

The Effectiveness of Self-Regulated Learning-Based Instruction on the Speaking Ability of Seventh-Grade Students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo

Bagoes Adhiyanto Putra Pratama | English Language Education, Universitas Islam Majapahit, Mojokerto, Indonesia

Rini Lindawati | English Language Education, Universitas Islam Majapahit, Mojokerto, Indonesia

Nurhayati Ganind | English Language Education, Universitas Islam Majapahit, Mojokerto, Indonesia

bagusadhiyanto56@gmail.com

Abstrak

This study aims to describe the English speaking ability of seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo, Mojokerto, before and after the implementation of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL)-based instruction. The approach used was quantitative with a one-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design involving eight students selected through purposive sampling from a population of 30 seventh-grade students. The treatment was administered over four meetings using three supporting instruments, namely the Target Score Matrix, the SRL Focus Monitoring Sheet, and the Self-Reflective Log, each representing the forethought, performance, and self-reflection stages of the SRL cycle. Students' speaking ability was assessed through an oral monologue task covering five components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, with a score range of 1–5 per component. The results of the analysis showed that the mean score increased from 15.38 at pretest to 19.88 at posttest, a mean difference of 4.50 points. A paired-samples t-test showed a significant difference, $t(7) = -11.906$, $p < .001$, while Cohen's d of 4.21 indicated a very large within-group change. The greatest improvement was found in the fluency component. Because this study involved only eight students without a comparison group, the findings only describe the change within the group studied and cannot be broadly generalized.

Keywords: Self-Regulated Learning; speaking ability; oral monologue; EFL learning; seventh-grade students

Introduction

Speaking is one of the productive skills that is most decisive in learning English as a foreign language (EFL). Unlike receptive skills, speaking requires learners to actively produce language by simultaneously integrating knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and communication strategies so that meaning can be conveyed effectively (Brown, 2004; Richards, 2008). Therefore, speaking ability is often regarded as a key indicator of communicative competence and overall English proficiency. Although learners may achieve good results on written tests, meaningful language learning still requires them to be able to convey ideas orally in authentic situations.

Adequate speaking proficiency not only supports language development but also contributes to students' overall academic achievement. Students who are able to convey ideas clearly tend to be more active in class discussions, more confident in answering questions, and more able to collaborate with peers. Through regular oral interaction, students gain opportunities to organize their ideas, deepen their understanding of the material, and practice critical thinking through communication with others. At the junior secondary level, speaking ability becomes an important foundation for English learning at subsequent levels, so its development needs to be introduced early rather than postponed until students reach a higher level of proficiency.

In reality, speaking remains a challenging area for many EFL learners, including in Indonesia (Sukma, 2022). Good mastery of grammar and vocabulary does not always correspond directly to oral communication ability, particularly when students are required to speak spontaneously. Some students tend to be hesitant, have difficulty finding the right words, produce grammatically inaccurate sentences, or speak with limited fluency. This gap between language knowledge and actual speaking performance confirms the need for a learning approach that provides adequate support for the development of oral communication.

Previous studies have identified a number of classroom factors that influence the development of students' speaking ability. One commonly found issue is the limited opportunity for students to practice speaking during the learning process. Limited class time, large numbers of students, and an assessment orientation that emphasizes written aspects more heavily cause meaningful speaking practice to be less than optimal. Under these conditions, teachers tend to focus more on language aspects that are easier to assess in writing, such as grammar and reading comprehension, so that students' opportunities to develop their speaking ability through sustained interaction become limited.

In addition to instructional factors, a number of studies have also highlighted the importance of learner autonomy in the language learning process. Many students are still highly dependent on teacher direction and have minimal involvement in practicing English independently outside of class. They rarely set their own learning targets, monitor their own progress, or reflect on the effectiveness of the learning strategies they use. Because the development of speaking ability requires consistent practice and active participation, low learner autonomy has the potential to hinder students from independently improving their speaking ability.

English is a compulsory subject at the junior secondary level in Indonesia, including in Islamic junior secondary schools (Madrasah Tsanawiyah/MTs) (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). The national curriculum emphasizes the development of students' communicative competence through interpersonal and transactional communication, so that English instruction needs to provide adequate space for students to practice speaking while also encouraging them to take greater responsibility for their own learning process.

