



Typing Not Talking? Gen Z Learners' Avoidance of Speaking English in Online Classes

Irmayani¹, Zida Fakhriyatul Jamilah², Mary Mae Labastida³

^{1,2,3}Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Islam Darul "Ulum Lamongan, Jawa Timur

Article Info	Abstract
Received: 2026-10-02 Revised: 2026-10-21 Accepted: 2026-10-22 Keywords: Online classes; Speaking Anxiety; Generation Z; English Learning; Descriptive Survey DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v14i2.12774 Corresponding Author: Irmayani irmayani@unisda.ac.id Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Islam Darul "Ulum Lamongan, Jawa Timur	<i>Digital communication is progressing and students of Generation Z are still involved in learning English. But many students prefer to type rather than talk, even in synchronous online classes where they are expected to interact directly by talking. The aim of this study is to investigate the primary reasons behind Generation Z students' hesitation to speak English in synchronous online EFL classes. This descriptive mixed-method study was done on forty English Language Education students from Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan. Data were collected by means of an online questionnaire comprising twelve Likert scale statements and three open-ended questions distributed via Google Forms. The quantitative results showed consistently high mean scores for speaking anxiety, preference for text-based communication, and fear of making mistakes. Qualitative findings supported these results through four core themes: fear of negative evaluation, preference for textual format, technical and environmental barriers, and the need for pedagogical support.</i>

1. Introduction

Digital communication has transformed the way Generation Z engages with language learning, especially in online English as a Foreign Language (EFL) schools. Generation Z (born between 1995 and 2010) is often characterized as the first generation to have grown up totally in the digital era. This group has grown up in a technological world, and consequently, they have developed specific ways of communicating—ways that value speed, the ability to do several things at once, and a preference for text-based, asynchronous communication. They are also quite good at using social media, messaging applications and digital content, making them competent digital communicators especially in text-based interactions (Mulyani et al., 2021).

However, these skills do not always lead to fluency when speaking out loud, particularly in formal learning settings such as English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. Educators sometimes meet digitally savvy and highly connected students who are slightly reluctant to verbally engage in live online classes (Rofiq & Pramuditha, 2021).

This issue is especially so in the case of language learning when one needs to be fluent to be able to communicate. Speaking is a constructive skill: it allows pupils to produce ideas, to work together to understand, to have real communication. But online learning settings can unintentionally provide opportunity for students to skip speaking activities, for example by muting their microphones and turning off their cameras. The same features that facilitate access, such as the chat feature and digital forums, also facilitate the avoidance of face-to-face verbal conversation.

This behavior results in what some academics have termed as “silent participation” or “ghost learning,” when students are physically present but linguistically absent (Yulia, 2021; Zhao, 2020). A number of research have revealed that foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA) has a definite limitation on the learners’ readiness to speak in a foreign language. FLSA is generally associated with fear of negative assessment, low self-confidence, and the need to perform well in front of peers (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Zhang & Liu, 2022).

Recent research has begun to disentangle how the modality of instruction—synchronous versus asynchronous, online versus in-person—affects this worry in particular, rather than seeing it as a fixed trait. Cheng (2025) observed that L2 speaking anxiety expressed differently in classroom and synchronous online contexts for EFL college students, indicating that the online environment itself generates distinct anxiety triggers beyond those in face-to-face instruction. Similarly, Resnik, Dewaele, and Knechtelsdorfer (2023) reported significant differences in the level and form of foreign language anxiety across in-person and online EFL classrooms in a mixed-methods design, further highlighting the significance of context-specific instruments.

In a similar study in online emergency remote teaching, Cancino and Cabello (2024) found that computer self-efficacy interacted with speaking anxiety, with students with less confidence in themselves in using the technology itself reporting more fear when required to speak live. Together, the findings confirm the rationale for the present study's instrument design, that is, the use of a tailored, context-specific measure of anxiety. This anxiety is likely to be exacerbated in online learning situations where the lack of physical cues when speaking, the extra strain of seeing oneself on-screen, and the potential for being recorded may all contribute to increased discomfort. This is why many students prefer written communication as it gives more time to think, plan and edit before giving a response.

