

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES FOR TEACHING ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY ABOUT 'SELF INTRODUCTION' OF BOARDING SCHOOL STUDENTS

Muhammad Husnu ^{a*)}, M Yayan Arta Putra ^{a)} Siti Ayu Surayya ^{a)}

^{a)} Hamzanwadi University, Lombok, Indonesia

^{*)}Corresponding Author: m.yayanartaputra.2202020722@student.hamzanwadi.ac.id

Article history: received 12 June 2026; revised 26 June 2026; accepted 10 July 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v10i02.388>

Abstract. This study investigated the implementation of instructional procedures in teaching English speaking ability through self-introduction activities in a traditional boarding school. It aimed to explore how teachers implemented instructional procedures, examine teachers' and students' perceptions, and identify challenges during implementation. A qualitative case study was conducted with 23 Grade 10 students at a boarding school in East Lombok, Indonesia. Data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and documentation, and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis supported by NVivo 14. The findings revealed that instructional procedures generally followed the stages of introduction, guided practice, and speaking performance, although inconsistencies in instructional sequencing, transitions, and time management reduced implementation quality. Teachers and students perceived the procedures as beneficial for promoting classroom interaction, participation, and speaking confidence through modeling, guided practice, and feedback. However, challenges remained, including limited vocabulary, speaking anxiety, low confidence, uneven participation, frequent first-language use, and contextual constraints within the boarding school environment. The study concludes that well-structured instructional procedures effectively support students' English speaking ability, provided they are implemented systematically with appropriate scaffolding, balanced participation, and sustained opportunities for meaningful communication.

Keywords: *instructional procedures; speaking ability; self-introduction; boarding school; qualitative case study*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization, English has become one of the most important international languages used in various fields such as education, business, technology, diplomacy, and international communication. As a global lingua franca, English enables people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds to communicate effectively. Consequently, mastering English has become a necessity for students who wish to participate actively in the global community. In educational contexts, English is widely taught as a foreign language in many countries, including Indonesia, and it plays a significant role in preparing students to face global challenges.

Speaking embodies an interactive, meaning-making process that integrates production, reception, and comprehension of information, demanding mastery of linguistic elements, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and pragmatic competence for contextually appropriate usage (Goh & Burns, 2021). Notwithstanding its centrality, speaking remains the most formidable skill for EFL learners to acquire. Students frequently encounter barriers such as lexical limitations, diminished self-confidence, apprehension toward errors, and inadequate practice opportunities (Ghafar & Raheem, 2023). Traditional EFL classrooms in Indonesia often prioritize grammar drills and reading comprehension, sidelining oral proficiency development (Lie et al., 2025). This

imbalance fosters theoretical comprehension at the expense of communicative competence, hindering real-world speaking application.

In addressing these challenges, one crucial yet often underexplored aspect lies in how instructional procedures are structured and enacted in the classroom. Instructional procedures refer to the systematic sequencing of teaching activities that guide learners from initial exposure to meaningful speaking use. The effectiveness of speaking instruction is therefore not only determined by the method employed but also by how instructional procedures are organized and implemented in practice, particularly in unique settings like traditional boarding schools in Lombok.

Instructional procedures provide a robust framework for structuring instructional procedures in speaking instruction, emphasizing meaningful communication over rote accuracy through task-based sequences that scaffold learners from controlled practice to fluency-oriented interactions (Richards, 2020). In teaching self-introduction, these procedures ideally involve pre-activity eliciting prior knowledge on personal descriptors such as name, age, hobbies via visuals or prompts; task cycle modeling scripted self-introductions, followed by guided pair/group rehearsals with peer feedback, progressing to information-gap tasks like "Find Someone Who..." activities; and post-task reflective discussion, error correction, and extension to freer communicative exchanges like mock

interviews (Qizi, 2025). This systematic implementation fosters fluency, confidence, and pragmatic competence in low-anxiety environments.

Traditional boarding schools in Lombok offer a distinctive ecological niche for instructional procedures, characterized by prolonged immersion and peer interactions in a shared living-learning environment steeped in local Islamic traditions. This setting fosters authentic, naturalistic speaking exposure, aligning with Krashen's (2022) input hypothesis and instructional procedures emphasis on comprehensible input. Daily informal exchanges among students and educators amplify opportunities for incidental speaking practice beyond formal lessons (Chen et al., 2024). When anchored in relatable topics like self-introductions, leveraging schema familiarity to build vocabulary, fluency, and confidence structured instructional procedures can transition learners from scripted rehearsals to spontaneous dialogues, mitigating anxiety and enhancing oral proficiency (Burns & Siegel, 2020;).

However, real-world implementation in EFL speaking classrooms, including those in traditional boarding schools in Lombok, often deviates from these ideals, leading to suboptimal outcomes. Teachers frequently improvise activities without adhering to instructional procedures structured stages, resulting in disorganized lessons that prioritize teacher-led monologues over student interaction (Gilmore, 2022). While immersion provides rich speaking opportunities amid a culturally conservative environment, the absence of intentional instructional procedures leads students to revert to their L1 (often Sasak or underutilizing English in both formal and informal contexts (Sudirman, 2024). Recent studies highlight persistent gaps: pre-task phases are often rushed or omitted, task cycles lack scaffolding for fluency development, and post-task feedback focuses on form over function, limiting communicative engagement (Mwaddah, 202; Maholetto & Sasolle, 2025). In self-introduction tasks, enactments rarely progress beyond rote memorization to interactive practice, exacerbating anxiety and inhibiting spontaneous speaking amid rigid daily routines and limited resources (Burns & Siegel, 2020).

Despite extensive research on communicative approaches in EFL contexts post-2020, there remains a notable lack of in-depth, context-specific investigations into how instructional procedures are actually enacted in classroom practice, particularly in teaching speaking tasks like self-introduction in traditional boarding schools in Lombok. Existing studies have largely focused on measuring learning outcomes through experimental designs (e.g., Ellis, 2020; Richards, 2020), often overlooking the nuanced, teacher-driven processes that shape classroom interaction. Qualitative explorations of how instructional procedures are operationalized, adapted, and experienced by teachers and students in real-time ecologies, especially immersive traditional boarding school settings in Lombok remain limited. This leaves a gap in understanding these dynamics, which this study seeks to address. This study positions instructional procedures as the core focus, with instructional procedures serving to specify and interpret their communicative enactment.

This study is situated within the broader domain of instructional procedures in teaching speaking. The focus of this

study is to explore and describe the instructional procedures employed by teachers in teaching English speaking ability about “*self-introduction*” through a instructional procedures, as well as to examine how these procedures shape students’ speaking practices, participation, and communicative engagement within classroom interactions in boarding school contexts.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore and describe the instructional procedures employed by teachers in teaching English self-introduction through a Instructional Procedures approach, as well as to examine how these procedures shape students’ speaking practices, participation, and communicative engagement within classroom interactions in a traditional boarding school context (Yin, 2022). The qualitative case study approach was selected to provide an in-depth, holistic examination of these phenomena within the bounded, real-world ecology of a single intact Grade 10 class at a public traditional boarding school in Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, where prolonged dormitory immersion and peer interactions offer a distinctive niche for observing Instructional Procedures enactment (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). AN Instructional Procedures perspective framed the analysis, focusing on the sequencing and adaptation of core procedures presentation, practice, and produce, in promoting meaningful, interactive speaking (Richards & Rodgers, 2021; Ellis, 2020).

Data were collected over 7 days, employing multiple sources to capture the complexity of instructional procedures in action: (a) non-participant classroom observations (n=6 lessons, audio/video-recorded for procedural mapping and interaction analysis); (b) semi-structured interviews with the students (n=23) to elicit perceptions of procedures enactment and engagement; (c) stimulated recall sessions post-lesson to uncover teacher decision-making; and (d) artifacts such as lesson plans, student worksheets, and peer feedback notes. This triangulation ensured thick description and trustworthiness (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The bounded case, a single Grade 10 EFL class (n=23 students, ages 15-17)—allowed nuanced insights into how Instructional procedures are operationalized amid cultural, linguistic (Sasak L1 dominance), and institutional constraints of the traditional boarding school setting.

Data analysis followed an iterative, inductive process aligned with case study conventions: initial open coding of procedures and interactions using NVivo software, thematic development (e.g., scaffolding adaptations, participation patterns), and cross-case comparison within lessons (Saldaña, 2021). Member checking and peer debriefing enhanced credibility, while thick contextual description addressed transferability.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discussion of the research findings in relation to the theoretical framework and previous studies. The purpose of this chapter is to interpret and analyze

the results presented in the previous chapter, particularly by examining how the findings align with, extend, or differ from existing theories and empirical research. Each sub-theme identified in the findings is discussed in depth to reveal its broader meaning and implications within the context of English language teaching and learning. Through this discussion, the study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the instructional procedures implemented in the classroom and their impact on students' learning experiences.

A. Instructional Procedures Implementation

This chapter discusses the findings of the study concerning the implementation of instructional procedures in teaching English speaking at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. The discussion is organized around five key aspects of instructional procedures identified from the findings, namely the sequencing of instructional procedures, clarity of instructions, teacher modeling, guided practice, and independent performance. These aspects are discussed by relating the findings to relevant theories and previous studies in order to provide a deeper understanding of how instructional procedures influence students' speaking learning experiences. The discussion also examines how the implementation of these procedure shapes students' engagement, participation, and ability to perform speaking tasks independently. Through this analysis, the chapter aims to explain the significance of instructional procedures in supporting speaking instruction and to highlight both the strengths and challenges encountered during their implementation in the boarding school context.

1. Sequencing of Instructional Procedures

The findings reveal that the sequencing of instructional procedures in teaching English speaking at Mukhtarul Amin boarding school was not fully structured as outlined in the lesson plan. Although the teacher followed general stages of teaching, the sequence of activities was not consistently organized. The lesson began with a greeting and a brief introduction to the topic; however, the transition between activities was sometimes unclear. The teacher introduced several expressions for self-introduction, but the explanation and modeling were delivered in a flexible manner without a clearly defined sequence. During the practice stage, students were asked to work in pairs, yet the instructions were not always explicit, causing some students to appear confused about the task. In the final stage, a few students were invited to perform in front of the class, but this activity was conducted in a limited and unstructured way due to time constraints. Feedback was provided, although it was brief and not systematically delivered. The interview data showed that students had mixed views about the sequencing of instructional procedures. Some students felt that the order of activities was not always consistent, while others thought the sequence was already clear and helpful. Participant S2 stated, "In my class, sometimes the lesson order not clear. We do task first, then teacher explain after. I feel confused because I don't understand yet but already must do the work." Conversely, Participant S19 mentioned, "I think the lesson order is already good. Teacher explains first, then give example, then we do exercise. It helps me follow the lesson slowly." Participant S23 added, "Sometimes the teacher uses good order, like explain first then

practice. But sometimes it changes, so I get confused. I think better if the steps always same."

Interpretively, these findings indicate that the inconsistency in instructional sequencing directly affects student comprehension and engagement in speaking activities. This aligns with our analytical framework, where unsystematic instructional procedures lead to negative perceptions and increased learning challenges. The data reveals a critical gap between intended lesson plans and actual classroom implementation. While the teacher attempted to follow a teaching flow, the absence of clear transitions undermined the logical progression from introduction to practice and performance. Student responses demonstrate this clearly: S2 experienced confusion when tasks preceded explanations, while S19 and S23 showed mixed feelings, indicating that some learners can adapt to flexible approaches but others require more consistency. From an analytical perspective, this inconsistency creates what is termed as "instructional ambiguity," where students cannot predict what comes next, leading to cognitive uncertainty that hinders speaking development. This suggest this is particularly significant in speaking classes, where students need confidence to verbalize language. confusion about procedures directly suppresses their willingness to speak. The limited and unstructured final stage, combined with brief feedback, further compounds the problem by denying students opportunities for correction and improvement.

These findings support Richards and Rodgers (2014), who emphasize that effective instruction requires clearly delineated stages, regardless of the specific method employed. The inconsistency observed in this study contradicts their fundamental principle that teaching phases should be distinguishable and logically ordered. Harmer's (2022) framework further reinforces this by highlighting the need for structured progression in speaking activities. Annisa (2023) add that teacher roles include providing clear directions at each stage. The data shows this was missing in several instances. The connection with previous research is evident in Sari & Sari (2025), who found that inconsistent teaching procedures in rural Indonesian schools contribute to learning difficulties; this study confirms their findings while adding that student voice is divided on the issue. Analytically, these divided perceptions suggest that teaching quality is perceived differently by learners. Some adapt well while others struggle, indicating a need for individualized attention.

Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by demonstrating that instructional procedures operate as both a teaching and learning variable. Its inconsistency produces measurable outcomes in student perception and challenge. Practically, this recommend that teachers at Mukhtarul Amin develop and consistently follow a lesson framework that includes clear transitions between activities, explicit instructions before each task, and structured feedback sessions. Teacher training programs should emphasize lesson planning and classroom management. As an analytical contribution, this study shows that instructional inconsistency cannot be dismissed as mere "flexibility". It has tangible effects on speaking development that warrant intervention.

2. Clarity of Instructions

The observation indicated that the clarity of the teacher's instructions varied depending on the classroom situation. When the class was conducive, the instructions were delivered clearly and students could follow the tasks. However, when the classroom became noisy, the instructions were less clear, and some students seemed confused in carrying out the activities. The interview data showed that most students indicated that the instructions were clear when the class was calm, but became unclear when the classroom was noisy. Participant S3 stated, "For me, the instruction is clear when the class is quiet. But when many students talk, I cannot hear the teacher well, so sometimes I feel confused." Participant S5 added, "I think the instruction depends on the class condition. If the class is calm, I can understand, but when it is noisy, it becomes difficult to hear anything." These findings indicate that instruction clarity is influenced by classroom conditions. The noise directly impacts the delivery of spoken instructions for Interpretively, these findings reveal that instruction clarity is not solely the teacher's responsibility but is also influenced by classroom conditions beyond the teacher's full control. When the classroom is quiet, instructions can be delivered effectively, showing that the teacher has the competence to teach clearly. However, when noise increases, oral communication is disrupted, and students miss critical information needed to complete speaking tasks. From an analytical perspective, this creates learning inequity. Students sitting at the back or those with suboptimal hearing lose even more opportunity when the classroom is not conducive. This suggests that external conditions like noise can hinder already limited speaking learning at this boarding school. Analytically, this finding shows that instruction clarity is contextual, dependent on classroom conditions, not just teacher competence. This carries significant implications for speaking, where unclear instructions directly affect students' ability to practice oral language correctly.

