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ABSTRACT


The objectives of the research method were to analyze: 1) the direct effect of students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances, 2) the direct effect of students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance, 3) the indirect effect of students’ speaking self-efficacy through students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances, and 4) the indirect effect of students’ collocational competence through students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performance. The method of the research was ex post facto research which did not use any treatment, but collected the data and saw the relationship of cause and effect that happened. Then, ex post facto design involved only one group and did not any control class. The sample of the research was seven classes at seven schools at seven sub-districts of Sukabumi region. The technique of analyzing data was path analysis and the data was calculated by using SPSS 20. The result indicated that 1) there was relationship between students’ collocational competence and students’ speaking performance that the lower the students’ collocation score, the lower the students’ speaking performances were. In other words, the result shows the students’ collocation low scores influenced their speaking performances which were low too, 2) there was direct effect from students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance that they could not both speak fluently and use appropriate word contextually because of their lack collocational competence, 3) there was indirect effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy through students’ collocational competence that the students’ speaking self-efficacy influenced their collocational competence which gave indirect effect on their speaking performances. Therefore, it can also be concluded that the students’ speaking performances was not that influenced by their speaking self-efficacy.

Keywords: Speaking Performance, Collocational Competence, Speaking Self-Efficacy.
ABSTRAK


Tujuan metode penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti 1) pengaruh langsung kepercayaan siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka terhadap prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka, 2) pengaruh langsung kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata terhadap prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka, 3) pengaruh tidak langsung kepercayaan siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka melalui kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata terhadap prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka, dan 4) pengaruh tidak langsung kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata melalui kepercayaan siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka terhadap prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka. Metode penelitian ini adalah expost facto yang tidak memberikan pengajaran, juga hanya melibatkan satu grup atau tidak menggunakan kelas kontrol. Sampel penelitian ini adalah tujuh kelas di tujuh sekolah di tujuh kecamatan kabupaten Sukabumi, Jawa Barat. Teknik analisis data pada penelitian ini adalah analisis jalur dan data dihitung dengan menggunakan SPSS 20. Berdasarkan uji hipotesis dibuktikan bahwa 1) terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata dan prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka bahwa semakin rendah kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata, maka semakin rendah pula prestasi siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka. Dengan kata lain, hasil penelitian menunjukkan nilai rendah yang diperoleh siswa mempengaruhi prestasi berbicara mereka yang juga rendah, 2) terdapat pengaruh langsung yang signifikan dari kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata terhadap prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka bahwa mereka tidak mampu berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris secara lancar dan tidak mampu untuk menggunakan kata yang sesuai dengan situasi juga karena kompetensi dalam pemilihan pasangan kata yang rendah, 3) terdapat pengaruh tidak langsung dari kepercayaan siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka melalui kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan pasangan kata bahwa kepercayaan siswa atas kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka mempengaruhi kompetensi siswa dalam pemilihan kata yang kemudian memberikan pengaruh secara tidak langsung terhadap kemampuan berbicara mereka. Oleh karena itu, dapat juga disimpulkan bahwa prestasi berbicara mereka tidak begitu dipengaruhi oleh kepercayaan mereka terhadap kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggrisnya.

Keywords: Prestasi Berbicara Bahasa Inggris, Kompetensi Siswa dalam Pemilihan Pasangan kata, Kepercayaan siswa atas Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Mereka
البحث المجري

أولئك. رئاسة العلاقة بينة التلميذ على الفترة التعليمية الكفاءة التعليمية في الاختبار مناسب الكلمة نحو الاحتياج التكلمهم:

غرض هذا تقنيش هو للفحص، 1) فتوث مباشرة ثقة التلميذ على فترة تكلم اللغة الإنجليزية، 2) فتوث مباشرة الكفاءة تعلمذ من خلال الكفاءة التعليمية، 3) فتوث محمد مباشرة ثقة التلميذ على فترة تكلم اللغة الإنجليزية من خلال الكفاءة التعليمية، 4) فتوث عبير مباشرة الكفاءة التعليمية، في الاختبار مناسب كلمة نحو التقدم التعليمي، على فترة اللغة الإنجليزية. هذه الطرقية التقنيش هي جذور، فكت، المثال، هذه الطرقية هي سبعة عشر، في سبعة المدرسة.

وسعة المنطقة تقسم شكل ورقي، صناعة التقنيشية بيئة هذا تقنيش صناعة خط وبيئة تخصص با، مرف. 20 تناو على الخباق، فرضية أن يعتقد. 1) هناك علاقة هام بين الكفاءة التعليمية في الاختبار مناسب كلمة التكلم اللغة الإنجليزية. 2) هناك فتوث مباشرة هام من الكفاءة التعليمية في الاختبار مناسب كلمة إلى الآخر، تكلم العلماء الإنجليزية. 3) هناك فتوث عبير مباشرة من ثقة التلميذ على فترة تكلم اللغة الإنجليزية، من خلال اختيارات التلميذ في الاختبار مناسب الكلمة.

كلمة مميزة: الإختبار تكلم اللغة الإنجليزية، الإختيارات التلميذ في الاختبار مناسب الكلمة، ثقة التلميذة.
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A. The Background of the Study

Being good at speaking English is important for both social and professional worlds because one can have many opportunities in dealing certain cases with wider communities, get job easier, earn more money by teaching English speaking, etc. Fortunately, for Indonesian to achieve those aims is not merely a dream because the implemented curriculum, 13 curriculum, which its English language teaching objective at Senior High Schools in Indonesia, focuses on the concept of communicative competence both orally and written (Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 70, 2013). This communicative competence goal also mentioned by Finnochiaro and Brumfit (in Richard and Rogers, 2001) that he said communicative competence was the ability to use the linguistic system effectively and appropriately. It means students learn English through using it to communicate both pair and group work. They also practice dialogue and comprehensible pronunciation to produce language fluently and acceptably. Yet, fluency and acceptable language is one of purposes in speaking activities and class, too.

Unfortunately, for English as foreign language students, it is difficult to find situation where English can be used, whereas they need to practice English speaking in the real context or situation so that they will feel the English learning they do more meaningful. As Shumin (in Richards and Renandya, 2002) states that speaking a language is difficult for especially foreign language students that effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interaction. In other case, EFL students feel extremely anxious to speak English in public; so they are tongue-tied or lost for words. Consequently, their speaking performances end up poorly. As a result, EFL students, with lack of exposure to the target language, are relatively poor at spoken English.

Actually, there are various factors that influence the EFL students’ success in speaking. Some of them are the mastery of features of connected speech to convey messages complete (intonation, stress, gesture, facial movement, and body language) (Spratt et al., 2011), vocabularies, grammar, culture, genre, speech acts, register, discourse, phonology (Scrivener, 2005), age or maturational constraints, aural medium, sociocultural factors, affective factors (Shumin, 2002), relevant knowledge, skills, intelligence and cognitive abilities (Schunk, 2003).

Therefore, it can be said that speaking mastery involves students’ inside and outside factors. It is like what Schunk (2003) states that speaking does not only require cognitive processing, but it also involves the affective factors of learning. Du (2009) agrees that the ignorance of the relationship between the students’ affective factors and their learning will have negative influence on the teaching and learning effect. In language learning, Brown (2000) asserts that if teaching is based only on cognitive consideration, the most fundamental side of human behavior will be omitted. In line with that, Krashen (in Du, 2009), in his Affective Filter Hypothesis, states that affective variables can either help or hinder the process of second language acquisition. The lower affective filter, the more language input will be obtained. On the other hand, the strong filter will prevent the input that will be obtained by the learners. Then, Krashen (in Brown, 2000) claims that the best acquisition will occur in environments where anxiety is low and defensiveness is absent. To be exact, the affective side also has important role and gives the learners great effect in language learning process. The affective sides here are such as motivation, anxiety,
personality traits, attitude, self-esteem, and self-efficacy, and other individual differences, such as gender, age, and nationality.

As one of affective factors, self-efficacy is a significant component of social cognitive theory (SCT) which suggests reciprocal interactions among these influences: environment, behavior, and personal factors including physiological, cognitive and affective aspects. In this theory, human beings have the ability to affect and shape their environment rather than passively react to it. With reference to the interaction among the three forces (personal, environmental and behavioral), individuals’ beliefs in their capabilities to perform a task (e.g. self-efficacy) determine the efforts and engagement they exert for the task (Schunk, 2003).

Also, self-efficacy appears to play a vital role in predicting learners’ performance in educational contexts and it can predict performance even better than actual abilities, or aptitude and it is a strong predictor of academic achievement (Doordinejad & Afshar, 2014; Hsieh & Schallert, 2008; Rahemi, 2007; Bandura (2006); Bentz, (2010); Rahimpour & Nariman-Jahan, (2010). In other words, students having knowledge and skill needed in language learning do not always succeed proficiently to perform it (Tilfarlioglu & Cinkara, 2009).


Nevertheless, Anyadubalu (2010) found a different result. In his study that involved 318 students in Thailand he found no significant relationship between self-efficacy and English language performance, hence the result was not in line with previous studies which indicated that there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and performance. He claimed that these results were possible because the participants were young and the collective society as cultural factor appears to discourage students to make decision on their own.

In spite of the different research results above, there are so many researchers tried to define self-efficacy. Some of them are self-efficacy refers to learner’s belief about their abilities to accomplish a task; it is also the students’ judgment of their academic competence, a degree to which the student thinks he or she has the capacity to cope with the language challenge (Rahimi & Abedini, 2009), and a key motivational force in cognitive system and considered to be a central mediator of effort (Tilfarlioglu & Cinkara, 2009).

Hence, self-efficacy mediates the relationship between knowledge and action. It is because self-efficacy affects individual’s behavior in four ways: selecting choice of behavior, determining how much and how long of the effort, affecting an individual’s thought patterns and emotional reaction, and recognizing human as producers than foreteller. For example, students with low self-efficacy creates fear and doubt that bring them away to pursuit the goals of learning; then they think that activities are tougher and more difficult than they really are; this emerges stress and failure on learning.

However, being good at speaking performance is not only a matter of having self-efficacy, but it is also a matter of mastery English vocabulary at collocational level or the vocabularies used by English native speakers. Because most English vocabularies are
Idioms that are not chunk of words that can merely be used without each of these collocates with the others that the different combination of the words can influence the meaning. Thus, collocational competence is also crucial in order to reach communication goal. There is a need, therefore, to develop one of the hallmarks of an advanced language user; collocational competence which is the possession of a sufficiently large and sufficient phrasal mental lexicon that enables the student to produce language that is fluent, accurate and stylistically appropriate (Lewis, 2000).

There is an urge for Indonesian as English as foreign language learner (EFL) to produce their speaking and writing skills to be like native English because with English language are different language structures between both languages, there are also many different ways in conveying the message to be exact as the native use unless there will be ambiguities occurred. Therefore, collocational competence in this case holds an important role, that collocation which the combination of chunk of words makes different meaning when they do not be with its exact pairs, e.g. look after, look at, and look for. Besides that, in Bahasa there is one word which if it is used in English, it has to use different words. For example, verb angkat in Bahasa can be paired with various nouns and in various contexts to make imperative sentence, e.g. ‘angkat’ tangan (in a classroom), ‘angkat’ tangan (criminal case: police to thief), ‘angkat’ ember, and ‘angkat’ telepon. Otherwise, in English those combinations of words cannot use the same verb, e.g ‘angkat’ tangan in classroom context becomes ‘raise’ your hand, ‘angkat’ tangan in criminal case becomes ‘put’ your hands up, ‘angkat’ ember becomes ‘lift’ the bucket, ‘angkat’ telepon becomes ‘pick’ up the phone. Apparently, what happens in our English learners is they directly translate Bahasa into English without noticing to its context. Hence, instead of memorizing single word, memorizing collocation gives more contribution in enhancing one’s speaking performance progress.

In addition, the use of idiomatic expressions is essential and indispensable in EFL environments in order to reach a more native-like language proficiency and knowledge. Idiomatic expressions, also known as idioms, are numerous and repeatedly occur in the English language. It is estimated that the English language contains at least 25,000 idiomatic expressions. Idiomatic Expressions are defined as an expression whose meanings cannot be inferred from the meanings of the words that make it up. On the other hand, it is also defined as an expression, word, or phrase that has a figurative meaning conventionally understood by native speakers. This meaning is different from the literal meaning of the idiom’s individual elements. In other words, idioms don’t mean exactly what the words say. They have, however, hidden meanings. For example, the idiomatic expression to kick the bucket has nothing to do with the physical action of kicking a bucket with your legs, which is part of your body. The idiom to kick the bucket means to die. Hence, an idiomatic expression carries a figurative meaning, not a literal one. That is, it carries a meaning that cannot be understood just by the literal meanings of the words that make it up (Abid, 2016).

Then, it is often found that students of EFL students are lack the vocabulary needed to produce correct written or spoken English. Besides that, they use inappropriate word combinations when they write or speak; i.e., words that do not go together. As a result, their writing is not proficient. As claimed by Hill: "Students with good ideas often lose marks because they do not know the four or five most important collocations of a key word that is central to what they are writing about" (Lewis, 2000, p. 50). Therefore, their writing is full of “miss-collocations” that make it sounds unnatural. Hill illustrates this problem with the following example in which students said: "His disability will continue until he
dies" rather than "He has a permanent disability". Hence, students should realize the fact that words have their collocational fields. These cases often happen when EFL students need to produce text in paragraphs, such as recount text for tenth grade of senior high school, which needs the collocational competence to make it well written or spoken. As the basic competence in English syllabus of senior high school for recount text itself is applying text structure and linguistic elements to carry out social functions declared and inquire about the actions/activities/events that had/had done/happened in the past without any specific mention of the time, according to the context of its use.

Next, students, for their part, are often not even aware of the significance of collocation knowledge. In other words, the students often do not recognize the importance of collocation knowledge (Laufer, 2005). One reason for this may be the fact that collocations tend to pose little difficulty in language comprehension. Students often underestimate the difference between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, and they assume that if they understand the words, they will be able to use them as well. As a result, many students tend to identify vocabulary learning with the acquisition of new words identify vocabulary learning or with an expansion of vocabulary size and they fail to pay sufficient attention to collocational relationships in the input. Also, they perceive knowledge of difficult or specialized words as an indicator of language progress. As a result, they often focus on memorizing long, decontextualized word lists, and they seldom pay attention to how these words are actually used. Those cases above happen because for intermediate students of a foreign or second language, vocabulary has always been a bottleneck impeding their progress. At this stage, the traditional way of memorizing the meaning and pronunciation of a new word is far from meeting the need of the students. With the expansion of the size of vocabulary, many problems arise concerning the proper use of a word in context, among which is collocation.

Finally, based on the speaking self-efficacy and collocation theories above, students have to have high speaking self-efficacy, so they will sustain in learning English, especially make great effort to master collocation, which is native-like vocabularies, as one of the ways to excel at speaking performance because when they enhance their collocation competence, their English skills both in spoken and written will be improved.

Regarding to see the effects which are caused by students’ speaking self-efficacy and collocational competence on their speaking performances, a study at seven senior high schools at seven sub-districs in Sukabumi regency will be tried to conduct. The students will be given speaking self-efficacy questionnaire, collocation test, and speaking test. The students who become the sample of the research are seven classes at seven sub-districs in Sukabumi regency. It is expected that the results of this study will give a contribution to pedagogical implication in which the teachers can provide the students with appropriate ways in teaching English collocation and English speaking. It is also expected that from the short introduction about speaking self-efficacy construct will give contribution to prevent the students from being passive during the speaking class and having low motivation in learning English.
B. The Question of the Research

Based on the discussion above, the writer would like to analyze the problem of the research by using the following questions:
1. Does students’ speaking self-efficacy have any direct effect on students’ speaking performances?
2. Does students’ collocational competence have any direct effect on students’ speaking performances?
3. Does students’ speaking self-efficacy have any indirect effect through collocational competence on students’ speaking performances?
4. Does students’ collocational competence have any indirect effect through speaking self-efficacy on students’ speaking performances?

C. The Objective of the Research

The objectives of the study are to examine:
1. The direct effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances.
2. The direct effect from the students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances.
3. The indirect effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy through collocational competence on their speaking performances.
4. The indirect effect from the students’ collocational competence through speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances.

D. The Significance of the Research

The significances of the research are as follow:
1. Teachers
   It is expected to enlighten teachers to be aware of students’ self-efficacy and collocational competence in regard to enhance English speaking.
2. Students
   By knowing causal relationship between speaking self-efficacy, collocational competence, and speaking performance, it is expected that students know what aspect that influence English speaking.
3. Researchers
   The research result is expected to be able to be guidance for further researches related to collocational competence, speaking self-efficacy, and speaking performance.
A. Self-Efficacy

1. The Nature of Self-Efficacy

The pioneer of Self-efficacy theory, Bandura proposes a social cognitive theory stating that the beliefs individuals have about their capabilities are critical to improvement and mastery. According to Bandura, how people behave can often be predicted by the beliefs they hold about their own capabilities (more so than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing). That is, individuals’ perception about how they themselves will perform at specific tasks and their confidence in their ability to complete them successfully has a large impact on how these individuals actually behave in situations. Besides that, self-efficacy is what an individual believes he or she can accomplish using his or her skills under certain circumstances. Said differently, self-efficacy is a judgment people make about their own future potential and ability (Margolis & McCabe, 2006). Also, Self-efficacy beliefs do not focus on level of competence; instead they focus on self-perception about competence (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Then, self-efficacy has been thought to be a task-specific version of self-esteem (Lunenburg, 2011), for self-efficacy is different from other, similar concepts. It differs from hope for success, optimism, self-esteem, self-concept, self-value, and self-worth, which are generalizable outlooks and personality qualities (Goddard et al., 2004; Robb, 2012; Zulkosky, 2009). Rather than being a trait which is stable, self-efficacy beliefs are specific to a particular situation (Fisher, 2011). In contrast to stable traits, self-efficacy is about belief in oneself to successfully show specific behaviors on a specific future task (Goddard et al., 2004; Robb, 2012; Zulkosky, 2009). The basic principle behind self-efficacy theory is that individuals are more likely to engage in activities for which they have high self-efficacy and less likely to engage in those who do not (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002).

2. Self-Efficacy Categorization

Since Bandura’s seminal work individuals’ self-beliefs has been considered critical forces in their academic achievement (Artistisco et al., 2003; Bandura & Locke, 2003; Pajares, 2002). There are two types of self-efficacy. They are positive self-efficacy and negative self-efficacy. Positive self-efficacy, such as beliefs in one’s capabilities and personal goals, is not only empowering, but it enhances attaining and achieving one’s goals (Bandura & Locke, 2003). One’s belief in the likelihood of goal completion can be motivating in itself (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). In an educational context, self-efficacy is the confidence that one has in one’s ability to perform tasks that affect one’s learning processes. Students with positive (high levels) of self-efficacy demonstrate positive social behaviors, both directly and indirectly (Bandura, 2006), and prefer deep learning to superficial learning (Liem et al., 2008). On the other hand, negative self-efficacy leads one to believe that things are tougher than they really are, fostering stress, depression, and a narrow vision of how to solve a problem (Bandura and Locke, 2003).

Besides that, Klassen et al. (2010) identified self-efficacy as a type of motivational variable of learning. Self-efficacy can be divided into two forms: general (array of tasks) and perceived (specific action; Luszcynska, Scholz, & Schwarzer, 2005). Furthermore, Bandura (2006) describes self-efficacy judgments as being specific to a learning task and...
influenced by one’s performance during the course of a task. Before students solve problems, they have an initial sense of their capability to successfully complete those problems. As they begin solving problems, they assess their performance in light of feedback, and experience increased efficacy after successful attempts or decreased efficacy after unsuccessful attempts. To the degree that feelings of self-efficacy predict future behaviors, we should expect students to behave differently when their efficacy is high versus when it is low. Considerable research has examined the role motivation plays in self-regulated learning, and prior studies have found that self-efficacy predicts learners’ cognitive and metacognitive behaviors (Pajares, 2008). However, much of this work has treated motivational constructs as stable components of the self-regulated learning (SRL) process that do not vary during learning; researchers typically assess motivation only at the outset or completion of a task. This treatment of motivation conflicts with models of self-regulated learning and, in the case of self-efficacy, with the theoretical assumptions about the construct itself. In other word, self-efficacy serves a self-regulatory function by providing individuals with the capability to influence their own cognitive processes and actions and thus alter their environments (Bandura, 2001).

