SELF-EFFICACY AND SPEAKING PERFORMANCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY AT TWELFTH-GRADE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Cika Shinta Sopia[1], Slamet Wahyudi Yulianto[2]

Universitas Subang

chikasofia26938@gmail.com, slamet.wahyudi.y@unsub.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and students' speaking performance. In terms of literal awareness, dealing with main ideas and supporting details in the first semester of twelfth grade for senior high school students in the academic year 2023/2024. The researcher employs a correlational study as a research design to explain the correlation. The population is students from the XII MIPA 2 semester. A total sampling of students from each class is conducted, so that 32 people are obtained as the sample for this research. Questionnaires and speaking test interviews are used by researchers in gathering data. The researcher utilized SPSS to examine and calculate the connection. The correlation level was discovered to be 0.805, indicating a high positive association between both. The findings of this study show a significant association between students' self-efficacy in speaking performance and literal understanding. It is recommended that teachers consider these findings when carrying out activities in class with varied student characteristics.

Keywords: *Self-Efficacy, Speaking Performance*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a kind of communication in which information, ideas, and feelings are transferred from one person to another. Language is also a communication system based on words and the mixing of words into sentences. People can expand their knowledge and understanding by using language and regarding something. Cameron (2001:17), in recent decades of applied linguistics. Language has traditionally been divided into four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing, reading and writing, grammar, vocabulary, and phonology. Many learners believe that English is a difficult language to learn, and because English is rarely spoken in Indonesia, both in school and in the social society, it gradually forms a mental block paradigm that causes them to avoid challenges. Furthermore, Oktaviani (2013) stated that the presence of people who comment excessively on beginners' English mistakes reduces learners' confidence to communicate in English, and fear of others' negative judgment is the most impactful component of students' anxiety in learning English, followed by communication anxiety, exam anxiety, and lastly anxiousness over being in an English class. Learning a language entails becoming familiar with the language's skills and components. The four skills listed above are critical to improving students' English fluency.

Speaking is a vital language ability since people spend more than 45 percent of their communication time listening, which is more than any other communicative activity. According to Amsori *et al* (2021), speaking skills cannot be isolated from speaking itself. It is considered the hardest talent for pupils to master and use. Both students and professors are frequently reluctant to utilize English to clarify subjects in class. As a result of this lack of implementation in the classroom, students' level of speaking skills is minimal.

Review of literature
Definition of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy beliefs, according to Bandura (1977), are people's beliefs about their ability to achieve desired outcomes by their actions. These beliefs are among the most crucial predictors of the activities people choose to engage in, as well as how far they will go to succeed in the face of hurdles and problems. As a result, they are also among the most important predictors of psychological well-

being and adjustment. Although the phrase "self-efficacy" is relatively new, psychological interest in beliefs about personal control has a long history.

Self-efficacy beliefs differ from a variety of similar ideas. Self-efficacy beliefs are not about competence; they are about one's ability to exercise one's skills under certain settings, particularly changing and trying ones. Self-efficacy beliefs are not behavioral predictions or intentions; they are concerned with what one believes one can accomplish rather than what one believes one will do. Although self-efficacy beliefs in a given domain will contribute to self-esteem in direct proportion to the emphasis one places on that domain, self-efficacy is not the same as self-esteem. Self-efficacy is not a motivator, drive, or control requirement.

One can have a strong need for control in one domain while having weak beliefs about one's ability to perform effectively in have been developed and are frequently used in research, but they have not been as useful in predicting how people will behave under specific conditions as specific self-efficacy measures. The formation of self-efficacy beliefs is influenced by four factors: a) mastery experience, b) vicarious experience, c) social persuasion, and d) physiological conditions. People who have demonstrated successful performance in the completion of a task (Bandura, 1977).

Student self-efficacy has evolved as an important notion in educational research over the last thirty years, according to Dinther *et al* (2010). Since the early 1990s, academics in higher education have attempted to identify environmental and instructional aspects that influence students' self-efficacy. We can conclude the following conclusions based on the findings of our literature review.

Types of Self-Efficacy Level

Hsieh discovered that self-efficacy was an excellent predictor of language learning achievement (Baleghizadeh & Masoun, 2013, p. 44). As a result, this section will go over different levels of self-efficacy as a predictor of language learning success. However, in this situation, pupils' self-efficacy levels will be divided into three categories: high, medium, and low. According to Hsieh (2008), students with high self-efficacy are more interested in studying foreign languages than students with low self-efficacy. They also have a more upbeat attitude and a stronger integrative approach. Furthermore, Bandura (1995) adds that the more confident students are in regulating their motivation and learning activities, the more confident they are in their ability to master academic subjects (p. 18, emphasis added).

Similarly, highlights that students with strong self-efficacy outperform those with low self-efficacy (Bandura in Mills et al., 2007, p. 418). A strong sense of self-efficacy also enables people to face stressful demands with confidence, to be motivated by physiological arousal, and to interpret favorable events as the result of effort and unpleasant events as the result of primarily external circumstances (Bandura, 1995, p. 5). Similarly, Wood and Bandura (cited in Bandura, 1989) contend that pupils who have a strong sense of self-efficacy have greater cognitive resourcefulness and strategic flexibility, allowing them to better handle their environment (p. 29). It's because students who have a strong feeling of self-efficacy prefer to relieve their tension and anxiety by acting in ways that change frightening situations into pleasant ones (Bandura, 1999).

