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Abstract: This study aims 1) to compare the speaking performance of university students who graduated from Islamic boarding school and public school-based senior high schools and 2) to investigate the potential factors affecting the difference of their speaking performance. First year students of a State Islamic University in Lampung - Indonesia participated as the subjects of research. The data of students’ speaking performance was obtained from the documentation of students’ speaking entrance test score. Then, a semi-closed-ended questionnaire investigating the curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs in their previous high schools covering the sorts, the frequency, and the duration of the activities was distributed to disclose the underlying reasons of the speaking performance differences. The results revealed that generally the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates’ speaking performance is slightly better than the public-based one with a minor difference on the five aspects of speaking assessment. The former showed better achievement in fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, whereas the latter got better result in grammar and pronunciation. Dissimilar variations of the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities at both types of school and the frequency of the activities might be the potential factors affecting the differences.
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INTRODUCTION

Speaking skill is the ability to use the language in oral form to express what is on one’s mind. In learning speaking, there are a number of components emphasized on: grammar, comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency (Brown, 2004) as the indicators of speaking ability. Thus, in the process of teaching and learning speaking teacher should facilitate students with such meaningful learning experiences to allow them practice and improve those components. It is expected that students do not only speak meaningfully and fluently but also produce accurate utterances. Based on its function, the purpose of teaching English Subjects in Current curriculum in High School in Indonesia includes: (1) to develop communication ability in the language both orally and in written form covering listening, speaking, reading, and writing, (2) to grow awareness of the nature and importance of English as a foreign language to become a major tool of learning, and (3) to develop understanding of the relationship between language and culture as well as expand the cultural horizons. Thus, students have cross-cultural insights and engage in cultural diversity (BNSP, 2005).

Thousands of students pursuing the higher education at Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia, in general, fall into two major categories: the graduates of Islamic boarding school-based senior high schools and those of public school-based ones (Akademik, 2016). Taking the curriculum of Islamic boarding school into consideration where it puts its emphasis more on religious lessons and practices (Amrizal, 2011; Rasyid, 2012), it is not surprising at all that the former possesses better competency in the field of religious subjects. In contrast, the latter excels at the non religious ones as the curriculum of public school-based is more on the non-religious subjects (Amrizal, 2011). English - one of the non-religious subjects – is exceptional since students at the Islamic boarding school, particularly the modern one, are also highly encouraged to master English, in this case speaking skills with daily conversation activity (Mastuki, 2005; Tahir, 2017) a particular research to disclose the fact of
the speaking ability of the two kinds of school graduates is necessarily carried out.

The purpose of this study was to reveal whether there was difference of speaking ability between the Islamic boarding school-based and public-based senior high school graduates, and also to find out the possible causes of the difference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

English Language Learning at Senior High School

Based on its function, the purpose of teaching English Subjects in Current curriculum in High School includes: (1) Develop communication ability in the language both orally and in written form. These capabilities include listening (listening), speaking (speaking), reading (reading), and writing (writing), (2) Grow awareness of the nature and importance of English as a foreign language to become a major tool of learning, (3) develop understanding of the relationship between language and culture as well as expand the cultural horizons. Thus, students have cross-cultural insights and engage in cultural diversity (BNSP, 2005).

To achieve the goal of teaching English subjects requires mutual linkages between components in the curriculum, the teaching objectives in the context of the current curriculum and aligned with the Content Standards set out in the Government Regulation No.19, expressed in terms of the formulation of standards of competence and basic competences are then formulated specifically in the form of indicators that is used as of consideration in choosing and developing other curriculum components, such as teaching materials, learning activities, and evaluation of learning. The four major components of this curriculum in English Language Curriculum Subjects must be explicitly included in the syllabus of English subjects developed both for the sake of learning in the classroom and for the development of teaching materials. In the teacher's instructions the four components are tested to be mapped by reference to the curriculum (BNSP, 2005).
Learning activities organized by school should, therefore, be aimed at equipping students with learning experiences to achieve the expected goals. These activities are commonly developed and grouped into three categories including intra-curricular, co-curricular and intra-curricular activities (Dakir, 2010).