Moreover, three types of self-efficacy are also introduced by Baron (2004): “self-regulatory self-efficacy (ability to resist peer pressure and avoid high-risk activities), social self-efficacy (ability to form and maintain relationships, be assertive and to engage in leisure time activities), and academic self-efficacy (ability to do the course work, regulate learning activities and to meet expectations)”. Academic self-efficacy refers to individuals convictions that they can successfully perform given academic tasks at designated levels on an academic task or attain a specific academic goal (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Linenbrink & Pintrich, 2002a; Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Since academic self-efficacy has been shown to correlate with student’s motivation and performance, it follows that students’ learning environments could be used to enhance self-efficacy (Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Schunk & Pajares, 2002). In the FL classroom the instructor can help students perform better and persist in studying longer by structuring activities that increase their self-efficacy. For example, level appropriate tasks related to the topic at hand will provide learners with a sense of control over said topic and will serve as a model for forthcoming assignments (Mills, 2004). Creating tasks that help learners improve their level of proficiency, and that encourage social situations where they interact with and watch effective performances of peers, could lead them to perform well using situation-and-domain specific competences gained during instruction. Moreover, self-efficacy theory suggests that academic self-efficacy may vary in strength as a function of task difficulty—some individuals may believe they are most efficacious on difficult tasks, while others only on easier tasks. Furthermore, self-efficacy is believed to be situational in nature rather than being viewed as a stable trait (Linenbrink & Pintrich, 2002a). Students make reliable differentiations between their self-efficacy judgments across different academic domains which, collectively, form a loose hierarchical multidimensional structure.

Two general categories of academic expectancy beliefs have been postulated. Academic outcome expectations are a student’s beliefs that specific behaviors will lead to certain outcomes (e.g., “If I do homework my grades will improve”). Academic efficacy expectations are a student’s beliefs in their ability to perform the necessary behaviors to produce a certain outcome (e.g., “I have enough motivation to study hard for this test”). Understanding the difference between these two forms of expectancy beliefs is important as “individuals can believe that a certain behavior will produce a certain outcome (outcome
expectation), but may not believe they can perform that behavior (efficacy expectation)” (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002, p. 111).

Moreover, researches conducted by Linenbrink and Pintrich (2003) have shown that academic self-efficacy is significantly associated with students' learning, cognitive engagement, analytical thinking, academic commitment, strategy use, persistence, susceptibility to negative emotions and achievement. In the academic context, children's beliefs in their personal efficacy to control their own educational processes and outcomes and to become proficient in challenging subject matter, likely has a great impact on their scholastic impetus, interest and educational performance. Students who are confident in their capability to organize, execute, and regulate their problem-solving or task performance at a designated level of competence are demonstrating high self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is generally regarded as a multidimensional construct differentiated across multiple domains of functioning.

Self-efficacy has influence over people's ability to learn, their motivation and their performance, as people will often attempt to learn and perform only those task for which they believe they will be successful (Lunenburg, 2011). Self-efficacy beliefs influence how people act, think, and motivate themselves. This is because self-efficacy beliefs involve cognition, motivation, and decision-making (Zulkosky, 2009). From their beliefs, they adjust their level of commitment, perseverance, problem solving, and strategy implementation when facing a specific challenge (Bandura & Locke, 2003).

The basic idea behind the self-efficacy Theory is that performance and motivation are in part determined by how effective people believe they can be. In Education, self-efficacy is a key contributing factor to learners' success; because self-efficacy influences the choices learners make and the courses of action they pursue (Pajares, 2002). The influence of self-efficacy to regulate one's learning activities over a long period is verified in longitudinal research spanning the transition from middle school to high school (Caprara et al., 2008). Children who had a high sense of efficacy to regulate their academic work achieved high grades in middle school and exhibited high self-efficacy to regulate their course work in high school. A strong sense of self-regulatory efficacy at the high school level predicted high academic performance on national achievement tests and less likelihood of dropping out of school, after controlling for middle school grades and socioeconomic status. This unique incremental productiveness was obtained by a within-person analysis using latent growth curve modeling that is statistically similar to hierarchical modeling. The positive contribution of efficacy belief to performance is further replicated at the collective level in within-team HLM of ongoing team performance (Chen, Kanfer, DeShon, Mathieu, and Kozlowski, 2009). In both within-person and within-team analyses, perceived efficacy predicts mutual assistance to fulfill team goals and level of team performance, after controlling for prior individual and team performance.
3. Self-Efficacy Dimensions

According to Bandura (2006), self-efficacy beliefs tap on three dimensions: (a) level or magnitude (the level of task difficulty); self-efficacy magnitude measures the difficulty level (e.g. easy, moderate, and hard) an individual feels is required to perform a certain task (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). How difficult is my class work? Are the quizzes easy or hard? (b) strength (the certainty of successfully performing a particular level of task difficulty); self-efficacy strength refers to the amount of conviction an individual has about performing successfully at diverse levels of difficulty (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). How confident am I that I can excel at my work tasks? How sure am I that I can climb the ladder of success?, and (c) generality (the extent to which magnitude and strength beliefs generalize across tasks and situations); generality of self-efficacy refers to the "degree to which the expectation is generalized across situations (Lunenburg, 2011).

Although Bandura argued that self-efficacy measurement should be domain specific; that is, the content of the scale items need to be directly related to the construct that is being measured, others maintained that measuring self-efficacy at a general level is relatively stable over time and over domains of functioning, as a psychological trait as opposed to a more conditional and fluctuating state. Because various experiences of failure and success in different domains of functioning may generate more generalized beliefs of self-efficacy, general self-efficacy (GSE) has great utility for explaining behavior in less specific contexts (Luszczynska et al., 2005; Scholz et al., 2002) and predicting general outcomes (Van der Slot et al. 2010). Since then, GSE has caught much attention in recent years in psychological and personality research (e.g., Cramm et al., 2013; Ebstrup et al., 2011), because it highlights the possibility to transfer personal efficacy judgments across tasks or activities (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006).

4. General Self-Efficacy (GSE) Measurement

According to Zhou (2015) many measures have been invented for GSE in order to capture individuals’ general beliefs about their capabilities to handle different situations by and large, with responses created largely through an aggregation of all successes and experiences, not just those in a given domain. Based on the accumulation of prior experiences, respondents will need to gather information of their past performance related life events as described in survey items to reach a general assessment of capacity to handle such situations. General Self-Efficacy (GSE) scale gained most popularity due to its ease for administration and accordance to the original conceptualization of the construct. He said that this scale assesses the strength of an individual’s belief in his/her own ability to respond to novel or difficult situations and to deal with any associated obstacles or setbacks. It has been adapted into 30 languages, with normal and clinical populations. Reliability analyses produced highly consistent results, with a high range of internal consistency between an alpha of 0.75 and 0.91. The GSE scale demonstrated some stability over a 4-month period with a test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.63. Nonetheless, the test-retest reliability dropped to 0.47 among migrants from East Germany over a 2-year period. Thus, although the GSE scale has been found to be internally consistent in numerous studies, its test-retest reliability is not too encouraging.

Validation studies of the GSE scale have also been conducted in 25 nations. While numerous studies with western samples defend the original one-factor structure of this construct via exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, the one-dimensional nature of the scale with Asian samples was not supported unequivocally. On one hand, cross-cultural
researchers argued that efficacy beliefs operate differently in non-western cultures than they do in western cultures. The role played by collective efficacy (i.e., a group’s shared belief) is possibly more salient among those with collectivist orientations found in many Asian countries. On the other hand, the dominant use of confirmatory factor analyses in past studies might have missed alternative factor structures of GSE. For example, with exploratory factor analyses, a two-factor structure of the scale with a Hong Kong schizophrenia sample. The two factors accounted for 69.0% of the total variance. The authors interpreted the new factor structure is interpreted that one’s self-efficacy in work-related situations involved both personal and environmental aspects.

The personal factor related to self-efficacy included nine items that tapped on self-directing or self-determining behaviors, and the environmental factor included only one item that was concerned with one’s self-efficacy in the social context such as expectations of others and support from others. Hence, within a limited number of validation studies with Chinese speaking populations, although a large portion of studies indicated that it can be seen as homogeneous and uni-dimensional, there is still a clear need for further examination of GSE using multiple methods of analyses, with non-western samples.

5. GSE: One Factor or Multiple Factors?

Zhou (2015) mentioned that perusal of the GSE items showed that the semantics of the items did not converge into one factor nicely at the conceptual level; rather, two-phase model of self-efficacy to a great extent. In this model, a distinction was made between pre-intentional motivation processes and post-intentional volition processes. In the pre-intentional phase, individuals first develop an intention (or goals) to act. The intention could stem from the belief that: (a) one is at risk for failure (risk perception), (b) behavioral change would reduce a failure threat (outcome expectancies), and (c) one is sufficiently capable of exercising control over a difficult behavior (perceived self-efficacy). After individuals set goals, they enter the post-intentional phase wherein they plan details and invest effort. Thus, the first phase leads to a behavioral intention and the second leads to actual behavior. Schwarzer and Renner (2000) termed self-efficacy that functions in the pre-intentional phase as action self-efficacy and the one in the post-intentional phase as coping self-efficacy.

The distinction between these two types of efficacy is necessary because it is possible that some individuals could be very confident in their ability to set goals and take initiative (high in action self-efficacy) but not so confident in their ability to maintain the effort to achieve the goals (low in coping self-efficacy). By contrast, others could have high confidence in their ability to recover from failures to continue goal pursuit (high in coping self-efficacy) but little confidence in getting started (low in action self-efficacy). Hence, these two types self-efficacy co-define GSE as a multidimensional construct. GSE may explain a broader range of human behaviors and coping outcomes when the context is less specific. It has been shown to be associated with a variety of variables, including future orientation, anxiety and depression, social relations, and academic achievement.

Speaking to this point, a closer look at the proposed factor structure of GSE showed that action self-efficacy seems to be in overlap to some extent with optimism in terms that both involve the general belief that desired outcomes (i.e., goals) are likely to be achieved. This belief is thought to influence people’s goal directed behaviors and, ultimately, goal achievement. Empirically, self-efficacy has been repeatedly found to be positively correlated to optimism. Hence, in the current study, optimism was included for the predictive validity examination. On the other hand, literature on identity has shed light on
its relationship with one’s coping strategy/style. Process model of identity, the manner in which individuals deal with events or stressors that may invalidate or force revisions in their self-view will vary with their identities. The identification of self would be associated with certain coping strategies. For this reason, personal identity was also included as a second variable for examining predictive validity.

6. **Sources of Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

Generally, self-efficacy is influenced by four main sources: enactive mastery experience—that is, hands-on experience; vicarious experiences—that is, other people’s experience; verbal persuasion—that is, appraisal or feedback from others; and physiological and affective states—that is, stress, emotion, mood, pain, and fatigue (Hodges, 2008).

6a. **Socio-Economic Status**

Sociologists divided individuals into upper class, middle class, working class and lower class (Moreno, 2010). SES effects students’ academic achievements. High-SES students get higher scores from low-SES students (Barry, 2005). At the same time, parental facilities and their education have influence on self-efficacy of students (Eccles & Davis-Kean, 2005). Learned helplessness may be seen in low-SES children. That is, these students may believe they can never overcome school works (Woolfolk, 2001). Therefore, the sources of self-efficacy from different SES students must be researched and how to increase must be considered.

6b. **Gender**

The relationship between gender differences and sources of self-efficacy has been examined in many studies. Gender has been identified as factors that affect foreign language students’ performance and motivation (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007). Self-efficacy research has focused on gender-related issues in different academic disciplines such as science and math. In a culture with a high rate of women who pursue FLs as a field of study, men tend to depreciate the study of FL because they assume that studying a FL is a female-restricted domain; they exhibit a higher sense of confidence in their abilities to do math and science than their female counterparts (Pajares, 2002). Therefore, male students exhibit feelings of discomfort whenever they are immersed in a language learning environment. On the opposite side of the continuum, female students were identified to be more self-efficacious in language arts (Pajares and Valiante, 2006). While it was found there wasn’t relationship gender and sources of self-efficacy (Klassen, 2004). There was a significant relationship in some studies (Britner & Pajares, 2006; Hampton & Mason, 2003; Joet, Usher, & Bressoux, 2011).

6c. **Learning Style**

Learning style is different ways which students own while learning a subject (Slavin, 2006). In Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP), three learning styles were proposed. Visual learners learn by seeing and use diagrams, tables, graphs, maps, posters. Auditory learners learn by listening and discussion, lectures, interviewing, hearing stories and audio tapes is appropriate for these. Kinesthetic learners learn by doing and like physical activity (Pritchard, 2009). To explore relationship between sources of self-efficacy and learning styles ease teachers’ instructional affairs in increasing students’ self-efficacy. Before the study was conducted, it was estimated verbal persuasion was more appropriate for auditory learners, vicarious experience was more appropriate for visual learners, mastery experience was more appropriate for kinesthetic learners and psychological state was more appropriate for all of them.
d. Mastery Experience

Mastery experience, also called enactive mastery, mastery learning, enactive attainment, or performance attainment, is the most powerful source of self-efficacy (Chowdhury, et al., 2002, Dawes, Horan, & Hackett, 2000). Smith (2002) states two reasons for this. First, enactive mastery is based on experiences that are direct and personal. Second, mastery is usually attributed to one’s effort and skill. In addition, mastery learning builds high levels of self-efficacy beliefs as people face new challenges ahead, based on their past successful experiences (Zulkosky, 2009). Patterns of past failure may lead to lower levels of self-efficacy beliefs and may negatively influence a person’s choices when facing new, future challenges (Zulkosky, 2009). Hampton & Mason (2003) found that weakened efficacy beliefs may result from repeated failed experiences which lead to people limiting their own choices, levels of success, and persistence in future challenging or stressful situations.

Cubukcu (2008) summarizes that self-efficacy beliefs are affected more by one’s own direct experiences with tasks than social comparison. In self-efficacy, students do not compare their perceived competence with their peer’s ability in the same area. They assess themselves of how capable they are to accomplish a given task. In academic self-efficacy, the studies concentrate more on students’ judgments of their capability. Self-efficacy is related to student engagement and leaning. The components of engagement are behavior, cognitive, and motivation. On behavioral engagement, the teacher can observe easily whether the students are engaged of effort, persistence, and help seeking. If they are not efficacious on themselves, they are more likely to give up. In contrast, teacher cannot access students’ cognitive engagement because it is in their heads. Students with high efficacy use more cognitive strategies than the others when they are engaged with the material deeper. Motivational engagement contains personal interest (like and dislike), value (importance and utility) and affect. It can be summarizes that self-efficacy can direct the students to more engagement in academic situation, so that it results in better learning achievement. Thus, the more students are engaged, the more they learn and the better they perform.
e. **Vicarious Experience**

Vicarious experience, known also as modeling, affects self-efficacy through a capability of others. Vicarious experience is believed to be the second most effective way to develop self-efficacy (Chowdhury et al., 2002, Wise & Trunnell, 2001). Vicarious learning means that one can watch the experiences of others and make connections between behaviors and consequences (Dutt, 2010; Roberts, 2010). This can take place through: observing a model, symbolic modeling, watching videos of oneself, or through cognitive self-modeling which means imagining oneself performing a specific task (Bautista, 2011). Observation serves as a positive or negative reinforcement for a person’s own self-efficacy beliefs as people assess their potential for success in the future as compared to someone else’s experience (Falcone, 2012). By observing others and the consequences of behaviors, vicarious learning allows observers to create knowledge about behaviors and to determine how they should behave in the future (Voit, 2005).

f. **Verbal Persuasion**

Verbal persuasion, also known as social persuasion is another way to increase people’s belief in their efficacy (Chowdhury et al., 2002). People who receive realistic encouragement will be more likely to exert greater effort and to become successful than when they are troubled by self-doubts. The latter’s confidence in their academic skills also can be enhanced when they receive feedback from people they know and can trust (e.g., teachers, parents, and friends) (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Verbal persuasion is when people are led to believe they can be successful at something through the power of suggestion, even if they have experienced difficulty with it in the past. It is also referred to as social persuasion (Goddard et al., 2004). Verbal persuasion takes the form of verbal interactions from others about the quality of performance and prospects for success in the future (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Warner et al., 2011). Verbal persuasion may be given through words that appeal to the emotions of a person, leading to emotional arousal which is another source of self-efficacy beliefs (DeSteno et al., 2004). Verbal persuasion may also come in the form of giving directions, suggestions, performance feedback, advice, pep talks, praise, and encouragement are also considered forms of verbal persuasion (Goddard et al., 2004; Myers et al., 2005; Zulkosky, 2009).
g. Physiological Arousal

Physiological arousal is also called affective arousal and emotional arousal (Smith, 2002). People use emotions as sources of information about their environment and as they form their expectations about the likelihood of specific events and actions. This emotional arousal is a source of self-efficacy beliefs. Emotional arousal can be defined as how a person responds to their own levels of anxiety and stress (Bautista, 2011). It is also known as somatic and affective states, sometimes referred to as mood (Warner, 2011). People experience different emotions and these emotions vary in how they influence future thinking and motivation (DeSteno et al., 2004). Positive and negative affective states bias expectancies based on the mood created (DeSteno et al., 2004). The emotional arousal that the students experience and examine in different contexts provides them with a measure of their abilities in performing a task. For example, experiencing high anxiety is likely to lower students' sense of self-efficacy (Raoofi, Tan, & Chan, 2012).

In other words, a person can gain self-efficacy beliefs by doing a task successfully, observing someone else doing it, receiving positive feedback, and by relying on their emotional arousal prior to engaging in a new challenge ahead (Zulkosky, 2009).

7. Distinctive Features of Self-efficacy

Zimmerman and Cleary (2006) name four main features of self-efficacy. First, it focuses on proposed abilities to perform a task rather than on behavior or psychological characters. In fact self-efficacy deals with "how well can I do something?" rather than "what am I like?". Next, self-efficacy beliefs are domain-specific, context-specific, and activity specific. In context-specific, for example an individual may shows a low self-efficacy for learning math in a competitive classroom context than in cooperative class. Though, self-efficacy is multidimensional and changes across particular activities within specific domain. Third, self-efficacy depends on mastery norm performance rather than normative or other measures. That is students beliefs about their skillfulness in doing a specific task such as writing an essay is measured and this gives no idea about comparing them with their peers ability in essay writing. As a final point, judgment about self-efficacy is done before really doing the task.
8. Self-Efficacy Effect

Self-efficacy beliefs can bolster or hamper motivation and lead to aspirational and strategic thinking when people face difficult problems that need to be solved (Bandura and Locke, 2003). Additionally, goal setting is strongly influenced by levels of self-efficacy beliefs; higher levels of efficacy beliefs lead to the establishment of more challenging goals and stronger levels of commitment and perseverance (Zulko, 2009). Lastly, self-efficacy has been shown to have a major influence on creativity (Bandura and Locke, 2003).

In contrast, feelings of fear and anxiety when facing a specific challenge may lead to low self-efficacy beliefs. People are less motivated when they have low self-efficacy beliefs. Low self-efficacy beliefs can be devastating to psychological well-being and can produce a self-fulfilling prophecy about failure and learned helplessness (Margolis and McCabe, 2006). When pursuing difficult challenges, people have to override a lot of dissuading negative feedback if they are to achieve their goals; if they have self-doubt they can become quitters rather than survivors in the face of challenges.

After that, Pajares (2002) argues that high self-efficacious individuals have the following characteristics: they do not see complex activities as a thread to evade rather they move toward it as a demanding activity to be mastered, their inherent interest in doing tasks is superior, their goals are more demanding, they keep up their attempt even in the face of difficulties, they would recover their self-belief rapidly after failures, and would see failures due to their own inadequate attempts or their own lack of knowledge or skill in fact they do not look for external elements, and they are also not nervous and are calmer in accomplishing complex tasks. On the contrary, low self-efficacious individuals consider tasks much harder than what they actually are, and this will increase their anxiety, tensions, depression and give them weaker view for solving problems.

Furthermore, Pajares (2005) mentions that high self-efficacious students try more, endure longer with encountering problems, are more optimistic, and are less nervous. Highly self-efficacious students consider themselves capable of doing academic tasks using different kinds of cognitive and metacognitive strategies while ineffectual ones do not believe in their capability.

Moreover, there is a considerable body of educational research that supports the idea that learners’ self-efficacies influence their motivation to learn (Pajares, 2003). There is a limited number of studies that investigated the effect of self-efficacy on motivation within foreign language learning contexts. This review found 7 articles that attempted to investigate the effects of self-efficacy on anxiety (Mills, Pajares & Herron, 2006; Erkan & Saban, 2011; Anyadubalu, 2010; and Çubukçu 2008) and attributions (Hsieh & Kang, 2010; Hsieh & Schallert 2008; and Graham, 2006).