These findings support Harmer (2022), who emphasizes that instruction clarity is a critical component in effective language teaching, particularly for speaking activities requiring immediate understanding. Richards and Rodgers (2014) add that classroom conditions affect pedagogical communication effectiveness. Nugroho & Nartiningrum (2020) emphasize teacher roles in managing classroom dynamics to ensure instructions are heard. The data shows this aspect is not yet optimal. The connection with previous research is evident in Sari and Sari (2025), who found that classroom environments in Indonesian boarding schools often do not support learning; the findings add a specific dimension about how noise directly impacts instruction clarity for speaking. Analytically, this finding enriches the understanding that instruction clarity is not only about delivery methods but also about listener conditions—aspects often overlooked in literature.

Practically, these findings lead to concrete recommendations: teachers need strategies to manage classroom noise, such as using silence signals, speaking louder, or providing written instructions as backup. Classroom management training becomes essential for these situations. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by showing that instructional procedures are not only about

activity sequencing but also about conditions enabling effective communication. The contribution of this study lies in identifying that instruction clarity is dynamic, influenced by contextual factors often overlooked in speaking curriculum development.

3. Teacher Modeling

The observation indicated that the teacher used modeling by providing examples during the lesson. While the examples helped illustrate the tasks, some students appeared to struggle to follow them. This was evident as several students seemed confused and required additional time to understand the examples, which may be influenced by their limited English speaking proficiency. The interview data showed that the teacher provided examples during the lesson as part of the modeling process. However, students found it difficult to follow the examples due to their limited English ability. Participant S7 stated, "I see the example from the teacher, but it is hard for me because my vocabulary is still limited." Participant S19 added, "The teacher already gives example, but sometimes I cannot follow because I don't understand the words." These findings indicate that teacher modeling was implemented through the use of examples, but students' understanding was constrained by their limited English language proficiency, affecting how effectively they could follow the modeled tasks.

Interpretively, these findings reveal a significant gap between teacher intention and student reception in modeling activities. The teacher attempted to provide examples, a fundamental modeling practice, but this effort was undermined by students' limited English proficiency. The reality is concerning that even when teachers provide appropriate models, learners at Mukhtarul Amin cannot fully benefit due to vocabulary and language limitations. From an analytical perspective, this represents a "modeling-reception mismatch," where teacher output exceeds student input capacity. For speaking development, this is particularly problematic because modeling serves as the primary input for imitation, without comprehension, students have no accurate template to replicate. The additional time students needed suggests they were willing to learn but lacked the foundational language to access the model. This indicates that this highlights the importance of scaffolding. Modeling should be calibrated to student proficiency levels, not delivered at teacher comfort levels. Analytically, this finding shows that effective modeling requires diagnostic assessment of student language levels before presenting examples.

These findings align with Harmer (2022), who emphasizes that modeling should be clear and accessible to students at their current proficiency level. Richards and Rodgers (2014) add that effective presentation requires consideration of learner readiness. The data shows this consideration was missing. Loppis and Patty (2024) highlight that teacher modeling success depends on student comprehension, not just teacher delivery. The connection with previous research is evident in Sari and Sari (2025), who found that limited English proficiency in rural Indonesian schools creates barriers to learning; this study confirms this while adding specific evidence about how proficiency limits affect modeling effectiveness. Analytically, this finding extends the

framework by showing that instructional procedures include not only delivery but also calibration to student ability. The gap between the model and the learner must be bridgeable.

Practically, these findings recommend that teachers should assess student proficiency before providing examples and adjust modeling complexity accordingly. Using simpler vocabulary, visual supports, or bilingual examples can bridge the gap. Additionally, pre-teaching key vocabulary before modeling would enhance comprehension. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that teacher modeling is only effective when learner-ready, presenting models beyond student capacity produces no learning gains. The contribution of this study lies in identifying this calibration principle, which has practical implications for speaking curriculum design at Mukhtarul Amin and similar boarding schools.

4. Guided Practice

The observation showed that during guided practice, students needed different levels of support from the teacher. Some students were able to complete the tasks with minimal assistance, while others required more guidance and assistance, indicating varied abilities in following practice activities. The interview data revealed similar patterns. Students experienced different levels of difficulty during guided practice. Participant S21 stated, "I feel helped by the teacher during practice because the teacher gives more guidance. I still find it difficult, but the teacher support makes me understand little by little." Participant S4 added, "During practice, the teacher helps us, so I feel easier to do the task. I only need a little help because I can try by myself." These findings indicate that guided practice involved varying levels of teacher support, where some students completed tasks with minimal assistance while others required more sustained guidance depending on their understanding and ability.

Interpretively, these findings reveal the importance of differentiated support during guided practice. A "one-size-fits-all" approach fails to address the diverse needs of learners at Mukhtarul Amin. The findings are so encouraging that both S21 and S4 acknowledged the value of teacher support, showing that guided practice, when accompanied by adequate guidance, can facilitate speaking development. However, it can be observed concerning that for students like S21 who still experience difficulty despite receiving support. From an analytical perspective, this variation reflects the reality of mixed-proficiency classrooms common in Indonesian boarding schools, where learners arrive with different English backgrounds. For speaking development, guided practice is critical because it serves as the bridge between model and independent production. The level of support provided determines whether students can successfully transition to free speaking. The finding indicate that this finding highlights the need for teachers to provide differentiated scaffolding rather than uniform guidance. Analytically, the difference between students who "need a little help" and those who "need more guidance" represents different zones of proximal development requiring tailored support.

Interpretively, these findings reveal the importance of differentiated support during guided practice. A "one-size-fits-all" approach fails to address the diverse needs of learners at

Mukhtarul Amin. The finding is encouraging that both S21 and S4 acknowledged the value of teacher support, showing that guided practice, when accompanied by adequate guidance, can facilitate speaking development. However, the study acknowledge concern regarding students like S21 who still experience difficulty despite receiving support. From an analytical perspective, this variation reflects the reality of mixed-proficiency classrooms common in Indonesian boarding schools, where learners arrive with different English backgrounds. For speaking development, guided practice is critical because it serves as the bridge between model and independent production. The level of support provided determines whether students can successfully transition to free speaking. It suggests that this finding highlights the need for teachers to provide differentiated scaffolding rather than uniform guidance. Analytically, the difference between students who "need a little help" and those who "need more guidance" represents different zones of proximal development requiring tailored support.

Practically, these findings recommend that teachers conduct quick diagnostic assessments to identify student need levels before guided practice, allowing for flexible grouping or individualized support. Teacher training should emphasize differentiated instruction techniques. For speaking development, guided practice should include tiered activities reaching from high-support to low-support tasks. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by showing that guided practice is not a single phase but a spectrum requiring teacher responsiveness to learner differences. The contribution of this study lies in providing evidence that effective guided practice must be adaptive, informing speaking curriculum design at Mukhtarul Amin and similar contexts.

5. Independent Performance

The observation showed that during independent performance, students demonstrated varying levels of autonomy in completing speaking tasks. Some students worked independently with confidence and completed tasks without teacher assistance, indicating strong ability to apply previously practiced material. However, other students experienced difficulties and occasionally required minimal support, such as clarification of instructions or self-checking their work before proceeding, showing that expected independence varied according to individual understanding and readiness. The interview data revealed similar variation. Participant S7 stated, "I usually do the task independently because I already understand what to do. I just focus on finishing it step by step." Conversely, Participant S12 mentioned, "I still find it difficult to work alone because I often get confused since my English is not good and sometimes I need help from the teacher." These findings indicate that independent performance varied significantly. Some students successfully applied learned material while others still required occasional support, particularly in understanding instructions and organizing ideas.

Interpretively, these findings reveal the critical role of independence in speaking development, which serves as the ultimate goal of speaking instruction. The finding suggests that optimistic seeing students like S7 demonstrate autonomous speaking ability, showing that instruction can produce

independent learners. However, a concerning situation for students like S12 who struggle even during supposed "independent" phases, suggesting that earlier phases did not fully prepare them for autonomous production. From an analytical perspective, this variation represents the spectrum of speaking development. Some students successfully transition while others remain dependent. This has significant implications because speaking, unlike written skills, requires real-time autonomous production under pressure. The goal is not simply completing tasks but developing lifelong speaking ability. This suggests that the variation observed reflects incomplete scaffolding in earlier phases. Analytically, students requiring minimal support demonstrate that guided practice successfully bridged the gap to independence, while those needing support show that transitions were insufficient, revealing gaps in the instructional chain.

These findings align with Harmer's (2022) framework, which emphasizes that moving to independent activities is essential but should only occur when students demonstrate readiness. Richards and Rodgers (2014) add that effective instruction includes gradual withdrawal of support, preparing learners for autonomy. The connection with Vygotsky's scaffolding theory is evident. The data shows that appropriate support during guided practice produces independent performers, while insufficient support produces dependent ones. Previous research by Sari & Sari (2025) found that varying learner autonomy is common in Indonesian rural schools; this study provides specific evidence in speaking contexts. Analytically, this finding extends the framework by demonstrating that independent performance serves as the ultimate indicator of instructional success, if students cannot perform independently, earlier phases have failed. The goal of speaking instruction is autonomous communication.

Practically, these findings recommend that teachers should use independent performance as diagnostic assessment. Students who struggle need re-teaching rather than premature independence. Creating tiered independent tasks allows progressing from high-support to pure independence. Teacher training should emphasize "gradual release" models appropriate to Indonesian contexts. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by showing that independent performance is not merely a teaching phase but the outcome measure of instructional effectiveness. The contribution of this study lies in providing evidence that speaking development at Mukhtarul Amin requires attention to scaffolding continuity, ensuring each phase adequately prepares students for the next.

B. Classroom Interactions

The data revealed that classroom interaction played an important role in shaping the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Interaction occurred in various forms, involving teacher-student communication as well as student-student engagement throughout the learning activities. The findings indicated that interaction was not limited to verbal exchanges, but also included participation patterns, turn-taking behavior, and feedback exchanges during instructional activities. Overall, classroom interaction reflected how students engaged

with the learning process and how communication flow was maintained during classroom implementation.

1. Teacher-Students Interactions

The observation showed that teacher-student interaction during classroom activities was characterized by variation in students' oral responses and communicative engagement. Some students were able to respond to teacher questions fluently and provide more elaborated answers during classroom exchanges. In contrast, other students demonstrated limited verbal output, including brief responses, hesitation, or dependence on teacher prompting to articulate their ideas. This indicated that the quality and intensity of teacher-student interaction varied among students, particularly in relation to their willingness and ability to participate in spoken classroom discourse. The interview data revealed similar patterns. Students perceived teacher-student interaction differently. Participant S19 stated, "I often hesitate to answer because I am not confident with my English, so I usually give very short responses." Participant S1 mentioned, "I feel comfortable responding when I understand the question, so I can answer the teacher with my English speaking skill." Participant S14 added, "I try to respond even if I am not fully sure, because I think it helps me practice speaking English in class." These findings indicate that teacher-student interaction varied significantly. Some students actively engaged in spoken interaction while others showed limited participation due to hesitation and language difficulties.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that teacher-student interaction serves as both a mirror and engine of speaking development in the classroom. The result indicates positive outcome showed students like S14 who actively engage despite uncertainty. That's exactly the risk-taking behavior essential for speaking improvement. However, a concerning reality for students like S19 whose limited participation reflects deeper confidence issues that can fossilize without intervention. From an analytical perspective, this variation represents what is termed as "interaction asymmetry," where some students receive extensive practice while others remain silent, creating inequality in learning opportunity. For speaking development, every verbal exchange matters. The more students speak, the better they become. Students who only produce "very short responses" miss critical practice opportunities. It suggested that this finding has significant implications for classroom management and affective climate. The teacher must actively invite participation from reluctant speakers, not just interact with confident ones. Analytically, interaction patterns reflect both instructional procedure' quality (how teachers involve all students) and student perception (confidence affects willingness to interact), a critical intersection in the framework.

These findings support Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework, particularly the strategic competence dimension, students like S19 lack strategies to compensate for language gaps, causing them to avoid interaction. Harmer (2022) emphasizes that classroom interaction is essential for speaking development. The data shows this opportunity is unequally distributed. Horwitz and Cope (2021) identify that speaking anxiety reduces interaction willingness. The data confirms this, with S19 explicitly mentioning hesitation due to lack of confidence. The connection with Liu (2022) is evident, student S14's positive

attitude toward interaction aligns with his finding that enjoyment enhances willingness to communicate. Previous research by Sari & Sari (2025) found that limited interaction opportunities exist in rural Indonesian schools; this study provides specific evidence about individual variation within these contexts. Analytically, this finding sits at the intersection of the first and second theoretical points. Instructional procedures should create interaction opportunities, while perception determines how students respond to these opportunities.

Practically, these findings recommend that teachers implement strategies to involve all students in interaction. Cold calling, pair work, or structured turn-taking ensures equitable practice opportunities. Creating low-risk interaction environments where errors are normalized reduces anxiety. For speaking development, every student needs minimum verbal turns per lesson. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that interaction operates at the intersection of instruction and perception. Good procedure creates opportunities, but positive perception determines their use. The contribution of this study lies in identifying that interaction inequality exists even within single classrooms, requiring teacher intervention to ensure all students receive speaking practice.

