THE EFFECTIVENESS OF "SPEAK UP NOW" TRAINING WITH VICARIOUS EXPERIENCE TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY

Hanina Maulidha[1] & Sri Tiatri[2]

[1]Master Program of Psychology, University Tarumanagara Jakarta
[2] Faculty of Psychology, University Tarumanagara Jakarta
Email: sri.tiatri@untar.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Public speaking self-efficacy is one of the components in public speaking skills that need to be possessed by students in high school. Various other methods have been developed, but only a few have been developed specifically to improve public speaking self-efficacy. This study aims to determine the effect of the training method that utilizes the Vicarious Experience on the Public Speaking Self-efficacy of SMP X students. This study is a Quasi Experiment with One Group Pre Test – Post Test research design. This research was conducted on 30 students of SMP X consisting of 16 male students and 13 female students. The result of this study found that there was a positive effect on the online public speaking training method "Speak Up Now" by using the Vicarious Experience method in improving Public Speaking Self-efficacy in junior high school students. The "Speak Up Now" training can be further extended to other similar communities.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, public speaking, training public speaking, online training, students

1.   PREFACE

Public speaking is a strategic communication that requires a public speaker to present ideas in a clear, logical, coherent, and convincing manner. Public speaking is rhetoric in social communication. Public speaking can also be explained as the process of designing and conveying messages to the audience. In addition, Wrench et all also explained that to be a good public speaker, it is necessary to plan and organize topics or materials. There are three types of public speaking based on the intended purpose: informative, persuasive, and entertaining. The ability in public speaking according to Warren is the level of student competence in delivering a speech or presentation in public by paying attention to three main components including content, structure, and delivery.

Self-efficacy in learning public speaking is students' belief in their ability to complete tasks in learning public speaking so that they can achieve the intended learning objectives, namely being able to speak according to their criteria and abilities. Observing the successful performance of others is a form of modelling and may influence the observers' self-efficacy. In a classroom, students who observe successful students might increase their own self-efficacy by vicariously experiencing the successful performance of the students themselves.

Self-efficacy is people's assessment of their ability to perform tasks at a certain level derived from various experiences and sources. According to Albert Bandura, four factors influence self-efficacy which include: Master of Experience, Vicarious Experience, Verbal Persuasion, and Emotional State.

During a vicarious experience, a model informs and motivates by providing information about specific behaviors and strategies that led to personal success in that particular situation. Some

studies revealed positive influences of the vicarious experience Usher and Pajares, Mori and Uchida, Bartsch et all, and Luzzo et al are some studies some studies revealed positive influences of the vicarious experience. So in this study public speaking self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to acquire or perform public speaking skills.

One of the ways to have public speaking skills is by participating in public speaking training. Public Speaking training is one method that can develop or increase confidence and self-efficacy in oneself and others, and can improve relationship skills with other people. Herbein et al. explained that public speaking training is a public speaking learning process that must pay attention to motivational aspects to be able to approach participants and must pay attention to verbal, auditory or voice, visual, and delivery techniques in public speaking so that there is a reduction in stage fright.

Self-Efficacy
Self-efficacy according to Bandura is an individual's assessment of the individual's ability to perform tasks at a certain level derived from various experiences and sources. These sources include active mastery or episodes of actual performance, modeling or observing other people's behavior and related outcomes, verbal persuasion or communication about one's competence, and people's attributions of what their physiological state reflects about their competence.

Self-efficacy can affect how individuals feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave. Self-efficacy is also explained as belief in one's ability to obtain or perform behavior at some predetermined level. In addition, self-efficacy can measure a person's thoughts, feelings, and actions and influence the actions we take. In this study, researchers used the theory of Bandura which explains that self-efficacy is a belief in one's ability to obtain or perform behavior at a given time certain levels.

According to Albert Bandura, four factors influence self-efficacy which include: Master of Experience, Vicarious Experience, Verbal Persuasion, and Emotional State.

Master of Experience or experience of success occurs when someone tries to do something and succeeds. So, individuals can master from experience.