Next, research indicates that self-efficacy beliefs affect the attributions learners make for their success and failure in a given task. According to the results of these studies, students with different levels of self-efficacy make different attributions for their success and failure in learning second language. For example, Hsieh and Schallert (2008) conducted a study on self-efficacy and attributions. In the study, 500 undergraduate students learning French, Spanish and German as a foreign language in the USA were examined. The study found that ESL learners who attributed their failure to lack of effort as a controllable attribution had higher self-efficacy than learners who did not attribute their failure to effort.

Similarly, a recent study into self-efficacy and attributions (Hsieh and Kang 2010) found that Korean students who had higher self-efficacy made more personal control
attributions such as effort than those with lower self-efficacy. In contrast, students who had lower self-efficacy made more external attributions such as to the teacher for their success and failure in their test. Graham (2006) also, in her qualitative research of students learning French in the UK, found that students with low self-efficacy tended to attribute their failure to low ability, a factor which is beyond students’ control, whereas students with high self-efficacy attributed their failure to controllable attributions such as insufficient effort or lacking in the use of appropriate strategies.

Then, Tlfarlioglu and Cinkara (2009) revealed that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between knowledge and action. In short, a student having knowledge and skill needed in language learning does not always succeed proficiently to perform it. It is because self-efficacy affects individual’s behavior in four ways: selecting choice of behavior, determining how much and how long of the effort, affecting an individual’s thought patterns and emotional reaction, and recognizing human as producers than foreteller. For example, student with low self-efficacy creates fear and doubt that bring him away to pursuit the goals of learning; then he thinks that activities are tougher and more difficult than they really are; this emerges stress and failure on learning. In Rahimi and Abedini (2009), based on what Bernhard and Pajares wrote, self-efficacy refers to learner’s belief about their abilities to accomplish a task; it is also the students’ judgment of their academic competence. Furthermore, Ehram (in Rahimian Abedini, 2009) noted that it is a degree to which the student thinks he or she has the capacity to cope with the language challenge. In short, self-efficacy can be defined a personal judgment of one’s ability to organize, execute, and cope with academic competence and its challenge. Moreover, self-efficacy can affect motivation and choice of activities. Student with high self-efficacy will give great effort when facing difficulties, he probably say “I can do this.” In contrast, student who has low self-efficacy may doubt his ability, he thinks “It seems hard and difficult.” Besides, it also mostly concerns to answer the question: Can I do this task with this situation? (Cubukcu: 2008). Zimmerman (2000) wrote that self-efficacy beliefs are not a single disposition but rather are multidimensional in form and differ on the basis of the domain of functioning. For example, one is efficacious on a history test; whereas, the efficacy belief differs on biology test. On the other words, perceived self-efficacy is in a particular task at specific given situation.

9. Speaking Self-Efficacy

According to Ali (2015) there were positive relationship between speaking skills achievement and satisfaction with speaking classes and speaking skills self-efficacy beliefs. Speaking self-efficacy belief was a stronger predicator of Iranian EFL students’ speaking skill achievement.

It was said that learners with higher speaking skill self-efficacy tended to perform better in speaking skills. Moreover, the extent of effort, insistence and flexibility were organized on the basis of self-efficacy beliefs. Then, self-efficacy beliefs could change an individual thinking prototypes and mental feedbacks. Learners with high self-efficacy tended to be more confident and were more positive to accomplish speaking activities with specials complexity levels. Those with a high self-efficacy belief tended to so complex assignments, whereas those with low self-efficacy might consider tasks more difficult than they actually were. This kind of belief might cause a feeling of anxiety and hopelessness.

Also, there were a lot of studies that examined relationships between EFL learners’ self-efficacy and their language skills proficiency. It was discovered a positive relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension skills success. When a research
regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and EFL listening success analyzed, the outcomes illustrated an important positive relationship between EFL learners’ self-efficacy belief and their listening achievement and listening comprehension self-efficacy remarkably relates to listening ability.

A lot of studies suggested that the use of strategies was largely associated to self-efficacy ideas. Then, there was a considerable relationship between the learners’ strategy use and their self-efficacy feelings that learning strategies are greatly related to self-efficacy feelings. Also, readers with advanced levels of self-efficacy applied more reading strategies that readers who had little self-efficacy.

In addition, many investigations had been carried out on self-efficacy in association with writing, reading, and listening skills, investigation on self-efficacy of speaking capability in foreign language learning has been ignored.

Moreover, it was also examined the result of a site ‘English Bar’ on college students’ speaking self-efficacy and students who often speak English at the ‘Bar’, tend to have a high self-efficacy in comparison to their classmates who hardly ever met the ‘Bar’. Liu considered some positive aspects of the ‘Bar’. First, students were allowed to choose either their co-workers or subject to decrease their stress. Second, students without an appropriate level of proficiency in speaking skills were motivated by the overseas instructors and their co-workers. Third, students’ self-efficacy was developed as they monitored ‘similar others’ who were proficient speakers. At the end, students try harder as they were making development to talk about themselves in English.

In addition, communication strategies help the learners become more positive about their capabilities to handle circumstances which are fearful to them because of their language imperfections. Teachers are able to guide the students to promote an idea that they have enough ability to become successful in their speaking objectives regardless of their language weakness through teaching communication strategies.
10. Foreign/Second Language Learners’ Self-Efficacy Beliefs

According to Raoofi, Hoon, & Heng (2012), self-efficacy is task-specific and differs from context to context. Various ways are required to assess self-efficacy when tasks vary because assessment of self-efficacy is task-specific. Therefore, self-efficacy needs to be measured specifically rather than generally. Since language learning differs from other types of learning, more attention needs to be paid to how learners develop self-efficacy and what factors affect their self-efficacy in second/foreign language contexts. While a large number of researchers have investigated the role of self-efficacy in different areas of learning, less research has focused on self-efficacy beliefs in the context of foreign language learning. However, there has been a growing interest in self-efficacy beliefs within the field of second language learning in the last ten years.

Research results from several areas indicate that self-efficacy is a key factor that affects students’ interest, persistence, extent of effort students invest in learning, the goals they choose to pursue, and their use of self-regulated strategies in performing a task. In foreign language learning contexts, research studies have examined self-efficacy in relation to a limited number of variables namely learning strategies, performance, causal attributions, and language anxiety. Still, not many research studies have been directed towards the development of self-efficacy in these contexts. Moreover, most of the studies have investigated the correlational relationship between students’ self-efficacy beliefs and these variables, and only a few studies have focused on the causal relationship between self-efficacy and mentioned variables. Research indicates that self-efficacy in the second language context influences students’ motivation and learning. Self-efficacy, as a central element of human agency, mediates between students’ aptitude, past achievements, and subsequent performances.

Among the different findings, the most consistent one is that students’ self-efficacy for foreign language affects performance in different language domains. Considering the critical role of beliefs and thoughts, it is necessary to do much research on students’ self-efficacy and how to develop it in educational settings such as schools and universities.
B. Collocational Competence

1. The Nature of Collocation

In the last two decades, there has been considerable discussion among ELT (English language teaching) researchers on the importance of lexical collocations for second/foreign language learning (Lewis, 2000). Palmer, F. R. is considered as a pioneer in the field of collocations; He (as cited in Kennedy, G. 2003) defines collocation as a succession of two or more words that must be learned as an integral whole and not pieced together from its component parts. Nesselhauf (2004), on the other hand, claims that collocation can be seen as a type of word-combination, most commonly as one that is fixed to some degree but not completely. This view is known as the phraseological approach and has been strongly adopted by researchers extensively working in the fields of lexicography and pedagogy. Celce-Murcia (2001) defines collocation as go togetherness of lexical items in combinations, which differs in frequency or acceptability. Items which collocate frequently with each other are called ‘habitual’, e.g. tell a story, whereas those which cannot go together are called ‘unacceptable’, e.g., *powerful tea instead of strong tea. Matrynska (2004) also defines collocations as “the company words keep together” and he suggests knowing a word by the company it keeps.

2. Collocation Categorization

Collocations are frequently recurring two-to-three word syntagmatic units which can include both lexical and grammatical words, e.g. verb + noun (pay tribute), adjective + noun (hot spice), preposition + noun (on guard) and adjective + preposition (immune to). Moreover, the grammatical words that constitute a collocation are grouped in various patterns (Lewis, 2000).

The difference between grammatical and lexical collocations is that the former includes a principal word that is an adjective, a verb or a noun and a grammatical word which is usually a preposition; e.g. verb + prepositions (walk up), noun + prepositions (anger at), adjective + prepositions (proud of), whereas the latter does not include grammatical words like prepositions; e.g. verb + noun (set the table), adjective + noun (fresh breathe), adverb + adjective (bitterly hurt). Lexical collocations consist only of lexical words and they may be more difficult to learn. Consequently, phrasal verbs such as carry on, give up…etc are considered as grammatical collocations and they are found in all English-English dictionaries while specific dictionaries are allocated to lexical collocations which may be ignored by native speakers too.

Besides that, according to Lewis, M (2000) and McCarthy and O’ Dell (2005) there are the most common patterns, such as adjective + noun (a difficult decision), verb + noun (submit a report), noun + noun (radio station), verb + adverb (examine thoroughly), Adverb + adjective (extremely inconvenient), verb + adjective + noun (revise the original plan), noun + verb (the fog closed in), adjective + noun (bright colour), noun + verb (the economy boomed), noun + noun (a sense of pride), verb + preposition + noun (filled with horror), verb + adverb (smiled proudly), and adverb + adjective (happily married).

However, many of the studies on collocations have shown that even high-level learners seem to experience problems in relation to using and developing L2 collocational knowledge (e.g., Nesselhauf, 2005; Revier and Henriksen, 2006; Conzett, 2000; Hill, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Decarrico, 2001). Apart from the prevalent grammatical and lexical distinction, a number of scholars suggest a broader continuum based on the criteria of semantic transparency, degree of substitutability, and degree of productivity with slight differences (Conzett, 2000; Hill, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2003).
On the other hand, Conzett (2000) adopts an approach which illustrates the idea of collocation as a continuum. Collocational continuum are idioms with the least productivity and allowance for substitutability of the constituent, and the most opaqueness in semantics (e.g., “to have a bee in the bonnet” or “to kick the bucket”). On the other end are the free combinations that are the most productive, semantically transparent and highly available for substitution of the constituents (e.g., “pretty girl” or “good guy”). Between these two ends are various types of restricted collocations. However, the current study mostly adopts the continuum put forward by Hill (2000) as it provides a comprehensive explanation of the classification criteria with easy-to-follow examples. On his continuum, collocations which are unique / fixed / strong are placed on the one end while those which are weak are on the other end, and medium strength collocations appear in the middle. According to Hill (2000), “to foot the bill” and “to shrug one’s shoulders” are examples of unique collocations in that neither can bill be substituted by invoice or coffee, nor shoulders with any part of the body, such as legs, arms or hands. Strong collocations follow unique collocations on the cline. In this category, trenchant criticism, nomadic tribe, rancid butter, ulterior motives, harbor grudges, and moved to tears are given as examples.

These collocations are not considered unique, for instance, a nomadic tribe is a strong collocation since nomadic collocates with a very limited number of nouns, and Hill (2000) indicates that any knowledge of the words trenchant, rancid, motive, grudge or tears would be seriously incomplete without some knowledge of these strong collocates. Weak collocations are those the constituents of which collocate freely with a number of lexical items and which can easily be predicted by students: long hair, cheap car, good boy, bad experience. However, this does not mean that they deserve less attention. For example, “good “, which freely collocates with a host of nouns to produce weak collocations, may also be components of many fixed or semi-fixed expressions (e.g., “he is a good age.”). Medium-strength collocations are placed in the middle of the collocational continuum and they constitute a large part of what is said and written: hold a meeting/conference, make a mistake/cake/an appointment and catch a cold are of this type. According to scholars (e.g., Hill, 2000; Lewis, 2000) the main problem of EFL learners in vocabulary stems from the fact that they know the words make and mistake, but since they do not store make a mistake in their mental lexicon as a single item, they cannot retrieve it when required. Thus, they propose that most lexical items represent single choices of meaning, and should be recognized and stored as single items for later use. Furthermore, they see this type of collocation, that is, medium-strength collocation, the most important of all in terms of expanding learners’ mental lexicons.

Furthermore, collocation can be characterized by three main criteria according to its meaning: Non-compositionality, non-substitutability and non-modifiability (Bowles, H., 2007, p. 08). First, a collocation is non-compositional in the sense that we cannot understand its meaning even if we understand the meaning of the individual words. A good example of non-compositionality is an idiom for instance, ‘to have an itching palm’ meaning ‘to be greedy for money’. Second, non-substitution ability means that we cannot substitute the words that constitute a collocation for their synonym. For example, in the collocation: close the meeting, it’s wrong to say shut the meeting because “shut” and “meeting” do not go together, whereas one could say shut the door. Finally, Collocations are non-modifiable, that is to say it is impossible to modify them by adding extra words.
3. The Importance of Collocations in EFL Contexts

According to Koç (2006), there are times when vocabulary was considered only in terms of single words and word families. Fortunately, after research revealed that vocabulary knowledge involves more than just knowing the meaning of a given word in isolation, that is, it also involves knowing the words that typically tend to co-occur with it. Collocation, and its importance for learners of a language, has long been recognized within the area of applied linguistics. A great number of scholars have stated the reasons that make collocations important for EFL learners.

Vocabulary choices can reveal information about the communicative messages of texts. For learners of a language, however, collocation can be the source of particular difficulties in attaining native-level competence due to the seemingly arbitrary nature of the word combinations and the sheer number of collocations present in the language. The most obvious reason that makes collocation important is the way words combine with other words, which is fundamental to all language use. Most people learn the conventional collocations of their own languages without noticing them much, and they have extensive knowledge of how words combine in their language, which enables them to retrieve lexical items and link them appropriately in language production; however, this is not the case for learners of a foreign language or second language in that they have to struggle to get them right. Therefore, most scholars have stressed that native-like proficiency in a language depends considerably on a stock of collocations and proposed that they should immediately be brought to the attention of non-native learners and syllabuses should be designed concerning these combinations. The pervasive nature of collocations has also been mentioned by many scholars that collocation is important in language use and teaching.

In the same vein, collocation as a crucial factor in the generation of a learner’s lexicon and for accuracy in the language. For example, collocations make up approximately 70% of everything we read, write, say or hear. Therefore, when students do not have ready-made chunks at their disposal, namely the collocations, which express precisely what they want to say, they have to generate utterances on the basis of grammar rules, which leads to numerous grammatical mistakes.

Collocation is crucial in that it allows learners to think more quickly and communicate more efficiently. Then, the fluency of native speakers to the retrieval of ready-made language immediately is available from their mental lexicons. In addition, they can read faster and listen at the speed of speech since they have no difficulty in recognizing collocations or multiword units. However, most EFL learners have to process them word-by-word. The basic problem of EFL learners is that they cannot recognize and produce these ready-made chunks, which seriously impedes their fluency.
4. **Collocation and Language Fluency**

Ellis (2005) and Lewis (2006) argue that fluency occurs because native speakers have a store of prefabricated and memorized lexical phrases, which they use skillfully in relevant situations with abnormal rate of articulation. They do not always rely on assembling strings of words on-line via syntactic rules. Moreover, stress and intonation also improve if language is met, learnt and acquired in chunks because quality input leads to quality output.

"Speaking natively is speaking idiomatically using frequent and familiar collocations, and the job of the language learner is to learn these familiar word sequences. That native speakers have done this is demonstrated not only by the frequency of these collocations in the language, but also by the fact that conversational speech is broken into 'fluent units' of complete grammatical clauses of four to ten words, uttered at or faster than normal rates of articulation. (Ellis, 2005, p. 128)."

5. **The Role of Collocations in Vocabulary Acquisition**

In the Lexical Approach, collocational patterns form the core of word knowledge. According to Thornbury "the ability to deploy a wide range of lexical chunks both accurately and appropriately is probably what most distinguishes advanced learners from intermediate ones" (2002, p. 116).

Morgan Lewis argues that increasing the learners’ collocational competence is the way to improve their language as a whole:

“The reason so many students are not making any perceived progress is simply because they have not been trained to notice which words go with which. They may know quite a lot of individual words which they struggle to use, along with their grammatical knowledge, but they lack the ability to use those words in a range of collocations which pack more meaning into what they say or write. (Lewis 2000:14)."
6. Properties of Collocation

Collocations whether unrestricted, semi-restricted or restricted have certain characteristics that often distinguish them from free-word combinations. McKeown and Radev (2006) argue that the arbitrariness of collocation captures the fact that substituting a synonym for one of the words in a collocational word pair may result in an infelicitous lexical combination. Native speakers may say white paint not *white milk (the use of white with milk is a redundancy) and warm greeting not *hot greeting.

Aitchison (2003) argues that the collocations that are associated with different forms reflect different meanings of the word itself. The collocates of the singular noun-form arm, for example, are all physical things as they relate to parts of the body like left, right while those of the plural noun-form arms are non-physical like control, nuclear, treaty because they significantly relate to weapons.

In addition, not all words that occur together frequently can form a collocation. Thus, the occurrence of doctor and hospital in an example like a doctor works in a hospital cannot create a reliable collocation. This is possibly because both doctor and hospital can be found to collocate more strongly with other items. Additionally, perhaps, that though such words occur in the same context, they do not necessarily follow the distance rule. Moreover, several authors like Aitchison (2003); McKeown and Radev (2006) argue that a word is known by the company it keeps. This keeping company is part of the meaning of a word. By looking at the linguistic contexts of words, different meanings can be distinguished, like the use of chair in these collocations: he sat in a chair; the vice manager will chair the meeting; she holds a university chair; when he won the race, his supporters chaired him round the field.

7. Multi-Word Units

The expression “Multi-Word Units” (MWU) is used to refer to words that are considered as a single unit. As claimed by Thornbury (2002) MWU are called simply lexical chunks. They include idioms such as ‘kick the bucket'; phrasal verbs like: give up; fixed phrases or “poly-words” such as 'up to now', 'upside down', 'out of my mind', 'of course', ‘in spite of’…; and semi-fixed phrases like 'a friend of mine/her/them'. MWU are also called “set phrases” or “phrases”. He identified two types of phrases, pragmatic and semantic phrases. Semantic phrases have three sub-types: collocations, idioms and quasi-idioms; while pragmatic phrases have only one type that is “pragmatisms”. He further considers collocations as “the absolute majority” of phrases. Consequently, collocations are a part of MWU. What characterizes collocations is the fact that its constituents are not always “fixed”, they could be separated from each other. Hence, Thornbury considers collocation as “a looser kind of association.

8. Collocations, Idioms and Phrasal Verbs

These three terms are often used interchangeably. Therefore, it is interesting to point out the relation that may exist between them. Let us first examine the meaning of idioms and phrasal verbs. An idiom is an expression in which all the words do not have their literal meanings, their sense is rather figurative or metaphoric. So, the meaning of the idiom is rarely understood. Besides, phrasal verbs are phrases in which verbs are joined to articles, for instance "give up" where meaning is rarely guessed from the individual words. Examining both definitions implies that idioms and phrasal verbs are like collocations because they include words that go together. So, collocations are often idiomatic. Jimmie
Hill said “...in a sense, all collocations are idiomatic and all phrasal verbs and idioms are collocations or contain collocations” (Lewis, 2000).

Moreover, Nesselhauf (2005, p. 14) summarizes classification of word combination as follows:

- **Free combinations** (e.g., *drink tea*):
  - The restriction on substitution can be specified on semantic grounds [i.e., you can substitute *tea* by *coffee*, *water*, *juice*, etc.] and all elements of the word combination are used in a literal sense.

- **Restricted collocations** (e.g., *perform a task*):
  - Some substitution is possible, but there are arbitrary limitations on substitution [e.g., you can also say *do a task*, but not *make a task*] and at least one element has a non-literal meaning, and at least one element is used in its literal sense; the whole combination is transparent.

- **Figurative idioms** (e.g., *do a U-turn*, in the sense of “completely change one’s policy or behavior”):
  - Substitution of the elements is seldom possible and the combination has a figurative meaning, but preserves a current literal interpretation.

