

Implementation Of Praktika.AI On Enhancing The Speaking Ability Of Eleventh-Grade Students At Smkn 3 Parepare

Irma Rahayu^{1*}, Ambo Dalle², Mujahidah³, Zulfah⁴, & Abdul Haris Sunubi⁵

¹State Islamic Institute, Parepare, Indonesia

²State Islamic Institute, Parepare, Indonesia

³State Islamic Institute, Parepare, Indonesia

⁴State Islamic Institute, Parepare, Indonesia

⁵State Islamic Institute, Parepare, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author, Email : irmarahayu@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29-05-2026

Revised: 10-07-2026

Accepted: 07-08-2026

Published: 02-09-2026

Volume: 4

Issue: 2

DOI: 10.61276/loquela.v4i2.93

KEYWORDS

Praktika.AI application, Speaking Ability, Eleventh-grade students at SMKN 3 Parepare

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of the Praktika.AI application in improving students' speaking especially Students at SMKN 3 Parepare. This research employed a quasi-experimental design involving pre-test and post-test administered to two groups, The population of this study consisted of students from class XI SMKN 3 Parepare. The sample was taken from two classes, consisting class XI Fashion of 22 total students who were taught using the Praktika.AI, and class Computer Network and Engineering as the control group, consisting of 24 student who were taught using conventional method. The instrument used in this study was a speaking test assessed based on three aspects: fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation, data analysis was carried out using SPSS. The results showed that the data were normally distributed. Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the significance values were as follows: pre-test for the experimental group for three aspect speaking test: fluency (0,008), vocabulary (0,129) and pronunciation (0,052) pre-test for the control group for three aspect speaking test: fluency (0,000), vocabulary (0,004) and pronunciation (0,000) . while post-test for the experimental group for three aspect speaking test : fluency (0,123), vocabulary (0,072) and



pronunciation (0,062) and post-test for the control group for three aspect speaking test: fluency (0,000), vocabulary (0,005) and pronunciation(0,012) All values were greater than a0.05, indicating normal distribution. There is a significant difference in speaking skills between students who are taught using the Praktika.ai application and those who are taught using conventional method.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence has become one of the most influential technologies in education because it can support learning through automation, feedback, and adaptive interaction. In English language learning, AI is increasingly used to assist learners in practicing language skills through digital platforms, speech recognition, and interactive learning systems. AI also contributes to language processing and autonomous translation, which shows its relevance in linguistic and educational contexts (Mujahidah et al., 2023). Baker and Smith define artificial intelligence as computer based systems that perform cognitive tasks related to learning, problem solving, machine learning, natural language processing, data mining, neural networks, and algorithms.

In English as a Foreign Language learning, speaking is one of the most important skills because it enables learners to express ideas, build interaction, and communicate meaning in academic and social contexts. Speaking requires learners to organize vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and meaning during real-time communication. Chaney as cited in Mujahidah et al., 2023 explains that speaking is a process of producing meaning through verbal and nonverbal symbols in various contexts. For vocational high school students, speaking ability is also important because it supports future communication in workplace settings, such as presentations, meetings, interviews, and professional interactions (Akongoh, 2021).

Although speaking is important, many EFL learners still face difficulties in developing oral communication skills. Students often feel anxious, uncomfortable, and afraid of making mistakes when they speak English in front of others. These difficulties become more serious when students have limited opportunities to practice speaking directly in the classroom.



The same problem is relevant to the context of SMKN 3 Parepare. Students need more practical and continuous speaking practice, but classroom learning often gives limited time for oral interaction. English learning in conventional classrooms tends to focus more on grammar, reading, or written exercises than on active speaking practice. As a result, students may understand English materials but still have difficulty speaking fluently and confidently. This condition shows a gap between the expected goal of English learning and the actual speaking performance of students in the classroom. The thesis background also emphasizes that students at SMKN 3 Parepare face challenges related to limited authentic communication, limited access to native speakers, and learning methods that still prioritize grammar and reading over oral communication.