More specifically, investigating the cognitive and psychological factors may help to understand why learners of Generation Z would prefer typing to speaking in online EFL sessions. These learners are accustomed to fast-produced content production and consumption, which is typically delivered by informal language and visual aspects. It can be somewhat of a shock to have to switch to formal spoken English in academic settings .

Furthermore, students in collectivist countries such as Indonesia may feel pressured not to make mistakes in front of their peers, especially in live online sessions where every word can be heard (Santoso & Lestari, 2023). Thus speaking can become a cause of stress in the classroom rather than a tool for language acquisition.

In terms of individual psychology, there are structural and pedagogical mismatches that worsen the problem. Many professors, accustomed to lecturing, may not give students the chance to speak, reducing the practice pupils need to acquire confidence. The

disconnect between digital resources and instructional design is especially obvious at colleges that rushed to online learning without the time to prepare.

The move to online education has also highlighted existing inequalities – not all students have equal access to dependable internet, a suitable study environment, or the technology to engage completely. A student with an instable internet connection might resort to typing simply because audio drops out; another might be silent altogether, to avoid being overheard by family members sharing the same place.

These environmental constraints, which are not generally discussed in academia, play a substantial role in students' preparedness and ability to speak in online classes (Zhang & Liu, 2022). Prior study has examined speaking fear, digital learning choices, and communication characteristics by generation in isolation. However, few studies have studied the interaction of these variables from the perspective of speaking avoidance in synchronous online EFL sessions. This gap warrants investigation, as spoken language use and fluency development are predominantly driven by speaking practice.

This is very much important to the post-pandemic Indonesia, in which many universities are still doing blended learning. Understanding the reason of Gen Z's reluctance to speak up in virtual classes is essential to guide the pedagogical decisions in higher education (Rahmawati, 2024). The present results are inconclusive. Purwanto et al. (2021) discovered that Indonesian undergraduates preferred live video conferencing to asynchronous discussion boards yet they felt apprehensive when being evaluated in real time. Yulia (2021) also showed that written conversations in chat rooms were judged to be less stressful than spoken exchanges, a pattern consistent with Zhao (2020) finding that students in the digital era increasingly prefer written communication, especially in academic environments. Other research challenges the idea that online learning is detrimental to verbal development and illustrates how online learning can be intentionally designed to boost speaking skills.

AI-driven tools, peer speaking assignments, virtual simulations, and gamified speaking activities, when implemented correctly, can reduce anxiety and improve participation (Rahmawati, 2024; Ismail & Prasetyo, 2022). However, the success of these approaches depends on the comprehension of the emotive and contextual demands of the students by the teachers. The researchers found that students who joined the English Language Education program at Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan were reluctant to speak in Zoom or Google Meet sessions but were active in online discussions in English, one of the programs conducted by the English Department Students' Association. Instead, they would often type comments, remain quiet, or look noticeably shy when prompted to speak. This pattern interfered with the progress they had made in spoken English and brought about the present inquiry into the causes behind it.

In this study, speech is considered as a linguistic and psychological event based on Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis and the framework of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The linguistic proficiency is not enough. We need an environment that facilitates students' risk taking by reducing their anxiety. Thus, it is important for educators developing online training to understand students' viewpoints, preferences, and concerns. Hence, this study answers the following main research question: "What are the major reasons for the Generation Z students' reluctance to speak English in the online EFL classes?" which are directed to three purposes: (1) to find out the most dominant reasons for speaking avoidance, (2) to examine the effect of digital learning

environment on speaking participation, and (3) to suggest for EFL teachers to develop a more inclusive and supportive speaking environment in online classes.

2. Method

This study adopted a descriptive research design employing a mixed-methods approach, gathering both quantitative and qualitative data within a single instrument. A mixed-methods strategy is appropriate when the research topic calls for both statistical measurement and narrative explanation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). The design enabled the researchers to determine the extent of speaking avoidance among Generation Z learners through Likert scale measurement and to explore the personal reasons for this behavior through open-ended responses in authentic classroom settings in synchronous online instruction.