- **Pure idioms** (e.g., *blow the gaff*):
  - Substitution of the elements is impossible and the combination has a figurative meaning and does not preserve a current literal interpretation.
9. Collocational Restrictions

Another important reason for teaching collocation is that the way words combine in collocations is fundamental to all language use (Hill, 2000). We do not speak or write as if language is one huge substitution table with vocabulary items merely filling slots in grammatical structures. Knowing which words collocate and which do not is an important part of language competence. The following examples may serve to illustrate this point.

a. Be careful. That snake is poisonous.

b. Be careful. That snake is toxic.

The two sentences share the same grammatical structure. Conzett (2000) commented that the student who came up with sentence (b) obviously understands the meaning of the word toxic, but he makes a collocational mistake. The word toxic is not used to describe snakes like the word poisonous can be. This example shows that words combine in restricted ways. In English, some collocational relationships are strong, and therefore highly predictable, such as those found in shrug one’s shoulders, foot the bill and dead battery. Some are common collocations – verbs such as do, have and get are often used in common collocations – but there are also restrictions. For example, we can say do one’s hair, do one’s best and do somebody a favour but not do a mistake. Lewis (2001) refers to this collocational characteristic of words as word grammar.

10. Collocational Competence

Learning a language is the result of many competences grouped together; hence, we should work on these competences to achieve the learning objectives. We often hear communicative and linguistic competence but “collocational competence” is usually an unfamiliar phrase. Collocational competence is the ability to accurately combine chunks of language thus enabling production of fluent, accurate and stylistically appropriate speech. Without this competence students are facing many problems in writing their assignments. One of these problems is grammatical mistakes as “students tend to create longer utterances because they do not know collocations which express precisely what they want to say” (Hill, as cited in Lewis, 2000, p. 49). Collocations “differ greatly between languages, and provide a major difficulty in mastering foreign languages”. Therefore, they need help in the classroom to pass over collocational problems.

As a result, to overcome the problem of word associations, collocational competence needs to be developed in order to achieve fluency and proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) generally and Foreign Language writing particularly. The development of students’ collocational competence would result in the improvement of communicative competence. Consequently, proficiency in the foreign language would increase as far as the learners’ competencies are developed. Writing as well as speaking would be more fluent, accurate and meaningful since the learner knows the most common collocations that enable him/her to speak and write more efficiently. Therefore, knowing collocations means knowing vocabulary, which facilitates the task for the learner to perform better in the foreign language.

Moreover, we assume that language students aim to become advanced speakers of the target language. The advanced students of a language normally have “a sufficiently large and significant phrasal mental lexicon” (Lewis, 2000) readily available to them when they use the language. Possessing and having access to an immense pool of collocations constitutes their collocational competence that enables them to express themselves effectively. Without this collocational competence, students may “create longer utterances because they do not know the collocations which express precisely what they want to say”
(Hill, 2000, p. 49). A comparison of the following two pairs of sentences helps illustrate the point.

(3a) That was a turning point in his life.
(3b) That was a very important moment in his life and everything changed afterwards.
(4a) One of the main ingredients of successful learning is setting yourself realistic objectives.
(4b) If you want to succeed in learning, you must set objectives which you can reach, because they are not too difficult or too easy for you. (Morgan Lewis, 2001)

(3b) and (4b) are grammatically correct and comprehensible but are clearly not as concise and effective as (3a) and (4a). Morgan Lewis refers to (3b) and (4b) as “intermediate” sentences. This is not because the grammatical structures in (3a) and (4a) are more complicated, or that these sentences make use of complicated words that are not in the intermediate students’ repertoire. Turning point, ingredients, successful, and realistic objectives are all words familiar to the intermediate students. The problem, according to Morgan Lewis, is that students have never noticed and learned the collocations associated with these items of vocabulary (i.e. a turning point, ingredients of successful learning and set realistic objectives) so they rely on individual words and over-grammaticalized structures, which results in expressions that are “intermediate”. Students should not be satisfied with this level of accuracy if their target is to become more advanced speakers of English.

11. L1 and L2 Language Users’ Need for Collocational Competence

Henriksen (2011) mentions collocational competence is important for language production and reception, enabling both the L1 and L2 language user: 1) to make idiomatic choices and come across as native-like; 2) to process language fluently under real-time conditions; 3) to disambiguate meaning of polysemous words, e.g., the verb commit in the following collocational contexts: commit a crime, commit oneself, commit to memory; and 4) to understand connotative meaning, e.g., the fact that the verb cause is often associated with negative connotations as in cause an accident.

It has also been pointed out that FSs fulfill basic communicative and social needs (Wray, 2002). Since many collocations are primarily referential units and therefore do not have the same sociocultural function, this may have an impact on the saliency and frequency of occurrence of many collocations, as well as L2 learners’ motivation to acquire collocations compared to the more pragmatically oriented FSs. However, collocations should be viewed as multi-word lexical items with form-meaning pairings which are associated with specific situations or phenomena and thus can be seen as lexical items that fulfill important communicative functions. Through extensive exposure to L1 input in various contexts and co-texts, native speakers will have developed strong associative links between constituents in preferred collocations. In the ongoing process of L1 acquisition, the native speaker will also have acquired knowledge of the meaning of the collocation and knowledge of the use restrictions of a particular collocation. As will be discussed below, the fact that the L2 learner does not have the same repeated and extended exposure to L1 input may, however, have important implications for L2 development and use of collocations.
12. Teaching Corpus-based Collocations

Vasiljevic (2014) points out that the sheer number of collocations and their pervasiveness in natural language pose challenges in terms of setting the learning goals and in terms of choosing the learning priorities. The *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English* (2002) includes about 150,000 collocations, and that list is far from being exhaustive. In the limited class time available, teachers have to be highly selective with regard to the phrases that will become the focus of class instruction. One common criterion for collocation selection is their *frequency of occurrence* in the corpus. Developments in computer technology have enabled the analysis of very large language corpora making it possible for researchers to obtain comprehensive data on the frequency of a particular word combination in the natural language. There are a number of online corpora available to language teachers and researchers. Some of the biggest ones are the 100 million-word *British National Corpus (BNC)* and the 450 million-word *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. Both corpora include a large collection of samples of written and spoken language from a wide range of sources.

The corpora websites offer a number of useful features such as search by word or phrase, by lemma, or by a part of speech, and they enable the users to perform an analysis of word frequencies, collocates, and distribution of synonyms in different types of texts, as well as indifferent time periods. These corpora have served as a basis for a large number of research publications throughout the world, and have permitted the development of authentic teaching materials and resources. The COCA corpus (http://corpus.byu.edu/coca), from which the examples in this paper are taken, is balanced between five different text types: spoken, fiction, magazine, newspaper and academic, allowing a comparison of word frequencies and use in different contexts. There are four basic search functions: 1) LIST which shows a list of words or word combinations ranked according to their frequency; 2) CHART which allows a comparison of frequencies in different genres or time periods; 3) KWIC (*Key Word in Context*) which displays search words in context with colour-coding for different parts of speech, and 4) the COMPARE option which allows a comparison of two words according to their general frequency or with their specific collocates.
13. Teaching Collocation at Tenth Grade

According to Antle (2013), there are some debates about the practicality of teaching collocations. The size of the mental lexicon (the number of chunks of language a native speaker has stored and is able to use) and the belief that mistakes in collocation usage have a limited effect on comprehension are two reasons against a collocation focus in the classroom. Then, learning collocations is challenging due to the enormous size of the mental lexicon. After that comprehension is not hindered to a great degree by speakers using inappropriate word combinations.

Perhaps the most recognizable benefit is that learners will sound more native like that collocation knowledge allows someone to say and write things like a native speaker. To illustrate, a great deal of language that would be considered to be grammatically accurate is in reality not used, e.g. biochemists are making research into the causes of AIDS. This sentence is grammatically accurate in tense, aspect, and subject and verb agreement, but native speakers would not use the verb make, but would use do instead. Because of the incorrect verb usage, the reader or listener would know a native speaker did not produce the sentence. Word choice mistakes also interfere with comprehension. We are able to understand quickly spoken language because we do not focus on the individual words but on chunks of language that we can often predict. Written texts with collocation errors are difficult to read, and take additional processing time to understand the intended meaning. Spoken language with collocation errors can hamper comprehension even further as speakers do not have the luxury of time to review what they have heard.

Another benefit concerns low-level speakers is that learning multiword units (a term he prefers although he also states it would be possible to use collocation), allows beginner learners to make productive use of the language without having to know a lot of vocabulary or grammar. He used survival vocabulary (travel English) to illustrate this point. This idea of productive use is one of the strongest reasons to focus on collocations as opposed to individual words. While there is another complete phrases, such as where is the bathroom?, it is reasonable to assume that by learning word combinations, especially verb-plus-noun collocations, low level students will have an easier time expressing themselves. Students who study lists of individual words are often unable to use them productively in conversations or in written texts.

It has been suggested that studying collocations can help students learn grammar. By learning chunks of language containing certain grammatical structures, the learner will be better able to acquire that grammatical pattern. It has been argued that a strict focus on grammar instruction has led to many of the word combination errors mentioned earlier. This problem occurs because learning grammar is often seen as a simple substitution exercise in which different word types can be placed into the correct slot. A better approach may be to teach appropriate word combinations from a lexical perspective and have students come to their own conclusions about the syntax of a language.

In addition, grammar, receptive and productive fluency should be improved that if students are taught that collocations are multiword units stored as single items in the mental lexicon, they should be able to string longer sequences of words together when producing language and also have an easier time identifying these chunks of language when listening or reading. After that, collocation study allows students to use language they already know. Moreover, learning more vocabulary is not just learning new words, it is often learning familiar words in new combinations. The first 1000 words of the General Service List (GSL) accounts for a surprisingly high percentage 84.3% for conversation, 82.3% for fiction, 75.6% for newspapers, and 73.5% for academic texts) of the written and
spoken language in English. If students are not aware of how the words fit together, they will continue to struggle in listening and reading and more so in speaking and writing. While these reasons all sound convincing, there is a need to support them with more research. Collocation research has been limited to short studies mostly dealing with advanced level students. Longitudinal studies focusing on different proficiency levels should provide a clearer picture of the potential benefits. The claims of improvements in grammar and fluency, in particular, need to be researched.

Thus, the teaching of English vocabulary, especially collocation is crucial in order to enhance the students’ English writing or speaking proficiencies. In learning vocabulary, there are at least six types of vocabulary. The types are word classes, word families, word formation, multi-word units, collocations and homonyms. These six types must be learnt and mastered by the EFL students in order to improve as well as to increase their English vocabulary mastery in both written and spoken communication. However, the 2013 curriculum has already provided curriculum that can educate future competency, communication skills, ability to think clearly and critically, ability to consider the moral aspects of a problem (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013).

After that, the use of textbook containing appropriate collocation for every level also holds important role in the students’ vocabulary development. Hence, there is an urge to know what are the collocations need to be acquired by the tenth grade students. For that reason, Choi and Chon, (2012) in their journal corpus-based analysis of collocations in tenth grade high school English textbooks analyzed the textbook corpus by utilizing Wordsmith Tools 4.0. They listed the single word items of the high-frequency collocations of the textbook corpus from the 16 publishers produced 145 different word types and the table below only focuses on the proper noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>High-frequency Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>High-frequency Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DO (11,068)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>USE (2,017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HAVE (8,525)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TALK (1,981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LIKE (4,689)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>DAY (1,964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>THINK (4,539)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>LOOK (1,937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PEOPLE (4,519)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>FIRST (1,854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LISTEN (4,010)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>WORK (1,846)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GOOD (3,618)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>GOING (1,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>READ (3,495)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>WORLD (1,743)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TIME (3,410)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>SURE (1,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GO (3,174)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>RIGHT (1,683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DID (3,029)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>GREAT (1,680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MAKE (2,991)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>READING (1,628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GET (2,730)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>LESSON (1,447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SCHOOL (2,567)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>STEP (1,436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>HAS (2,529)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>WAY (1,434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>KNOW (2,511)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MAN (1,402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WANT (2,469)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>FOOD (1,377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ENGLISH (2,374)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>NEED (1,369)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted from Choi and Chon, (2012)

After that, the following table is the list of the high-frequency collocations of the tenth grade high school textbooks. The search with the pivot words at Concord function to extract concordance lines produced 852 high-frequency collocations. In the process, idioms (e.g., get started), and free combinations (e.g., great people) were eliminated from the analysis. As the collocations that were valid for coding were those that fell between the categories of free combinations and idioms. Flexibility was permitted to some extent, but there are collocations excluded that included grammatical functions.

Next, collocations such as want to see, wants to see, wanted to see were all included under the category of want to see. Table 2 presents 50 of the collocations; due to space limitation, it can be seen that words, such as, high school, school student, middle school, go to school, make friend, good friend, new friend, and volunteer work were associated with learners’ immediate lives. Collocations such as use a word, use expressions, and key words seem to have been listed due to how they often appear in the textbooks for stating directions in exercises or activities.

Then, there were other collocations including expressions of time (e.g., have time, free time, take time) being closely related to how the learners manage time. The list, however, as useful as they may be for their daily lives, indicates that the collocations may not be so effective for expanding the learners’ academic vocabulary knowledge, or to prepare for the CSAT (College Scholastic Ability Test) which requires vocabulary at the 4,200 word level (i.e., a bit beyond the 4th 1,000 word level) (Joo, 2008). Although the list can be considered useful for learners’ coverage of high-frequency collocations, such as at 1,000 to 2,000 word levels, extra training of collocations of those including low frequency words may separately be needed.

**Table 2.2**

50 High-Frequency Collocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>high school (555)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>take a picture (102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>volunteer work (344)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>good job (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>good idea (319)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>use computer (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>have time (271)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>use computer (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>make sure (232)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>sound great (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>long time (226)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>see the movie (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>get ready (204)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>good friend (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>do the work (200)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>read newspaper (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>read a book (181)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>take order (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>take care (159)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>real life (89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At last, Thornbury (2006) suggests some ideas for teaching collocation:
a. Ask the learners to brainstorm any verb or noun, then check for common collocates and using collocation dictionary.
b. Learners search for band names, film and book titles, check using a dictionary whether they are common collocation or not.
c. Use dictionary and fill in a collocation grid.
d. Make groups of learner and read out the list of word. Such as include part of body “hand, foot, head, ear, face, etc” and ask them to think of as many collocations of related expression as they can with these words.
e. Learners sort words on cards into their collocation pairs such as “heavy + rain, wide + world, broad + smile, lucky + break, etc” and follow up by asking learners to write sentences using these combinations.

Adopted from Choi and Chon, (2012).
14. Classroom Activities Focusing on Collocations

Hill, Michael Lewis and Morgan Lewis cited in Károly (2005) present general and specific classroom activities, which centre on collocation (2000). These could easily be incorporated into lessons to raise students’ awareness of English word combinations, provide practice and encourage learner autonomy.

a. Students read or listen to a text, and they have to find some collocations which centre on a topic.
b. Students are given a list of words and they have to find what collocates with them in the text.
c. Students have to do a gap-filling collocation exercise based on the text.
d. Students have to do a matching exercise based on the collocations which occurred in the text.
e. Students have to find the odd one out in a list of words, which can be combined with another word.
f. Students are given a word, and they have to brainstorm as many collocate as they can.
g. Students get a list of words which collocate with one word; they have to guess the headword.
h. Students read a text and then they have to summarize it orally using collocations.
i. Students have to translate sentences/short texts containing collocations.
j. Students have to spot the errors in a text.

15. Collocation Dictionaries

According to Nation, from a vocabulary point of view, research into collocation is needed:

a. To tell us what the high-frequency collocations are;
b. To tell us what the unpredictable collocations of high-frequency words are;
c. To tell us what the common patterns of collocations are […];
d. To provide dictionaries (or information for dictionaries) that help learners deal with low-frequency collocations. (Nation 2001, p. 328)

All the above is possible through the use of corpora. However, in case corpus consultation is not possible in the classroom or students have difficulties in accessing the corpus directly, collocation dictionaries are an option. This type of dictionary is usually based on large corpora, including learner corpora, and provides invaluable information to learners. Three well-known collocation dictionaries which are currently available are The BBI dictionary of English word combinations, The LTP dictionary of selected collocations and the most recent Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English (McIntosh et al., 2009 cited in Cerqueira (2009, p. 27).
C. Speaking
1. The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is people’s daily need, by which they express ideas and emotion or respond to others’ talk. When others can understand what have been talked, it means that the speaker gets the meaning across. Following are definition of speaking from several experts.

Cameron (2001) stated that speaking was the active use of language to express meaning, that the other people could make sense of them. It could be said that the ability to speak a language was synonymous with knowing the language since speech was the most basic means of human communication.

Thornbury (2005) mentioned that speaking requires the ability to co-operate in the management of speaking turns. It typically took place in the real time for detailed planning as well. In this condition, a lot of memorized lexical expressions were also necessary in spoken language. Therefore, the study grammar may not be the most important matter in order to reach the most efficient way on speaking.

Harmer (2001) argued that some people thought that if they wanted to speak fluently in English, they needed to be able to pronounce phonemes correctly, use appropriate stress and intonation patterns and speak in connected speech. However, speaking was more than it. Actually, the speakers of English had to be able to speak in different genres and situations.

Kayi (2006) believed that speaking was the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of non-verbal symbols in a variety of contexts.

Spratt, Pulverness, & Williams, (2005) explained that speaking was a crucial part in language learning. It needed the speakers to produce the target language in the spoken form. Moreover, it involves the speaker to use speech to express meanings to other people.

Brown (2001) proposed that when someone could speak a language it meant that he could carry on a conversation reasonably competently. In addition, he stated that the benchmark of successful acquisition of language was almost always the demonstration of an ability to accomplish pragmatic goals through an interactive discourse with other language speakers.

Nawshin (2009) conveyed speaking was a productive skill that there were two important aspects in speaking: accuracy and fluency. Accuracy was the extent to which students’ speech matches what people actually said when they used the target language. Besides, fluency was the extent to which speakers use the language quickly and confidently, with few hesitations, unnatural pauses, false starts, words searches, etc.

Thornbury (2005) added that speaking was an interactive skill that required the ability to have cooperation with the other aspects of language. Speaking skill needed to be developed and practiced independently from the other aspects of language, such as grammar and listening. In that case, the teaching and learning process would be as interesting as possible to be conducted in each classroom in order to make the students became more interested in learning the other aspects of language.
2. The Importance of Speaking

Concerning the speaking influence, Baker and Westrup (2003), speaking has a positive impact on students educationally and professionally. Educationally, it reinforces students’ grammar, vocabulary, and functional language, allows them to experiment the language in different contexts, improves their English level and provide them with the opportunity to study in an English speaking country. Speaking is also a medium to study other subjects like Math and Science and obtain success in examinations. Professionally, speaking enables learners to maintain better future careers and gain promotion, since governments and companies currently only appoint the staff who can speak English naturally and communicate efficiently.

Moreover, regarding to speaking, of all four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), speaking seems intuitively the most important: people who know a language are referred to as “speakers” of that language, as if speaking included all other kinds of knowing and many if not most foreign language learners are primarily interested in learning to speak. Consequently, a large percentage of the world’s language learner study English in order to develop proficiency in speaking (Richard and Renandya, 2002). Aural medium is one of factors affecting adult EFL learner oral communication in the fact that when one person speaks and the other responds through attending by means of the listening process. During interaction, every speaker plays a double role – both as listener and as a speaker. So, speaking is closely related to or interwoven with listening, which is the basic mechanism through which the rules of language are internalized (Kang, 2002). In speaking, people put ideas into words, talking about perceptions, feeling and intention. They want other people to comprehend. They ask the listeners or receivers to get information. All theories reviews provided above again show that speaking activity is not merely an individual action. It requires audience or partner to listen and possibly to respond the speaker.
3. Elements of Speaking
Many students have difficulties in speaking; it is likely caused by the lack of speaking element that they acquire. According to Harmer (2002) they are many elements of speaking that must be mastered by students in order to be a good speaker:

a. Connected Speech
Effective speakers of English need to be able not only to produce the individual phonemes of English, but also to use fluent connected speech. In connected speech sounds are modified, omitted, added, or weakened. It is for this reason that we should involve students in activities designed specifically to improve their connected speech.

b. Expressive Devices
Native of English change the pitch and stress of particular parts of utterances, vary volume and speed, and show another physical and non-verbal means how they are feeling. The use of these devices contributes to the ability to convey meaning. They allow the extra expressions of emotion and intensity, students should be able to deploy at least some of such supra segmental features and devices in the same way if they are to be fully effective communicators.

c. Lexis and Grammar
Spontaneous speech is marked by the use of number of common lexical phrases, especially in their performance of certain language function. Teachers should therefore supply variety of phrases for different functions, such as: greeting, agreeing and disagreeing.

d. Negotiation Language
Effective speaking benefits from the negotiatory language we use to seek clarification and to show the structure of what we are saying. We often need ask for clarification when we are listening to someone else talk. Speaking is not only having amount of vocabularies and knowing the grammatical structures, but also mastering all elements of speaking above. All messages we delivered will be acceptable by all communicants if we mastered those elements.

