confirmed that intelligibility, comprehensibility, and accentedness remain partially independent dimensions of L2 speech, reinforcing the view that pronunciation should be evaluated in terms of how well it supports communication rather than how closely it matches native-speaker norms. In the present study, pronunciation is examined both through students' self-perceptions and through their directly assessed speaking performance.

Speech rate represents another important dimension of oral performance. Munro and Derwing (2001) demonstrated that speaking rate can influence listeners' perceptions of L2 speech, while Kormos and Dénes (2004) identified speech rate as a measurable dimension of L2 fluency. More recent research has shown that speech rate can vary according to communication tasks. Thorpe et al. (2025) examined speech rate together with language anxiety, accentedness, and comprehensibility across different tasks. Therefore, speech rate is included in the present study as both a self-perceived aspect in the questionnaire and an observed component of the speaking test.

Grammar also contributes to oral English performance because learners need to construct meaningful and structurally appropriate utterances while speaking in real time. Bygate (2001) showed that speaking requires learners to access and use linguistic knowledge under real-time processing constraints. de Jong (2023) likewise places linguistic competence within a broader understanding of speaking proficiency. In the present study, grammar is assessed directly through the speaking-test rubric because grammatical accuracy can be observed in students' actual spoken production.

Beyond individual linguistic components, learners also develop perceptions of their general English performance. Self-assessment involves

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

learners' judgments of their own language ability and may provide information that differs from direct performance assessment. Oscarson (1989) explains that learner self-assessment represents a distinct source of information about language ability. More recently, Anh, Dong, and Trang (2022) found that EFL learners' self-assessment of their speaking performance did not always align closely with their actual test results, suggesting that self-perceived and directly measured performance can reasonably be expected to diverge. Therefore, the present study includes English performance in the questionnaire while measuring grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate directly through the speaking test.

Taken together, the literature indicates that oral English performance involves several dimensions rather than one isolated ability. Based on these perspectives, the present study examines four self-perceived aspects through the questionnaire speaking anxiety, pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance and three observed aspects through the speaking test grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate. This combination provides descriptive information about both students' perceptions and their actual oral performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to describe students' speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, perceived speech rate, self-perceived English performance, and actual oral English performance. The study did not examine causal effects or statistical relationships among variables. The research was conducted at private Islamic school, Thailand, during August as part of the researcher's International Community Service Program (KKN International). The population consisted of 25 Grade 11 Thai students who participated in the English learning activities during the research period. Because of the limited population, all 25 students participated in the questionnaire using total sampling. Subsequently, 10 students participated in the speaking test. They were purposively selected based on questionnaire completion, availability, and variation in their questionnaire responses. Thus, the questionnaire findings represent all 25 students, whereas the speaking-test findings describe only the 10

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

selected participants and are interpreted as complementary descriptive data.

Two instruments were used: a 26-item questionnaire and a direct speaking test. The questionnaire employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) and consisted of four constructs: speaking anxiety (Q1–Q8), self-perceived pronunciation (Q9–Q14), self-perceived speech rate (Q15–Q20), and self-perceived English performance (Q21–Q26). The speaking test used the topic "Introduce Myself," in which students introduced themselves orally in English. Their performance was assessed on grammar, speech rate, and pronunciation using a five-point rubric for each component, with a maximum score of 15. The final score was calculated using the formula: Final Score = (Total Score/15) × 100. Speech rate was assessed as perceived speaking pace based on observable features such as continuity, excessive hesitation, long pauses, and the extent to which the pace supported clear communication, rather than through an objective words-per-minute calculation.