Vicarious Experience occurs by seeing other people who do the same thing as us, so it will happen if the individual sees other people who do the same thing as him and other people successfully execute it and it will increase self-efficacy. But if the individual sees other people doing the same thing and the other person fails, it will make the individual have the same perception and it will decrease the individual's self-efficacy.

Verbal Persuasion occurs when a person is verbally convinced that they can achieve or master a task, then they are more likely to do the task well, but if people are told that they cannot complete the task, they will give up on completing the task.

Emotional State occurs when a person thinks that they are most likely unable to complete a task and it will occur if people think negative thoughts while they are completing a task. Stress and anxiety are big fears and will affect a person's self-efficacy. But anxiety and stress will not affect a person's self-efficacy if they interpret their stress as a positive thing, such as they think that if I become nervous, I will not succeed in this task.
Public Speaking Self-Efficacy

Public speaking is a "strategic communication act" that requires a public speaker to present ideas in a clear, logical, coherent, and convincing manner. Public speaking is rhetoric in social communication. Public speaking is the process of designing and conveying messages to the audience. To be a good public speaker, it is necessary to plan and organize topics or materials. Warren also specified three types of public speaking based on the intended purpose: informative, persuasive, and entertaining. Ability in public speaking is the level of student competence in delivering a speech or presentation in public by paying attention to three main components including content, structure, and delivery. There are four main components in effective public speaking, namely content, structure, delivery, and the use of effective presentation aids. The content consists of the main topic of the speech, the main points used to support the main topic, and evidence used to clarify, explain, or support the main points.

Self-efficacy in learning public speaking is students' belief in their ability to complete tasks in learning public speaking so that they can achieve the intended learning objectives, namely being able to speak according to their criteria and abilities.

Therefore, in this study, public speaking is a public speaking skill by paying attention to content, structure, delivery, and audience.

As for self-efficacy, people's assessment of their ability to perform tasks at a certain level comes from various experiences and sources. Therefore in this study, public speaking self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to speak in public.

Public Speaking Training
Public Speaking training is one way to develop or increase confidence in oneself and others and can improve relationship skills with other people.

In addition, Public Speaking Training is also a training program that is prepared with various elements, including introductions and conclusions in the first and last course units. To develop public speaking skills, children or students must be informative and interesting. Some materials must exist in public speaking training: nonverbal-visual, nonverbal-auditory, language use, and organization. In addition, public speaking training is a public speaking learning process that must pay attention to motivational aspects to be able to approach participants and must pay attention to verbal, auditory, or voice aspects, visuals, and delivery techniques in public speaking so that there is a reduction in stage fright. In speaking, the presence of the interlocutor requires two conditions, namely a) reciprocal conditions; and b) time pressure conditions.

The Youth Speaks Up program is a program developed by Brann-Barrett in 2005. This program specifically focuses on communication, the element that plays a role in achieving other goals by increasing student participation in each monthly meeting and their input.

Public Speaking Training according to Herbein is a training program designed to cultivate children's or youth's public speaking skills which must be informative and interesting. Among them, some materials must be included in public speaking training: non-verbal-visual, non-verbal-auditory, language use, and organization with the Focus Group Discussion method for children and adolescents. This study developed a special program for junior high school students in Indonesia, regarding the Public Speaking Training Program designed by Herbein.

Focus Group Discussions have been used effectively when conducting research with children and adolescents, and when exploring educational issues, it is said that one of the benefits of focus group discussions for children and adolescents is that they serve as models of the social environment at school. In this study, the researchers decided to use the definition of Herbein et al. which explains that public speaking training is a public speaking learning process that must focus on motivational aspects in order to approach participants and must pay attention to verbal, auditory, visual aspects, and delivery techniques in public speaking so that there is a reduction in stage fright.

Observational Learning
Social cognitive theory is a learning theory that explains behavioral patterns. The theory developed by Albert Bandura focuses on how and why people tend to imitate or imitate what they see through the media or other people. Social cognitive theory is a development of social learning theory that provides a framework for understanding, predicting, and changing human behavior. The social cognitive theory makes several assumptions about learning and behavioral performance. This assumption addresses the reciprocal interaction between individuals, behavior, and the environment; active learning. Bandura formulated a comprehensive theory of observational learning which he has developed to cover the acquisition and performance of various skills, strategies, and behaviors.