As an initial step, a preliminary speaking assessment was conducted on seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo to identify prospective research participants. This assessment involved eight students based on data and observations of speaking performance available at the school, and was used solely for the purpose of participant selection, not as a formal pretest for the study. The assessment results showed that all eight students obtained scores below the school's Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM). Based on the five-component analytic speaking rating scale with a range of 1–5 per component (maximum score of 25), the school's English KKM of 75 on a scale of 100 is equivalent to a score of 18.75 on the 25-point scale. Because the rating scale uses whole numbers, the operational mastery threshold was set at a score of 19; students with scores of 19–25 were categorized as having achieved mastery, while those scoring below 19 were categorized as not yet having achieved mastery. These results formed the basis for determining participants through

purposive sampling, with the consideration that students whose initial achievement was still low were deemed to be most in need of additional support in developing their speaking ability. Because the sampling was purposive rather than random, the results of this preliminary assessment cannot be used to describe the speaking ability of all seventh-grade students in general, but only serve as the basis for selecting research participants.

Various instructional approaches have been implemented to improve students' speaking ability, yet most still emphasize teacher-led classroom activities. Attention to approaches that encourage students to manage their own learning while developing their speaking ability remains relatively limited, particularly at the junior secondary level in the Indonesian EFL context. This condition underscores the need for further research into instructional approaches capable of combining meaningful speaking practice with the strengthening of learner autonomy.

Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) is widely known as an instructional approach that encourages students to take an active role in managing their own learning process. Rather than relying entirely on teacher direction, students are encouraged to set learning goals, select appropriate strategies, monitor their progress, and evaluate their own learning outcomes (Zimmerman, 2000). SRL is generally described as a cyclical process consisting of three interrelated stages, namely forethought (planning), performance (implementation and monitoring), and self-reflection. The principles of SRL are highly relevant to English language learning because language proficiency develops through continuous practice that is not limited to classroom activities alone. Previous studies have also reported that learners who actively regulate their own learning tend to show higher engagement, more effective use of learning strategies, and better learning outcomes compared to students who rely solely on teacher direction (An et al., 2021).

Based on the conceptual framework of SRL and previous research findings, Self-Regulated Learning-based instruction is considered an appropriate approach for improving students' speaking ability. Through goal-setting, self-monitoring, strategy implementation, and self-reflection activities, students are expected to take a more active role in managing their own learning while gradually developing their oral communication ability. Therefore, this study aims to examine the effectiveness of Self-Regulated Learning-based instruction in improving the speaking ability of seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo, Mojokerto, by formulating two research questions: (1) what is students' speaking ability before the implementation of SRL-based instruction, and (2) is there a significant difference in students' speaking ability before and after the implementation of that instruction. The findings of this study are expected to provide empirical evidence regarding the implementation of SRL-based instruction at the junior secondary level in Indonesia, as well as practical implications for English language teaching, particularly speaking instruction.

Literature Review

Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) has received considerable attention in English language education because it encourages students to take an active role in managing their own learning. Various studies have consistently shown that students who apply SRL strategies, such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-reflection, tend to demonstrate greater learning autonomy, stronger engagement, and better language learning outcomes across various educational contexts (An et al., 2021).

Nurjanah et al. (2021) examined the implementation of SRL strategies in an online speaking class and found that planning, monitoring, and reflection activities encouraged students to take greater responsibility for their own learning and increased participation in speaking practice. However, that study focused on the learning experience in an online environment and did not quantitatively measure changes in speaking ability. This study complements those findings by using

a quantitative one-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design to measure changes in students' speaking ability after the direct implementation of SRL-based instruction in the classroom.

Öztürk and Çakıroğlu (2021) examined the integration of SRL strategies in a flipped-learning-based EFL classroom and found that SRL supported students' autonomy, engagement, and active participation. However, that study focused more on English language learning in general within a technology-based environment, rather than specifically on speaking ability. In contrast, this study assesses students' speaking ability through the direct implementation of SRL-based instruction using paper-based classroom activities.

The contribution of SRL has also been examined in relation to secondary school students' English writing ability. Bai and Wang (2021) found that students who applied SRL strategies more frequently tended to produce better writing because they were able to regulate their learning process more effectively. Although this finding supports the benefits of SRL in English language learning, that study focused only on writing ability. This study extends that line of research by examining the role of SRL in the development of speaking ability.