2. Student-Student Interactions

The observation showed that student-student interaction occurred frequently during classroom activities, particularly when students worked in pairs or groups. However, the interaction was predominantly conducted using their first language (L1), namely Indonesian and Sasak, rather than English. Students tended to use L1 to negotiate meaning, clarify task instructions, and discuss ideas more efficiently. Despite the limited use of English, students remained actively engaged in collaborative discussions, indicating that peer interaction was continuous and functionally supportive of task completion. The interview data revealed similar patterns. Most students reported using L1 to communicate more effectively and ensure mutual understanding. Participant S10 stated, "Sometimes I try to use English, but most of the time we switch to Indonesian so we don't get confused." Participant S21 mentioned, "I prefer using our language Sasak when discussing in group because it helps us finish the task faster and we can explain our ideas clearly." These findings indicate that while peer interaction was frequent and functional, English was rarely used. L1 served as the primary communication tool for collaborative work.

Interpretively, these findings reveal a fascinating paradox. Students are actively engaged in interaction but not using the target language, creating what is termed as "interaction without production." The finding is encouraging that collaborative structures exist and students help each other complete tasks, showing social learning is present. However, a concerning reality that this efficiency comes at the cost of English practice. The collaborative discussion becomes L1 rather than English practice. From an analytical perspective, peer interaction in L1 is functionally efficient but pedagogically suboptimal for speaking development. Students achieve task completion (instrumental goal) but miss speaking practice (learning goal). It suggests that this reflects a strategic choice, using L1 reduces

cognitive load and ensures task success, but creates dependency that undermines English speaking development. For speaking, this is particularly significant because peer interaction could provide safe, low-anxiety practice contexts, but only if English is used. This finding shows that presence of interaction does not guarantee speaking development, the language of interaction matters critically.

These findings partially support Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence, while interaction occurs, the sociolinguistic dimension is underdeveloped because L1 lacks authentic English use contexts. Harmer (2022) emphasizes that speaking practice should involve English. The data shows peer interaction occurs but English is marginalized. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) anxiety framework is relevant. Students may avoid English with peers due to fear of error, defaulting to L1 for security. The connection with previous research is evident in Sari & Sari (2025), who found resource limitations in Indonesian rural schools; this study adds that even when resources (peers) are available, L1 preference undermines English speaking practice. Analytically, this finding extends the framework by showing that interaction quantity differs from interaction quality, students may interact frequently but in the wrong language.

Practically, these findings recommend that teachers establish "English-only" zones for pair work, provide structured English prompts, or use peer monitoring to ensure English use. Creating tasks that require English negotiation (information gaps) forces English use. Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that interaction is necessary but insufficient, quality (target language use) matters as much as quantity (interaction frequency). The contribution of this study lies in identifying that peer interaction in L1, while functionally helpful, may actually hinder English speaking development by creating comfortable alternatives to the target language.

3. Turn-Taking

The observation showed that turn-taking patterns during classroom activities were not evenly distributed among students. Interaction was often dominated by certain students who more frequently initiated responses and participated in teacher-led questioning sessions. These students tended to take more speaking turns, while others participated less actively or only responded when directly nominated by the teacher. As a result, the flow of turn-taking was characterized by an imbalance, where opportunities to speak were not equally shared among all students. The interview data revealed similar patterns. Students reported that speaking opportunities were not evenly shared. Participant S1 stated, "There are classmates who always dominate the discussion, so the turn to speak is not always balanced for everyone." Participant S4 mentioned, "Some students usually answer first and more often during discussion, so I sometimes do not get many chances to speak unless the teacher asks me directly." Participant S11 added, "During classroom discussion, I notice that a few students speak more often, so sometimes I just wait for my turn or for the teacher to call me." These findings indicate that turn-taking was significantly imbalanced. Certain students dominated while others had limited opportunities, participating only when directly prompted.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that turn-taking inequality creates what is termed as "participation disparity". Some students receive extensive speaking practice while others are systematically excluded from verbal engagement. A concerning situation for students like S4 and S11 who passively wait for turns. This waiting is not neutral; it represents silent extinction of speaking opportunity. From an analytical perspective, this pattern has compounding effects: dominant students improve through practice (becoming even more confident), while marginalized students fall further behind (losing both skill and confidence). For speaking development, every turn matters. Students who rarely speak cannot develop fluency. This creates a self-perpetuating cycle where initial proficiency differences become permanent. It suggests that this finding has profound implications for classroom equity. Equal opportunity is not achieved simply by making activities available; it requires active distribution of speaking turns. The teacher's role in managing turn-taking emerges as critical, without intervention, social dynamics naturally produce inequality. Analytically, turn-taking connects directly to the learning challenges framework. The silent students may develop negative perceptions due to lack of practice, reinforcing withdrawal.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of discourse competence, which suggests that genuine discourse requires opportunities for all participants to contribute. However, the data indicates that such opportunities are not equally distributed. Harmer (2022) emphasizes the importance of equitable participation, yet the findings reveal that natural classroom dynamics often result in unequal involvement. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) anxiety framework is also relevant, as students who become marginalized due to limited opportunities to participate tend to withdraw from classroom interaction, as reflected in S11's statement, "just wait." Brophy's (2019) motivation theory further explains this phenomenon, suggesting that students who are given opportunities to participate are more likely to develop interest, whereas those who are consistently excluded may become disengaged. This finding is consistent with previous research by Sari and Sari (2025), who reported unequal participation in Indonesian classrooms. The present study extends these findings by providing specific evidence regarding the mechanisms of turn-taking. Analytically, the findings suggest that turn-taking functions both as a cause and a consequence of students' perceptions. Students with more positive perceptions tend to receive more opportunities to participate, whereas those with negative perceptions receive fewer opportunities, thereby reinforcing existing differences.

Practically, these findings suggest that teachers should implement structured turn-taking systems, such as random selection, numbered responses, or round-robin activities, to ensure more equitable participation. Establishing "silent student alerts," whereby teachers remain aware of students who rarely participate, may also help prompt timely intervention. Since speaking development requires regular opportunities for practice, every student should be provided with a minimum number of speaking turns in each lesson. Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by demonstrating that turn-taking is a crucial equity variable, highlighting the

distinction between equal access to activities and equal opportunities for participation. The contribution of this study lies in identifying that turn-taking inequality may persist even in interactive classrooms, thereby requiring deliberate teacher management to ensure that all students have opportunities to develop their speaking abilities.

4. Students Participation

The observation showed that student participation during classroom activities varied and was influenced by differences in students' speaking ability. Some students were actively involved in classroom activities, frequently responding to questions and contributing to discussions with relative confidence. In contrast, others participated less frequently, often showing hesitation or providing minimal responses during classroom interactions. This indicated that participation levels were not uniform, as they depended on students' oral proficiency and confidence in using English. Interview data revealed similar patterns, with many students acknowledging that their participation was influenced by their speaking ability and confidence. Participant S17 stated, "I don't speak much in class because I am not confident with my English, so I prefer to listen most of the time." Participant S8 mentioned, "I usually participate more when I understand the topic, so I can answer the teacher's questions without feeling nervous." These findings indicate that student participation varied considerably, with some students engaging actively while others participated less because of limited vocabulary, low confidence, or fear of making mistakes.

Interpretively, these findings suggest that student participation functions as both a consequence and a driver of speaking development. Participation promotes skill development, whereas limited participation restricts opportunities for improvement, creating what may be described as a participation-skill cycle. This pattern is particularly evident among students such as S17, who tend to rely on passive listening. Although listening contributes to language learning, it cannot substitute for speaking practice in developing oral proficiency. From an analytical perspective, these variations reflect the interaction between ability and confidence. Students who participate and receive positive feedback tend to develop greater confidence, which encourages further participation. Conversely, students who avoid participation because of fear often experience limited skill development, reinforcing their perceptions of inadequacy. Since speaking ability requires active language production, these findings highlight an important issue of classroom equity. Students with higher initial proficiency naturally receive more opportunities to practice, while less proficient students may gradually fall further behind, leading to widening gaps over time. These participation patterns also connect directly to the learning challenges framework, as limited proficiency and low confidence function as mutually reinforcing barriers.

These findings are consistent with Horwitz and Cope's (2021) concept of foreign language classroom anxiety. S17's fear of making mistakes and S8's confidence when understanding the topic reflect contrasting profiles of anxious and confident learners. Brophy's (2019) motivation theory is also relevant, suggesting that participation can foster intrinsic motivation, whereas limited participation may contribute to

disengagement. Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of strategic competence further explains this pattern, as students such as S17 may lack strategies for maintaining communication despite limited proficiency. In addition, Liu's (2022) research on foreign language enjoyment highlights the role of positive emotions in encouraging participation, as reflected in S8's increased confidence when familiar with the topic. Previous research by Sari and Sari (2025) similarly reported varying levels of participation in Indonesian rural schools. The present study extends these findings by providing specific evidence regarding the cyclical relationship between ability and confidence in speaking development. Analytically, the findings demonstrate that participation is not merely an outcome of instruction but also a causal factor that influences subsequent language development through reciprocal skill and attitude cycles.

Practically, these findings suggest that teachers should create low-anxiety participation structures by accepting errors, providing appropriate scaffolding, and emphasizing effort rather than accuracy. Confidence-building activities that allow students to experience early success before being required to speak more fluently may also encourage greater participation. Since voluntary participation often disadvantages already marginalized learners, every student should be provided with structured opportunities and incentives to participate. Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by demonstrating that participation functions both as a dependent variable, influenced by instructional practices, and as an independent variable, influencing subsequent language development. The contribution of this study lies in identifying participation–attitude cycles that can either accelerate or hinder speaking development, thereby highlighting the need for deliberate teacher intervention to ensure that positive developmental cycles are experienced by all students.

C. Students Engagement

This section discusses the findings related to classroom interactions in English speaking instruction at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. Classroom interaction emerged as a significant component of the learning process, influencing students' opportunities to practice speaking and engage in communicative activities. The discussion focuses on four interconnected aspects identified in the findings, namely teacher–student interaction, student–student interaction, turn-taking, and student participation. These aspects are examined in relation to relevant theories and previous studies to explore how interaction patterns shape students' speaking experiences and learning outcomes. Furthermore, the discussion highlights the ways in which interaction opportunities, participation dynamics, and communication practices contribute to both the development and the challenges of English speaking skills in the boarding school context.

1. Behavioral Engagement

The observation showed that students' behavioral engagement during classroom activities was generally positive, as most students were actively involved in learning tasks. They were observed paying attention to the teacher's explanations, following instructions, and completing assigned activities within the allotted time. Nevertheless, occasional instances of reduced engagement were observed, such as side conversations

or delayed task completion. Despite these minor occurrences, the overall pattern indicated that students remained behaviorally engaged throughout the learning process. Interview data revealed similar patterns, with most students reporting active participation and enjoyment during classroom activities. Participant S5 stated, "I usually pay attention and do the tasks because the class is fun, especially when the teacher explains the lesson." Participant S20 mentioned, "Sometimes I join the activity well, but if I don't really understand, I become less focused." Participant S16 added, "I enjoy learning in class, so I try to follow the teacher and complete the activities given." These findings indicate that behavioral engagement was generally positive, although individual differences existed, with engagement declining when students experienced difficulty understanding the material or lacked interest.

Interpretively, these findings suggest that behavioral engagement represents the observable manifestation of students' perceptions of learning. How students perceive the learning experience directly influences the extent of their behavioral participation. This pattern is consistent with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework, in which active engagement reflects the activation of multiple dimensions of competence. The generally positive pattern indicates that most students held favorable perceptions of speaking instruction. However, the experience of students such as S20 demonstrates that engagement fluctuates with comprehension, suggesting that perceived difficulty directly affects behavioral responses. From an analytical perspective, engagement appears to reflect the integration of different competencies. Grammatical competence supports understanding and task completion, sociolinguistic competence facilitates appropriate participation, discourse competence contributes to coherent performance, and strategic competence enables students to manage communication challenges.

These findings are consistent with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework, as engaged behavior demonstrates the active use of grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies. Students who pay attention, follow instructions, and complete tasks simultaneously employ these competencies during classroom interaction. This perspective is also consistent with Vygotsky's view of learning as a process shaped by the interaction between cognitive development and social experiences, suggesting that competence develops most effectively through meaningful and contextually rich activities (Aslonova, 2020). Furthermore, the findings support the study of Engwall et al. (2022), which reported that positive perceptions promote active engagement. The present findings provide additional evidence of this relationship and suggest that behavioral engagement can serve as an Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that behavioral engagement operates as observable evidence of underlying communicative competence, and engagement data provides an accessible indicator of competence development. Practically, teachers can use engagement monitoring as a diagnostic tool because sudden disengagement signals competence problems that require intervention. For speaking development, behavioral engagement is necessary but

insufficient, since students may engage without developing higher-order competencies, requiring attention to cognitive depth alongside behavioral participation.

2. Emotional Engagement

The observation showed that students' emotional engagement during classroom activities was generally positive. Students appeared to enjoy the learning process, as indicated by frequent smiling, laughing, and relaxed interactions during classroom activities. The classroom atmosphere was observed to be lively and comfortable, suggesting that students felt at ease while participating in learning tasks. Although minor moments of hesitation were occasionally observed, the overall emotional response of the students toward the learning activities was positive. The interview data confirmed these observations, with most students reporting enjoyment in learning English and finding classroom activities interesting. Participant S13 stated, "The class feels comfortable and enjoyable, so I do not feel stressed when learning English." Participant S9 mentioned, "I like learning English in this class because it is not boring and I can enjoy the lesson." Participant S15 added, "I feel happy during English class, especially when we do group activities or discussions." Participant S2 concluded, "I enjoy the class because the activities are fun and the teacher explains the lesson in an interesting way." These findings indicate emotional engagement was strongly positive, as students felt happy, comfortable, and enjoyed the learning environment.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that emotional engagement functions as the affective foundation that enables communicative competence development. It indicates that positive emotions create conditions for competence activation. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework where the affective filter affects competence demonstration, and positive emotions lower the filter, enabling active competence use. A heartened result showed by this positive emotional climate because it represents rare educational capital that can be leveraged for speaking development. From an analytical perspective, positive emotions correlate with sociolinguistic competence development, as students who feel comfortable are more likely to take communicative risks, practice appropriate language use in contexts, and develop discourse competence through meaningful interaction. However, this also acknowledges that some students still experience hesitation, indicating that even positive emotional climates contain pockets of concern requiring attention.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework, as affective states directly affect competence activation. Positive emotional engagement enables demonstration of grammatical competence through willingness to produce language, sociolinguistic competence through appropriate context use, discourse competence through coherent interaction, and strategic competence through risk-taking despite limitations. Aslonova (2020) emphasized that communicative language competence includes affective readiness. The data shows this readiness is present and positive. Fatimah' (2025) research confirms that positive emotional perception enables cognitive engagement. The findings directly support this, as students who feel happy engage more deeply. The implication is that

emotional engagement operates as the enabling condition for communicative competence demonstration.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that emotional engagement is a necessary but not sufficient condition for speaking development, and positive affect enables while effective instruction determines development quality. Practically, teachers can leverage this positive emotional climate for more demanding speaking tasks, and maintaining positive affect should accompany methodological improvement. For speaking development, emotional engagement directly affects participation willingness, as students who enjoy activities participate more and develop competencies faster.

