Students' Intuition-Based Self-Efficacy and Evidence-Based Self-Efficacy towards Their Oral Presentation

Piyarat Wattananan and Saowaluck Tepsuriwong
King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Abstract

Self-efficacy has a profound effect on learners' performance, especially, in speaking skills and oral presentations as they require many more skills other than language knowledge. This study aims to investigate students' intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy in oral presentations. The study was conducted with 24 subjects. They were asked to do a questionnaire and to report their intuition-based self-efficacy in their oral presentations. Later, the same questionnaire was used to rate their self-efficacy after the actual performance. The results showed that the levels of intuition-based self-efficacy were significantly higher than that of evidence-based self-efficacy in all three components of the presentation: language, delivery and organization. Evidence from the students' actual performance strongly affected their self-efficacy suggesting that there is a bidirectional relationship between them and that evidence plays important roles in improving students' performance.

Keywords *self-efficacy, intuition-based self-efficacy, evidence-based self-efficacy, belief, oral presentation*

1. Introduction

Research on individual differences which involve elements such as learners' beliefs, self-esteem, self-efficacy, expectation and anxiety has shown that this multidimensional construct plays a crucial role in determining the course of actions and success or failure in learners' language learning (Dörnyei, 2005), and the effects of these factors are not less than those of cognitive elements such as aptitude, intelligence and thinking processes (Kennedy, et al, 2000). Among these variables, self-efficacy, which is the main focus of this present study has received ample attention from researchers as it "may be the most important building block in one's self-concept" (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003:10-11) and this concept or belief that learners holds about their abilities powerfully influences the ways in which they behave (Bandura, 1977; Schunk, 1995).

Self-efficacy is defined as an individual's belief or expectation of their ability to perform a specific task in a specific context (Bandura, 1977). It concerns the judgment of their

competence which in turns affects their confidence and motivation which guides what and how they can do to perform a task or to cope with the challenge of learning (Delcourt & Kinzie, 1993; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009). Bandura (1986) explained that the assessment of one's own ability contributes to the levels of their achievement as it determines the knowledge, skills, and attempt required to endure a task, the effort demanded to persevere, and the levels of stress or anxiety they may encounter. Learners with higher self-efficacy are likely to perform better than those with lower self-efficacy since they start the task with a positive attitude and strong realization of their full potential. They are confident that they have sufficient knowledge and skills to achieve the goal. This can-do attitude drives them to actively engage in the task and successfully complete it or cope better with problems along the course; while learners with low self-efficacy tend to suffer more and are likely to develop apathetic learning atmospheres which lead to stress and eventually a devastating demotivation stage of learned-helplessness. These poor learners generally start the task with a pessimistic concept thinking that it is beyond their ability and attribute their failure to deficiency in their ability, and this impairs self-esteem. Self-efficacy is, therefore, a crucial factor that fosters learners' success or failure in school. Moreover, it is a promising predictor of academic success and it helps explain why students with the same knowledge and skills might perform differently (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy can be domain-specific depending on the task and the context. Learners' self-efficacy in a range of domains can vary. For example, they may believe that they have a stronger ability in a particular skill or there may be an area where they are more confident to perform. Learners may have English self-efficacy which can be different from their mathematic self-efficacy. They may also feel that they are likely to be successful in some tasks than others. Many foreign language learners, for example, usually have a stronger sense of self-efficacy in receptive skills than productive skills due to their limited exposure and opportunities for language use. These English learners may think that they are better at reading than speaking which is the skill that they are not confident with. Moreover, when facing a difficult situation, generally learners choose to perform in areas where they have high self-efficacy, and to avoid areas in which they have low self-efficacy so that their self-esteem would not be threatened (Bandura, 1993).

2. Literature review

2.1 Factors influencing self-efficacy and self-efficacy research

Mercer (2012) views that self-efficacy is an integral part of a global self-concept with a multiple and interrelated construct. Moreover, it is a relational state rather than a trait in learners' characteristics. Self-efficacy is influenced by several factors and variables, such as skills, tasks, situations, conditions, ages, genders, proficiency levels, preferences

