



Speaking difficulties, contributing factors, and coping strategies in academic speaking activities among English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang

Ririn Aprilia^{1*}, An Fauzia Rozani Syafei¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: ririnaprilias2004@gmail.com

Volume 15, Number 1, 2026, 111-122

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/n3xnm38>

Abstract:

Academic speaking is essential in higher education as it enables students to communicate ideas, present arguments, and participate effectively in academic interactions. However, many English Education students continue to experience difficulties in academic speaking despite having completed several speaking courses. This study investigated the types of academic speaking difficulties experienced by students, the factors contributing to these difficulties, and the strategies used to cope with them. Using a descriptive research design with quantitative and qualitative data, the study involved 72 English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang. Data were collected through a 4-point Likert-scale questionnaire and semi-structured interviews and analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic analysis. The findings showed that students generally experienced moderate levels of difficulty in academic speaking, with grammatical accuracy identified as the most challenging aspect ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.77$). These difficulties were influenced by linguistic, psychological, cognitive, and sociocultural factors, particularly limitations in vocabulary and difficulties in generating and organizing ideas. Students reported a high level of strategy use, with rehearsing before speaking emerging as the most frequently used strategy ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.60$). Nevertheless, students relied mainly on self-directed and informal strategies rather than structured learning approaches. The findings suggest the need for integrated and strategy-based instructional support to enhance students' academic speaking competence in higher education.

Keywords: academic speaking, speaking difficulties, coping strategies, higher education

© The Author(s). Published by Universitas Negeri Padang. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic speaking refers to spoken communication in formal educational contexts, including presentations, seminars, class discussions, consultations, and thesis defenses. In English Education programs, these tasks require students to convey content knowledge, organize arguments, use discipline-appropriate vocabulary, maintain grammatical and phonological control, and respond to interlocutors in real time (Goh & Burns, 2012; Richards, 2008; Thornbury, 2005). From a communicative-competence perspective, successful academic speaking depends not only on linguistic knowledge but also on sociolinguistic, discourse, and

strategic competence, because students must adjust register, build coherent contributions, and manage communication problems during formal interaction (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2008; Hymes, 1972). Therefore, academic speaking functions as an important indicator of students' ability to participate in higher-education discourse and to express, support, and defend ideas clearly.

However, EFL learners often experience substantial challenges when they are required to speak in academic contexts. Earlier studies report that speaking difficulties may arise from limited vocabulary, grammatical inaccuracy, pronunciation problems, weak fluency, fear of making mistakes, low confidence, and anxiety (Al Hosni, 2014; Ariyanti, 2016; Juhana, 2012; Ur, 1996). Vocabulary limitations are especially problematic because lexical knowledge supports idea expression and speech development (Nation, 2022), whereas anxiety can disrupt attention, fluency, and willingness to communicate (Horwitz et al., 1986). In Indonesian and university EFL contexts, similar difficulties have been reported in academic speaking classes, general speaking tasks, and formal oral presentations (Damayanti & Listyani, 2020; Handayani et al., 2020; Putri et al., 2020).

Recent research further suggests that academic speaking problems are not caused by a single factor; rather, they involve the interaction of linguistic, psychological, cognitive, and sociocultural demands. Students may know the topic but still struggle to generate and organize ideas, monitor grammar, adapt to formal academic norms, and speak spontaneously under evaluative conditions (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021; Goh, 2007; Hinkel, 2005; Lan et al., 2024; Nunan, 2003). Studies at the tertiary level also show that learners frequently manage these constraints through rehearsal, planning, peer support, observation of models, and the use of learning resources or digital tools (Islam & Roy, 2024; Pham & Nguyen, 2021; Rahman et al., 2024; Richards, 2008). Nevertheless, in the local context of English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang, more focused evidence is needed to clarify the types of difficulties students experience in academic speaking activities, the factors that contribute to those difficulties, and the coping strategies they use.

Based on this problem, the present study aims to investigate speaking difficulties experienced by English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang in academic speaking activities. Specifically, this study seeks to identify and describe the types of speaking difficulties experienced by students, analyze the factors contributing to these difficulties, and examine the strategies used by students to cope with or manage the difficulties.

2. METHOD

This section presents the methods used in this study, including the research design, population and sample, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques. The methods are described systematically to ensure clarity and replicability of the research process

2.1. Research Design

This study employs a descriptive research design with quantitative and qualitative data. This design is considered appropriate as the study aims to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the speaking difficulties experienced by English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang in academic speaking activities, including the contributing factors and the strategies used to cope with these difficulties.

