

## Speaking Skills Development in Indonesian Senior High School: A Mixed Methods Needs Analysis of Student Preferences, Challenges, and Teacher Support

Rini<sup>1</sup>, Charlie Baka<sup>2</sup>, Rigel Sampelolo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja, Jakarta, Indonesia

**ABSTRACT:** Despite widespread recognition of speaking proficiency as central to English language learning, senior high school students in Indonesia continue to exhibit significant difficulties in oral communication, and the specific preferences, challenges, and support needs driving these difficulties remain insufficiently understood. This study investigates two interrelated questions: (1) what types of learning activities do students prefer to enhance their speaking skills, and (2) what challenges do students encounter in learning English speaking skills, and what teacher support do they identify as most beneficial? A convergent mixed-methods design was employed, integrating quantitative data from a 25-item Likert-scale questionnaire administered to 15 students across five needs analysis dimensions Target Situation Analysis (TSA), Present Situation Analysis (PSA), Learning Needs (LN), Learners' Wants (LW), and Learning Preferences (LP) with qualitative data from semi-structured interviews conducted with five purposively selected participants. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics; qualitative data underwent systematic thematic analysis following Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's (2020) interactive model. Findings revealed that students demonstrated Very High awareness of speaking importance (TSA M = 4.78) while simultaneously recognising significant deficiencies in current proficiency (PSA M = 3.83), particularly vocabulary limitations (M = 4.00) and difficulty expressing ideas fluently (M = 3.93). Students articulated strong learning needs (LN M = 4.41), prioritising frequent oral practice (M = 4.53), immediate constructive feedback (M = 4.40), and teacher modelling. Qualitative analysis identified six themes: linguistic challenges, affective barriers, peer influence, classroom contextual factors, out-of-class environmental factors, and desired teacher support. The consistent convergence of quantitative and qualitative strands strengthens the validity of the findings and generates evidence-based implications for speaking instruction design, teacher professional development, and curriculum policy in Indonesian EFL contexts.

**KEYWORDS:** needs analysis, speaking skills, target situation analysis, learning needs, learners' wants, foreign language anxiety, EFL, senior high school, mixed methods

### INTRODUCTION

Speaking proficiency occupies a central position in second language acquisition research and pedagogical practice, constituting the primary mode through which learners engage in academic discourse, professional interaction, and social participation (Nation & Newton, 2020). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, the development of oral communicative competence presents learners with uniquely demanding cognitive and affective challenges: real-time management of phonological accuracy, lexical selection, grammatical encoding, and pragmatic appropriateness, performed under conditions of social exposure and evaluative risk (Goh & Burns, 2022). For Indonesian senior high school students, speaking proficiency represents not only an academic requirement but a critical determinant of readiness for higher education and participation in an increasingly globalized labor market.

Indonesia's recent adoption of the Kurikulum Merdeka (Kemendikbudristek, 2022) signals a deliberate policy shift toward communicative competence and student-centred pedagogy. Yet despite this reform imperative, Indonesian EFL learners consistently demonstrate limited oral fluency, accuracy, and communicative confidence a persistent deficit pointing to a fundamental misalignment between curriculum intentions and instructional realities (Maru, Pikirang, & Setiawan, 2021). Bridging this gap requires systematic empirical investigation of learners' actual needs, preferences, and challenges investigation that neither curriculum documents nor standardized assessments can adequately provide.

Needs analysis, as theorized by Hutchinson and Waters (1987), provides precisely this empirical foundation. Their framework distinguishes between target needs the communicative demands learners must meet in target situations and learning needs the



conditions, activities, and support learners require to develop requisite competencies. Target needs are further differentiated into necessities (objective task demands), lacks (the gap between current and target proficiency), and wants (learners' subjective perceptions and preferences). Originally developed for English for Specific Purposes (ESP), this framework has been productively extended to general EFL instruction, ensuring curriculum design responds to documented learner realities rather than assumed requirements (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Indrasari, 2016).

The affective dimension of speaking development has attracted substantial scholarly attention since Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) foundational identification of foreign language anxiety as a distinct, multi-component construct. Their research established that speaking consistently elicits higher anxiety than other language skills, with learners experiencing communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety. Recent research by Dewaele, Albakry, and Alrefaie (2024) confirms that speaking anxiety remains pervasive across EFL contexts and significantly depresses learners' willingness to communicate and actual oral performance. Dörnyei's (2020) motivational self-system framework provides complementary insight by distinguishing between the ideal L2 self (the learner's envisioned future competent self) and the actual L2 self (current perceived competence). When the ideal self is vivid and the path toward it is perceived as achievable, the tension generates productive motivation; when the gap is perceived as insurmountable, it generates discouragement and withdrawal.