and experience of success or failure in a particular area as well as sources of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy could be developed from four main sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional states (Bandura, 1997) and these four sources can promote either high or low levels of self-efficacy. Mastery experiences rely on learners' own views of their past experiences. If students experience success in tasks, their self-efficacy will be high (Warren, 2011). In addition, previous and current successes can build up future success and higher self-efficacy. Vicarious experiences, on the other hand, are related to the group or peers. If a learner believes that 'If my friends can do it, I can do it too.', a positive effect can occur. However, if he/she thinks that 'If all my friends cannot do it, how can I do it?', a negative influence can result. Another factor that influences one's self-efficacy is social persuasion which can be expectations or perceptions of other people (Bandura, 1977). Social persuasion can affect an individual's beliefs in his or her capabilities. In a language classroom, social persuasion can come in forms of feedback, either from the teacher or peers. Teachers can help raise students' self-efficacy via a constructive feedback and encouragement (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Another crucial source of self-efficacy is related to learners' emotional states in different situations. When they feel nervous or depressed, they will develop a weak sense of self-efficacy in the area which is related to their performance and capabilities (Bandura, 1997). High anxiety and worry about a task can affect both self-efficacy and the actual performance. These four causes are, therefore, vital variables that contribute to different degrees of self-efficacy.

Britner and Pajares (2006) researched Bandura's (1997) aforementioned hypothetical sources of self-efficacy focusing on science self-efficacy of middle school students. In this study, a significant correlation between mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasions, physiological arousal, and self-efficacy was observed. Moreover, they found that gender also influenced the students' levels of self-efficacy. In their research, girls reported stronger science self-efficacy than did boys.

Self-efficacy is also directly correlated with the level of English language performance. Dodds (2011) revealed that students who had strong beliefs in their abilities were able to perform well in English lessons, while students who indicated low levels of self-efficacy performed the tasks at low-range levels. Magogwe and Oliver (2007) reported the dynamic relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, ages and self-efficacy beliefs of language learners in Botswana.

Skills and tasks are also vital influences of self-efficacy. Learners may perceive themselves having different mastery levels of language skills. These perceptions have become an intricate construct of learners' self-concept and these interest scholars to investigate different facets of self-efficacy in terms of language skills.

Rahimi and Abedini (2009) studied the relationship between self-efficacy and listening skills and concluded that listening comprehension self-efficacy was significantly related to listening proficiency. Williams and Takaku (2011) researched other skills investigating the roles of adaptive help seeking and self-efficacy in writing. They observed an inverse correlation between self-efficacy and help seeking behaviour reporting that high levels of help seeking behavior resulted in better performance in composition tasks.

Some studies explored speaking self-efficacy and oral presentation self-efficacy (McCarthy, 2001; Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Rahayu & Jacobson, 2012). These studies revealed that speaking self-efficacy could be influenced by opportunities for language use and practice. It is, therefore, subject to changes. Rahayu and Jacobson (2012) presented the findings from their case study of four students using a multi-user virtual environment. They revealed that authentic target language use fostered the subjects' speaking self-efficacy since this learning environment provides opportunities for students to interact with others. Tucker and McCarthy (2001) explored whether the experiential nature of service-learning improves student's presentation self-efficacy beyond typical classroom assignments of undergraduate business students. They suggested that students' presentation efficacy was likely to increase through classroom practice. Dwyer and Fus (2002) investigated the relationship between public speaking self-efficacy and course grade. They found that students' self-efficacy increased over the semester and this was related to students' final grades. Another study by Warren (2011) also supported the strong relationship between self-efficacy and speaking performance. He found that students who felt confident in their abilities and had strong senses of self-efficacy in public speaking were more likely to perform better than those lacking self-efficacy. This research also showed a positive relationship between public speaking self-efficacy and public speaking skills.

Although some of these studies focused on oral presentation self-efficacy which is the focus of this study, none of them have explored how this belief could be changed or affected by reality, actual practice or true performance. The present study, therefore, aims to investigate this gap in the literature, exploring the relationship between intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy for oral presentation skills. We argued that these two aspects of self-efficacy are different and they influence each other as self-efficacy is a relative perception about a learner's' ability. In addition, evidence-based self-efficacy should be encouraged since it is based on feedback and self-reflection which provides an effective tool for learners to improve their ability and future performance.

In this study 'intuition-based self-efficacy' refers to self-efficacy which comes from learners' ideal self or general perception of their own ability. This perception is generally related to their intuition, ego or instincts. Learners could be guided by their intuition and

perceive themselves to be able or not able to perform well. This 'intuition-based' belief may or may not be the same as the 'evidence-based' one which occurs after they reconsider their capacity based on the evidence of their actual performance. 'Evidence-based self-efficacy' comes from learners' reflection. It is the belief about their ability after getting the evidence or feedback of their action. This type of self-efficacy is related to an accurate self-assessment. Cholle (2011) states that it is necessary to accurately assess one's own intuition in order to get the right self-concept and not to over or underestimate one's ability.

