TRANS-KATA
Journal of Language, Literature, Culture, and Education

e-ISSN: 2747-0555 | Volume 7, No. 1, 2026
http://ejournal.transbahasa.co.id/index.php/jllce

A STUDY ON HOW LIMITED VOCABULARY AND LOW LEARNING INTEREST REDUCE STUDENTS' CONFIDENCE IN SPEAKING ENGLISH

Anjelina Agustina Ndruru[1]*, Yasminar Amaerita Telaumbanua[2], Yaredi Waruwu[3], Afore Tahir Harefa[4]

[1,2,3,4]*English Education Study Program, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Universitas Nias, Indonesia*

anjelinandruru01@gmail.com[1], Yasminaramaeritatelaumbanua@unias.ac.id[2], yarediwaruwu@unias.ac.id[3], aforetahirharefa@unias.ac.id[4].

Received: 17-09-2026 Accepted: 18-11-2026 Published: 20-11-2026

Abstract: This study investigated the contribution of limited vocabulary and low learning interest to students' confidence in speaking English at SMP Swasta Idanoi. The research used a quantitative survey design. The population comprised 51 seventh-grade students enrolled in the 2025/2026 academic year; 25 students from Class VII-B were selected purposively as participants. Data were obtained from an oral vocabulary-related assessment and two questionnaires using five-point Likert response scales, one for learning interest and one for speaking confidence. Descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression were conducted in SPSS version 26. The partial regression result for limited vocabulary was not statistically significant ($B = -0.435$, $p = .722$). By contrast, low learning interest had a statistically significant partial contribution ($B = -0.655$, $p = .001$). The regression model with both predictors was significant, $F(2, 22) = 7.158$, $p = .004$, and accounted for 39.4% of the variance in speaking confidence ($R^2 = .394$). Thus, in this sample, learning interest made a significant unique contribution, whereas the vocabulary measure did not. Given the purposive sample of 25 students and the survey design, the results indicate statistical relationships and should not be interpreted as proof of causation.

***Keywords**: Limited vocabulary; learning interest; speaking confidence; EFL students; junior high school.*

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesian junior high schools, English is taught as a compulsory subject, with speaking forming an important part of students' communicative development. Through speaking, learners use English to convey messages and take part in real communication; it is therefore commonly regarded as an important dimension of EFL achievement (Asnaini et al., 2025). Despite this expectation, some learners remain reluctant to speak English in class. Their reluctance may be connected with several factors, including linguistic resources and their attitudes toward learning. One possible linguistic constraint is a limited vocabulary. Having access to a sufficient range of words helps learners formulate utterances, communicate ideas, and respond to others. When their available vocabulary is restricted, learners may find it difficult to choose appropriate words, arrange what they want to say, or continue an utterance smoothly. Rahmaniah et al. (2022) describe how vocabulary limitations can constrain learners' involvement in speaking tasks. In addition, learners may recognize words when they encounter them but be unable to retrieve and use those words productively in conversation (Webb & Nation, 2017). Such difficulties can coincide with hesitation, anxiety, and reluctance to speak, and may be related to lower confidence in oral communication.

Students' interest in learning is another factor that may be related to their confidence when speaking English. Interest can shape how much attention learners give to a lesson and how actively they take part in classroom tasks. Primastami and Insani (2024) reported that learners with limited interest may participate less and display more passive classroom behavior. In English lessons, reduced interest may be accompanied by less willingness to practise speaking and engage with opportunities to

*Corresponding Author:
anjelinandruru01@gmail.com

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA
This is an open access article under CC-BY-SA Licence

use the language. Fewer opportunities to participate may, in turn, limit learners' speaking experience. Hidi and Renninger (2006) explain that interest is closely connected with engagement in learning. Accordingly, vocabulary limitations and low learning interest represent two different dimensions that may be associated with speaking confidence: the first concerns the language resources available to learners, while the second concerns their engagement with learning activities. This study therefore considers their individual and combined statistical contributions.

Preliminary work at SMP Swasta Idanoi provided the local context for this study. During classroom observations on November 14, 2025, several students appeared hesitant when invited to answer in English, avoided speaking before the class, or used their first language instead. Interviews held on November 22, 2025, indicated that some students felt unsure when speaking because they had difficulty recalling vocabulary; they also described English lessons as difficult and monotonous. The teacher similarly reported that students often remained quiet or gave brief responses during oral activities. These observations suggest that both vocabulary-related difficulty and limited interest warrant examination in relation to students' speaking confidence. They are preliminary contextual information, not quantitative results of the present study.