The social dimensions of speaking development peer relationships, classroom norms, and environmental factors represent an additional layer of complexity. Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory establishes interaction with more capable others as the primary mechanism through which learners develop communicative competence within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Sato and Ballinger (2023) demonstrate that the quality of peer interaction can either facilitate or inhibit speaking practice: supportive peer climates increase risk-taking and communicative engagement, while critical or mocking responses can silence even linguistically capable learners. Philp, Adams, and Iwashita (2024) emphasize that psychologically safe learning environments where errors are normalised as inevitable constituents of language development are essential preconditions for oral participation. Teacher feedback practices similarly carry profound implications for learner confidence and persistence: Ellis (2024) concludes that the affective quality of feedback may be as consequential for speaking development as its informational accuracy, a finding that resonates with Dweck's (2017) research on growth mindset as a predictor of persistence through difficulty.

Despite the growing volume of needs analysis research in Indonesian EFL contexts, significant gaps remain. Existing studies have concentrated predominantly on university-level populations (Rahman, Sahib, & Arianto, 2022) or have employed exclusively quantitative methodologies that, while yielding important breadth data, cannot capture the contextual depth and experiential nuance of students' speaking challenges (Pratama & Wulandari, 2023). Mixed-methods investigations that systematically integrate statistical patterns with rich qualitative insight remain comparatively rare a significant lacuna given that effective instructional design requires not merely knowledge of what student's need but deep, contextualized understanding of why they struggle and what forms of support they identify as genuinely helpful.

This study addresses these gaps through a convergent mixed-methods needs analysis guided by two research questions: (1) What types of learning activities do senior high school students prefer to enhance their speaking skills? (2) What challenges do students encounter in learning English speaking skills, and what teacher support do they identify as most beneficial? The study makes three principal contributions. Theoretically, it extends Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) needs analysis framework by systematically integrating contemporary understanding of affective and social factors in speaking development. Practically, it generates evidence-based guidance for teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers designing speaking instruction responsive to students documented needs. Methodologically, the mixed-methods design demonstrates how quantitative and qualitative strands can be triangulated to produce a more comprehensive and valid understanding of learner needs than either strand could yield independently.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design (Creswell & Poth, 2018), in which quantitative and qualitative data are collected concurrently, analysed independently, and integrated at the interpretation stage to produce a more comprehensive understanding than either strand could yield alone. This design was selected because needs analysis research benefits fundamentally from the complementary strengths of both approaches: quantitative measurement provides systematic, comparable data on the



breadth and patterning of students' needs across multiple dimensions, while qualitative inquiry captures the contextual depth, experiential nuance, and explanatory mechanisms that statistical data cannot reveal.

## Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at a senior high school in Tana Toraja, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The quantitative strand involved 15 students who completed the needs analysis questionnaire. For the qualitative strand, five students were purposively selected from the questionnaire respondents based on their willingness to participate in extended interviews, their ability to articulate their experiences, and their representation of diverse proficiency levels and perspectives. Pseudonyms Meica, Tria, Reinhard, Adrival, Reza, and Edelweis are used throughout to protect participant confidentiality. The sample size, while modest, is consistent with established norms for needs analysis research, which prioritises depth of contextual understanding over statistical generalizability (Patton, 2015), and is appropriate for the bounded exploratory scope of this study.

## Data Collection Instruments

### Questionnaire

Quantitative data were collected using a structured 25-item questionnaire measuring five dimensions adapted from Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) needs analysis framework: Target Situation Analysis (TSA, 5 items), Present Situation Analysis (PSA, 5 items), Learning Needs (LN, 5 items), Learners' Wants (LW, 5 items), and Learning Preferences (LP, 5 items). Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The instrument was developed through systematic review of established needs analysis instruments in EFL speaking research, and item content was validated through expert review by two EFL teaching specialists. Internal consistency was satisfactory across all dimensions.

### Semi-Structured Interviews

Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured individual interviews following Brinkmann and Kvale's (2018) epistemological principles. Interviews were conducted in Indonesian to enable participants to express their experiences with maximal naturalness and precision. The protocol covered six thematic domains: speaking difficulties in English, emotional experiences during oral tasks, peer influences on speaking confidence, classroom factors affecting oral participation, out-of-class factors influencing speaking development, and desired forms of teacher support. Each interview lasted 30–45 minutes, was audio-recorded with informed consent, and was subsequently transcribed verbatim by the researcher.

## Data Analysis

### Quantitative Analysis

Questionnaire data were analysed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores and standard deviations for individual items and each dimension. Mean scores were classified using a five-level categorical scale: Very High (4.50–5.00), High (3.50–4.49), Moderate (2.50–3.49), Low (1.50–2.49), and Very Low (1.00–1.49). This classification follows conventions established in Indonesian EFL needs analysis research and enables systematic comparison across dimensions and items.

### Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative data were analysed using the interactive model described by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2020), comprising three iterative processes: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Data condensation involved reading and re-reading transcripts for familiarisation, then applying a hybrid coding approach using both deductive codes derived from the research questions and inductive codes emerging from the data (Saldaña, 2021). Codes were progressively refined and consolidated into categories through constant comparative analysis, and categories were synthesised into overarching themes. Data display involved organising themes with representative quotations presented in both original Indonesian and English translation, enabling both the authenticity of participants' voices and reader accessibility. Conclusion drawing and verification involved interpreting patterns across themes, triangulating with quantitative findings, and actively seeking disconfirming evidence.

## Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations

Trustworthiness was established through four criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985): credibility was addressed through prolonged engagement with the research site, triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data sources, and member checking whereby participants reviewed and confirmed the accuracy of their interview summaries; transferability was supported through thick contextual description; dependability was demonstrated through maintenance of a detailed audit trail documenting all analytical



decisions; and confirmability was established through peer debriefing with an independent researcher. All ethical protocols were observed: institutional ethical approval was secured, informed consent was obtained from all participants, and pseudonyms were employed throughout to protect confidentiality.

**RESULTS**

**Quantitative Findings: Students' Needs Analysis Profiles**

*Overview Across Dimensions*

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for all five needs analysis dimensions. The overall mean of 4.30 (High category) indicates that students held consistently positive orientations toward English speaking development across all dimensions measured. Critically, the highest scores appeared in the TSA dimension (M = 4.78, Very High), reflecting students' strong awareness of speaking importance, while the lowest scores appeared in the PSA dimension (M = 3.83, High), reflecting recognition of current proficiency limitations. The gap between these dimensions approximately 0.95 points constitutes the quantitative signature of the necessity-lack relationship at the core of Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) needs analysis framework.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics by Needs Analysis Dimension**

Dimension	N	Mean	SD	Category
Target Situation Analysis (TSA)	15	4.78	0.288	Very High
Learning Needs (LN)	15	4.41	0.616	High
Learners' Wants (LW)	15	4.32	0.477	High
Learning Preferences (LP)	15	4.17	0.534	High
Present Situation Analysis (PSA)	15	3.83	0.680	High
<i>Overall Mean</i>	15	4.30	0.339	High

*Note.* Category scale: Very High = 4.50–5.00; High = 3.50–4.49; Moderate = 2.50–3.49; Low = 1.50–2.49; Very Low = 1.00–1.49.

*Target Situation Analysis (TSA)*

Table 2 presents item-level statistics for the TSA dimension. All five items achieved Very High categorisation, with students demonstrating exceptionally strong awareness of speaking's relevance to academic success (M = 4.87), global communication (M = 4.87), and interaction with international interlocutors (M = 4.80). These results confirm that students possess clear and vivid instrumental and integrative motivations for developing speaking proficiency a finding that aligns with Dörnyei's (2020) concept of the ideal L2 self, in which a compelling vision of future communicative competence provides the motivational foundation for sustained learning effort.

**Table 2. Target Situation Analysis (TSA): Item-Level Descriptive Statistics**

Item	N	Mean	Category
Speaking English is important for academic success	15	4.87	Very High
English speaking supports global communication	15	4.87	Very High
Speaking enables interaction with foreign nationals	15	4.80	Very High
English speaking enhances future career prospects	15	4.73	Very High
Speaking proficiency is required in target professional contexts	15	4.60	Very High
<i>TSA Dimension Mean</i>		4.78	Very High

*Present Situation Analysis (PSA)*

Table 3 presents item-level statistics for the PSA dimension. The highest-scoring items vocabulary limitations (M = 4.00), difficulty expressing ideas (M = 3.93), and infrequent English use in school (M = 3.93) identify the primary domains of perceived speaking deficiency. The relatively lower mean for grammatical inaccuracies (M = 3.40, Moderate category) suggests that students perceive lexical and fluency-related challenges as more pressing than morphosyntactic difficulties, a finding consistent with research



demonstrating that vocabulary limitations are the most universally reported barrier to speaking fluency among Indonesian EFL learners (Rahman, Sahib, & Arianto, 2022).

**Table 3. Present Situation Analysis (PSA): Item-Level Descriptive Statistics**

Item	N	Mean	Category
Vocabulary limitations impede speaking performance	15	4.00	High
Difficulty organising and expressing ideas in English	15	3.93	High
English is used infrequently in school settings	15	3.93	High
Pronunciation difficulties affect communicative clarity	15	3.87	High
Grammatical inaccuracies reduce speaking confidence	15	3.40	Moderate
<i>PSA Dimension Mean</i>		3.83	High

**Learning Needs (LN)**

Table 4 presents item-level statistics for the LN dimension. The Very High score for more frequent speaking practice (M = 4.53) indicates that students possess metacognitive awareness of the practice-frequency gap between current instruction and optimal learning conditions. The near-equivalent scores for immediate feedback (M = 4.40), teacher modelling (M = 4.40), and relevant materials (M = 4.40) collectively suggest that students seek not only more practice time but qualitatively richer instructional interactions characterised by expert modelling, authentic materials, and responsive feedback.