One possible solution to this problem is the use of AI-based learning media that can provide more flexible and interactive speaking practice. AI has the potential to improve English learning because it can analyze students' needs, provide real-time feedback, and adjust learning materials based on learner progress. Purbasari and Mulia also explain that AI-based tools can support English learning by giving students more opportunities to interact with digital learning media (Purbasari & Mulia, 2025).

Praktika. AI is one of the AI-based applications that can be used to support English speaking practice. This application provides interactive conversation, pronunciation practice, accent training, personalized learning paths, and real-time feedback. Praktika. AI allows learners to practice speaking in different communication contexts, such as daily conversation, academic situations, and professional interaction. Purbasari and Mulia state that AI-based speaking applications can support students by creating interactive learning experiences and giving opportunities for speaking practice (Purbasari & Mulia, 2025). Denes explains that AI-based learning systems can support personalized learning by adapting to learner needs and providing useful feedback during the learning process (Denes, 2023).

The features of Praktika. AI are relevant to the needs of EFL learners because the application allows students to practice speaking independently without being limited by classroom time. Students can repeat speaking exercises, receive feedback, and build confidence through continuous interaction with AI tutors. Torkhani explains that AI enhanced language learning can improve EFL students' English speaking skills through



interactive practice and technology supported feedback (Torkhani, 2025). Almelhes also explains that AI adoption in second language learning can support vocabulary retention, grammar accuracy, and pronunciation development (Almelhes, 2023). The use of Praktika. AI is also in line with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching. CLT emphasizes that language learning should focus on meaningful communication, direct interaction, and real life language use. Richards and Rodgers explain that CLT views language as a tool for communication and prioritizes learners' ability to use language functionally in social contexts (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, AI-based conversation practice can support communicative learning because it gives students more chances to speak, respond, and practice English in meaningful situations.

However, the use of Praktika. AI in Indonesian vocational high school contexts still needs further investigation. Previous studies have discussed AI-based language learning, speech recognition, and AI supported speaking practice, but limited research has focused specifically on the implementation of Praktika. AI for enhancing students' speaking ability at the vocational high school level. This gap is important because vocational students need English speaking skills not only for academic achievement but also for career preparation. Therefore, research on Praktika. AI at SMKN 3 Parepare can provide new value by showing how AI-based speaking practice works in a real classroom context.

Based on the problem and research gap above, this study aims to examine the implementation of Praktika. AI in enhancing the speaking ability of eleventh grade students at SMKN 3 Parepare. This study also aims to describe students' perceptions of using Praktika. AI in the speaking learning process. The findings are expected to provide practical insight for English teachers in using AI-based learning media and to contribute to the development of more interactive, adaptive, and communicative speaking instruction.

Method

This study employed a quasi experimental design using a pre-test and post-test control group design. The experimental group received speaking instruction by using the Praktika. AI application, while the control group received conventional speaking instruction without the application.



The research was conducted at SMKN 3 Parepare, located on Karaeng Burane Street No. 16, Mallusetasi, Ujung District, Parepare City. The participants were eleventh grade students of SMKN 3 Parepare. The sample consisted of two classes selected through purposive sampling because both classes had relatively similar initial English speaking ability. The Fashion class, consisting of 22 students, served as the experimental group. The Computer Network and Engineering class, consisting of 24 students, served as the control group. Therefore, the total number of participants was 46 students.

The research procedure consisted of three main stages: pre-test, treatment, and post-test. In the pre-test, students from both groups were asked to create and perform a dialogue with their partner using the theme of asking and giving directions. This activity was used to measure students' speaking ability before the treatment. After the pre-test, the experimental group learned speaking through Praktika. AI, while the control group learned through conventional classroom activities.

During the treatment, both groups received the same speaking topic, namely asking and giving directions. In the experimental group, the teacher explained the material, gave examples of expressions, and guided students to open the Praktika. AI application. Students practiced dialogues directly with the AI tutor, received correction or feedback from the application, and wrote down the feedback they obtained. After practicing with Praktika. AI, students performed a pair dialogue in front of the class based on the speaking practice they had completed with the AI tutor. The teacher then gave additional feedback on their speaking performance.