Technology-based SRL has also been examined in relation to English learning outcomes. An et al. (2021) found a positive relationship between technology-assisted SRL strategies, English self-efficacy, learning enjoyment, and overall learning outcomes. However, that study used a correlational survey design with university students and did not involve a classroom learning intervention or direct speaking assessment. This study, by contrast, examines the effectiveness of SRL-based instruction through a direct classroom intervention with junior secondary school students.

Evidence from Islamic-affiliated secondary schools also shows that SRL can support the development of students' speaking ability while also taking students' confidence into account. Muhsinin et al. (2025) found that encouraging students to regulate their own learning made a positive contribution to speaking achievement and learning responsibility, although self-confidence was also included as an additional variable. This study focuses specifically on the instructional effectiveness of SRL-based learning without examining psychological variables, while the similarity in educational context strengthens the contextual relevance of this study.

More recently, Fitriati and Willian (2025) explored artificial intelligence-based SRL to support EFL learners' presentation skills and found that the technology facilitated students' planning, monitoring, and reflection during presentation activities. Although presentation skills involve oral communication, they are not entirely equivalent to the speaking ability assessed in this study. Therefore, the relevance of that study lies in the application of the SRL process rather than in the construct of speaking ability itself. This study assesses students' monologue speaking ability through paper-based SRL instruments without involving artificial intelligence-based technology.

Overall, previous studies consistently show that Self-Regulated Learning makes a positive contribution to English language learning by fostering students' autonomy, responsibility, and active engagement. However, existing studies have focused more on online learning, technology-based learning, writing ability, presentation skills, or general English achievement. Empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of classroom SRL-based instruction on the monologue speaking ability of junior secondary school students remains relatively limited. To fill this gap, this study examines changes in the speaking ability of seventh-grade students after the implementation of SRL-based instruction using a quantitative one-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design.

Theoretically, SRL is understood as a learning process in which students actively regulate their thoughts, motivation, and learning behavior in order to achieve specific goals (Zimmerman, 2000). Zimmerman (2000) explains that SRL consists of three cyclical stages, namely forethought (planning goals and strategies before learning), performance (implementing strategies accompanied

by self-monitoring), and self-reflection (evaluating learning outcomes for future improvement). In this study, these three stages were operationalized respectively through the Target Score Matrix, the SRL Focus Monitoring Sheet, and the Self-Reflective Log.

Speaking ability, meanwhile, is understood as the ability to use English orally by integrating language knowledge and communicative competence to convey meaningful messages (Richards, 2008). Harris (1969) proposed five main components for assessing speaking ability, namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, which served as the reference framework for the assessment rubric in this study. These five components complement one another in describing students' overall speaking performance. Pronunciation relates to clarity of sound, word stress, and intonation; grammar relates to the accuracy of oral sentence structure; vocabulary relates to the accuracy and diversity of word choice; fluency describes the smoothness and continuity of speech delivery; and comprehension relates to the clarity and organization of the message conveyed so that it is easily understood by listeners (Harris, 1969). In the context of SRL-based instruction, these five components can become the focus of students' attention during the planning stage, be monitored during the implementation stage, and be evaluated during the reflection stage, so that students gain a clearer picture of which aspects of their speaking ability have developed and which still require improvement.

The link between SRL and speaking ability lies in the fact that the development of speaking skills requires students to take an active role in their own learning; students who regulate their own learning tend to practice more consistently, evaluate their own performance, and make improvements based on their learning experience. At the forethought stage, students prepare the goals and language resources needed before the speaking task; at the performance stage, students implement the strategies they have planned while monitoring their own performance; and at the self-reflection stage, students evaluate their learning outcomes to determine improvement strategies for the next opportunity (Zimmerman, 2000). Thus, the implementation of SRL-based instruction in speaking activities is expected to support the sustained improvement of students' speaking ability.

Research Method

This study used a quantitative approach with a one-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design (Creswell & Creswell, 2023), which was chosen because the study involved one pre-existing group of students without a comparison control group. The research population consisted of all seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo, Mojokerto, for the 2025/2026 academic year, totaling 30 students, divided into classes VII-A and VII-B with 15 students each. The sample was drawn from class VII-A through purposive sampling (Sugiyono, 2022) based on the results of the preliminary speaking assessment, consultation with the English teacher, and students' previous speaking performance, with the criteria of having experience with speaking activities, experiencing difficulty conveying ideas orally, showing limited participation, and being willing to take part in the study. Of the 15 students who took part in the initial stage of the study, only eight students completed the entire research procedure (pretest, treatment, and posttest), as the other seven students did not submit their posttest recordings by the specified deadline; therefore, the final analysis used data from only these eight students ($n = 8$). The main research instrument was an individual monologue speaking test assessed using an analytic rubric adapted from Harris's (1969) assessment criteria, covering five components—pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension—each scored from 1–5, giving a maximum total score of 25. The feasibility of the instrument was tested through content validation (expert judgment) by two English Language Education lecturers at Universitas Islam Majapahit, with validation results of 96.43% and 91.67% respectively, both categorized as highly valid (Akbar, 2017), and inter-rater reliability was tested