2.2 Components of effective oral presentation and oral presentation self-efficacy

Oral presentation skills, especially in English, are usually demanding and challenging for foreign language learners as they require a lot more skills than language knowledge. In order to give an effective presentation, students need to be well prepared both in terms of 'what' and 'how' to present. They need to understand the topic and its purpose clearly, know their audience, organize their speech, choose appropriate visual aids and choose effective language for the talk. Moreover, they need to be confident to speak in public and stay in control to effectively deliver the message across.

An effective presentation consists of three main components: language, delivery and organization (Kougl, 1988; Metcalfe, 2010). The first component is language. The speakers need to choose appropriate words and grammatical forms to convey messages (Prabpairee, 2000). They need to be well aware of the meanings of words to provide clear, accurate and appropriate language in order to prevent misunderstanding, especially when presenting in a language which is not their mother tongue.

The second component is delivery. Delivery refers to the way that speakers convey the message to an audience (Kougl, 1988). In order to deliver an effective presentation, both voice and body language are crucial factors (Warren, 2011). In addition, eye contact, gestures, facial expressions, and presentation techniques are vital. Delivery could help speakers provide clear and interesting presentations.

The third component is organization. The presenters need to organize their talk in a coherent way to ease the listeners in understanding the content (Prabpairee, 2000; Lucas, 2012). Coherence in organization would help the audience to follow the presentation easily and to understand the presentation accurately. A well-organized presentation could help speakers deliver the message coherently.

All the three components are key contributors to the success of a presentation. Students need to gain 'control' over these elements of effective presentations by, for example, preparing themselves well. Once they are well prepared, their anxiety would be lower and they would feel more confident and in-control over the situation. This, in turn, would

reinforce high self-efficacy, a promising predictor of good performances (Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Dodds, 2011; Warren, 2011).

The researchers hypothesized that students' oral presentation self-efficacy for these components of presentation would be different relying on the perceptions of control over these variables. In addition, the intuition-based self-efficacy would be different from the evidence-based one. Evidences from the real performance would provide feedback for learners to reflect upon their performance and this may fine-tune their self-efficacy.

3. Purposes of the study

This study aims to investigate student's intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy in an oral presentation. The primary research question addressed is '*Is there a correlation between students' intuition-based and evidence-based oral presentation self-efficacy?*'

4. Methodology

The research was conducted in a natural classroom setting with 24 subjects in science and engineering fields. All of them enrolled in an elective English course at a tertiary level. The course aimed to improve the four language skills as well as thinking skills by using tasks and class activities in addition to oral presentations as the main mode of learning instruction. In class, the students learned about how to deliver an effective presentation. They studied components of an oral presentation and were assigned to give a presentation on one assigned topic in groups. Prior to the oral performance, a questionnaire was distributed to investigate their 'intuition-based self-efficacy' in their ability.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part consisted of twenty questions with 5-rating scales asking about students' presentation self-efficacy. The second part contained two open-ended questions asking about strengths and weaknesses of their presentation. The last part had one question asking them to do the overall self-evaluation of the oral presentation. This questionnaire was adapted from Dwyer and Fus (2002) and Warren (2011). For the questionnaire, see Appendix.

Four weeks after the presentation, the same questionnaire was redistributed to investigate their 'evidence-based self-efficacy'. The video of the presentation was shown to the subjects as evidence to remind them of their performances. The data from the two sets of the questionnaire were then compared by using the t-test method to discern the statistical differences between the two types of self-efficacy in oral presentations. As for the rating scale part of the questionnaire, the following scheme was used to interpret the data.

1.00 – 1.80	strongly disagree	(very low self-efficacy)
1.81 – 2.60	disagree	(low self-efficacy)
2.61 – 3.40	neutral	(moderate self-efficacy)
3.41 – 4.20	agree	(high self-efficacy)
4.21 – 5.00	strongly agree	(very high self-efficacy)

5. Findings and discussion

Comparing the questionnaires' results, differences between the students' intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy in oral presentations were noticed. The major findings are presented and discussed as follow:

5.1 Levels of students' intuition-based self-efficacy and evidence-based self-efficacy

When asking the subjects to rate their performances before the real presentation with the rating scale of 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent), most students (71%) viewed their presentation skills quite high, between 7 and 9. Only a few students (29%) rated themselves quite low between 4 and 6. This suggested that they believed in their oral presentation ability, and they seemed to have high self-efficacy. This view was confirmed by a high average mean score of the intuition-based self-efficacy questionnaire (3.73 = high self-efficacy, see Table 1).