**Intra-curricular activity**

In general, intra-curricular activities are activities undertaken by the school that has a regular, systematic and scheduled program with a major purpose of educating students and allowing them to achieve the educational objectives (Dakir, 2010). It means that students are obliged to follow the activities commonly offered to students in the form of lessons presented in the class. As of boarding school concept is concerned, in particular, the activities are the collaboration among the curriculum of boarding school, Ministry of Religious Affairs and Ministry of National Education (Amrizal, 2011).

English subject is an inseparable part of intra-curricular activities in senior high school starting from the first year up to the third year of study with varied number of hours ranging from 2 to 4 in a week (Permendikbud No. 59, 2014).

**Co-curricular Activity**

Co-Curricular activity is an activity that is to support the attainment of intra-curricular programs (Dakir, 2010). In other words, it is carried out with the intention that students better understand and deepen the existing material in intra-curricular, usually in the form of assignment or other actions relating to the learning materials of intra-curricular program. In conducting co-curricular activities, there are some things to take into account:

1) The task should be clear and appropriate to the subject or sub-subject being taught.

2) The teacher should know the level of difficulty for the students so that the tasks given to the students in accordance with their ability.
3) The assessment of co-curricular task should be clear and fair in accordance with the results of each student’s ability.
4) The co-curricular task should be to deepen the students’ knowledge of certain learning materials (Saputra, 1998).

Co-curricular activity is an additional activity of students which is mandatory, although not necessarily carried out in the classroom. The following are some of the co-curricular programs: Reading articles related to lesson other than textbook, home assignment, visiting museum and other historical places etc (Saputra, 1998).

Extra-curricular activity

Extracurricular activities are activities performed outside of regular school hours, and most of the materials are beyond the ones given in intra-curricular, which serve primarily to develop the ability of students in accordance with their interests and talents, expand their knowledge, learn how to make relationship, add skills and can be implemented in schools or sometimes outside of school (Dakir, 2010).

In carrying out the extracurricular activity, there are things that must be considered including active participation and fun (Permendikbud No. 62, 2014). All students should be encouraged to actively participate in the extra-curricular activities relevant to their interests. Besides, the activities carried out should be created in such a joyful atmosphere that students may have fun while doing the activities.

These programs can be in the form of activities of physical performances like scouting and marching; scientific works; talent and interest development; religious affairs and others (Permendikbud No. 62, 2014)

Concept of Speaking Ability

Learning speaking has a purpose that is to make the students able to use English as a means of communication. Speaking is the
main skills in communication in two ways of process between a speaker and a listener and involved productive and receptive skills of understanding (or listening with understanding) from this definition, it can be inferred that in order to be able to speak, one should master the productive skills and the receptive skills (Carter & Nunan, 2001).

Further, Harmer states that speaking is expressive sound counterpart to aid require somewhat more complex abilities. He adds that oral language or speaking is the most confidential form of immediate communication (Harmer, 2000). The objects of teaching and learning a foreign language is to motivate the students to be able to use English in oral and written, in this case the writer underlines about students’ speaking ability.

Speaking skill is the ability to use the language in oral form. From elementary, even kindergarten up to university, this skill is limited to the ability to conduct a simple conversation on some subjects e.g. expressing regret, gratitude, agreement, offer, certainty, etc (Setiyadi, 2006). Among the four skills, speaking skill is a difficult one to assess with precision, because speaking is a complex skill to acquire (Luoma, 2014). The five components generally recognized in analyzing speech process include comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency (Brown, 2004).

Thus, it can be concluded that students’ speaking ability is their ability to express what they are going to say to other people by using their own words with good mastery of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and also comprehension of the content.

**METHOD**

The study tries to compare the speaking performance of the Islamic boarding school-based and public-based senior high school graduates. This research, therefore, uses a descriptive comparative approach. Then, the description is in the form of narrative to complete the overall picture of what is happening in activities or events that are reported (Creswell, 2012). The respondents were all first year students
staying at the Students’ Dormitory (Ma’had Al-Jami’ah) of a State Islamic University in Lampung – Indonesia.

