YASIN
Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sosial Budaya

p-ISSN: 2808-2346
e-ISSN: 2808-1854

Terindeks: SINTA 5, Copernicus, Dimensions, Scilit, Lens, Crossref, Semantic, Garuda, Google, Base, etc.

https://doi.org/10.58578/yasin.v6i3.10470

SPEAK UP, STAND OUT: IMPROVING SELF-CONFIDENCE THROUGH PUBLIC SPEAKING TRAINING FOR PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS

Cindy Anastasia, Alexandra Beatrix, Tiara Kusumadewi, Hana Safira, Khanza Nazala, Winda Wijaya, Carissa Aryella, Eka Danta Jaya Ginting
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia
cindyanastasia126@gmail.com; beatrixsembiring07@gmail.com

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Apr 22, 2026	May 20, 2026	Jun 1, 2026	Jun 6, 2026

Abstract

Although public speaking and self-confidence have been widely examined, limited studies have addressed integrated training modules designed specifically for first-year psychology students in Indonesia. This study aims to develop and describe a training module to enhance self-confidence and public speaking skills among first-year students, Class of 2025, at the Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Sumatera Utara. A qualitative descriptive design for module development was employed, involving 15 participants selected purposively based on the results of a Training Needs Analysis. Data were collected through focus group discussions, questionnaires, pre- and post-tests, behavioural observation checklists, and trainer evaluations, and were analyzed descriptively. The findings show that many participants experienced psychological barriers to verbal participation, including fear of making mistakes (66.7%), shame in front of peers (20%), and low self-confidence (46.7%). A structured one-day training module consisting of material sessions, ice-breaking activities, and a public speaking practice activity titled "Just One Minute" was developed to address these barriers. Post-training measures and behavioural observations indicated improvements in students' willingness to

Yasin Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

speak and reductions in communication anxiety. The study concludes that experiential learning and interactive training methods can support the development of speaking courage and reduce classroom communication anxiety among first-year university students. This study contributes to psychological intervention and academic communication training by identifying common speaking barriers among early-adult students and offering a practical module for strengthening self-confidence and public speaking skills. The module may serve as a reference for psychology faculties and other educational institutions in designing structured communication-skill programmes, while further research is recommended to examine its long-term effects on academic participation and self-efficacy.

Keywords: Self-Confidence; Public Speaking; Training Module; Psychology Students; Training Needs Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Academic communication skills are one of the fundamental competencies students need to undertake higher education. Higher education not only demands cognitive mastery but also requires students to be able to express ideas, argue verbally, and actively participate in various academic situations such as class discussions, presentations, and Q&A sessions with lecturers (Coleman, 2011). This demand is increasingly relevant considering that college graduates are also faced with the need for professional communication in an increasingly competitive workplace. However, in reality, not all students are adequately prepared for communication, especially in the first year of college when they are still adapting to the new academic environment.

The phenomenon of students' low confidence in public speaking has become a concern in various studies. Data obtained through an initial survey of the 2025 class of students from the Faculty of Psychology, University of North Sumatra, showed that 46.7% of students stated they lacked confidence when speaking in class, 66.7% stated they did not dare to express their opinions when lecturers asked questions, and 53.3% admitted to being inactive in class discussions. Furthermore, 66.7% of students cited fear of making mistakes as the main factor inhibiting their verbal participation. This condition reflects the existence of serious and systemic psychological barriers that, if not addressed appropriately, can impact students' low academic engagement in the long term.

Psychological barriers to academic communication are not solely caused by a lack of understanding of the course material, but are more influenced by internal factors such as low self-confidence, anxiety about speaking, and concerns about negative judgment from the social environment. Eriksson et al. (2020) explains that the transition to early adulthood is a period marked by identity exploration and the formation of interpersonal competencies, so that first-year students are particularly vulnerable to experiencing barriers in social and academic participation. Self-confidence, from Deng and Liu (2025) perspective, is not merely a belief in technical competence, but rather an individual's ability to continue moving forward and acting even when faced with fear and uncertainty. Thus, low self-confidence is not just an individual problem, but rather an issue that requires structured and systematic psychological intervention.

Previous studies have examined the relationship between self-confidence and communication skills. Purba et al. (2023) found a significant relationship between self-confidence and students' communication skills, while Wahyuni (2015) shows that individuals with high levels of speaking anxiety tend to avoid situations that require public speaking. Razali et al. (2023) have shown that public speaking training is effective in improving self-confidence and communication skills. However, most of these studies focus on the general effectiveness of training without systematic and structured documentation of module design. Studies that specifically outline the process of designing a training module that integrates self-confidence and public speaking materials, complete with needs analysis, session blueprints, evaluation instruments, and interactive training methods in the context of first-year psychology students in Indonesia, are still very limited. This gap serves as the scientific basis for this research.