Data collection involved administering the questionnaire to all 25 students, followed by the individual speaking test with 10 selected participants. The questionnaire responses and speaking-test scores were subsequently entered into SPSS. Questionnaire item validity was examined using corrected item-total correlation within each construct, with .396 used as the validity criterion for the 25 questionnaire respondents. Based on this criterion, five speaking-anxiety items (Q2–Q6), one pronunciation item (Q13), three speech-rate items (Q15–Q17), and one English-performance item (Q25) met the criterion. Reliability was examined separately for the multi-item constructs using Cronbach's Alpha. Constructs represented by only one retained valid item were not subjected to internal-consistency analysis. Construct scores for descriptive analysis were calculated using only the retained valid items.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the questionnaire and speaking-test results, including mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum scores. Questionnaire findings were reported for the four measured constructs, while speaking-test results were reported for grammar, speech rate, pronunciation, total score, and final score. The quality of the quantitative

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

instruments was supported through item-validity and internal-consistency testing, while the speaking assessment used predetermined criteria and a structured rubric to provide a consistent basis for scoring oral performance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Questionnaire Validity

The questionnaire consisted of 26 items completed by 25 students. The corrected item-total correlation was used to determine whether each item adequately represented the overall questionnaire score. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Questionnaire Validity Results

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Decision
Q1	.166	Invalid
Q2	.426	Valid
Q3	.557	Valid
Q4	.429	Valid
Q5	.584	Valid
Q6	.574	Valid
Q7	.244	Invalid
Q8	.332	Invalid
Q9	.272	Invalid
Q10	.238	Invalid
Q11	.299	Invalid
Q12	.274	Invalid
Q13	.521	Valid
Q14	.185	Invalid
Q15	.432	Valid
Q16	.489	Valid
Q17	.428	Valid
Q18	.039	Invalid
Q19	.187	Invalid
Q20	.210	Invalid
Q21	.371	Invalid
Q22	.034	Invalid
Q23	.069	Invalid
Q24	.112	Invalid

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Decision
Q25	.447	Valid
Q26	.029	Invalid

The results show that 10 of the 26 items were valid, namely Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q13, Q15, Q16, Q17, and Q25. The other 16 items obtained corrected item-total correlation values below .396 and were therefore classified as invalid. This result indicates that the items did not contribute equally to the overall questionnaire score.

The presence of invalid items does not automatically make the entire instrument unusable. Instead, the finding indicates that some statements may require revision, clearer wording, or further pilot testing. For the present analysis, the valid items provide the basis for retaining questionnaire items that demonstrated a sufficient relationship with the overall score.

Questionnaire Reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire was examined using Cronbach's Alpha. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Questionnaire Reliability Results

Item Set	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Initial questionnaire	26	.789	Acceptable
Valid items	10	.817	Good

Internal consistency was examined using Cronbach's Alpha for the questionnaire item sets. The original 26-item questionnaire produced an overall Cronbach's Alpha of .789, while the 10-item retained set produced a coefficient of .817. These coefficients are reported as overall internal-consistency indicators and are not interpreted as evidence that the four constructs form a single homogeneous scale. Because the number of retained valid items differed across the four constructs, particularly for self-perceived pronunciation and English performance, construct-level reliability should be interpreted cautiously.

Descriptive Statistics of Questionnaire Responses

The descriptive statistics of the questionnaire responses are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Questionnaire Responses

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

Aspect	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Speaking Anxiety	25	3.22	0.80	2.00	4.75
Pronunciation	25	3.39	0.60	1.83	4.50
Speech Rate	25	3.12	0.62	1.50	4.33
English Performance	25	2.44	0.63	1.17	3.67

The results show that pronunciation obtained the highest mean score (M = 3.39, SD = 0.60). Speaking anxiety followed with a mean of 3.22 (SD = 0.80), while speech rate obtained a mean of 3.12 (SD = 0.62). English performance obtained the lowest mean score at 2.44 (SD = 0.63).