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of all students in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang who have participated in academic speaking activities, such as proposal seminars, class presentations, and other formal academic tasks. In this research, the population includes students from the 2021 and 2022 cohorts, totalling 251 students.

The sample for the quantitative data was selected using a simple random sampling technique, which provides each member of the population an equal opportunity to be chosen. A total of 72 students were selected to complete the questionnaire, representing the population and providing an overview of students' speaking difficulties and contributing factors in academic speaking activities (Ary et al., 2010).

For the qualitative data, a smaller group of participants was selected using purposive sampling. These participants were chosen based on their experience in academic speaking activities and their willingness to provide in-depth information

2.3. Instruments

In this study, quantitative data are collected through a structured questionnaire using a 4-point Likert scale. The questionnaire is used to identify the types of speaking difficulties and the factors contributing to these difficulties. The instrument consisted of a number of statement items measured using a four-point Likert scale, with the following categories: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree.

Qualitative data are obtained through semi-structured interviews to explore in greater depth the strategies used by students to cope with speaking difficulties, as well as to provide further explanation of the difficulties and factors identified in the questionnaire data (Creswell, 2012; Creswell, 2014).

2.4. Data Collection

The data obtained were processed using Microsoft Excel to generate frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation values for each item. A total of 72 students participated as respondents in the questionnaire. These results are presented systematically in the following sections based on the research questions of the study

2.5. Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed using appropriate procedures. The quantitative data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, to describe general patterns of students' responses and to identify general patterns of students' academic speaking difficulties, the contributing factors, and the coping strategies used to deal with those difficulties.

The mean scores were interpreted using the following classification developed by the researcher based on the range of the four-point Likert scale used in this study: 1.00–1.99 indicates a low level, 2.00–2.99 indicates a moderate level, and 3.00–4.00 indicates a high level.

Meanwhile, the qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews were analyzed to provide deeper explanations and to support the findings, particularly for the third research question. Thus, the qualitative data were used to enrich and clarify the overall interpretation of the results.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study employed a descriptive design with quantitative and qualitative data to provide a comprehensive understanding of students' academic speaking difficulties. The quantitative data were collected through a structured questionnaire, while the qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain an overview of the academic speaking difficulties experienced by English Education students, including the contributing factors and the strategies used to cope with these difficulties. The instrument consisted of a number of statement items measured using a four-point Likert scale, with the following categories: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree.

To interpret the results, the mean scores were categorized into three levels developed by the researcher based on the range of the four-point Likert scale used in this study: 1.00–1.99 indicates a low level, 2.00–2.99 indicates a moderate level, and 3.00–4.00 indicates a high level.

A total of 72 students participated as respondents in the questionnaire. The data obtained were processed using Microsoft Excel to generate frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation values for each item. These results are presented systematically in the following sections based on the research questions of the study.

3.1. Results

The results of this study are presented based on the three research questions, namely: 1) the types of academic speaking difficulties experienced by English Education students, 2) the factors contributing to these difficulties, and 3) the strategies used by students to cope with the difficulties. The data were obtained from the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while the interview data were analyzed thematically to support and enrich the quantitative findings. The findings are presented in the following sections.

3.2. Types of Academic Speaking Difficulties Experienced by English Education Students

Table 1. Types of Academic Speaking Difficulties Experienced by English Education Students

No	Statement	Frequency				Mean	SD	Category
		SD	D	A	SA			
1	Statement 1 (L. Vocabulary)	3	30	35	4	2.53	0.67	Moderate
2	Statement 2 (L. Vocabulary)	7	19	40	6	2.62	0.78	Moderate
3	Statement 3 (L. Vocabulary)	8	7	44	13	2.86	0.84	Moderate
4	Statement 4 (L. Grammar)	4	6	41	21	3.11	0.77	High
5	Statement 5 (L. Grammar)	56	15	41	11	2.84	0.78	Moderate
6	Statement 6 (L. Grammar)	19	21	33	12	2.75	0.85	Moderate
7	Statement 7 (L. Pronunciation)	19	39	12	2	2.03	0.74	Moderate
8	Statement 8 (L. Pronunciation)	4	30	19	4	2.19	0.86	Moderate
9	Statement 9 (L. Fluency)	10	15	41	12	2.93	0.76	Moderate
10	Statement 10 (L. Fluency)	9	24	31	7	2.59	0.86	Moderate
11	Statement 11 (L. Fluency)	14	14	37	12	2.84	0.89	Moderate
12	Statement 12 (NL. Anxiety)	19	21	25	12	2.62	0.99	Moderate