**Table 4. Learning Needs (LN): Item-Level Descriptive Statistics**

Item	N	Mean	Category
More frequent speaking practice opportunities	15	4.53	Very High
Immediate and constructive teacher feedback	15	4.40	High
Teacher modelling of target speaking behaviours	15	4.40	High
Materials directly relevant to real-life communication	15	4.40	High
Small-group speaking practice activities	15	4.33	High
<i>LN Dimension Mean</i>		4.41	High

**Learners' Wants (LW) and Learning Preferences (LP)**

Table 5 presents item-level statistics for both the LW and LP dimensions. The Very High scores for more interesting materials (M = 4.73) and topics tailored to student interests (M = 4.53) within the LW dimension align with self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), which establishes that intrinsic motivation and its associated benefits for engagement and persistence is most reliably activated when learning activities are perceived as inherently interesting and personally relevant. Within the LP dimension, the preference for teachers using simple English (M = 4.40) aligns with Krashen's (1985) comprehensible input principle, while the preference for educational games (M = 4.27) corroborates Wulandari, Marsigit, and Retnawati's (2024) evidence that game-based language learning effectively reduces anxiety and increases authentic oral engagement.

**Table 5. Learners' Wants (LW) and Learning Preferences (LP): Item-Level Descriptive Statistics**

Item	N	Mean	Category
<b>LEARNERS' WANTS (LW)</b>			
More interesting and engaging speaking materials	15	4.73	Very High
Topics tailored to students' personal interests	15	4.53	Very High
Activities integrating real-life communication contexts	15	4.20	High
Video and audio multimedia materials	15	4.13	High



Peer collaborative speaking tasks	15	4.00	High
<i>LW Dimension Mean</i>		4.32	High
<b>LEARNING PREFERENCES (LP)</b>			
Teachers using simple and comprehensible English	15	4.40	High
Language learning through educational games	15	4.27	High
Individual speaking and presentation tasks	15	4.13	High
Group discussions and collaborative activities	15	4.00	High
Role-play and simulation activities	15	4.07	High
<i>LP Dimension Mean</i>		4.17	High

**Qualitative Findings: Challenges and Support Needs**

Thematic analysis of interview transcripts from five participants generated six overarching themes illuminating the challenges students encounter in speaking development and the forms of teacher support they identify as most beneficial. Table 6 provides a summary overview; each theme is elaborated below with illustrative evidence.

**Table 6. Summary of Qualitative Themes: Speaking Challenges and Support Needs**

Theme	Label	Key Findings
Theme 1	Linguistic Challenges	Pronunciation difficulties, limited vocabulary range, and grammatical inaccuracies all impeding clear communication and reducing willingness to speak
Theme 2	Affective Barriers	Pervasive anxiety, low confidence, and fear of negative evaluation particularly fear of peer judgment when making errors in public performance
Theme 3	Peer Influence on Speaking Confidence	Dual role of peers: supportive classmates increase willingness to communicate, while critical or mocking peers elevate anxiety and inhibit oral participation
Theme 4	Classroom Contextual Factors	Individual presentations perceived as high-stakes and anxiety-inducing; dominance of Indonesian and local languages reducing English use within the classroom
Theme 5	Out-of-Class Environmental Factors	Limited English-speaking environments and infrequent daily use; exposure to fluent speakers and language-oriented extracurricular activities identified as facilitative
Theme 6	Desired Teacher Support	Consistent encouragement, non-critical affective feedback, explicit appreciation of effort, and increased structured opportunities for oral practice

**Theme 1: Linguistic Challenges**

All five interviewed participants identified linguistic difficulties as primary speaking challenges, with pronunciation emerging as the most consistently mentioned obstacle. Meica articulated the compounding relationship between linguistic and affective dimensions:

*"Kesulitannya ialah berbicara Bahasa Inggris dengan jelas tidak terbata-bata... Ya, kesulitan pengucapan menjadi tantangan utama."* ("The difficulty is speaking English clearly without stammering... Yes, pronunciation difficulty is my main challenge.")

Tria elaborated on how lexical limitations interact with affective barriers to produce a compound inhibitory effect:

*"Kurangnya kosakata... Pelafalannya yang biasa tidak ditahu... Ditahu artinya tapi agak takut untuk mengemukakan pendapat."* ("Lack of vocabulary... Pronunciation often not known... Knowing the meaning but somewhat afraid to express opinions.")



Reinhard identified the affective consequence of linguistic difficulty specifically in terms of self-confidence:

*"Pengucapan kalimat dalam Bahasa Inggris yang masih berbelit-belit membuat saya kurang percaya diri."* ("The laboured pronunciation of English sentences makes me feel less confident.")

These accounts reveal that linguistic challenges do not operate independently of affect: pronunciation difficulties generate self-consciousness, which reduces willingness to speak, which in turn limits practice opportunities and retards the development of phonological accuracy a self-reinforcing cycle consistent with Horwitz et al.'s (1986) conceptualisation of communication apprehension.

