p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

p-ISSN 2252-7427 e-ISSN 2541-3635
Indonesian EFL Journal
AISEE
The Association of Indonesia Scholars of English Education

I PREFER TO STAY SILENT": STUDENTS' NARRATIVES OF TEACHER DOMINANCE IN ELT CLASSROOM

Bahar*[1], Dahlia Husain[2], Ana Mariana[3]
[1]*English Literature, Social Economy Faculty, Universitas Fajar, Indonesia*
[2,3]*English Literature, Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Gorontalo, Indonesia*

Corresponding author's email: baharsetiawan@unifa.ac.id

APA Citation: Bahar., Husain, D., & Mariana, A. (2026). I prefer to stay silent": Students' narratives of teacher dominance in ELT classroom. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 12*(1), 184-198. https://doi.org/10.25134/z5ha0462

Received:12-09-2025 Accepted: 21-11-2025 Published: 30-01-2026

Abstract: Speaking is frequently positioned as the most visible indicator of success in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning, yet many Indonesian classrooms still show minimal student oral participation even in higher education. This study explores how learners narrate teacher power in EFL speaking lessons and how these interactional patterns shape psychological barriers that ends up in classroom silence. Using an interpretive qualitative design, the research was conducted at Fajar University, Indonesia. Unstructured, in-depth interviews were conducted in Indonesian with ten EFL students and one English lecturer to reduce language constraints on disclosure. Data were analyzed through iterative thematic coding, constant comparison, and theme refinement. The study revealed that power enactments were linked to four mutually reinforcing consequences: lowered speaking self-confidence, heightened fear of negative evaluation and punishment, weakened motivational intensity, and boredom-driven disengagement. Under such conditions, silence operated less as evidence of inadequate linguistic competence than as a rational strategy of self-protection within a high-risk, low-reward communicative environment. The study contributes a student-centered account of how everyday classroom routines operationalize power in speaking instruction and suggests that transforming authority from coercive control to supportive guidance is crucial for fostering willingness to communicate. Pedagogical implications include face-sensitive feedback, expanded wait time and turn allocation, negotiated topics, and psychologically safe participation norms to sustain ongoing speaking engagement for learners.
Keywords: *Teacher power; Classroom silence; EFL speaking lessons; Willingness to communicate; Fear of negative evaluation*

INTRODUCTION

In English as a foreign language, speaking is often treated as the most visible indicator of successful language learning. This narrative comes from the idea that through spoken interaction that learners transform their knowledge of vocabulary and grammar into communicative action (Sukmara et al., 2025; Vali et al., 2025). Classroom speaking provides opportunities to practice fluency, negotiate meaning, and build pragmatic competence through real-time exchanges. Yet, in many Indonesian context, EFL speaking lessons continue to be marked by a persistent and puzzling phenomenon: students remain silent, avoid volunteering responses, and participate minimally even when speaking is the stated instructional goal (Kurniawan, 2025). Explanations for this reluctance have frequently emphasized linguistic limitations—restricted vocabulary, imperfect grammar, or inaccurate pronunciation—as the primary barriers. While these factors matter, research has also suggested that linguistic explanations alone are insufficient to account for why learners who possess at least basic language resources still choose not to speak in class. The decision to speak either to take turn or to respond to something happening or remain silent is also shaped by psychological experiences and the social environment of the classroom (Hastini et al., 2025; Lee & Hampel, 2023).

It is a common believe among EFL studies that learners' willingness to speak depends not only on competence but also on affective conditions, including confidence, motivation, and anxiety

(Hernández, 2025). Self-confidence has been repeatedly identified as a key factor supporting learners' speaking engagement; when confidence is low, learners are less likely to take communicative risks or initiate interaction (Chaira & Taufik, 2025; Novia & Ramayanti, 2023; Rawis et al., 2024; Sudirman et al., 2020). Motivation is likewise central, sustaining learners' effort and persistence in the face of difficulty, especially in speaking where mistakes are unavoidable and exposure is public. In addition, when it comes to willingness to communicate (WTC) there were discussion on some variables such as how learners recognize classroom expectations, social support, and possible consequences as a reason on whether they choose to speak at a given moment. These perspectives highlighted that students may remain silent not because they have nothing to say linguistically, but because classroom conditions make speaking emotionally threatening, socially risky, or motivationally unrewarding (Alpeza et al., 2025; Sulindra et al., 2025).

Within this broader conversation, the role of the teacher is especially consequential. Teachers not only design speaking tasks and allocate turns; they also establish the emotional climate of the classroom, model interactional norms, and communicate what counts as acceptable participation. A consistent theme in the motivation literature is that teachers can function as a primary source of motivational support during classroom learning and that positive stimuli such as appreciation or supportive feedback can strengthen learners' motivation to engage. On the other hand, teacher practices can unintentionally undermine motivation when learners experience the classroom as unsupportive or punitive (Bozkurt & Topkaya, 2023). Studies that discuss teacher authority and classroom management further suggest that teacher power can be exercised as constructive control, guiding behavior and supporting learning, rather than as dominance that positions students as passive objects. Importantly, when speaking participation is demanded without psychological safety, teacher authority may amplify fear and silence instead of fostering engagement (Nirwana et al., 2025). Unfortunately, according to some studies, EFL classroom interaction is highly orchestrated in a teacher centred setting, in some cases even hierarchical (Dunham et al., 2024; Wang & Yuan, 2025).

This study is motivated by classroom narratives in which students attribute their reluctance to speak to patterns of teacher dominance during speaking instruction. Dominance is seen as an interactional structure where the teacher monopolizes talk time, minimizes question-and-answer exchanges, controls topic selection, and restricts students' opportunities to practice speaking. Students also describe experiences of being interrupted with immediate "wrong" labelling and being subjected to punitive consequences such as being asked to stand in public when unable to answer. Such practices appear to trigger a cluster of psychological outcomes: diminished self-confidence, reduced motivation intensity, heightened fear of speaking, and disengagement or boredom. While teacher authority is necessary for organizing classroom activity, the narratives suggest that certain deployments of authority may shift from supportive control to oppressive domination—an important distinction emphasized in work on power relations. When this shift occurs, students may interpret speaking not as a learning opportunity but as exposure to judgment and punishment (Nasution, 2025).