Table 1 Mean scores of students' intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy

Components	Intuition-Based Self-Efficacy	Evidence-Based Self-Efficacy
Language	3.58	3.11
Delivery	3.70	3.27
Organization	3.92	3.63
Average mean of all components	3.73	3.33

The questionnaire results suggested that the subjects had high intuition-based self-efficacy in oral presentations. Of the twenty responses, eighteen were at a high level of self-efficacy, while only two answers (question 4 and 10) were a bit lower, at a moderate level. This level of self-efficacy was especially high in terms of organization as the mean score was higher than the other two components. This might be because the organization part was the part that the students could prepare so this part was controllable for them. Once a student believed in his or her ability to control the situation, high self-efficacy would occur.

As for the evidence-based self-efficacy, the result revealed a change in students' perception about their performance. In this evidence-based rating, only slightly more than half of them (54%) viewed their presentation skill quite high, between 7 and 9. The rest (46%) rated themselves quite low, between 3 and 6. The subjects seemed to have lower self-efficacy

after they saw their performance from the video. This finding was also supported by the statistical test. The mean scores of intuition-based self-efficacy (3.73) was higher than those of evidence-based self-efficacy (3.33) and it was also significantly higher than that of the evidence-based ones ($t = 2.169$, $p < 0.05$). Clearly, the change in their perception about their ability lay in the video which served as evidence of their ability providing a clear feedback that enabled them to reflect upon their real performance. Feedback plays a very important role in the learning process (Hyland, 2006; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). It provides useful information that feeds back to learners to further improve their performance and this part of the findings would be further highlighted in the next section. The students seemed to realize that they could not perform as well as they thought so their self-efficacy was markedly dropped.

Given the evidence-based self-efficacy, most levels changed from high to moderate. This revealed that although students were quite positive about their ability in presentation, their perceptions about themselves were changed in a downward direction when the evidence of the performance became available. It was noticed that the highest mean self-efficacy scores appear to be in organization, which was the part that could be prepared or managed before the presentation. For language and delivery, the mean scores were lower. Obviously, language and delivery were more difficult to control since they depended on feelings or 'affects' and language proficiency. Nervousness, anxiety, and excitement could easily occur while presenting and this directly affected the actual performance. Therefore, lower levels of self-efficacy could be perceived when the students evaluated their performance.

In terms of language use, the mean score of evidence-based self-efficacy was lower than the other two (3.11), which was similar to that of the intuition-based self-efficacy. To support the result, these parts of the intuition-based and the evidence-based self-efficacy were tested and a significant difference was noticed ($t = 2.252$, $p < 0.05$). This suggested that students had higher self-efficacy in terms of language use before their presentations. The evidence of language use in the presentation strongly affected their perception of their language ability. It helped raise their awareness of the language problems in their performance.

Similar to the language component, for the delivery, students' levels of self-efficacy were lower after they had seen the evidence of their presentations. The mean score of intuition-based self-efficacy was 3.70, and the evidence-based score was 3.27 and a significant statistical difference was shown ($t = 2.281$, $p < 0.05$). Again, in this area evidence seemed to affect students' perceptions as they found that their performances were not as good as they had thought.

In terms of organization, the mean scores were 3.92 and 3.63 in the intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy categories, respectively. The result of the statistical test also suggested a significant difference between the two types of self-efficacy ($t = 1.433$, $p > 0.05$).

Noticeably, the results showed that after the presentation, the students tended to exhibit lower self-efficacy. A study by Alwi and Sidhu (2013) also pointed towards the same direction in that when comparing students' perceptions (intuition-based self-efficacy) with teacher's evaluation, students tended to perceive themselves at a higher level and believed that they could perform well. The students' evaluation of their actual performance, however, was not high and this could affect their confidence and self-efficacy (Whitman & Boase, 1983). Since a performance could be affected by stress, anxiety or nervousness, evaluation of the actual performance often resulted in lower scores than that of perception or intuition.