The novelty of this research lies in the development of a training module that integratively combines two key psychological constructs, namely self-confidence and public speaking, in one comprehensive intervention design based on a Training Needs Analysis (TNA). This module was designed with reference to an experiential learning approach that emphasizes active participant involvement through direct practice methods, interactive games, speaking simulations, and reflection, in accordance with student learning preferences identified in the needs analysis process. The theoretical basis used includes the concept of self-confidence according to Uglanova (2024), which divides self-confidence into three main aspects: behavioral confidence, emotional confidence, and spiritual confidence; and the theory of public speaking according to Lucas and Stob (2004), which includes elements of

speaker, message, channel, listener, feedback, distractions, and situation. Training evaluation was conducted using the Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) Kirkpatrick (2016) model which includes four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and results.

Based on the description above, this study focuses on the development and description of a self-confidence and public speaking training module as a form of psychological intervention for students of the 2025 intake of the Faculty of Psychology, University of North Sumatera. The purpose of this study is to systematically describe the process of designing the training module starting from needs analysis, preparation of training objectives, development of session blueprints, to the design of evaluation instruments, so that it can become an applicable scientific reference for the development of academic communication intervention programs in higher education environments.

METHODS

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach that aims to describe in depth the process of designing, developing, and implementing a self-confidence and public speaking training module as a form of psychological intervention. The qualitative approach was chosen because this study does not intend to test statistical hypotheses, but rather seeks to understand and describe the phenomenon of academic communication barriers experienced by students and respond to them through a structured and systematic intervention design (Adiyaksa & Hastaning, 2016; Nasution, 2023). The main characteristics of this study are naturalistic, contextual, and process-oriented, so the descriptive qualitative approach is considered most appropriate to answer the formulated research objectives.

The research design used was training module development, implemented in a single integrated intervention cycle. The module development process was carried out in stages and systematically, starting with the training needs analysis (TNA) stage, formulating training objectives, compiling a blueprint or module summary, developing training session descriptions, and designing evaluation instruments. The training was designed to be conducted in one day with a total duration of 240 minutes or four hours, encompassing the entire series of activities from participant registration, material delivery, ice-breaking activities, hands-on practice sessions, to summative evaluation. The training room layout used a U-shape formation, chosen to support active interaction between facilitators and participants and to provide a space for public speaking simulations in a safe and supportive

atmosphere. This design was chosen because it can accommodate an experiential learning approach that emphasizes direct participant involvement in every stage of the training activity.

The participants in this study were 15 students from the Faculty of Psychology, University of North Sumatra, class of 2025. The participants were selected using a purposive sampling technique, which is based on certain considerations and criteria relevant to the research objectives. The participant selection criteria included: (1) being an active student in the Faculty of Psychology, USU, class of 2025; (2) showing indications of obstacles in academic self-confidence and verbal participation based on initial observations and informal interactions during lectures; and (3) demonstrating readiness and interest in participating in the training program. The number of 15 participants was deemed sufficient for the implementation of small-group-based training that allows for intensive interaction between facilitators and participants, and provides sufficient space for each participant to actively participate in practical sessions. These participants are considered capable of representing the conditions of students in the class of 2025 who require interventions to develop self-confidence and academic communication skills.

Data collection in this study was conducted in several stages and used various complementary instruments. First, in the needs analysis stage, data were collected through the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) method as an initial identification to obtain a qualitative picture of the obstacles experienced by students in academic situations. A closed questionnaire was also distributed to 15 students who were the target subjects to obtain descriptive quantitative data regarding their level of self-confidence, verbal participation habits, psychological barriers, skill needs, and training method preferences. Second, in the training implementation stage, data were collected through a multiple-choice pre-test and post-test instrument that included ten items related to the basic concept of self-confidence, factors that influence self-confidence, the understanding and importance of public speaking, techniques for managing nervousness, and verbal and nonverbal communication strategies. This instrument was used to measure the increase in participants' cognitive understanding before and after the presentation of the material. Third, during the training process, the facilitator conducted direct observations using a behavioral observation checklist to monitor participants' active participation, enthusiasm, involvement in the simulation, and obstacles that emerged during the implementation. Fourth, at the end of the training session, participants completed a training evaluation form consisting of two parts: a training

satisfaction evaluation form with a scale of 1 to 5 that included 12 statements regarding the suitability of the material, clarity of delivery, effectiveness of the method, comfort of the atmosphere, and benefits of the training; and a trainer evaluation form consisting of 14 statements with response options from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree that measured mastery of the material, clarity of delivery, ability to create an interactive atmosphere, and professionalism of the facilitator. Furthermore, one week after the training, follow-up data was collected through a retention questionnaire that used a self-confidence scale adapted from Davinda (2025) to measure the sustainability of the training's impact on participants' self-efficacy and confidence in post-training academic activities. All instruments used were adapted to the training objectives, which covered three domains of change: cognitive, affective, and conative, and referred to Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) evaluation model, which includes four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and outcome.