A power-relational lens provides a useful theoretical frame for interpreting these classroom experiences. From this perspective, power is not simply possessed; it is exercised through everyday routines, discourse practices, and disciplinary mechanisms that shape what learners can do and how they position themselves in interaction. In speaking classrooms, power is enacted in turn allocation, topic control, evaluation practices, and correction styles (Bahar et al., 2024; Purwati & Setiawan, 2022). When teachers interrupt learners to mark errors in ways that close interaction, or when punitive practices publicly highlight failure, power may operate as a disciplinary force that produces self-surveillance and self-silencing (Alghamdy, 2024). Relatedly, scholars on teacher power and influence in organizational and classroom contexts suggests that power can be used to regulate behavior and maintain classroom order, but its effects on learner motivation and participation may depend on whether it is enacted as supportive control or coercive domination. This distinction is central to understanding why some forms of teacher authority may facilitate engagement while others may suppress it.

Although prior studies have acknowledged affective factors in speaking, there remains a need for focused investigation into how students themselves narrate and make sense of teacher power as a contextual driver of silence. Much of the earlier conversation has tended to foreground learner deficits—linguistic or individual psychological traits—rather than the relational and interactional conditions in which those

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

psychological experiences are produced. Moreover, while teacher power has been discussed as a mechanism for classroom control and behavior management, less attention has been given to how particular power enactments in speaking lessons shape learners' confidence and fear in ways that directly influence WTC and speaking participation Addressing this gap is pedagogically important because speaking development is practice-dependent: reduced participation limits opportunities for feedback, interactional repair, and fluency building.

The present study responds to this need by examining EFL learners' narratives of classroom silence, with particular attention to teacher power as experienced by students and the psychological barriers that follow. Conceptually, research are drawn on emphasizing that self-confidence is a significant predictor of speaking engagement and WTC and that motivation intensity is crucial for sustaining speaking effort. We also align with arguments that teacher practices and affective support can shape motivation and engagement through appreciation and supportive responses. At the same time, we extend this work by foregrounding teacher dominance as a contextual mechanism that can erode confidence, diminish motivation, heighten fear, and produce boredom—conditions under which silence becomes a rational strategy of self-protection.

This article addresses the following research questions: (1) How do students describe and interpret teacher power in EFL speaking lessons (e.g., talk-time monopoly, topic control, punitive discipline, interruptive correction)? (2) How do students' narratives link teacher dominance to psychological barriers, particularly fear of speaking and low speaking self-confidence? (3) How do students explain the ways teacher dominance influences their motivation intensity and classroom engagement (including boredom), and how do these experiences contribute to speaking avoidance?

Speaking is frequently positioned as a central outcome of English language teaching because it represents the moment when learners convert linguistic knowledge into social action: producing meanings in real time, managing turn-taking, and responding to interlocutors. Recent work continues to emphasize that speaking development is deeply tied to interactional practice, where learners can build fluency and pragmatically appropriate language through authentic exchanges (Sukmara et al., 2025; Vali et al., 2025). Yet, a recurrent pattern in many EFL classrooms is the mismatch between speaking as an instructional goal and students' limited oral participation. In Indonesian contexts, classroom-based reports suggest that students often remain silent, avoid volunteering, and contribute minimally during speaking-oriented lessons, even when teachers explicitly prioritize oral practice (Kurniawan, 2025). This phenomenon has attracted continuing scholarly attention because silence in speaking classes reduces opportunities for practice, feedback, negotiation of meaning, and the development of interactional competence.

Historically, learners' reluctance to speak has been explained largely through linguistic deficits, such as limited vocabulary, imperfect grammar control, and pronunciation difficulties. Such explanations are intuitively appealing because learners do need a threshold level of linguistic resources to express themselves. However, work in applied linguistics increasingly suggests that linguistic explanations alone do not fully account for why learners with at least basic language resources still choose silence or avoid participation (Cechová, 2025). In other words, speaking is not only a matter of competence; it is also a matter of readiness, willingness, and perceived safety in a specific classroom environment. This shift in framing opens space for exploring how psychological factors and social classroom dynamics interact to shape students' speaking behavior.

Affective variables including confidence, motivation, and anxiety have long been recognized as shaping language learning engagement. Recent discussions continue to argue that learners' willingness to speak is strongly influenced by these affective conditions rather than being determined by competence alone (Hernández, 2025). When students feel confident, they are more likely to take communicative risks and engage in oral participation; when confidence is low, they may remain silent even if they have the language resources to attempt speech. This pattern has been reported in EFL contexts where speaking engagement is closely tied to learners' self-perceptions, prior experiences of evaluation, and expectations of how errors will be treated (Chaira & Taufik, 2025; Novia & Ramayanti, 2023; Rawis et al., 2024; Sudirman et al., 2020). Importantly, these studies imply that speaking is a socially exposed act: students speak not only to demonstrate linguistic knowledge but also to position themselves among peers and under teacher evaluation.

Self-confidence has also been repeatedly linked to speaking engagement and willingness to communicate (Salbaş & Ekmekci, 2025; Ulpa et al., 2025; Ye & Hu, 2025). Evidence indicates that confidence is not merely a stable trait but can be shaped by classroom conditions such as participation opportunities, quality of feedback, and the presence or absence of supportive interpersonal relations. In this vein, self-confidence is commonly treated as a significant factor that supports students' willingness to engage in classroom speaking, particularly when learners must manage the risk of making errors publicly. Related scholarship suggests that confidence contributes to learners' readiness to communicate and to sustain participation over time.

Motivation is another affective variable that has been consistently associated with persistence and engagement in speaking (Hiver & Dao, 2025; Saiful, 2025; Saito et al., 2025). Because speaking requires repeated practice and tolerance of mistakes, motivation functions as a psychological engine that helps learners remain engaged despite difficulties. Current perspectives continue to describe motivation intensity as central to learners' readiness to participate in speaking activities and invest effort in oral tasks (Huang, 2025; Suryanto et al., 2025; Zhong et al., 2025). Motivation, however, is also sensitive to the classroom environment and to teacher behavior, particularly in contexts where students interpret teacher reactions as support or threat.

Speaking anxiety represents a further barrier to oral participation. Learners can experience fear of negative evaluation, embarrassment, or punishment, all of which can trigger avoidance and self-silencing (Ali et al., 2025; Gobena, 2025; Vi et al., 2025). In Indonesian settings and other EFL contexts, researchers have reported that anxiety interacts with confidence and perceived classroom safety, producing reluctance to volunteer responses or initiate speaking (Hastini et al., 2025; Lee & Hampel, 2023). Thus, affective variables are best understood as part of a dynamic system shaped by the social conditions of the classroom rather than as purely internal learner attributes.