This survey was conducted to 40 students of English Language Education Program at Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan, Indonesia. All participants were fourth semester undergraduate students, having experience in online learning via platforms like Zoom and Google Meet. The participants were recruited using purposive sampling. The researchers' aim was to focus on students who had direct and prolonged experience with synchronous online English instruction so as to generate relevant and informed responses.

In educational research, purposive sampling is a frequent sample method when a study aims to include participants with specified qualities or experiences that are relevant to the research issue (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018). All participants experienced online English classes and were involved in a variety of virtual speaking activities, which suggested that they were well familiarized with digital learning environments and were in a good position to contribute useful data on the topic under inquiry.

The researchers used a self-designed online questionnaire via Google Forms with closed and open-ended questions to collect data. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first portion gathered demographic information such as gender, age, online learning experience, and self-rated English competence. The second half consisted of twelve Likert scale statements to test the levels of speaking avoidance and speaking anxiety. Each statement was scored using a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). These items were adapted from the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986) and altered according to recent research on online communication preferences (Zhang & Liu, 2022). The last section consisted of three open-ended questions, which aimed to elicit students' own comments on their fear of speaking and suggestions for boosting verbal involvement in online lectures.

The instrument was subjected to different procedures to test its validity and reliability. First, to establish content validity, two EFL instructors with competence in language evaluation reviewed the items to check for clarity and relevance. Feedback was received on clearer wording and suggestions were included. Then, a pilot test was performed with 10 students who were not in the main study to examine the clarity and appropriateness of the items.

Finally, Cronbach's Alpha was used to compute the dependability coefficient and it was found to be 0.87, suggesting strong internal consistency. Data collection was carried out over a two-week period in April 2026. During the online lectures, the link to the questionnaire was shared in the WhatsApp group of the students. Each participant read

and approved a permission statement before completing the questionnaire, stressing that participation was anonymous and voluntary.

3. Result

Quantitative Findings

Descriptive statistics were used to provide an overview of students' responses to the twelve Likert-scale items measuring avoidance behavior, speaking anxiety, and preference for text-based communication. The means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Students' Responses to Speaking-Related Statements (n = 40)

No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I feel anxious when I have to speak English during online classes.	4.28	0.54	Strongly agree
2	I prefer typing my responses than speaking them during class discussions.	4.32	0.49	Strongly agree
3	I worry about speaking with grammatical mistakes.	4.15	0.61	Agree
4	I feel more confident when I type my answers than when I speak them.	4.21	0.56	Agree
5	I will not turn on my mic unless the teacher calls my name specifically.	4.25	0.63	Strongly agree
6	I am worried about what I sound like when I pronounce words in front of others.	4.05	0.72	Agree
7	My internet connectivity slows down my willingness to speak.	4.10	0.64	Agree
8	I feel uneasy that people are watching me speak on camera.	3.98	0.81	Agree
9	I feel more focused when I type than when I speak.	4.13	0.68	Agree
10	I prefer to listen than to speak.	4.00	0.60	Agree
11	I think that my speaking skills are not good enough.	4.22	0.58	Agree
12	I can get nervous about speaking online in English.	4.30	0.51	Strongly agree

Table 1 shows consistently high mean scores across nearly all items, particularly those related to anxiety, lack of confidence, and textual preference. Item 2 recorded the highest level of agreement ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.49$), indicating a clear behavioral preference for typing over speaking. This finding aligns with Zhao's (2020) claim that Generation Z's communication comfort zone has shifted as a result of their heavy reliance on text-based platforms.

Furthermore, items connected to anxiety (Items 1, 5, and 12) also received strong agreement, underscoring that psychological barriers are a central driver of speaking avoidance, consistent with Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) foundational account of foreign language classroom anxiety. Items related to pronunciation discomfort (Item 6, $M = 4.05$) and technical or environmental barriers (Item 7, $M = 4.10$) also scored highly, indicating that both internal and external factors jointly shape participation, a pattern consistent with Yulia (2021) and Fitria (2023).