The data obtained in this study were analyzed using qualitative descriptive analysis techniques carried out in stages. First, data from the FGD results and open-ended questionnaire responses were analyzed through a data reduction process, namely sorting and focusing on information relevant to barriers to student self-confidence and verbal participation, followed by presenting the data in the form of descriptive narratives that systematically illustrate the findings. Second, closed-ended questionnaire data from the needs analysis stage were analyzed using simple quantitative descriptive analysis in the form of percentage calculations to describe the distribution of respondents' answers to each statement item, the results of which were then interpreted qualitatively to support module design. Third, pre-test and post-test data were analyzed by comparing scores before and after the training to identify any increase in participants' cognitive understanding as an indicator of success at the learning level in Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) model. Fourth, behavioral observation data during the training were analyzed descriptively based on the facilitator's checklist notes to describe the dynamics of participant engagement, changes in communication behavior, and obstacles that emerged during the session. Fifth, training satisfaction evaluation data and trainer evaluation data were analyzed by calculating the average score per statement item to reflect the level of participant satisfaction and assessment of the quality of the training. All the analysis results were then integrated holistically to produce a comprehensive description of the design, implementation, and evaluation process of self-confidence and public speaking training modules as psychological interventions for students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of North Sumatra, class of 2025.

RESULTS

The research results are presented based on three main evaluation components referring to Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) model: learning evaluation through pre-tests and post-tests, behavior evaluation through public speaking practice observations and case studies, and reaction evaluation through training and trainer evaluation questionnaires. Furthermore, follow-up evaluation of the results was conducted one week after the training through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and a Google Form-based self-confidence scale.

Learning Evaluation: Pre-Test and Post-Test

Learning evaluation was conducted through a pre-test before the training began and a post-test after all material was delivered. Both instruments consisted of 10 multiple-choice questions covering the basic concepts of self-confidence, factors influencing self-confidence, the definition and importance of public speaking, barriers to public speaking, and basic verbal and nonverbal communication techniques.

Based on the results of the pre-test taken by 15 participants, it was found that most participants already had a basic understanding of the training material. A total of 12 participants (80%) obtained the highest score of 100, 2 participants (13.3%) obtained a score of 90, and 1 participant (6.7%) obtained a score of 80. The average pre-test score for all participants was 97.33. As shown in Table 1, the distribution of pre-test scores reflects that the participants' initial cognitive understanding was in the good to very good category.

Table 1. Pre-Test Results of Training Participants

No.	Participant Initials	Pre-Test Score
1	NK	100
2	CHR	100
3	SA	100
4	SH	90
5	NA	100
6	GA	90
7	FN	100
8	SR	100
9	AML	100
10	RZK	100

No.	Participant Initials	Pre-Test Score
11	GVS	100
12	LB	100
13	SUN	100
14	SNA	100
15	RDM	80
Average		97,33

After the training, participants completed a post-test, with results showing improvement compared to the pre-test. Fourteen participants (93.3%) achieved a perfect score of 100, and one participant (6.7%) achieved a score of 90. The average post-test score increased to 99.33. Table 2 presents a complete comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores for all participants.

Table 2. Post-Test Results and Comparison with Pre-Test

No.	Participant Initials	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change
1	NK	100	100	0
2	CHR	100	100	0
3	SA	100	100	0
4	SH	90	100	+10
5	NA	100	100	0
6	GA	90	100	+10
7	FN	100	100	0
8	SR	100	100	0
9	AML	100	100	0
10	RZK	100	100	0
11	GVS	100	90	-10
12	LB	100	100	0
13	SUN	100	100	0
14	SNA	100	100	0
15	RDM	80	100	+20
Average		97,33	99,33	+2,00

Overall, there was an average increase in scores of 2.00 points from pre-test to post-test. While this increase is numerically moderate, it should be noted that participants' pre-test scores were already in the very high category, thus providing limited room for improvement (a ceiling effect). This increase remains clinically significant because it occurred in participants who had not previously achieved the maximum score, namely SH (90→100), GA (90→100), and RDM (80→100).

Behavior Evaluation: Observation of Public Speaking Practice

Behavioral evaluation was conducted through direct observation of participants' public speaking practice in the "Just One Minute" case study session. The facilitator used a behavioral observation checklist and an assessment rubric that covered aspects of speaking confidence, vocal clarity, eye contact, body language, coherence of ideas, and level of reliance on the text. Table 3 presents a summary of the behavioral observation results for all participants.