13	Statement 13 (NL. Anxiety)	10	27	18	8	2.36	0.96	Moderate
14	Statement 14 (NL. Organization of ideas)	10	22	37	3	2.62	0.79	Moderate
15	Statement 15 (NL. Organization of ideas)	10	27	27	2	2.47	0.74	Moderate

The analysis shows that the mean scores across all items range from 2.03 to 3.11, with standard deviation values between 0.67 and 0.9. Based on the established interpretation criteria, most of the difficulties fall within the moderate category. Although most of the difficulties fall within the moderate category, the most prominent difficulty experienced by students was related to grammatical accuracy, particularly in the use of correct tense forms (Statement 4), which obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.77$) and was the only item categorized as high. This finding indicates that tense usage remains the greatest challenge for students in academic speaking activities compared to other linguistic and non-linguistic difficulties.

3.3. Factors Contributing to Students' Difficulties in Academic Speaking

Table 2. Factors Contributing to Students' Difficulties in Academic Speaking

No	Statement	Frequency				Mean	SD	Category
		SD	D	A	SA			
1	S.16(L.Limited Vocabulary)	5	18	35	14	2.99	0.8	Moderate
2	S.17(L.Grammatical Difficulty)	13	28	25	6	2.53	0.8	Moderate
3	S.18(L.Pronunciation Difficulty)	17	28	24	3	2.40	0.8	Moderate
4	S.19(L.Fluency Difficulty)	11	35	21	5	2.51	0.81	Moderate
5	S.20(L.Fluency Difficulty)	10	27	30	5	2.66	0.8	Moderate
6	S.21(P.Anxiety)	13	19	26	14	2.82	1.00	Moderate
7	S.22(P.Anxiety)	12	20	28	12	2.82	0.9	Moderate
8	S.23(P.Lack of Confidence)	13	34	20	5	2.52	0.8	Moderate
9	S.24(P.Low Motivation)	18	27	21	6	2.51	0.9	Moderate
10	S.25(P.Lack of Confidence)	14	28	23	7	2.63	0.9	Moderate
11	S.26(C.Difficulty in Organizing Ideas)	12	13	38	9	2.93	0.91	Moderate
12	S.27(C.Difficulty in Planning)	15	33	20	4	2.52	0.8	Moderate
13	S.28(C.Difficulty in Organizing Ideas)	9	32	27	4	2.71	0.77	Moderate
14	S.29(S.Limited Exposure to Academic Norms)	10	34	23	5	2.68	0.8	Moderate
15	S.30(S.Difficulty in Using Idioms)	11	53	26	2	2.64	0.75	Moderate

16	S.31(S.Limited use with academic expressions)	10	34	23	5	2.71	0.8	Moderate
----	---	----	----	----	---	------	-----	----------

The results indicate that all items fall within the moderate category, with mean scores ranging from 2.40 to 2.99 and standard deviation values between 0.75 and 1.00, suggesting that these factors consistently contribute to the challenges students face in academic speaking activities. Among these factors, limited vocabulary emerged as the most prominent challenge, as Statement 16 obtained the highest mean score ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.80$), indicating that students frequently experience difficulty expressing their ideas clearly due to insufficient vocabulary knowledge.

3.4 Strategies Used to Overcome Speaking Difficulties

Table 3. *Strategies Used by English Education Students to Overcome Speaking Difficulties*

No	Statement	Frequency				Mean	SD	Category
		SD	D	A	SA			
1	S.32(L.Practicing Vocabulary)	0	18	33	21	3.41	0.74	High
2	S.33(L.Practicing Grammar)	0	10	47	15	3.4	0.59	High
3	S.34(L.Practicing Grammar)	0	11	50	11	3.42	0.56	High
4	S.35(L.Practicing Pronunciation)	1	0	41	30	3.82	0.57	High
5	S.36(L.Practicing Pronunciation)	9	24	27	12	3.09	0.92	High
6	S.37(L.Improving Fluency)	2	11	40	19	3.52	0.73	High
7	S.38(P.Managing Anxiety)	2	4	39	27	3.74	0.6	High
8	S.39(P.Building Confidence)	8	16	32	16	3.27	0.92	High
9	S.40(P.Building Confidence)	1	6	35	30	3.81	0.68	High
10	S.41(C.Planning)	1	6	31	34	3.80	0.7	High
11	S.42(C.Rehearsing)	1	1	34	36	3.97	0.6	High
12	S.43(C.Planning)	0	6	46	20	3.74	0.57	High
13	S.44(S.Observing Models)	1	6	45	20	3.73	0.6	High
14	S.45(S.Using Academic Expressions)	1	7	49	15	3.6	0.6	High
15	S.46(S.Observing Models)	4	23	40	5	3.23	0.7	High
16	S.47(S.Adapting Register and Tone)	2	11	47	12	3.56	0.6	High
17	S.48(S.Adapting Register and Tone)	0	7	42	23	3.84	0.61	High