The literature has addressed vocabulary knowledge, interest in learning, and confidence in oral communication from a range of perspectives. Rahmaniah et al. (2022), for example, discussed vocabulary learning among seventh-grade students and the role of vocabulary in language participation. Webb and Nation (2017) explain the importance of vocabulary knowledge across language skills, including learners' ability to communicate. Primastami and Insani (2024) examined learning interest and student achievement, while Asnaini et al. (2025) considered confidence in EFL speaking. MacIntyre et al. (1998) also highlight the relevance of affective factors, such as anxiety and self-confidence, to willingness to communicate in a second language. Taken together, these works provide a basis for considering linguistic and motivational dimensions when studying oral communication.

Although these publications provide useful insights into vocabulary, learning interest, and affective factors, the present study focuses on the way a vocabulary-related measure and learning interest contribute to speaking confidence within one statistical model. The research was conducted with seventh-grade students at SMP Swasta Idanoi, a context that is not represented by simply combining findings from studies conducted with other learners or outcomes. Its contribution is to examine the separate contributions of the two predictors and the explanatory contribution of the model as a whole. The analysis does not test an interaction between the predictors. Specifically, the study aims to determine whether limited vocabulary and low learning interest are statistically related to students' confidence in speaking English, individually and when entered together in a multiple-regression model. The findings may help teachers consider both students' access to vocabulary and their engagement when planning classroom speaking opportunities.

The preliminary observations at SMP Swasta Idanoi on November 14, 2025, and interviews on November 22, 2025, also indicated that some students were reluctant to answer in English, avoided speaking before classmates, and relied on their first language. Students described English as difficult and monotonous, while the teacher noted that oral responses were often brief or absent. These accounts are included to explain the setting and the reason for selecting the research variables; they are not treated as measured outcomes or as evidence of statistical relationships.

Earlier research has considered vocabulary, learning interest, and speaking confidence, but this study places limited vocabulary and low learning interest in the same multiple linear regression model for

 ©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

seventh-grade learners at SMP Swasta Idanoi. The analysis estimates the partial contribution of each predictor while controlling for the other, as well as the overall explanatory contribution of the two-predictor model. It does not examine whether one predictor changes the effect of the other.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there any effect of limited vocabulary on students' confidence in speaking English at SMP Swasta Idanoi?
2. Is there any effect of low learning interest on students' confidence in speaking English at SMP Swasta Idanoi?
3. To what extent do limited vocabulary and learning interest collectively influence students' speaking confidence?
4. Do limited vocabulary and low learning interest have a significant simultaneous effect on students' confidence in speaking English at SMP Swasta Idanoi?

METHOD

Type of Research

A quantitative survey design was selected because the study examined numerical scores and used statistical procedures to assess the relationships among the research variables. Rauteda (2025) describes quantitative educational research as an approach associated with measurement, objectivity, and the testing of hypotheses. These features correspond to the purpose of this research: to estimate the individual and combined statistical contributions of Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest to Students' Confidence in Speaking English.

Population

The population was defined as the full group of students to whom the study's research focus applied. Hossan et al. (2023) describe a research population as the set of eligible individuals identified according to the study criteria. In this research, the population included all 51 seventh-grade students enrolled at SMP Swasta Idanoi during the 2025/2026 academic year. They were organized into Class VII-A and Class VII-B.

Sample

Rather than selecting participants randomly, this study used purposive sampling. This approach involves choosing participants in accordance with criteria relevant to the research purpose (Campbell et al., 2020). Hossan et al. (2023) likewise explain that sampling procedures identify members of a population who will provide the data required by a study.

Twenty-five students from Class VII-B participated in the research. The class was selected after a preliminary discussion with the English teacher, who indicated that its learning context was relevant to the issues addressed in this study: vocabulary limitations, learning interest, and confidence in speaking English. The selection was therefore guided by the teacher's preliminary information, not by a claim that the students had already been classified through the study's measurement instruments.

All 25 students enrolled in Class VII-B were included. Thus, the participants represented the selected class only; they were not a randomly selected representation of all 51 seventh-grade students. This distinction is important when interpreting the scope of the findings.

The 25 participants provided the data for the quantitative procedures, including multiple linear regression with two predictors. Given the modest sample size and the purposive selection of one class, the statistical results are interpreted with caution. They describe the participating students and should not be assumed to represent all seventh-grade students at the school or elsewhere. Further research with larger and more representative samples would be needed to assess the wider applicability of the findings.

Research Instrument

Research instruments are tools through which information about the variables of a study is gathered in a consistent manner. In quantitative studies, tests and questionnaires

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

can produce numerical observations for statistical analysis. Gay et al. (2012) emphasize the need for instruments to correspond to the constructs and objectives being investigated. In line with this principle, the present study used an oral speaking task to assess Limited Vocabulary and questionnaires to obtain scores for Low Learning Interest and Students' Confidence in Speaking English.