Table 3. Results of Observations of Participants' Public Speaking Practice

No.	Participant Initials	Category	Short Description
1	NK	Very good	Courage to appear very good, clear voice, maintained eye contact, coherent and confident delivery
2	CHR	Very good	Opinions are delivered clearly and in a structured manner, with natural body language, actively interacting with the audience.
3	SA	Very good	Good performance with convincing intonation, maintained eye contact, ideas delivered coherently
4	SH	Good	Bold and quite clear, but still looks a little nervous in some parts
5	NA	Very good	Good self-confidence, able to maintain audience attention, supportive body language
6	GA	Good	The idea was conveyed quite coherently, but there was still a little hesitation in maintaining intonation and eye contact.
7	FN	Very good	Good communication, clear voice, confident, minimal reliance on text
8	SR	Very good	Structured presentation, supportive expression, courage to appear in front of a group
9	AML	Very good	Speaking quite fluently and confidently, able to maintain the audience's attention

No.	Participant Initials	Category	Short Description
10	RZK	Very good	Clear delivery, convincing intonation, good eye contact with the audience
11	GVS	Good	Dare to appear and the idea is quite clear, but still depends a little on the arrangement of the material
12	LB	Very good	The material is delivered coherently and confidently, body language and expressions are supportive.
13	SUN	Very good	Speak in a clear voice, maintain eye contact, and maintain the audience's focus.
14	SNA	Very good	Speaking quite fluently, natural body language, ideas delivered systematically
15	RDM	Very good	Increased self-confidence is seen, opinions are conveyed clearly, interaction with the audience is maintained.

Based on Table 3, 12 participants (80%) were in the "Very Good" category and 3 participants (20%) were in the "Good" category. There were no participants in the "Sufficient" or "Poor" categories. This finding indicates that the majority of participants were able to demonstrate basic public speaking skills effectively after attending the training.

Reaction Evaluation: Training and Trainer Evaluation Questionnaire

The reaction evaluation was conducted through a training satisfaction questionnaire and trainer evaluation completed by all 15 participants at the end of the training session. Based on the training evaluation results, all aspects assessed were dominated by the "Strongly Agree/*Sangat Setuju*" (SS) and "Agree/*Setuju*" (S) categories, with no dominant negative assessments. Participants assessed that the training material was easy to understand, aligned with students' academic needs, and able to improve their understanding of self-confidence and public speaking. The training method, which combined lectures, interactive games, and hands-on practice, was deemed interesting and effective in increasing participant engagement. The overall training atmosphere was deemed comfortable, interactive, and not stressful..

The trainer evaluation results for all seven facilitators, namely Cindy Anastasia Tamba, Alexandra Beatrix, Tiara Kusumadewi, Hana Safira, Khanza Nazala Khairina, Winda Wijaya, and Carissa Aryella Permana, also showed a very positive response. The majority of participants gave a rating of "Strongly Agree" (SS) on all trainer evaluation indicators, which

included mastery of the material, clarity of delivery, systematic flow of the material, relevance of examples, ability to build an interactive atmosphere, responsiveness to questions, providing feedback, and professionalism of appearance. Some participants gave ratings of "Agree" (S) and "Neutral" (N) on several indicators for certain trainers, but no negative ratings were found in all trainer evaluations.

Formative Evaluation

Formative evaluation was conducted through direct observation during the training. At the beginning of the activity, some participants appeared passive, shy, and nervous when asked to express their opinions. After the icebreaker session and group activities, participants began to show greater engagement and comfort. During the material delivery session, participants responded enthusiastically to the trainer's questions and actively asked questions related to their personal experiences in public speaking. During the practice session, most participants showed a gradual increase in speaking confidence. The facilitator's reflective notes indicated that the participatory approach, hands-on practice, and interactive games were deemed effective in building participant engagement and comfort during the training.

Evaluation of Results: Follow-Up FGD and Self-Confidence Scale

One week after the training, a follow-up evaluation was conducted using two methods: a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and a self-confidence scale using a Google Form. The FGD was conducted face-to-face and attended by all 15 training participants to explore changes in their academic communication behavior after the training.

Based on the results of the follow-up FGD, most participants reported positive changes in their courage and confidence in academic situations. Several participants reported that they had begun to feel more confident answering lecturers' questions in class without having to wait for others to answer first. Others reported that they felt more prepared when asked to make presentations, were less panicked than before, and had begun to practice speaking without relying so heavily on notes. One participant (NAS, Participant 14) reported that she had begun to raise her hand when the lecturer asked a question, something she had rarely done before. Another participant (GVS, Participant 11) revealed that although she still felt a little nervous, she was now better able to manage it and not let it hinder her participation in class. Overall, participants felt that the training had a significant impact on their courage and preparedness in academic communication situations.

