

English Meeting: Enhancing English Public Speaking Skills Through The T.A.I.L.–S.T.A.R.T.–C.L.O.S.E. Framework And Body Language Training For English Education Students At Universitas Islam Makassar

Muthmainnah Mursidin^{1*}, Sitti Nurjannah², Ida Ilmiah Mursidin³

^{1,2}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

³Jurusan ekonomi syariah, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Islam, IAIN Parepare, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author:

Email: muthmainnahmursidin.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id

Abstract.

This community service program was designed to strengthen the English public speaking competence of students in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Islam Makassar. The activity addressed recurring difficulties in organizing self-introductions, opening and closing presentations, and maintaining effective non-verbal delivery. A practice-based workshop was developed around three mnemonic frameworks: T.A.I.L. for self-introduction, S.T.A.R.T. for presentation openings, and C.L.O.S.E. for presentation closings, supported by training in seven elements of body language. The program used guided modelling, individual writing, paired rehearsal, short presentation challenges, peer feedback, self-reflection, and facilitator observation. Evaluation focused on the structure of participants' speaking scripts, clarity of delivery, use of transitions, audience engagement, and awareness of eye contact, posture, gesture, facial expression, voice, strategic pauses, and movement. The implementation indicated that the mnemonic frameworks helped participants organize ideas more quickly and reduced their dependence on improvised or repetitive expressions. Participants also demonstrated more purposeful openings and closings and greater attention to non-verbal delivery. Pronunciation consistency, spontaneous responses, and sustained fluency remained areas requiring continued practice. The program shows that a compact, scaffolded, and highly participatory English Meeting can serve as a practical model for extracurricular speaking development in higher education.

Keywords: body language, English meeting, public speaking, presentation skills and speaking framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

Public speaking is an important professional and academic competence for university students, particularly for those preparing to become English teachers. Students in an English Education program are expected not only to understand linguistic forms but also to communicate ideas clearly, manage an audience, and model confident language use. In practice, however, classroom presentations often reveal a gap between students' knowledge of English and their ability to deliver a coherent spoken message. Some students begin without a clear opening, rely heavily on notes, use repetitive expressions, or end abruptly with a routine phrase. Others understand the content but struggle to maintain eye contact, vary their voice, or control nervous movements. This local concern is consistent with Indahyanti, Rahman, and Mursidin [13], who found that English Education students experienced moderate to high levels of public-speaking anxiety associated with limited grammar and vocabulary, difficulty constructing sentences, fear of negative evaluation, and visible bodily tension.

These difficulties are not simply matters of grammar. Speaking in front of an audience requires the simultaneous management of content, organization, language choice, voice, and non-verbal behaviour. Thornbury explains that speaking is produced under real-time conditions, which limits the amount of planning available to the speaker [1]. Harmer likewise emphasizes that successful speaking activities need meaningful rehearsal, interaction, and opportunities for feedback rather than explanation alone [2]. For student presenters, therefore, a useful intervention should make the structure of a presentation visible and memorable while providing repeated opportunities to practise it.

Community-service initiatives in communication education have increasingly used participatory workshops to make speaking skills more accessible. Makkuraga Putra et al., in "Public Speaking

Enhancement Workshop For Children of Migrant Workers In Penang Malaysia,” combined speech exercises, simulations, structured presentation stages, and video-based evaluation [4]. Their program illustrates the value of active participation and a clear speaking sequence. In the language-training context, Aqromi et al., through “Language Diplomacy Through BIPA: An Indonesian Language Training Program For NEUST Philippines Students,” highlighted the importance of practical and systematic training that responds to learners’ immediate communicative needs [5]. Dangin and Hartati’s “Empowering Creativity: Enhancing Creative Writing Skills through Pixton in Community Service Initiatives” further shows that workshops become more meaningful when participants create their own products, collaborate, and reflect on their performance [6]. These three studies support an approach in which learners do not merely receive information but repeatedly produce, review, and improve communicative work. A closely related community-service activity at Universitas Islam Makassar used participatory Show and Tell practice to strengthen verbal delivery, stage control, and interaction with an audience [14]. This local evidence reinforces the decision to place guided performance, rather than lecture alone, at the centre of the English Meeting program.

The English Meeting program was developed as an extracurricular capacity-building activity for the student community of the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Makassar. The program was not positioned as a replacement for a regular speaking course. Instead, it offered a focused practice space where students could examine the parts of a presentation, rehearse them in manageable segments, and receive immediate feedback from peers and the facilitator.