Three instruments were administered: one oral speaking assessment and two questionnaires. The speaking assessment provided the score for Limited Vocabulary (X1); the questionnaire on learning interest measured X2; and a separate questionnaire measured the dependent variable, Students' Confidence in Speaking English (Y). The instruments were organized around the indicators specified for each construct.

Limited Vocabulary (X_1)

Limited Vocabulary (X1) was assessed through an oral task called the "Introduction Test." Students were asked to speak in front of the class, introducing themselves and describing their class schedules in simple English. The expected content included personal information, class and school subjects, schedule details, and relevant time expressions. Each student completed the task in approximately 2–4 minutes.

The researchers rated each performance against four vocabulary-related dimensions: Vocabulary Breadth, Vocabulary Depth, Vocabulary in Context, and Word Usage. A four-point rubric was applied to each dimension. The scale was intentionally coded in the direction of vocabulary limitation: 4 represented Very Limited Vocabulary, 3 Limited Vocabulary, 2 Fair Vocabulary, and 1 Good Vocabulary. Accordingly, a larger combined X1 score represented a greater degree of vocabulary limitation.

Low Learning Interest (X_2)

Low Learning Interest (X2) was measured with 20 questionnaire statements. The statements covered four areas: Feeling Bored During Learning, Lack of Attention During Lessons, Passive Participation in Class, and Avoidance of Learning Activities. Five statements represented each area. The instrument was intended to capture students' reported experiences of boredom, inattention, limited participation, and avoidance in English learning.

Students' Confidence in Speaking English (Y)

The questionnaire for Students' Confidence in Speaking English (Y) also contained 20 statements. Its five dimensions were Confidence in Speaking Situations, Communication Behavior, Positive Belief in Speaking Ability, Speaking Skill Confidence, and Positive Self-Perception. Each dimension was represented by four statements addressing students' reported confidence when speaking, expressing ideas, communicating, and using English orally.

Both questionnaires used five response options on a Likert-type scale, a format commonly applied to the measurement of attitudes and perceptions (Koo & Yang, 2025). The options were Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Neutral (N) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1. Scoring followed the intended direction of each construct: X2 statements represented limitations in learning interest, whereas Y statements represented positive speaking confidence.

Overall, the study used one oral task scored across four vocabulary dimensions and two questionnaires. The learning-interest questionnaire comprised 20 statements across four indicators, and the speaking-confidence questionnaire comprised 20 statements across five indicators.

Table 1. *Distribution of Questionnaire Items*

Variable	Indicators	Item Numbers	Number of Items
X_2	Feeling Bored During Learning	1–5	5
X_2	Lack of Attention During Lessons	6–10	5
X_2	Passive Participation in Class	11–15	5
X_2	Avoidance of Learning	16–20	5

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

	Activities		
X_2 Total	**4 indicators**	**1–20**	**20**
Y	Confidence in Speaking Situations	1–4	4
Y	Communication Behavior	5–8	4
Y	Positive Belief in Speaking Ability	9–12	4
Y	Speaking Skill Confidence	13–16	4
Y	Positive Self-Perception	17–20	4
Y Total	**5 indicators**	**1–20**	**20**

Table 2. *Summary of Research Instruments*

Variable	Instrument	Indicators	Items/ Assessment
Limited Vocabulary (X_1)	Speaking test	4	1 oral task
Low Learning Interest (X_2)	Questionnaire	4	20 statements
Speaking Confidence (Y)	Questionnaire	5	20 statements
Total		**13 indicators**	**40 questionnaire statements and 1 speaking task**

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Before the main statistical analysis, the instruments were examined for validity and reliability. For the vocabulary speaking task (X1), expert judgment was used to review whether the task and rubric adequately represented the intended content. The two questionnaires—Low Learning Interest (X2) and Students' Confidence in Speaking English (Y)—were assessed for item validity using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation.

The item analysis found that each of the 20 statements in the X2 questionnaire met the validity criterion; the coefficients ranged from 0.545 to 0.962. The 20 statements in the Y questionnaire were also retained as valid, with coefficients between 0.584 and 0.897. In both cases, the reported coefficients were above the r-table reference value of 0.396.

Internal consistency was evaluated with Cronbach's Alpha. The coefficient for the Low Learning Interest questionnaire was 0.951, and the coefficient for the speaking-confidence questionnaire was 0.958. As both exceeded the 0.70 criterion used in this study, the two questionnaires were judged to have high internal consistency.