4. Functions of Speaking
Speaking gives big contribution for human’s life. By speaking people can change their life and upgrade it into the next level and reach every dream that they desire. In many situations, one makes utterances with purposes; they have message to deliver to other through everything they said. Speaking activities have functions that differ in situations and contexts and those different functions make speaking has different forms. A lot of attempts have been made to classify the functions of speaking in human interactions.

There are interactional and transactional functions in speaking. Making distinctions between both; interactional functions focus to maintain the social relationship while transactional functions focus on the information exchanges during the speaking.

Furthermore, Alfi (2015) expands Brown and Yule’s framework and classifies speaking into three different functions and forms. They are talk as interaction, as transaction and as performance.

a. Talk as an Interaction
Talk as interaction refers to the talk made by people because they want to look friendly to other people. When people meet they exchange greeting, engage in small talk, recount recent experiences and so on because they wish to be friendly and to establish comfortable zone of interaction with others. The focus of the talk is to maintain the social relationship, not to exchange information.
b. Talk as a Transaction

Talk as interaction refers to the talk that focuses on the message on the talk, the information that should be understood by the speaker.

This talk does not focus on the participants or the social relations. Next, transactional talk is associated with other activities. For example, students may be engaged in hands-on activities (e.g., in a science lesson) to explore concepts associated with floating and sinking. In this type of spoken language, students and teacher usually focus on meaning or on talking their way to understanding, not to focus on the participant.

c. Talk as a Performance

Talk as performance is a talk that is done in public, transferring information before the audience, such as a classroom presentation, public announcement and speeches. The talk is focus both on the information and audience. This kind of talk is usually planned and it uses written language. Speaking is not just producing sounds, words and sentences in certain understandable language. Speaking is an activity where people show their feelings, thoughts and believes to other through the language that both understands. Everyone has different purposes in using the language so that speaking has several functions and forms.

5. Types of Speaking Performance Classroom

There are six categories apply to the kinds of oral production that students are expected to carry out in the classroom according Nunan (2003):

a. Imitative

A very limited portion of classroom speaking time may be spent generating “human tape recorder” speech, where, for example, learners practice an intonation contour or try to pinpoint a certain vowel sound. This practice is for focusing on some particular element of language form. “Drills” offer students an opportunity to listen and to orally repeat certain strings of language that may pose some linguistic difficulty—either phonological or grammatical. They can help to establish certain psychomotor patterns and to associate selected grammatical forms with their appropriate context.

b. Intensive

Intensive speaking goes one step beyond imitative to include any speaking performance designed to practice some phonological or grammatical aspects of languages. Intensive speaking can be self-initiated or it can ever form part of some pair work activity, where learners are “going over” certain forms of language.

c. Responsive

A good deal of student’s speech in the classroom is responsive: short replies to teacher or student-initiated questions or comments. These replies are usually sufficient and do not extend into dialogues. It is meaningful and authentic.

d. Transactional (Dialogue)

Transactional language, carried out for purpose of conveying or exchanging specific information, is an extended form of responsive language.

e. Interpersonal (Dialogue)

It is carried out for the purpose of maintaining social relationships than for the transmission of facts and information. These conversations are a little trickier for learners because they can involve some or all factors such as: a casual register, colloquial language, emotionally charged language, slang, ellipsis, sarcasm and a covert “agenda”.
f. Extensive (Monologue)

Students at intermediate to advance levels are called on to give extended monologues in the form of oral reports, summaries, or perhaps short speeches. Here the register is more formal and deliberative. These monologues can be planned or impromptu.

6. Characteristics of Spoken Language

Speaking skill is seen as somewhat difficult for some language learners. Here, a speaker should at least pronounce the words well, choose the suit dictions, and try to do grammatically correct though, perhaps in any cases, it is common when a speaker speaks without having good attention at accuracy or fluency. Brown (2001) says that there are eight characteristics of spoken language can make oral performance easy as well as, in some cases, difficult:

a. Clustering

Fluent speech is phrasal, not word by word. Learners can organize their output both cognitively and physically through such clustering.

b. Redundancy

The speaker has an opportunity to make meaning clearer through the redundancy of language. Learners can capitalize on this feature of spoken language.

c. Reduced Forms

Contractions, elisions, reduced vowels, etc., all form special problems in teaching spoken English. Students who do not learn colloquial contractions can sometimes develop a stilted, bookish quality of speaking that in turn stigmatize them.

d. Performance Variables

One of the advantages of spoken language is that the process of thinking as you speak, allows you to manifest a certain number of performance hesitations, pauses, backtracking, and corrections. Learners can actually be taught how to pause and hesitate. For example, in English our “thinking time” is not silent; we insert certain “fillers” such as uh, um, well, you know, I mean, like, etc., one of the most salient differences between native and nonnative speakers of a language is in their hesitation phenomena.

e. Colloquial Language

Make sure our students are reasonably well acquainted with the words, idioms, and phrases of colloquial language and that they get practice in producing these forms.

f. Rate of Delivery

Another salient characteristic of fluency is rate of delivery. One of our tasks in teaching spoken English is to help learners achieve an acceptable speed along with other attributes of fluency.

g. Stress, Rhythm, and Intonation

This is the most important characteristic of English pronunciation. The stress-timed rhythm of spoken English and its intonation patterns convey important messages.

h. Interaction

Learning to produce waves of language in a vacuum—without interlocutors—would rob speaking skill of its richest component: the creativity of conversational negotiation. This analysis shows how easily speaking skill can be accommodated within this particular view of language. When a teacher asks students to use the spoken language in the classroom, he/she needs them to take part in a process where not only involves a knowledge of the target language, but also a general knowledge of interaction between
the speaker and hearer in order that meanings and negotiate meanings are made clear. For example, the hearer may respond or give feedback as to whether the hearer has understood or not what the speaker has just said.

After that, according to Mazouzi (2013), learners’ activities should be designed based on equivalence between fluency and accuracy achievement. Both fluency and accuracy are important elements of communicative approach. Classroom practice can help learners develop their communicative competence. So they should know how the language system works appropriately.

The first characteristic of speaking performance is fluency and it is the main aim of teachers in teaching speaking skill. According to Hughes (2002), fluency is the learners’ ability to speak in understandable way in order not to break down communication because listeners may lose their interest. Then, fluency is the ability to answer coherently by connecting the words and phrases, pronouncing the sounds clearly, and using stress and intonation. (Hedge 2000)

The second characteristic of speaking performance is accuracy. Learners should be fluent in learning a foreign language. Therefore, teachers should emphasize accuracy in their teaching process. Learners should pay enough attention to the exactness and the completeness of language form when speaking such as focusing on grammatical structures, vocabulary, and pronunciation.

According to Thornbury (2005), learners’ correct use of grammatical structures requires the length and complexity of the utterances and the well-structured clauses. To gain accuracy in terms of vocabulary means to select suitable words in the suitable contexts. Learners sometimes apply similar words or expressions in various contexts which do not mean similar things, so learners should be able to use words and expressions correctly. After that, pronunciation is the lowest level of knowledge that learners typically pay attention to it. In order to speak English language accurately, learners should master phonological rules and they should be aware of the various sounds and their pronunciations. Learners should also know the stress, intonation, and pitch. All of these elements help learners speak the English language easily and effectively.
7. **Factors Affecting Speaking Skill**

If teachers want to help learners overcome their difficulties in learning speaking skill, they should identify some factors that influence their speaking performance. Learners’ speaking performance is influenced by factors like performance conditions, affective side, listening skill, and feedback during speaking tasks (Tuan and Mai, 2015).

a. **Performance conditions**

Learners carry out a speaking activity under different conditions. Performance conditions impact speaking performance and these conditions involve time pressure, planning, the quality of performance, and the amount of support.

b. **Affective Side**

One of the important factors in learning a language is the affective side of students. A lot of affective variables have been connected to second language acquisition and motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety were the three main types that have been investigated by many researchers.

c. **Listening ability**

Learners cannot improve their speaking ability unless they develop listening ability. Learners should comprehend what is uttered to them in order to have a successful dialogue. When students talk, the other students answer through the listening process. Speakers have the role of both listeners and speakers. It can be concluded that students are not able to reply if they cannot comprehend what is told. That is to say, speaking is very closely related to listening.

d. **Topical knowledge**

The knowledge structures in long term memory. That is, topical knowledge is the speakers’ knowledge of related topical information. It enables students to apply language with respect to the world in which they live. Topical knowledge has a great impact on the learners’ speaking performance.

e. **Feedback during speaking activities**

A lot of learners expect their teachers to give them the necessary feedback on their speaking performance. The decisions that instructors adopt towards their learners’ performance depend on the stages of the lesson, the tasks, and the kinds of mistakes they make. If instructors directly correct their students’ problems, the flow of the dialogue and the aim of the speaking task will be spoiled.

Besides that, Mahripah (2014) also proposed factors affecting speaking.

a. **Linguistic components of language**
   e.g., phonology, syntax, vocabulary
b. **Semantics**
c. **Psychological**
   e.g., Motivation and personality
d. **Phonology**
e. **Grammatical competence**

Next, Merisuo-Storm (2007) also mentioned several factors affecting speaking.

a. **Language learning**

An integrative and friendly view towards the people whose language is being learned makes sensitize learners to the audio-lingual aspects of language and making them more sensitive to pronunciation and accent of language. If learners have an unfriendly attitude towards the language, they will not have any substantial improvement in acquiring the different features of language. Without positive attitudes
towards the speaking performance, the aim of speaking will not be obtainable for learners.

b. **The fear of speaking English**

It is pertinent to some personality constructs like anxiety, inhibition, and risk taking. Speaking a language sometimes results in anxiety. Sometimes, extreme anxiety may lead to despondence and a sense of failure in learners. Anxiety has a negative effect on the oral performance of English speakers. Adults are very careful to making errors in whatever they tell. In their opinion, errors show a kind of unawareness which can hinder them to speak English in front of other people. Speaking anxiety may originate from a classroom condition with the different abilities of language learners. Learners are divided into two groups: strong and weak ones. The strong learners often dominate the slow and weak ones. The weak learners do not usually want to talk in front of the strong ones which lead to their silence during the whole class activity. Inhibition is a feeling of worry that stops people from telling or performing what they want. All human beings make a series of defenses to protect the ego. Due to the fact that committing mistakes is a natural process of learning a language, it certainly causes potential threats to one’s ego. These threats disappoint the learners to talk English and prefer to be silent rather than being criticized in front of a large number of people. Risk-taking is pertinent to inhibition and self-respect. EFL learners who have a low self-respect tend to stop taking a risk of committing mistakes in their speaking tasks which resulting in the inhibition to the betterment of their speaking skills.

8. **Aspect of Speaking Competencies**

Speaking is a two-way processing between the speaker and the listener; it makes use of both speaking which is a productive skill and listening with understanding which is a receptive skill. Speaking is important that it is one of the central elements of communication in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teaching. The more definitions of speaking are uttered by other experts.

According to Harmer (2001), speaking competencies are the ability to speak fluently presupposes not only knowledge of language features, but also the ability to process information and language “on the spot” and carry on a conversation reasonably and competently. They know about a language – verb forms, vocabulary items, basic grammatical patterns, and the like, and quite another to know how to use it effectively in a conversational exchange.

a. **Fluency**

Speaker can be said as fluent speaker if he/she can use the language quickly and confidently, with few hesitation or unnatural pause, false start, word searches, etc (Nunan, 2003). Speaker needs to know where she/he has to pause and stop his/her speaking in appropriate place. Furthermore, it can be said to speak fluently if a speaker does not produce word per word at a time in his/her speaking. Therefore a good speaker is demanded to be able to produce word in speech into groups of words that form a meaningful unit (phrases or clauses).
b. **Accuracy**

Accuracy happens when students speech matches what people actually say when they use the target language specifically. Accuracy deals with the grammatical structures which cover some aspects like part of speech, tense, phrase, sentence, etc. therefore, in order to achieve the level of accuracy the students are demanded to use the correct grammatical structures in their speech. (Nunan, 2003)

c. **Pronunciation**

At the beginning level, the goal of teaching pronunciation. Furthermore at the advance level the pronunciation goals can focus on elements that enhance communication which will cover stress pattern, intonation, voice quality, etc. However, there are some factors within learner that effect pronunciation. (Brown, 2001)

d. **Native language**

It is clear enough that native language will become the most influential factors affecting learners’ pronunciation. Moreover, the native language in this case the learners’ mother tongue usually brings a strong accent in their pronunciation style.

e. **Age**

The ranges of age can influence the success of the pronunciation mastery. Children under age of puberty will have an excellent chance “sounding like native” if they continue living in authentic contexts. Beyond the puberty, while they almost surely know a “foreign accent”, attribute of age will have no longer advantage. Therefore, it just a myth about the belief that “the younger, the better” in learning language.

f. **Exposure**

If they want to be success to achieve goal of the study, learners need to have positive attitude toward the people who speak the language they want to acquire.

g. **Motivation**

Motivation will be the strongest factor that can bring the learners to the success of study. If the motivation and concern are high, it will be a good start for the learners to improve their pronunciation.

h. **Vocabulary**

Vocabulary becomes a very important part of language learning which can use to determine students can speak fluently or not. They can generate sentences in only by using words so it is impossible to speak fluently without having vocabulary mastery. In fact, some students have only limited vocabulary so they meet some difficulties when they want to speak. Therefore, the teacher needs to make more effort to enrich the students’ vocabulary. Nunan (2003) proposes four principles for teaching vocabulary; focusing on the most useful vocabulary first, focusing on the vocabulary in the most appropriate way, giving attention to the high frequency words across the four strands of a course, encouraging learners to reflect on take responsibility for learning.
9. **Aspects of Speaking Performance**

Brown (2010) proposes five aspects of speaking performances. They are:

a. **Content**
   The content and ideas have to organized and appropriate; the topic is suitable.

b. **Grammar**
   The grammatical error is estimated.

c. **Vocabulary**
   The choice of words is highlighted.

d. **Pronunciation**
   The pronunciation is clear and correct.

e. **Fluency**
   There is no repetition and mostly easy to understand.

10. **Micro and Macro Skills of Speaking**

    In teaching oral communication, there are some factors that encourage learner to gain successful practice in speaking skill. Alfi (2015) has broken down both micro skills and macro skills of speaking:

a. **Micro Skills**
   When learners can produce differences among the English phonemes and allophonic variants, produce chunks of language of different length, produce English stress pattern, word in stressed and unstressed positions, rhythmic structures, and intonation contours, produce reduces forms of words and phrases, use an adequate number of lexical units (words) in order to accomplish pragmatic purposes, produce fluent speech at different rates of delivery, use grammatical words classes (noun, verb, etc.), system (e.g., tense, agreement, pluralization), word order, pattern, rules, elliptical forms, produce speech in natural constituent –in appropriate phrases, pause groups, breathe groups, and sentence constituents, express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms, and use cohesive devices in spoken discourse.

b. **Macro Skills**
   When learners can accomplish appropriately communicative functions according to situations, participants and goals, appropriate registers, implicature, pragmatic conventions, and other linguistics features in face to face conversations, convey links and connections between events and communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification, use facial features, kinesics, body language, and other nonverbal cues along with verbal language to convey meanings, and develop and use a battery of speaking strategies, such as emphasizing key words, re-paraphrasing providing a context for interpreting the meaning of words, appealing for help, accurately assessing how well your interlocutor understand you. So, the speaking ability is dealing with not only the capability in producing correct grammar or fluently in communicating but also the circumstances that the speaker and hearer have. To gain meaningful communication, it is needs both the speaking competence and performance.
11. Classroom Speaking Activities

According to Harmer (2001), in the teaching and learning process the teacher should be innovative to make the interesting materials, practicing various techniques of teaching and also using interesting media. These are suitable for the students in order to help them to speak in the language. There are many classroom speaking activities that can be used in teaching speaking. The activities are described as follows. The first of all is acting from the script. In this activity, the teacher asks the students to act out scenes from plays, their dialogues are made by themselves. The students are asked to act out in front of the class. The teacher should give students time to prepare their dialogues. The second is communication games. There are many communication games. The purpose is to get student speak-up in the teaching-learning process, which is speak as quickly and fluently as possible. Two particular categories are information-gap games and television and radio games where the student has to be a partner in order to solve a puzzle, draw a picture (describe and draw), put things in the right order (described and arrange) or find similarities and differences between pictures.

The next activity is discussion. Discussion can be performed in the form of highly formal, whole group stage events and informal small-group interactions. One of the reasons that discussions may be failed is that students are unwilling to give an opinion in front of the whole class, particularly if they do not have any idea to say. The examples of the activities are buzz group, instant comment, formal debates, unplanned discussion and reaching a consensus. After that is prepared talks. In this activity, students should make a presentation on a topic of his or her choice. Such talks are not designed for informal spontaneous conversation but more writing-like because they are prepared. Prepared talk represents definable and useful speaking activity. When students are doing this activity the teacher should give to others, who do not perform prepared talk, task to give attention as they listen. Then they can give feedback to performers.

Questionnaires are also useful activities. By being pre-planed, the questionnaires ensure that both questionnaire and respondent have something to say to each other. Questionnaires may well encourage the natural use of certain repetitive language pattern and then be situated in the middle of the communication continuum. The results obtained from questionnaires actually can form the basis for written work, discussions, or prepared talks. Another activity is simulation and role-play. The students can reach the benefits of using simulation and role-play. Those kinds of activities can be used to encourage the students’ speaking skill or to train students for specific situations. Those are real life activities, as they do so in the real world. Teachers may also use them to assess students’ speaking performance.

The statements above are strengthened by Kayi (2006). Kayi argues that there are many activities to promote speaking. There are thirteen activities to promote speaking. Those are discussion, role play, simulations, information gap, brain storming, storytelling, interviews, story completion, reporting, playing cards, picture narrating, picture describing, and then find the differences.

From the explanations of kinds of classroom speaking activities, the writer concludes that many kinds of classroom speaking activities can be conducted in teaching learning activity of speaking. The activities are made by the teacher, in order to make the students join the speaking activities. Also, the students can improve their speaking skill easily.
In addition, the classroom speaking activities consist of four activities, they are:

a. **Acting from a Script**
   In this section, the teacher asks the students to perform the play based on the dialogue in the script. Thus, the teacher as the director and the students perform the dialogue.

b. **Communication Games**
   A game is one of activities that can help students relaxed in learning the language. This technique is particularly suitable for the children in mastering the language. It is designed to provoke communication between students, so that the students has to talk to a partner in order to solve a puzzle, draw a picture, puts the things in right order, and differences between picture.

c. **Discussion**
   The problem in conducting the discussion is the students’ reluctant to give opinion in front of their friends. Particularly when the students were not mastered the topic of discussion. Therefore to encourage the students is to provide activities which force the students in expressing the ideas through the topic which is familiar with student’s world. For instance are their daily activity, the situation of their class, and describing that situation.

d. **Problem Solving**
   The material is used in this technique giving the students to work in pairs or groups. They share their problem, opinion and feeling. In this case the teacher as the bridge to communicate among the participants. Then, the students give a question and answer each other. This communication will help the students practicing and expressing their ideas in spoken language.

e. **Role Play**
   A popular way of the aspect of speaking activities is to use simulations and role plays. This is where students pretend that they are in a different situation, either as themselves or playing the role of someone is quite different. We could ask them to be guest at some parties and go there as different characters. They could, as themselves, pretend to be at an airport trying to check luggage, or either as themselves or another character take part in a television program. In all these cases the students are using language in order to participate in the activity rather than other way round. Some students find it very comfortable to use language in a simulated environment, playing the role of someone else. It allows them to experiment freely to be another people.
12. **Problems in Speaking Skill**

There are some problems for speaking skill that teachers can come across in helping students to speak in the classroom. These are inhibition, lack of topical knowledge, low participation, and mother-tongue use (Tuan and Mai, 2015; Munjayanah (2004).

a. **Inhibition**

It is the first problem that students encounter in class. When they want to say something in the classroom they are sometimes inhibited. They are worried about making mistakes and fearful of criticism. They are ashamed of the other students’ attention towards themselves. A language classroom can also create inhibitions and apprehension for the students. Unlike reading, writing or listening activities, speaking requires some degree of real-time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say thing in foreign language in the classroom: worried about mistakes or simply shy of the attention that their speech attract.

b. **Nothing to Say**

The second problem is that learners complain that they cannot remember anything to say and they do not have any motivation to express themselves. Learners often have nothing to say probably because their teachers had selected a topic that is not appropriate for them or they do have enough information about it. It is very difficult for learners to answer when their teachers ask them to tell things in a foreign language because they have little opinions about what to say, which vocabulary to apply, or how to use grammar accurately.

c. **Low Participation**

The third problem in the speaking class is that the participation is very low. In a class with a large number of students, each student will have very little time for talking because just one student talks at a time and the other students try to hear him/her. In the speaking class, some learners dominate the whole class while others talk very little or never speak.

d. **Mother-tongue Interference**

The fourth problem related to the speaking ability is that when some learners share the same mother-tongue, they try to use it in the speaking class because it is very easy for them. There are some reasons why learners use mother-tongue in their speaking classes. The first reason is that when teachers ask their learners to talk about a topic that they do not have enough knowledge, they will try to use their language. The second reason is that the application of mother-tongue is very natural for learners to use. If teachers do not urge their learners to talk in English, learners will automatically use their first language to explain something to their classmates.

e. **Teacher’s Language at Class**

The last reason refers to the fact that if teachers regularly use their learners’ mother language, their learners will feel comfortable to do so in their speaking class.
13. Teaching Speaking

Since English is included as a compulsory subject in senior high schools in Indonesia, the learners have the same need. The need is passing the examinations to move to the next level and graduate from the school, and the general requirement is the students are able to speak and hold conversations. From a communicative purpose, speaking is closely related to listening. The interaction between these two skills is shown in the conversation. According to Brown (2001) there are seven principles for designing speaking techniques.

a. Use techniques that cover the spectrum of learner needs, from language based focus on accuracy to message-based on interaction, meaning, and fluency.