### **Theme 2: Affective Barriers Anxiety, Low Confidence, and Fear of Negative Evaluation**

Affective barriers emerged as pervasive and powerful inhibitors of oral participation across all five participants. Meica described an interconnected set of affective experiences linking nervousness, uncertainty, and fear of peer judgment:

*"Biasanya merasa gugup dan tidak yakin dengan kemampuan saya... Takut dihakimi teman kelas ketika salah dalam berbicara Bahasa Inggris. Jadi merusak kepercayaan diri sendiri."* ("I usually feel nervous and unsure of my abilities... Afraid of being judged by classmates when making mistakes in speaking English it damages my self-confidence.")

Tria's account reveals a more complex affective profile shaped by perfectionism and identity protection:

*"Saya orangnya tipikal takut salah, apa-apa harus benar dan saya mempunyai ego yang tinggi otomatis saya kalau salah pengucapan dan ditatap aneh kepercayaan diri saya rendah."* ("I am the type of person who fears being wrong everything must be correct and with high ego, when I mispronounce something and receive strange looks, my confidence drops sharply.")

Reza offered a more economical summary that captures the core of the affective barrier cluster: 'Kurang percaya diri... Takut mendapat penilaian buruk dari teman' (Lack of confidence... Afraid of receiving negative judgments from friends). Collectively, these accounts align closely with Horwitz et al.'s (1986) three-component model of foreign language anxiety, demonstrating all three dimensions communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and performance anxiety operating in the studied context.

### **Theme 3: Peer Influence on Speaking Confidence**

Students identified peer responses as a dual-valenced influence on speaking confidence, capable of either supporting or inhibiting oral participation depending on their quality. Meica captured this bidirectionality directly:

*"Teman saya supportif dapat meningkatkan kepercayaan diri tetapi teman yang mengkritik membuat saya gugup."* ("Supportive friends can increase my confidence but critical friends make me nervous.")

Reinhard's response identified the most concrete inhibitory peer behaviour ridicule of pronunciation errors and articulated a corresponding environmental need:

*"Dengan tidak tertawa jika pengucapan saya berbelit-belit."* ("By not laughing if my pronunciation is laboured.")

In notable contrast, Adrival demonstrated affective resilience that normalised peer ridicule: 'Kadang teman saya menertawakan tapi menurut saya itu hal normal' (Sometimes my friends laugh, but I think it's normal). This variation in students' responses to identical peer behaviours underscores Philp et al.'s (2024) emphasis that individual learners construct significantly different relationships with the social dimensions of oral risk-taking.

### **Theme 4: Classroom Contextual Factors**

Students identified specific classroom conditions that amplified speaking challenges. Individual presentations emerged as particularly anxiety-provoking contexts, with Meica stating: 'Presentasi individu di depan, saya sangat gugup dan tidak yakin' (Individual presentations in front of the class make me very nervous and unsure). Tria elaborated on the structural barriers to productive feedback during presentations:

*"Presentasi, mengapa demikian? Karena disaat presentasi kita harus menjelaskan ke orang lain dan mendapatkan umpan balik, akan tetapi jika didalam kelas pasti tidak ada yang mau bertanya karena merasa takut, malu bahkan tidak mengerti apa yang dipresentasikan."* ("Presentations because during them we must explain to others and receive feedback, but in class no one wants to ask questions because they feel afraid, embarrassed, or don't understand what is being presented.")

Reinhard identified the dominance of non-English languages as a structural classroom barrier: 'Kegunaannya karena didalam kelas teman-teman cenderung menggunakan bahasa tradisional atau Bahasa Indonesia' (The issue is that in class, friends tend to use traditional language or Indonesian). This finding reflects the broader sociolinguistic reality of EFL instruction in multilingual Indonesian contexts, where English competes not only with Bahasa Indonesia but with local vernacular languages as classroom media.



## **Theme 5: Out-of-Class Environmental Factors**

Students identified diverse environmental factors as influences on their speaking development outside the classroom. Meica described the motivational effect of encountering proficient English speakers: 'Ketika ke luar dan berinteraksi dengan orang fasih berbahasa Inggris, saya terdorong untuk berbicara Inggris dengan seseorang' (When going out and interacting with people fluent in English, I feel encouraged to speak English with someone). Tria highlighted the developmental value of language-oriented extracurricular involvement: 'Saya masuk organisasi yang memang orang-orang di dalamnya mau berkembang, banyak yang menggabungkan bahasa dan semuanya menarik' (I joined an organisation where people want to develop themselves many combine languages and everything is interesting). Reza and Edelweis both identified the limiting effects of restricted English environments: 'Kurang latihan dan kurang menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam sehari-hari' (Lack of practice and infrequent English use in daily life) and 'Lingkungan terbatas' (Limited environment) respectively. These accounts collectively highlight the importance of creating bridges between classroom instruction and out-of-school communicative opportunities.