Data Collecting Technique

The research data came from three sources: the oral speaking assessment, the two questionnaires, and documentation. The oral task supplied the Limited Vocabulary score, whereas students' responses to the questionnaires provided the Low Learning Interest and speaking-confidence scores. Attendance records and research photographs were collected as supplementary documentation.

For the oral assessment, students completed the "Introduction Test" by giving a short self-introduction and describing their class schedules in simple English. The speaking period lasted about 2–4 minutes. The researchers evaluated the recorded performance with the four-part vocabulary rubric—Vocabulary Breadth, Vocabulary Depth, Vocabulary in Context, and Word Usage. Each dimension received a score from 1 to 4, with higher totals indicating more pronounced vocabulary limitations. Thus, X1 was derived from performance in an oral task, not from a multiple-choice vocabulary test.

Students also completed two 20-item questionnaires: one concerning Low Learning Interest and the other concerning their confidence in speaking English. Both used five response categories. The researchers explained the directions before administration so that participants could understand how to select their responses. Item scoring was aligned with the coding direction established for each variable.

Attendance lists and photographs taken during the research activities were collected as documentation. These materials served as supplementary records of the participants and the implementation of data collection.

Data Analysis Technique

Multiple linear regression was preceded by checks of the assumptions relevant to the planned analysis. The researchers examined the distribution of regression residuals, the

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

linearity of the relationships between each predictor and the outcome, and the possibility of multicollinearity between the two independent variables.

Normality Test

The normality assessment focused on the regression residuals. Two graphical procedures were reviewed: the Histogram of Regression Standardized Residuals and the Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residuals.

The histogram displayed a distribution that was broadly bell-shaped. In the Normal P-P Plot, most plotted residual points lay near the diagonal reference line, although a small number showed some departure. On the basis of these graphical patterns, the residual distribution was treated as approximately normal for the purposes of the analysis.

Linearity Test

The linearity check examined whether each independent variable had a linear relationship with speaking confidence. The Deviation from Linearity significance value was 0.893 for Limited Vocabulary (X1) and confidence (Y), and 0.528 for Low Learning Interest (X2) and confidence (Y). Both values exceeded the 0.05 threshold. Accordingly, the analysis found no statistically significant departure from linearity for either pair of variables.

Multicollinearity Test

Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were used to assess multicollinearity between the predictors. Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest each had a tolerance of 0.975 and a VIF of 1.026. Because tolerance was above 0.10 and VIF was below 10 for both variables, the results did not indicate problematic multicollinearity.

Table 3. *Results of Linearity Test*

Variables	Deviation from Linearity	Decision
X1 and Y	0.893	Linear
X2 and Y	0.528	Linear

Table 4. *Results of Multicollinearity Test*

Independent Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Limited Vocabulary (X1)	0.975	1.026
Low Learning Interest (X2)	0.975	1.026

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

The analysis addressed the statistical relationships of Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest with Students' Confidence in Speaking English at SMP Swasta Idanoi. Complete data were obtained from 25 seventh-grade participants. The X1 score came from the oral vocabulary-related task, while X2 and Y were represented by questionnaire scores. Table 5 summarizes the descriptive results for these measures.

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics of the Research Variables*

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Limited Vocabulary (X_1)	25	5	16	11.28	2.407
Low Learning Interest (X_2)	25	20	87	49.60	16.215
Speaking Confidence (Y)	25	20	82	60.12	17.251

Source: SPSS Output (2026)

As reported in Table 5, the Limited Vocabulary scores ranged from 5 to 16, with a mean of 11.28. Low Learning Interest scores extended from 20 to 87 and had a mean of 49.60. For Students' Confidence in Speaking English, the observed scores ranged from 20 to 82, with an average of 60.12. These values describe the scores recorded for the 25 participants.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

A multiple linear regression model was fitted to estimate the partial contribution of each predictor while the other predictor was held constant, and to assess the model containing both predictors. The coefficient estimates produced by SPSS version 26 are reported in Table 6.

Table 6. *Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients*

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	97.495	15.261	–	6.389	.000

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

Limited Vocabulary (X_1)	-0.435	1.205	-0.061	-0.361	.722
Low Learning Interest (X_2)	-0.655	0.179	-0.615	-3.661	.001

Source: SPSS Output (2026).