It is important to note a methodological limitation regarding Table 3. The scores presented for each aspect were computed from all items originally assigned to that aspect, not only from the items that met the validity criterion in Table 1. This distinction matters most for pronunciation and English performance, where only one item each (Q13 and Q25, respectively) met the validity criterion; five and five items, respectively, did not. Because a psychometrically defensible multi-item scale score requires that the contributing items demonstrate an adequate relationship with the overall construct, the pronunciation and English performance means reported here should be interpreted as preliminary descriptive indicators rather than as scores from a validated scale. The speaking anxiety and speech rate means are comparatively more defensible, since a majority of their items (5 of 8, and 3 of 6, respectively) met the validity criterion. This limitation is revisited in the Limitations section below.

With this caveat in mind, the relatively high pronunciation score indicates that pronunciation was a noticeable aspect of the students' English-speaking experience. This finding supports the view that pronunciation remains important for intelligible oral communication. Derwing and Munro (2005) emphasize that pronunciation should be considered in relation to intelligibility and comprehensibility rather than only native-like production. The finding is also relevant to Thai EFL contexts, where pronunciation difficulties continue to be reported among learners.

Speaking anxiety also showed a relatively high mean score of 3.22. This indicates that anxiety was a noticeable experience among the participants. The

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

finding is consistent with studies of Thai learners that have reported communication apprehension and speaking anxiety in classroom contexts (Esteban & Pratumtone, 2024; Kalra & Siribud, 2020; Muengnakin & Narathakoon, 2025; Poolperm & Boonmoh, 2024). This pattern also resembles findings from other EFL settings; Veenstra and Weaver (2022), for instance, observed that foreign-language speaking anxiety among EFL learners in Japan tended to remain elevated and relatively stable across a semester rather than diminishing with continued exposure. The result suggests that emotional experiences remain an important part of students' English-speaking experiences.

Speech rate obtained a mean of 3.12. This result indicates that students also perceived speech rate as an aspect of their speaking experience. Kormos and Dénes (2004) identified temporal characteristics as important dimensions of L2 fluency, while Munro and Derwing (2001) demonstrated that speaking rate can influence listeners' perceptions of L2 speech. Therefore, the presence of speech-rate-related perceptions in the present data is consistent with the broader understanding of oral fluency.

English performance had the lowest questionnaire mean, at 2.44, though as noted above this score is drawn from an aspect with only one validated item and should be read with particular caution. This finding tentatively indicates that students' perceptions of their general English performance were lower than their perceptions of pronunciation, speaking anxiety, and speech rate. This difference is important because learners' perceptions of their own ability may provide information that is different from direct performance assessment. de Jong (2023) emphasizes that speaking proficiency is multidimensional and should be interpreted carefully according to the assessment method used.

Speaking Test Results

Ten students completed the "Introduce Myself" speaking task. Their performance was assessed in grammar, speech rate, and pronunciation.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Test Performance

Aspect	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Grammar	10	3.20	1.03	1.00	4.00

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

Aspect	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Speech Rate	10	3.30	0.82	2.00	4.00
Pronunciation	10	3.20	0.63	2.00	4.00
Total Score	10	9.70	2.11	5.00	12.00
Final Score	10	64.67	14.07	33.33	80.00

The speaking-test results show that speech rate obtained the highest mean score (M = 3.30, SD = 0.82). Grammar and pronunciation both obtained a mean of 3.20. The students' average final speaking score was 64.67, with scores ranging from 33.33 to 80.00.

The relatively similar grammar and pronunciation scores suggest that the students demonstrated comparable performance in these two components. Grammar had the largest standard deviation (SD = 1.03), indicating greater variation among students. Pronunciation had the smallest standard deviation (SD = 0.63), suggesting that the students' pronunciation scores were relatively consistent.

Speech rate produced the highest speaking-test mean. This finding is broadly consistent with the questionnaire result, in which speech rate also obtained a relatively high mean of 3.12. The similarity indicates that speech rate was a noticeable aspect of the students' speaking experiences and observed performance. However, because the present study uses descriptive analysis rather than correlational or inferential statistics, this similarity should not be interpreted as evidence of a statistical relationship between the two measures.