Willingness to communicate (WTC) has become a useful lens for explaining why learners speak in some moments but remain silent in others (Nyamekye et al., 2025; Salbaş & Ekmekci, 2025; Shahrokhi & Dehaghani, 2025). WTC scholars emphasizes that learners' decisions to speak are context-sensitive and are sometimes influenced by immediate situational cues, including perceived support, classroom norms, and expected consequences of participation. Studies have shown that learners' readiness to communicate is shaped by both individual affective factors and the classroom environment that frames participation as safe or risky (Kocaman, 2025; Portugal-Toro et al., 2025). Importantly, WTC is not reducible to proficiency: learners may have adequate language resources but still choose not to speak when anxiety is high or confidence is low.

In classroom interaction, WTC can be influenced by teacher practices that either broaden or restrict opportunities to speak. Turn allocation, topic selection, feedback style, and tolerance for errors can all raise or lower students' perceived communicative safety (Järvinen et al., 2025; Mahbodi et al., 2025) When the social environment communicates that mistakes will be penalized or that only "correct" speech is acceptable, WTC may decrease because learners anticipate negative outcomes. Conversely, when the environment signals supportive norms—encouraging attempts and treating mistakes as learning opportunities—WTC may increase. This situational framing links WTC to teacher–student interaction and, more broadly, to how power operates in classroom discourse.

Teacher behavior is widely recognized as a major influence on classroom climate. Teachers do not only deliver content; they also establish participation norms, shape emotional tone, and provide signals about whose voices matter (Aziz et al., 2025; Podiya et al., 2025; Steuer et al., 2025). Motivation research highlights that teachers can be a primary source of motivation, not merely through task design but also through interpersonal behaviors such as appreciation and supportive responses. In a similar direction, the role of appreciation has been positioned as a stimulus that can trigger and sustain motivation, potentially supporting learners to take risks in speaking and persist through errors.

In Indonesian EFL contexts, where students may have limited exposure to English outside school, the classroom becomes a central site for practice and affective support. When students feel that teachers are responsive, fair, and encouraging, motivation can increase and anxiety may be reduced. Conversely, when teachers are perceived as punitive, dismissive, or unapproachable, students' motivation intensity can decline and speaking avoidance can become a rational response. This concern is consistent with arguments that motivation is a key factor for success in EFL learning, especially in skill areas like speaking that require sustained practice.

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

While classroom management and teacher authority are necessary features of schooling, the form of authority matters. A power-relational perspective helps distinguish between teacher authority as supportive control and authority as domination. From this viewpoint, power is exercised through discourse, routines, and disciplinary mechanisms that shape the possibilities for student action and participation (Laia et al., 2025; Sharmin, 2025) In classroom interaction, power can be observed in who controls topics, who allocates speaking turns, how evaluation is performed, and how mistakes are treated. When teachers monopolize talk time, restrict students' opportunities to ask questions, or limit peer interaction, the interactional space for student speaking becomes structurally constrained.

Research discussing teacher authority and classroom management suggests that power can be exercised as constructive control that supports learning rather than as domination that positions students as passive objects (Cechová, 2025; Ibrahimova, 2025). This distinction is crucial for speaking classes because oral participation requires students to expose their developing competence publicly. If authority is enacted in ways that intensify embarrassment or increase fear of mistakes, teacher power may discourage speaking rather than support it.

Related scholars also recognizes that teacher power can serve functional goals, such as reducing disruption and guiding classroom behavior. For example, power can be conceptualized as a regulatory mechanism that influences student behavior and supports classroom functioning However, the motivational and affective consequences of power depend on how it is enacted. Coercive or punitive enactments may "control" behavior in the short term but undermine students' willingness to participate, especially in speaking tasks that require voluntary engagement. Studies discussing learner anxiety and the social-emotional dynamics of language learning highlight that classroom climate and teacher behaviors can shape whether students experience speaking as threatening or supportive (Hastini et al., 2025; Lee & Hampel, 2023). In Indonesian classrooms where teacher dominance is perceived as strong, punitive practices can amplify fear and reduce students' willingness to volunteer responses, contributing to persistent silence.

The literature suggests a plausible pathway linking teacher dominance to affective barriers and then to silence: (1) dominance practices reduce opportunities to speak and raise the perceived cost of speaking; (2) reduced practice and heightened evaluative threat weaken self-confidence; (3) punitive or unsupportive classroom climate lowers motivation intensity; and (4) fear of speaking increases, leading students to avoid participation. Self-confidence, as noted, is a significant factor supporting classroom speaking engagement (Gunawan, 2025; Ulpa et al., 2025) and is linked to broader readiness to communicate. When confidence is undermined, learners are less likely to initiate speaking, even when linguistic resources are present (Chaira & Taufik, 2025; Novia & Ramayanti, 2023; Rawis et al., 2024; Sudirman et al., 2020).

Motivation likewise mediates the relationship between classroom context and participation. Speaking requires repeated engagement; when teacher practices are perceived as discouraging or punitive, motivation intensity may decrease and learners may withdraw from speaking activities. Conversely, appreciation and supportive feedback can function as motivational stimuli and may encourage students to take communicative risks In EFL contexts, where motivation is often considered critical to success, demotivating classroom climates can have a direct impact on oral participation.

WTC provides a conceptual bridge that connects these affective factors to observable behavior. When confidence is low, anxiety is high, and motivation is weakened, WTC is likely to decline, leading to minimal voluntary speaking. Importantly, this framing also clarifies why linguistic explanations are incomplete: learners may remain silent even when they have sufficient vocabulary and grammar to attempt speaking because the situational costs outweigh the perceived benefits. This aligns with the broader critique that speaking reluctance cannot be fully explained as a linguistic deficit and must include psychological and social-environmental dimensions.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design to explore how teacher dominance and classroom power relations are experienced and narrated by participants in an English language teaching (ELT) context. A qualitative approach was selected because the focal constructs which is teacher dominance, fear of speaking, and low self-confidence are context-bound and they are best examined through participants' interpretations of

classroom events rather than through predetermined numerical indicators (Chand, 2025; Usman et al., 2025). The study was designed as an interview-based inquiry that prioritizes participants' accounts of everyday classroom interaction, with the goal of identifying recurring patterns and themes that explain why students may "prefer to stay silent" during English speaking activities. In line with interpretive qualitative traditions, the study assumes that students' and teachers' meanings are shaped by social interaction and institutional norms (Valle & Ferreira, 2025). Accordingly, the primary data consisted of in-depth interview narratives that capture what participants perceived to be the sources of speaking reluctance, how they experienced classroom interaction, and how particular teacher practices were interpreted as supportive control or as domination(Brink, 1993).