using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) with a two-way mixed-effects model, yielding an Average Measures ICC of 0.891, indicating good inter-rater consistency.

The research procedure consisted of three main stages: pretest, treatment, and posttest. The pretest was conducted to measure students' initial speaking ability through an individual monologue task on the theme of self-introduction, with five minutes of preparation time and a speaking duration of approximately two to three minutes without reading from a script. The treatment stage took place over four meetings, each lasting 80 minutes (2 x 40 minutes), with activities designed based on Zimmerman's (2000) SRL cycle: the first meeting focused on setting learning goals through the Target Score Matrix; the second and third meetings emphasized speaking practice accompanied by self-monitoring through the SRL Focus Monitoring Sheet as well as feedback and independent improvement; and the fourth meeting focused on final speaking practice and comprehensive reflection through the Self-Reflective Log. The consistency of treatment implementation was monitored using a fidelity checklist completed by the researcher at each meeting. The posttest was conducted using the same procedures, assessment criteria, preparation time, and speaking duration as the pretest, but with a different topic (daily activities and future plans) to reduce the possible influence of task familiarity. Each student's final score was obtained from the average score of two raters (the researcher and an English teacher at the school) who worked independently based on audio recordings that were coded to be free from bias related to student identity. The pretest and posttest data were then analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores), a Shapiro-Wilk normality test on the difference scores (given the small sample size, $n = 8$), a paired-samples t-test to examine the significance of the score difference, and the calculation of Cohen's d_z effect size to determine the magnitude of the within-group change (Cohen, 1988), with all statistical analyses processed using IBM SPSS Statistics.

Results and Discussion

Research Results

This section presents the research findings regarding the speaking ability of seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo before and after the implementation of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL)-based instruction. Data were obtained from a monologue speaking test assessed based on five components using an analytic rubric adapted from Harris (1969), with final scores calculated from the average of two independent raters. Inter-rater consistency was tested using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and showed good results (Average Measures ICC = 0.891), so the average score of the two raters was used as the primary data for all subsequent statistical analyses. Of the 15 students who took part in the initial stage of the study, only eight students completed the entire research procedure, and their data were analyzed in full.

Students' Speaking Ability Before the Implementation of SRL-Based Instruction

The first research question aimed to describe students' speaking ability before the implementation of SRL-based instruction. The pretest data for the eight students are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Pretest Scores and Descriptive Statistics of Students' Speaking Ability

No	Student Code	Pretest Score
1	S-1	18
2	S-2	14
3	S-3	17
4	S-4	13

5	S-5	15
6	S-6	18
7	S-7	15
8	S-8	13
	Mean	15.38
	Minimum Score	13
	Maximum Score	18
	Standard Deviation (SD)	2.066

Note: The ideal maximum score is 25 (five components $\times$ score of 1–5). Data processed by the researcher (2026).

Based on Table 1, students' pretest scores ranged from 13 to 18, with the highest scores obtained by S-1 and S-6 (18 each), while the lowest scores were obtained by S-4 and S-8 (13 each). The mean pretest score of 15.38 with a standard deviation of 2.066 indicates that students' initial speaking ability was still relatively low and varied. For descriptive comparison, when these scores are converted to a 100-point scale to be compared with the school's English Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM) of 75, all eight students (100%) were below the KKM before the implementation of SRL-based instruction. This conversion to a 100-point scale was used solely for descriptive purposes; all statistical analyses in this study continued to use raw scores with a maximum of 25. The variation in pretest scores among students, reflected in the standard deviation of 2.066, also indicates that although all eight students had not yet reached the KKM, the level of difficulty they experienced in speaking was not entirely uniform. Some students, such as S-1 and S-6, already showed relatively better initial oral communication capital compared to other students such as S-4 and S-8, although both groups remained in the “not yet mastered” category according to the established criteria.