The main contribution of the program lies in the use of three mnemonic frameworks developed for the training. T.A.I.L. guides a short self-introduction through Title/Name, Affiliation, Interest/Information, and Link/Goal. S.T.A.R.T. guides an opening through Salutation, Topic Introduction, Attention Grabber, Relevance and Roadmap, and Transition to the first point. C.L.O.S.E. guides a closing through Conclude/Summary, Leave a Message, Open for Questions, Strong Closing Statement, and Exit Gracefully. These frameworks were paired with explicit practice in seven delivery elements: eye contact, posture, hand gestures, facial expression, voice tone and pace, strategic pauses, and movement in the speaking space.

This article reports the design, implementation, and observed outcomes of the English Meeting program. It focuses on two questions: (1) how can a mnemonic and practice-based framework be implemented to support English public speaking among English Education students, and (2) what changes are visible in the organization and delivery of students’ short presentations after guided practice? The article also identifies areas that require follow-up so that the activity can be developed into a sustainable speaking community rather than a one-time workshop.

II. METHODS

The activity used a participatory training design with four connected stages: needs identification, material preparation, guided workshop implementation, and performance-based evaluation. The intended participants were undergraduate students of the English Education Study Program at Universitas Islam Makassar who needed additional practice in presenting ideas in English. The program was organized as a face-to-face English Meeting outside the core structure of a regular lecture. This arrangement was important because it allowed the facilitator to emphasize rehearsal, experimentation, and peer response without the pressure of a formal examination.

Needs identification was conducted through preliminary observation of student presentations and informal discussion about difficulties experienced when speaking in front of classmates. The recurring concerns were limited opening and closing expressions, uncertainty about how to introduce oneself professionally, dependence on written notes, rapid speech when nervous, weak eye contact, and difficulty connecting one section of a presentation to the next. The training material was then organized around these concrete difficulties rather than around a broad survey of public speaking theory.

The learning handout was developed as a sequence of short explanations, model expressions, guided tasks, performance challenges, and reflection prompts. Each framework was introduced through a contrast between less effective and more effective examples. Students then moved from controlled tasks, such as

filling in missing information and matching expressions with functions, to productive tasks, such as writing an original self-introduction, designing an opening, and composing a closing. The gradual movement from recognition to production was intended to reduce cognitive load and make the speaking structure easier to internalize.

The workshop itself followed an experiential cycle of modelling, preparation, rehearsal, feedback, revision, and performance. This cycle is consistent with experiential learning, in which learners develop understanding through concrete experience and reflection [8]. Peer feedback was used because a listener can often identify unclear structure, limited eye contact, or distracting movement more easily than the speaker. At the same time, self-recording and reflection encouraged participants to compare how they believed they sounded with how their performance was actually received. This practice-oriented sequence also corresponds with the microteaching training reported by Indahyanti et al. [15], in which explanation, direct performance, and focused group discussion helped English Education students improve instructional communication and readiness.

Table 1. Content and function of the T.A.I.L.–S.T.A.R.T.–C.L.O.S.E. training framework

Framework	Components	Main learning function
T.A.I.L.	Title/Name; Affiliation; Interest/Information; Link/Goal	Helps students deliver a concise, relevant, and memorable self-introduction.
S.T.A.R.T.	Salutation; Topic Introduction; Attention Grabber; Relevance and Roadmap; Transition	Helps students begin a presentation with audience orientation, purpose, and a clear transition.
C.L.O.S.E.	Conclude/Summary; Leave a Message; Open for Questions; Strong Statement; Exit Gracefully	Helps students summarize, communicate a take-away, manage questions, and end professionally.
Body language	Eye contact; posture; gestures; facial expression; voice; pauses; movement	Connects verbal organization with credible, audience-centred delivery.

The first practice block focused on self-introduction. Students completed a short personal script using T.A.I.L., rehearsed it with a partner, and delivered it within a limited time. The listener recorded the information understood from the introduction, allowing the speaker to see whether the intended message had been communicated. This task treated intelligibility and relevance as more important than memorizing a long text.

The second block focused on opening a presentation. Students identified the function of model sentences, rearranged a disordered opening, and then designed an original opening using S.T.A.R.T. They were encouraged to select one appropriate hook rather than combine several unrelated attention-grabbing techniques. A short challenge required each participant to deliver an opening while peers assessed the clarity of the greeting, topic, hook, roadmap, transition, confidence, and intonation.

