

Barriers to Having Successful Communication Skills in Performing English Public Speaking: A Study of EFL Learners

Marnangkok Pakpahan

English Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business

University of Widya Dharma Pontianak, Indonesia

Email: marnangkok@widyadharma.ac.id

Abstract

Successful communication might be hindered by certain factors which act as barriers to its success and effectiveness. Hence, the present study was aimed at exploring any possible barriers faced by EFL learners to having successful communication skills in performing English public speaking tasks. The data of the present study were obtained from twenty-four research participants, using total population sampling technique, in the form of video-taped recordings - as the main instrument for data collection. The data were analyzed qualitatively using mixed methods research approach and applying thematic analysis strategy. The design of the present study was case study in nature. The findings of the present study revealed that most of the research participants are still at the level of 'Proficient' and 'Basic' categories regarding their competence in performing English public speaking oral communication. In terms of Grammatical & Vocabulary usages and Pronunciation & Intonation main themes, their competence is classified as 'Proficient' category, and in terms of Discourse Management and Fluency main themes, their competence is classified as 'Basic' category. The most dominant barriers faced by the research participants to having successful communication skills in performing English public speaking tasks are related to Discourse Management and Fluency main themes.

Keywords: Barriers, Communication Skills, Public Speaking, EFL Learners

INTRODUCTION

The core purpose of learning a foreign language is for being able to have good communication skills in the target language orally and in written as well. Therefore, the ability of foreign language learners to have successful and effective communication skills in the target language becomes the key point in achieving their foreign language learning goals. The same applies to foreign language learning like English language as it is "one of the most important languages in the world" (Baugh & Cable, 2002, p. 3).

As a matter of fact, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners often face barriers or obstacles in producing successful and effective communication skills in real life practices such as in English Public Speaking class. As Radhika (2020) claimed that when individuals make use of different words, phrases or sentences, which are not understandable, then it was regarded as one of the major barriers to effective and successful communication. Therefore, when the individuals are not able to acquire an efficient understanding of the words being used or misinterpret the words, they will not be able to communicate with others in an efficient and successful manner. The present study, therefore, contributes to exploring any possible barriers or obstacles faced by EFL learners to having successful communication skills in performing English public speaking tasks in their Public Speaking class.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. Review of Relevant Literature

What is Public Speaking?

Public speaking is “a process, an act and an art of making a speech before an audience” (Nikitina, 2011, p. 10). In addition, Shyam & Joy (2016) defined public speaking as a structured speech pattern given to an audience with three major goals in mind: to inform, persuade, and entertain. In other words, public speaking can be meant as an activity of speaking on a topic in an organized, face-to-face, prepared, purposeful attempt to inform, persuade, or entertain a group of people through words, physical delivery, and (at times) with the help of visual or audio aids.

Moreover, Novakovic & Teodosijevic (2017) claimed that public speaking can also be done when you do not have any living person(s) in front of you, but you are talking only to a machine or tool, such as when we speak in front of a camera, whether it is a live broadcast, through some means of communication, or footage that would later be broadcasted. This means that when someone is talking to a machine, or a tool, and not a living person or people, he is actually talking to anyone or people who will ever see the footage and by which he wants to achieve some goals.

In conclusion, public speaking which was traditionally meant as an act of face-to-face speaking to a live audience in the past, today it includes any form of speaking (formally and informally) to an audience, including pre-recorded speech delivered over great distance by means of technology. In brief, the concept of public speaking is the act or process of giving speech(es) in front of public or the art of making effective oral communication with an audience, where every aspect given by the speaker is addressed to a group of people or individual listener, either live or via electronic means of communication, which aims to achieve a specific goal through various techniques of influence, information, and entertainment.

Types of Public Speaking

Every day, across the globe, people often stand to speak before some types of audiences. Although public speeches have various types, they are usually grouped into three types based on the intended objectives: Informative Speech, Persuasive Speech, and Entertaining Speech.