Differences in Students' Speaking Ability Before and After the Implementation of SRL-Based Instruction

The second research question aimed to examine whether there was a significant difference in students' speaking ability before and after the implementation of SRL-based instruction. A comparison of pretest and posttest scores is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of Pretest, Posttest, and Individual Improvement Scores

No	Student Code	Pretest Score	Posttest Score	Improvement
1	S-1	18	21	+3
2	S-2	14	20	+6
3	S-3	17	21	+4
4	S-4	13	18	+5
5	S-5	15	20	+5
6	S-6	18	21	+3
7	S-7	15	20	+5
8	S-8	13	18	+5

Note: Improvement was calculated as the difference between posttest and pretest scores. Data processed by the researcher (2026).

Based on Table 2, all eight students obtained higher posttest scores than pretest scores after participating in SRL-based instruction, with improvements ranging from 3 to 6 points. The largest improvement occurred for S-2, from 14 to 20 (+6 points), while the smallest improvements occurred for S-1 and S-6, each at 3 points. The consistent direction of improvement across all students indicates that the positive change occurred not only for some students but across the entire

group studied. Interestingly, students with relatively lower pretest scores, such as S-2, S-4, and S-8, actually showed relatively high gain scores (5–6 points), while students with the highest pretest scores, namely S-1 and S-6, showed relatively more moderate gains. This pattern is consistent with the possibility of greater room for improvement among students whose initial achievement was lower, although this pattern also needs to be considered as a possible indication of regression to the mean, which will be discussed further in the discussion section.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Pretest and Posttest Scores

Statistic	Pretest	Posttest
Number of Students (N)	8	8
Mean	15.38	19.88
Minimum Score	13	18
Maximum Score	18	21
Standard Deviation (SD)	2.066	1.246

Note: Data processed by the researcher (2026).

Table 3 shows that students' mean speaking score increased from 15.38 at pretest to 19.88 at posttest, an increase of 4.50 points. The standard deviation also decreased from 2.066 to 1.246, indicating that the distribution of posttest scores among students became more homogeneous and more concentrated around the mean compared to the distribution of pretest scores.

Table 4. Mean Scores for Each Speaking Component at Pretest and Posttest

Speaking Component	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Improvement
Pronunciation	2.75	3.75	1.00
Grammar	3.25	3.88	0.63
Vocabulary	3.00	3.88	0.88
Fluency	2.50	3.63	1.13
Comprehension	3.88	4.75	0.87

Note: Each component score uses a 1–5 scale. Data processed by the researcher (2026).

Table 4 shows that improvement occurred in all five speaking components assessed. The fluency component showed the greatest improvement, from 2.50 to 3.63 (an increase of 1.13 points), indicating that students demonstrated more continuous and fluent speaking ability after participating in SRL-based instruction. In contrast, the grammar component showed a relatively smaller improvement (0.63 points), which is consistent with the characteristic of this component, which generally requires more time and repeated exposure to develop significantly.

Before testing the main hypothesis, a Shapiro-Wilk normality test was conducted on the pretest-posttest difference scores given the small sample size ($n = 8$). The test results showed a statistic value of $W = 0.860$ with a significance of $p = 0.120$. Because the p -value was greater than 0.05, the assumption of normality was not violated, so the difference score data could be considered normally distributed and suitable for further analysis using a paired-samples t -test.

Table 5. Results of the Paired-Samples t -Test

Variable	Mean Difference	SD of Difference	SE of Difference	95% CI	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pretest – Posttest	-4.500	1.069	0.378	-5.394 to -3.606	-11.906	7	< .001

Note: Data processed by the researcher (2026) using IBM SPSS Statistics.

Table 5 shows that the mean difference between pretest and posttest scores was -4.500, with a standard deviation of the difference of 1.069 and a standard error of 0.378. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference ranged from -5.394 to -3.606. The paired-samples t -test yielded $t(7)$

= -11.906, $p < .001$. The negative t -value arose from the order of subtraction used (pretest minus posttest); because posttest scores were generally higher than pretest scores, the mean difference and t -value were negative. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, meaning there was a statistically significant difference between students' speaking scores before and after participating in SRL-based instruction.