Bandura distinguishes three main functions of modeling: response facilitation, inhibition or disinhibition, and observational learning. Observational learning through modeling occurs when the observer displays a new pattern of behavior which, before exposure to the modeled behavior, has a zero probability of occurrence even when the motivation is high. The observational learning process consists of four stages: attention, retention, production, and motivation.

Attention is the first process in observation. Attention towards relevant events lead to said event being perceived meaningfully. The characteristics of the model and observer influence one's attention to the model.

Retention is the second stage in the observation process. Retention is the process of coding or cognitively organizing, rehearsing, coding, and transforming model information for storage in memory.

Production is the third stage in the learning process in observation. The production process starts from problems that occur resulting in modeled behavior appearing not only because information does not have a code, but also because students have difficulty translating information and encoding it into memory so that it becomes real action.

Furthermore, the last stage of the learning process through observation is motivation. Motivation is the fourth process, influencing observational learning because people are more likely to be involved in the previous three processes, namely attention, retention, and production. In this motivational process, individuals form expectations about the anticipated action outcomes based on the consequences experienced by them and the model. The activity in question is when the consequences of the behavior being modeled provide the observer with information about functional value and fit. Consequences in motivation include creating outcome expectations and increasing individual self-efficacy.

This research was conducted under COVID-19 conditions. This study contributes to experts in the field of educational psychology to develop this research further. In addition, the researcher also wants to provide insight to the readers to be able to develop the design of teaching programs, especially for the field of public speaking in schools. This research may also be useful for teachers in schools, to create awareness and program designs to support learning activities to prepare students for public speaking skills. So that schools can prepare the right method so that teaching and learning activities are more effective.

This paper has five sections. First, a description of variables observed in this study. Second, an explanation of the theory used in this study, namely Self-efficacy, Public Speaking Self-efficacy, Public Speaking Training, and Observational Learning. The third description of the method used. Fourth, a description of the findings and discussion of this research. Fifth, conclusions and suggestions for the future research.

2.   RESEARCH METHOD

Participant and Procedure

The population in this study were students of the Integrated Islamic Junior High School (SMP) X in South Jakarta. The number of students in SMP X is 110. Of the 110 students for the school, grade 8 is a class that has urgency according to research needs. Therefore, the participants of this study were grade 8 students with a total of 30 students consisting of 16 male students and 13 female students. In this study, the population used was SMP X students who had low self-efficacy in public speaking. The researcher uses a purposive sampling technique where the technique is to determine the research sample with certain considerations that aim to make the data obtained later can be more vicarious. The sampling procedure was carried out by researchers by testing the self-efficacy in public speaking of 30 students.

This study is a Quasi Experiment that places the subjects in the actual condition. The design of this study was classified as "One Groups Pretest-Posttest Design", namely a research design with a pre-test before treatment and a post-test after the treatment. Thus the result can be more accurate because it can be compared with the pre-test.

The procedure starts with a group of students who need public speaking learning, with have low public speaking self-efficacy, are grouped with other students before being given intervention treatment on their public speaking ability test so that pre-test values were obtained. After that, all groups were given 12 sessions of public speaking training intervention. Then the public speaking ability was tested again with the same test equipment to obtain a post-test score. Then, the pre-test and post-test scores were compared.

Research Instruments

Self-efficacy according to Bandura [6] is a belief in a person's ability to perform behavior at some predetermined level. Public speaking according to Warren is the level of student competence in delivering a speech or presentation in public by paying attention to three main components including content, structure, and delivery. Therefore, the operational definition of public speaking self-efficacy in this study is the belief in one's ability to perform public speaking. Measurement of public speaking self-efficacy uses a measuring tool called the "Public Speaking Self-efficacy Scale" developed by. The instrument consists of 34 items using a Likert scale of 1-6 (1 = Very Much Unlike Me, 6 = Very Much Like Me). The measuring tools were adapted beforehand. The procedure for adapting the measuring instrument has gone through four stages, namely the translation process by a sworn translator, content validation process, and readability test by three

experts including two psychology experts and one communication expert and professional public speaker. The measuring instrument was tested on October 24, 2021 on 30 students in grades 7 and 8 at SMP X Jakarta which resulted in the Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.925.