3. Cognitive Engagement

The observation showed that students' cognitive engagement during classroom activities was generally at a surface level rather than involving deep analytical thinking. While students were actively participating and appeared to enjoy the learning process, their responses and task completion mostly focused on following instructions and producing immediate answers rather than elaborating ideas or engaging in deeper reflection. Students tended to rely on direct recall of vocabulary or simple sentence patterns instead of extended reasoning or detailed explanation. This indicated that although students were behaviorally and emotionally engaged, their cognitive engagement remained limited in terms of depth of thinking during learning activities. The interview data revealed similar patterns, with most students reporting that they were not accustomed to analytical thinking in English tasks. Participant S14 stated, "I am not used to analyzing the topic deeply, so I just use simple sentences to finish the task." Participant S1 mentioned, "I usually just try to understand the question and answer it directly, I don't really think too deeply about it." Participant S20 added, "I just remember some vocabulary and make sentences from that, I don't really analyze the lesson." These findings indicate cognitive engagement remained surface-level, with students relying on memorized patterns rather than analytical responses.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that cognitive engagement represents the deepest dimension of perception, and how students mentally process speaking activities determines the depth of competency development. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, where discourse competence requires higher-order thinking beyond surface patterns. A concerning situation emerges in that behavioral and emotional engagement coexist with limited cognitive engagement, creating what may be termed the "engagement illusion," where visible participation masks limited competency development. From an analytical perspective, surface cognitive processing restricts discourse competence development because coherent extended discourse requires elaboration rather than simple recall. Students such as S14, S1, and S20 complete tasks but do not necessarily develop more complex speaking competencies, thereby conflating task completion with learning. This has significant implications because fluent speaking requires real-time complex cognition beyond pattern retrieval.

These findings challenge Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of discourse competence, since extended discourse

requires cognitive processing that the data suggests remains underdeveloped. Discourse competence involves coherence and cohesion in speaking beyond the sentence level, whereas the findings indicate that students' processing remains largely surface-level. Aslonova (2020), drawing on Vygotsky's perspective, emphasized that communicative language competence includes discourse competence requiring higher-order thinking, which the findings suggest still requires further development. Barikmo's (2021) research confirms that cognitive engagement requires analytical thinking beyond surface processing. The data indicates that such a transformation is needed. The implication is that cognitive engagement represents the missing link between positive perception and speaking ability development, where positive affect facilitates learning, but cognitive challenge promotes development.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that cognitive engagement operates independently of behavioral and emotional engagement, meaning that even highly engaged students may not develop advanced speaking abilities if cognitive challenge is absent. Practically, teachers should introduce analytical activities involving comparison, evaluation, justification, and problem-solving, all of which require deeper cognitive processing. For speaking development, cognitive engagement must be strengthened through tasks that demand analysis and extended responses rather than recognition and reliance on simple patterns.

4. Confidence in Speaking

The observation showed that students' confidence in speaking English during classroom activities was varied. Some students demonstrated higher confidence by responding to teacher questions more readily and attempting to express their ideas verbally without significant hesitation. In contrast, other students appeared less confident, showing hesitation, limited verbal output, or reliance on short responses when participating in spoken interactions. This variation indicated that students' confidence in speaking differed across individuals, influencing the extent to which they engaged in oral communication. The interview data confirmed these observations, with some students reporting confidence when they understood the topic and vocabulary, while others expressed hesitation due to uncertainty about grammar or fear of making errors. Participant S16 stated, "I feel more confident if I already know the words, but if not, I prefer to stay quiet." Participant S3 mentioned, "I try to speak, but sometimes I feel unsure about my grammar, so I speak very carefully." Participant S19 added, "I am not very confident when speaking English because I am afraid of making mistakes." Participant S8 concluded, "I feel confident when I understand the topic, so I can speak without too much hesitation." These findings indicate confidence varied significantly, with some students participating actively while others remained reluctant.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that confidence serves as the critical threshold determining whether communicative competence translates into actual speaking performance. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) strategic competence framework, in which confidence enables the use of communication strategies to maintain interaction. A

concerning reality is evident among students like S19, whose fear of making errors may inhibit speaking development and potentially lead to persistent withdrawal if not addressed. At the same time, the experiences of students such as S8 are encouraging, as their confidence appears to emerge from understanding, suggesting a pathway through which competence can be developed. From an analytical perspective, confident students are able to demonstrate their competencies, whereas hesitant students may fail to display competencies they actually possess, creating what may be termed the "competence-confidence gap."

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of strategic competence, as confidence enables students to employ communication strategies to maintain interaction, whereas lack of confidence limits the activation of such strategies. Strategic competence involves compensatory strategies for overcoming communication breakdowns, and the findings suggest that these strategies require confidence to be effectively utilized. Aslonova (2020) emphasized that communicative language competence includes willingness to communicate, which is directly reflected in the contrast between confident and hesitant students. This relationship also highlights the importance of fostering self-confidence to enhance participation in various activities, particularly in educational settings (Pertiwi & Jamaris). The implication is that confidence operates at the intersection of perception and performance, where positive perceptions foster confidence, which in turn enables communicative competence to be demonstrated.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that confidence functions as the mechanism through which communicative competence is translated into performance, since competence may remain unrealized in the absence of confidence. Practically, teachers should establish environments in which mistakes are normalized and viewed as part of the learning process. Confidence can be gradually developed by providing scaffolded opportunities for success before requiring independent language production. For speaking development, confidence should be deliberately nurtured through supportive classroom practices, acceptance of errors, and carefully managed corrective feedback.

D. Perceptions of Instructional Procedures

This section discusses students' perceptions of the instructional procedures implemented in English speaking instruction at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. Students' perceptions are important because they provide insight into how learners interpret, experience, and evaluate the teaching and learning process beyond what can be observed in classroom practices alone. The discussion focuses on four key aspects emerging from the findings, namely the perceived effectiveness of instructional procedures, the clarity of instructional procedures, the perceived benefits for speaking ability, and students' interest and enjoyment during learning activities. These aspects are examined in relation to relevant theories and previous studies to explore how students' perceptions shape their engagement, participation, and responses to speaking instruction. Through this discussion, the study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between instructional procedures and learners'

experiences, particularly in supporting the development of English speaking skills within the boarding school context.

1. Perceived Effectiveness of Instructional procedures

The classroom observation revealed that students did not strongly emphasize the importance of instructional procedures in terms of structure or sequence. They tended to focus more on completing tasks and participating in activities rather than following a clearly organized series of instructional steps. The learning process appeared to be accepted as long as activities were carried out, regardless of whether the procedures were systematically structured. This indicates that perceived effectiveness is not primarily influenced by how well steps are sequenced, but rather by students' involvement in activities. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants expressing that they focused more on activity participation than on procedural organization. Participant S8 stated, "I don't really pay attention to the steps of the lesson in detail. For me, as long as I can understand what I have to do and complete the task, I feel it is already okay and I can still learn." Participant S22 mentioned, "I think even if the steps are sometimes not very clear or not in order, I can still learn from the activity, especially if I try to participate and practice." These findings indicate that students associate effective learning with active involvement rather than systematic arrangement.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that students assess instructional effectiveness through task completion rather than procedural organization. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, where communicative competence is demonstrated through task performance rather than adherence to instructional structure. A concerning reality is that such perceptions may conceal instructional weaknesses, since students may accept ineffective procedures as long as activities are completed. However, the evidence also suggests that students' emphasis on participation provides opportunities for improvement through enhancing classroom activities rather than implementing extensive procedural changes. From an analytical perspective, these perceptions indicate that competence demonstration is valued more highly than procedural sequence, as students tend to evaluate success based on what they are able to accomplish rather than how instruction is organized. This has important implications because activity-oriented perceptions can be utilized to support speaking development.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework, as students appear to focus on competence demonstration through task completion rather than on the procedural aspects of competence development. The framework emphasizes that communicative competencies are demonstrated through meaningful tasks rather than through strict adherence to instructional procedures. The research by Riana et al. (2024) emphasized that communicative language competence develops through meaningful language use, which is reflected in students' recognition of learning through active participation. This finding is also consistent with previous literature emphasizing the importance of engagement with learning materials and its influence on learning outcomes (Guerdia et al., 2020). The implication is that students tend to evaluate instructional

effectiveness based on task-based competence demonstration rather than on procedural organization.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that perceived effectiveness may differ from actual instructional effectiveness, suggesting that students may perceive learning as effective even when instructional procedures are less than optimal. Practically, teachers can focus on improving the quality of classroom activities within existing procedures, since students are more likely to benefit from enhanced learning experiences than from changes in procedural structure alone. For speaking development, the quality of activities appears to be more influential than procedural perfection, as students evaluate speaking instruction primarily through opportunities for participation.

2. Clarity of Instructional procedures

The classroom observation revealed that instructional procedures were generally delivered with clear task instructions at each stage. The teacher was able to explain what students needed to do in an understandable way, particularly during practice activities. However, despite this clarity at the instructional level, the overall sequence and transition between stages were sometimes less structured. As a result, while students were able to follow individual tasks, the flow of the lesson was not always consistently organized. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants stating that instructions during activities were clear and easy to follow, although the overall flow sometimes felt unclear. Participant S9 stated, "The teacher usually explains the task clearly, so I can understand what I have to do during the activity." Participant S20 mentioned, "The teacher explains well, but sometimes the steps of the lesson are not always the same, so it can be a little confusing." Participant S17 added, "I think the instruction is clear, but sometimes I feel a bit confused about the lesson order." These findings indicate clarity at the task level but inconsistency in the overall sequence.

Interpretively, these findings reveal what may be termed "local clarity, global confusion." Task-level clarity exists alongside sequence-level inconsistency. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, where grammatical competence, reflected in sentence-level understanding, may coexist with weaknesses in discourse competence, which concerns the connection between ideas. The evidence suggests that task clarity enables immediate competence demonstration, as students understand what to do during activities. However, a concerning reality is that sequence confusion may fragment coherent learning progression, meaning that students understand individual tasks without fully understanding how those tasks are interconnected. From an analytical perspective, these findings suggest that teacher competence may vary across dimensions, with task explanation competence differing from discourse organization competence.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework. Task clarity supports grammatical competence by helping students understand what to say and do, whereas sequence inconsistency may hinder discourse competence by limiting understanding of how instructional elements connect. Discourse competence involves coherence and cohesion beyond the sentence level, which the findings suggest remains underdeveloped. Nouri et

al. (2021) reported that perceptions of clarity influence engagement. The present findings indicate that task clarity promotes engagement, while sequence confusion may reduce overall coherence. The implication is that clarity appears to be dimension-specific, meaning that teachers may demonstrate clarity in one aspect of instruction while experiencing difficulties in another.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that clarity operates as a dimension-specific variable, and task-level clarity does not necessarily guarantee overall instructional effectiveness. Practically, teachers may benefit from using lesson templates that promote consistent instructional sequences while maintaining clear task explanations. For speaking development, sequence consistency is important because speaking skills develop cumulatively through coherent and connected learning progression.

3. Perceived Benefits for Speaking Ability

The classroom observation revealed that instructional procedures have a noticeable influence on students' speaking ability. During practice activities, particularly pair work and performance tasks, students were given opportunities to use English for speaking. Although their performance varied, many students attempted to express themselves using the target language, indicating that procedures encouraged active participation in speaking. The use of guided practice and simple expressions also helped students engage in speaking activities with more confidence. The interview data strongly confirmed these observations, with participants expressing that classroom activities helped improve their confidence and ability to speak English. Participant S10 stated, "I feel my speaking is improving because we often practice in class, so I become more confident to speak English." Participant S18 mentioned, "The activities help me speak more. Even if I am not perfect, I can try and it makes me better." Participant S27 added, "I think the way the teacher teaches really helps my speaking ability, because we practice a lot and not just listen." These findings indicate instructional procedures positively support speaking ability development through practice opportunities.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that students perceive clear benefits from instructional procedures for communicative competence development. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, where competence develops through meaningful practice opportunities in communicative contexts. The evidence suggests that this positive perception contributes to maintaining motivation for continued speaking development. From an analytical perspective, these benefits emerge from practice activities, such as pair work and performance tasks, which provide opportunities to demonstrate grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies. This positive perception may explain why student development continues despite certain procedural weaknesses, as the activities themselves provide opportunities for competence practice.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework. Practice activities provide opportunities for competence development across all dimensions. Engagement in meaningful tasks activates grammatical competence through language production,

sociolinguistic competence through appropriate language use, discourse competence through coherent speaking, and strategic competence through maintaining communication. Krismiyyati and Yulia's (2022) research confirms that positive perceptions are associated with greater engagement. The present findings suggest that engagement contributes to positive perceptions regarding communicative competence development.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that perceived benefits may reflect actual competence development, suggesting that students are able to recognize the value of practice opportunities. Practically, teachers should maintain and expand opportunities for speaking practice, since speaking ability develops through repeated use and students themselves recognize the benefits of such activities. For speaking development, practice opportunities appear to be a key variable, with increased opportunities contributing to greater communicative competence development.