The overall mean final speaking score was 64.67. This result indicates that the students demonstrated a moderate level of performance in the "Introduce Myself" speaking task. The result should be interpreted within the context of the specific speaking task and scoring rubric, because oral performance can vary according to task demands and assessment conditions.

The descriptive findings provide information about several aspects of English-speaking experiences among the participating Grade 11 Thai students. The questionnaire covered speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance, while the speaking task provided direct observations of grammar, speech rate, and pronunciation.

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

The preliminary questionnaire results showed that pronunciation had the highest original aspect-level mean (M = 3.39), followed by speaking anxiety (M = 3.22), speech rate (M = 3.12), and English performance (M = 2.44). These values should be interpreted cautiously because the original aspect-level calculations included items that were subsequently identified as invalid. In particular, pronunciation and English performance each had only one item that met the validity criterion. Therefore, the questionnaire results are more appropriately understood as preliminary descriptive information rather than definitive measurements of the four constructs.

The speaking-test results provide a separate description of observed oral performance among the 10 participating students. Speech rate had the highest mean among the three assessed components (M = 3.30, SD = 0.82), followed by grammar (M = 3.20, SD = 1.03) and pronunciation (M = 3.20, SD = 0.63). The mean final speaking score was 64.67 (SD = 14.07), with scores ranging from 33.33 to 80.00.

The difference between the questionnaire results and the speaking-test results should not be interpreted as evidence of a statistical relationship or discrepancy between self-perception and actual ability. The two measures involved different instruments, different scoring procedures, and different numbers of participants. In addition, the questionnaire included 25 students, whereas the speaking test involved only 10 students. The results therefore provide complementary descriptive information rather than evidence of association between the measures.

The relatively prominent role of speaking anxiety in the questionnaire is consistent with previous studies reporting the relevance of anxiety and communication apprehension among Thai EFL learners (Esteban & Pratumtone, 2024; Kalra & Siribud, 2020; Muengnakin & Narathakoon, 2025; Poolperm & Boonmoh, 2024). However, the present findings do not establish whether anxiety influenced students' speaking performance because no correlational or causal analysis was conducted.

The speaking-test findings also illustrate the multidimensional nature of oral

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

production. Grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate were assessed separately because students may display different levels of performance across these components. This approach is consistent with the view that L2 speaking involves several linguistic and temporal dimensions (Bygate, 2001; Kormos & Dénes, 2004; de Jong, 2023). Nevertheless, the present study only describes the observed scores and does not determine which component contributes more strongly to overall speaking proficiency.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings may be considered as context-specific information for the participating school. The observed presence of speaking anxiety and the variation in grammar, pronunciation, and speech rate may help teachers identify areas that could receive attention in classroom speaking activities. However, such implications should be understood as practical considerations rather than conclusions demonstrated through experimental evidence.

Overall, the findings should be interpreted within the specific context of 25 Grade 11 Thai students at one school in Satun, Thailand, with direct speaking-test data obtained from only 10 students. The descriptive design, the limited number of valid questionnaire items in two constructs, and the restricted speaking-test sample prevent broader generalization. Future studies should employ a larger sample, improve and re-pilot the questionnaire, use clearly operationalized speaking measures, and include multiple speaking tasks and independent raters.

CONCLUSION

This study provided a descriptive account of speaking anxiety, self-perceived pronunciation, speech rate, and English performance among 25 Grade 11 Thai students at private Islamic school, Thailand. It also described the oral performance of 10 students who completed an “Introduce Myself” speaking task. The questionnaire validity analysis showed that 10 of the 26 original items met the predetermined validity criterion. Five valid items represented speaking anxiety, one represented self-perceived pronunciation, three represented speech rate, and one represented English performance.