Informative speech or speaking is one of the most familiar public speaking types. The main purpose of the informative speech is to distribute one’s knowledge of any subject with the audience. The reasons for giving informative speech might be varying extensively. For example, someone could be invited to train a group of co-workers on how to apply the latest computer software. Informative speech is usually incorporated in many different professions or occupations, e.g., teachers speak to their students and the parents as well, physicians usually give lectures regarding their expertise to their patients, medical students, and other physicians. Therefore, informative speech becomes a general part of many jobs and everyday activities. As a conclusion, having an ability to speaking effectively and successfully has become a vital and necessary expertise in today’s life.

Persuasive speech or speaking is another common type of public speaking. This type of public speaking is usually conducted to convince other people or audience. In everyday lives, people are generally called to motivate, convince, or encourage others to transforming their beliefs, taking action, or reconsidering the decision. Convincing clients to buy the products of a company and inspiring students to go to college are examples of public speaking activities to persuade or influence other people. Therefore, persuasive speech becomes an important part of getting and continuing success because if someone or people can develop the skills of persuading or influencing others effectively, it will prove to be professionally and personally rewarding.

Entertaining speech or speaking is another type of public speaking engaging a display of speaking to any types of occasions such as performing introductions of wedding toasts, giving and acknowledging awards, providing eulogies at the memorial services and funerals, performing motivational speeches, and giving after-dinner speeches. Therefore, there are experts, from comedians to religious leaders, that make living only from giving entertaining speeches.

B. Conceptual Framework

The Nature of Thematic Analysis

Caulfield (2019) defined thematic analysis as a method of analyzing qualitative data. It is usually applied to a set of texts, such as an interview or transcripts. In this case, the researcher is trying to closely examine the data to identify common themes – topics, ideas, and patterns of meaning that come up repeatedly. Therefore, thematic analysis approach is often considered as a good approach to be applied when a researcher is trying to find out something about values from a set of qualitative data such as interview transcripts, or survey responses, and the like.

Furthermore, Caulfield (2019) added that there were various approaches to conducting thematic analysis, but whichever of the approaches is used, it should follow a six-step process, they were: *familiarization, coding, generating themes, reviewing themes, defining & naming themes, and writing up*. He, then, summarized the description of each of the six steps as follows:

1. Familiarization is an important thing to do to get a complete overview of all the data which were already collected before getting started to analyze individual items. This step might involve transcribing audio or video recordings, reading through the text and taking initial notes, and generally looking through the data to get familiar with it.
2. Coding means identifying patterns among them by highlighting sections of the data and coming up with shorthand labels or “codes” to describe their content. This step is done to go through the transcript of every video transcript and highlight everything that jumps out as relevant or potentially interesting. As well as highlighting all the phrases and sentences that match these codes, we can keep adding new codes as we go through the text. After that all the data are collated together into groups identified by code, which then these codes allow the researcher to gain a condensed overview of the main points and common meanings that recur throughout the data.
3. Generating themes is a process of turning codes into themes. Themes are generally broader than codes. Most of the time, several codes are combined into a single theme and other codes might become themes in their own right. The process of generating themes might be varying according to what the researcher is trying to find out, that is creating potential themes that tell the researcher something helpful about the data for his/her purposes.
4. Reviewing themes is an intention to make sure that all of the themes are useful and can become accurate representations of the data. If any problems are encountered with the themes, the researcher might split them up, combine them, discard them or create new ones: whatever makes them more useful and accurate.
5. Defining & naming themes is a process of defining themes which involves formulating exactly what it is meant by each theme and figuring out how it helps the researcher understand the data. And naming themes involves coming up with a succinct and easily understandable name for each theme.
6. Writing up is a process of writing up the analysis of the data. Like all academic texts, writing up a thematic analysis requires an introduction to establish the research question, aim, and approach. This process should also include a methodology section, describing how the data were collected (e.g., through semi-structured interviews or open-ended survey questions) and explaining how the thematic analysis approach was conducted. The results or findings

section usually addresses each theme in turn. Finally, the conclusion explains the main takeaways and shows how the analysis has answered the research question.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of the current study was to explore any possible barriers faced EFL learners to having successful communication skills in performing English Public Speaking tasks by doing an analysis on the students' video-taped transcripts to find out the feasibility results of their video-taped oral performance tasks.