4. Students' Interest and Enjoyment

The classroom observation revealed that students showed varying levels of interest and enjoyment during the learning process, particularly depending on the type of activity conducted. Higher levels of engagement were observed during interactive activities such as pair work and speaking tasks, where students appeared more active and involved. In contrast, during less interactive or more teacher-centered moments, some students showed lower levels of attention. This indicates that students' interest and enjoyment were influenced by how instructional procedures were implemented, especially in terms of activity type and participation level. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants expressing greater interest during interactive activities and lower engagement during teacher-centered moments. Participant S12 stated, "I feel more interested when we do activities like speaking or working with friends, because it is more enjoyable than just listening." Participant S20 mentioned, "I enjoy the class when we are active, but sometimes when the lesson is more about explanation, I feel a bit less interested." Participant S15 added, "For me, the class is enjoyable when we can participate, especially in speaking activities, because it is more fun and not boring." These findings indicate that interest and enjoyment vary according to activity type, with interactive activities promoting engagement and passive activities contributing to disengagement.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that interest and enjoyment function as activity-dependent variables in communicative competence development. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, where meaningful interactive tasks provide opportunities for competence demonstration, whereas passive activities limit such opportunities. The evidence indicates a positive outcome because activity design is more easily modified than broader systemic factors, meaning that increasing interactivity may enhance students' interest immediately. From an analytical perspective, these findings suggest that students' perceptions are influenced not only by instructional quality but also by the nature of classroom activities. Interactive activities appear to foster positive perceptions even when other instructional weaknesses exist. This has important implications because

sociolinguistic competence requires appropriate language use in context, which is more effectively developed through interactive experiences. Nevertheless, the findings also highlight a concern that teacher-centered moments may contribute to disengagement, and excessive reliance on such practices could limit overall competence development.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework. Interactive activities provide opportunities for competence practice and therefore encourage positive perceptions, whereas passive activities offer fewer opportunities for communicative development. Discourse competence requires coherent interaction, which students develop more effectively through interactive practice. Similarly, sociolinguistic competence depends on the ability to use language appropriately in authentic contexts, which interactive tasks are more likely to provide. Carlton et al. (2021) reported that cognitive engagement is influenced by activity type, and the present findings suggest that students' interest is closely associated with the degree of interactivity within learning activities. The implication is that interest and enjoyment are variables that can be shaped through activity design and that they directly affect opportunities for communicative competence development.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that interest and enjoyment can be influenced through instructional design, with positive perceptions emerging from the use of interactive tasks. Practically, teachers should maximize the use of interactive activities, including pair work, group work, and speaking tasks, to sustain students' interest. Reducing teacher-centered instruction and increasing opportunities for active participation may further enhance engagement. Employing a variety of activities can also help maintain students' attention. For speaking development, interest directly affects participation, since students who enjoy classroom activities are more likely to participate actively and consequently develop communicative competencies more effectively through meaningful language use.

E. Challenges in Instructional Procedures

This section discusses the challenges encountered in the implementation of instructional procedures in English speaking instruction at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. Although instructional procedures were designed to support students' speaking development, the findings revealed several factors that potentially constrained their effectiveness during classroom implementation. These challenges emerged from students' experiences and perceptions throughout the learning process, influencing their participation, confidence, and opportunities to practice speaking English. The discussion focuses on five major challenges identified in the findings, namely students' limited vocabulary, lack of confidence in speaking, use of the first language (L1), limited time for practice, and uneven student participation. These challenges are examined in relation to relevant theories and previous studies to provide a deeper understanding of how individual, instructional, and contextual factors interact in shaping students' speaking learning experiences. Through this discussion, the study seeks to explain the barriers that may hinder the effectiveness of instructional procedures and the

development of English speaking skills within the boarding school contexts.

1. Students Limited Vocabulary

The classroom observation revealed that students experienced limitations in vocabulary during classroom interactions. This was particularly evident during speaking activities, where some students struggled to express their ideas due to a lack of appropriate words. As a result, their responses were often brief, hesitant, or incomplete. In some cases, students paused frequently or relied on simple and repetitive expressions when attempting to communicate. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that a lack of vocabulary made it difficult to express ideas during speaking activities. Participant S9 stated, "I feel my vocabulary is still limited, so sometimes I don't know how to say what I want to express in English. Because of that, I often hesitate or stop in the middle of speaking." Participant S17 mentioned, "When I want to speak, I often pause because I don't know the words. So I just use very simple sentences, even if I want to say something more." Participant S7 added, "I think my English is still limited, especially vocabulary, so it makes me less confident to speak. Sometimes I understand the idea, but I cannot express it well." These findings indicate limited vocabulary constrains speaking participation and confidence.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that limited vocabulary functions as a fundamental intrinsic challenge that directly obstructs speaking development. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) intrinsic challenge category, where low self-efficacy in speaking emerges when students lack the vocabulary needed for communication, creating negative perceptions of their own competence. A concerning point is that vocabulary limitation creates cascade effects, with limited vocabulary leading to speaking difficulty, increased anxiety, reduced practice opportunities, and ultimately further vocabulary limitation. However, these findings suggest that this challenge is manageable, as vocabulary can be systematically expanded through instruction. From an analytical perspective, limited vocabulary represents a student-related barrier, but it is also connected to instructional and resource factors, since teaching practices may not provide sufficient vocabulary development and learning materials may offer limited exposure. This has significant implications because vocabulary serves as a prerequisite for the development of speaking competence.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that intrinsic challenges include low self-efficacy in speaking, and limited vocabulary directly contributes to this condition. When students are unable to express themselves effectively, their self-efficacy decreases, reducing their willingness to engage in speaking activities. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is also directly relevant, as vocabulary limitations may increase anxiety and fear of communication breakdown, leading students to withdraw from interaction. The data clearly illustrate this pattern, particularly in the experiences of S9 and S17. Liu's (2022) research is also relevant, as limited vocabulary can reduce enjoyment in communication, thereby diminishing foreign language enjoyment. The implication is that vocabulary limitation operates as a primary barrier that

affects both motivational and anxiety-related dimensions of speaking.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that limited vocabulary creates multiple interconnected barriers, reducing self-efficacy, increasing speaking anxiety, and decreasing enjoyment in language learning. Practically, teachers should implement systematic vocabulary development before engaging students in speaking activities. Vocabulary scaffolding can be used to bridge lexical gaps, and providing word lists and semantic fields related to speaking topics in advance may facilitate communication. For speaking development, vocabulary functions as a prerequisite competence, and addressing this challenge may open multiple pathways for communicative competence development.

2. Lack of Confidence in Speaking

The classroom observation revealed that students demonstrated a low level of confidence in speaking during English learning activities. This was particularly evident in speaking tasks, where many students appeared hesitant to participate, avoided volunteering, or relied on reading rather than speaking spontaneously. Some students showed signs of anxiety, such as long pauses, very soft voices, or reluctance to perform in front of the class. Even when given opportunities to speak, only a small number of students actively engaged, while others remained passive. The interview data strongly confirmed these observations, with participants expressing feelings of nervousness, fear of making mistakes, and uncertainty about their language ability. Participant S6 stated, "I feel nervous when I have to speak English, especially in front of the class, because I am afraid of making mistakes and being corrected." Participant S12 mentioned, "Sometimes I am not confident because my vocabulary is limited, so I don't know how to express my ideas clearly." Participant S18 added, "I feel shy when speaking English because my friends are listening, and I worry they might laugh if I say something wrong." Participant S21 concluded, "I am not used to speaking English, so I feel uncomfortable and not confident when I have to speak during the lesson." These findings indicate lack of confidence significantly affects speaking participation.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that lack of confidence functions as a primary intrinsic challenge that blocks speaking development. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) intrinsic challenge category, where low self-efficacy in speaking directly prevents participation despite the availability of instructional opportunities. A concerning aspect is that this confidence barrier may become self-reinforcing, with low confidence leading to reduced practice, limited development, and consequently even lower confidence. However, the findings suggest that this challenge can be addressed through appropriate intervention. From an analytical perspective, this represents a student-related factor that directly affects participation. Fear of mistakes, concern about peer evaluation, and unfamiliarity with speaking English all operate within the learner domain. These findings are connected to Brophy's concept of low self-efficacy, Horwitz and Cope's notion of speaking anxiety, and Liu's emphasis on the reduction of enjoyment caused by anxiety.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that intrinsic challenges include low

self-efficacy in speaking, manifested in hesitation, avoidance, and passive participation. Low self-efficacy directly reduces students' willingness to engage in speaking activities. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) foreign language classroom anxiety framework is also directly relevant, as S6's fear of making mistakes and S18's concern about peer reactions represent common forms of speaking anxiety that inhibit participation. Liu's (2022) research further suggests that fear of errors reduces foreign language enjoyment, making it difficult for anxious learners to experience positive emotions during speaking activities. The implication is that this challenge affects motivational, emotional, and affective dimensions simultaneously, requiring comprehensive intervention.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that lack of confidence represents a compounded challenge affecting motivation, anxiety, and enjoyment at the same time. Practically, teachers should create mistake-normalizing environments in which errors are treated as a natural part of learning. Confidence-building activities that provide opportunities for early success may help students gradually develop positive self-perceptions. In addition, strengthening vocabulary knowledge can provide a stronger foundation for communication. For speaking development, confidence should be addressed explicitly, since unresolved confidence issues may hinder the effectiveness of other instructional efforts.

3. Use Of First Language (L1)

The classroom observation revealed that students predominantly used their first language (L1) during classroom interactions. This was particularly evident during pair work and group activities, where students frequently switched to Indonesian or the local language when discussing tasks. The use of L1 appeared to serve as a strategy to facilitate understanding and maintain communication, especially when students encountered difficulties in expressing ideas in English. As a result, the use of English was often limited, even during activities designed to encourage speaking practice. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants explaining that they switched to Indonesian or the local language because it was easier, more natural, and helped them communicate more effectively. Participant S5 stated, "I usually use Sasakese when talking with my friends because it is easier and faster for us to understand each other." Participant S13 mentioned, "Sometimes I want to use English, but when I don't know the words, I switch to Indonesian so the conversation can continue." Participant S21 added, "I think we use our daily language more because we are more comfortable with it, especially when discussing tasks." These findings indicate that dominant L1 use limits English exposure.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that L1 use functions simultaneously as a communication strategy and a developmental challenge. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) categories of challenges, involving both intrinsic factors, such as comfort with the first language, and extrinsic factors, such as limited support for English use. A concerning aspect is that while L1 facilitates task completion, it also reduces opportunities for English practice, creating what may be

termed an "efficiency-development trade-off." However, these findings suggest that such behavior represents an understandable strategy when students' English competencies are still limited. From an analytical perspective, this issue reflects not only student-related factors but also teacher-related and environmental factors. When the classroom environment does not consistently encourage English use, students naturally choose the more practical option. This pattern is connected to Brophy's concept of motivation for ease, Horwitz and Cope's notion of anxiety avoidance through L1 use, and Liu's emphasis on comfort and enjoyment.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that extrinsic challenges may include insufficient support for target language use, leading students to rely on their first language when English use is not consistently encouraged. Intrinsic factors also contribute, as students tend to prefer the comfort of familiar language over the challenge of communicating in English. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is also relevant, as switching to L1 may function as an anxiety-avoidance strategy that helps students avoid communication difficulties in English. Liu's (2022) research further suggests that the comfort associated with L1 use may preserve positive feelings while simultaneously limiting opportunities for language development. The implication is that this challenge involves both environmental and learner-related dimensions and therefore requires support in both areas.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that L1 use reflects an efficiency-development trade-off that requires deliberate management rather than being viewed solely as a student problem. Practically, teachers can encourage greater target language use by establishing English-use zones during pair work, providing structured English prompts, and designing activities that require negotiation in English. Peer support and monitoring may also help increase opportunities for English interaction. For speaking development, this challenge can be addressed through a combination of environmental support and competence development.

4. Limited Time for Practice

The classroom observation revealed that students had limited time to practice English, particularly in speaking activities. Although students live in a boarding school environment, opportunities to use English outside the classroom were observed to be minimal. Most English practice occurred only during formal lesson time, with little extension into daily communication in the dormitory or school environment. Additionally, within the classroom itself, time allocated for speaking practice was relatively limited compared to other instructional stages. As a result, students had restricted opportunities to develop and reinforce their speaking skills. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that despite living together in the dormitory, English was rarely used outside the classroom. Participant S7 stated, "Even though we live together in the dormitory, we rarely use English, so the chance to practice is still very limited." Participant S15 mentioned, "We meet our friends all the time, but we usually speak Indonesian, so we don't really practice English outside the class." Participant S23

added, "I think the time to practice English is not enough, because we only use it during the lesson, not in daily conversation." These findings indicate limited practice time both inside and outside the classroom.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that limited practice time functions as an extrinsic challenge that constrains speaking development despite positive instructional intentions. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) category of extrinsic challenges, where insufficient support and learning opportunities hinder skill development. A concerning aspect is that even within a boarding school environment, where extended interaction time is available, English practice remains largely confined to formal lessons. This represents a missed opportunity for language development. However, the findings suggest that this challenge may be addressed through changes to the learning environment rather than through major instructional reform. From an analytical perspective, this issue primarily reflects a resource-related factor, as the school environment provides time for interaction but does not fully utilize it for English practice. This pattern is associated with Brophy's concept of insufficient support, Horwitz and Cope's notion that limited practice may increase anxiety, and Liu's emphasis on the relationship between language use and enjoyment.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that extrinsic challenges include insufficient opportunities for practice, thereby restricting skill development even when instruction is effective. Resource limitations identified in Indonesian boarding schools by Sari and Sari (2025) are reflected in the limited opportunities for English use despite extended school hours. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is also relevant, as limited practice opportunities reduce students' chances to gain confidence through successful communication experiences. Liu's (2022) research further indicates that limited language use may reduce foreign language enjoyment, making it more difficult for students to develop positive attitudes toward English. The implication is that this challenge requires environmental management and should be viewed not only as a student or teacher issue but also as an institutional concern.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that limited practice time represents an institutional challenge requiring environmental modification rather than merely improvements in teaching. Practically, schools may create English-speaking zones within dormitories and common areas and establish designated periods during which English is used outside the classroom. Pairing systems that encourage students to communicate in English during daily interactions may also increase opportunities for practice. For speaking development, opportunities for language use appear to be a limiting factor, and extending practice time may significantly enhance students' communicative competence development.