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

The original questionnaire responses produced preliminary mean scores of 3.22 for speaking anxiety, 3.39 for pronunciation, 3.12 for speech rate, and 2.44 for English performance. Because these preliminary scores were calculated from the original item groups before validity screening, they should not be interpreted as fully validated construct scores. This limitation is particularly important for pronunciation and English performance, for which only one item in each construct met the validity criterion.

In the direct speaking assessment, the 10 participating students obtained mean scores of 3.20 for grammar, 3.30 for speech rate, and 3.20 for pronunciation. The mean final speaking score was 64.67. These findings provide descriptive information about the oral performance of the participating students, but they do not establish relationships between speaking anxiety, self-perceptions, and speaking performance.

The findings should therefore be understood as context-specific observations rather than evidence that represents Thai students generally. The study was limited by the small sample, the use of only 10 students for the speaking assessment, the limited number of valid questionnaire items in two constructs, and the descriptive research design. Future research should involve larger samples, develop and revalidate the questionnaire with sufficient items for each construct, use clearly defined objective measures where appropriate, employ multiple speaking tasks, and establish inter-rater reliability for direct speaking assessment.

Despite these limitations, the study provides preliminary descriptive information about the coexistence of affective, perceptual, and performance-related aspects of English speaking among the participating Thai EFL students. The findings may serve as a basis for further research using stronger measurement procedures and larger samples.

REFERENCES

Anh, K. H., Dong, M. H., & Trang, N. H. (2022). An investigation into English-majored students' self-assessment of their speaking performance.

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

International Journal of Instruction, 15(3), 191–208. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15311a

Bygate, M. (2001). Speaking. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 14–20). Cambridge University Press.

Chalhoub-Deville, M., & Wigglesworth, G. (2005). Rater judgment and English language speaking proficiency. *World Englishes, 24*(3), 383–391. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0083-2919.2005.00419.x

Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 417–446. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00095

De Jong, N. H. (2023). Assessing second language speaking proficiency. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 43*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-030521-052114

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 379–397. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588486

Esteban, R., & Pratumtone, K. (2024). Communication apprehension among Thai university students in an English as a foreign language classroom. *THAITESOL Journal, 37*(2).

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

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Kalra, R., & Siribud, S. (2020). Public speaking anxiety in the Thai EFL context. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 13*(1), 195–209. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/237845

Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System, 32*(2), 145–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.001

Levis, J. (2020). Changes in L2 pronunciation: 25 years of intelligibility, comprehensibility, and accentedness. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 6*(3), 277–282.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24–45). McGraw-Hill.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language:

November 2026. Vol.8, No,2
e-ISSN: 2721-205X
pp.95-112

Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 564–576. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00623.x

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

Muengnakin, K., & Narathakoon, A. (2025). Investigating communication apprehension in English among Thai high school students: A two-pronged study on speaking anxiety and attitudes. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 18*(1), 268–293. https://doi.org/10.70730/NSCM3699

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1999). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning, 49*(Suppl. 1), 285–310. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.49.s1.8

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2001). Modeling perceptions of the accentedness and comprehensibility of L2 speech: The role of speaking rate. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 23*(4), 451–468. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263101004016

Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and applications. *Language Testing, 6*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553228900600103

Poolperm, R., & Boonmoh, A. (2024). Differences in Thai students' anxiety when speaking English in onsite and online classrooms. *THAITESOL Journal, 37*(1), 1–23. https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thaitesoljournal/article/view/270772

Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 41*(2), 363–387. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000311

Thorpe, W. C., Baker-Smemoe, W., Hartshorn, K. J., McMurry, B. L., & Wilcox, M. (2025). The relationship of language anxiety and English learners' accentedness, comprehensibility, and speech rate across three communication tasks. *System, 133*, 103721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103721

Veenstra, R. J., & Weaver, C. (2022). Examining a continuum of FL speaking anxiety over time in an EFL classroom in Japan. *System, 110*, 102889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102889

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal, 37*(3), 308–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071315