In the control group, the teacher explained the same topic and gave examples of expressions related to asking and giving directions. Students received vocabulary input, wrote down key expressions, prepared a dialogue with their partner, and performed the dialogue in front of the class. The teacher gave feedback on fluency, pronunciation, and sentence structure. The post-test was conducted after the treatment. In the post-test, students from both groups performed a dialogue in front of the class with their partner to measure the improvement of their speaking ability after the learning process.

The instruments used in this study were a speaking test, a speaking assessment rubric. The speaking test was used in the pre-test and post-test to measure students' speaking ability before and after the treatment. The



speaking assessment rubric measured three aspects: fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Each aspect was classified into four categories: excellent, good, fair, and poor. The scoring range was 81–100 for excellent, 70–80 for good, 40–60 for fair, and below 40 for poor. The speaking assessment rubric was adapted from Brown’s language assessment framework (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2018).

The data were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis was used to calculate the mean score and standard deviation of students’ speaking scores in the pre-test and post-test. Inferential analysis was conducted using SPSS. Before hypothesis testing, a normality test was conducted to examine whether the data were normally distributed. The data were considered normally distributed if the significance value was higher than 0.05. After that, an independent sample t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group.

Discussion

The findings of this study are presented based on two main results: students’ speaking scores in the experimental class, students’ speaking scores in the control class. The speaking assessment covered three aspects, namely fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation.

The pre-test and post-test results showed that the experimental class experienced improvement in all speaking aspects after learning with Praktika. AI. In the pre-test, the experimental class obtained a mean score of 37.73 in fluency, 42.27 in vocabulary, and 39.77 in pronunciation. After the treatment, the post-test mean scores increased to 66.14 in fluency, 73.86 in vocabulary, and 67.50 in pronunciation. These results indicate that students’ speaking ability improved after they practiced speaking through Praktika. AI. The most visible improvement appeared in vocabulary, followed by fluency and pronunciation.

Table 1. Mean scores of students’ speaking ability

No	Group	Aspect	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Gain
1	Experimental	Fluency	37,73	66,14	28,41
2	Experimental	Vocabulary	42,27	73,86	31,59
3	Experimental	Pronunciation	39,77	67,50	27,73

124



This work is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Copyright © 2026, Irma Rahayu, et al.

4	Control	Fluency	34,58	55,21	20,63
5	Control	Vocabulary	38,33	60,63	22,30
6	Control	Pronunciation	34,17	55,00	20,83

Table 1 shows that both groups improved after the learning process. However, the experimental class obtained higher gains than the control class in all speaking aspects. In fluency, the experimental class improved by 28.41 points, while the control class improved by 20.63 points. In vocabulary, the experimental class improved by 31.59 points, while the control class improved by 22.30 points. In pronunciation, the experimental class improved by 27.73 points, while the control class improved by 20.83 points.

The descriptive results also showed that the post-test scores of the experimental class were higher than those of the control class. The experimental class obtained a post-test mean score of 66.14 in fluency, while the control class obtained 55.21. In vocabulary, the experimental class obtained 73.86, while the control class obtained 60.63. In pronunciation, the experimental class obtained 67.50, while the control class obtained 55.00. These differences indicate that the use of Praktika. AI gave stronger improvement than conventional instruction.

Table 2. Post-test comparison between experimental and control classes

No	Aspect	Experimental Mean	Control mean	Mean Difference	Cohen's d
1	Fluency	66,14	55,21	10,93	1,43
2	Vocabulary	73,86	60,63	13,23	1,51
3	Pronunciation	67,50	55,00	12,50	1,50
4	Overall speaking score	69.17	56.94	12,23	1,61

Table 2 shows that the experimental class outperformed the control class in the post-test. The effect sizes were large in all speaking aspects. Fluency obtained Cohen's d = 1.43, vocabulary obtained Cohen's d = 1.51, pronunciation obtained Cohen's d = 1.50, and the overall speaking score obtained Cohen's d = 1.61. These values indicate that the difference between the experimental and control classes was not only statistically meaningful but also practically strong.