3.   RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this study, researchers measured public speaking self-efficacy in SMP X students with a public speaking self-efficacy measuring instrument that was given at the beginning or before the implementation of the intervention and in the final session or after the implementation of the intervention. From the results of the pre-test, the researcher categorizes the participants into three categories of public speaking self-efficacy, namely the low group, medium group, and high group. This is to make it easier for researchers to see the initial abilities of participants. However, this categorization cannot be used as a reference for further grouping participants, either in observations during the program or in the focus of program objectives. The categorization based on self-efficacy is often not in accordance with the results of observations on participants' self-efficacy when public speaking. From the three groups, it turned out that all participants experienced a positive increase in post-test scores. In addition, based on the observation assessment, not only the low group experienced low scores. But the moderate group also experienced low scores and showed an increase in their post-test scores. Therefore, the researcher decided to analyze changes in public speaking self-efficacy in participants who had high and low gain scores.

Before doing the difference test between pre-test and post-test scores, the researcher has conducted a normality test first which aims to determine the normality distribution of the data obtained using 1-sample KS in the SPSS version 20 program. Based on the results of the normality test on the pre-test data, it is known that the normal distribution of data is $p = 0.956$ ($p > 0.05$) with the result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov = 0.511. The results of the distribution of data from the post-test results were also normally distributed, namely $p = 0.318$ ($p > 0.05$) with the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov = 0.958. Then the researcher calculated the difference test, which obtained the mean value of public speaking self-efficacy in the pre-test and post-test of 126.9667 (SD = 15.43056) and 137.9667 (SD = 20.34272). Furthermore, the value of $t = -6304$, $p = 0.000$ (< 0.05), which means that there is a significant change in public speaking self-efficacy through pre-test and post-test on research participants. This proves that the public speaking training program is effective in increasing public speaking self-efficacy in SMP X students significantly.

In addition to measuring public speaking self-efficacy as the main measuring tool that has been declared significant, this study uses an additional measuring tool, namely the observation sheet— assessment of the situational appropriateness of public speaking skills developed by [9]. The measuring instrument aims to provide an assessment of observations on public speaking training activities. In measuring these observations, four aspects are identified, namely visual, auditory or voice, verbal, and delivery techniques.

The observation assessment also focuses on participants who have high and low gain scores or changes in scores from the results of the public speaking self-efficacy assessment (can be seen in Table 1). The group of participants who experienced a high score change were P1 with a score of 48, P2 with a score of 45, P3 with a score of 40, P4 with a score of 39, P5 with a score of 36, P6 with a score of 32, and P7 23. Then the group of participants who experienced a change in score the low ones are P30 with a score of 1, P29 with a score of 1, P28-P25 with a score of 2, and P24 with a score of 5. Changes in the public seeking self-efficacy score are also supported by changes in scores on the observation assessment on the first and last days.

Table 1 shows that all participants' scores had improved positively. This is in line with additional assessments, namely observational assessments that pay attention to four aspects, namely visual, auditory or voice, verbal, and delivery techniques. In general, participants who show significant changes are due to factors that affect their self-efficacy in public speaking. Among these are recognizing everything that participants do during public speaking training, providing direct examples or using the media to present appropriate role models or figures in each public speaking training session, providing opportunities for participants to practice what has been taught, and providing opportunities for participants to provide feedback to other participants.