The third block addressed closing a presentation. Students practised summarizing no more than three points, formulating one take-away message, inviting questions, returning to an opening hook, and ending without apologetic or hesitant expressions. In the final simulation, students combined an opening, a brief content section, and a closing. The last block concentrated on non-verbal delivery. Students compared ineffective and effective body language, completed a self-assessment, performed a silent-speech task, and repeated a short presentation after receiving feedback on posture, eye contact, gestures, and voice.

Evaluation was descriptive and performance based. The sources of evidence were students' written scripts, completed handout tasks, peer-feedback forms, short presentation performances, self-reflection responses, and facilitator field notes. The evaluation did not aim to produce an inferential claim about treatment effectiveness. Instead, it documented practical changes in the structure and delivery of speaking performances and identified skills that remained unstable after the workshop. The main indicators were

completeness of speaking structure, relevance of content, smoothness of transitions, audience orientation, vocal clarity, and control of non-verbal behaviour.

Table 2. Implementation stages and evidence used in the evaluation

Stage	Focus	Core activities	Evidence collected
1	Self-introduction	T.A.I.L. script, paired speed introduction, listener recall	Script completeness, intelligibility, partner notes
2	Opening	Function matching, sentence sequencing, 90-second challenge	S.T.A.R.T. use, hook, roadmap, transition, peer feedback
3	Closing	C.L.O.S.E. script and full presentation simulation	Summary, take-away message, Q&A invitation, professional exit
4	Delivery	Body-language self-assessment, silent speech, presentation makeover	Eye contact, posture, gesture, voice, pauses, movement
5	Reflection	Self-review and follow-up practice plan	Perceived difficulty, learning gain, next practice target

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Participation and learning process

The workshop format created a different speaking environment from a conventional presentation assignment. Instead of asking participants to deliver a complete presentation immediately, the facilitator separated the performance into small parts. This made it possible to discuss why an expression worked, where a transition was missing, and how a speaker's posture affected the audience's interpretation. Students were generally more willing to attempt a second performance after feedback because the task was short and the expected improvement was specific.

The strongest engagement appeared in activities that required visible production: the speed introduction, the design of an opening, peer scoring, silent speech, and the full presentation simulation. These tasks gave participants a concrete product and a clear reason to listen to one another. This pattern is consistent with Dangin and Hartati [6], who emphasize participant creation, collaboration, and reflection in a community-service workshop. It also supports the participatory orientation reported by Makkuraga Putra et al. [4], in which simulation and evaluation were central rather than supplementary activities.

Pair and group work also reduced the distance between preparation and performance. Students could test an expression with one listener before using it in front of a larger group. Peer feedback was particularly useful for non-verbal aspects. Speakers were not always aware that they looked down, shifted weight repeatedly, or spoke at a pace that made their ideas difficult to follow. When the same short speech was repeated after one or two specific comments, the difference was immediately visible to both the speaker and the group.

B. Development of speaking organization

The T.A.I.L. framework helped participants move beyond an introduction consisting only of a name and place of origin. By adding affiliation, interest, and purpose, the introduction became more relevant to an academic or professional setting. The framework also limited unnecessary detail. Participants were encouraged to choose information that supported the context of the meeting rather than list unrelated personal facts. In practice, this produced introductions that were easier for listeners to remember and easier for speakers to rehearse.

S.T.A.R.T. produced the clearest change in presentation organization. Before guided practice, an opening was often treated as a greeting followed immediately by the title of the topic. After modelling and reconstruction tasks, participants began to include a reason for listening and a brief roadmap. The attention grabber was initially challenging because some students selected a quotation or statistic without connecting it to the topic. The revision process therefore emphasized relevance: a hook was considered effective only when it led naturally to the purpose of the talk. This point reflects Brown's principle that assessment should examine meaningful performance rather than isolated language forms [3].

The C.L.O.S.E. framework addressed a common weakness in student presentations: the tendency to end with “That is all, thank you” without summarizing the message. The requirement to state one take-away encouraged students to decide what the audience should remember. This was pedagogically useful because it forced the speaker to distinguish the central message from supporting details. Participants also became more aware that inviting questions, responding calmly, and maintaining eye contact after the final sentence are part of the closing rather than separate formalities.