As we know, an oral presentation is normally one of the difficult situations that students have to face in their foreign language learning so stress can occur and this might affect performance and self-efficacy (Anyadubalu, 2010). Evidence could provide a good feedback for students to improve themselves, while a strong sense of self-efficacy provides a good start and moral support for them to perform. Once students have high self-efficacy and feel confident in their abilities, they are likely to perform well (Williams & Burden, 1997; Dwyer & Fus, 1999; Dodds, 2011; Warren, 2011; Alwi & Sidhu, 2013).

5.2 Levels of students' self-efficacy in each component of an oral presentation

In this section, levels of students' self-efficacy in each component of an oral presentation would be discussed in detail.

Table 2 Levels of students' self-efficacy in each component of an oral presentation

Descriptions	Intuition-Based	Inter-pretation	Evidence-Based	Inter-pretation
Language Components				
1. Use English fluently.	3.42	High	2.83	Moderate
2. Use English accurately.	3.33	Moderate	3.04	Moderate
3. Use English effectively.	3.63	High	3.08	Moderate
4. Use of transition signals /expressions	3.96	High	3.50	High
Delivery Components				
5. Make a presentation within time limit.	4.13	High	3.75	High
6. Prepare effective visual aids.	3.83	High	3.67	High
7. Use visual aids effectively.	4.08	High	3.71	High
8. Control over excitement.	3.25	Moderate	2.75	Moderate
9. Use various presentation techniques.	3.71	High	3.42	High
10. Grab audience's attention.	3.54	High	3.00	Moderate
11. Use effective body language.	3.79	High	3.13	Moderate
12. Make eye-contact effectively.	3.92	High	3.00	Moderate
13. Raise or lower voice to make effective presentation.	3.54	High	3.29	Moderate
14. Deliver message without reading from notes.	3.46	High	3.21	Moderate
15. Deal with questions effectively.	3.46	High	3.08	Moderate
Organization Components				
16. Organize contents logically.	3.88	High	3.63	High
17. Support main ideas with adequate evidence.	3.92	High	3.83	High
18. Start with an introductory statement that summarizes the main idea.	4.04	High	3.54	High
19. End with a conclusion that reviews the main ideas.	4.00	High	3.58	High
20. Structure the presentation effectively (having introduction, body and conclusion).	3.75	High	3.58	High

5.2.1 Language components

The components related to language appeared to be affected by evidence the most. The four questions asked in this component included accuracy, fluency, the use of transition signals and effectiveness of the language use. The results suggested that the use of transitions and the accuracy of language use were not much affected. The subjects seemed to be highly confident about their ability to use signal words and fixed expressions for a presentation. This might be because they could prepare well for this component. The students had learned these from class so they could take control over this part of the presentation.

As for accuracy, the subjects' intuition-based and evidence-based self-efficacy was at the same 'moderate' level. They regarded themselves as intermediate language users of English and did not expect to produce a grammar-free oral production from the beginning. They, however, expected to perform well in terms of fluency and to use English effectively, though not perfectly. Therefore, this part of the intuition-based self-efficacy was 'high'. The evidence of the actual performance, nevertheless, brought down the levels of their self-efficacy after the task. They might find it more difficult than expected to take control over their language use; thus, they could not perform as planned, and as a result, their self-efficacy dropped.

5.2.2 Delivery components

In terms of delivery, the subjects were asked about issues of time, visual aids, body language, and presentation techniques. Like the language components, the elements that were highly related to preparation and could be easier to gain control over were least affected by evidence. This helped explain why the subjects had high self-efficacy over issues of time control and the use of visual aids both before and after the actual presentation.

In terms of 'affects' which were more difficult to control (Arnold, 2011), the subjects seemed to be well aware of these emotional factors. They realized that they might not have been able to control their excitement well and rated their self-efficacy at the moderate level both before and after the presentation.

In terms of the presentation techniques, apparently, the evidence from the actual presentation affected their self-efficacy more. From their intuition, the subjects felt that they would present well using effective body language, having good eye contact, controlling their voices to grab the audience's attention and dealing with questions well. They had learnt about how to make effective delivery and were also well prepared for the presentation. However, the actual performance was not as expected so the

evidence-based self-efficacy was highly affected as their actual delivery was influenced by their affective factors which were not easy to control.