The present study was set out to answer the following question: What barriers hinder EFL learners to having successful communication skills in performing English Public Speaking tasks at a higher education level?

METHODOLOGY

A research method is directly related to the nature of the research study and its objectives. Since the present study was case study in nature, so mixed methods approach was employed using thematic analysis strategy. Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018) stated that case studies are a design of inquiry found in many fields, especially evaluation, in which the researcher develops an in-depth analysis of a case, often a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. Cases are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time (Yin, 2014).

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018) defined mixed methods research as an approach to inquiry involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating the two forms of data, and using distinct designs that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks. The core assumption of this form of inquiry is that the integration of qualitative and quantitative data yields additional insight beyond the information provided by either the quantitative or qualitative data alone. In addition, they argued that mixed methods research could incorporate elements of both qualitative and quantitative approaches as they claimed that the distinction between qualitative research and quantitative research was framed in terms of using words (qualitative) rather than numbers (quantitative). A more complete way to view the gradations of differences between them is in the basic philosophical assumptions that researchers bring to the study, the types of research strategies used in the research (e.g., quantitative experiments or qualitative case studies), and the specific methods employed in conducting these strategies (e.g., collecting data quantitatively on instruments versus collecting qualitative data through observing a setting). Therefore, the present study used mixed methods research that involved a purposive sampling technique.

Research Setting

The present study was conducted at a private university located in Pontianak, in the region of West Kalimantan, Indonesia. In this research study, 'Borneo University' (pseudonym) is used to identify this particular institution.

Research Participants

The participants of the present study were 24 (twenty-four) students of the English study program, Faculty of Economics and Business of Borneo University who were studying, and taking the English Public Speaking subject, at the University in the even semester of academic year 2021/2022. Those twenty-four students were selected using total population sampling technique, that is, a type of purposive sampling technique that involves examining the entire population having a particular set of characteristics (e.g., specific attributes/traits, experience, knowledge, skills, exposure to an event, etc.). Therefore, this technique is usually

used to examine the entire population with specific traits like some particular experience, such as similar knowledge skills, exposure to an event, etc.

Instrument for Data Collection

The present study used the research participants' video-taped recordings as the main instrument for data collection. This technique was selected because it allowed the researcher considerable flexibility to probe the oral performances of the participants and gave the researcher the opportunity to gain deep information about the phenomena being investigated (Corbetta, 2003).

Procedures for Data Collection

The data of the present study were collected by doing the following steps: First, the researcher, who was also the lecturer of Public Speaking subject of the students, assigned the students to perform a free-topic informative speech within the time limit of 5 - 10 minutes. Then the students performed their informative speech at home and they had to video tape or record their oral performance while they were doing their task. Second, the students had to submit the video-taped recording of their task to the lecturer via Google Classroom. Then the lecturer (researcher) took the students' video-taped recordings from the Google Classroom to be analyzed.

The data collection process was conducted on Wednesday, 27 April 2022, which was started at 17.00 p.m., when the students joined their mid semester test of English Public Speaking subject.

Techniques for Data Analysis

The data of the present study were analyzed qualitatively applying mixed methods research approach using thematic analysis strategy. The data analysis process was conducted by firstly watching and transcribing each of the research participants' video-taped recordings, and then interpreting the transcripts of the participants' video-taped recordings following the six-step process (*familiarization, coding, generating themes, reviewing themes, defining & naming themes, and writing up*) of thematic analysis approach, which was discussed previously in "Conceptual Framework" section or part. Finally, the results of the data analysis were explained and described in a narrative way.

The data analysis of the present study involved the process of data reduction, selection, and simplification (Creswell, 2005). To conduct this analysis work, the transcripts of the participants' video-taped recordings were coded according to the key themes, development of clusters, and finally the analysis was conducted based on the literature and emerging themes.