This study was conducted in 2015 where at that time there were 5220 new students enrolled in the intended university that distributed into 5 faculties (Tarbiyah and Education, Syariah and Law, Ushuluddin and Philosophy, Dakwah and Communication, and Economy and Islamic Business). Of those first year students in 2015, 273 students that consisted of 70 male and 203 female decided to stay at the Students’ Dormitory. To be more specific, of 273 students, 187 were public-based senior high school graduates, and the 86 of them were Islamic boarding school graduates.

The researchers used documentation and questionnaire as the data collecting techniques. The document analyzed was the entrance test score of English speaking ability of students wanting to stay at Students’ Dormitory (Ma’had Al-Jami’ah). Meanwhile, the questionnaire was investigating the extra-curricular, co-curricular and intra-curricular activities conducted at their schools in terms of the types of activities, the frequency and the duration of those activities. There were 14 items of the questionnaire comprising 8 items related to intra-curricular activities, 3 items for co-curricular activities and another 3 items for extra-curricular activities. The questionnaire was developed in a semi-closed-ended format.

In this research, the researchers analyzed the data following three steps: data reduction, data display, and data conclusion. In the first step, the researchers selected the data that is suitable with the focus of the problem. The researchers discarded the irrelevant data. In data display, the researchers displayed the data in the form of narrative of the research result. Finally, after analyzing and displaying the data, the researcher made a conclusion (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Speaking Performance of Islamic Boarding School- and Public School-Based Graduates

To obtain the empirical data, the document of entrance test score of the new students, especially the English oral test, was vigorously analyzed. The result of the analysis is displayed in table 1.

| Criteria       | Pronunciation | Vocabulary | Fluency | Grammar | Comprehension | Average |
|----------------|----------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|
| Boarding School| 59             | 65         | 64      | 56      | 62            | 61.2    |
| Public School  | 63             | 60         | 58      | 60      | 57            | 59.6    |

From the table, it can be concluded that the speaking ability of the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates is a little bit better than that of public-based senior high school graduates. The average score of the boarding school graduates is amounting 61.2 while that of the public school is 59.6. It indicates two things:
1) The difference of the two average scores is very slight, 1.6. It means that there is only a slight difference between the speaking ability of the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates and that of the public-based senior school.
2) Despite the fact that the speaking ability of the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates is slightly higher than that of the public-based senior school, the average score achieved by the two groups is considered low, 59.6 and 61.2, compared to national standard of the criteria of minimum mastery (KKM) for all subjects including English applied at school in general which is minimally 75 (Nasional, 2006).

When analyzed further, on one side it was found that the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates got better result in such aspects as vocabulary, fluency and comprehension public school ones. To elaborate, the average score of vocabulary aspect collected by the former amounts 65, while the latter got 60. It
means that there is a difference of 5 points. Then, for the fluency aspect, the gap is expanding to 6 points in which the former gained 64 average score and the latter’s average score is 58. For the next aspect comprehension, the gap is exactly the same as the first one vocabulary that is 5 points. The average score achieved by the former is amounting 62, whereas the latter could get 57. In short, the graduates of boarding school could show better performance in these three aspects of speaking with 5 to 6 points in distance. Collectively they excelled the public school graduates 16 points for vocabulary, fluency and comprehension aspects.

On the other side, public-based senior high school graduates showed higher competence in the aspects of pronunciation and grammar. To be specific, for the aspect of pronunciation the average score attained by the graduates of public senior high school is 63 which is 4 points higher than that of boarding school graduates 59. Likewise, there is a 4-point-difference, too for the grammar aspect in which the public senior high school graduates obtained 60 compared to 56 of the boarding school graduates. It is obvious that the public school graduates performed better in the aspects of pronunciation and grammar with the gap of 4 points for each. Altogether, they collected 8 points higher for these two aspects of speaking.