Next, the effect size was calculated using Cohen's d_z , obtained by dividing the mean difference by the standard deviation of the difference scores ($d_z = D/\text{SD} = 4.50/1.069 = 4.21$). Based on Cohen's (1988) criteria, a d_z value of 4.21 far exceeds the threshold for a large effect ($d_z \geq 0.80$), indicating a very large standardized within-group change. Overall, these findings indicate that students' speaking ability improved substantially after participating in SRL-based instruction, although this finding should be interpreted as a change observed within the research group, not as absolute causal evidence, given that this study did not involve a comparison control group.

Discussion

The first research question aimed to describe the speaking ability of seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo before the implementation of SRL-based instruction. The pretest results showed a mean score of 15.38 with a range of 13–18, and all students were below the school's KKM. This finding describes the initial condition of students' still-limited speaking ability, consistent with various studies highlighting that EFL students in Indonesia often face difficulty speaking spontaneously despite having adequate language knowledge (Sukma, 2022). This condition is also consistent with the general picture presented in the introduction, namely that limited practice opportunities, an instructional orientation that emphasizes written aspects more heavily, and low learner autonomy have the potential to hinder the development of students' speaking ability at the junior secondary level.

The second research question aimed to examine whether there was a significant difference in students' speaking ability before and after the implementation of SRL-based instruction. The results of the analysis showed an increase in mean score from 15.38 to 19.88 (a difference of 4.50 points), supported by a significant paired-samples t -test result, $t(7) = -11.906$, $p < .001$, and a Cohen's d_z effect size of 4.21, which is categorized as very large. This finding indicates that students showed substantial improvement in their speaking performance within the research group after participating in SRL-based learning activities. This improvement is consistent with the series of instructional processes that gave students the opportunity to set speaking targets, monitor their own performance, and reflect on their learning progress. Nevertheless, because this study used a one-group pretest-posttest design without a comparison group, the findings are more appropriately interpreted as changes observed within the research group, rather than as definitive evidence that SRL-based instruction was the sole factor causing the improvement, as other external factors may also have contributed.

The observed improvement occurred across all five speaking components assessed, with fluency showing the greatest improvement (1.13 points). One possible explanation is that fluency is closely related to students' ability to maintain continuity of speech in conveying ideas. During the treatment period, students had repeated opportunities to practice speaking, which is thought to have supported their ability to speak more fluently and confidently at posttest. In contrast, the pronunciation and grammar components tend to require longer practice time and language exposure before meaningful improvement can be clearly observed. However, because this study did not examine the contribution of each instructional activity separately, the improvement in fluency

cannot be attributed to any single SRL instrument, but should instead be understood as part of the overall instructional program implemented.

At the component level, the improvement in the comprehension component (from 3.88 to 4.75) indicates that students became increasingly able to organize their ideas coherently, making their messages easier for listeners to understand. This is consistent with the reflection activities in the Self-Reflective Log, which repeatedly asked students to examine the clarity and organization of the oral messages they conveyed. The improvement in the vocabulary component (0.88 points) is also consistent with the planning activities in the Target Score Matrix, in which students were directed to identify relevant vocabulary before carrying out the speaking task, giving them more adequate word preparation when performing at posttest. Meanwhile, the improvements in pronunciation (1.00 points) and grammar (0.63 points) were relatively more moderate, which is consistent with the nature of these two aspects, which tend to develop gradually through repeated exposure and practice rather than through a single, relatively brief treatment cycle. This pattern of improvement across all components strengthens the picture that SRL-based instruction has the potential to support the overall development of speaking ability, not only certain aspects, although the magnitude of improvement for each component still varied.

In interpreting the magnitude of the observed change, a number of threats to internal validity inherent in the one-group pretest-posttest design used must also be considered. The threat of history, namely the possibility of additional English exposure outside the study, and the threat of maturation, namely students' natural change as they become more accustomed to speaking activities, could not be fully controlled, even though the study was conducted over a relatively short period with a consistent instructional procedure. The threat of testing effects was minimized by using different but equally difficult pretest and posttest topics, although the possibility that students became more familiar with the assessment format cannot be entirely ruled out. The threat of regression to the mean also needs to be considered, given that students were selected based on relatively low initial achievement, so that some of the score improvement may have been influenced by natural statistical variation rather than solely by the treatment given. To reduce threats related to instrumentation and researcher expectancy, identical rubrics and assessment procedures were applied at pretest and posttest, assessment was conducted by two independent raters, and recordings were coded so that raters were unaware of student identity or the timing of data collection. Nevertheless, because this study did not involve a control group, the relative contribution of these factors to the observed score improvement cannot be definitively separated from the influence of SRL-based instruction itself.