The research was conducted in Fajar University, Indonesia. The setting was selected because it represented a typical Indonesian EFL setting. The classroom context is important for understanding the phenomenon of silence because students' speaking participation is shaped by local norms of teacher authority, classroom management, and assessment routines. In Indonesian EFL contexts, learners often have limited opportunities to use English outside classroom, which places greater pressure on classroom interaction as the main site for oral practice.

Participants included one English lecturer, and ten EFL students. Recruiting both the teacher and the students allowed the study to capture perspectives from the two primary agents in classroom interaction: the teacher, who designs and manages speaking activities and regulates participation, and the students, who experience these practices and make moment-to-moment decisions about whether to speak or remain silent.

Students were eligible if they were enrolled in the targeted class and were willing to share their experiences of speaking participation in English lessons. While the study centered on students who reported reluctance to speak, the recruitment strategy aimed to capture variation in experience, including students who were more willing to participate and those who frequently avoided speaking. Such variation supports a richer account of how teacher dominance may be perceived differently across learners.

A purposive approach was used to ensure that participants could provide information relevant to the research focus: the use of teacher power and its perceived psychological consequences for speaking participation. The lecturer participant was included because their instructional and managerial choices shaped the classroom environment described by students.

Data were generated primarily through unstructured, in-depth interviews with the teacher and the students. Interviews were conducted in Indonesian (the participants' daily language) to ensure that responses were not constrained by participants' English proficiency or willingness to speak English. Using Indonesian was especially important because the research topic involved reluctance to speak; conducting interviews in English could have inadvertently reproduced the very anxiety and avoidance being studied. Allowing participants to communicate in a familiar language increased the likelihood of detailed reflection, emotional nuance, and clarification of sensitive experiences.

Interviews were unstructured and in-depth, with each session lasting approximately 45 minutes to 60 minutes. The unstructured format enabled participants to lead the direction of the narrative, highlight personally salient events, and elaborate on meanings they attached to teacher behavior and classroom interaction. While the interviews did not rely on a rigid set of questions, the researchers used a flexible interview guide to keep the conversation aligned with the study aims.

The analysis combined an established qualitative workflow for organizing and reducing data with a thematic approach for identifying patterns of meaning. The overall analytic orientation followed an iterative process of reading, coding, categorizing, and theme development.

The study drew on a data analysis approach that emphasizes systematic handling of qualitative data through cycles of reduction, display, and conclusion drawing. The process unfolded through the following steps: (1) Familiarization: The researchers repeatedly read the transcripts to gain a holistic understanding of participants' narratives and to identify preliminary patterns. (2) Initial coding: Meaningful segments of text were coded using short labels that summarized the essence of participants' statements (e.g., "teacher talks too much," "no chance to ask," "punishment for wrong answers," "interrupted by correction," "fear of being called," "embarrassment," "loss of motivation"). Coding was conducted with sensitivity to both what happened in class (interactional practice) and how participants felt (psychological response).

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

Categorization. Codes reflecting similar ideas were grouped into broader categories. For example: Theme development: Categories were then consolidated into interpretive themes that captured recurrent patterns across participants. Themes were constructed to reflect a pathway from teacher dominance practices to psychological barriers and then to speaking avoidance. In the present study, the primary themes aligned with participants' repeated emphasis on (a) lack of self-confidence, (b) reduced motivation intensity, and (c) fear of speaking. Theme refinement and narrative synthesis: Themes were refined by reviewing within-theme coherence (whether excerpts fit together meaningfully) and between-theme distinctiveness (whether themes represented different facets of the phenomenon). The final thematic narrative was developed by selecting representative excerpts, identifying variations across students, and integrating the teacher's perspective where relevant.

In qualitative analysis, researchers are instruments of interpretation. To manage interpretive bias, the authors maintained analytic memos documenting emerging thoughts, uncertainties, and decisions about code definitions and theme boundaries. These memos also recorded reflections on how researcher assumptions might influence interpretation and how alternative explanations were considered.

Several strategies were used to strengthen the study's credibility, dependability, and confirmability.

Member checking. To verify the plausibility of interpretations and to support claims of data saturation, participants were invited to review transcripts and provide feedback on whether the text accurately captured their intended meanings. Participants could clarify ambiguities, correct factual inaccuracies, or expand on key points.

Audit trail. The researchers maintained documentation of the analytic process, including coding notes, theme definitions, and decisions regarding inclusion of excerpts. This trail supports transparency and allows readers to understand how conclusions were reached.

Thick description: Findings were supported by rich excerpts that illustrate the classroom events and psychological reactions described. Thick description enables readers to assess transferability to similar ELT contexts.

Triangulation of perspectives. Including both student and teacher interviews provided complementary viewpoints on classroom interaction and disciplinary practices. While the study privileges student narratives (consistent with the article title and purpose), teacher accounts offered contextualization and helped interpret classroom norms.

The study followed ethical principles for research with human participants. Prior to data collection, participants were informed about the study's aims, procedures, and their rights, including the right to decline participation or withdraw without penalty. Consent was obtained from the teacher and from students (and, where required, from guardians and school authorities). Participants were assured of confidentiality. Pseudonyms or codes (e.g., S1–S10) were used to protect identities in transcripts and publications.

Given that some interview content involved sensitive experiences (e.g., punitive discipline and public embarrassment), interviews were conducted respectfully, and participants were reminded that they could skip any question. Data were stored securely, and only the research team had access to audio files and transcripts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study set out to understand why students in an Indonesian EFL students context prefer to remain silent during English speaking lessons, focusing on how teacher dominance and classroom power relations shape students' psychological experiences (Hastini et al., 2025; Kurniawan, 2025; Lee & Hampel, 2023). The findings reveal a coherent pattern: students' speaking avoidance is not primarily a product of linguistic insufficiency, but also a consequence of classroom interactional arrangements where teacher power is enacted in ways that restrict participation opportunities and elevate the affective risks of speaking. Across student narratives, four interrelated psychological outcomes emerged, those are low self-confidence, reduced motivation intensity, fear of speaking, and boredom which resulted in disengagement (Chaira & Taufik, 2025; Novia & Ramayanti, 2023; Rawis et al., 2024; Sudirman et al., 2020). All of which were consistently linked to experiences of teacher dominance, including teacher talk, limited question-and-answer opportunities, unilateral topic control, interruptive correction, and punitive disciplinary practices (Dunham et al., 2024; Wang & Yuan, 2025).