5.2.3 Organization components

Organization was the only component where the subjects showed 'high' levels of self-efficacy both before and after the performance. The evidence did not seem to significantly affect the students' self-efficacy. The subjects were highly confident with the organization of their talk. They believed that they had structured the presentation well by introducing logical content and strongly supporting their points. Classroom instruction and good preparations must have played important roles in the students' self-efficacy. Once they had learned and prepared well, they became confident and could easily manage their presentation skills.

6. Implications and conclusion

The results have shown that the students seemed to have high levels of self-efficacy towards their oral presentation. After learning about effective presentations and having a good preparation, they intuitively believed in their ability. The evidence of students' actual performance, however, could strongly affect their self-efficacy. The levels of self-confidence seemed to be lower after they had watched their actual performance. The lower levels of evidence-based self-efficacy, however, do not imply a negative washback effect. On the other hand, the video of their performance provided an important feedback for further improvement (Hyland, 2006; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The students showed high awareness of their own weaknesses from the evidence. Their lower levels of evidence-based self-efficacy did not mean that they had lost their beliefs in their ability but they seemed to rely more on reasons, not intuition, which is one sign of learning development. The evidence from many studies also confirms that affective factors like emotion and cognition or reasons are inseparable in the learning process. They complement each other (Damsio, 1994; Forgas, 2008).

The practical implications of this part of the findings are related to the accurate evaluation of one's own performance and the use of feedback to improve learning. Although it is important to maintain a high level of self-efficacy or self-perception, it is necessary to encourage an accurate one. As shown in the study, evidence of students' real presentation could be used as a rich, authentic source of information to feed back to learners for their self-assessment. Evidence-based self-efficacy, therefore, plays vital roles in improving students' performances. They should not base their learning on their 'intuition' but 'evidence' of their actions. Moreover, teachers can also play a major role in providing suggestions, encouragement and constructive feedback to students.

Furthermore, the extent to which the evidence plays a role seems to lie in the level of 'control' that students have over the components of the presentation. It could be seen that for aspects that they could prepare or 'control', for example, useful formulaic expressions, organization of content, visual supports and time plan, the levels of intuition-based self-efficacy was quite high, and in the real performance, even though the behavior was not as good as planned, self-efficacy dropped only slightly. A significant difference was not noticed in this part of intuition- and evidence-based oral presentation self-efficacy. This implies that learner's preparation and rehearsals for oral presentation in terms of language and aspects that could be prepared could be effective tools to help them. Preparations and rehearsals can help students develop a can-do attitude and they should also be encouraged to put more effort and persistence in completing challenging tasks like oral presentations.

As for factors that are harder to control in terms of 'affects', self-efficacy seemed to be markedly affected by evidence. Affects, such as anxiety, nervousness or excitement, have proved to be the main factor that influences the students' actual performance especially in terms of language and delivery. Therefore, the students need to be trained in how to gain control over these emotional factors by different techniques such as breathing deeply and staying in control so that they could gain a lot more from their capital of high levels of intuition-based self-efficacy.

In conclusion, this study revealed the difference in students' intuition-based and evidence-based oral presentation self-efficacy. Evidence from their real performance provided feedback that helped learners re-evaluate themselves and this lowered their self-perception about their presentation abilities. Moreover, the extent to which the evidence affected the intuition belief seemed to rely on the perceptions of control over the variables involved in the presentation. It seemed that the areas more amendable to pre-planning were less likely to be changed by the actual presentation. Nevertheless, this study was conducted in a small-scale with only one class and with a one-off presentation. A replication of the study would be very useful to see whether the same results could be obtained in other contexts and in a bigger-scale research. Moreover, it would be particularly interesting to see if this downward direction of evidence-based oral presentation self-efficacy would happen over a number of presentations in a longitudinal study or with other language skills.

References

Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self-efficacy, anxiety, and performance in the English language among middle-school students in English language program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, *4*, 907-912.

Alwi, N. F. B. & Sidhu, G. K. (2013). Oral presentation: Self-perceived competence and actual performance among UiTM business faculty students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *90*, 98-106.

Arnold, J. (2011). Attention to affect in language learning. *Anglistik International Journal of English Studies*, *22*(1), 11-22.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), 117–149.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman and Company Press.

Bong, M. & Skaalvik, E. M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: How different are they really? *Educational Psychology Review*, *15*(1), 1-40.

Britner, S. L. & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of science self-efficacy beliefs of middle school students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *43*(5), 485-499.