In addition to the FGD, a follow-up evaluation was also conducted by completing a self-confidence scale adapted from Davinda (2025) and distributed via Google Form one week after the training. This scale consists of 18 statements with a five-point Likert scale response format, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree/STS) to 5 (Strongly Agree/SS), which covers aspects of self-confidence in the context of academic communication such as presentations, class discussions, and interactions with lecturers.

The results of filling out the scale show a positive picture in most of the statement items. On the item related to the courage to express opinions during group discussions, all participants gave responses ranging from agree to strongly agree, with 60% choosing a score of 5 (SS) and 40% choosing a score of 4 (S), and no participants choosing below a score of 4. A similar pattern was also seen in the item on the ability to explain material in front of a large audience, where the majority of participants (46.7%) chose a score of 5 (SS) and 40% chose a score of 4 (S). Similarly, on the item on the belief in being an achiever, as many as 93.3% of participants gave a positive response (scores of 4 and 5), reflecting a fairly high level of confidence in their own academic potential.

On the item of ability to answer questions calmly even in stressful situations, the majority of participants (66.7%) chose a score of 4 (S) and 20% chose a score of 5 (SS), while only a small portion (13.3%) were still unsure by choosing a score of 2. This shows that self-regulation in stressful situations is starting to form, although it is not yet completely evenly distributed. Meanwhile, on the item of independence in making decisions in front of the class, the majority of participants (46.7%) chose a score of 4 and 40% chose a score of 5, with only two participants (13.3%) still at a score of 3 (neutral).

For the unfavorable statements, the results also showed an encouraging trend. For the item "I have a bad assessment of myself," the majority of participants chose a score of 1 (STS) at 33.3% and a score of 2 (TS) at 40%, indicating they disagreed with the negative statement, reflecting a relatively positive self-assessment. Similarly, for the item "I am embarrassed to express my opinion in class," 46.7% of participants chose a score of 1 (STS) and none chose a score of 5 (SS), indicating that the barrier of embarrassment in participating in class had decreased significantly. For the item "I feel embarrassed to ask friends or lecturers," 80% of participants chose a score of 1 or 2, indicating that feelings of embarrassment in asking questions had significantly decreased after the training.

However, there were also several items that showed varying results. For the item "I feel that others are better than me when presenting," the distribution of responses was spread fairly evenly from scores 1 to 4, with the majority (33.3%) at score 2 (TS) and 26.7% at score 3 (neutral). This indicates that feelings of comparing oneself to others have not completely disappeared and may require further intervention. Similarly, for the item "I just keep my opinion because I don't dare to express it during discussions with lecturers," the distribution of responses was spread relatively evenly from scores 1 to 4 (around 26.7% at scores 1, 2, and 3, respectively), indicating that obstacles in interacting directly with lecturers are still experienced by some participants.

In general, the results of the self-confidence scale indicate that the training had a measurable impact on increasing participants' self-confidence in the context of academic communication, particularly in the areas of expressing opinions, independence in academic situations, and positive self-assessment. However, several aspects, such as emotional regulation when interacting directly with lecturers and the tendency for social comparison, still require attention in subsequent intervention sessions.

Table 4. Distribution of Post-Training Self-Confidence Scale Scores

No.	Statement	STS (1)	TS (2)	N (3)	S (4)	SS (5)	Type
Aspects of Self-Confidence and Academic Ability							
1.	I am confident that I can prepare and deliver a presentation in front of the class well.	0%	0%	20%	26,7%	53,3%	F
2.	I can make my own decisions in front of the class without the help of others.	0%	0%	13,3%	46,7%	40%	F
3.	I am confident that I can become a successful person.	0%	0%	6,7%	53,3%	40%	F
4.	I am confident that I can answer questions calmly, even in stressful situations.	0%	13,3%	0%	66,7%	20%	F
5.	I am able to explain the material in front of many people.	0%	0%	13,3%	40%	46,7%	F
Aspects of Courage to Speak and Participate							
6.	I dare to express my opinion when giving a presentation in front of the class.	0%	6,7%	6,7%	53,3%	33,3%	F
7.	I dare to express my opinion during group discussions	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	F