Since the elements of speaking, that is, aspects of oral skills, are not well defined as they involve many different features, including grammar, appropriateness, pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency (Hughes, 2002), the data of the present study - the transcripts of the research participants' video-taped recordings of public speaking oral performances, which were prepared and delivered by the participants, were analyzed and scored using a *Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR) for Evaluating Oral Performances*, which was adapted and modified by the researcher from several sources, they are: *Rubric for Assessing Speaking* (Brown, 2004, pp 172-173), *Assessing Speaking Performance* (UCLES, 2008), *Modified Public Speaking Competence Scoring Rubric* (Joe et al., 2015), and *Public Speaking Competence Rubric for Evaluating Speeches* (Gadakhabadze, 2021). In her paper, Gadakhabadze (2021) stated that Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR) was considered to be reliable techniques of assessment used by a researcher to assess each research participant's oral performance for a variety of reasons, for examples: first and foremost, it is frequently utilized for evaluating students' public speaking oral performances at the higher education level since it is understandable by the speech rater(s), and the second, it is an excellent combination of the

most necessary PSCR approaches and includes virtually all key features demonstrated in previous public speaking rubrics such as Thomson and Rucker's (2002), Morreale et al. (2007), Lucas' (2007), AAC&U's VALUE rubric (Rhodes, 2010), and many more.

In order to maintain the objectivity, avoid any kind of bias, and meet the needs and purposes of the present study as well, the data analysis of the present study was conducted applying a thematic analysis strategy which was limited to the following key themes: *Grammatical Usage*, *Vocabulary Usage*, *Discourse management*, *Pronunciation*, *Intonation*, and *Fluency*. Since the assessment procedures and assessment criteria play an important role when evaluating students' oral performances, the clarification and limitation of each key theme is given as follows:

1. *Grammatical Usage* refers to the characteristics of utterances used at the level of clause or sentence relations such as using correct parts of speech in clauses or sentences, using verb tenses accurately, and having the correct agreement between subjects and predicates.
2. *Vocabulary Usage* refers to a reflection of the depth of vocabulary and the proportions of low and high frequency of vocabulary use when speaking on any different things or topics. Vocabulary usage could also apply to the kinds of adjectives used for description.
3. *Discourse Management* refers to the ability of producing extended spoken texts such as oral communication or conversation. Therefore, discourse management is often considered to be a good criterion in formal evaluation of spoken and written language. In real practices, a range of devices are used to produce effective discourse, including cohesion and coherence, paralinguistic tools, different communicative functions, and conversational principles. Discourse management score is assessed on one's ability to produce good oral communications which are relevant (on topic) and express the ideas in an easy-to-follow way but descriptive manner.
4. *Pronunciation* refers to the speaker's ability to pronounce words following pronunciation features at word level and sub-word level. In the word level, the words are categorized as meaningful or not meaningful. The pronunciation of meaningful words is then classified as 'target-like', 'marginally non-target-like', or 'clearly non-target-like'. In the sub-word level, syllables are again assessed as to whether they are 'target-like', 'marginally non-target-like', or 'clearly non-target-like' (Iwashita, N., Brown, A., McNamara, T., and O'Hagan, S., 2008).
5. *Intonation* refers to the speaker's ability to produce a number of completed intonation units. These completed intonation units are classified into: completed units, cut-off or incomplete units, and isolated words. The intonation units are then further broken down into sub-categories: English-like intonation (E), nearly English-like (Nr), and non-English-like (N), and the criteria for allocation into these sub-categories include: following general patterns such as rising pitch to indicate continuation, and falling phrase-final pitch to end a thematic section; placing pitch accent on focused words and phrases in the sentence; and pronouncing English words using the intonation patterns of another language (Iwashita et al., 2008).
6. *Fluency* means being able to speak continuously following suitable measures of fluency by chunking and linking words together and speaking the language smoothly and confidently, with few hesitations or unnatural pause, false starts, and word searches. Therefore, a fluent speaker knows where he has to pause and stop his speaking in appropriate place or time and does not produce word by word at a time in his speaking. In brief, a good and fluent speaker is demanded to be able to produce words in speech into groups of words that form a meaningful unit (phrases or clauses).

For time-consuming reason and other intended purposes, the six key themes above were then classified, by the researcher, into just four main themes, they are: *Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage*, *Discourse management*, *Pronunciation & Intonation*, and *Fluency*. Therefore, to obtain the scores of the research participants' public speaking oral performance features, which was based on the results of the data analysis using thematic analysis strategy (i.e., the

four main themes) to analyze the transcripts of the participants' video-taped recordings, a Public Speaking Competence Rubric for Evaluating Oral Performances (as shown in Table 1) was used to determine the score of each research participant for each main theme.