The results indicate that all strategy items fall within the high category, with mean scores ranging from 3.09 to 3.97 and standard deviation values between 0.56 and 0.92. Among the coping strategies, rehearsal before speaking was the most frequently employed strategy, as

reflected in Statement 42, which obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.60$). This finding suggests that students rely heavily on practice and preparation before engaging in academic speaking activities to improve their confidence and performance.

Table 4. Interview Findings on Students' Academic Speaking Strategies

Theme	Category	Code	Data (Evidence)
Linguistic	Vocabulary (14)	Checking correctness (1)	"Asking my friends about the English..." (R48)
Linguistic	Vocabulary (14)	improving vocabulary (3)	"To improve vocabulary, that is by reading many English books..." (R26); "Talking with native speakers..." (R26); "Practicing frequently..." (R26)
Linguistic	Vocabulary (14)	note-taking vocabulary (2)	"Note on my phone, if there is a new word..." (R48); "There is a new word, note it..." (R26)
Linguistic	Vocabulary (14)	memorizing vocabulary (2)	"The most effective, the first one is memorizing vocab" (R26); "Memorizing and learning vocabulary..." (R36)
Linguistic	Vocabulary (14)	using translation tool (2)	"Type in Indonesian, and then translate..." (R48); "If there is something I don't understand, look at google translate" (R59)
Linguistic	Grammar (2)	sentence construction (2)	"Practicing grammar, like constructing words, sentences..." (R26); "Constructing sentences before speaking" (R36)
Linguistic	Pronunciation (9)	checking pronunciation (4)	"How to pronounce" (R26); "Check how to pronounce on google translate..." (R59); "Check on google translate how the correct pronunciation..." (R36); "If confuse about the pronunciation, check on translation..." (R49)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	avoiding audience (3)	"Look at a view where there is no one..." (R48); "Look back to avoid nervous" (R48); "Look back..." (R26)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	avoiding eye contact (2)	"Don't make eye contact..." (R26) "Don't make eye contact with audience" (R26)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	holding object (2)	"I should holding a thing, pen..." (R48); "I always bring a pen whenever I perform" (R48)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	anxiety reduction (4)	Preparing beforehand" (R59); "Not thinking about nervousness..." (R59); "Prepared 3-4 days before the

			performance" (R49); "I prepare before speaking..." (R36)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	Relaxation (1)	"Just relax, don't be stiff when performing" (R26)
Psychological	Anxiety (13)	slowing speech (1)	"Speak slower to..." (R36)
Psychological	Confidence (8)	peer support (2)	"They believe I can..." (R48); "They see us, so become enthusiastic" (R48)
Psychological	Confidence (8)	supportive environment (3)	"Supportive classroom environment can improve confidence" (R26); "I prefer relaxed class environment..." (R36); "Non-judgmental friends..." (R36)
Psychological	Confidence (8)	seeking reassurance (1)	"Asking my friends 'Can I do it?'" (R48)
Psychological	Confidence (8)	audience engagement (1)	"The class that pay attention to us give in a sense of security when presenting..." (R49)
Psychological	Confidence (8)	self-confidence regulation (1)	"Managing my self-confidence in public..." (R36)
Cognitive	Rehearsing (11)	Practice (6)	"If I want to perform, I practice before..." (R48); "The strategy is many practice..." (R48); "More about practicing" (R26); "Actually, try it first" (R59); "Practicing as if presenting..." (R49); "Practice before presenting..." (R36)
Cognitive	Rehearsing (11)	memorizing speech (4)	"Memorize first what I want to speak..." (R59); "Memorize in the morning..." (R59); "Memorize it so..." (R59)
Cognitive	Rehearsing (11)	practice with peers (1)	"The other strategy, maybe practicing with peers..." (R36)
Cognitive	Self-Monitoring (3)	self-recording (1)	"I often recording..." (R48)
Cognitive	Self-Monitoring (3)	repetition strategy (1)	"Usually, I repeat words when I pause..." (R36)
Cognitive	Self-Monitoring (3)	speech control (1)	"Speak slowly..." (R36)
Cognitive	Planning (9)	Outlining (3)	"Creating an outline..." (R26); "Usually, make an outline..." (R59); "I have compiled the main points..." (R36)
Cognitive	Planning (9)	preparing notes (3)	"I make a note in Word for explanation..." (R48); "Make notes on paper..." (R49);