Qualitative Findings

Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis approach, students' responses to the three open-ended questions were coded and organized into four main themes, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Themes and Representative Student Statements

No.	Theme	Example Student Statement
1	Fear of Negative Evaluation	"I fear that if I say something incorrect, I will get laughed at by my classmates."
2	Textual Preference	"Typing gives me time to think and feels safer."
3	Technical and Environmental Barriers	"My internet is unstable, and I am shy to speak while there is noise happening."
4	Pedagogical Support	"I will speak if I am given the chance to prepare first or practice with a small group."

The Textual Preference theme supports that the typing is not just a convenience, but also a self-protective mechanism, in line with Santoso and Lestari (2023) and Mulyani et al. (2021). The Technical and Environmental Barriers topic reflects the uneven digital infrastructure across Indonesia and echoes Yulia's (2021) comment that some students are mute by necessity rather than by choice.

Finally, the Pedagogical Support theme proposes that students are not unwilling to talk by choice, but are willing to participate if provided with enough preparation and low-stakes practice, a pattern that mirrors the scaffolding tactics proposed by Zhang and Liu (2022). In conclusion, the quantitative and qualitative results converge on a similar explanation: Several intertwined variables are responsible for the unwillingness of Generation Z students to speak English in synchronous online classes. These include speech nervousness, a preference for text-based communication, and limits of the online learning environment and technology.

Therefore, their hesitance to talk does not suggest they are disengaged or indifferent. Instead, participating in an online EFL classroom can bring about affective and pragmatic problems, which may make students more comfortable to remain silent or communicate through text. The findings answer the research question by demonstrating that speaking avoidance is not only about motivation or readiness to engage, but a reaction to the combination of psychological and environmental characteristics students experience in online learning. The commentary below places these findings in connection to key theoretical and empirical works.

4. Discussion

The present study examined the reasons for Generation Z students' resistance to speak English in synchronous online EFL classes, focusing on the interplay of psychological, technological and pedagogical aspects. The findings showed that students regularly expressed significant levels of speaking fear, preference for text-based interaction, and sensitivity to technological and environmental constraints. This section explores the theoretical and practical contributions of the research, its novelty, the research gap indicated previously, and critically situates the findings within the current literature.

The present study's findings of high anxiety scores are similar with earlier studies that have found affective obstacles to be important in foreign language speaking (Horwitz et al., 1986; Zhang & Liu, 2022). Similar to the findings of Cheng (2025), where the EFL learners showed different patterns of anxiety in a synchronous online environment than in a face-to-face classroom, the present study supports the idea that the online modality itself contains triggers of anxiety (e.g., discomfort with self-view, being recorded) that are not simply a carryover of anxiety experienced in a traditional classroom.

This pattern can be seen through Krashen's (1982) Affective Filter Hypothesis as an elevated affective filter that hinders students' willingness to produce spoken output, even when their underlying linguistic competence may be adequate, a distinction that corresponds with Canale and Swain's (1980) separation of linguistic competence from the confidence required to employ it communicatively.

In addition, the results address a significant gap discussed in the previous section of this study. While previous studies tended to regard speaking avoidance as a general outcome of online learning difficulty (Rofiq & Pramuditha, 2021), not many studies have investigated it as a behavioral choice between typing and speaking during synchronous sessions. This study is the first to give empirical proof, both in terms of Likert-scale measurement and students' own words, that speaking avoidance in synchronous EFL classrooms is a distinct issue and not an extension of the wider phenomenon of online learning fear by documenting this choice explicitly. This conclusion is an extension of the work of Resnik, Dewaele, and Knechtelsdorfer (2023) who also indicated that the nature of foreign language anxiety varies greatly according to instructional mode. Also, its contextual focus contributes to this study. Santoso & Lestari (2023) found that Indonesian EFL learners feel more evaluation anxiety in collectivist educational settings, because observable errors carry social ramifications.