Table 1: Public Speaking Competence Rubric for Evaluating Oral Performances

	Grammatical Usage and Vocabulary Usage	Discourse Management	Pronunciation and Intonation	Fluency
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker shows a good degree of control of a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms. ❖ Speaker uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and explain views on a wide range of topics being talked or discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker produces extended stretches of language with very little hesitation. ❖ Speaker's speaking contributions are relevant and there is a clear organizational of ideas. ❖ Speaker uses a range of cohesive devices and discourse markers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's pronunciation is intelligible. ❖ Speaker's intonation is appropriate. ❖ Speaker's sentence and word stress are accurately placed. ❖ Speaker's individual sounds are articulated clearly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's fluency is well acceptable. ❖ Speaker maintains and develops the speaking performance in complete fluency.
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5.</i>			
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms, and attempts some complex grammatical forms. ❖ Student uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and explain views on a wide range of topics being talked or discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker produces extended stretches of language despite some hesitation. ❖ Speaker's speaking contributions are relevant and there is very little repetition. ❖ Speaker uses a range of cohesive devices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's pronunciation is intelligible. ❖ Speaker's intonation is generally appropriate. ❖ Speaker's sentence and word stress are generally placed accurately. ❖ Speaker's individual sounds are generally articulated clearly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's fluency is quite acceptable. ❖ Speaker maintains and develops the speaking interaction in a quite fluent way with very little effort.
2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms. ❖ Speaker uses a range of appropriate vocabulary when talking about any related topics being discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker produces ideas which are extended beyond short phrases, despite hesitation. ❖ Speaker's speaking contributions are mostly relevant, despite some repetition. ❖ Speaker uses basic cohesive devices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's pronunciation is mostly intelligible. ❖ Speaker has some control of phonological features at both utterance and word levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Speaker's fluency is just at appropriate level. ❖ Speaker can just keep the speaking interaction going with very little fluency and effort.
0	Performance is below Band 1.			

In reporting the research participants' scores using the Public Speaking Competence Rubric for Evaluating Oral Performances (Table 1) above, the obtained scores were firstly converted into a *Public Speaking Competence Rating Scale*, which was adapted and modified from *Proficiency Rating Scale* (Schreiber, 2010). The Public Speaking Competence Rating Scale consists of five levels or bands with five categories as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Public Speaking Competence Rating Scale

Bands / Levels	Range of scores	Categories
Band 5	4.50 - 5.00	Advanced
Band 4	3.50 - 4.49	Proficient
Band 3	2.50 - 3.49	Basic
Band 2	1.50 - 2.49	Minimal
Band 1	0 - 1.49	Deficient

Having obtained the research participants' scores using the Public Speaking Competence Rubric for Evaluating Oral Performances (Table 1) and the Public Speaking Competence Rating Scale (Table 2), the results of the present study were finally reported and discussed in a narrative way in *Findings and Discussion* section below.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Findings

The findings of the present study are reported and summarized under four main themes, namely *Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage*, *Discourse management*, *Pronunciation & Intonation*, and *Fluency*. These four main themes are used as the headings for narrating the findings of the present study since they are used as the main criteria for interpreting, processing, and analysing the data obtained from the research participants.

1. Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage

The research participants' scores under this main theme are summarized as follows:

- Four students obtained scores belonging to Band 5

- Fourteen students obtained scores belonging to Band 4
- Four students obtained scores belonging to Band 3
- Two students obtained scores belonging to Band 2
- None of the students obtained scores belonging to Band 1

2. *Discourse management*

The research participants' scores under this main theme are summarized as follows:

- Only one student obtained score belonging to Band 5
- Eight students obtained scores belonging to Band 4
- Eleven students obtained scores belonging to Band 3
- Four students obtained scores belonging to Band 2
- None of the students obtained scores belonging to Band 1

3. *Pronunciation & Intonation*

The research participants' scores under this main theme are summarized as follows:

- Three students obtained scores belonging to Band 5
- Thirteen students obtained scores belonging to Band 4
- Five students obtained scores belonging to Band 3
- Three students obtained scores belonging to Band 2
- None of the students obtained scores belonging to Band 1

4. *Fluency*

The research participants' scores under this main theme are summarized as follows:

- Two students obtained scores belonging to Band 5
- Four students obtained scores belonging to Band 4
- Ten students obtained scores belonging to Band 3
- Eight students obtained scores belonging to Band 2
- None of the students obtained scores belonging to Band 1

B. Discussion of Findings

In discussing the research findings of the present study reported above, the following explanations and descriptive percentages of the research participants' scores are summarized and explained in a narrative way as follows:

1. *Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage*

The descriptive percentages of data under the heading of this main theme are narratively explained as follows:

- 8.33% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 5**, which is grouped into '**Advanced**' category.
- 50.00% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 4**, which is grouped into '**Proficient**' category.
- 25.00% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 3**, which is grouped into '**Basic**' category.
- 16.66% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 2**, which is grouped into '**Minimal**' category.
- None of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 1** ('**Deficient**' category).

Referring to the total percentages of data under the heading of this main theme, it can be seen that most of the research participants, that is: 50.00%, belong to **Band 4**, which is

classified as '**Proficient**' category. Then it is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 3**, which is classified into '**Basic**' category, that is: 25.00%. After that, it comes the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 2**, which is classified as '**Minimal**' category, that is: 16.66%. The last, and the least, percentage is the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 5**, which is classified as '**Advanced**' category, that is: 8.33%.

2. Discourse management

The descriptive percentages of data under the heading of this main theme are narratively explained as follows:

- 4.16% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 5**, which is grouped into '**Advanced**' category.
- 33.33% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 4**, which is grouped into '**Proficient**' category.
- 45.83% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 3**, which is grouped into '**Basic**' category.
- 16.66% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 2**, which is grouped into '**Minimal**' category.
- None of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 1** ('**Deficient**' category).

Based on the total percentages of data under the heading of this main theme, it can be seen that most of the research participants, that is: 45.83% belong to **Band 3**, which is classified as '**Basic**' category. Then the next percentage is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 4**, which is classified as '**Proficient**' category, that is: 33.33%. After that, it comes the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 2**, which is classified as '**Minimal**' category, that is: 16.66%. The last, and the least, percentage is the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 5**, which is classified as '**Advanced**' category, that is: 4.16%.

3. Pronunciation & Intonation

The descriptive percentages of data under the heading of this main theme are narratively explained as follows:

- 12.50% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 5**, which is grouped into '**Advanced**' category.
- 45.83% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 4**, which is grouped into '**Proficient**' category.
- 25.00% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 3**, which is grouped into '**Basic**' category.
- 16.66% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 2**, which is grouped into '**Minimal**' category.
- None of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 1** ('**Deficient**' category).

In reference to the total percentages of data under the heading of this main theme, it can be seen that most of the research participants, that is: 45.83%, belong to **Band 4**, which is classified as '**Proficient**' category. The next percentage is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 3**, which is classified as '**Basic**' category, that is: 25.00%. After that, it is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 2**, which is classified as '**Minimal**' category, that is: 16.66%. The last, and the least, percentage is the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 5**, which is classified as '**Advanced**' category, that is 12.50%.

4. *Fluency*

The descriptive percentages of data under the heading of this main theme are narratively explained as follows:

- 8.33% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 5**, which is grouped into '**Advanced**' category.
- 16.66% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 4**, which is grouped into '**Proficient**' category.
- 41.66% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 3**, which is grouped into '**Basic**' category.
- 33.33% of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 2**, which is grouped into '**Minimal**' category.
- None of the research participants got scores belonging to **Band 1** ('**Deficient**' category).

From the total percentages of data under the heading of this main theme, it can be seen that most of the research participants, that is: 41.66%, belong to **Band 3**, which is classified as '**Basic**' category. The next percentage is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 2**, which is classified as '**Minimal**' category, that is: 33.33%. After that, it is followed by the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 4**, which is classified as '**Proficient**' category, that is: 16.66%. The last, and the least, percentage is the percentage of research participants that belongs to **Band 5**, which is classified as '**Advanced**' category, that is 8.33%.