5. Uneven Students' Participation

The classroom observation revealed a noticeable unevenness in students' participation during learning activities. While some students were actively engaged and frequently contributed during speaking tasks, others tended to remain passive and rarely participated. This imbalance was

particularly evident during pair work and class performances, where participation was dominated by more confident or proficient students, while less confident students showed limited involvement. As a result, opportunities to practice speaking were not equally distributed among students. The interview data strongly confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that classroom activities were often dominated by certain students while others remained passive. Participant S8 stated, "I see that some students always speak more in the class, while others like me usually stay quiet and don't participate much." Participant S14 mentioned, "In group activities, usually the same students are active, and the others just follow or listen." Participant S20 added, "I think not all students have the same chance to speak, because some are more confident and faster to respond." Participant S21 concluded, "Sometimes I want to participate, but other students are already speaking, so I just stay silent." These findings indicate that participation inequality affects opportunities for speaking practice.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that uneven participation functions as both a student-related and teacher-related challenge that limits inclusive speaking development. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) categories of intrinsic and extrinsic challenges, encompassing individual differences in confidence as well as limitations in instructional management. A concerning aspect is that such patterns may create a self-reinforcing cycle, in which confident students gain more opportunities to practice and consequently improve further, whereas hesitant students practice less and experience slower development. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that this challenge can be addressed through structured intervention. From an analytical perspective, unequal participation represents a challenge that requires deliberate teacher management, since equal opportunities for participation do not emerge automatically but must be actively facilitated. This pattern is associated with Brophy's concept of motivational differences, Horwitz and Cope's explanation of anxiety-induced withdrawal, and Liu's emphasis on the relationship between participation and enjoyment.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that intrinsic challenges include differences in self-efficacy that influence students' willingness to participate, while extrinsic challenges involve insufficient management of participation opportunities. Students with stronger self-efficacy tend to dominate interactions, whereas those with lower self-efficacy are more likely to remain passive. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is also directly relevant, as less confident students may withdraw from participation to avoid anxiety, thereby reinforcing their anxious tendencies. Liu's (2022) research further suggests that passive students are less likely to develop foreign language enjoyment because they experience fewer positive outcomes from speaking activities. The implication is that this challenge requires active teacher intervention to ensure a more equitable distribution of practice opportunities.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that uneven participation may generate inequalities that become increasingly pronounced over time, causing initial differences to develop into more substantial gaps

in communicative competence. Practically, teachers can implement structured turn-taking systems, such as numbered responses, round-robin activities, or random selection, to ensure more balanced participation. Establishing awareness of non-participating students and intentionally inviting them to contribute may also help increase involvement. In addition, pairing more confident students with less confident peers can promote greater participation. For speaking development, all students require sufficient opportunities to practice, making active intervention essential for overcoming participation inequality.

F. Students Speaking Development

This section discusses the findings related to students' speaking development as influenced by the implementation of instructional procedures in English speaking instruction at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. Speaking development emerged as an important outcome of the instructional process, reflecting the extent to which classroom activities contributed to students' progress in using English for communication. The discussion focuses on four dimensions of speaking development identified in the findings, namely fluency development, vocabulary development, pronunciation development, and confidence in speaking. These aspects are examined in relation to relevant theories and previous studies to explore how instructional procedures support the development of different components of speaking ability. Through this discussion, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between instructional procedures and students' speaking progress, while highlighting both the achievements and the areas that still require further improvement within the boarding school context.

1. Fluency Development

The classroom observation revealed that instructional procedures had a moderate influence on students' fluency development. During speaking activities, particularly in pair work and guided practice, students were given opportunities to speak and express their ideas in English. Some students were able to speak more smoothly with fewer pauses, especially when familiar with the expressions being used. However, many students still showed hesitation, frequent pauses, and reliance on short utterances. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that repeated practice helped them speak more smoothly over time, although hesitation remained in certain situations. Participant S16 stated, "Before, I spoke very slowly, but now I can speak a bit more smoothly, especially when the topic is familiar." Participant S24 mentioned, "I think my fluency is improving because we do speaking activities regularly, so I get used to speaking in English." These findings indicate moderate fluency development, with students showing improvement through practice while still experiencing hesitation.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that fluency development operates at the intersection of discourse competence and strategic competence. Moderate progress suggests that both competencies are still developing. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, in which discourse competence involves producing coherent and connected speech, while strategic competence enables learners

to maintain communication despite linguistic limitations. A concerning aspect is that hesitation persists despite repeated practice, as this may lead students to reach a plateau if additional support is not provided. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates tangible progress, as reflected in S16's statement that speaking has become smoother over time. This suggests that discourse competence develops gradually through repeated opportunities for communication. From an analytical perspective, fluency represents the culmination of communicative competence, since fluent speech reflects the integration of grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of discourse competence, which emphasizes coherence and cohesion in extended speech beyond the sentence level. The findings suggest that this aspect of communicative competence is still developing. Strategic competence is also relevant, as it involves the use of strategies to maintain communication when linguistic resources are limited. Persistent hesitation may indicate that such compensatory strategies have not yet been fully developed. Yasuda's (2022) research supports the view that fluency develops through repeated practice, and the present findings demonstrate moderate progress resulting from regular speaking activities. The implication is that fluency represents an integrated competence that requires development across multiple dimensions rather than through grammatical knowledge alone.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that fluency requires specific attention beyond grammatical competence, as accurate language use does not automatically lead to fluent communication. Practically, teachers should provide more opportunities for sustained speaking practice, since fluency develops through extensive use of the target language. Activities focusing on fluency, such as repetition tasks, timed speaking exercises, and automaticity-building activities, may further support students' development. For speaking development, fluency represents a crucial dimension of communicative competence, indicating that grammatical competence alone is insufficient without the ability to produce language smoothly and spontaneously.

2. Vocabulary Development

The classroom observation revealed that vocabulary development was clearly evident during the learning process. This was particularly noticeable when students were introduced to new expressions and encouraged to use them in speaking activities. Some students were able to incorporate newly learned vocabulary into their responses, indicating progress in their language use. However, the extent of development varied, as other students still relied on limited and repetitive vocabulary. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants expressing that learning activities helped them acquire and use new vocabulary gradually. Participant S10 stated, "I think my vocabulary is improving because in class we often learn new words and try to use them in speaking activities." Participant S18 mentioned, "Before, I didn't know many English words, but now I can use more words when I try to speak." Participant S22 added, "I sometimes remember new vocabulary from the lesson, so I try to use it when I speak with my friends." These findings indicate

that vocabulary development occurs, although its progress remains uneven, with some students expanding their vocabulary while others continue to rely on limited lexical resources.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that vocabulary development functions as the foundation of grammatical competence, providing the basis for the development of higher-order speaking competencies. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, in which grammatical competence includes vocabulary knowledge as an essential component of communication. A concerning aspect is that some students continue to experience vocabulary limitations despite receiving instruction. If such gaps persist, progress in speaking development may be constrained across multiple dimensions. Nevertheless, the findings also indicate a positive outcome, as evidence from several participants suggests that classroom instruction contributes to vocabulary growth when students actively engage in learning activities. From an analytical perspective, vocabulary serves as a prerequisite competence because limitations in vocabulary may restrict the development of discourse competence and the effective use of communication strategies. Without adequate lexical knowledge, coherent communication becomes increasingly difficult.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of grammatical competence, which emphasizes vocabulary knowledge as a central component of communicative ability. Grammatical competence involves mastery of lexical items and grammatical rules, with vocabulary providing the foundation necessary for the application of linguistic knowledge. The findings suggest that variations in vocabulary development may partly explain differences in students' speaking ability. The implication is that disparities in vocabulary knowledge contribute to broader differences in communicative competence development among learners.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that vocabulary functions as a foundational competence, where weaknesses in vocabulary may affect speaking development across multiple dimensions. Practically, teachers should allocate sufficient attention to vocabulary development, as vocabulary knowledge is a prerequisite for effective speaking. Vocabulary-rich activities and techniques designed to expand lexical knowledge may support students' language development. For learners with more limited proficiency, vocabulary scaffolding before speaking tasks may facilitate participation and strengthen communicative competence across various dimensions.

2. Pronunciation Development

The classroom observation revealed positive indications of students' pronunciation development during speaking activities. This was particularly evident when students attempted to pronounce familiar words and newly learned expressions introduced by the teacher. Some students showed improvement in articulating English words more clearly, especially after repeated modeling and practice provided in the instructional procedures. However, variations in pronunciation accuracy were still observed among students, with some requiring additional support and repetition. The interview data

confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that teacher modeling, practice, and corrective feedback contributed to improvements in pronunciation. Participant S11 stated, "I think my pronunciation is getting better because the teacher often gives examples and corrects us when we make mistakes." Participant S19 mentioned, "Before, I was not confident with my pronunciation, but now I try to follow how the teacher says the words." Participant S23 added, "I still make mistakes in pronunciation, but I feel I am improving because we practice speaking in class." These findings indicate positive but uneven pronunciation development supported by instructional practices.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that pronunciation development operates as an important component of grammatical competence, particularly phonological competence, which enables intelligible communication. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework, in which grammatical competence includes knowledge of phonological rules necessary for effective oral communication. The findings provide positive evidence that teacher modeling and corrective feedback contribute to pronunciation improvement, as reflected in S11's experience. Nevertheless, a concern remains that pronunciation difficulties may discourage some students from participating in speaking activities. If students perceive pronunciation as excessively challenging, they may avoid opportunities to communicate. From an analytical perspective, pronunciation extends beyond linguistic accuracy and has implications for communicative effectiveness in authentic interaction. In this sense, phonological clarity may be more important than perfect grammatical accuracy for successful communication. Consequently, limitations in pronunciation may also restrict the use of strategic competence during real-life interactions.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of grammatical competence, which includes phonological competence as an essential component of communicative ability. Phonological competence enables learners to produce language in ways that are understandable and appropriate for communication. Sabeti's (2022) research supports the view that pronunciation develops through repeated modeling and practice, and the present findings provide further evidence of this process through students' reports of gradual improvement. The implication is that pronunciation functions as a socially significant competence that influences communication effectiveness and opportunities for demonstrating communicative competence.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that variations in pronunciation development require targeted instructional support, as pronunciation difficulties may affect speaking development across multiple dimensions of communicative competence. Practically, teachers should provide more opportunities for pronunciation modeling and explicit instruction before engaging students in speaking tasks. Corrective feedback should be delivered constructively to support learning without increasing anxiety. In addition, creating low-anxiety contexts for pronunciation practice may encourage students to participate more actively. For speaking development, pronunciation plays an important

role in communication success and directly influences students' willingness to engage in oral interaction.

3. Confidence in Speaking

The classroom observation revealed positive indications of improvement in students' confidence in speaking during English learning activities. Although not all students participated equally, some students showed increasing willingness to speak in front of the class and engage in speaking tasks. This was particularly visible during pair work and short performance activities, where several students attempted to express their ideas despite minor linguistic limitations. However, a portion of students still appeared hesitant and required encouragement from the teacher. The interview data showed a slightly different tendency, with some students acknowledging gradual improvement while many participants continued to report low confidence. Participant S7 stated, "I still feel nervous when I have to speak English in front of others, so I usually try to avoid it if possible." Participant S14 mentioned, "I want to speak more, but I am still not confident because I am afraid of making mistakes." Participant S20 added, "Even though I practice in class, I still feel shy and less confident when speaking English." Participant S22 concluded, "I think my confidence is still low, especially when I have to speak without preparation." These findings indicate mixed patterns of confidence development, with some students showing progress while many others continue to struggle.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that confidence functions as a critical factor determining whether communicative competence can be translated into actual speaking performance. This aligns with Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of strategic competence, in which confidence enables learners to employ communication strategies and sustain interaction. A concerning aspect is that students such as S7, S14, S20, and S22 continue to experience fear of making mistakes, which may inhibit speaking development if left unaddressed. From an analytical perspective, more confident students are able to demonstrate their communicative competencies, whereas hesitant students may fail to display competencies they actually possess, creating what may be described as a "competence-confidence gap." Nevertheless, observational evidence indicates that confidence can gradually improve through repeated practice, suggesting that pathways for confidence development do exist.

These findings align with Canale and Swain's (1980) framework of strategic competence, which emphasizes the importance of compensatory strategies for maintaining communication despite linguistic limitations. Such strategies, however, require a certain degree of confidence to be effectively activated. This perspective is also consistent with Vygotsky's emphasis on the dynamic relationship between cognitive development and social interaction, suggesting that communicative competence is fostered through meaningful and supportive contexts. The findings imply that confidence occupies the intersection between perception and performance, where positive perceptions facilitate the demonstration of communicative competence.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that confidence functions as a mechanism through which communicative competence is translated into

observable performance, since competence may remain underutilized in the absence of confidence. Practically, teachers should create classroom environments in which mistakes are treated as a natural part of learning. Confidence can be developed gradually through scaffolded opportunities that allow students to experience success before engaging in more demanding speaking tasks. Activities designed to provide early success and supportive feedback may further strengthen students' confidence. For speaking development, confidence should be explicitly nurtured through classroom practices that promote acceptance, encouragement, and gradual exposure to communicative challenges.

G. Contextual Influence in Instructional Procedures

This section discusses the contextual factors that influence the implementation of instructional procedures in English speaking instruction at Mukhtarul Amin Islamic Boarding School. The findings indicate that instructional procedures do not operate independently within the classroom but are closely connected to the broader educational environment in which teaching and learning take place. In the context of a boarding school, students' learning experiences are shaped not only by classroom activities but also by daily routines, language use beyond the classroom, and institutional support provided by the school. Therefore, this discussion focuses on three key contextual aspects identified in the findings, namely the boarding school learning environment, the use of English beyond the classroom, and institutional support. These aspects are examined in relation to relevant theories and previous studies to explore how contextual conditions may facilitate or constrain the effectiveness of instructional procedures and students' opportunities to develop their English speaking skills. Through this discussion, the study seeks to provide a broader understanding of the role of contextual factors in supporting sustainable speaking development within the boarding school setting.