A central contribution of this study is its support for the argument that linguistic explanations alone do not sufficiently account for classroom silence. Students did mention that English was "hard," but

their accounts repeatedly located the decision to remain silent in the classroom's social-emotional ecology: fear of being stopped, corrected publicly, punished, or exposed in front of peers; reduced chances to practice; and a sense that only certain students receive attention. This is consistent with WTC scholars emphasizing that willingness to speak is situational, shaped by both personal affective factors and classroom context. In other words, students' silence functioned as a rational strategy of self-protection in a context where speaking was perceived as high-risk and low-reward (Bahar et al., 2024; Purwati & Setiawan, 2022).

The findings also align with the broader view that speaking is an inherently social act in the classroom: students do not speak only to demonstrate language knowledge, but also to manage face, identity, and social positioning. When teacher dominance structures interaction as primarily evaluative where the teacher controls the floor and publicly labels responses as "wrong" students may interpret speaking as exposure to judgment rather than as participation in a learning community. Thus, speaking reluctance is best understood as a phenomenon produced at the intersection of power, pedagogy, and affect (Cechová, 2025; Salbaş & Ekmekci, 2025; Ulpa et al., 2025; Ye & Hu, 2025)

Teacher power as "control" versus "domination"
The data strongly invite interpretation through the lens of power as enacted in everyday routines and discourse practices. Students described instructional interaction patterns where teacher talk dominates, student turns are scarce, and participation is tightly controlled through evaluative interruption and punishment. In Foucauldian terms, such practices can operate as disciplinary mechanisms: they produce surveillance (students anticipate being watched and judged), normalize certain forms of "correct" participation (speaking only when sure), and encourage self-regulation through silence.

Importantly, the issue is not that teachers should have no authority. Teacher authority is necessary for organizing learning. However, the findings suggest that participants experienced teacher power not as supportive classroom control but as coercive domination. This distinction resonates with arguments that teacher power should function as control to facilitate learning rather than domination t hat constructs students as passive objects. likewise discuss how power can regulate classroom behavior, yet the present findings emphasize a crucial point: regulatory power that relies on public punishment and harsh evaluation may carry unintended motivational and psychological costs that suppress speaking participation.

Theme 1: Low self-confidence as a product of restricted practice and punitive exposure
Students' narratives indicate that self-confidence is undermined by two mutually reinforcing mechanisms: (1) reduced opportunities to practice speaking and build competence in a supportive environment; and (2) increased risk of embarrassment through punitive or public evaluation (Alghamdy, 2024; Alpeza et al., 2025; Nasution, 2025; Sulindra et al., 2025).

First, participants repeatedly described teacher-centered instruction where the teacher "explains" for most of the lesson and provides minimal time for Q&A or discussion. This matters because confidence in speaking is not built solely through knowledge of language forms, but through repeated opportunities to attempt speech, receive supportive feedback, and experience small successes. When speaking opportunities are limited, students cannot develop the sense of mastery that underpins confidence. This aligns with the idea that confidence is a significant factor enabling speaking engagement and with research linking self-confidence to speaking participation and WTC. In the present context, teacher dominance constrained students' access to those confidence-building experiences.

Second, the narratives show that punitive practices—especially being asked to stand publicly when unable to answer—intensify shame and pressure. Such practices do not merely "correct" behavior; they communicate that failure is punishable and that inability to speak is a public deficit. This kind of exposure is particularly damaging in speaking, where students already face vulnerability in using a non-native language. Emphasizes self-confidence as a key factor affecting speaking willingness; the present findings demonstrate how teacher dominance can directly erode that confidence through public punishment and limited supportive practice.

Taken together, the data suggest that students' confidence was not simply low as a personal trait; rather, it was produced by classroom conditions that simultaneously reduced practice and increased threat. In WTC terms, these conditions lower students' perceived communicative competence and raise anticipated costs, thus decreasing readiness to speak.

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

> S4: *"Hhhmmmm. Kadang saya tidak percaya diri pak malu kalau bicara, saya jarang bicara di kelas juga karena guru lebih banyak menghabiskan waktu menjelaskan materi pelajaran."*
> (Hhhmmmm. Sometimes I am not confident, Sir, I feel shy when speaking. I rarely talk in class as well because the teacher spends more time explaining the lesson material.)

> S9: *"Hhhmmm. Saya malu pak kalau di sebut namaku oleh guru karena tidak bisa berbicara. Merasa tertekan, saya biasa di suruh berdiri kalau tidak bisa menjawab sehingga tidak punya rasa percaya diri kalau bicara di depan kelas."*
> (Hhhmmm. I feel embarrassed, Sir, when the teacher calls my name because I cannot speak. I feel pressured; I am usually asked to stand if I cannot answer, so I do not have confidence to speak in front of the class.)

Theme 2: Reduced motivation intensity under teacher dominance and limited autonomy

A second theme concerns motivation intensity—students' willingness to invest effort and sustain engagement in speaking. Participants described feeling "lazy," "not motivated," and "not enthusiastic," often attributing these feelings to teacher anger, punishment, lack of attention, and unilateral decisions about topics and materials (Hiver & Dao, 2025; Saiful, 2025; Saito et al., 2025)

Motivation scholarship underscores that sustained effort in speaking requires encouragement because speaking demands risk-taking and tolerance of mistakes. Yet students reported that attempts to ask questions could be met with teacher anger, and that the classroom pace continued without checking understanding. Such experiences can reduce students' sense of autonomy and relatedness—conditions often necessary for motivation to flourish.

The findings also resonate with the claim that teacher appreciation can function as a stimulus for motivation. In the present study, students experienced the opposite: punitive consequences and emotional distance replaced appreciation and encouragement. This likely weakened motivation to engage in speaking tasks, consistent with the idea that the teacher is a major motivational source during classroom learning. In an EFL context where motivation is often described as critical for success, motivational damage can be especially harmful because reduced motivation decreases practice frequency, which then slows improvement and further reduces confidence—a cyclical pattern (Ali et al., 2025; Gobena, 2025; Huang, 2025; Suryanto et al., 2025; Vi et al., 2025; Zhong et al., 2025).

Another key motivational mechanism emerging from the data is lack of agency. Students described that the teacher controlled topic selection, initiated talk, and determined what would be discussed. When topics were not comprehensible or relevant, students felt less able to contribute and became demotivated. This suggests that teacher dominance does not only restrict talk time; it also restricts participation by limiting students' ability to shape discourse. Such unilateral control can lead students to perceive speaking tasks as externally imposed rather than collaborative, reducing intrinsic engagement.