Taken together, the three frameworks functioned as speaking scaffolds. They did not provide a fixed script that every participant had to copy. Instead, they offered a sequence of communicative decisions. This distinction matters. A framework can reduce uncertainty for a developing speaker, but overdependence on memorized wording can produce rigid delivery. For that reason, the facilitator repeatedly encouraged students to keep the sequence while adapting the language to their own topic and speaking style. The attention given to transitions and functional expressions is also supported by Mursidin and Mursidin [16], who emphasized that discourse markers contribute to coherence, fluency, and more natural organization in EFL production.

Table 3. Qualitative changes observed during guided practice

Performance area	Initial tendency	Change after guided practice	Continuing need
Self-introduction	Limited to name and origin; uneven detail	More balanced identity, affiliation, interest, and goal	Natural delivery without sounding memorized
Opening	Greeting and topic stated without context	Use of a relevant hook, roadmap, and transition	Selecting reliable facts and connecting the hook to the topic
Closing	Abrupt ending or generic thanks	Summary, take-away message, Q&A invitation, and composed exit	Handling spontaneous questions confidently
Body language	Inconsistent eye contact, closed posture, rapid pace	More deliberate eye contact, open posture, pauses, and gestures	Maintaining control throughout a longer presentation
Language delivery	Reliance on notes and self-correction	Greater willingness to speak from key points	Pronunciation consistency and sustained fluency

C. Body language and confidence

The body-language segment made participants examine aspects of speaking that are often discussed only after content and grammar. Eye contact, posture, facial expression, gesture, voice, pause, and movement were practised as observable behaviours. The activity did not present non-verbal communication as a substitute for accurate content. Rather, it treated verbal and non-verbal delivery as mutually supporting. A clear message can lose impact when delivered too softly or while reading continuously, just as confident gestures cannot compensate for an unclear argument.

The presentation makeover activity was particularly effective for illustrating this relationship. A participant first delivered a short opening while intentionally using ineffective body language, and the group identified the resulting impression. The same text was then repeated with a stable posture, audience-facing gaze, clearer volume, and purposeful pauses. Because the words remained unchanged, the group could isolate the effect of delivery. This form of immediate contrast turned abstract advice into a shared observation.

Confidence developed through manageable success rather than through motivational instruction alone. Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy is relevant here: confidence is strengthened when learners experience mastery, observe others, and receive credible feedback [7]. The short, repeated performances allowed participants to correct one element at a time. A student who could not yet deliver a three-minute talk fluently could still improve the first thirty seconds, make eye contact with several listeners, or replace an apologetic opening with a clear statement. These small gains provided a realistic basis for further practice. The anxiety profile reported by Indahyanti, Rahman, and Mursidin [13] further suggests that repeated, low-

risk performance is important because public-speaking difficulty may appear simultaneously in cognition, language production, and physical behaviour.

The use of voice and strategic pauses remained more difficult than adopting an open posture. Some participants equated fluency with speaking quickly, particularly when nervous. The workshop therefore treated a pause as part of meaning rather than as evidence that the speaker had forgotten the text. Participants were asked to pause after a hook, before a key message, and at the end of a major point. Continued recording and self-review are necessary because pace and intonation are difficult to monitor while speaking.

D. Relevance to community-service practice

The results suggest that a university-based student community can benefit from a service format that is practical, bounded, and responsive to an identified need. Aqromi et al. [5] reported that systematic language training is most useful when the material is closely connected to the participants' immediate communication context. The present program followed the same principle by using situations students encounter regularly: introducing themselves, opening a seminar or classroom presentation, explaining a topic, answering questions, and closing professionally.

The mnemonic frameworks also make the program replicable. A facilitator can adapt the examples to different proficiency levels while retaining the sequence. For beginners, the output may consist of a thirty-second introduction and a simple opening. More proficient students can apply the same framework to research presentations, teaching demonstrations, scholarship interviews, or academic conferences. The frameworks can also be incorporated into mentoring activities led by senior students, thereby extending the program beyond a single facilitator.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The evaluation was primarily descriptive and based on participant products, peer comments, reflection, and facilitator observation. The program did not use a validated public speaking scale or a controlled pre-test and post-test design. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as evidence of practical progress during the activity, not as proof of a causal effect. Future implementation should record the number and profile of participants, use an analytic performance rubric before and after training, preserve anonymized speaking samples, and collect follow-up data several weeks later.