CONCLUSION

In reference to the findings of the present study, some major conclusions concerning the identifiable barriers faced by EFL learners to having successful communication skills in performing English public speaking tasks are drawn as follows:

1. In terms of **Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage** main theme, it is found that most of the research participants, i.e., 50.00%, are classified as '**Proficient**' category; and the least percentage is the percentage of research participants that is classified as '**Advanced**' category, i.e., 8.33%. This means that around 41.67% of the research participants are still classified under '**Proficient**' category.
2. In terms of **Discourse Management** main theme, it is found that most of the research participants, i.e., 45.83%, are classified as '**Basic**' category; and the least percentage is the percentage of research participants that is classified as '**Advanced**' category, i.e., 4.16%. This means that more than half of the research participants, i.e., 50.01%, are classified into two classification of categories, namely '**Proficient**' category, i.e., 33.33% and '**Minimal**' category, i.e., 16.66%.
3. In terms of **Pronunciation & Intonation** main theme, it is found that most of the research participants, i.e., 45.83%, are classified as '**Proficient**' category; and the least percentage is the percentage of research participants that is classified as '**Advanced**' category, i.e., 12.50%. This means that around 41.67% of the research participants are classified under '**Proficient**' category.
4. In terms of **Fluency** main theme, it is found that most of the research participants, i.e., 41.66%, are classified as '**Basic**' category; and the least percentage is the percentage of research participants that is classified as '**Advanced**' category, i.e., 8.33%. This means that around half of the research participants, i.e., 50.01%, are classified into other two classification of categories, namely '**Minimal**' category, i.e., 33.33% and '**Proficient**' category, i.e., 16.66%.

In summary, most of the research participants are still at the level of '**Proficient**' and '**Basic**' categories regarding their competence in performing English public speaking oral

communication. In terms of *Grammatical Usage & Vocabulary Usage* and *Pronunciation & Intonation* main themes, their competence is mostly at the level of '**Proficient**' category, and in terms of *Discourse Management* and *Fluency* main themes, their competence is mostly at the level of '**Basic**' category. And the most dominant barriers faced by the research participants to having successful communication skills in performing English public speaking tasks are related to *Discourse Management* and *Fluency* main themes.

REFERENCES

- Baugh, A. C. & Cable, Thomas. (2002). *A history of the English Language* (5th ed.). London: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*, Chapter 7. Pearson Longman.
- Caulfield, J. (September 6, 2019). *How to Do Thematic Analysis | A Step-by-Step Guide & Examples*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/thematic-analysis/>. Revised on May 5, 2022.
- Corbetta, P. (2003). *Social research theory, methods and techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Gadakhabadze, A. (2021). The Impact of Deductive, Inductive and Mixed Methods of Instruction on EFL Students' Public Speaking Skill (A Case of Georgian Higher Educational Institution). *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 17(33), 128.
- Hughes, R. (2002). *Teaching and researching speaking*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Iwashita, N., A. Brown, T. McNamara, and S. O'Hagan. (2008). Assessed Levels of Second Language Speaking Proficiency: How Distinct? *Applied Linguistics* 29(1), 24–49. Oxford University Press.
- Joe, J., Kitchen, C., Chen, L., & Feng, G. (2015). *A prototype public speaking skills assessment: An evaluation of human-scoring quality* (Research Report No. RR-15-36). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12083>
- Radhika, K. (2020). Understanding Barriers to Effective Communication. University of Delhi | DU · Department of Adult, Continuing Education & Extension PhD.
- Nikitina, A. (2011). *Successful Public Speaking*. Arina Nikitina & bookboon.com
- Novakovi, N. & Teodosijevic, B. (2017). Basics of Public Speaking. *Journal of Economics, Management and Informatics*, 8(2), 33-46.
- Shyam, S. S. & Joy, E.I. (2016). Public speaking skills. In *Training Manual on Theeranaipunya - Equipping Fisherwomen Youth for Future*, p. 129-132. Kochi: ICAR-Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.