> S7: *"Saya kadang heran pak, karena guru Bahasa Inggrisku kalau mengajar sibuk sendiri, hhmmm biasa menjelaskan saja tidak ada tanya jawab. Jadi tidak ada juga praktek berbicara (speaking) sehingga kami tidak bisa communikasi."*
> (Sometimes I wonder, Sir, because my English teacher seems busy on their own when teaching, hhhmmm, usually just explaining without any question-and-answer session. So there is also no speaking practice, and as a result we cannot communicate.)

> S3: *"Hahahah, itu guru kalau mengajar cuek sekali, jarang kita ditanya masalah materi sudah mengerti atau tidak, lanjut terus. Jadi saya susah speaking karena cuma disuruh menulis baru menghafal."*
> (Hahahah, that teacher is very indifferent when teaching; we are rarely asked whether we understand the material or not, the lesson just continues. So I find speaking difficult because we are only told to write and then memorize.)

> S1: *"Saya kadang malas pak belajar Bahasa inggris apalagi speaking, karena guruku sedikit sedikit kita dihukum berdiri sampai pulang kalau tidak bisa bicara. Kadang saya bertanya kepada guru tapi malahan kadang marah, itu yang membuat saya tertekan dan tidak bersemangat belajar."*
> (Sometimes I feel lazy to study English, especially speaking, because my teacher often punishes us by making us stand until dismissal if we cannot speak. Sometimes I try to ask the teacher, but they even get angry; that makes me feel pressured and unmotivated to study.)

> S5: *"Guru kurang perhatian kita mengerti atau tidak pembelajaran tetap lanjut terus.tidak ada kesempatan bertanya."*

(The teacher pays little attention to whether we understand or not; the lesson just keeps going. There is no opportunity to ask questions.)

Theme 3: Fear of speaking as an interactionally produced barrier

Fear of speaking emerged as a direct consequence of evaluative interaction practices. Students described being stopped mid-speech, told they were "wrong," and corrected in ways that cut off their attempt to communicate. This form of interruption is not merely corrective feedback; it is a power enactment that closes the interactional space and signals that only error-free speech is acceptable (Kocaman, 2025; Nyamekye et al., 2025; Portugal-Toro et al., 2025; Salbaş & Ekmekci, 2025; Shahrokhi & Dehaghani, 2025).

From a power-relational perspective, repeated public labeling of error can function as a disciplinary technology that produces self-surveillance: students monitor themselves intensively to avoid making mistakes, and when certainty is not possible, they choose silence. In this sense, fear of speaking is socially produced. It emerges not only from personal anxiety but from an environment where mistakes are associated with negative consequences.

This finding is important because it clarifies a mechanism through which teacher dominance reduces WTC. When students anticipate interruption and public correction, the psychological cost of participation rises, lowering situational willingness to speak. Moreover, students' descriptions of the teacher's emotional demeanor—rarely smiling, creating a tense atmosphere—suggest that fear is reinforced by affective climate. A stern or distant demeanor can be interpreted as lack of psychological safety, intensifying anxiety and reluctance.

The narratives also show fear connected to punishment. Students who have observed others being punished or have experienced punishment themselves may generalize that speaking is risky. This is particularly concerning in speaking instruction because language learning requires experimentation and error as part of development. If the classroom environment treats error as a violation, learners will avoid the experimentation that is necessary for growth.

S10: *"Hhhmmm, saya takut bicara pak karena setiap temanku bicara biasa langsung di stop oleh guru, "Salah caramu!, tidak begitu", jadi saya tidak bicara karena takut akan terjadi kesalahan."*
(Hhhmmm, I am afraid to speak, Sir, because whenever my friends speak, they are usually stopped immediately by the teacher, "That's wrong!, not like that," so I do not speak because I am afraid of making mistakes.)

S2: *"Itu guruku tidak pernah tersenyum kalau masuk mengajar, jadi saya merasa tidak nyaman dengan keadaan di kelas selalu muncul rasa was was."*
(My teacher never smiles when entering the class to teach, so I feel uncomfortable in the classroom situation; there is always a sense of anxiety.)

S6: *"Hhmm, Bahasa Inggris susah pak, ditambah lagi guru suka marah kalau salah menjawab, ya lebih memilih diam saja mendengar, daripada di hukum disuruh berdiri ketika berbuat kesalahan."*
(Hhmm, English is difficult, Sir, and in addition the teacher often gets angry when we answer incorrectly. So I prefer to stay silent and just listen rather than be punished and made to stand when making mistakes.)

Theme 4: Boredom and disengagement as outcomes of teacher-centered routines and selective attention

Although the first three themes (confidence, motivation, fear) were most prominent, students also reported boredomand jenuh (fatigue) linked to monotonous instruction and selective attention. They described speaking lessons as repetitive, and dominated by memorization and teacher explanation, also perceived that the teacher focused mainly on students who were already strong (Cechová, 2025; Hastini et al., 2025; Ibrahimova, 2025; Lee & Hampel, 2023).

Boredom is significant because it represents a different pathway to silence: students may remain silent not only because they are afraid or lack confidence, but because they are disengaged and see little meaning in participation. In teacher-dominated classrooms, students can become passive recipients of instruction, and passive roles often foster boredom over time (Chaira & Taufik, 2025; Gunawan, 2025; Novia & Ramayanti, 2023; Rawis et al., 2024; Sudirman et al., 2020; Ulpa et al., 2025).

When students are not invited into dialogic interaction, speaking becomes something done "to" them (as evaluation) rather than "with" them (as communication). The result is reduced cognitive and emotional investment.

Selective attention is also important: when students perceive that only the "smart" students receive attention, they may infer that their participation is not valued, further lowering

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

confidence and motivation. This creates inequity in participation opportunities and can solidify silent identities among lower-participating learners.

> S8: *"Saya bosan pak, karena guru kalau mengajar temanku yang pinter dia perhatikan kalau saya tidak pernah, jadi melihat saja begitu."*
> (I feel bored, Sir, because when the teacher is teaching, they pay attention to my classmates who are smart, but never to me, so I just sit and watch.)

> S1: *"Menurutku pak, guru Bahasa Inggris kalau mengajar Speaking begitu begitu saja, misalnya disuruh menghafal saja di kelas sampai pulang, jadi bagaimana tidak bosan, menoton caranya mengajar."*
> (In my opinion, Sir, the English teacher teaches speaking in the same way all the time, for example we are only told to memorize in class until dismissal, so how could we not be bored? The teaching method is monotonous.)