   This means that every activity that the teacher creates should be able to scaffold students with the building blocks of the languages. For the example, when a teacher applies communicative activities in the class, those activities should be able to help the students to achieve the building block of the languages too. And the same time, a teacher has to do the drilling as meaningful as possible.

b. Provide intrinsically motivating techniques.

   Make the students to have goals on their learning activities. A teacher can help them to find the reason for learning such as for status, for achieving knowledge or anything. Even when the learning activates are not that interesting, try to tell students the benefit of the learning. A teacher can tell the reason why the students have to learn something to create motivations for the students.

c. Encourage the use of authentic language in meaningful contexts.

   Authentic language is not easy to be created. To make the activity in the class meaningful and to create authentic language and context need creativity and effort. Teacher is possible to do so with many resources she or he has, even to create a meaningful and authentic language drilling for the students.

d. Provide appropriate feedback and correction.

   In learning new languages in the classroom, students really depend on teachers’ feedback corrections. The right feedback and corrections help them to improve their language.

e. Capitalize on the natural link between speaking and listening.

   Learning speaking cannot be separated with listening activity. As a teacher, he or she can combine both of them. Even when the teacher focus on teaching speaking, listening activates cannot be neglected. It is because learning speaking can be done through natural process by listening to the language first.

f. Give students opportunities to initiate oral communication.

   To make the students have real communicative skill, a teacher should designed opportunities where the students have a lot of chances to speak; to ask and answer questions, to respond, to give comments and to share opinions.

g. Encourage the development of speaking strategies.

   Make the students aware of developing their speaking strategies in communications. A teacher can make them learn about simple words to ask for repetition and clarifications, to get attentions, to make facial expression etc., due to give them strategies to communicate with others. The techniques for teaching speaking have to emphasize of giving students chance to practice their English, to be creative to have experiment with the language in order to find the right one, to facilitate students by giving feedback and to build motivation to speak. According to Brown (2001) there are some important points that should be considered in teaching speaking to young learners. The first thing to be considered is who the learner is and why they are. The clear
objective is the next. At the end of the lesson, students at least are able to do something using oral English. The third is since the final objective of learning speaking is communication, all materials that are given to the students such as vocabulary, grammatical structures, and other language items, are expected to be applied by students in the daily life. Teacher’s role in the speaking learning is creating activities in which the students can practice and apply what they have learnt orally. In other words, this is the turn of the students to practice communication.

14. Criteria for Speaking Tasks

Task design begins with the assessment of the students’ need. The purposes of the test and the practical circumstances in which it will be arranged the general guidelines, the most important factor in the task designed is the score users need to know about the examiners’ speaking skills, Louma (2009). Furthermore, according to Thornbury (2005) there are some criteria that needed to make good speaking tasks.

a. Productivity

It means that speaking tasks should give a big opportunity to the students to speak in the target language. The teachers should make a good task to invite the students join to speak activity. It indicates that many students join speak-up in the speaking activity.

b. Purposeful

In this case, the tasks from the teacher should have purposes in the speaking activity. The Productivity of the tasks can be increased if there are some purposes that the teachers want to achieve. The example of the tasks should be meaningful, that is group discussion activity and it can be maximized the participation of all the members in the class.

c. Interactivity

It means that the tasks should build interaction among the students in the speaking activity. It is the basic goal of speaking activity. The goal of speaking activity is to communicate or to interact with others. So, good speaking tasks can make interaction among the students in the speaking activity.

d. Challenge

The speaking tasks should be challenging for the students. It is in order to force students’ creativities, ideas, knowledge and also abilities. These will help them to increase their speaking skill and to achieve the goal of teaching-learning process.

e. Safety

The tasks of the students should be safety–while it should be challenging. They should feel safe and confident when they do the tasks in order to achieve the goal of teaching-learning process. The classroom atmosphere and the teacher attitude very determined in this case.
15. Assessing Speaking

According to Brown (2004), a productive performance, the oral or written stimulus must be specific enough to elicit output within an expected range or performance such that scoring or rating procedures apply appropriately. It can be simply said that input factor will give influences in the output so that the brainteaser and stimulus must be adequate for every speaking activities. In designing speaking activities or instructional materials for EFL teaching, it is also necessary to recognize the very different functions speaking performance in daily communications and the different purpose for which our students speaking skill. For any activity we use in class whether it be one that seeks to develop proficiency in using talk as interaction, transaction, or performance, it is needed to be considered what successful completion of the activity involves.

C. Previous Study

There are several previous studies related to the relationship of collocational competence, speaking self-efficacy, and speaking performance.

First, Liu (2013) investigated the effects of a campus “English Bar” on college students’ speaking self-efficacy. Using a questionnaire and in-depth interviews, it was revealed that students who often speak English at the "Bar", showed a considerably higher level of self-efficacy compared to their peers who seldom or never visited the “Bar”. The positive effects of frequenting the “Bar” were described by Liu as follows: first, students were free to choose the partners as well as the topics to reduce their anxiety. Second, students with poor speaking skills were encouraged by the foreign teachers and their partners. Third, students’ self-confidence and self-efficacy was increased as they observed “similar others” who were fluent English speakers. Finally, students were motivated and worked harder as they realised that they were making progress in their use of English for self-expression.

Second, Hairuzila and Subarna (2007) have begun their study on the self-efficacy of pre-university ESL students at University Teknologi Petronas (UTP). This study has found that the students have high levels of self-efficacy regarding their ability to speak in English. The students also had high perceived self-efficacy in the oral communication activities. It was because the total mean score for this factor was 2.54. It showed that students enjoyed and were willing to participate in most of the activities like drama and discussion. Aspiration can defined as a strong desire to be able to become someone who could communicate well in English. The study had shown that the students were found to be highly efficacious on their aspiration to become good communicators in English. The total mean score for this factor was 1.97.

Third, Hairuzila & Rohani (2008) indicated that the t-test results on speaking self-efficacy level of female students were significantly higher than male students in terms of ability (t=4.32, df=336, p<0.01) and aspiration (t=3.27, df=336, p<0.00). These findings on gender differences were similar to several previous studies done on the relationship between gender and self-efficacy.

Fourth, Hairuzila, Rohani, and Ridhuan (2011) indicated that 169 senior-year students in University Technology Petronas (UTP) had high self-efficacy in their oral communication ability in all three proposed constructs: aptitude (ability), attitude and aspiration. In other words, students' positive aptitude would result in positive attitude towards improving their oral communication ability and aspirations to reach the desired effect.
Fifth, Lopez (2006), in her study done on 90 first year students at University of Puerto Rico, 64 students were identified as having high self-efficacy and 26 were found to be having low self-efficacy. One of the areas that had been examined was students’ oral participation in classroom. The researcher determined the correlation between the students’ self-efficacy and the frequency they participated in oral class activities. The result (r = .523) revealed that the correlations were moderately significant at the p < .01 level. Therefore, these result demonstrated that the high self-efficacy students in this study participated more in oral activities than the low self-efficacy students.

Sixth, Yazdandoost, AmalSaleh, and Kafipour (2014) analyzed the relationship among collocation knowledge and listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. 50 students involved in the study took a test of both lexical and grammatical collocations to measure their collocational knowledge, first. Then, an IELTS sample test (IELTS Practice Plus Pearson Education Longman University, Version two) was administered in order to find the students’ reading, writing, speaking and listening proficiency. Pearson correlation coefficient illustrated a significant correlation between knowledge of collocation and reading (P=0.724), writing (P=0.724), listening (P=0.706) and speaking (P=0.885) proficiency. Regression model was conducted to find the exact contribution between variables. It indicated that knowledge of collocation can be a predicator for all four language skills. In addition, knowledge of collocation has the greatest impact (R²=78.3%) on participants’ speaking proficiency.

In short, the research conducted Hairuzila and Subarna (2007), Hairuzila & Rohani (2008), Hairuzila, Rohani & Mohammad Ridhuan (2011), and Lopez (2006) showed that self-efficacy has relationship with speaking performance. Meanwhile, in collocation and speaking aspects it showed that there are relationships between them. Those researches were conducted by Yazdandoost, AmalSaleh, and Kafipour (2014).

What makes the current research different with the previous ones are it does not use in-depth interviews like Liu’s, it does not use drama and discussion like Hairuzila and Subarna’s, nor observation like Lopez’s as the technique of data collection, it does not compare the result between male and female like Hairuzila and Rohani’s, nor three self-efficacy constructs: aptitude (ability), attitude, and aspiration like Hairuzila, Rohani and Ridhuan’s, and it does not involve the other language skills like Yazdandoost, AmalSaleh, and Kafipour’s.

The current research is a quantitative ex post facto research. The objective of the research method are to analyze the direct effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances, the direct effect from the students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances, the indirect effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy through the students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances, and the indirect effect from the students’ collocational competence through the students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances. The technique of data collection is by giving the students speaking self-efficacy questionnaire, collocation test, and speaking test. After that, the technique of data analysis is by using path analysis.
E. Thinking Framework

According to the theoretical framework above, the writer provides thinking framework about the relationship of the students’ speaking self-efficacy, collocational competence, and their speaking performance.

It is undeniable that English has a great influence in International world that the mastery of it becomes urgent. One needs to be so well at communicating in English both in these spoken and written languages, so they can connect with wide range of people. Regarding this communicative goal, Indonesia also concerns about it, thus now the English objective in secondary school is being good at its both spoken and written languages. Speaking performance itself refers to one’s ability to successfully perform a specific task at a designed level. There are many factors that can influence speaking performance; two of them are self-efficacy and collocational competence.

Self-efficacy belief itself regulates human functioning through cognitive, motivational, affective, and decisional processes. They affect whether individuals think in self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways; how well they motivate and persevere, when they face any difficulties; the quality of their emotional life and vulnerability to stress. Most individuals have knowledge and skills that are not used in proper settings. Therefore the knowledge alone does not ensure effective practice. Individuals must also be guided by a belief in their ability to effectively use their knowledge in a given context. Students’ belief on their capability either positively or negatively influences their willingness to speak. Furthermore, self-efficacy measurement should be domain specific; that is, the content of the scale items need to be directly related to the construct. Therefore, in this current research this self-efficacy construct is adjusted to become a new construct, which is speaking self-efficacy.

After that, collocational competence is the possession of a sufficiently large and sufficient phrasal mental lexicon that enables the student to produce language that is fluent, accurate and stylistically appropriate.

Thus, she thinks that collocational competence and speaking self-efficacy have causal relationships and both of them affect speaking performance directly and indirectly. The thinking framework is drawn as follows:

![Path Analysis Diagram](image)

Where:

- \( X_1 \) : Students’ speaking self-efficacy
- \( X_2 \) : Students’ collocation
- \( Y \) : Students’ speaking
- \( \varepsilon \) : Error
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Method and Design of the Research
This quantitative research uses path analysis and relies on English language learning to analyze the direct effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances, the direct effect from students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance, the indirect effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy through students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances, and the indirect effect from students’ collocational competence through students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performance. The writer uses ex post facto research design because she does not give any treatments, but collect the data and see the relationship of cause and effect that happens. Ex post facto design involves only one group and does not use any control class.

B. The Place and the Time of the Research
This research conducted on 16 April, 2018 at SMAN 1 Surade, SMAN 1 Jampang Kulon, SMAN 1 Ciracak, SMAN 1 Cikembar, SMAN 1 Cibadak, SMAN 1 Warung Kiara, SMAN 1 Cisaat, Sukabumi. Those schools were chosen because of their good qualities.

C. The Population and the Sample of the Research
The population of the research involved tenth grade students at seven schools at seven sub-districts in Sukabumi region and the sample used was seven classes at seven schools at seven sub-districts in Sukabumi. In this research purposive target population and cluster random sampling were used, that the population was used only the public schools and the sample was the class that randomly chosen.

D. The Instrument of the Research
There are three instruments used in this research. They are speaking self-efficacy questionnaire, collocation test, and speaking test.

1. Speaking Self-efficacy
   The questionnaire is adapted from Asakereh, A. and Dehghannezhad, M. (2015).
   a. Conceptual Definition
      Speaking self-efficacy refers to individuals’ perception about how they themselves will perform at specific English speaking tasks and their confidence in their ability to complete them successfully.
   b. Operational Definition
      Speaking self-efficacy questionnaire comprised of 28 items, based on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The score were arranged gradually into 5-4-3-2-1. It brings consequence that the lowest score will be 0, while the highest score will be 100.
**Table 3.1**

**Speaking Self-Efficacy Questionnaire**

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have enough ability to improve my speaking skills. (Saya memiliki kemampuan yang cukup untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am sure that if I practice speaking more, I will get better grades in the course. (Saya yakin bahwa jika saya berlatih lebih rajin, maka saya akan mendapatkan nilai yang lebih baik saat tes berbicara di kelas bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I can speak better than my classmates. (Saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris lebih baik daripada teman sekelas saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Even if the speaking task is difficult and I don’t have the required vocabulary, I can find the strategy to get the message across. (Bahkan jika tugas berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris sulit dan saya tidak memiliki kosa kata yang cukup, saya mampu menemukan cara untuk menyampaikan maksud saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am not stressed out when speaking English in the classroom. (Saya tidak merasa cemas ketika berbicara bahasa Inggris di kelas.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I enjoy speaking with a proficient partner. (Saya nyaman berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan teman yang pintar berbicara bahasa Inggris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am one of the best students in speaking courses. (Saya adalah salah satu siswa/i terbaik dalam berbicara bahasa inggris di kelas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I enjoy meeting tourists because I can speak with them well. (Saya nyaman ketika bertemu dengan turis dari luar negeri karena saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris bersama mereka dengan baik.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The more difficult the speaking practice is, the more enjoyable it is.(Semakin sulit pelajaran berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris, maka semakin menarik)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 When the instructor asks a question, I raise my hand to answer it even if I’m not sure about it. (Ketika guru bertanya sebuah pertanyaan dalam bahasa Inggris, dengan tanpa diminta saya mengangkat tangan untuk menjawab dalam bahasa Inggris, bahkan jika saya tidak yakin dengan jawabannya.)

11 I'm confident about my ability to interact with other English speakers. (Saya percaya diri dengan kemampuan saya dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan orang lain yang berbahasa Inggris.)

12 While speaking, I can deal efficiently with unexpected situations. (Saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris, bahkan di situasi yang tidak terduga.)

13 While speaking, I can remain calm when facing difficulties. (Ketika berbicara bahasa Inggris, saya mampu tetap tenang ketika saya merasa sulit dalam menyampaikan maksud saya kepada lawan bicara saya.)

14 When I’m talking with fluent speakers, I let them know if I need help. (Ketika saya berbicara dengan orang yang pintar berbicara bahasa Inggris, saya tidak ragu memberitahuinya bahwa saya kehabisan kata-kata dalam bahasa Inggris dan membutuhkan bantuan untuk merangkai kata-katanya.)

15 I'm confident I can communicate what I mean easily. (Saya percaya diri bahwa saya mampu menyampaikan pesan dalam bahasa Inggris dengan mudah.)

16 I feel confident that I can achieve a native-like accuracy in speaking. (Saya merasa percaya diri bahwa saya mampu menyampaikan pesan dengan tepat dalam bahasa Inggris sebaik orang penutur asli bahasa Inggris.)

17 I’m able to actively participate in my speaking classes. (Saya mampu berpartisipasi secara aktif di kelas bahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris saya.)

18 I'm sure I can use English outside the classroom. (Saya yakin bahwa saya juga mampu menggunakan bahasa Inggris di tempat atau situasi selain ketika pelajaran
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I believe I am a good English speaker. (Saya yakin bahwa saya pintar dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I strongly believe that I can achieve native-like fluency in English. (Saya sangat yakin bahwa saya mampu berbicara lancar dalam bahasa Inggris seperti orang penutur asli bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I can describe my school to others in English. (Saya mampu memberikan informasi tentang keadaan gedung sekolah saya kepada orang lain dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I can tell a story in English. (Saya mampu bercerita dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I can ask my teachers questions in English. (Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya mampu bertanya kepada guru dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can produce sentence with idiomatic expressions. (Saya mampu membuat kalimat berbahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan idiom dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I can introduce my teacher to someone else in English. (Saya mampu memperkenalkan guru saya kepada orang lain dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I can discuss subjects of my interest with my classmates. (Saya mampu berdiskusi tentang hobi saya dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I can introduce myself in English. (Saya mampu memperkenal diri saya dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I can answer my teachers’ questions in English (Saya mampu menjawab pertanyaan yang berbahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Collocational Competence**

The collocation test is adopted from Sadeghi, K. and Panahifar, F. (2012).

a. **Conceptual Definition**

Collocational competence is important for language production and reception, enabling both the L1 and L2 language users: 1) to make idiomatic choices and come across as native-like; 2) to process language fluently under real-time conditions; 3) to disambiguate meaning polysemous words, e.g. the verb *commit* in the following collocational contexts: *commit a crime, commit oneself, commit to memory*; 4) to understand connotational meaning, e.g. the fact that the verb *cause* is often associated with negative connotations as in *cause of accident*.

b. **Operational Definition**

The test consists of 50 numbers of multiple choice questions. The correct answer was graded 1 and the wrong answer was graded 0. The assessment used the following formula:

\[
\frac{N}{5} \times 10
\]

Note:

N : The correct answer

It brings consequence that the lowest score will be 0, while the highest score will be 100.

c. **Collocation Test Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Collocation Categorization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Action Verb (Lexical)</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Adjective (Lexical)</td>
<td>13-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Preposition (Grammatical)</td>
<td>23-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Adverb of Manner (Lexical)</td>
<td>43-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Speaking Performance

The speaking test will use a rubric which is adopted from Ningrum, Husna, and Tanjug, (2017). The theme will be about “My English learning experiences.” The reason why that theme is chosen is because tenth grade students are learning recount text. It is according the base competence in 13 curriculum used by the students. The basic competence which states that is as follows, “4.7 Producing recount text both spoken and written in work report and historical events essay, by concerning social function, text structure, and the correct language features.”

a. Conceptual Definition

Speaking refers to active use of language to express meaning so that the other people can make sense of them. It could be said that the ability to speak a language is synonymous with knowing the language since speaking is the most basic means of human communication.

b. Operational Definition

The students took 5 minute speaking performance test. The aspects assessed were content, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency. The highest score for each aspect was 20, so the total score was 100.

c. Speaking Performance Test Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>My English learning experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Recount text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Aspect</td>
<td>Content, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Feature</td>
<td>Past tense, transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Orientation, events, reorientations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question of the Test</td>
<td>“Please tell me your English learning experience by using recount text (structures: orientation, events, reorientation) and its language features (past tenses and transitions). The assessment involves five English speaking performance aspects (content, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency). The test will be individual, without text and take for 5 minutes of assessment. Thank You”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4
Speaking Performance Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Unorganized content and ideas, a lot of misunderstanding of the topic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are less organized and misunderstanding of the topic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are less organized and almost appropriate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are highly organized and it is appropriate</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>There are many errors in grammar around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in grammar around 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a little error in grammar around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no error in grammar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>There are many errors in choice of words around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in choice of words around 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is little error in choice of words around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There have good choice of words</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>There many errors in pronunciation around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in pronunciation about 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is little errors in pronunciation around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pronunciation is clear and correct</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>There is repetition and difficult to understand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some repetitions and speak hesitantly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a little repetition and almost easy to understand</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no repetition and mostly easy to understand</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

1. Speaking Self-Efficacy Instrument

In order to design the speaking skills self-efficacy beliefs questionnaire items were adopted from Asakereh, A. and Dehghannezhad, M. (2015). According to them, the questionnaire enjoyed acceptable validity and the reliability was 0.84. It means the questionnaire has very high correlation and reliable.