No.	Statement	STS (1)	TS (2)	N (3)	S (4)	SS (5)	Type
Aspects of Self-Confidence and Academic Ability							
8.	When the lecturer asked a question, I volunteered to answer without being asked.	6,7%	0%	33,3%	40%	20%	F
9.	I feel valuable when I am able to provide answers in group discussions.	0%	0%	0%	33,3%	66,7%	F
Self-Assessment Aspects and Social Barriers							
10.	I am not confident in answering questions from lecturers, even though I know the answers.	26,7%	33,3%	6,7%	33,3%	0%	UF
11.	I have a bad opinion of myself	33,3%	40%	6,7%	20%	0%	UF
12.	I am embarrassed to express my opinion in class	46,7%	20%	13,3%	20%	0%	UF
13.	I feel embarrassed to ask my friends or lecturers	40%	40%	6,7%	6,7%	6,7%	UF
14.	I feel that other people are better than me when presenting.	20%	33,3%	26,7%	20%	0%	UF
15.	I don't dare to express my opinion in front of my classmates.	40%	33,3%	13,3%	13,3%	0%	UF
16.	I am not confident with the presentation that I have delivered in front of the class.	40%	40%	13,3%	6,7%	0%	UF
17.	I need a friend's help to answer questions from the lecturer because I can't answer them myself.	20%	40%	26,7%	13,3%	0%	UF
18.	I just kept my opinion, because I didn't dare to express it during the discussion with the lecturer.	26,7%	26,7%	26,7%	20%	0%	UF

Description: STS = Strongly Disagree; TS = Disagree; N = Neutral; S = Agree; SS = Strongly Agree. F = Favorable (positive statement); UF = Unfavorable (negative statement). Numbers are in percentage (N = 15).

DISCUSSION

Analysis and Interpretation of Results

The overall results of this study indicate that the Speak Up, Stand Out: Building Confidence Through Public Speaking training had a positive impact on participants' cognitive understanding, communication behavior, and self-confidence. These findings

address the research objective, which focused on developing and implementing an integrated training module that integrates self-confidence and public speaking skills as a form of psychological intervention for first-year students of the Faculty of Psychology, USU.

In terms of cognitive understanding, the average increase in score from 97.33 in the pre-test to 99.33 in the post-test indicates that the material delivered during the training successfully strengthened participants' understanding. Although the numerical increase is relatively small, it needs to be understood in the context of the ceiling effect that occurred because most participants already had very good initial understanding. This condition is in line with the initial TNA findings which showed that students' obstacles were not cognitive but rather psychological aspects such as anxiety about speaking and low self-confidence in academic situations. Therefore, the most significant impact of the training lies not in the increase in test scores alone, but rather in changes in behavior and self-confidence reflected in the results of observations and follow-up evaluations.

In terms of behavior, observations of public speaking practice showed that 80% of participants were in the "Very Good" category and 20% were in the "Good" category, with no participants falling below that. This achievement is highly relevant to the training's conative objective, which is to help participants practice basic public speaking skills directly and reduce reliance on texts. Observed behavioral changes, including greater confidence in speaking in front of a group, better eye contact, more convincing intonation, and more coherent delivery of ideas, demonstrate that the experiential learning approach used in the training is able to encourage the internalization of skills practically, rather than merely theoretical understanding (Ichsan et al., 2025; Ichsan & Samsudin, 2019; Pranajati & Ichsan, 2025; Rustam & Ichsan, 2020).

The results of the one-week post-training follow-up evaluation through FGDs and a self-confidence scale further strengthened the picture of the training's effectiveness. In the follow-up FGDs, most participants reported a marked change in their courage and readiness for academic communication. Participants who previously almost never raised their hands when lecturers asked questions began to try to do so independently, and participants who previously relied heavily on notes during presentations began to be able to convey ideas more freely and confidently. These findings reflect changes at the behavioral level within Kirkpatrick's (2016) evaluation framework, indicating that the training's impact goes beyond

mere cognitive understanding, but has begun to be internalized in participants' actual actions in the academic environment.

The results of the post-training self-confidence scale adapted from Davinda (2025) also strengthened the FGD findings. The distribution of responses to the favorable items showed a positive trend, with the majority of participants choosing a score of 4 (S) to 5 (SS) for aspects of self-confidence and academic ability, such as confidence in being able to deliver a presentation well (53.3% SS), confidence in being able to achieve (40% SS), and the ability to explain material in front of many people (46.7% SS). In terms of courage to express opinions and participation, the item "I dare to express my opinion during group discussions" even showed a distribution that was entirely at a score of 4 and 5, with 60% of participants choosing SS. Meanwhile, for the unfavorable items, the majority of participants gave responses at a score of 1 (STS) and 2 (TS), indicating that barriers such as shyness, negative self-assessment, and a lack of courage to express opinions had decreased significantly post-training.

However, there are several items that show varying distributions of responses, particularly for the items "I feel that others are better than me when presenting" and "I just keep my opinion to myself because I don't dare to express it during discussions with lecturers." This pattern indicates that aspects of social comparison and obstacles in interacting directly with lecturers are dimensions that require a longer time and intensity of intervention to change consistently. It is understandable considering that feelings of social inferiority and anxiety towards academic authority are relatively deep-rooted constructs and cannot be changed substantially in just one training session (Ally, 2023). This finding is in line with Toyama and Yamazaki's (2021) view that individuals with high levels of speaking anxiety require a longer duration of intervention and a more individualized approach to produce equivalent changes.