> S3: *"Itu guruku pak, tidak pernah memberikan kesempatan tanya jawab dia sendiri menghabiskan waktu pembelajaran sampai pulang, jadi tidak ada saya cuma mendengar di kelas sampai jenuh."*
> (My teacher never gives opportunities for question and answer; they spend the whole lesson time until dismissal, so there is nothing for me to do except listen in class until I feel bored.)

Finally, by foregrounding students' narratives, this study highlights how learners interpret teacher behavior and how those interpretations shape emotional responses and participation choices. Such interpretive detail is difficult to capture through survey measures alone and is valuable for designing pedagogical interventions.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted in a single school with a small participant group. While this supports deep contextual understanding, it limits generalizability. Second, the findings are based primarily on self-reported narratives; although these narratives are crucial for understanding experience, they may be influenced by memory, social desirability, or selective recall. Third, translation from Indonesian to English introduces interpretive risk; although efforts were made to preserve meaning, nuance may be affected.

Future research could expand the scope in several ways. Multi-site studies could explore whether similar dominance–psychology pathways appear across diverse Indonesian regions and school types. Studies could also incorporate classroom observation and discourse analysis to examine how dominance is enacted in real-time interaction (e.g., turn-taking, feedback moves) and how these patterns correlate with student participation. Longitudinal research could explore how teacher practices shape confidence and fear over time and whether changes in feedback style or discipline practices lead to measurable improvements in speaking participation and WTC.

CONCLUSION

This study examined Indonesian EFL students' narratives of classroom silence in speaking lessons by foregrounding how teacher power was experienced and interpreted in everyday interaction. Across interviews, students consistently framed their reluctance to speak not primarily as a deficit of linguistic knowledge, but as a rational and protective response to a classroom ecosystem where speaking carried high emotional risk and limited communicative reward. Teacher dominance was reported through practices such as talk-time monopoly, restricted turn allocation, unilateral topic control, interruptive error correction, and punitive discipline. These interactional patterns were closely linked to four mutually reinforcing psychological consequences: lowered speaking self-confidence, heightened fear of negative evaluation and punishment, weakened motivational intensity, and boredom-driven disengagement.

Taken together, the findings suggest that silence in EFL speaking classrooms should be understood as an interactionally produced phenomenon at the intersection of pedagogy, power, and affect. When authority is enacted as coercive control rather than supportive guidance, students become more likely to self-monitor, avoid exposure, and withdraw from participation, thereby reducing the very practice opportunities required for speaking development. This study therefore contributes a student-centered account of how power operates through routine classroom discourse to shape willingness to communicate.

Pedagogically, the results indicate the need to reposition teacher authority toward facilitative, face-sensitive practice that lowers the social cost of speaking. Strategies that can help include expanding wait time and equitable turn allocation, negotiating topics and task formats to increase relevance and agency, reframing errors as learning resources through supportive feedback, and establishing psychologically safe participation

norms that reduce fear of embarrassment or punishment.

Finally, because this inquiry was based on a small sample in a single institutional setting and relied on interview narratives, the findings are best viewed as analytically transferable rather than statistically generalizable. Future research could triangulate student accounts with classroom observations and interactional/discourse analysis, compare multiple institutions, and examine longitudinally how shifts from coercive to supportive power enactments influence confidence, motivation, willingness to communicate, and sustained speaking participation.

REFERENCES

Alghamdy, R. Z. (2024). English teachers' practice of classroom discourse in light of zone of proximal development theory and scaffolding techniques. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 15*(1). https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1501.06

Ali, S. W., Bay, I. W., & Nur, F. S. (2025). Barriers to English-speaking proficiency among Indonesian EFL learners. *International Journal of Integrative Sciences, 4*(6), 1185–1194. https://doi.org/10.55927/ijis.v4i6.327

Alpeza, F., Loo, C. K. Y., Zhuang, Q., Hartman, M., Goh, S. S. N., & Li, J. (2025). A scoping review of primary breast cancer risk reduction strategies in East and Southeast Asia. *Cancers, 17*(2), 168. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers17020168

Aziz, M., Napitupulu, D. S., & Parapat, F. A. (2025). The influence of teacher communication patterns in Aqidah Akhlak education on students' academic achievement. *Attadrib: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, 8*(1), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.54069/attadrib.v8i1.840

Bahar, B., Limbong, S., Yusmanizar, Y., Insan, A. N., & Fitriana, F. (2024). Students reluctance to speak is a result of teachers dominance and powerful in EFL classrooms. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR), 6*(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.16035

Bozkurt, D., & Topkaya, E. Z. (2023). Critical pedagogy in English language teaching. *Innovational Research in ELT, 4*(2), 53–58. https://doi.org/10.29329/irelt.2023.623.5

Brink, H. I. L. (1993). Validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Curationis, 16*(2). https://doi.org/10.4102/curationis.v16i2.1396

Cechová, B. P. (2025). *Managing classroom discipline and behaviour in English language classes* [Unpublished manuscript/Laporan penelitian].

Chaira, R., & Taufik, T. (2025). The relationship between self-confidence and peer social acceptance. *TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal, 4*(1), 315–324. https://doi.org/10.61445/tofedu.v4i1.451

Chand, S. P. (2025). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation, 6*(1), 303–317. https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001

Dunham, H., Holyoke, E., & Crook, K. (2024). Teacher expertise in early childhood instruction: Cross-analysis of language policy and culturally sustaining pedagogies with multilingual learners. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 24*(3), 633–662. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984241276303

Gobena, G. A. (2025). Psychological barriers contributing to students' poor English language speaking skills. *International Journal of Instruction, 18*(1), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.18115a

Gunawan, W. (2025). Raciolinguistic practices in Indonesian context: A bibliometric analysis. *Multidisciplinary Reviews, 8*(8), Article 2025259. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025259

Hastini, H., Mertosono, S. R., Wahyudin, W., Eisenring, M. A. A., & Sadilia, S. (2025). Targeted learning with speaking worksheets: Advancing professional communication skills in EFL higher education. *Utamax: Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education, 7*(1), 12–29. https://doi.org/10.31849/utamax.v7i1.25132

Hernández, E. J. N. (2025). Análisis sistemático de la desmotivación del inglés. *GADE: Revista Científica, 5*(3), 537–555. https://doi.org/10.63549/rg.v5i3.726

Hiver, P., & Dao, P. (2025). From task motivation to L2 learning: Understanding links through learners' task engagement. *TESOL Quarterly*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3410

Huang, W.-C. (2025). Transforming self-identity in EMI: The interplay of behavioral engagement, motivational intensity, and self-efficacy. *Education Sciences, 15*(4), 429. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040429