Nevertheless, discrepancy of competence does not exist as the average score of each aspect obtained by the two groups is fairly close. In other words, overall the speaking ability of the graduates of both types of school is unexpectedly below the standard. This phenomenon is commonly found in Indonesia as most students feel anxious to produce the language orally (Anandari, 2015). The anxiety residing within the students undoubtedly hinder their speaking performance. Many students are lack of confidence to speak up their ideas and feel afraid of making mistakes. Inhibition makes them feel worried of making mistakes, afraid of getting disapproval, and shy (Ur, 1996). As a result, students could not perform their best ability in speaking.
Potential Causes of Speaking Ability Differences

To disclose the possible causes of the differences, analyzing of the questionnaire was necessarily carried out. Three major components were covered in the questionnaire including activities of intra-curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Result of questionnaire is presented one by one regarding those three major components respectively. Table 2 presents the respondents’ responses upon the questions of intra-curricular activities given to them.

Table 2 result of questionnaire for intra-curricular activities

| Question                                      | Public School | Boarding School |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| The number of sessions in a week              |               |                 |
| 1 x                                           | 48 %          | 1 x 25 %        |
| 2 x                                           | 52 %          | 2 x 33 %        |
| 3 x                                           | 33 %          | 42 %            |
| The duration of each session                  |               |                 |
| -                                             | -             | 45 minutes 11 % |
| 1 hour                                       | 35 %          | 2 hours 67 %    |
| 2 hours                                      | 65 %          | 3 hours 27 %    |
| Teachers’ speaking ability                    |               |                 |
| Bad                                           | 0 %           | Bad 0 %         |
| Fair                                          | 75 %          | Fair 44.5 %     |
| Good                                          | 33 %          | Good 55.5 %     |
| Teachers’ teaching skills                     |               |                 |
| Bad                                           | 0 %           | Bad 0 %         |
| Fair                                          | 58 %          | Fair 52 %       |
| Good                                          | 42 %          | Good 48 %       |
| The availability of English learning facilities |             |                 |
| Bad                                           | 33 %          | Bad 30 %        |
| Fair                                          | 50 %          | Fair 52 %       |
| Good                                          | 17 %          | Good 18 %       |
| The availability of supporting English learning materials | | |
| Bad                                           | 33 %          | Bad 30 %        |
| Fair                                          | 50 %          | Fair 52 %       |
| Good                                          | 17 %          | Good 18 %       |
| Teachers’ way of teaching                     |               |                 |
| Bad                                           | 17 %          | Bad 3.7 %       |
| Fair                                          | 66 %          | Fair 70 %       |
| Good                                          | 17 %          | Good 26.3 %     |
| Chances for students to practice using English |               |                 |
| Yes                                           | 6 %           | Yes 23.7 %      |
| No                                            | 27 %          | No 24.3 %       |
| Sometimes                                     | 67 %          | Sometimes 52 %  |

Intra-curricular activities as elaborated in table 2 disclose the superiority of the teaching and learning process of English subject at boarding school. About the number and duration of English sessions
in a week, in public school it was only once or twice with 1 or two hours per session, while in some boarding schools it was up to thrice with 45 minutes, two or three hours per session. Then, concerning the teacher’s competence, the speaking ability and teaching skills, it was apparent that the ones in boarding school were better than those in public school. However, regarding the learning facilities, seemingly there was no significant difference.

Table 3 result of questionnaire for co-curricular activities

| Question                        | Public School |         | Boarding School |         |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                                 | Answer        | %       | Answer          | %       |
| Co-curricular activities        | Yes           | 18.5    | Yes             | 32      |
|                                 | Additional class | 18.5 | - Speech          | 23      |
|                                 |               |         | - Vocabulary enrichment | 28      |
|                                 |               |         | - Conversation exercise |         |
|                                 | No            | 81.5    | No              | 17      |
| The frequency of the            | Often         | 67      | Often           | 41      |
| co-curricular activities        | Sometimes     | 33      | Sometimes       | 29      |
|                                 | Never         | 80      | Never           | 33      |
| The duration of the             | No answer     | 13      | 1 hour          | 42      |
| co-curricular activities        | 1 hour        | 7       | 2 hours         | 25      |

Likewise, co-curricular activities in boarding school apparently a lot better than those in public school in terms of program and frequency. There were more programs available for students at boarding school to practice their English compared to those at public school. Three co-curricular activities at boarding school were mentioned by the respondents: speech, conversation exercises and vocabulary enrichment; while at public school there was only one activity, additional class. Besides, the frequency as well as the duration of the programs in boarding school were also higher in number than that in public school. 81.5% respondents of public school graduates claimed that there were no curricular activities at
their school, whereas only 17% of boarding school graduates who did not get the co-curricular activities at boarding school.