## **Theme 6: Desired Teacher Support**

Students articulated clear, consistent preferences for teacher support characterised by affective encouragement, non-critical feedback, and increased practice opportunities. Meica prioritised positive reinforcement:

*"Guru selalu apresiasi dan mendorong kita untuk terus maju dan tidak mengkritik ketika kita salah."* ("Teachers who always appreciate and encourage us to keep progressing and who do not criticise when we make mistakes.")

Tria specified the precise quality of feedback students find most supportive emphasising the distinction between affective acknowledgment and direct error correction:

*"Dukungan, kayaknya selalu di apresiasi, walaupun salah kita tetap diberikan kata-kata penyemangat, tidak langsung menyatakan bahwa itu ucapan kita salah."* ("Support means always being appreciated even when wrong, we are given encouraging words rather than being directly told that our speech is incorrect.")

Adriana requested increased practice opportunities: 'Dukungannya yaitu menyuruh saya untuk berbicara menggunakan bahasa Inggris sehingga dengan cara itu saya bisa mengasah skill public speaking' (The support I need is being asked to speak English so I can develop my public speaking skill). Reinhard requested specific corrective feedback: 'Saran atau umpan balik jika saya masih sedikit kurang' (Advice or feedback when I am still lacking). Reza's summary 'Lebih banyak latihan dan dukungan agar tidak takut salah' (More practice and support so as not to be afraid of making mistakes) encapsulates the affective-pedagogical nexus that characterises all six participants' accounts: effective teacher support must simultaneously create conditions for more practice and reduce the evaluative threat that makes practice psychologically costly.

## **DISCUSSION**

### ***The Necessity-Lack Gap and Its Implications***

The most theoretically consequential finding of this study is the pronounced gap between students' Very High awareness of speaking importance (TSA M = 4.78) and their recognition of current proficiency limitations (PSA M = 3.83). Within Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) framework, this gap constitutes the operational definition of the speaking skill 'necessity-lack': students are acutely aware of the communicative demands they must eventually meet but experience their current abilities as substantially inadequate to those demands. This gap structure has direct pedagogical significance: it confirms that students already possess the instrumental and integrative motivational foundation what Dörnyei (2020) terms a compelling ideal L2 self that researchers identify as a precondition for sustained learning effort. The instructional challenge, consequently, is not to generate motivation but to channel existing motivation productively through pedagogical designs that make the ideal communicative self-attainable rather than aspirational.

This finding aligns closely with Nurhayati, Suryani, and Hidayat (2024), who documented a structurally identical awareness-ability gap among Indonesian senior high school students across multiple institutional settings, and with Pratama and Wulandari (2023), who found that Indonesian students increasingly frame English speaking proficiency as a career necessity while simultaneously reporting substantial oral proficiency deficits. The consistency of this pattern across studies and contexts suggests a systemic structural feature of Indonesian EFL instruction: students are exposed to extensive content about why English is important without receiving sufficient structured practice in how to develop it communicatively.



## *Vocabulary and Affective Barriers: An Interactive Deficit*

The PSA findings identify vocabulary limitations ( $M = 4.00$ ) as students' most pressing linguistic challenge a finding that converges with both the quantitative literature (Rahman, Sahib, & Arianto, 2022) and the qualitative accounts provided by all five interviewed participants. However, the qualitative data reveal that vocabulary limitations and affective barriers do not operate independently: the two interact in a compounding cycle in which limited lexical resources generate communication failures, communication failures trigger anxiety and fear of judgment, anxiety reduces willingness to attempt communication, reduced communication attempts limit vocabulary development, and thus limited vocabulary persists. This interactive dynamic is captured most precisely in Tria's account of knowing a word's meaning but feeling 'agak takut untuk mengemukakan pendapat' (somewhat afraid to express opinions) a formulation that illustrates how the Affective Filter (Krashen, 1985) can block even available linguistic knowledge from productive deployment.

Instructional responses to this interactive deficit must therefore be dual-targeted: addressing vocabulary development through systematic, contextually embedded lexical instruction (Nation & Newton, 2020) while simultaneously addressing the affective conditions that prevent available vocabulary from being deployed communicatively. Krashen's (1985) comprehensible input hypothesis and Swain's (1985) comprehensible output hypothesis together imply that learners need both input just beyond their current level activating lexical acquisition and opportunities to produce language in low-stakes conditions activating procedural automaticity. The students' strong preference for simple English instruction ( $M = 4.40$ ) and educational games ( $M = 4.27$ ) reflects intuitive alignment with these theoretical principles.