Based on Table 6, the multiple linear regression equation is:

$$\mathbf{Y = 97.495 - 0.435X_1 - 0.655X_2}$$

The estimated intercept was 97.495. In the fitted equation, the coefficient for Limited Vocabulary was −0.435. This coefficient represents the expected change in the predicted confidence score for a one-unit increase in X1 when X2 is held constant. Its p-value was .722, so the partial association was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

For Low Learning Interest, the estimated coefficient was −0.655. This represents the predicted change in the confidence score for a one-unit increase in X2 while X1 remains constant. The associated p-value was .001, indicating a statistically significant partial relationship. The negative signs must be read in light of the coding of the two instruments, particularly the fact that higher X2 scores indicate greater limitations in learning interest.

Simultaneous Test (F-test)

The simultaneous test was conducted to determine whether Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest jointly contributed to the regression model for Students' Confidence in Speaking English. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *Simultaneous Test (F-test)*

Model	F	Sig.
Regression	7.158	.004

Source: SPSS Output (2026).

The regression model produced an F value of 7.158 with a significance value of .004. Since .004 is below the .05 criterion, the null hypothesis for the overall model was rejected. The two predictors, considered together in the regression equation, therefore accounted for a statistically significant portion of variation in speaking-confidence scores in this sample.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The coefficient of determination was used to identify the proportion of variation in Students' Confidence in Speaking English explained by the two independent variables. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Coefficient of Determination (R^2)*

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.628	.394	.339	14.02445

Source: SPSS Output (2026).

The R Square statistic in Table 8 was .394. This indicates that the model containing Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest accounted for 39.4% of the observed variance in Students' Confidence in Speaking English. The other 60.6% was outside the explanatory contribution of these two predictors in the fitted model; the present data do not identify which other factors account for that portion.

Partial Test (t-test)

The t-test results in Table 6 were used to assess the partial contribution of each predictor. For Limited Vocabulary, the significance value was .722, which exceeded .05. The null hypothesis for this predictor was therefore not rejected; the analysis did not establish a statistically significant unique contribution of X1 after controlling for X2.

The result for Low Learning Interest was different. Its significance value was .001, below .05, so the null hypothesis for X2 was rejected. Within this model and sample, Low Learning Interest showed a statistically significant partial relationship with Students' Confidence in Speaking English, whereas Limited Vocabulary did not.

Limited Vocabulary and Students' Confidence in Speaking English

When Low Learning Interest was included in the regression equation, Limited Vocabulary did not show a statistically significant unique contribution to speaking confidence. This result should not be taken to mean that vocabulary has no role in learning English.

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

More narrowly, the data from this particular vocabulary assessment did not provide evidence of an independent statistical contribution to confidence after accounting for the learning-interest score.

This finding differs from Al Indra et al. (2024), who reported a significant relationship between vocabulary mastery and students' speaking ability. It also differs from Dalimunthe and Haryadi (2022), who examined the effect of vocabulary mastery and learning methods on English speaking ability. These studies emphasize the relevance of vocabulary knowledge to students' oral language performance. Similarly, Rahmaniah et al. (2022) examined vocabulary teaching among seventh-grade students, highlighting the role of vocabulary development in English learning. Related research has also examined vocabulary difficulties and vocabulary acquisition among EFL learners (Harselina et al., 2024; Trang et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2025).

The difference may partly reflect the distinction between the outcomes investigated. Speaking ability and speaking performance concern what learners can do orally, whereas speaking confidence concerns their perceptions of their readiness or ability to speak. Vocabulary knowledge provides resources for understanding and producing language, but a learner's vocabulary score and self-reported confidence are not identical measures. A student may have vocabulary limitations without reporting confidence at the same level, and vocabulary knowledge alone may not determine how confident a student feels.

The operational measures used here are also relevant. X1 was obtained from the Introduction Test, in which students introduced themselves and described their class schedules. The rubric assessed Vocabulary Breadth, Vocabulary Depth, Vocabulary in Context, and Word Usage. By contrast, Y was measured through a questionnaire about students' confidence. Since the oral task and questionnaire addressed different constructs and used different response formats, their scores need not show the same pattern. Research on vocabulary strategies, proficiency, and vocabulary knowledge likewise illustrates that vocabulary learning and use can be examined through different measures (Ruswandi et al., 2024; Usman et al., 2024; Zano, 2022).

The finding should be viewed in relation to the study's limited sample of 25 students from a single seventh-grade class. Earlier studies differed in their participants, educational settings, measures, and outcomes. Such differences may help explain why their findings are not identical to the present result. The current analysis does not negate the importance of vocabulary for language learning; it indicates only that the vocabulary score used here was not a statistically significant partial predictor of reported speaking confidence in this sample.