			"Note on paper or phone is more complete explanation..." (R26)
Cognitive	Planning (9)	audiences analysis (1)	"Find out about the audience..." (R26)
Cognitive	Communication Strategy (4)	topic understanding (2)	"Understanding the topic before..." (R36); "Understanding the topic and what I will speak..." (R36)
Cognitive	Communication Strategy (4)	using notes when stuck (1)	"If get stuck, look at the notes, look at the cue card..." (R49); "Using notes in paper..." (R49)
Cognitive	Communication Strategy (4)	code switching (1)	"When the presentation is more doing code-switching..." (R26)
Sociocultural	Observing Models (9)	observing models (8)	"Watching senior seminars" (R48); "Watching YouTube how to speak formally..." (R48); "Watching other seminars..." (R26); "Imitating native speaker..." (R26); "Watching senior or other seminars" (R59); "Watching YouTube like the conferences..." (R49); "Pay attention to the lectures speak" (R49); "Watching senior seminar" (R49)
Sociocultural	Observing Models (9)	modeling behavior (1)	"Imitating people who speak well..." (R59)
Sociocultural	Language Policy Strategy (3)	English-only exposure (1)	"Speaking classes should implement more English speaking..." (R59)
Sociocultural	Language Policy Strategy (3)	forced English environment (1)	"Must be forced to speak English to get used to it" (R59)
Sociocultural	Language Policy Strategy (3)	enforced participation (1)	"Every student must participate in speaking in class..." (R49)
Sociocultural	Learning Environment Strategy (3)	safe classroom (1)	"A safe classroom environment..." (R36)
Sociocultural	Learning Environment Strategy (3)	speaking opportunity (1)	"Give students the opportunity to practice speaking..." (R36)
Sociocultural	Learning Environment Strategy (3)	constructive feedback (1)	"The lectures providing constructive feedback, like pronunciation correctness..." (R36)

In terms of vocabulary, students reported using multiple strategies such as note-taking, memorization, translation tools, reading, and exposure to English through media. Students

frequently mentioned noting new vocabulary, as one student stated, “Note on my phone, if there is a new word...” (R48), and memorizing vocabulary as an effective strategy, as another participant explained, “The most effective... is memorizing vocab” (R26). They also reported using translation tools, as one respondent noted, “Type in Indonesian, and then translate...” (R48), and learning through media such as YouTube, songs, and movies, as one student mentioned, “Watching YouTube or TikTok...” (R59). Additionally, some students improved vocabulary by reading English materials and interacting with others, as one participant stated, “Reading before performing...” (R59), while another added, “Talking with native speakers...” (R26). These findings suggest that students rely on a combination of intentional learning (e.g., memorization and note-taking) and incidental exposure (e.g., media and interaction) to expand their vocabulary.

3.5. Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the academic speaking difficulties encountered by English Education undergraduates at Universitas Negeri Padang are deeply multidimensional and intricately linked. One possible explanation is that academic speaking requires students to simultaneously manage multiple cognitive processes, including generating ideas, organizing arguments, selecting appropriate vocabulary, and monitoring grammatical accuracy. The need to perform these processes in real time may increase cognitive pressure and make linguistic errors more likely to occur, particularly during formal speaking tasks. The reality that grammatical accuracy (tenses) registered the highest overall difficulty level ($M = 3.11$) indicates that despite passing advanced speaking courses, students experience severe friction in monitoring structural forms while simultaneously generating complex ideas during spontaneous formal talk. This pronounced ‘fluency-accuracy trade-off’ aligns perfectly with long-standing theoretical claims by Thornbury (2005) and Brown (2007), which posit that real-time oral processing demands often force learners to sacrifice structural accuracy to maintain communicative momentum.