The findings of this study are generally consistent with various previous studies on the implementation of SRL in language learning, although differences in research design, participants, and instructional context need to be considered. Nurjanah et al. (2021) examined the implementation of SRL strategies in a speaking class with an emphasis on planning, monitoring, and reflection to support the speaking development of secondary school students. Although the participants, instructional procedures, and educational context differed from this study, both studies similarly examined students' speaking development in relation to SRL principles. Similarly, Bai and Wang (2021) examined the relationship between SRL and English achievement using a correlational design focused on general language learning achievement, rather than change following a specific instructional intervention. Thus, the findings of these studies provide relevant support for the role of SRL in language learning, while this study provides evidence of observed changes in speaking performance within a specific group of seventh-grade students.

Unlike those studies, this study applied a one-group pretest-posttest design to examine changes in students' speaking performance after participating in SRL-based instruction. In line with

this, An et al. (2021) examined the role of SRL in the general process and achievement of English learning, whereas this study specifically assessed students' speaking ability using an analytic rubric administered before and after the instructional program. Muhsinin et al. (2025) conducted a study in an Islamic-affiliated educational context similar to this study, but there were differences in participant characteristics, instructional procedures, intervention duration, and research design, so the results of the two studies cannot be directly compared without taking these differences into account. In addition, Fitriati and Williyani (2025) focused on the application of SRL strategies to develop students' presentation skills, whereas this study assessed individual speaking performance through an oral assessment conducted before and after the instructional program. Thus, although previous studies generally reported positive findings regarding SRL in language learning, the results of this study need to be interpreted within the specific educational context, participant characteristics, instructional procedures, research design, and assessment method used in this study.

Several limitations of this study need to be considered in interpreting the findings above. Although the study initially involved 15 students from class VII-A, only eight students completed the entire research procedure and were included as complete cases in the final analysis, as the other seven students did not submit their posttest recordings by the deadline. Consequently, the use of complete-case analysis has the potential to introduce attrition bias, as the students remaining in the final analysis may not fully represent the characteristics of the initial group. The relatively small final sample size ($n = 8$) also limits the representativeness and generalizability of the findings, so the interpretation of both the statistical results and their educational implications needs to be made cautiously.

In addition, the one-group pretest-posttest design without a control group limits this study's ability to ensure that the observed improvement is solely related to the instructional program implemented. Although the pretest and posttest questions were reviewed and validated before use, both assessments addressed topics related to students' personal information, so the possible influence of material familiarity or practice effects cannot be entirely ruled out. The relatively short intervention duration (four meetings) also limits the opportunity to observe the development of students' speaking ability over a longer period. Therefore, the findings of this study are more appropriately interpreted as a description of the change observed within the participant group in this specific research context, rather than as definitive causal evidence of the effectiveness of SRL-based instruction. Future research is recommended to involve a larger sample, a comparison or control group, a longer intervention period, and additional assessment procedures to obtain stronger evidence regarding the implementation of Self-Regulated Learning-based instruction in developing the speaking ability of EFL students (Saifulloh, 2021, 2026a, 2026b; Saifulloh et al., 2023, 2026; Saifulloh, Retnaningdyah, & Mustofa, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c; Saifulloh, Retnaningdyah, Mustofa, et al., 2025; Saifulloh & Anam, 2022).

Practically, these findings suggest that structured SRL activities—goal-setting through the Target Score Matrix, self-monitoring through the SRL Focus Monitoring Sheet, and reflection through the Self-Reflective Log—can serve as one alternative instructional activity that encourages students to become more engaged in speaking practice. Teachers can adapt these three instruments to suit the needs of their respective classes, for example by simplifying the monitoring sheet format for students at lower levels or adjusting speaking topics to the ongoing curriculum material. In addition, because this study only measured speaking ability through individual monologue, the application of SRL to other forms of oral interaction, such as paired dialogue or group discussion, remains open for further study so that the benefits of this approach can be more comprehensively understood in the context of English learning at the junior secondary level.

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine changes in the speaking ability of seventh-grade students at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo after the implementation of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL)-based instruction using a one-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design involving eight students. The descriptive results showed that students' mean speaking score increased from 15.38 at pretest to 19.88 at posttest, an increase of 4.50 points. A paired-samples t-test showed a statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest scores, $t(7) = -11.906$, $p < .001$, with Cohen's $d_z = 4.21$ indicating a very large within-group change. These findings indicate that students experienced a substantial improvement in speaking ability within the research group after participating in SRL-based instruction, although, due to the absence of a comparison group, the findings are more appropriately interpreted as changes observed within the group studied, rather than as absolute causal evidence that SRL-based instruction was the sole cause of this improvement.