Table 4 result of questionnaire for extra-curricular activities

| Question                        | Public School |    | %  | Boarding School |    | %  |
|---------------------------------|---------------|----|----|-----------------|----|----|
| Extra-curricular activities     | Yes           | 58 |    | Yes             | 67 |    |
| - English club                  |               |    |    | - English club  |    |    |
| - public speaking               |               |    |    | - Speech        |    |    |
| - speech contest                |               |    |    | - News          |    |    |
| - Story telling                 |               |    |    | - casting       |    |    |
| - Scrabble                      |               |    |    | - Storytelling  |    |    |
| - Debate                        |               |    |    | - Debate        |    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - Reading poetry|    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - Solo song     |    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - Broadcasting  |    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - ITEC (information technology) |    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - English club  |    |    |
|                                 |               |    |    | - Scrabble      |    |    |
| No                              | 42            |    |    | No              | 33 |    |
| The frequency of the            |               |    |    |                |    |    |
| extra-curricular activities     | Often         | 0  |    | Often           | 73 |    |
|                                 | Sometimes     | 67 |    | Sometimes       | 22 |    |
|                                 | Never         | 33 |    | Never           | 5  |    |
| The duration of the             | 1 hour        | 34 |    | 1 hour          | 27 |    |
| extra-curricular activities     | 2 hours       | 33 |    | 2 hours         | 29 |    |
|                                 | 3 hours       | 33 |    | 3 hours         | 44 |    |

Obviously, the variety of programs, the frequency and duration of sessions of extra-curricular activities elaborated in the table above showed that the activities in boarding school were higher than those in public school. To be specific, 67% of boarding school respondents claimed that they got extra-curricular activities compared to 58% of public school. It means that there is 7% difference in which the rate of activities at boarding school is higher than that at the latter. In addition, the varieties of activities at boarding school were also greater than those in public school for instance the presence of such activities as poetry reading, solo song, news casting and IT English club at boarding school. Speaking about
the frequency of activities as well as the duration of extra-curricular activities, it is unlikely that the public school is behind the boarding school.

As a whole, the superiority of English programs in terms of intra-, co- and extra-curricular activities for students of Islamic boarding school-based senior high school compared to those of public senior high school is very obvious. It is dealing with the varieties of activities, the frequency of the program implementation as well as the duration of the activities carried out.

It is evident that students of Islamic boarding school got more chances to practice using English. Therefore, their fluency was better than those of public school. It also inevitably affects their better vocabulary mastery and level of comprehension. This emphasizes that one of the effective ways to let students augment their speaking skills is by providing more opportunities for them to practice using the language (Khan & Ali, 2010). It implies that by having more chance to practice using the language, students tend to be more confident and acquire better competence (Boonkit, 2010).

The establishment of the varied speaking practice programs for students alone, however, is not sufficient to promote their speaking skills. It should be supported with competent tutors who will overwhelmingly motivate the students to be actively involved in the activities by showing their good level of speaking skills as well as employing effective and interesting teaching techniques. Otherwise, the learning goals are not optimally achieved by the students as indicated in this research. It is true that the graduates of boarding school show better performance of speaking skills than the public school ones, yet, it is still below the standard. It may happen due to the teachers’ lack of competencies. It was revealed that the teachers’ speaking skills were deemed improper by more than 40% of students of boarding school. Worse than that, more than 50% students thought that the teachers’ teaching skills are not good.

To add, the teaching learning materials as well as supporting facilities are also influential to the attainment of the learning
objectives. For the case of the boarding school, the situation of the two elements was found to be exactly the same. It was exposed that only 18% students of boarding school considered that they had good materials and facilities of teaching and learning, 50% students thought of having fair materials and facilities, and 32% students believed that they had bad learning materials and facilities.