However, this dynamic has rarely been studied about synchronous online communication behaviors of Generation Z. The study addresses the gap by delivering empirical evidence from an underrepresented group in the literature on speaking anxiety and practical insights for EFL instruction in similar digitalized educational environments in Southeast Asia.

The persistent preference for typing as seen across the quantitative and qualitative data should not be read as disengagement. Rather, as the Pedagogical Support theme shows, students showed a clear disposition to speak when properly prepared, in smaller group settings and with instructor encouragement. This outcome is consistent with Nugroho and Mutiaraningrum (2020) who reported that structured pre-speaking activities assist learners in coping with oral anxiety in online classrooms and with the meta-analytic finding of Xiong et al. (2024) that scaffolded, low-stakes speaking opportunities consistently decrease anxiety in varied EFL populations. In this sense, typing is not employed as an act of avoidance per se, but as a self-regulation tool that allows students to regulate their emotive filter and still remain engaged in the learning process.

The technical and environmental hurdles noted in the qualitative data — unreliable internet, noisy home surroundings — serve to further situate these findings within Indonesia's greater digital divide (Yulia, 2021). This reconfirms that speaking avoidance cannot be addressed by psychological psychotherapy alone. Equal access to reliable technology and private study space is a precondition for meaningful oral engagement in online EFL training.

Although this work has its merits, it has several drawbacks that should be taken into account. The very small sample size ($n = 40$) from a single institution may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other EFL situations. Additional research might include various universities and larger samples. Longitudinal studies could also be conducted to see how speaking confidence and avoidance behavior changes as students become more experienced with synchronous online education. Further research exploring the factors of personality, gender and previous digital communication behaviors could improve our understanding of the dynamics behind spoken avoidance and engagement.

To summarize, the data reveal that the reluctance of Generation Z students to speak English in synchronous online classes is a result of the interaction of psychological, technological and environmental variables and not a lack of motivation or interest. By viewing typing as a valid, self-protective form of communication rather than a lack of engagement, teachers are able to develop more emotionally supportive and pedagogically scaffolded ways to online speaking education. The findings offer significant evidence for reconsidering participation strategies in EFL environments that are increasingly influenced by both digital fluency and affective vulnerability.

5. Conclusion

This mixed-methods explanatory study shows that Generation Z students' reluctance to speak in English in synchronous online EFL classrooms is due to a convergence of speaking fear, a learned preference for text-based communication, and technological and environmental constraints. Students who exhibited marked avoidance tendencies were not disengaged or indifferent, but were responding to affective pressures such as fear of negative evaluation, self-consciousness on camera, and discomfort with real-time linguistic performance, which were further compounded by structural barriers such as unstable internet connectivity and unsupportive home environments. These findings suggest that typing is not a denial of speech involvement, but a self-protective, self-regulatory mechanism that enables students to stay involved while maintaining an increased emotive filter.

This study contributes to the existing knowledge by framing speech avoidance as a separate, real-time behavioral choice during synchronous online education rather than as a secondary indication of general online learning problems. This study expands Krashen's (1982) Affective Filter Hypothesis and Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence to Generation Z's synchronous EFL participation in a specific context, demonstrating that digital fluency and oral fluency are two distinct skills influenced by different psychological and contextual demands. Therefore, the study contributes to theoretical discussions on foreign language speaking anxiety, intergenerational communication behavior, and learner-centered online pedagogy.

From a pedagogical point of view, the results highlight the significance of flexible and emotionally supportive teaching styles in synchronous online classes. Practical tools such as scaffolded speaking tasks, small group practices, optional asynchronous speaking formats (e.g., voice recordings, Flipgrid, Vocaroo), and teacher-provided preparation time offer low-cost, pedagogically sound approaches grounded in learner-centered principles of online English instruction. These approaches foster more learner confidence, alleviate the strain of immediate judgment, and promote sustainable development of oral engagement. In addition to enhancing immediate speaking outcomes, the validation of

typing as a genuine first step in communication encourages a more inclusive classroom atmosphere that accounts for differences in fear, access to technology and willingness to talk.