Figure 1
Changes in Behavior of Participants Group with High Gain Score

Participants	Intervention	Behavior Prior to Intervention	Behavior after Intervention
P1 RDA	1,2,3,4	Shy, unclear articulation, tense, quiet voice, self-doubt.	More confident, the voice is louder, does not hesitate to speak, can deliver presentations with various intonations, and the articulation is clear.
P2 HAS	2,3,4	Using the filter feature in the Zoom Meeting app, pointing the camera at their hair or forehead,	No longer using filter, the camera is always active and the face is fully visible, making a very good presentation and being very confident when delivering it.
P3 ARA	2,3,4	Talking too fast, short of breath, panicking or not calm when talking.	Calmer when speaking publicly, breathing is no longer heard, feeling relaxed before starting, making Cue Cards, and making good visualizations by utilizing the green screen background feature.
P4 ASY	1,2,3,4	A soft voice, the distance between the camera and them is far, feeling shy and having no friends.	Became more confident, willing to lead the ice breaking, the distance between the camera and themselves is appropriate, always activate the camera, the voice is more audible, and willing to lead the group.
P5 AAR	1,2,3,4	Sending messages using only the chat feature, never talking directly, afraid and nervous	Willing to communicate directly, courageous, having clear articulation, and speaking in a structured manner.
P6 KYR	2,3,4	Shy, the camera is pointed away from face, quiet voice, confused about how to open the presentation	Camera is pointed at the face, can make intonation variations, and open the presentation with several variations of openings.
P7 SRA	2,3,4	Shy, not knowing how to convey messages, flat intonation, insecure, and experiencing stage fright	Able to read scripts with various intonations: news reader/ Voice Over/ and Reporter, able to make various kinds of intonation, able to make Cue Card, and confident.

Table 1 Explanation: 1 = Mastery of Experience; 2 = Vicarious Experience; 3 = Verbal Persuasion; 4 = Emotional State

Based on Table 1, the researcher can conclude that participants who improved significantly were due to the intervention paying attention to several factors to increase their self-efficacy. From the table above, the most frequently used are vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional states.

In general, participants showed drastic improvement due to factors that affect their self-efficacy. For example, the researchers often recognize everything that participants do during public speaking training, provide direct examples or use the media to present appropriate role models or figures in each public speaking training session, provide opportunities for participants to practice what has been taught, and provide opportunities for participants to provide feedback to other participants in turn.

One example is participant P1 with the initials RDA. P1 at the fourth meeting of the public speaking training, P1 was observed to have had difficulties in clear articulation and voice volume.

Therefore, the researcher asked P1 to mimic what the researcher had done, utilizing the lion face technique, planet language, and reading a few sentences aloud.

Therefore, based on what P1 experienced, it is in line with the concept of the source or self-efficacy factor, that is the vicarious experience carried out by the researcher to show the correct example to P1, the verbal persuasion when P1 was convinced that he was able to do things well. The emotional state was initially tense, then when convinced by the participants and P1 had time to relax, turned out to be very influential on his appearance in public speaking.

Besides P1, there was also P2 or with the initials HAS who showed very positive changes. At the beginning of the meeting, P2 often covered his face using the filters available in the Zoom Meeting application or pointing their camera away from their face. During the third to the fifth meeting, the researcher continued to try to call or ask P2 to answer questions. Initially, his voice was small, but during the fifth meeting, P2 voices became louder, heard clearly and loudly enough. Finally, at the fifth meeting, the researchers gave P2 special appreciation because P2 managed to show his face without a filter and focus the camera position to show his face. Until the last meeting, P2 was able to focus and present the artist from Japan, namely Katsushika Hokusai very well and received appreciation from other participants, the majority of whom did not expect that P2 could conduct a very optimal presentation. Overcoming the things experienced by P2, the researcher took actions that affected P2's emotional state and convinced P2 that in public speaking training activities there was no need to be ashamed or afraid because this session was merely a learning activity. The researchers also showed an example of a good camera position for Zoom Meeting along with not using filters, the sitting distance between participants and the camera and consider other participants not something to be afraid of.