Low Learning Interest and Students' Confidence in Speaking English

The regression analysis showed a statistically significant partial relationship between Low Learning Interest and Students' Confidence in Speaking English. The coefficient was negative. This direction is consistent with the instrument coding: a higher X2 score represented greater limitations in learning interest, while a higher Y score represented stronger speaking confidence. Therefore, within the observed data, students reporting greater limitations in learning interest tended to have lower speaking-confidence scores.

This pattern can be considered alongside Hidi and Renninger's (2006) account of interest as a factor associated with engagement in learning. When interest is limited, students may be less inclined to attend to or participate in learning activities. In English classes, reduced engagement may coincide with fewer attempts to speak and fewer opportunities to practise oral communication. The present analysis does not establish this as a causal sequence, but it identifies a statistically significant association between the learning-interest measure and reported speaking confidence. Other studies of interest and engagement in language learning provide related

 ©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

perspectives (Mahibba et al., 2024; Wahyuni et al., 2025a, 2025b).

Primastami and Insani (2024) examined learning interest in relation to achievement in Javanese language courses, a different subject and outcome from those considered here. Their work nevertheless provides context for understanding the educational relevance of students' interest. Noyan et al. (2025) focused more directly on factors associated with EFL learners' lack of interest in English lessons. Neither study investigated exactly the same population and outcome as the present research. The current findings add evidence from one junior high school class about the statistical association between limited learning interest and speaking confidence. Related discussions of low interest among junior high school students and motivation in willingness to communicate also provide useful context (Mendrofa et al., 2026; Purwaningsih & Harahap, 2025).

MacIntyre et al. (1998) place confidence and affective conditions within their account of willingness to communicate in a second language. Their framework is relevant because oral participation involves more than a learner's knowledge of language forms. Viewed in this context, the significant partial result for Low Learning Interest suggests that motivational dimensions should also be considered when interpreting students' reported confidence in speaking English.

The survey findings should not, however, be interpreted as proof that low learning interest causes a reduction in confidence. The design identifies associations among the scores collected at a particular time; it does not establish the direction of causation or demonstrate a causal mechanism. The conclusion supported by the data is that greater reported limitations in learning interest were associated with lower speaking confidence among the participating students.

Combined Contribution of Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest

The third research question addressed how much of the variation in Students' Confidence in Speaking English could be accounted for by the two predictors in combination. The R Square value of .394 indicates that Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest together explained 39.4% of the variance in the confidence scores. The remaining 60.6% was not explained by this two-predictor model.

The model brings together two distinct aspects of students' learning experiences. Limited Vocabulary represents a linguistic measure, whereas Low Learning Interest represents a motivational measure. Considering both in one regression analysis offers an estimate of their combined explanatory contribution to speaking-confidence scores. It does not imply that these are the only relevant dimensions or that the model captures every influence on students' confidence.

The overall R Square value should not be read as evidence that both predictors made statistically significant independent contributions. The partial tests provide a more specific result: Low Learning Interest was statistically significant, while Limited Vocabulary was not significant after controlling for Low Learning Interest. Thus, the model's combined explanatory value and the separate t-test results answer different questions and should be interpreted together.

The unexplained 60.6% leaves room for factors not included in this study. Previous literature discusses speaking anxiety, self-efficacy, and willingness to communicate as relevant concepts in second-language communication (MacIntyre et al., 1998; Asnaini et al., 2025). Because these variables were not measured here, their contribution to the confidence scores cannot be estimated from the present data. They may be considered in subsequent studies. Other work has examined speaking confidence among learners (Brilianti, 2023; Supriyanto & Savitri, 2024), while Fang (2024) and Fitrah et al. (2025) have considered self-efficacy, motivation, confidence, and speaking performance.

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

Simultaneous Statistical Contribution of Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest

The fourth research question concerned the statistical significance of the regression model when Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest were entered together. The F-test result showed that the overall model was significant. In other words, the two-predictor model explained a statistically significant amount of variation in students' speaking-confidence scores in the sample.

The significant F-test does not require each predictor to have a significant t-test result. In this study, the partial test for Limited Vocabulary was not significant, whereas the partial test for Low Learning Interest was significant. The overall F-test evaluates the model containing both predictors, while each t-test evaluates the unique contribution of one predictor with the other held constant. The outcomes can therefore differ without being inconsistent.

A combined contribution in multiple regression should also be distinguished from a statistical interaction. The overall model test evaluates the predictors entered together. An interaction analysis, by comparison, would test whether the association between one predictor and speaking confidence depends on the value of the other predictor. No interaction term was included in this study. The F-test consequently supports the statistical significance of the two-predictor model, not an interaction between Limited Vocabulary and Low Learning Interest.