Future research should explore the extent to which these avoidance patterns are durable over time using longitudinal designs, extend this investigation across multiple institutions and larger samples to improve generalizability, and examine how variables such as gender, personality traits, and prior digital communication habits interact with speaking avoidance in synchronous EFL contexts. Future studies could also investigate the effectiveness of specific pedagogical interventions, such as structured scaffolding or hybrid synchronous-asynchronous speaking tasks to directly mitigate speaking avoidance among Generation Z learners in various educational environments.

6. References

- Abdullah, M. F., & Hidayati, N. (2021). Students' perceptions toward speaking anxiety in online English classes during COVID-19 pandemic. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 8(2), 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i2.3456>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Cancino, M., & Cabello, G. (2024). Foreign language speaking anxiety and computer self-efficacy in an online emergency remote teaching environment: Perceptions from EFL learners. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 48(4). <https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v48n4-13>
- Cheng, Z., & Sun, P. P. (2025). Does L2 speaking anxiety differ in classroom and synchronous online learning environments? Evidence from EFL college students. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 41(5), Article e70115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.70115>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fitria, T. N. (2023). English lecturers' difficulties in teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP). *International Journal of Language Education*, 7(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v7i1.19178>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>
- Ismail, N., & Prasetyo, B. (2022). The role of self-efficacy in EFL learners' speaking anxiety during online learning. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v8i1.5270>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Kusmayanti, I. N., Hendryanti, R., & Suwarsono, L. W. (2022). Exploring Indonesian university students' speaking anxiety in online English medium classes (EMI). *Bahasa dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya*, 50(2).

- Lee, K., & Steneck, N. H. (2023). Responsible research conduct: A global perspective on ethical collaboration and attribution. *Journal of Research Integrity and Ethics*, 15(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrie.2023.01.004>
- Marlia, M., Akbal, F. A., Nur, S., & McDonald, D. (2023). EFL students' speaking anxiety in Indonesian senior high school. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 17(1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v17i1.121085>
- Mulyani, S., Handayani, R., & Lestari, R. (2021). Learning preferences of Generation Z in EFL class. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 9(1), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um030v9i12021p023>
- Nugroho, A., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2020). Strategies to overcome students' speaking anxiety in online classrooms. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(2), 248–267. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jevl.v10i2.2122>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants, Part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Rahmawati, S. (2024). The use of AI in ESP instruction: A study on its effectiveness and challenges. *Technology in Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 50–72.
- Resnik, P., Dewaele, J.-M., & Knechtelsdorfer, E. (2023). Differences in the intensity and the nature of foreign language anxiety in in-person and online EFL classes during the pandemic: A mixed-methods study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 57(2), 618–642.
- Rofiq, A., & Pramuditha, N. (2021). Exploring students' online learning anxiety in speaking class. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 21(2), 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um007v21i2p130-138>
- Santoso, B., & Lestari, A. (2023). Developing a culturally responsive ESP curriculum for Indonesian students. *Journal of Language and Culture in Education*, 11(2), 98–115.
- Siregar, E., & Zulfikar, R. (2023). The effectiveness of blended learning to improve students' speaking performance: A case study in Indonesian EFL context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 34(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i1.75-93>
- Xiong, Y., Zhang, Q., Zhao, L., Liu, S., Guan, H., Sui, Y., Feng, J., & Lee, K. M. R. (2024). A meta-analysis and systematic review of foreign language anxiety interventions among students. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 43(5–6), 620–650. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X241291258>
- Yulia, H. (2021). Online learning to improve students' speaking skill: Obstacles and strategies. *Studies in English Language and Education (SiELE)*, 8(1), 163–177.
- Zhang, W., & Liu, Y. (2022). Foreign language speaking anxiety in online learning: Chinese EFL learners' perspective. *System*, 107, Article 102785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102785>
- Zhao, Y. (2020). Digital communication and language learning in the Gen Z era. *Computers & Education*, 157, Article 103972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103972>