Ibrahimova, S. (2025). The influence of teacher behavior on classroom discipline and learner autonomy. *Porta Universorum, 1*(3), 118–125. https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010311

Järvinen, K., Kähkönen, A.-L., Nieminen, P., & Mäntylä, T. (2025). Pre-service teachers interaction with students manifested in speech turns–a case study of interaction and acoustic analyses. *Classroom Discourse*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2025.2546863

Kocaman, O. (2025). Understanding what makes every language learner unique: Individual differences in language learning. *Journal of Individual*

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

Differences in Education, 7(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.47156/jide.1680621

Kurniawan, Y. (2025). The effectiveness of project-based learning in enhancing students' speaking skills in English. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran, 8*(1), 2861–2867. https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v8i1.42957

Laia, S. E., Marwa, M., Ramsilas, N., & Nadeak, W. (2025). Power relations in teacher-student interactions: A critical discourse analysis of English classroom talk. *Pedagogical Research Journal, 3*(1).

Lee, H., & Hampel, R. (2023). *Geosemiotics as a multiperspectivist lens: Theorizing L2 use of semiotic resources in negotiation of meaning with mobiles from outside the classroom* [Unpublished manuscript].

Mahbodi, M., Papi, M., & Wolff, D. (2025). How learners' trust in teachers shapes their feedback-seeking behaviors: A mixed-methods study. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251352268

Nasution, Y. I. S. (2025). The power of pedagogy: Teacher language authority in EFL. *Didaktika: Jurnal Kependidikan, 14*(3), 5789–5802. https://doi.org/10.58230/27454312.2527

Nirwana, Gunawan, W., & Muhlis. (2025). Understanding raciolinguistic dynamic in EFL classroom: A systematic literature review on language and identity in global educational contexts. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature), 10*(1), 175–200. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v10i1.36951

Novia, F., & Ramayanti, R. (2023). The correlation between students' self-confidence and speaking achievement. *Didascein: Journal of English Education, 4*(1), 35–43.

Nyamekye, E., Mutawakil, A.-R., & Slippe, D. P. (2025). The predictive impact of linguistic anxiety and 'fear of lecturers' on students' willingness to communicate in class. *Discover Psychology, 5*(1), Article 88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00348-1

Podiya, J. K., Navaneetham, J., & Bhola, P. (2025). *Influences of school climate on emotional health and academic achievement of school-going adolescents in India: A systematic review* [Unpublished manuscript].

Portugal-Toro, A., García-Peñalvo, F. J., Balderas Ruiz, L. A., & Vences Esparza, A. (2025). Cognitive and affective processes in second language oral communication: A mixed methods research. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, Article 1571099. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1571099

Purwati, O., & Setiawan, S. (2022). Exploring teacher power use and student silence in an EFL classroom: Evidence from Indonesia. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12*(2), 157–165. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.02.16

Rawis, J. A. M., Roza, N., Tawil, M. R., Anggraini, D. U., & Salabi, A. (2024). The influence of self-concept on students' self-confidence with positive thinking as a moderating variable. *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research, 4*(2), 3775–3783. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i2.9830

Saiful, S. (2025). Speaking up with confidence: Affect perseverance theory as pedagogical tool at high school. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review, 4*(3), 497–508. https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v4i3.3081

Saito, K., Dewaele, J.-M., & Abe, M. (2025). Disentangling the causal role of motivation, enjoyment, and anxiety in second language speech learning: A final report. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263125000038

Salbaş, H., & Ekmekci, E. (2025). The impact of classroom environment on students' willingness to communicate in foreign language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research, 129*, Article 102517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102517

Shahrokhi, M., & Dehaghani, F. J. (2025). Mediating role of students' self-assessment in the relationships among EFL students' L2 grit, motivation, and willingness to communicate. *BMC Psychology, 13*(1), Article 1052. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03414-4

Sharmin, M. (2025). Gendered participation in the global South: Voice, power, and classroom interaction in Bangladeshi tertiary EFL education. *ICRRD Journal, 6*(4), 189–208. https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v6i4.7

Steuer, G., Grecu, A. L., & Mori, J. (2025). Error climate and alienation from teachers: A longitudinal analysis in primary school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12659

Sudirman, A. M., Junaid, R., & Tamallo, I. I. (2020). The correlation between students' self-confidence and speaking performance. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning* [Sertakan nama jurnal jika ada].

Sukmara, E., Friatin, L. Y., & Tarwana, W. (2025). Boosting EFL speaking skills through role play: Evidence from seventh grade students. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy), 9*(2), 230–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/jall.v9i2.21510

Sulindra, E., Cendra, A. N., & Hartani, T. (2025). Power dynamics in EFL, ESL, ELF: A metaphorical adaptation of the Newtonian system. *English Education and Literature Journal, 5*(2), 194–205.

Suryanto, S., Fakhri, M., Alsolami, T., & Shinjee, B. (2025). Learner initiative and oral proficiency:

Investigating the link in English language instruction. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 11*(2), 143–158. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v11i2.11766

Ulpa, S., Tahir, M., & Amin, F. H. (2025). Teachers' perceptions of speaking confidence strategies: A case study at Cambridge English School. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 8*(2), 370–378. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v8i2.44442

Usman, A. C., Al-Hendawi, M., & Bulut, S. (2025). Approaches to qualitative research: A narrative literature review. *Advances in Medicine, Psychology, and Public Health, 2*(2), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12804997

Vali, A., Behtary, S., & Mostofy, A. (2025). Do free discussion courses matter? Evaluating the differential impacts of input-based instruction and proficiency level on IELTS speaking scores. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 6*(2), 716–724. https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.2.716-724

Valle, P. R. D., & Ferreira, J. D. L. (2025). Content analysis in the perspective of Bardin: Contributions and limitations for qualitative research in education. *Educação Em Revista, 41*, Article e49377.

Vi, N. H. T., Dan, T. C., & Han, T. P. B. (2025). Exploring classroom English-speaking anxiety: Perspectives of English non-majored students. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejals.v8i2.592

Wang, K., & Yuan, R. (2025). Incorporating critical pedagogy into second language teacher education: An identity lens. *RELC Journal, 56*(1), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882241302847

Ye, X., & Hu, G. (2025). Effects of motivational interventions on EFL learners' willingness to communicate, self-confidence, and anxiety: An experimental study. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251367858

Zhong, J., Ismail, L., & Lin, Y. (2025). Investigating EFL students' engagement in project-based speaking activities: From a multi-dimensional perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, Article 1598513. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1598513