2. Collocational Competence Instrument

Sadeghi, K. and Panahifar, F. (2012) collocation test was adopted. According to them, the collocation test was valid and the reliability was 0.64. It means the test has very high correlation and reliable.

3. Speaking Performance Instrument

Ningrum, R. P., Husna, L., and Tanjung, F (2017) speaking rubric was adopted to assess the students’ speaking performances. The rubric was valid and the reliability was 0.96. It means that the rubric has very high correlation and reliable.

F. The Technique of the Data Collection

The data collection was conducted in three sessions. First, the students did speaking self-efficacy questionnaire. The second, the students did collocation test. Third, the students did speaking test. The students did the speaking self-efficacy questionnaire for 40 minutes, collocation test for 50 minutes, and did speaking test for 5 minutes. The collected data compiled into an Excel spreadsheet and prepared for an analysis using SPSS 20.

G. The Technique of the Data Analysis

Path analysis was chosen as the most appropriate procedure for analyzing the possible causal relationships among speaking self-efficacy and collocation competence as having an effect on students’ speaking performances. SPSS 20 will be used as a tool in calculating the data. The steps are as follows.

1. First Step : Determine the structural equation
2. Second Step : Calculate the regression coefficient
3. Third Step : Calculate the path coefficient from column Beta
4. Fourth Step : Determine the significance
5. Fifth Step : Calculate the effect of variables x on variable y.

Direct : \((\rho_{yx1} \cdot \rho_{yx1}) + (\rho_{yx2} \cdot \rho_{yx2})\)
Indirect : \((\rho_{yx1} \cdot \gamma_{x1x2} \cdot \rho_{yx2}) + (\rho_{yx2} \cdot \gamma_{x2x1} \cdot \rho_{yx1})\)
Total : \((\rho_{yx1} \cdot \rho_{yx1} + \rho_{yx1} \cdot \gamma_{x1x2} \cdot \rho_{yx2} + (\rho_{yx2} \cdot \rho_{yx2} + \rho_{yx2} \cdot \gamma_{x2x1} \cdot \rho_{yx1})\)
Error : \(\sqrt{1 - R^2}\)
H. The Statistical Hypotheses of the Research

The statistical hypotheses of this research are:

1. $H_0: \rho_{y1x} = 0$
   (There is no relationship between students’ collocational competence and students speaking performance)

   $H_1: \rho_{y1x} \neq 0$
   (There is a relationship between students’ collocational competence and students speaking performance)

2. $H_0: \rho_{yx1} = 0$
   (Students’ speaking self-efficacy has no direct effect on their speaking performances)

   $H_1: \rho_{yx1} \neq 0$
   (Students’ speaking self-efficacy has a direct effect on their speaking performances)

3. $H_0: \rho_{yx2} = 0$
   (Students’ collocational competence has no direct effect on their speaking performances)

   $H_1: \rho_{yx2} \neq 0$
   (Students’ collocational competence has a direct effect on their speaking performances)
CHAPTER IV
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. Finding
1. Descriptive Analysis

The tests involve speaking self-efficacy test, collocation test, and speaking test. The writer used SPSS 20 to process the data and use descriptive technique to obtain the information. Based on the calculation, the data description is as follows.

a. Warung Kiara Students’ Speaking Self-efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>620</strong></td>
<td><strong>1597</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
b. Warung Kiara Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.2
Warung Kiara students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>31.0000</td>
<td>11.42481</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>79.8500</td>
<td>15.14934</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>23.0000</td>
<td>6.13875</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above, it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Warung Kiara students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 79.85 is 15.14; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 23.00 is 06.13; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 31.00 is 11.42.

c. Warung Kiara Students’ Speaking Score

Figure 4.1
Warung Kiara’s Speaking Score

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
d. Cibadak Students’ Speaking Self-efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

Table 4.3
Cibadak Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
e. Cibadak Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.4
Cibadak Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>38.2500</td>
<td>9.77039</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>85.5000</td>
<td>10.29819</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>27.6000</td>
<td>10.31300</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Cibadak students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 85.50 is 10.29; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 27.60 is 10.31; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 38.25 is 09.77.

f. Cibadak Students’ Speaking Score

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, and fluency aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
g. Ciracap Students’ Speaking Self-efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

**Table 4.5**

Ciracap Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>785</strong></td>
<td><strong>1491</strong></td>
<td><strong>552</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
h. Ciracap Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.6
Ciracap Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>32.2500</td>
<td>7.15891</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>87.5500</td>
<td>11.27398</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>26.7000</td>
<td>7.37778</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Ciracap students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 87.55 is 11.27; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 26.70 is 07.37; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 32.25 is 07.15.

i. Ciracap Students’ Speaking Scores

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
j. Surade Students’ Speaking Self-efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

Table 4.7
Surade Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
k. Surade Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.8
Surade Students’ Achieveent Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>33.2500</td>
<td>8.77721</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>78.4000</td>
<td>10.95157</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>22.2000</td>
<td>5.50215</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Surade students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 78.40 is 10.95; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 22.20 is 05.50; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 33.25 is 08.77.

l. Surade Students’ Speaking Scores

![Speaking Score](image)

Figure 4.4
Surade Students’ Speaking Score

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
m. Cikembar Students’ Speaking Self-efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

Table 4.9
Cikembar Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>270</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>765</strong></td>
<td><strong>1710</strong></td>
<td><strong>552</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
n. Cikembar Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.10
Cikembar Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>38.0000</td>
<td>12.50263</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>78.0500</td>
<td>8.92351</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>27.4000</td>
<td>9.20183</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Cikembar students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 78.05 is 08.92; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 27.40 is 09.20; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 38.00 is 12.50.

o. Cikembar Students’ Speaking Scores

Figure 4.5
Cikembar Students’ Speaking Scores

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
p. Jampang Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

Table 4.11
Jampang Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
q. Jampang Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.12
Jampang Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>39.2500</td>
<td>11.84050</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>74.5500</td>
<td>10.51052</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>27.6000</td>
<td>7.61163</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Jampang students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 74.55 is 10.51; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 27.60 is 07.61; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 39.25 is 11.84.

r. Jampang Students’ Speaking Scores

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, pronunciation, and fluency aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
s. Cisaat Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Speaking Scores

Table 4.13

Cisaat Students’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the students got the highest score at speaking self-efficacy and the lowest score at collocational competence. After that, their small English speaking performance scores were influenced by their small collocational competence score which means there is relationship between students’ collocational competence and their speaking performances. In contrast, there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and their speaking performances since the students’ high speaking self-efficacy did not influence their speaking performance score.
t. Cisaat Students’ Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.14
Cisaat Students’ Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>31.1905</td>
<td>7.89062</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>82.0000</td>
<td>9.49210</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>22.0952</td>
<td>6.37107</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data above it can be concluded: 1) The variation of the Jampang students’ speaking self-efficacy mean score which is 82.00 is 09.49; 2) The variation of the students’ collocational competence score which is 22.09 is 06.37; 3) the variation of the students’ speaking performance score which is 31.19 is 07.89.

u. Cisaat Students’ Speaking Score

Figure 4.7
Cisaat Students’ Speaking Scores

From the figure above it can be seen that there are grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation aspects needed to be improved in order to be proficient English speakers.
a. Descriptive Statistics of Each of the Schools Achievement

Table 4.15
Descriptive Statistics of Each of the Schools Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WarKir</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cibadak</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ciracap</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Surade</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cikembar</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jampang</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cisaat</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above indicates the following results. First, it is SMAN 1 Ciracap got the highest mean score at speaking self-efficacy questionnaire. The class used was the science class which most of the students were persistent to study; SMAN 1 Cibadak got the highest mean score at collocation test. The school was the one of the favorite public schools in Sukabumi regency; SMAN 1 Jampang Kulon got the highest score at speaking performance test. The school is a reputable public school that the students are chosen according to their excellent academic achievement. Second, there is indirect effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy on the students’ speaking performance. Third, there is direct effect from the students’ collocational competences on the students’ speaking performances.

b. All of the Schools Achievement Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.16
All of the Schools Achievement Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaking performance</td>
<td>34.7163</td>
<td>10.41587</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking self-efficacy</td>
<td>80.8511</td>
<td>11.62874</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collocation</td>
<td>25.2057</td>
<td>7.89169</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 141 students participating in this research. They were tested 3 materials: speaking self-efficacy, collocation, and speaking. The tests were divided into 2 sections. From the table above, it is found that the students got the highest mean score at speaking self-efficacy and they got the lowest mean score at collocation. In other words, the result shows that there is no relationship between speaking self-efficacy and speaking performance. However, there is relationship between collocational competence and speaking performance.
c. The Correlation of the Data

Table 4.17
The Correlation of the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy, Collocational Competence, and Their Speaking Performance before the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>speaking performance</th>
<th>speaking self-efficacy</th>
<th>collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking performance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collocation</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking performance</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking self-efficacy</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collocation</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>speaking performance</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking self-efficacy</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collocation</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it can be concluded that:

1. The correlations between students’ speaking self-efficacy and students’ speaking performance

   The correlation between first independent variable, speaking self-efficacy and the dependent variable, speaking performance is 0.008, which means the correlations between both are very weak and insignificant; 0.462.

2. The correlations between students’ collocational competence and students’ speaking performance

   The correlation between collocational competence and speaking performance is 0.388, which means the relationship between both is weak and significant; 0.000.

3. The correlations between students’ speaking self-efficacy and students’ collocational competence

   The correlation between these two independent variables, speaking self-efficacy and collocation is 0.099, which means the relationship between both is very weak and insignificant; 0.122.
d. The Effects and Significances from the Students’ Self-Efficacy and Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances.

Table 4.18

The Effects and Significances from the Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances before the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>23.009</td>
<td>6.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLOCATION</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>4.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The effects and significance from students’ speaking self-efficacy on students speaking performances

The path coefficient of speaking self-efficacy is -0.031 and its significance is 0.699. Thus, there is insignificant effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy on students’ speaking performances.

2. The effects and significance from students’ collocational competence on students’ speaking performances

The path coefficient of students’ collocational competence is 0.391 and its significance is 0.000. Thus, there is significant effect on students’ collocational competences.

e. The Determinant Coefficient before the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

Table 4.19

The Determinant Coefficient before the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.389 a</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>9.66273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), COLLOCATION, SELF-EFFICACY

The determinant coefficient is used to see how much independent variable (x) influences the dependent variable (y), which is shown in percentage. The formula is

\[
(r)^2 \times 100 \%
\]

As seen at the table above adjusted r square is 0.139, it means that the determination coefficient or the effect of speaking self-efficacy and collocational competence simultaneously to speaking performance is 13.9 %.
f. The Structural Equation

\[ Y = -0.031x_1 + 0.391x_2 \]

**Figure 4.1**
**The Path Analysis Design before the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted**

The figure above shows: 1) the direct effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy on the students’ speaking performances (\( \rho_{yX1} \)); 2) the direct effect from the students’ collocational competence on the students’ speaking performances (\( \rho_{yX2} \)); 3) the relationship between the students speaking self-efficacy and the students’ collocational competence (\( r_{X1X2} \)); 4) the other effects from outside of the variables on the students’ speaking performances (\( \rho_{Y\varepsilon} \)).
f. The Effects from Variables $X_i$ on Variable $Y$.

Table 4.20
The Effects from Variables $X_i$ on Variable $Y$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient Beta</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it can be seen that the direct effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy on students’ speaking performance is 0.0009 and its indirect effect through students’ collocational competence is 0.001. While the direct effect from students’ collocational competence on speaking performance is 0.1528 and its indirect effect through students’ speaking self-efficacy is 0.01. Finally the total effect from these two independent variables on speaking self-efficacy and collocation is 0.1557.

g. The Correlation between the Students’ Collocational Competence and Their Speaking Performance after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

Table 4.21
The Correlation between the Students’ Collocational Competence and Their Speaking Performance after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The correlations between the students’ collocational competence and the students’ speaking performance
The correlation between collocational competence and speaking performance is 0.388, which means the relationship between both is weak, but significant; 0.000.
h. The Effects and Significances from the Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted.

Table 4.22
The Effects and Significances from the Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>21.799</td>
<td>2.724</td>
<td>8.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Speaking

1. The effects and significance from students’ collocational competence on students’ speaking performances
The path coefficient of students’ collocational competence is 0.388 and its significance is 0.000. Thus, there is significant effect on students’ collocational competences.

i. The Determinant Coefficient from the Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

Table 4.23
The Determinant Coefficient from the Students’ Collocational Competences on the Students’ Speaking Performances after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.368(^{a})</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>9.63314</td>
<td>1.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collocation
b. Dependent Variable: Speaking

Adjusted r square shows the effect of collocation on speaking performance is 0.145 (14.5%).
j. The Structural Equation after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

\[ Y = 0.388x_2 \]

\[ \varepsilon (0.855) \]

\[ \rho_{yx} (0.388) \]

Figure 4.2
The Path Analysis Design after the Students’ Speaking Self-Efficacy Was Omitted

The figure above shows that it is only the students’ collocational competence which has the direct effect on the students speaking performance which is 0.388 after the students’ speaking self-efficacy was omitted because of its insignificancy. This effect is smaller than before the speaking self-efficacy was omitted which is 0.391.

k. The Hypotheses Testing

The statistical hypotheses of this research are:

1. \( H_0: \rho_{x_12} = 0 \)  
   (There is no relationship between students’ collocational competence and students speaking performance)

   \( H_1: \rho_{x_12} \neq 0 \)  
   (There is relationship between students’ collocational competence and students speaking performance)

2. \( H_0: \rho_{yx1} = 0 \)  
   (Students’ speaking self-efficacy has no direct effect on their speaking performances)

   \( H_1: \rho_{yx1} \neq 0 \)  
   (Students’ speaking self-efficacy has direct effect on their speaking performances)

3. \( H_0: \rho_{yx2} = 0 \)  
   (Students’ collocational competence has no direct effect on their speaking performances)

   \( H_1: \rho_{yx2} \neq 0 \)  
   (Students’ collocational competence has direct effect on their speaking performances)

Finally, it can be concluded that:

1. \( H_0 \) stated that there is no relationship between students’ collocational competence and students speaking performance is **rejected**.

2. \( H_0 \) stated that students’ speaking self-efficacy has no direct effect on their speaking performances is **accepted**.
3. H₀ stated that students’ collocational competence has no direct effect on their speaking performances is rejected.

B. Discussion

Four research questions guided this research. The first research question involves analyzing the students’ speaking self-efficacy has direct effect on the students’ speaking performance. The second research question involves analyzing the students’ speaking self-efficacy has indirect effect through collocational competence on students’ speaking performance. The third research question involves analyzing the students’ collocational competence has direct effect on the students’ speaking performance. The last research question involves analyzing is the students’ collocational competence have indirect effect through speaking self-efficacy on the students’ speaking performance. After analyzing the data and testing the hypotheses, the results were discussed as follows:

1. The students’ collocational competence and the students’ speaking performance have no significant relationship

The result of the first hypothesis confirmed that H₀ was rejected that there is significant relationship between the students’ collocational competence and their speaking performance. According to Ellis (2005) and Lewis (2006) fluency occurs because native speakers have a store of prefabricated and memorized lexical phrases, which they use skillfully in relevant situations with abnormal rate of articulation. Therefore, the higher collocational competence one has, the better their English speaking are and vice versa.

Therefore, for English as foreign language, collocational competence and needs to be developed in order to achieve fluency and proficiency. The development of students’ collocational competence would result in the improvement of communicative competence. Consequently, proficiency in the foreign language would increase as far as the learners’ competencies are developed. Writing as well as speaking would be more fluent, accurate and meaningful since the learner knows the most common collocations that enable them to speak and write more efficiently. Therefore, knowing collocations means knowing vocabulary, which facilitates the task for the learner to perform better in the foreign language.

Nevertheless, language is not an autonomous system for communication. It is embedded in and supplemented by gesture, gaze, stance, facial expression, voice quality in the full array of options people can use for communicating (Clark, 2009). Even if children are born with a learning mechanism dedicated to language, the main proposals is to focus only on syntactic, hence the rest has to be learnt and it can be affected by social interaction and cognitive development.

Furthermore, language use has a heavy skill component, which demands that the user perform complex operations accurately and quickly since one important concept related to language learning is automaticity (Hadley, 2001; Brown & Lee, 2015). The idea here is that many language skills require a student to do many different things at the same time; for example, speaking involves choosing words, applying grammar rules, and attending to pronunciation and intonation — all while trying to decide what to say. A speaker cannot consciously pay attention to all of these operations simultaneously, so some of them must be practiced often enough that they can be performed automatically. It takes repeated practice to learn to perform any skill smoothly and automatically because language learning is no exception and this has some important implications for the ways in which students must learn: 1. Language
students need a lot of practice. To learn to speak well, students need to spend a lot of time speaking; in order to learn to read quickly and effectively, they need to spend a lot of time reading, and so forth. 2. Language students need repeated practice.

Those theories above are supported by previous research from Yazdandoost, AmalSaleh, and Kafipour (2014) who analyzed the relationship among collocation knowledge and listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. Regression model was conducted to find the exact contribution between variables. It indicated that knowledge of collocation can be a predictor for all four language skills. In addition, knowledge of collocation has the greatest impact (R²=78.3%) on participants’ speaking proficiency.

2. The students’ speaking self-efficacy has no direct effect on their speaking performance.

The result of the first hypotheses confirmed that H₀ was accepted that there was insignificant effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performance. The result in this research indicated that speaking self-efficacy did not rather influence the students’ speaking performance. It can be seen from the result of their speaking score which were so small, whereas their speaking self-efficacy score were so high.

According to Zhou (2015), such situation mentioned above can happen because there are two-phase model of self-efficacy to a great extent. In this model, a distinction was made between pre-intentional motivation processes and post-intentional volition processes. In the pre-intentional phase, individuals first develop an intention (or goals) to act. The intention could stem from the belief that: (a) one is at risk for failure (risk perception), (b) behavioral change would reduce a failure threat (outcome expectancies), and (c) one is sufficiently capable of exercising control over a difficult behavior (perceived self-efficacy). After individuals set goals, they enter the post-intentional phase wherein they plan details and invest effort. Thus, the first phase leads to a behavioral intention and the second leads to actual behavior. As it termed by Schwarzer & Renner (2000), self-efficacy that functions in the pre-intentional phase as action self-efficacy and the one in the post-intentional phase as coping self-efficacy.

The distinction between these two types of efficacy is necessary because it is possible that some individuals could be very confident in their ability to set goals and take initiative (high in action self-efficacy) but not so confident in their ability to maintain the effort to achieve the goals (low in coping self-efficacy). By contrast, others could have high confidence in their ability to recover from failures to continue goal pursuit (high in coping self-efficacy) but little confidence in getting started (low in action self-efficacy). Hence, these two types self-efficacy co-define GSE as a multidimensional construct. GSE may explain a broader range of human behaviours and coping outcomes when the context is less specific.

In short, from the explanation above, the participants of the research were only in pre-intentional motivation processes phase (high in action self-efficacy, but low in coping self-efficacy) and they fail in post-intentional volition processes phase because of several factors, such as their socio-economic status that they have no access or facilities to learn English vigorously, vicarious experience that they have no role model of how great mastering English is, and verbal persuasion that the students’ environment less persuade them in mastering English, especially mastering English speaking.

Moreover, such situation which mentioned in the result can happen because English lesson needs adequate practice besides merely the high of speaking self-
efficacy. As Thornbury (2005) that speaking is an interactive skill that requires the ability to have cooperation with the other aspects of language. Speaking skill needs to be developed and practiced independently from the other aspects of language, such as grammar and listening.