## *The 4Cs of Effective Speaking Instruction: Convergent Evidence*

The convergent quantitative and qualitative findings of this study collectively point toward four interdependent conditions for effective speaking instruction in this context. First, communicative authenticity: students' Very High scores for interesting materials ( $M = 4.73$ ) and personally relevant topics ( $M = 4.53$ ), combined with qualitative accounts of motivation generated by encounters with fluent English speakers and language-oriented organisations, affirm Ryan and Deci's (2020) self-determination theory prediction that intrinsic motivation is activated by activities perceived as inherently meaningful. Second, cognitive accessibility: students' preference for simple English instruction ( $M = 4.40$ ) and the qualitative evidence that cognitive overload particularly in high-stakes presentation contexts increases anxiety and reduces communicative performance, together support the importance of managing instructional complexity to maintain productive engagement. Third, constructive feedback: the qualitative data provide particularly compelling evidence that the affective quality of teacher feedback its capacity to convey genuine appreciation of communicative effort may be as pedagogically consequential as its informational content. Tria's explicit preference for encouragement over direct error correction, Meica's emphasis on appreciation and forward momentum, and Reza's formulation of 'support so as not to be afraid of making mistakes' collectively constitute a specification of the feedback conditions necessary for sustained oral risk-taking. These accounts are theoretically grounded in Ellis's (2024) comprehensive review and in Dweck's (2017) growth mindset framework. Fourth, collaborative practice: the preference for small-group practice (LN  $M = 4.33$ ) and group discussions (LP  $M = 4.00$ ), combined with qualitative evidence of the confidence-building effects of supportive peer environments, aligns with Sato and Ballinger's (2023) demonstration that well-structured peer interaction generates substantial speaking development opportunities.

## *Peer Climate as a Pedagogical Responsibility*

The qualitative theme of peer influence warrants specific pedagogical attention. The data reveal that the same peer behaviours reactions to pronunciation errors, for instance can generate diametrically opposite affective responses in different learners: paralysing humiliation for Tria, matter-of-fact normalisation for Adrival. This variability does not imply that peer climate is therefore inconsequential; rather, it underscores Philp et al.'s (2024) point that psychologically safe classroom environments are most needed precisely by the learners who are most affectively vulnerable to peer criticism and those learners are least likely to benefit from instructional designs that assume resilience. The pedagogical implication is that creating explicit classroom norms that frame errors as expected and valuable constituents of language development is not optional affective support but a prerequisite for the communicative risk-taking that oral proficiency development requires.



**Pedagogical Implications**

The integrated findings of this study generate a set of evidence-based instructional recommendations, synthesised in Table 7. Below:

**Table 7. Evidence-Based Pedagogical Implications for Speaking Instruction**

Need / Challenge	Instructional Response	Theoretical Basis
Linguistic Gap (PSA M = 3.83)	Targeted vocabulary and pronunciation instruction integrated within communicative activities; spaced repetition for high-frequency hospitality and academic vocabulary; explicit phonological awareness tasks	Nation & Newton (2020); Goh & Burns (2022)
High Practice Need (LN M = 4.53, Very High)	Increase proportion of class time devoted to meaning-focused oral output; incorporate structured speaking routines with predictable scaffolding to reduce cognitive overload	Ellis (2024); Krashen (1985)
Affective Barriers (Themes 2 & 3)	Implement classroom norms explicitly normalising errors; adopt process-oriented feedback that separates effort from accuracy; use small-group practice before whole-class performance	Horwitz et al. (1986); Dweck (2017); Philp et al. (2024)
Interest and Relevance (LW M = 4.73, Very High)	Align speaking topics with students' expressed interests and future communicative contexts; incorporate contemporary multimedia and authentic materials	Ryan & Deci (2020); Syafiq et al. (2021)
Teacher Feedback Quality (Theme 6)	Prioritise affective support alongside corrective feedback; separate appreciation of communicative effort from accuracy evaluation; model target language behaviours explicitly	Ellis (2024); Dörnyei (2020)

The implications extend beyond individual teachers to curriculum developers and institutional leaders. Curriculum developers should ensure that speaking syllabi incorporate flexible topic selection that allows teachers to align content with students identified interests, provide guidelines for varied activity formats that span individual and collaborative tasks, and establish assessment frameworks that prioritise formative, process-oriented feedback. School leaders should invest in professional development for teachers specifically addressing the affective dimensions of speaking instruction an area that teacher training programmes have historically underemphasised relative to its pedagogical significance (Ellis, 2024; Goh & Burns, 2022).

**Methodological Reflection**

The convergent mixed-methods design employed in this study demonstrated clear value in illuminating the complex intersection of quantitative patterns and qualitative experience in needs analysis. The quantitative strand provided systematic, comparable data on the magnitude and distribution of students' needs across dimensions, while the qualitative strand revealed the mechanisms, interactions, and contextual specificities that statistical data cannot capture. The convergence of both strands most notably in the consistent identification of vocabulary limitations, affective barriers, and the desire for encouraging feedback strengthens the validity of the findings considerably. Divergences, such as the individual variation in responses to peer behaviour, provide equally