The paired sample t-test also showed significant improvement within each group. In the experimental class, the improvement was significant for



fluency, $t(21) = 19.61$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.18$. The improvement was also significant for vocabulary, $t(21) = 14.93$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.18$. Pronunciation also improved significantly, $t(21) = 16.95$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.61$. These results confirm that students in the experimental class improved significantly after learning with Praktika. AI.

The control class also showed significant improvement after conventional instruction. Fluency improved significantly, $t(23) = 20.38$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.16$. Vocabulary improved significantly, $t(23) = 15.45$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.15$. Pronunciation also improved significantly, $t(23) = 14.23$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.90$. However, the gain scores and post-test comparison show that the improvement in the experimental class was stronger than the improvement in the control class.

The normality test showed mixed results. Some data met the normality assumption, while some other data did not. In the experimental class, the post-test data for fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation were normally distributed based on the Shapiro Wilk test. In the control class, several data were not normally distributed, especially fluency and pronunciation. Therefore, the interpretation of the t-test results should be supported by descriptive mean differences and effect size values. The thesis also reports that the paired sample t-test produced significance values below .05 for all three speaking aspects in both classes.

The findings show that the implementation of Praktika. AI improved students' speaking ability in the experimental class. Students' scores increased in fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation after they used the application. This improvement can be explained by the learning features of Praktika. AI, which provide repeated speaking practice, AI-based interaction, and immediate feedback. These features gave students more opportunities to practice English beyond direct teacher explanation.

The improvement in fluency indicates that students became more able to express ideas orally after using Praktika. AI. Before the treatment, students' fluency was in the poor category. After the treatment, their fluency moved toward a better level. This result suggests that frequent speaking practice with AI tutors helped students reduce hesitation and produce spoken English more smoothly. The finding supports the idea that AI-based speaking practice can create a more stable and flexible learning environment for oral communication (Adistia et al., 2025).



The vocabulary score showed the highest gain in the experimental class. This result indicates that the use of Praktika. AI helped students choose and use more appropriate words during speaking tasks. The application allowed students to engage with varied topics and expressions, especially in the context of asking and giving directions. This kind of contextual speaking practice can help students connect vocabulary with communicative use, not only memorize isolated words. This finding is consistent with the view that AI-based learning can provide personalized language input and support vocabulary development (Fink et al., 2024).

The improvement in pronunciation also shows that Praktika. AI supported students' oral accuracy. Students could receive direct correction and feedback while practicing speaking. This feedback helped students identify pronunciation errors and correct them during learning activities. The result is relevant to the finding that AI-based speech recognition technology can improve pronunciation accuracy in English learning (Abimanto & Sumarsono, 2024).

The comparison between the experimental and control classes shows that conventional instruction also improved students' speaking ability. However, the experimental class achieved higher gains and higher post-test scores in all speaking aspects.

This indicates that the use of Praktika. AI gave additional learning value compared with conventional classroom activities. The application gave students more time to practice, more flexible learning access, and immediate correction. These elements are difficult to provide consistently in conventional classroom instruction because teachers have limited time to give individual feedback to every student.

The findings also support the principle of communicative language learning. Speaking ability develops when students have more chances to use language in meaningful interaction. Praktika. AI gave students simulated communication activities through AI tutors, which made speaking practice more active and less dependent on teacher led instruction. This is relevant to Communicative Language Teaching because the learning process focused on language use, interaction, and meaning making in practical situations (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The findings are also in line with previous research on Praktika. AI. Munaufilyyaqin found that Praktika. AI was effective in improving students'



speaking skills, including pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehensibility (Munaufilyyaqin, 2025). The present study confirms this result in the context of vocational high school students at SMKN 3 Parepare. This strengthens the claim that Praktika. AI can be used as an alternative learning medium for EFL speaking instruction.