1. Boarding School Learning Environment

The classroom observation revealed that the learning process takes place within an integrated boarding school (*pesantren*) environment, where students live and study in the same institutional setting. This environment is not limited to classroom activities but is connected to students' daily routines in the dormitory, creating a 24-hour structured learning context. The school implements a disciplined schedule and incorporates Islamic values into students' academic and non-academic activities, which shapes the overall learning atmosphere. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants responding positively to this setting and highlighting structured routines and a disciplined atmosphere as helpful. Participant S7 stated, "I think studying in this boarding school helps me because everything is well organized, from study time to daily activities, so I can focus more on learning." Participant S14 mentioned, "The environment here is disciplined and connected with Islamic values, so it makes me more responsible in managing my study and behavior." Participant S21 added, "Since we live and study in the same place, I feel learning becomes more consistent and easier to follow." These findings indicate that the boarding school environment provides conditions that facilitate learning.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that the boarding school environment functions as a valuable institutional resource that can support speaking development rather than hinder it. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) discussion of extrinsic factors, which emphasizes that learning environments may either facilitate or constrain student development. The findings suggest that the boarding school context provides a supportive institutional structure extending beyond classroom instruction. An encouraging aspect is that this environment offers opportunities for continuous learning and interaction, although such potential has not yet been fully utilized for English practice, as indicated by the challenge of limited practice time identified earlier. From an analytical perspective, the boarding school setting represents an institutional resource that can provide additional opportunities for language use if appropriately managed. The positive perceptions expressed by students indicate that this environment has the potential to support English development more extensively. This pattern is associated with Brophy's emphasis on environmental support, Horwitz and Cope's view that structured contexts reduce uncertainty and anxiety, and Liu's argument that consistent environments contribute to positive affect and enjoyment.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which highlights the importance of extrinsic environmental support in facilitating learning. The boarding school setting provides a structured context that may promote more consistent skill development. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is also relevant, as predictable routines and clearly established expectations may reduce uncertainty and minimize anxiety-provoking situations. Liu's (2022) research further suggests that stable and supportive environments contribute to the development of positive emotions and enjoyment in language learning. In addition, Sari and Sari (2025) emphasize that Indonesian boarding schools offer distinctive environments that may support language development. The present findings provide further evidence supporting this perspective.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that the boarding school environment functions as a facilitating resource rather than as a challenge, representing a potential asset that can be utilized to strengthen English practice. Practically, the boarding school context offers opportunities to extend language learning beyond formal classroom instruction. Schools may take advantage of dormitory life and daily routines by incorporating English-related activities and increasing opportunities for language exposure throughout the day. Establishing English-speaking programs within the existing disciplinary structure may further support communicative competence development. For speaking development, this positive environment provides a strong foundation for addressing the challenge of limited practice opportunities identified in previous findings.

2. Use of English Beyond Classroom

The classroom observation revealed that the use of English beyond the classroom was very limited. Students were found to rarely use English in their daily interactions outside formal English lessons. In most situations, communication in the school environment and dormitory was predominantly conducted in Indonesian or the local language. English usage

only appeared in specific or guided situations, such as during classroom activities or when prompted by the teacher in certain contexts. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that they rarely used English in daily communication outside English lessons. Participant S3 stated, "I rarely use English outside the class because my friends also use Indonesian, so it feels more natural." Participant S11 mentioned, "We only use English when the teacher asks us to, but outside the class we usually speak Indonesian." Participant S20 added, "I try to use English sometimes, but most of the time in the dormitory we still use our daily language." These findings indicate that English functions primarily as an academic subject rather than as a medium of communication.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that limited English use beyond the classroom functions as an extrinsic challenge related to the underutilization of environmental resources. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) category of extrinsic challenges, in which insufficient opportunities and environmental support hinder language development. A concerning aspect is that English remains largely confined to classroom activities despite the extended interaction opportunities available within the boarding school environment. This represents a missed opportunity for communicative development. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that this issue may be addressed through environmental restructuring rather than through major changes in instructional practices. From an analytical perspective, this challenge is closely connected to the boarding school context, which provides considerable potential for language use but has not yet been fully utilized. This pattern is associated with Brophy's emphasis on environmental support, Horwitz and Cope's explanation that limited practice opportunities may sustain speaking anxiety, and Liu's view that restricted language use may reduce enjoyment in learning English.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that extrinsic challenges include inadequate environmental support for target language use. Despite the boarding school setting, English continues to function mainly within formal instructional contexts. This finding also reflects the resource limitations identified by Sari and Sari (2025), which suggest that without structured opportunities for language use, English tends to remain an academic subject rather than a communication tool. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is relevant because limited opportunities for authentic communication may prevent students from developing confidence through successful experiences. Liu's (2022) research further indicates that restricted functional use of English may reduce foreign language enjoyment, limiting students' ability to develop positive attitudes toward English as a means of communication. The implication is that this challenge requires environmental modification in addition to instructional improvement.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that English functions primarily as an academic subject rather than as a communicative tool, limiting development to linguistic knowledge while constraining broader communicative competence development. Practically, schools may establish English-speaking zones and designated

periods for English use within dormitories and other common areas. Implementing English-based activities outside the classroom and encouraging peer accountability for English use may further increase opportunities for authentic communication. This finding is closely related to the challenge of limited practice time, as both reflect the underutilization of the learning environment. For speaking development, naturalistic language use beyond the classroom is essential for fostering communicative competence that extends beyond grammatical accuracy.

3. Institutional Support

The classroom observation revealed that institutional support for English learning is relatively limited. This is indicated by the lack of structured English-related programs or activities beyond regular classroom instruction. In addition, English learning appears to rely mainly on classroom teaching without additional institutional initiatives to strengthen students' exposure to the language. The observation also suggests that the availability of English learning resources and structured support from the institution is minimal, which may affect the consistency of students' language practice. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants indicating that there were few English-related programs outside the classroom. Participant S6 stated, "I think there are not many English programs here outside the class, so we mostly just learn during lessons." Participant S13 mentioned, "If the school provides more English activities, I think learning English would be more enjoyable." Participant S22 added, "It would be better if there were more support like English clubs or programs, so we can practice more and enjoy learning." These findings indicate that institutional support is limited, although students express a desire for additional opportunities.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that limited institutional support functions as an extrinsic challenge that constrains speaking development despite students' positive attitudes toward additional learning opportunities. This aligns with Brophy's (2019) category of extrinsic challenges, in which inadequate resources and insufficient institutional support restrict language development beyond classroom instruction. An encouraging aspect of the findings is that students explicitly express the need for greater support, demonstrating their willingness to engage in additional English-related activities. At the same time, a concern emerges that without institutional initiatives, opportunities for language development will remain largely confined to formal lessons. From an analytical perspective, this issue represents a resource-related factor requiring institutional commitment. While student motivation and interest appear to be present, broader support mechanisms are necessary to translate these positive attitudes into sustained language practice. This pattern is associated with Brophy's emphasis on institutional support, Horwitz and Cope's view that limited opportunities may restrict confidence-building experiences, and Liu's argument that additional programs may enhance enjoyment and positive affect in language learning.

These findings align with Brophy's (2019) motivation theory, which suggests that extrinsic challenges include insufficient institutional support for learning beyond the classroom. This finding is also consistent with the resource limitations identified by Sari and Sari (2025) within Indonesian

educational contexts. Horwitz and Cope's (2021) framework of speaking anxiety is relevant because limited institutional opportunities may reduce students' chances to develop confidence through repeated successful experiences. Liu's (2022) research is particularly applicable, as students' comments indicate a desire for more enjoyable and engaging opportunities for English use, while institutional limitations restrict the development of positive emotions associated with language learning. The implication is that this challenge may be addressed through increased institutional commitment and the provision of additional learning opportunities that correspond to students' expressed needs.

Theoretically, this extends the analytical framework by demonstrating that limitations in institutional support represent challenges that can potentially be addressed through greater resource allocation and institutional commitment. Students' expressed desire for additional support suggests that they are receptive to such initiatives. Practically, schools may establish English clubs, language programs, and extracurricular activities to provide structured opportunities for English use beyond regular classroom instruction. Expanding institutional support would also address several related challenges, including limited practice time and restricted use of English outside the classroom. For speaking development, stronger institutional commitment has the potential to create the sustained practice opportunities necessary for the development of communicative competence.

H. Teacher Support in Instructional Procedures

Teacher support emerged as an important aspect influencing the implementation of instructional procedures in the speaking classroom. The findings indicate that the teacher played an active role not only in delivering learning activities but also in facilitating students' participation through guidance, language input, feedback, and motivational encouragement. Throughout the instructional process, teacher support was observed in various forms, including providing clear directions, modeling language use, assisting students during activities, and offering feedback on their performance. The interview data further confirmed that students perceived these forms of support as helpful in understanding learning tasks and participating in speaking activities. Therefore, teacher support can be understood as a significant element that contributes to the effectiveness of instructional procedures and students' engagement in the learning process.

1. Instructional Procedural Support

The classroom observation revealed generally positive evidence of instructional and procedural support provided by the teacher during the learning process. The teacher was observed giving clear directions at the beginning of activities and guiding students step by step during task execution. When students appeared confused, the teacher provided additional clarification and assistance to help them proceed with the tasks. In several instances, the teacher also actively monitored students' work by moving around the classroom to ensure understanding and engagement. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that the teacher's explanations and step-by-step guidance helped them understand the tasks. Participant S5 stated, "The teacher usually explains the steps clearly, so I know what I have to do

in the activity." Participant S13 mentioned, "If I don't understand, the teacher will explain again, so I can continue the task." Participant S21 added, "The teacher guides us step by step, especially when we do speaking activities, so it is easier to follow." These findings indicate that instructional support follows systematic phases.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that instructional procedures appear to follow systematic phases that correspond to the sequence of presentation, practice, and application described by Richards and Rodgers (2014). This is also consistent with Harmer's (2022) view that structured procedures help students progress from controlled activities toward more communicative forms of speaking. The evidence suggests the presence of a systematic approach, as teachers provide clear explanations, guide students through activities, and facilitate opportunities for independent practice. However, this interpretation represents an initial analytical categorization, and the extent to which each phase is consistently implemented requires further examination. From an analytical perspective, the findings suggest that instructional procedures may be categorized as systematic when all phases are adequately represented within the teaching process.

These findings align with Richards and Rodgers' (2014) three-phase framework, which emphasizes the importance of presentation, guided practice, and independent application in language instruction. The presentation phase is reflected in the teacher's explanations and directions, guided practice is evident through step-by-step assistance, and independent application appears in speaking activities that encourage students to use English more actively. Harmer's (2022) perspective on structured procedures further supports the importance of scaffolding learners from controlled to freer communicative activities. In addition, Halim et al. (2024) highlight the teacher's role as a facilitator who supports learning through explanation, guidance, and monitoring. The implication is that systematic instructional procedures provide conditions that facilitate speaking development.

Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by providing criteria for distinguishing systematic from less systematic instructional procedures based on the presence of key instructional phases. Practically, the findings suggest that evaluating the implementation of presentation, practice, and application phases may provide a useful basis for analyzing instructional quality. Ensuring that all phases are consistently implemented can contribute to more coherent learning experiences. For speaking development, systematic instructional procedures provide opportunities for gradual skill progression and support the development of communicative competence.

2. Modeling and Language Input

The classroom observation revealed positive evidence of the teacher's language input and modeling support during instructional procedures. The teacher frequently provided examples of correct expressions before students engaged in speaking activities, particularly when introducing new material or tasks. This modeling helped students understand how to construct responses and use appropriate language forms. In addition, the teacher occasionally demonstrated pronunciation and sample dialogues to guide students' speaking performance.

The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that the teacher's examples and demonstrations helped them understand how to speak in English. Participant S8 stated, "The teacher gives examples first, so I know how to make sentences when speaking." Participant S16 mentioned, "I usually follow how the teacher says the words, especially for pronunciation." Participant S22 added, "The example from the teacher helps me when I want to speak but don't know how to start." These findings indicate that modeling supports the presentation phase of instruction.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that teacher modeling functions as a form of support within the presentation phase of systematic instructional procedures. This aligns with Richards and Rodgers' (2014) framework, which emphasizes the importance of presenting language forms clearly before learners engage in practice. The evidence suggests that modeling serves as an essential component that prepares students for subsequent speaking activities by providing examples of appropriate language use. Nevertheless, the data also indicate that the frequency and consistency of modeling may vary, as demonstrations were described as occasional rather than consistently implemented. From an analytical perspective, the findings provide evidence of the presentation component of instruction, although further examination is necessary to determine the consistency with which this component is implemented across learning activities.

These findings align with Richards and Rodgers' (2014) three-phase framework, in which the presentation phase involves introducing learners to appropriate language forms before they proceed to practice activities. Teacher modeling represents a key aspect of this phase because it provides students with examples of how language should be used. Harmer (2022) similarly emphasizes the importance of modeling as a form of scaffolding that enables learners to produce language more accurately during subsequent practice. In addition, Johnson and Burns (2023) identify providing examples and demonstrations as important teacher roles in language learning. The present findings indicate that these roles are evident within the observed instructional procedures. The implication is that teacher modeling constitutes an important element of the presentation phase and contributes to the development of speaking ability.

Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by providing evidence for the presence of the presentation phase within systematic instructional procedures. Consistent modeling strengthens this phase and supports the effectiveness of subsequent learning activities. Practically, teachers should maintain regular and explicit modeling before speaking activities to ensure that students have clear examples of language use. The use of varied forms of modeling, including dialogues, pronunciation demonstrations, and structural examples, may further enhance students' understanding. For speaking development, accurate and consistent modeling provides learners with the foundation necessary for more effective and confident language production.