These outcomes mirror recent data from Rahman et al. (2024) and Islam and Roy (2024), who confirmed that senior EFL learners generally struggle with moderate-tier oral performance challenges rooted in cognitive organizing strains and performance anxiety. This pattern may emerge because academic speaking tasks often require students to present information logically and coherently while maintaining language accuracy. When students are uncertain about how to structure their ideas or support their arguments, their cognitive resources may become overloaded, leading to hesitation, reduced fluency, and increased anxiety. When evaluated against Handayani et al. (2020), who targeted general speaking anxiety in the exact same institution (UNP), this research uncovers a highly specialized gap: university-level speaking anxiety does not operate in a vacuum but is heavily fueled by cognitive processing loads unique to academic discourse patterns (Goh & Burns, 2012). Furthermore, the findings corroborate Lan et al. (2024) regarding the massive impact of formal task demands on student oral production.

A striking revelation from this study is the sharp contrast between the moderate nature of the difficulties and the exceptionally high, proactive deployment of coping mechanisms (with mean scores reaching 3.99 for structured rehearsal). Undergraduates are evidently not passive victims of their communicative limits; they display resilient learner autonomy by co-opting mobile technology (digital dictionaries, lexical logs) and peer-observation strategies to mitigate psychological and linguistic friction. The frequent use of these strategies may be attributed to their accessibility and practicality. Digital tools and self-directed preparation techniques can be

employed independently outside the classroom, allowing students to address immediate linguistic needs and build confidence before participating in academic speaking activities. However, as noted, these tactics remain heavily localized, self-taught, and informal. This imbalance underscores an urgent pedagogical obligation for university lecturers to embed explicit strategy instruction directly into oral communication syllabi, bridging the gap between student independence and structured academic growth.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that academic speaking difficulties among English Education undergraduates at Universitas Negeri Padang constitute a multidimensional, developmental phenomenon. On the whole, students experience moderate difficulty across linguistic, organizational, and psychological domains, with spontaneous grammatical accuracy (tenses) forming the most severe bottleneck. This friction is sustained by an active interplay between limited active lexical banks, heavy real-time cognitive organizing loads, public performance anxiety, and minimal institutional immersion in academic English registers.

Nonetheless, undergraduates exhibit highly robust strategic competence, actively counteracting these communication barriers through cognitive coping actions—specifically intensive pre-performance rehearsal and systematic outline drafting. However, their intense reliance on self-taught, informal tactics exposes an instructional gap. It is therefore recommended that university instructors integrate explicit, formal oral strategy training into the classroom, that curriculum planners formalize strategic instruction within core course outlines, and that future researchers deploy experimental designs to test the objective efficacy of strategy-based academic speaking interventions.

REFERENCES

- Al Hosni, S. (2014). Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 2(6), 22–30.
- Amoah, S., & Yeboah, J. (2021). The speaking difficulties of Chinese EFL learners and their motivation towards speaking the English language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.4>
- Ariyanti, A. (2016). Psychological factors affecting EFL students' speaking performance. *ASIAN TEFL Journal of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.21462/asianteftl.v1i1.14>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/l.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2008). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. A. Soler & M. S. Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41–57). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0_3
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.

- Damayanti, M. E., & Listyani, L. (2020). An analysis of students' speaking anxiety in academic speaking class. *ELTR Journal*, 4(2), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v4i2.70>
- Goh, C. C. M. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Handayani, T., Rozimela, Y., & Fatimah, S. (2020). An analysis of English-speaking anxiety experienced by the second-year students of English Language and Literature Department of Universitas Negeri Padang and its causal factors. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 580–592.
- Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2005). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Routledge.
- 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>
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
- Islam, M. S., & Roy, S. (2024). Challenges in developing learners' English-speaking skills at the tertiary level in the EFL context: Teachers' and learners' perceptions [Preprint]. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4491944/v1>
- Juhana, J. (2012). Psychological factors that hinder students from speaking English in class: A case study in a senior high school in South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12), 100–110. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/2887>
- Lan, B., Keo, V., Sam, R., & Roeut, W. (2024). Exploring EFL learners' perception toward the difficulties in oral presentation. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(3), 174–190. <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v13i3.9662>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pham, N. H. T., & Nguyen, H. B. (2021). Difficulties in English speaking skills of non-English majored freshmen at a university. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 10(4), 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2021/v10/i4/APR21008>
- Putri, S. A., Amri, S., & Ahmad, A. (2020). The students' difficulties factors in speaking. *J-Shelves of Indragiri*, 1(2), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.32520/jsi.v1i2.1059>
- Rahman, A., Hamid, M., Hizbana, A. F., Halik, N., & Budianto, L. (2024). University students' perspective on English speaking challenges: A descriptive study. *JET (Journal of English Teaching) Adi Buana*, 9(1), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.36456/jet.v9.n01.2024.8763>
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Longman.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University Press.