Then the next participant is P3 or with the initials of ARA participant. P3 is one of the participants who is quite braver than the other participants. However, the participants at the first meeting in speaking or public speaking still need to be trained. For example, in speaking, P3 is a participant who finds it very difficult to speak at a stable speaking speed. P3 also often spoke quickly and made eye contact that did not focus on seeing the audience and looked panicked when showing an object or image that he wanted to convey to other participants. Therefore, when the P3 training is given, the participants are often asked to practice what has been taught to the fullest. Until there is a change in behavior, P3 is able to control the speed and volume of the voice in speaking, eye contact is well controlled, and when showing the visualization of an object or image, P3 is not so panicked. This was proven at the time of the presentation at the end of the meeting to the maximum, even P3 took advantage of the background feature in the Zoom Meeting by using a green screen. So that P3 shows the background when he is in the situation of the Galliopoli War. What is done to help change P3's behavior is to pay attention to the emotional state and experience of the vicarious. The researcher focuses on providing vicarious experiences by giving examples of speaking in a calm state and focusing on the objectives to be conveyed by making Cue Cards containing the points to be conveyed when speaking publicly.

P4 or ASY is one of the participants who always performs visually using a small chair, with the camera far away. So that P4's face only looks blurry, then his voice is small, and he doesn't look confident like when he says his name or only when asked about news. However, when the four researchers met, asked P4 to sit closer to the camera so that his face could be seen clearly. At first P4 didn't want to, but when encouraged by other participants, P4 finally wanted to sit closer to the camera. Then, P4 was also asked by researchers at the sixth meeting to try to practice the material on how to open and deliver content, at first his voice was very small, but the researcher kept asking

participants to try again until finally his voice started to sound clear, the articulation was clear, the intonation sounded better. although still like reading. However, the visual, voice, and verbal changes were much better until at the end of the training session P4 presented about New York City. P4 shows that his public speaking appearance is more confident and more communicative even though his intonation is still like reading. What the researcher did to help P4 was to give verbal persuasion and pay attention to his emotional state in the form of affirmations and beliefs to convince P4. Next, the researcher gave an experience that was exemplified by other participants who could be close to the camera and speak loudly, without being shy. Then the researcher gave an example to P4 about how to sit, camera distance, and convey body language confidently, and gave an example of a video of a public speaker from America who has physical limitations but is able to speak in public well and confidently.

The next participant is P3 with the initials of ARA. P3 is one of the participants who were bolder than other participants. However, P3 still needs training during the first meeting in public speaking. For example, P3 finds it very difficult to speak at a stable speaking speed. P3 often spoke hastily and did not make eye contact with the audience and looked panicked when showing an object or image that he wanted to present to other participants. After P3 was given training, they often asked the researchers if they can practice what has been taught to the fullest. In time, P3 was able to control the speed and volume of their voice in speaking, eye contact is well controlled, and when presenting an object or image, P3 was not so panicked. This was proven at the time of the presentation at the end of the meeting, even P3 took advantage of the background feature in the Zoom Meeting by using a green screen. P3 showed the Gallipoli War as their background. To change P3's behavior, the researchers paid attention to the emotional state and vicarious experience. The researcher focuses on providing vicarious experience by speaking in a calm state and focusing on the objectives by making Cue Cards containing the points that are to be conveyed when speaking publicly.

P4 or ASY is one of the participants who always performed using a small chair, with the camera placed far away. This resulted in P4's face looking blurry, quiet voice, and not looking confident when asked for their name or greeted. However, at the fourth meeting, the researcher asked P4 to sit closer to the camera so that their face could be seen clearly. At first, P4 refused, but when encouraged by other participants, P4 agreed. Then, P4 was asked by researchers at the sixth meeting to practice a presentation, where at first their voice was quiet. The researcher kept asking participants to try again until finally, their voice started to sound louder, the articulation was clear, and the intonation improved, although it still sounded like reading. However, the visual, voice, and verbal improvements were much more significant at the end of the training session when P4 presented about New York City. P4 showed that they are more confident and more communicative even though their intonation still sounds like reading. What the researcher did to help P4 was to give verbal persuasion and pay attention to their emotional state in the form of affirmations and beliefs to convince P4. Next, the researcher showed an example of other participants who stood closer to the camera and speak loudly, without feeling shy. The researcher also showed an example to P4 about how to sit, camera distance, and convey body language confidently, and sent an example of a video of a public speaker from America with physical limitations but can speak in public well and confidently.