Practical Implications and Limitations

The significant partial result for Low Learning Interest indicates that students' engagement with English learning is relevant when considering their reported confidence in speaking activities. Teachers may therefore wish to provide meaningful opportunities for students to use English and participate orally. Vocabulary instruction also remains educationally relevant because learners need words to express ideas, although the vocabulary measure in this study did not show a significant unique contribution to confidence. Research on speaking performance and classroom participation similarly points to the value of opportunities for oral practice (Andriani et al., 2024). These points are implications for teaching practice, not effects of an intervention tested in this research. The study did not evaluate a particular teaching strategy or measure classroom support, body language, or peer support; no findings about the effects of those factors can therefore be claimed.

Several limitations should be considered when reading the results. The participants were 25 students from Class VII-B at SMP Swasta Idanoi, selected purposively, so the findings are specific to this group and cannot automatically be generalized to other classes or schools. In addition, the variables were measured using different methods: an oral vocabulary-related task for Limited Vocabulary and self-report questionnaires for Low Learning Interest and speaking confidence. Self-reported answers may not fully capture students' behavior or experiences. The analysis also included only two predictors, leaving other linguistic, motivational, and psychological dimensions outside its scope. Finally, the survey was conducted over a limited period and cannot establish causal relationships or track changes in confidence over time.

Further studies could recruit more participants from different classes or schools and include additional variables, such as speaking anxiety and self-efficacy. Researchers could also combine survey data with other forms of evidence or use designs suited to examining change over time. These approaches may extend understanding of the factors associated with students' confidence in speaking English.

CONCLUSION

The results show that Limited Vocabulary did not make a statistically significant partial contribution to students' confidence in speaking English, whereas Low Learning Interest did. When both predictors were entered into the regression model, the model was statistically significant and accounted for

©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

39.4% of the variance in speaking-confidence scores. This combined result does not mean that both predictors were independently significant: the partial test identified a significant contribution for Low Learning Interest only. The findings therefore point to learning interest as an important correlate of speaking confidence in the participating seventh-grade students.

For classroom practice, the findings suggest that teachers may consider students' interest and participation alongside opportunities to develop vocabulary and practise speaking. Engaging activities and a supportive environment may create more opportunities for oral participation, although the present study did not test a specific intervention. The conclusions are limited to 25 students in one class at SMP Swasta Idanoi and should not be generalized beyond this context without further evidence. Future research may use larger, more varied samples and examine additional factors related to speaking confidence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to express sincere gratitude to Almighty God for His grace and blessings throughout the completion of this research. The researchers also gratefully acknowledge the support and guidance of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education and the English Education Study Program of Universitas Nias. Special appreciation is extended to the academic advisor, thesis supervisor, and research instrument validators for their valuable guidance, corrections, suggestions, and constructive feedback. The researchers also sincerely thank the English teacher and the seventh-grade students of Class VII B at SMP Swasta Idanoi for their cooperation and participation during the research process. Finally, heartfelt gratitude is expressed to the researchers' beloved parents and friends for their continuous prayers, encouragement, moral support, and assistance throughout the completion of this study.

AI ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers declare that artificial intelligence (AI) tools, specifically ChatGPT, were used in the preparation of this manuscript for language editing, drafting assistance, organization of ideas, and improvement of clarity. All AI-assisted outputs were carefully reviewed, revised, and validated by the researchers. The researchers take full responsibility for the accuracy, interpretation, originality, and final content of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Al Indra, R., Eliwarti, & Syarfi, M. (2024). The correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of the first-year students of senior high school. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, *12*(1), 98–107. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i1.4135

Andriani, R., Sumardi, M. S., & Pratama, A. (2024). Factors affecting students' English speaking performance in classroom participation. *Jurnal Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, *5*(2), 208–212. https://doi.org/10.30596/jppp.v5i2.20470

Asnaini, A., Tohamba, C. P. P., & Rusli, T. I. (2025). Self-confidence factors of EFL students in speaking class: A case study in higher education. *Klasikal: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, *7*(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.52208/klasikal.v7i1.1263

Brilianti, A. E. (2023). The student's speaking confidence level at Language Center Pare Kediri. *Journal of General Education Science*, *1*(3), 151–154. https://doi.org/10.62966/joges.v1i3.335

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Dalimunthe, L., & Haryadi, R. N. (2022). The effect of learning methods and vocabulary mastery on English speaking ability. *Lingua Educationist: International Journal of Language Education*, *1*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.54099/le.v1i1.58

Fang, F. (2024). Learners' speaking self-efficacy, self-efficacy sources, and their relations in the traditional and flipped instructional modes. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2414

 ©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

051

Fitrah, A. I., Korompot, C. A., & Sakkir, G. (2025). The influence of EFL students' self-confidence and motivation on speaking performance. Journal of Excellence in English Language Education, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.26858/joeele.v4i2,%20April.72619

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications (10th ed.)*. Pearson.