The implication of this study is that English teachers can use Praktika. AI as a supplementary medium for speaking practice. The application should not replace the teacher's role, but it can support students by providing additional practice and feedback. Teachers can use the application before classroom performance, during guided practice, or as an independent speaking assignment. In this way, students can practice more often, receive feedback more quickly, and build confidence before speaking in front of the class.

However, the findings should be interpreted carefully because the normality test results were not fully consistent across all datasets. Some data did not meet the normality assumption, especially in the control class. Future studies may strengthen the analysis by using additional non parametric tests or larger sample sizes. Future studies can also examine other speaking components, such as grammar, comprehension, interaction, and task completion, to provide a broader picture of speaking performance.

Conclusion

This study shows that Praktika. AI can be used as an effective supporting medium to enhance students' English speaking ability. The implementation of Praktika. AI helped students improve their fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation through repeated speaking practice, real-time feedback, and interactive communication with AI-based features. The findings indicate that students who learned speaking through Praktika. AI achieved better improvement than students who learned through conventional instruction. This means that AI assisted speaking practice can give additional learning value because it allows students to practice more actively, receive immediate correction, and build confidence in using English orally.

The study also shows that students had a very positive perception of using Praktika. AI in speaking learning. The questionnaire result reached 87.59%, which belongs to the very good category. This result indicates that



students considered Praktika. AI useful, engaging, and helpful for improving their speaking performance. The application made the learning process more enjoyable because students could practice with AI avatars, explore various topics, and receive instant feedback on pronunciation, vocabulary, and intonation. Therefore, Praktika. AI not only contributed to students' speaking improvement but also supported their motivation and confidence in learning English.

Based on these findings, the use of Praktika. AI is relevant to the need for more adaptive, interactive, and technology supported English learning at vocational high schools. The application does not replace the role of the teacher, but it can strengthen speaking instruction by providing additional practice outside limited classroom time. In this context, Praktika. AI can be considered a practical learning medium for helping EFL students improve oral communication skills in a more flexible and personalized way.

References

- Abimanto, D., & Sumarsono, W. (2024). Improving English pronunciation with AI speech recognition technology. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 6(1), 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v6i1.3810>
- Adistia, L., Cahyani, M., Hafifah, U., & Addhiny, T. R. (2025). Innovative approaches to speaking skills: The Praktika AI solution. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Islamic Education and Science Development* (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 34–43).
- Akongoh, R. N. (2021). Teacher based assessment of speaking in Cameroonian secondary schools: The impact of teacher training. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 1– 11. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.2.1>
- Almelhes, S. A. (2023). A review of artificial intelligence adoption in second language learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(5), 1259 - 1269. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1305.21>
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2018). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Denes, G. (2023). A case study of using AI for General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) grade prediction in a selective independent school in England. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4. 100129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100129>



-
- Fink, M. C., Robinson, S. A., & Ertl, B. (2024). AI-based avatars are changing the way we learn and teach: Benefits and challenges. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1416307. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1416307>
- Mujahidah, Salija, K., & Rahman, M. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence based instruction in ELT at an Indonesian Islamic higher education. *Himalayan Journal of Education and Literature*, 4(2), 17–25. <https://himjournals.com/article/1074>
- Munaufilyyaqin, A. Q. (2025). The effectiveness of using Praktika. AI application towards students' speaking skill at MA Nurul Islam Lampung [Doctoral thesis, State Islami Institute]. <https://etheses.iainkediri.ac.id/18452/>
- Purbasari & Mulia.(2025). Students' perspective and challenge towards utilization of Talkpal. AI in ESP classroom. ICEETE Conference Series, 3(1), 18–30. <https://prosiding.utp.ac.id/index.php/ICEETE/article/view/226>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Torkhani, D. (2025). AI enhanced language learning: The impact of talkpal. ai on efl undergraduate students' english speaking skills. *American Journal of STEM Education*, 11, 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.32674/232w1188>