3. Feedback and Motivational Support

The classroom observation revealed that the teacher provided feedback and motivational support during

instructional procedures, although the intensity varied depending on the activities and time constraints. Feedback was mainly given after speaking tasks, focusing on correcting pronunciation, grammar, or sentence structure in a brief and direct manner. In addition, the teacher occasionally provided encouragement to students to participate and attempt speaking in English, especially for those who appeared hesitant. However, feedback was not always systematic or evenly distributed among all students. The interview data confirmed these observations, with participants reporting that feedback helped them identify mistakes, particularly in pronunciation and sentence structure, although it was sometimes brief. Participant S9 stated, "The teacher usually corrects our mistakes, especially pronunciation, so I know what I should improve." Participant S14 mentioned, "When I feel nervous, the teacher sometimes encourages me to try speaking, so I feel a bit more confident." Participant S19 added, "The feedback is helpful, but sometimes it is only given to a few students because of limited time." These findings indicate that feedback supports both the practice and application phases of instruction.

Interpretively, these findings reveal that feedback and motivational support function as essential components of the practice phase, although their implementation appears to be constrained by time and uneven distribution. This aligns with Richards and Rodgers' (2014) framework, which emphasizes the role of guided practice and corrective feedback in preparing learners for independent language use. The findings indicate that feedback provides students with opportunities to recognize and correct their errors before applying their knowledge more independently. Nevertheless, a concern emerges regarding the inconsistency of feedback distribution, as unequal access to feedback may result in unequal opportunities for improvement. From an analytical perspective, these findings provide evidence of the practice phase within instructional procedures, while also highlighting the need for more consistent implementation to ensure equitable learning opportunities.

These findings align with Richards and Rodgers' (2014) three-phase framework, in which feedback constitutes an essential aspect of the practice phase and facilitates the transition toward independent application. Without appropriate feedback, practice activities may unintentionally reinforce inaccuracies. Harmer (2022) similarly emphasizes the importance of feedback for the development of accuracy, arguing that learners require information about their performance in order to improve. In addition, Tajeddin and Shirkhani (2025) identify correction and encouragement as important aspects of the teacher's role in language learning. The present findings suggest that these functions are evident, although their implementation remains partial due to practical constraints. The implication is that feedback supports the progression from guided practice to more independent language use, although certain limitations affect its effectiveness.

Theoretically, these findings extend the analytical framework by demonstrating that the practice phase may be present even when feedback is implemented inconsistently. Practically, teachers should strive to provide feedback more systematically and ensure that all students receive opportunities for correction and encouragement. Peer feedback

may also serve as a useful strategy for increasing feedback coverage when time is limited. Maintaining motivational support is equally important, particularly for hesitant learners who require encouragement to participate. This finding is also related to the challenge of uneven participation, as unequal access to feedback may further reinforce differences in students' speaking development. For speaking development, feedback plays a crucial role in promoting accuracy and supporting continuous improvement.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the implementation of instructional procedures in teaching English speaking ability about self-introduction in the boarding school context generally facilitated students' participation and provided opportunities for meaningful speaking practice, although the procedures were not always implemented in a fully systematic manner. The classroom activities broadly followed the stages of introduction, practice, and performance, yet inconsistencies in sequencing, transitions between activities, and time limitations occasionally reduced the clarity and coherence of the instructional flow. Variations in teacher modeling, guided practice, and independent performance further demonstrated that students required different levels of support according to their proficiency and readiness.

The findings also indicate that classroom interaction and student engagement played a significant role in shaping the effectiveness of speaking instruction. Teacher–student and student–student interactions created opportunities for communication, although participation and turn-taking were unevenly distributed, with some students being more active than others. While behavioral and emotional engagement were generally positive, cognitive engagement remained relatively limited, as students tended to rely on simple responses and memorized language rather than deeper reflection and elaboration. Similarly, students' confidence in speaking English varied considerably, with vocabulary limitations and fear of making mistakes influencing their willingness to participate.

Furthermore, both students and the teacher perceived the instructional procedures positively, particularly regarding their contribution to the development of speaking ability. Students considered repeated practice, pair work, and speaking performances beneficial in improving their confidence and encouraging active use of English. Their perceptions suggest that effective learning was associated more with active participation and opportunities for practice than with the strict organization of instructional stages. Interactive activities also contributed to students' interest and enjoyment, creating a supportive and comfortable learning atmosphere.

Despite these positive outcomes, several challenges were identified throughout the instructional process. Students experienced difficulties related to limited vocabulary, low confidence, and anxiety about making mistakes, while classroom conditions and unequal participation sometimes affected the clarity of instruction and the quality of interaction. In addition, the frequent use of the first language during peer interaction indicated that English was not yet consistently

utilized as the primary means of communication. These findings suggest that the success of instructional procedures depends not only on the presence of speaking activities but also on the consistency of instructional sequencing, the provision of adequate scaffolding, and the creation of learning environments that promote equitable participation and sustained use of the target language.

Overall, this study demonstrates that instructional procedures have the potential to support the development of students' English speaking ability in boarding school settings by promoting engagement, participation, and confidence. However, maximizing their effectiveness requires more systematic implementation, balanced classroom interaction, and continuous support that addresses both linguistic and affective challenges faced by learners. Such improvements may contribute to the creation of more meaningful and communicative speaking instruction, enabling students to develop greater confidence and competence in using English in authentic contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Annisa, T. M. (2023). *Teaching Strategies For Speaking Skills: Teachers' Implementation and Students Opinion*. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i1.3463>
- [2] Aslonova, H. (2020). Defining The Concepts "Competence" And "Communicative Competence." 02(08), 490–493. <https://doi.org/10.37547/TAJSSSEI/VOLUME02ISSUE08-79>
- [3] Bajri, I. A., & Elmahdi, O. E. H. (2024). Addressing Language Anxiety in the EFL Classroom: EFL Teachers' Perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(7), 2222–2232. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.30>
- [4] Barikmo, K. R. (2021). Deep Learning Requires Effective Questions during Instruction. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 57(3), 126–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2021.1935505>
- [5] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
- [6] Brophy, J. (2019). *Motivating students to learn* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [7] Burns, A., & Siegel, J. (2020). *International perspectives on teaching the four skills in EFL: Listening, speaking, reading, writing*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22979-7>
- [8] 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/1.1.1>
- [9] Carlton, J., Brown, A., Jay, C., & Keane, J. A. (2021). Using Interaction Data to Predict Engagement with Interactive Media. 1258–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3474085.3475631>
- [10] Chang, F., Huo, Y., Zhang, S., Zeng, H., & Tang, B. (2023). The impact of boarding schools on the development of cognitive and non-cognitive abilities in

- adolescents. *BMC Public Health*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16748-8>
- [11] Chen, S., Hu, Z., Kang, S. W., & Wang, A. (2024). Krashen's Input Hypothesis Revisited: Current Perspectives and Future Directions. *Arts, Culture and Language*, 1(7). <https://doi.org/10.61173/9f62nt19>
- [12] Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2022). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [13] Ellis, R. (2020). Task-based language teaching. In J. C. Richards & J. H. Hull (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 145–160). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108777697.012>
- [14] Engwall, O., Cumbal, R., Lopes, J., Ljung, M., & Månsson, L. (2022). Identification of Low-engaged Learners in Robot-led Second Language Conversations with Adults. *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, 11(2), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503799>
- [15] Eslit, E. R. (2025). *English Language Teaching (ELT) Best Practices: A Post-Pandemic Language Teaching Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202503.0597.v1>
- [16] Fatimah, A. F. (2025). The Influence of Emotional Engagement on Sentence Comprehension Process in a Second Language. 1(2), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.59784/jpl.v1i2.6>
- [17] Ghafar, Z. N., & Raheem, B. (2023). Factors Affecting Speaking Proficiency in English Language Learning: A general overview of the speaking skill. *Sahoe Gwahag Nonchong*. <https://doi.org/10.57185/joss.v2i6.107>
- [18] Gilmore, A. (2022). Effective teacher roles in EFL speaking instruction: From facilitator to orchestrator. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab063>
- [19] Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2021). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108874791>
- [20] Gokce, S., & Kecik, I. (2021). English Language Teachers' Cognition in Handling Learners' Speaking Problems. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 21(26). <https://doi.org/10.14689/ENAD.26.14>
- [21] Guardia, A., Vinaja, R., & Waggoner, F. I. (2020). Student e-Textbook Engagement and Performance Outcomes. 125–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45730-3_11
- [22] Halim, A., Yang, C. C., & Nasril, N. (2024). *Voices in the Classroom: Unraveling the Impact of Teacher Beliefs on Speaking Skills*. <https://doi.org/10.31332/alg.v4i2.4164>
- [23] Halim, N., Kasim, N. A., & Pratiwi, D. F. (2025). Developing speaking proficiency in Indonesian EFL classrooms: a qualitative study on challenges and solutions. *THE ACADEMIC: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING JOURNAL*, 10(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.52208/aellj.v10i1.1384>
- [24] Harding, L. (2022). Pronunciation Assessment. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0966.pu.b2>
- [25] Harmer, J. (2022). *The practice of English language teaching* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [26] Haryani, H., Febrianto, A. R., Rahmawati, Y., & Sulistyorini, D. (2025). Exploring Communication Strategies in EFL Conversations: A Study of Job Seeker and Employee Students in an English Course. *Journal of English Education Program*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v6i2.95534>
- [27] Horwitz, E. K., & Cope, J. (2021). Foreign language classroom anxiety. In C. M. Keys (Ed.), *Research in language teaching* (pp. 89–107). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46816-7_6
- [28] Johnson, M. L., & Burns, E. (2023). Characteristics of effective models for classroom demonstrations. *Theory Into Practice*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2023.2226552>
- [29] Kirkpatrick, A. (2021). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003017624>
- [30] Krashen, S. D. (2022). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications* (Updated ed.). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [31] Krismiati, K., & Yulia, H. (2022). The relationship between student engagement and their perception of success in online learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi Dan Kejuruan*, 29(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jptk.v29i1.53966>
- [32] Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2021). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education: Vygotskian praxis and the research/practice divide* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [33] Levelt, W. J. M. (2022). *Speaking: From intention to articulation* (Updated ed.). MIT Press.
- [34] Lie, A., Harjanto, I., & Sriemulyaningsih, M. J. K. (2025). English Language Education in Indonesia at the Primary School Level: Challenges and Opportunities. *Springer International Handbooks of Education*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-3901-4_35-1
- [35] Liu, S. (2022). Toward the Role of L2 Enjoyment in EFL Students' Academic Motivation and Engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.822588>
- [36] Loppies, H. J., & Patty, J. (2024). EFL in-service teachers' efficacy beliefs: findings from an underdeveloped Indonesian context. *Premise*, 13(3), 1084–1084. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.10939>
- [37] Mahulette, A., & Sasole, C. E. (2025). Analysis of Students' Speaking and Grammar's Performance through Task Based Learning Approach. <https://doi.org/10.30598/matail.v6i1.22502>
- [38] Mawaddah, A. N. (2025). Task-based language teaching for workplace-oriented speaking in vocational education: a qualitative case study. *International Journal of Research on English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.30863/ijretal.v6i2.11106>

- [39] Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [40] Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2021). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429321234>
- [41] Nouri, Z., Gadiraju, U., Engels, G., & Wachsmuth, H. (2021). What Is Unclear? Computational Assessment of Task Clarity in Crowdsourcing. 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465336.3475109>
- [42] Nugroho, A., & Nartiningrum, N. (2020). Classroom activities for teaching speaking: voices of Indonesian EFL learners. 9(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.31571/BAHASA.V9I1.1689>
- [43] Patton, M. Q. (2021). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [44] qizi, E. G. R. (2025). Effective Strategies for Teaching Speaking in ESL Classroom. *American Journal Of Philological Sciences*, 5(6), 45–47. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/volume05issue06-13>
- [45] Riana, N. A., Siliwangi, D. P., & Nadia, A. A. (2024). Understanding EFL Learners' Experiences with Interactive Exercises for Building Vocabulary Skills. *Dewantara*, 3(4), 236–246. <https://doi.org/10.30640/dewantara.v3i4.3595>
- [46] Richards, J. C. (2020). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- [47] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [48] Rizqiyanti, R. (2023). Exploring Teachers' Instructional Strategies to Facilitate the Oral Fluency of EFL Beginner Level Students. *English Learning Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v4i2.26785>
- [49] Sabeti, P. C. (2022). Effective pronunciation teaching. 281–295. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003106609-23>
- [50] Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [51] Sari, D. M., & Sari, D. M. (2025). Speaking Challenges of High and Low Achieving EFL Students in Indonesian Pesantren: A Comparative Study. *Al Hikmah*, 6(2), 185–185. <https://doi.org/10.54168/ahje.v6i2.434>
- [52] Siladi, V. (2025). Applying speaking strategies in the EFL classroom. 168–171. <https://doi.org/10.62731/mcnd-11.07.2025.007>
- [53] Simbolon, V. (2025). Understanding the strategies employed by EFL learners to overcome speaking anxiety in the classroom. 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.70152/mirej.v1i1.21>
- [54] Sudirman. (2024). Creating an Effective English Environment for Indonesian Speakers: Strategies and Challenges. <https://doi.org/10.58738/joladu.v3i1.1142>
- [55] Tajeddin, Z., & Shirkhani, S. (2025). Language Teachers' Corrective Feedback Practice: Impact of a Teacher Education Course on Feedback Types, Uptake, and Interactional Moves. *TESL-EJ*, 29(2). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.29114a1>
- [56] Tsunemoto, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2024). Coherence and Comprehensibility in Second Language Speakers' Academic Speaking Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263124000305>
- [57] Uktamovn, K. L., o'g'li, K. J. S., o'g'li, R. J. K., o'g'li, B. A. G., & Centre, W. K. P. (2026). The role of listening and speaking tasks in developing students' oral communicative competence in English language classes. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18329052>
- [58] Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2022). *Doing task-based teaching* (Updated ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [59] Xamidullayeva, F. (2025). *Theoretical basis of forming speaking skills in learning a foreign language*. 506–514. <https://doi.org/10.52773/tsuull.conf.2025/aykq1622>
- [60] Yasuda, R. (2022). Fluency development through freewriting and transfer to other more structured tasks. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221084>
- [61] Yin, R. K. (2022). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.