Therefore, by getting more chances to practice, in terms of variety of activities, frequency and duration of English speaking activities, graduates of boarding school-based senior high school could acquire better performance than the public school-based ones. Nevertheless, this achievement still falls below the standard on the grounds that they were not guided by the supposedly competent teachers. Also, the situation of lacked leaning materials and facilities contribute to the low achievement of the speaking skills.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, as a whole, the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates’ speaking ability is slightly better than the public-based senior high school graduates’. To be specific, it was found out that there was a minor difference of the students’ speaking ability in the five aspects of speaking assessment – pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, grammar and comprehension. The Islamic boarding school-based graduates showed better achievement on the aspects of fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, whereas the public-based graduates got better result in the aspects of grammar and pronunciation.

Then, there were several causes of speaking ability differences between the Islamic boarding school-based senior high school graduates and the public-based senior high school graduates. The differences may happen due to dissimilar variations of the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities of the English subject at both types of school. In addition, the frequency of the activities also counts. Apparently, students at Islamic boarding school had more opportunity to practice using English compared to public-based
school students. However, considering the accuracy of grammar and pronunciation, interestingly students of public-based school showed their superiority due to the teachers’ tendency to emphasize more on this particular aspect.

Taking the research findings into account, it is highly recommended that students are given as much opportunity as possible to practice producing the target language, English, both inside and outside the class for the sake of acquiring good speaking ability in terms of the fluency as well as the accuracy. Also, there should be a well-maintained collaboration among English teachers and other parties at school, especially the school management, to make sure that the programs of English subject in intra-, co- and also extra-curricular activities are properly designed and effectively implemented.

REFERENCES
Akademik, B. (2016). *Laporan Hasil Seleksi Mahasiswa Baru IAIN Raden Intan Lampung Tahun 2016*. Bandar Lampung.

Amrizal. (2011). Sekolah Versus Pesantren, Sebuah Perbandingan Menuju Format Baru Mainstream Lembaga Pendidikan Nasional Peniada Dikotomik. *Jurnal Sosial Budaya*, 8(1), 114–131.

Anandari, C. L. (2015). Indonesian EFL Students’ Anxiety in Speech Production: Possible Causes and Remedy. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(1), 1–16.

BNSP. (2005). *Standar Isi SMA/MA*. Jakarta.

Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1305–1309.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman Education Ltd.
Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (Fourth Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Dakir, H. (2010). *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan Kurikulum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Harmer, J. (2000). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburg Gate: Pearson Education Limited.

Khan, N., & Ali, A. (2010). Improving the speaking ability in English: The students’ perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3575–3579.

Luoma, S. (2014). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mastuki, H. (2005). *Manajemen Pondok Pesantren*. Jakarta: Diva Pustaka.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis, an Expanded Sourcebook* (Second Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication Inc.

Kemendikbud (2014). Permendikbud No. 59 tentang Kurikulum 2013 Sekolah Menengah Atas/Madrasah Aliyah. Jakarta

Kemendikbud (2014). Permendikbud No. 62 tentang Kegiatan Ekstra Kurikuler pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. Jakarta.

Kemendiknas (2006). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 24 Tahun 2006 tentang Pelaksanaan
Irfani, Meisuri, & Rohmatillah, Speaking Performance of Islamic Boarding School and Public School-Based Graduates: A Comparative Study

Standar Isi dan Standar Kompetensi Lulusan. Jakarta.

Rasyid, R. (2012). The Integration of the National Curriculum into Pesantren Education System. JICSA, 1(2), 1–12.

Saputra, Y. M. (1998). Pengembangan Kegiatan Ko/Estrakurikuler. Jakarta: Depdikbud.

Setiyadi, A. B. (2006). Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Tahir, S. Z. Bin. (2017). Multilingual Teaching and Learning at Pesantren Schools in Indonesia. Asian EFL Journal, 98(2), 74–94.

Ur, P. (1996). A Course in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.