Overall, the results at Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) fourth level of evaluation, the results level, indicate that the training successfully delivered identifiable impacts across three key dimensions: cognitive understanding of self-confidence and public speaking, changes in communication behavior directly observed in practice sessions, and increased self-confidence as reported by participants through scales and follow-up focus groups. Together, these three dimensions reflect that the intervention provided was relevant and responsive to the participants' actual needs as identified during the TNA phase.

Comparison with Previous Theory and Literature

The findings of this study align with Angelis' (2005) view that true self-confidence does not mean being free from anxiety, but rather the ability of an individual to continue acting even when faced with uncertainty. The results of the follow-up FGD, which showed that participants began to dare to answer the lecturer's questions despite still feeling a little nervous, reflect the development of the behavioral and emotional confidence aspects that form the theoretical basis of this study (Hagenauer & Volet, 2014). These results also align with Zhang et al.'s (2020) argument that public speaking skills develop through repeated and structured speaking experiences, where each opportunity to perform contributes to strengthening the speaker's self-efficacy.

These findings are also consistent with research by McNatt (2019), which demonstrated that public speaking training is effective in improving students' self-confidence and communication skills. Furthermore, these findings support the findings of Septia et al. (2022), who stated a significant relationship between students' self-confidence and communication skills, and extend these findings by demonstrating that this relationship can be systematically intervened through a structured training program. Particular attention should be paid to the three participants who were in the "Moderate" self-confidence category post-training. This finding does not contradict the literature but rather reinforces Wahyuni's (2013) view that individuals with very high levels of speaking anxiety require longer intervention duration and a more individualized approach to achieve significant change. These three participants were participants who showed higher levels of psychological barriers from the TNA stage, so one day of training may not be sufficient to produce changes equivalent to those of other participants.

This study offers a distinct contribution from previous studies, as it not only examines the effectiveness of training in general but also systematically documents the module design process from the needs analysis stage to follow-up evaluation. The multi-layered evaluation approach using Kirkpatrick's model, which encompasses four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and outcome, makes this study more comprehensive than previous studies, which generally only measure one or two levels of evaluation.

Research Implications

Theoretically, this study contributes to the development of the literature on training as a psychological intervention in the context of higher education in Indonesia, particularly

regarding the integration of self-confidence and public speaking within a single, integrated program design. The Kirkpatrick-based multi-layered evaluation framework implemented in this study can serve as a methodological reference for future researchers who wish to develop and evaluate similar intervention programs. Practically, the findings of this study have direct implications for the Faculty of Psychology at the University of North Sumatra, particularly in designing orientation programs or strengthening communication skills for new students at the beginning of their studies. The training modules developed in this study can be adapted and implemented more broadly as part of student self-development programs. For other higher education institutions, the Training Needs Analysis approach before designing intervention programs can be a best practice worth replicating to ensure the program's relevance and effectiveness to students' actual needs.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully developed and implemented the "Speak Up, Stand Out: Building Confidence Through Public Speaking" training module as a systematic psychological intervention that improves the self-confidence and public speaking skills of the 2025 intake of students from the Faculty of Psychology, University of North Sumatra, as evidenced by a multi-layered evaluation (needs analysis, design, implementation, and evaluation) at three levels of Kirkpatrick's evaluation. Theoretically, the study integrates the construct of self-confidence from Angelis (2005), public speaking theory from Lucas and Stob (2004), and Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2024) evaluation model, thus offering a holistic perspective that complements previous studies that tend to separate the constructs. Methodologically, a multi-layered evaluation approach that documents the TNA, session blueprints, formative and summative instruments, and post-training follow-up, provides an applicable framework for researchers and practitioners who wish to adapt or develop similar communication interventions. Practically, this module is worthy of being adapted by the Faculty of Psychology, USU, and other higher education institutions as a self-development program for new students to overcome early academic communication barriers in college. However, the study's limitations—including the limited sample size, non-experimental design, short follow-up evaluation, and the need for more intensive intervention for participants with moderate self-esteem—suggest the need for further research with larger and more diverse samples, experimental/quasi-experimental designs, medium- to long-term

evaluations (e.g., three and six months), and the development of booster sessions or follow-up modules targeting social comparison and academic authority anxiety to verify and refine the effectiveness and sustainability of the intervention's impact.

REFERENCES

Ally, A. (2023). *Understanding Anxiety, and Its Implications for Teaching and Learning: A Perspective on Freud and Others*. University of Witwatersrand.

Coleman, J. C. (2011). *The Nature of Adolescence*. Routledge.