Apparently, the result of the current research is only similar with one previous research from Anyadubalu (2010) who found no significant relationship between self-efficacy and English language performance.

Meanwhile, most of the researches related with self-efficacy and speaking performance showed that there was significant relationship between them. Some of researchers are 1) Liu (2013) it was revealed that students who often speak English at the "Bar", showed a considerably higher level of self-efficacy compared to their peers who seldom or never visited the “Bar”; 2) Hairuzila and Subarna (2007), their study had shown that the students were found to be highly efficacious on their aspiration to become good communicators in English; 3) Hairuzila & Rohani (2008) indicated that the t-test results on speaking self-efficacy level of female students were significantly higher than male students in terms of ability and aspiration. These findings on gender differences were similar to several previous studies done on the relationship between gender and self-efficacy; 4) Hairuzila, Rohani & Ridhuan (2011) who found that students' positive aptitude would result in positive attitude towards improving their oral communication ability and aspirations to reach the desired effect.

3. The students’ collocational competence has no direct effect on their speaking performance.

The result of the first hypotheses confirmed that H₀ was rejected and there was significant effect from the students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance. The result in this research indicated that collocational competence significantly influenced the students’ speaking performance that it is only 0.388 after speaking self-efficacy variable was omitted. In other words, one who has high collocational competence can select which vocabularies used in particular contexts (Koç, 2006).

In the same vein, collocation as a crucial factor in the generation of a learner’s lexicon and for accuracy in the language. For example, collocations make up approximately 70% of everything we read, write, say or hear. Therefore, when students do not have ready-made chunks at their disposal, namely the collocations, which express precisely what they want to say, they have to generate utterances on the basis of grammar rules, which leads to numerous grammatical mistakes.

Thus, collocation is crucial in that it allows learners to think more quickly and communicate more efficiently. Then, the fluency of native speakers to the retrieval of ready-made language immediately is available from their mental lexicons. In addition, they can read faster and listen at the speed of speech since they have no difficulty in recognizing collocations or multiword units. However, most EFL learners have to process them word-by-word. The basic problem of EFL learners is that they cannot recognize and produce these ready-made chunks, which seriously impedes their fluency.

Theoretically, Lewis (2000) proposed that collocational competence indeed needs to be developed in order to achieve fluency and proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) generally and Foreign Language writing particularly. The development of students’ collocational competence would result in the improvement of
communicative competence. Consequently, proficiency in the foreign language would increase as far as the learners’ competencies are developed. Writing as well as speaking would be more fluent, accurate and meaningful since the learner knows the most common collocations that enable him/her to speak and write more efficiently. Therefore, knowing collocations means knowing vocabulary, which facilitates the task for the learner to perform better in the foreign language.

The finding of the current research is the same with Yazdandoost, AmalSaleh, and Kafipour’s research in 2014 who analyzed the relationship among collocation knowledge and listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. 50 students involved in the study took a test of both lexical and grammatical collocations to measure their collocational knowledge, first. Then, an IELTS sample test (IELTS Practice Plus Pearson Education Longman University, Version two) was administered in order to find the students’ reading, writing, speaking and listening proficiency. Pearson correlation coefficient illustrated a significant correlation between knowledge of collocation and reading, writing, listening, and speaking proficiency. Regression model was conducted to find the exact contribution between variables. It indicated that knowledge of collocation can be a predicator for all four language skills. In addition, knowledge of collocation has the greatest impact on participants’ speaking proficiency.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusions

Based on the result of hypotheses testing and the data analysis in chapter four, three following conclusions are made. First, there was relationship between students’ collocational competence and students’ speaking performance that the lower the students’ collocation score, the lower the students’ speaking performances were. In other words, the students were not competent at the collocation which made them faced difficulties in speaking in English. Whereas, the collocational competence can contribute a lot on the other skills beside speaking skill as well. Second, there was direct effect from students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance that they could not select appropriate word contextually because of their lack collocational competence. Their lack collocational competence could be influenced by their inappropriate vocabulary memorization that they only learnt single word without concern the word that collocate with the particular word. Also their habits which were not used to speaking in English, so their vocabulary competence became rusty and difficult to memorize. Third, there was indirect effect from the students’ speaking self-efficacy through students’ collocational competence that the students’ speaking self-efficacy influenced their collocational competence which gave indirect effect on their speaking performances. That situation might happen because they did not believe in their own speaking skill or they did not find English was not important, difficult, and uninteresting, so it influenced their laziness to study and enhance their vocabulary competence. In the end, their speaking performedance was also influence by their belief in English.

B. Suggestions

1. Suggestions for the English Teachers

The result shows that there were three aspects in speaking performance the students got the lowest scores at; they are grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Therefore, it is advisable that these three aspects become the teachers’ concerns in enhancing the students’ speaking performances.

2. Suggestions for Other Researchers

The result shows that there is no relationship between the students’ speaking self-efficacy and the students’ speaking performance that theoretically there is, hence it needs further research about whether the participants who are divided based on the sex (female and male) will influence the relationship or not. After that, this research does not attach the students’ speaking performance audio or video, so it will be better if the attachment exists.

3. Suggestions for the English Department

The result of this research shows how big environment influences one’s failure in mastering English speaking, that even though someone has high speaking self-efficacy or they believe in their capabilities in speaking English, they apparently cannot overcome obstacles from their environments that prohibit them in realizing their belief of their own English skill into reality or mastering English speaking skill. It is like that they want to be able to master English speaking, but their environment cannot afford providing what they need in achieving their dreams.

Therefore, schools where students spend their time most at need to revise its English department policies and programs. The English programs have to enrich student’s four
English skills by giving them a lot of exposures and enlightenments. For example, schools set an English reading program that there is special schedule when the students have to read English books, journals, or novel before studying in the morning.

C. Implication

The knowledge about speaking self-efficacy can be implemented for both English teachers and English as Foreign Language (EFL) students. For teachers, it is important for them to be role models for theirs students, as it is one of the sources in self-efficacy belief, called vicarious experience. As the matter of fact, teachers have to shows how English speaking is implemented in an appropriate context. And also, they have to support and encourage their students’ English skills, so the students are confidence about their English speaking skill.

Next, speaking self-efficacy belief may enlighten the students to master English speaking even though their environment do not support their dreams or belief, they have to be able to endure the obstacles from their outside factors (e.g., the lack of facilities and unavailable financial support), for example by deepening their relationship with Allah so that they will be more ready in facing anything, including the English speaking challenges. Most of all, they have to persevere in pursuing their goals and maintaining their speaking self-efficacy into significant success at English speaking performance no matter what happens in the processes.

After that, self-efficacy can enhance students’ speaking performance because it can influence students’ attitudes when they deal with certain English specific tasks, hence having high self-efficacy means they will be able to manage their strategies to achieve their goals, especially if one can overcome the interferences from inside factors (e.g., laziness, pessimistic, and anxiety), they will show excellent English performances.

Meanwhile, on the other side by having high collocational competence, the students will be able to speak in English fluently and comprehensively. Therefore, to achieve their goals, they must not learn English vocabulary as single item or one by one vocabulary item memorization, but the students have to find the collocation from each word they find and they must not directly translate Bahasa into English in producing both spoken and written language because it can lead into ambiguity problems faced by the listeners. In addition, the students can use Corpus of Contemporary English American (COCA) and collocation dictionary as tools to check whether their vocabularies have already been native-like or not yet.

Finally, collocational competence offers EFL students’ improvement of their English speaking performance in specific and four English skills in general that by mastering English collocation one can be better English performers both when they are producing and receiving English language regarding Bahasa has different language structure as English, which is full of idiomatic expression, so it will be in vain if one only learns vocabulary word by word without knowing the word that usually collocates with it.
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## Speaking Skills Self-Efficacy Belief

Name=………………………… School=…………………………

SD = Strongly disagree; D = Disagree; N =Neutral; A = Agree; Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have enough ability to improve my speaking skills. (Saya memiliki kemampuan yang cukup untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am sure that if I practice speaking more, I will get better grades in the course. (Saya yakin bahwa jika saya berlatih lebih rajin, maka saya akan mendapatkan nilai yang lebih baik saat tes berbicara di kelas bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can speak better than my classmates. (Saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris lebih baik daripada teman sekelas saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Even if the speaking task is difficult and I don’t have the required vocabulary, I can find the strategy to get the message across. (Bahkan jika tugas berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris sulit dan saya tidak memiliki kosa kata yang cukup, saya mampu menemukan cara untuk menyampaikan maksud saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am not stressed out when speaking English in the classroom. (Saya tidak merasa cemas ketika berbicara bahasa Inggris di kelas.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I enjoy speaking with a proficient partner. (Saya nyaman berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan teman yang pintar berbicara bahasa Inggris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am one of the best students in speaking courses. (Saya adalah salah satu siswa/i terbaik dalam berbicara bahasa inggris di kelas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy meeting tourists because I can speak with them well. (Saya nyaman ketika bertemu dengan turis dari luar negeri karena saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris bersama mereka dengan baik.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The more difficult the speaking practice is, the more enjoyable it is. (Semakin sulit pelajaran berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris, maka semakin menarik)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When the instructor asks a question, I raise my hand to answer it even if I’m not sure about it. (Ketika guru bertanya sebuah pertanyaan dalam bahasa Inggris, dengan tanpa diminta saya mengangkat tangan untuk menjawab dalam bahasa Inggris, bahkan jika saya tidak yakin dengan jawabannya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I’m confident about my ability to interact with other English speakers. (Saya percaya diri dengan kemampuan saya dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan orang lain yang berbahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>While speaking, I can deal efficiently with unexpected situations. (Saya mampu berbicara bahasa Inggris, bahkan di situasi yang tidak terduga.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>While speaking, I can remain calm when facing difficulties. (Ketika berbicara bahasa Inggris, saya mampu tetap tenang ketika saya merasa sulit dalam menyampaikan maksud saya kepada lawan bicara saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When I’m talking with fluent speakers, I let them know if I need help. (Ketika saya berbicara dengan orang yang pintar berbicara bahasa Inggris, saya tidak ragu memberitahunya bahwa saya kehabisan kata-kata dalam bahasa Inggris dan membutuhkan bantuan untuk merangkai kata-katanya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I’m confident I can communicate what I mean easily. (Saya percaya diri bahwa saya mampu menyampaikan pesan dalam bahasa Inggris dengan mudah.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel confident that I can achieve a native-like accuracy in speaking. (Saya merasa percaya diri bahwa saya mampu menyampaikan pesan dengan tepat dalam bahasa Inggris sebaik orang penutur asli bahasa Inggris.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I’m able to actively participate in my speaking classes. (Saya mampu berpartisipasi secara aktif di kelas bahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris saya.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|18 | I’m sure I can use English outside the classroom. (Saya yakin bahwa saya juga mampu menggunakan bahasa Inggris di
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I believe I am a good English speaker. (Saya yakin bahwa saya pintar dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I strongly believe that I can achieve native-like fluency in English. (Saya sangat yakin bahwa saya mampu berbicara lancar dalam bahasa Inggris seperti orang penutur asli bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I can describe my school to others in English. (Saya mampu memberikan informasi tentang keadaan gedung sekolah saya kepada orang lain dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I can tell a story in English. (Saya mampu bercerita dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I can ask my teachers questions in English. (Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya mampu bertanya kepada guru dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can produce sentence with idiomatic expressions. (Saya mampu membuat kalimat berbahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan idiom dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I can introduce my teacher to someone else in English. (Saya mampu memperkenalkan guru saya kepada orang lain dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I can discuss subjects of my interest with my classmates. (Saya mampu berdiskusi tentang hobi saya dalam bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I can introduce myself in English. (Saya mampu memperkenalkan diri saya dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I can answer my teachers' questions in English. (Saya mampu menjawab pertanyaan yang berbahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Asakereh, A. & Dehghannezhad, M. (2015)
Collocation Test

Dear Participants:
The aim of the research method is to analyze the direct effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy on their speaking performances, the direct effect from students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance, the indirect effect from students’ speaking self-efficacy through students’ collocational competence on their speaking performances, and the indirect effect from students’ collocational competence through students’ collocational competence on their speaking performance. The collected data is merely for academic research. Your personal information will be kept confidential. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Please complete this section.
Name: ………………………Age: ………………L1: …………
School where you study at: ……………………………………..
Class: …………………………………………………..
Do you know other language besides English? …………………
Time: 40 minutes

A. Please choose the most appropriate verb.
Example: When I go to wedding, I … perfume.
a. wear  b. hit  c. have  d. beat

1. The police had no evidence of him having … any actual crime.
a. performed  b. made  c. committed  d. acted
2. I don’t want to … the wrong decision and regret later.
a. do  b. make  c. achieve  d. get
3. She prepared the meals, swept the rugs and ……………… the beds.
a. did  b. put  c. made  d. set
4. I ……………… about Julie. She’s quite nice really.
a. did a mistake  b. did wrong  c. made a mistake  d. made wrong
5. She ……………… her 50th birthday in Paris.
a. took  b. made  c. paid  d. spent
6. He’s ……………… weight since he gave up smoking.
a. put on  b. grown  c. added  d. increased
7. Punk rockers dye their hair red and green because they want other people to ……………… attention to them.
a. give  b. pay  c. have  d. make
8. Do you think this color ……………… me?
a. suits  b. makes  c. fits  d. matches
9. Bill said the two parties could not ……………… an agreement on financing issues.
a. arrive  b. make  c. reach
10. She ................ a big favor and took care of the kids for the afternoon when I had to visit the doctor.
   a. made  b. did  c. paid  d. gave

11. When I met John for the first time, I ................
   a. made friends with him  b. became a friend with him  c. made a friend with him  d. found friends with him

12. If you don’t make back-up copies of all the files on your computer, you’ll be ................ the risk of losing all your data during a power failure.
   a. doing  b. making  c. running  d. developing

B. Please choose the most appropriate adjective
   
   Example: Jack had ................. information on the recent event.
   a. first class  b. brand-new  c. first-hand  d. business class

13. My Grandfather was a .......... smoker.
   a. heavy  b. strong  c. thick  d. deep

14. We got stuck in ................. traffic for more than an hour.
   a. crowded  b. jam  c. heavy  d. condensed

15. He is tall and has .................
   a. broad shoulders  b. four shoulders  c. broad-shoulder  d. four shoulder

16. They have raised the ............... on the interstate to 75 miles per hour.
   a. allowed speed  b. speed limit  c. limit speed  d. speed allowed

17. Joe gave Lynne a ........... glance to see if she was OK.
   a. speedy  b. fast  c. quick  d. rapid

18. A war between groups of people living in the same country leads to a/an .............
   a. inner war  b. civil war  c. internal war  d. internal fight

19. If someone has a ....., he says unkind things.
   a. harsh tongue  b. sharp tongue  c. rough tongue  d. bitter tongue

20. She had such a ........... that I couldn’t hear what she said.
   a. calm voice  b. slow voice  c. soft voice  d. relaxed voice
21. …………… volcano has erupted recently or is expected to erupt quite soon.
   a. A live  c. An active
   b. An energetic  d. An awakening
22. If you are …………… you accept behavior or beliefs that are different from yours.
   a. broad-minded  c. light-minded
   b. broad-minded  d. light-minded

C. Please choose the most appropriate preposition
Example: There are major financial constraints………… all schools.
   a. to  c. on  d. toward
23. The dry weather had an adverse effect …………… the potato crops.
   a. in  c. on
   b. of  d. for
24. I look forward to receiving your comments………… my composition.
   a. in  c. with
   b. on  d. for
25. Children go to school ……………
   a. by car  c. by a car
   b. with car  d. with a car
26. She called her mum instead of her husband ……………
   a. by mistake  c. with mistake
   b. by wrong  d. with wrong
27. He has a good command …………… English.
   a. in  c. to
   b. of  d. over
28. I have an allergy………… flower pollen.
   a. with  c. to
   b. from  d. by
29. A policeman is required to wear his uniform while he is ………. duty.
   a. on  c. in
   b. over  d. for
30. We got very surprised …………… the news.
   a. at  c. from
   b. with  d. of
31. The island of Cuba is adjacent …………… Florida.
   a. with  c. to
   b. of  d. from
32. Instructors should keep their students informed …………… any changes in procedure.
   a. to  c. with
   b. from  d. of
33. That case is identical …………… the one I am working on.
   a. to  c. of
   b. with  d. as
34. We’ve been talking about this for over an hour; let’s move………… to another topic.
   a. up  c. in
34. I’m sorry I can’t drive you all the way to school, but I can drop you ………………… at the bus stop if you like.
   a. off  b. over  c. out  d. back

35. It’s taken me more than a month to get……………… this cold.
   a. away  b. over  c. back  d. down

36. Patty was Ron’s girlfriend for a long time, but they broke………………two weeks ago.
   a. with  b. out  c. down  d. up

37. My father never studied English formally; he just picked it …….when he came here ten years ago.
   a. out  b. off  c. up  d. on

38. She told me that she wanted to go Alaska and work on a fishing boat for the summer, but I talked her………………of it.
   a. off  b. out  c. up  d. down

39. My grandfather has been feeling very sad; let’s go to his house and cheer him………………
   a. up  b. off  c. on  d. out

40. The second draft was an improvement ……… the first.
   a. to  b. on  c. of  d. for

41. Other kids always pick …………… her because she’s so overweight.
   a. off  b. out  c. up  d. on

D. Please choose the most appropriate adverb

Example: I ……………. remember that we agreed to meet at the gym.
   a. strongly  b. completely  c. distinctly  d. entirely

42. She’s practicing …………… for the piano competition.
   a. hard  b. strongly  c. a lot  d. intensely

43. I didn’t know what to do so I just ………………… around town all morning.
   a. wandered aimlessly  b. walked entirely  c. wandered entirely  d. walked aimlessly

44. The hotel is……………….recommended for its excellent facilities.
   a. deeply  b. highly  c. absolutely  d. completely

45. It’s difficult to calculate ………………… how much we’ve spent.
   a. correctly  b. rightly  c. accurately  d. appropriately

46. The children were ………………… asleep in bed.
   a. entirely  b. deeply  c. absolutely  d. completely
b. intensely  
48. The two ideas are……………. related.
    a. closely  
    b. totally  
    c. exactly  
    d. really

49. I ……………… agree with you on the question of nuclear waste.
    a. fundamentally  
    b. really  
    c. entirely  
    d. bitterly

50. He ………………believed that he was right.
    a. entirely  
    b. firmly  
    c. strongly  
    d. totally
The Answer of Collocation Test

Example: C

1. C
2. B
3. C
4. C
5. D
6. A
7. B
8. A
9. C
10. B
11. A
12. B

Example: B

13. A
14. C
15. A
16. B
17. C
18. B
19. B
20. C
21. C
22. A
23. C
24. B
25. A
26. A
27. B
28. C
29. A
30. A
31. C
32. D
33. A
34. D

Example: B

35. A
36. B
37. D
38. C
39. C
40. A
41. C
42. D
43. A
44. A
45. B
46. C
47. C
48. A
49. C
50. D
## Speaking Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Unorganized content and ideas, a lot of misunderstanding of the topic.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are less organized and misunderstanding of the topic.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are less organized and almost appropriate.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and ideas are highly organized and it is appropriate.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>There are many errors in grammar around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in grammar around 50%.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a little error in grammar around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no error in grammar.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>There are many errors in choice of words around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in choice of words around 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is little error in choice of words around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There have good choice of words</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td>There are many errors in pronunciation around 80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some errors in pronunciation about 50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is little errors in pronunciation around 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pronunciation is clear and correct</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td>There is repetition and difficult to understand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some repetitions and speak hesitantly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a little repetition and almost easy to understand</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no repetition and mostly easy to understand</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Ningrum, R. P., Husna, L., & Tanjung, F. (2017)
Speaking Performance Test
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Class: 
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UIN Jakarta
Di
Tempat

PERSETUJUAN PENELITIAN

Nama Instansi : SMA Negeri 1 Surade
Alamat : Jln. Raya Cikaso KM 1 Surade Kabupaten Sukabumi

Berdasarkan Surat No. Un.01/Ft./MPBI/70/IV/2018 Perihal Permohonan Izin Penelitian, Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Jakarta pada prinsipnya kami mengijinkan kegiatan tersebut yaitu :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Nama</th>
<th>NIM</th>
<th>Prodi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Risa Aryani</td>
<td>21150140000022</td>
<td>Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demikian surat permohonan kami ajukan dan atas perhatiannya serta perkenannya, kami menyampaikan terima kasih.

Surade, 16 April 2018
Kepala Sekolah

Drs. I. Rosim, M.Pd
NIP. 195910201983021003