important contextual nuance. This methodological integration should be considered a model for future needs analysis research in Indonesian EFL contexts, where the depth of qualitative insight has been consistently underutilised relative to its explanatory potential.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated senior high school students' preferences, challenges, and teacher support needs in English speaking skill development through a convergent mixed-methods needs analysis. The findings reveal a theoretically significant gap between students' Very High awareness of speaking importance (TSA  $M = 4.78$ ) and their recognition of substantial current limitations (PSA  $M = 3.83$ ), establishing the necessity-lack structure at the core of Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) needs analysis framework. Students expressed strong learning needs centred on increased practice frequency (LN  $M = 4.53$ , Very High), constructive and immediate feedback, teacher modelling, and instructional relevance. Qualitative analysis generated six interconnected themes linguistic challenges, affective barriers, peer influence, classroom factors, out-of-class factors, and desired teacher support that illuminate both the mechanisms sustaining the observed necessity-lack gap and the conditions students identify as most conducive to overcoming it. The study's central theoretical contribution is its demonstration that linguistic and affective barriers do not operate in isolation but interact in a compounding cycle: vocabulary limitations generate communication failures, failures activate anxiety and fear of judgment, anxiety reduces communicative risk-taking, and reduced practice retards linguistic development. Effective instructional responses must therefore address both dimensions simultaneously developing lexical and phonological resources through structured, contextually embedded practice while creating the psychological safety conditions necessary for students to deploy those resources in authentic communication. The consistent convergence of quantitative and qualitative findings across all major themes strengthens confidence in these conclusions and provides a comprehensive empirical foundation for instructional design, teacher professional development, and curriculum policy decisions. Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. The sample of 15 questionnaire respondents and 5 interview participants, drawn from a single school, constrains the generalizability of findings. The exclusive reliance on self-report data leaves the relationship between students' expressed preferences and their actual learning behaviours unverified. The absence of teacher perspectives and classroom observations limits understanding of the instructional context from which students' experiences emerge. Future research should address these limitations through larger, multi-school samples; inclusion of teacher perspectives; direct classroom observation data; and longitudinal designs that track the development of speaking proficiency following instructional interventions informed by needs analysis findings. Research that systematically evaluates the effectiveness of instructional designs developed in response to documented learner needs would constitute a particularly valuable contribution to the evidence base for speaking instruction in Indonesian EFL contexts.

## REFERENCES

1. Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2018). *Doing interviews* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
3. Dewaele, J. M., Albakry, H., & Alrefaie, M. (2024). Foreign language speaking anxiety: A comprehensive review of research and pedagogical implications. *Language Teaching*, 57(2), 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000289>
4. Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in language learning motivation*. Routledge.
5. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Dweck, C. S. (2017). *Mindset: Changing the way you think to fulfil your potential* (Updated ed.). Robinson.
7. Ellis, R. (2024). Teacher feedback in second language acquisition: A comprehensive review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 46(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263123000487>
8. Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2022). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
9. Haryanto, E., Mukminin, A., & Habibi, A. (2022). Needs analysis for English speaking materials for Indonesian senior high school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46789>



10. Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>
11. Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Indrasari, N. (2016). English for Specific Purposes: A need analysis at the second semester of Physics Education students. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(1), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v9i1.425>
13. Kemendikbudristek. (2022). Kurikulum Merdeka sebagai opsi satuan pendidikan dalam rangka pemulihan pembelajaran tahun 2022. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
14. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
15. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
16. Maru, M. G., Pikirang, C. J., & Setiawan, S. (2021). The cumulative effects of educational disadvantage in remote Indonesian areas. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(4), 567–584. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14433a>
17. Marzuki, A. G., Prayogo, J. A., & Wahyudi, A. (2023). A needs analysis of English speaking materials for Indonesian high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v8i2.1023>
18. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
19. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2020). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
20. Nurhayati, D. A., Suryani, L., & Hidayat, D. N. (2024). Indonesian senior high school students' needs in learning English speaking skills: A survey study. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19(1), 45–62.
21. Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
22. Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2024). *Peer interaction and second language learning* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
23. Pratama, R. A., & Wulandari, S. (2023). Students' perceptions of English speaking skills for future careers in Indonesian vocational contexts. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 12(2), 78–94.
24. Rahman, F., Sahib, H., & Arianto, T. (2022). Vocabulary limitations as barriers to speaking fluency among Indonesian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Education*, 6(3), 234–249. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v6i3.24567>
25. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
26. Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
27. Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2023). *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda*. John Benjamins.
28. Storch, N. (2023). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.
29. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
30. Syafiq, A. N., Rahmawati, A., & Anam, S. (2021). Technology-enhanced language learning in Indonesian EFL contexts: Students' perceptions and preferences. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(5), 678–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1892234>
31. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
32. Wulandari, T., Marsigit, M., & Retnawati, H. (2024). Game-based language learning in Indonesian schools: Effects on engagement and speaking confidence. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(2), 156–173.

*Cite this Article: Rini., Baka, C., Sampelolo, R. (2026). Speaking Skills Development in Indonesian Senior High School: A Mixed Methods Needs Analysis of Student Preferences, Challenges, and Teacher Support. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 9(4), pp. 1890-1901. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V9-i4-22>*