Harselina, H., Idayani, A., & Sailun, B. (2024). Students' difficulties with vocabulary mastery in English language education at the university level. *J-SHMIC: Journal of English for Academic*, *11*(2), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.25299/jshmic.2024.vol11(2).18668

Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four-phase model of interest development. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(2), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_4

Hossan, D., Dato' Mansor, Z., & Jaharuddin, N. S. (2023). Research population and sampling in quantitative study. *International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship*, *13*(3), 209–222. https://doi.org/10.58915/ijbt.v13i3.263

Koo, M., & Yang, S. W. (2025). Likert-type scale. *Encyclopedia*, *5*(1), Article 18. https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia5010018

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(4), 545–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Mahibba, E. R., & Rodliyah, R. S. (2024). The use of a culturally responsive teaching approach in improving interest and learning outcomes in English teaching. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, *24*(2), 163–178. https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v24i2.75384

Mendrofa, D. F., Gea, J. K., Lase, A., Buulolo, M., Telaumbanua, I. M., & Telaumbanua, Y. A. (2026). Students' low interest in learning English despite the use of active learning strategies in junior high school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia: Teori, Penelitian, dan Inovasi*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.59818/jpi.v6i1.2542

Noyan, M., Usadiati, W., & Mafulah, S. (2025). Exploring factors influencing EFL students' lack of interest in English lessons. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning*, *6*(1), 22–32. https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v6i1.22907

Primastami, R. J., & Insani, N. H. (2024). Investigating the impact of learning interest on student achievement in Javanese language courses at state senior high schools. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *16*(4), 5897-5908. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v16i4.5669

Purwaningsih, S., & Harahap, A. (2025). Exploring EFL students' willingness to communicate: The role of motivation in English learning. *EduInovasi: Journal of Basic Educational Studies*, *5*(2), 1074-1087. https://doi.org/10.47467/eduinovasi.v5i2.8422

Rahmaniah, S., Salam, U., Wardah, W., Regina, R., & Rezeki, Y. S. (2022). The use of Bingo game in teaching vocabulary to the seventh-grade students. *Journal of English as a Foreign Language Education*, 3(2), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.26418/jefle.v3i2.61249

Rauteda, K. R. (2025). Quantitative research in education: Philosophy, uses and limitations. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, *2*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.56916/jmrd.v2i1.993

Ruswandi, R., Aprilianti, Z. V. T., & Utami, U. F. (2024). Investigating EFL learners' autonomous use of vocabulary learning strategies outside of school. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, *8*(2), 532–542. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i2.26832

Supriyanto, A. C., & Savitri, W. E. (2024). Exploring factors influencing speaking confidence among secondary school students. *Channing: Journal of English Language Education and Literature*, *9*(2), 61–74. https://doi.org/10.30599/channing.v9i2.3784

Trang, N. H., Truong, D. V., & Ha, H. T. (2023). Quantifying vocabulary learning belief and strategy. *Heliyon*, *9*(5), Article e16009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16009

Usman, M., Yoestara, M., Rizal, M., Nurjannah, C., & Mohamed, N. A. (2024). A study on enhancing EFL students' vocabulary proficiency via TikTok. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *11*(3), 1315–1331. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.38472

Wahyuni, N. T., Mulyanah, A., Winahyu, S. K., Sariah, Darmawati, B., Widiastuti, R., Zabadi, F., Parwati, S. A. P. E., Ratnawati, & Izzak, A. (2025a). Developing a situational interest scale for Indonesian young learners: Beyond academic scores in primary EFL classrooms. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *10*, Article 57. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00356-7

Wahyuni, N. T., Mulyanah, A., Winahyu, S. K., Darmawati, B., Widiastuti, R., Sariah,

 ©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA

Parwati, S. A. P. E., Ratnawati, & Izzak, A. (2025b). Leveraging situational interest to enhance motivation and engagement in Indonesian primary EFL classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *15*(6), 1975–1986. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1506.26

Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned.* Oxford University Press.

Zano, K. (2022). Breadth and depth-vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension in an English first additional language context. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *10*(2), 223–233. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i2.4827

Zeng, Y., Kuo, L.-J., Chen, L., Lin, J.-A., & Shen, H. (2025). Vocabulary instruction for English learners: A systematic review connecting theories, research, and practices. *Education Sciences*, *15*(3), Article 262. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030262

 ©0000 The Author(s). Published by TRANSBAHASA