The next participant is P5 with the initials AAR. P5 preferred to answer or ask questions through the chat feature on the Zoom Meeting rather than saying it directly. The researcher asked P5 to talk directly without using chat, and at the third meeting P5 finally agreed to speak directly. P5 claimed that they were too lazy to talk and were afraid of being laughed at by other participants.

The researcher asked P5 to continue to answer questions and provide examples to other participants. Finally, at the seventh meeting, P5 managed to put on a very good performance, which was a presentation about Taman Mini Indonesia Indah even though P5 sounds as if they were running where their breathing can be heard loudly. However, at the last meeting P5 showed a very good public speaking performance. P5 even applied the Ice Breaking opening delivery technique then when he spoke, P5 was more confident and was no longer breathing heavily. In that session, P5 gave an excellent presentation about the tourist attractions at the Ragunan Zoo. The researchers did this because P5 had a bad experience in a discussion. This was conveyed to the researcher through the private chat feature. P5 claimed that they were often teased for being too active in discussions, so P5 was often called "ambitious". Resulting in P5 being shy and afraid to talk directly and preferring to use the chat feature. The researcher conducted verbal persuasion and gave an explanation to all participants, that in this training no one should make fun of each other, and made sure that everyone was able to do well in public speaking. Then, the researcher deliberately gave questions to P5 directly until P5 became confident.

P6 or KYR is the second female participant in the high gain score category. P6 has a soft voice, which makes P6 too shy to express an opinion. Their camera is often pointed at a chair or other place away from P6's face. P6 is one of the participants who showed good progress when practicing intonation. At the last meeting, P6 managed to present with a good variety of intonation with a soft voice and P6's face was clearly visible. In this case, the researcher paid more attention to verbal persuasion, emotional state, and representative experience. Verbal persuasion is in the form of affirmations that they are a capable person, considering P6 already has a basis in using intonation. Next, the researcher gave examples of the use of intonation and ways to avoid being nervous when speaking in public. P7 or SRA was a participant who was initially shy and was always confused about what to say when they were asked to practice something. However, this can be overcome by the researcher paying attention to their emotional state of being afraid and shy by reassuring them and asking other participants to ask P7 to read a news script repeatedly, until P7 became infatuated with reading news scripts with various intonations. Finally, at the last meeting, P7 presented a very interesting presentation using precise intonation.

This study provided a "Speak Up Now" online public speaking training intervention with a vicarious experience model that is successful in helping students improve self-efficacy. Researchers also have evidence that poor presentation by a representative model indirectly reduces participants' self-efficacy [14]. The positive effect of vicarious experience was also obtained in research by Bartsch et all [14], their study focused on master's-level students in a research and statistics course, the live vicarious experience peer model presentation may also enhance academic self-efficacy in both undergraduate and graduate psychology statistics and research methods courses. Luzzo et al [15] examined vicarious experience by showing undergraduate students describing their personal experiences with math and science by their video presentation. Furthermore, the media itself (video vs. live) can affect students' academic self-efficacy levels.

Direct interaction can provide a more realistic or authentic presentation, which leads to greater persuasion, which is why it is necessary to directly verbalize persuasion to participants even in online media [14]. Videos may feel distant and a hindrance to personal connection [15]. In contrast, live presentations give students more opportunities to make connections and find common ground between them [14]. although the public speaking training "Speak Up Now" is conducted online due to the pandemic, students can find the right model and suit themselves will be able to improve their own public speaking self-efficacy through activities such as the live vicarious experience peer model presentation may also enhance academic self-efficacy.

4.   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to test the effectiveness of the online "Speak Up Now" Public Speaking Training intervention program in improving public speaking self-efficacy. The data processing in this study using the paired sample t-test statistical test showed that there were differences in the results of the pre-test and post-test. Thus, it can be said that the online "Speak Up Now" Public Speaking Training program intervention is effective in increasing public speaking self-efficacy in SMP X students.