Davinda, P. Z. (2025). *Hubungan Kepercayaan Diri dan Berpikir Positif dengan Kecemasan Berbicara Saat Presentasi Kuliah pada Mahasiswa Baru Psikologi Islam Angkatan 2024 Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga* [Skripsi, UIN Salatiga]. https://e-repository.perpus.uinsalatiga.ac.id/23329/

De Angelis, B. (2005). *Confidence: Finding It and Living It*. Hay House.

Deng, Y., & Liu, H. (2025). To overcome test anxiety in on-line assessment: Unpacking the mediator roles of techno competencies, teacher support, self-efficacy, and autonomy. *BMC Psychology, 13*, Article 192. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02545-y

Eriksson, P. L., Wängqvist, M., Carlsson, J., & Frisén, A. (2020). Identity development in early adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 56*(10), 1968–1983. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001093

Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. E. (2014). "I don't think I could, you know, just teach without any emotion": Exploring the nature and origin of university teachers' emotions. *Research Papers in Education, 29*(2), 240–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2012.754929

Ichsan, A. S., Abdullah, M. A., Masakin, M. I., Khairunnas, M., Fakhrurrozi, M. A., Alayya, A. A. R., Isyanti, A. P., Khairani, A., Dewi, A. P., Isnaini, D. L., Ulhaq, D., & Hasanah, L. N. (2025). Holiday Programs Berbasis Pesantren Sebagai Internalisasi Pendidikan Anak di Koripan 1 Dlingo Bantul. *ABDI DAYA: Jurnal Pengabdian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.52421/abdidaya.v3i1.603

Ichsan, A. S., & Samsudin, S. (2019). Penanaman Pendidikan Karakter Anak Dalam Struktur Sosial Keluarga Desa di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Basicedu, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v3i2.34

Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2024). Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation. *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research, 45*.

Lucas, S., & Stob, P. (2004). *The Art of Public Speaking*. McGraw-Hill Education.

McNatt, D. B. (2019). Enhancing public speaking confidence, skills, and performance: An experiment of service-learning. *The International Journal of Management Education, 17*(2), 276–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2019.04.002

Nasution, A. F. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Harfa Creative.

Prameswara, A. D., & Sakti, H. (2016). Pernikahan Jarak Jauh: Studi Kualitatif Fenomenologis pada Istri yang Menjalani Pernikahan Jarak Jauh. *Jurnal Empati, 5*(3), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2016.15360

Pranajati, N. R., & Ichsan, A. S. (2025). Strategy Development for Installing Children's Awareness of National Resilience as an Indonesian Geostrategy. *ARZUSIN: Jurnal Manajemen dan Pendidikan Dasar, 5*(2), 568–582. https://doi.org/10.58578/arzusin.v5i2.5180

Purba, R. K., Soesilo, T. D., & Irawan, S. (2023). Hubungan Antara Kepercayaan Diri dan Harga Diri dengan Komunikasi Interpersonal Mahasiswa. *G-Couns: Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling, 8*(1), 331–340. https://doi.org/10.31316/gcouns.v8i01.4799

Razali, G., Andamisari, D., Putranto, A., Ambulani, N., Sanjaya, F., & Deryansyah, A. D. (2023). Pelatihan Public Speaking Dalam Meningkatkan Komunikasi Sosial. *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat, 4*(2), 4759–4767. https://doi.org/10.31004/cdj.v4i2.16094

Rustam, R., & Ichsan, A. S. (2020). Pendidikan Islam Berbasis Kearifan Lokal. *IQRO: Journal of Islamic Education, 3*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.24256/iqro.v3i1.1366

Septia, S., Sumantri, M. S., & Hasanah, U. (2022). Hubungan Kepercayaan Diri dengan Kemampuan Komunikasi Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar. *EduStream: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 5*(2), 152–159. https://doi.org/10.26740/eds.v5n2.p152-159

Toyama, M., & Yamazaki, Y. (2021). Classroom interventions and foreign language anxiety: A systematic review with narrative approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, Article 614184. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.614184

Uglanova, E. (2024). Self-confidence. In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 6226–6229). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17299-1_2624

Wahyuni, E. (2015). Hubungan Self-Efficacy dan Keterampilan Komunikasi dengan Kecemasan Berbicara di Depan Umum. *Jurnal Komunikasi Islam, 5*(1), 51–82. https://doi.org/10.15642/jki.2015.5.1.51-82

Wahyuni, S. (2013). Hubungan Antara Kepercayaan Diri dengan Kecemasan Berbicara di Depan Umum pada Mahasiswa Psikologi. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi, 1*(4), 220–227. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v1i4.3519

Zhang, X., Ardasheva, Y., & Austin, B. W. (2020). Self-efficacy and English public speaking performance: A mixed-method approach. *English for Specific Purposes, 59*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.02.001