Improvement was observed in all five speaking components assessed, with the fluency component showing the highest mean improvement, indicating that students were able to speak with greater continuity and fluency in conveying their ideas. Several methodological limitations need to be considered in interpreting these findings, including the small final sample size, the absence of a control group, the relatively short intervention duration, participant attrition from 15 initial students to eight complete cases, and the use of a fidelity checklist completed by the researcher without independent observation. Thus, the findings of this study are limited to the specific context of the eight participants at MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo, Mojokerto, and need to be interpreted cautiously and not generalized to a broader population without further empirical support. For English teachers, SRL-based instruction can be considered as one alternative approach to support student participation in speaking activities, while future research is recommended to involve a larger sample, a control group, and a longer intervention period.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank MTs Sunan Ampel Jatirejo, Mojokerto, for the permission and support provided during the implementation of this research, as well as all parties who assisted in the process of data collection and validation in this study.

References

- An, Z., Wang, C., Li, S., Gan, Z., & Li, H. (2021). Technology-assisted self-regulated English language learning: Associations with English language self-efficacy, English enjoyment, and learning outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 558466. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.558466>
- Akbar, S. (2017). Instrumen perangkat pembelajaran. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, 96, 102404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102404>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage.

- Fitriati, S. W., & Williyani, A. (2025). AI-enhanced self-regulated learning: EFL learners' prioritization and utilization in presentation skills development. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 9(2), 22-37. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202530647>
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. McGraw-Hill.
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris fase D*. Kemendikbudristek.
- Muhsinin, M., Haerazi, H., & Rahman, A. (2025). Implementing self-regulated learning in improving EFL students' speaking skills integrated with self-confident level in Islamic-affiliated schools. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 10(1), 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v10i1.850>
- Nurjanah, R. L., Saptanto, D. D., & Dewi, M. K. (2021). Using modelling-based speaking module for informal interaction class to support self-regulated learning. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2), 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.28656>
- Öztürk, M., & Çakıroğlu, Ü. (2021). Flipped learning design in EFL classrooms: Implementing self-regulated learning strategies to develop language skills. *Smart Learning Environments*, 8, Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-021-00146-x>
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saifulloh, A. I. (2021). Ecocriticism as the Development of Teaching Materials in Literary Theories and Appreciation Courses. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v3i1.1752>
- Saifulloh, A. I. (2026a). *IMPLEMENTING MULTILITERACIES PEDAGOGY TO PROMOTE ENGLISH MULTIMODAL AND ECOLOGICAL LITERACY*.
- Saifulloh, A. I. (2026b). *Introduction to Literature : Reading , Interpreting , and Analyzing Literary Texts*.
- Saifulloh, A. I., & Anam, S. (2022). The Effectiveness of Pedagogical Ecocriticism to Enhance Environmental Awareness in Post Pandemic Era. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 14(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v14i1.1130>
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., & Mustofa, A. (2025a). Immersive Situated Practice Within a Local Curriculum for Hybrid Learning. *Veredas Do Direto*, 2–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v22.n5.3587>
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., & Mustofa, A. (2025b). *Literacy as Resistance : Critical Framing for Promoting Ecological Awareness*. 996–1012. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.vi.21731>
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., & Mustofa, A. (2025c). *Theoretical Praxis in Environmental Education within EFL Contexts*. 1(1), 1–14.
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., Mustofa, A., & Suhartono, S. (2025). Immersive Situated Practice Within a Local Curriculum for Hybrid Learning. *Veredas Do Direto*, 22(5), e223587. <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v22.n5.3587>
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., & Mustopa, A. (2023). *Damaging Discourse in Online News Trends Over Ecological Literacy*. 5(4), 885–900. <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>
- Saifulloh, A. I., Sengsouk, K., Fatoni, A., & Irfan, S. (2026). *Transforming Eco-Digital Literacies Through Multimodal Projects In English Language Learning*. 13(01), 60–72.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sukma, F. (2022). The implementation of self-regulated learning towards EFL students' speaking skills: Senior high school case. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, 5(2), 117-132. <https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v5i2.2721>

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.