Acknowlegdement

REFERENCE

"Bandura_1993.pdf," Educational Psychologist, vol. 28, no. 2. pp. 117–148, 1993.

A. Wrench and R. Garrett, "Identity work: stories told in learning to teach physical education," Sport. Educ. Soc., vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2012, doi: 10.1080/13573322.2011.607909.

D. A. Luzzo, P. Hasper, K. A. Albert, M. A. Bibby, and E. A. . J. Martinelli, "Effects of self-efficacy-enhancing interventions on the math/science self-efficacy and career interests, goals, and actions of career undecided college students.," J. Couns. Psychol., vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 233–243, 1999, doi: 10.1037//0022-0167.46.2.233.

D. A. Luzzo, P. Hasper, K. A. Albert, M. A. Bibby, and E. A. J. Martinelli, "Effects of self-efficacy-enhancing interventions on the math/science self-efficacy and career interests, goals, and actions of career undecided college students.," J. Couns. Psychol., vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 233–243, 1999, doi: 10.1037//0022-0167.46.2.233.

D. Sellnow, Confident Public Speaking 2nd Edition, 2nd ed. Belmon: Thomson Wadsworth, 2009.

E. Herbein, J. Golle, M. Tibus, J. Schiefer, U. Trautwein, and I. Zettler, "Fostering elementary school children's public speaking skills: A randomized controlled trial," Learn. Instr., vol. 55, no. October, pp. 158–168, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.10.008.

I. Lisnawati, Y. Yuniawati, and W. N. Kartadireja, "Student's Self-Efficacy in Speaking Learning," vol. 306, no. Isseh 2018, pp. 255–261, 2019, doi: 10.2991/isseh-18.2019.59.

J. L. Warren, "The relationship between service learning and public speaking self-efficacy: Toward engaging today's undergraduates," ProQuest Diss. Theses, p. 94, 2011, [Online]. Available:
http://search.proquest.com.ezaccess.library.uitm.edu.my/docview/1499244514?accountid=42518.

K. Mori and A. Uchida, "Can contrived success affect self-efficacy among junior high school students?," Res. Educ., no. 82, pp. 60–68, 2009, doi: 10.7227/rie.82.5.

M. T. Brann-Barrett, "Youth speaks up: Perceived communication changes experienced by grade 6 participants in a personal development program," Alberta J. Educ. Res., vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 155–171, 2005.

N. M. Thomas, J. Hofer, and D. Kranz, "Effects of an intergenerational program on adolescent self-concept clarity: A pilot study," J. Pers., no. May, pp. 1–14, 2021, doi: 10.1111/jopy.12678.

P. Sugiyono, Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alpabeta, 2011.

R. A. Bartsch, K. A. Case, and H. Meerman, "Increasing Academic Self-Efficacy in Statistics With a Live Vicarious Experience Presentation," Teach. Psychol., vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 133–136, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0098628312437699.

R. B. Anderson, "Vicarious and Persuasive Influences on Efficacy Expectations and Intentions to Perform Breast Self-Examination," Public Relat. Rev., vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 97–114, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0363-8111(00)00033-3.

S. Dale, Learning Theories An Educational Perspective Sixth Edition, 6th ed. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., publishing, 2012.

S. E. Lucas, "English Public Speaking and the Cultivation of Talents for Chinese College Students," Chinese J. Appl. Linguist., vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 163–182, 2013, doi: 10.1515/cjal-2013-0011.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2006) Sources of academic and self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of entering middle school students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 31, 125-141

X. Zhang, Y. Ardasheva, J. Egbert, and S. C. Ullrich-French, "Building Assessments for Self-Efficacy in English Public Speaking in China," Asia-Pacific Educ. Res., vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 411–420, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s40299-019-00441-9.

Z. Barry and S. Dale, "Albert Bandura: The scholar and his contributions to educational psychology.," Am. Psychol. Assoc., 2003, [Online]. Available: https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-02627-018.

Z. Barry and S. Dale, "Albert Bandura: The scholar and his contributions to educational psychology.," Am. Psychol. Assoc., 2003, [Online]. Available: https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-02627-018.