Cholle, F. P. (2011). *The Intuitive compass: Why the best decisions balance reason and instinct*. New York, NY: L Jossey-Bass.

Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. New York, NY: Avon Books.

Delcourt, M. A. B. & Kinzie, M. B. (1993). Computer technologies in teacher education: The measurement of attitudes and self-efficacy. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27*, 35-41.

Dodds, J. (2011). *The correlation between self-efficacy beliefs, language performance, and integration amongst Chinese immigrant newcomers*. Saint Paul, MN: Hamline University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dwyer, K. & Fus, D. (2002). Perceptions of communication competence, self-efficacy, and trait communication apprehension: Is there an impact on basic course success? *Communication Research Reports, 19* (1), 29-37.

Forgas, J. P. (2008). Affect and cognition. *Perspective on Psychological Science*, *3*(2), 94-101.

Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*, 81-112.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal*, *44*(4), 279-285.

Kennedy, T. J., Nelson, J. K., Odell, M. R. L. & Austin, L. K. (2000). The FELS attitudinal inventory. *Foreign Language Annuals*, *33*(3), 278-287.

Kougl, K. (1988). *Primer for public speaking*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Press.

Lucus, S. E. (2012). *The arts of public speaking* (11th ed.). Madison, WI: McGraw Hill Press.

Magogwe, J. M. & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System*, *35*(3), 338-352.

McCarthy, M. (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, S. (2012). Self-concept: Situating the self. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory and practice*, (pp. 10-25). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prabpairee, W. (2000). *Using rehearsal and peer feedback to help reduce student's anxiety while giving presentation*. (Master's thesis, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand).

Rahayu, P. & Jacobson, M. (2012). Speaking self-efficacy and English as a foreign language: Learning processes in a multi-user virtual environment. In J. Peterson, O. Lee, T. Islam & M. Piscioneri (Eds.), *Effectively implementing information communication technology in higher education in the Asia-Pacific region*, (pp. 161-181). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Rahimi, A. & Abedini, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners' self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas Royal, 3*(1), 14-28.

Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy and education and instruction. In J.E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application*, (pp. 281-303). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Tucker, M.L. & McCarthy, A.M. (2001). Presentation self-efficacy: Increasing communication skills through service-learning. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *13*(2), 227-244.

Usher, E. L. & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*, 751-796.

Warren, J. L. (2011). *The Relationship between service learning and public speaking self- efficacy: Toward engaging today's undergraduates***.** (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, USA).

Williams, J. D. & Takaku, S. (2011). Help seeking, self-efficacy, and writing performance among college students. *Journal of Writing Research*, *3*(1), 1-18.

Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Whitman, R. F. & Boase, P. H. (1983). *Speech communication: Principles and contexts*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing.

Authors

Piyarat Wattananan is a holder of MA in Applied Linguistics (English Language Teaching) from King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand.

Saowaluck Tepsuriwong is an assistant professor at the School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand. She was awarded a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Reading, UK in 2000. *saowaluck.tep@kmutt.ac.th*

Appendix: Questionnaire on beliefs about oral presentation abilities

Part 1: Please rate your oral presentation abilities on the rating scales.

(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

Descriptions		1	2	3	4	5
Language						
1	I can use English fluently.					
2	I can use English accurately.					
3	I can use English effectively.					
4	I can use transition signals /expressions well.					
Delivery						
5	I can make the presentation within the time limit.					
6	I can prepare an effective visual aid.					
7	I can use visual aid effectively.					
8	I can control my excitement during the presentation.					
9	I can use a variety of techniques in the presentation.					
10	I can grab the audience's attention well.					
11	I can use effective body language.					
12	I can make eye-contact effectively.					
13	I can raise or lower my voice to make the presentation effective.					
14	I can deliver the message without reading from notes.					
15	I can deal with all questions effectively.					
Organization						
16	I can organize the content logically.					
17	I can support the main ideas with adequate evidence.					
18	I can make a good start by including an introductory statement that summarizes the main idea in the presentation.					
19	I can end the presentation with a conclusion that reviews the main ideas.					
20	I can structure the presentation effectively having an introduction, bodies and a conclusion.					

Part 2: What are your strengths and weaknesses when giving a presentation?

Part 3: In general, how well do you think you can make a presentation? Please give a score to yourself.

I think my presentation ability is …….. out of 10.

Thank you for your cooperation!