A second limitation concerns sustainability. Public speaking improves through repeated use, while a one-session workshop mainly provides structure and an initial successful experience. The recommended follow-up is a regular English Meeting in which students rotate as speaker, moderator, evaluator, and audience member. Short video assignments can support self-review, but they should be accompanied by clear consent procedures and should not replace live interaction. A simple progression—from self-introduction to three-minute presentation, teaching demonstration, and academic talk—would allow the community to monitor development over time.

IV. CONCLUSION

The English Meeting program provided a structured and participatory approach to public speaking development for English Education students at Universitas Islam Makassar. T.A.I.L. supported concise and purposeful self-introductions, S.T.A.R.T. helped students establish an audience-centred opening, and C.L.O.S.E. guided them toward a clear summary, take-away message, question invitation, and professional exit. When these frameworks were combined with explicit body-language practice, participants were better able to connect the organization of their ideas with the way those ideas were delivered.

The most important practical finding is that students benefited from breaking a presentation into short, observable, and revisable components. Modelling, paired rehearsal, peer feedback, reflection, and repeated performance made improvement visible within the workshop. The frameworks should nevertheless be treated as scaffolds rather than scripts. Continued practice is needed to strengthen pronunciation, spontaneous response, vocal variation, and fluency across longer presentations.

For future community-service implementation, the program should be developed as a recurring English speaking community and supported by a verified pre-post performance rubric, anonymized video samples, and follow-up assessment. With these additions, the model has potential for adaptation in other

English Education programs, student organizations, and youth learning communities that require an accessible introduction to academic and professional public speaking.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses appreciation to the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Makassar, and to the students who participated in the English Meeting activities and provided peer feedback during the speaking practice.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Thornbury, *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005.
- [2] J. Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.
- [3] H. D. Brown, *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, 2004.
- [4] A. Makkuraga Putra, E. Perwitasari, H. Budianto, and M. Mardhiyyah, "Public Speaking Enhancement Workshop For Children of Migrant Workers In Penang Malaysia," *International Journal Of Community Service*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 381–387, 2025, doi: 10.51601/ijcs.v5i4.936.
- [5] N. L. Aqromi, S. Y. Riska, E. T. Bantug, and C. Febrindasari, "Language Diplomacy Through BIPA: An Indonesian Language Training Program For NEUST Philippines Students," *International Journal Of Community Service*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 458–465, 2025, doi: 10.51601/ijcs.v5i4.930.
- [6] D. Dangin and E. Hartati, "Empowering Creativity: Enhancing Creative Writing Skills through Pixton in Community Service Initiatives," *International Journal Of Community Service*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 76–80, 2024, doi: 10.51601/ijcs.v4i1.244.
- [7] A. Bandura, *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1997.
- [8] D. A. Kolb, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.
- [9] A. Mehrabian, *Silent Messages*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1971.
- [10] C. Gallo, *Talk Like TED: The 9 Public-Speaking Secrets of the World's Top Minds*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2014.
- [11] D. Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1936.
- [12] A. Pease and B. Pease, *The Definitive Book of Body Language*. New York: Bantam Books, 2004.
- [13] R. Indahyanti, A. W. Rahman, and M. Mursidin, "Measuring Language Anxiety of EFL Students in Public Speaking," *Klasikal: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 196–203, 2023, doi: 10.52208/klasikal.v5i1.666.
- [14] A. S. Rijal, S. Sulviana, M. Mursidin, Jusmaniar, M. C. Imran, S. Nurjannah, R. Indahyanti, and Mujahidah, "Show and Tell Techniques dalam Meningkatkan Kemampuan Public Speaking Siswa MA Ulul Albab Makassar," Ash-Shahabab: *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2025, doi: 10.59638/ashabdimas.v4i1.1832.
- [15] R. Indahyanti, J. Nonci, M. C. Imran, M. Mursidin, S. Sulviana, S. Nurjannah, R. Faried, and Sulistiana, "Penguatan Keterampilan Mengajar Mahasiswa melalui Pelatihan Microteaching," *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 7651–7656, 2024, doi: 10.31004/cdj.v5i4.32219.
- [16] M. Mursidin and I. I. Mursidin, "The Variety Of DMS On EFL Students' English Writing," DIKDAS MATAPPA: *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dasar*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 106–112, 2021, doi: 10.31100/dikdas.v4i1.1006.