A strong sense of self-efficacy is more than just one degree of the characteristic. Medium self-efficacy is the following stage. Students with a Medium Level of Self-Efficacy tend to choose the least dangerous option of activities (Michelle, 2013). They lack the confidence to engage in hard activities that children with a high sense of self-efficacy have. They are not, however, completely shunning difficult tasks. She also asserted that pupils with a moderate sense of self-efficacy are constantly concerned about their ability to accomplish homework. They prefer to decline assignments if they fear they will be unable to effectively accomplish them. If they should accomplish the chores, they will do so, but they do not have high expectations of obtaining a good grade (p. 11).

Furthermore, pupils with a moderate sense of self-efficacy can restore efficacy after failing. Nonetheless, they lose faith in their abilities fast, succumbing to stress and melancholy. Students with a medium sense of self-efficacy, on the other hand, may manage stress and grief better than students with a low sense of self-efficacy. The following part will discuss the reasons why children have low self-efficacy.

Previous anxiety research shown that students with low self-efficacy were more likely to be exposed to uncomfortable events. It was because they were concerned; they had low task-specific competence expectancies; they interpreted physiological arousal as anxiety; they interpreted social feedback as evaluations of personal value; and they felt personally responsible for failure rather than success (Jerusalem & Mittag, cited in Bandura, 1995, p. 178). Students with poor self-efficacy experience self-doubt, anxiety arousal, threat appraisals of events, and emotions of coping limitations when confronted with difficult conditions and demands. They are frequently uncomfortable when presented with dangerous situations because they lack the courage to deal with them. According to Mills *et al* (2007), students with low self-efficacy prefer to complete only uncomplicated academic work. They also avoid tough academic pursuits since they lose faith quickly. As a result, students who have low self-efficacy do worse than students who have high self-efficacy.

According to the explanation above, self-efficacy has numerous stages in realizing students' best talents. So, as explained in the following explanation, what elements influence students' self-efficacy should be highlighted.

Speaking Performance

Several professions have proposed definitions for speaking. Speaking is a way of conveying ideas, knowledge, and emotions to others. It is the most important way for the storyteller to convey himself verbally. Fluency is defined by Harmer (2001) as the capacity to speak fluently using one's experience and facts on the spot. It must be capable of assisting with speech management. It happens in the real world with little warning. As a result, fluency is essential to complete the conversation's objective. According to Richards (2008), speaking entails exploring ideas, completing tasks, eliminating various components of the world, or simply being together. It implies that students can convey and explore their thoughts more easily if they can speak effectively or smoothly. Speaking English also helps students stay current in the disciplines of health, technology, and science.

METHOD

The current study employed a quantitative approach to data analysis. The quantitative technique and descriptive method were used in this study since the primary purpose was to establish whether or not there was a correlation between students' levels of self-efficacy based on their positive psychological aspects and their English-speaking performance. A correlation research design was employed in this study to determine the correlation. According to Creswell (2012, p. 21), a correlation research design is a quantitative research technique in which the researcher examines the degree of association (or relation) between two or more variables using the statistical procedure of correlation analysis.

The population is 32 students from XII MIPA 2 consisting of 14 male students and 18 female students in SMA Negeri 1 Subang. To collect the data, the researcher used questionnaire and speaking test interview. To find out students' self-efficacy level the questionnaire that is used in this study was the "Children's Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy Questionnaire" adapted from Pastorelli *et al* (2001). The questionnaire was employed to find out at what level of self-efficacy the students belonged to. The questionnaire also described students' beliefs and confidence while using English in the classroom.

Table 1. Likert Scale of Self-Efficacy

Not quite sure	A little sure	Somewhat sure	Sure	Very sure	Really sure	Completely sure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

An instrument or questionnaire is said to be valid if the questions on an instrument or questionnaire can reveal something that will be measured by the questionnaire (Ghozali, 2018:51). As a result, a pilot test was done to ensure the validity of the questionnaire consisted of respondent of 32 students. The formula is as follows;

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{\{(\sum x^2)\}\{(\sum y^2)\}}}$$

r_{xy} :   correlation coefficient of a sample

x : $(x_i - \bar{x})$ score item

y   : $(y_i - \bar{y})$ total score

(Sugiono, 2007, p.228)

To calculate the r-table, it was also necessary to find the degree of freedom. The degree of freedom calculation is formulated as (df = n - K). Since the sample (n) of the pilot test was 32, and K is a variable of this research. So 32 – 2 = 30. After that, the value of r-result and r-table can be seen in the table below.

Table 2. The Result of Validity Test on Students' Self-Efficacy

Question	r-result	r-table	Description
1	.75	.36	Valid
2	.86	.36	Valid
3	.87	.36	Valid
4	.93	.36	Valid
5	.67	.36	Valid
6	.88	.36	Valid
7	.69	.36	Valid
8	.86	.36	Valid
9	.84	.36	Valid
10	.82	.36	Valid
11	.80	.36	Valid
12	.87	.36	Valid
13	.89	.36	Valid
14	.84	.36	Valid

The table below shows the results of a reliability test on students' self-efficacy questionnaires using Cronbach's Alpha. The results also shows whether the questionnaire toward the research become reliable or not.

Table 3. The Result of Reliability Test on Students' Self-Efficacy

Variable	K	R	Criteria
Students' self-efficacy in speaking English	14	.965	Highly Reliable

Table 4. The Reliability of the Data Interpretation

Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
$\alpha \geq 0.9$	Excellent
$0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$	Good
$0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$	Questionable

$0.6 > \alpha \geq 0.5$	Poor
$0.5 > \alpha$	Unacceptable

(George & Mallery, 2003)

After conducting a questionnaire on students, the researcher carried out a speaking test interview by asking students to describe pictures. The assessment carried out is guided by aspects from Brown (2010) which consist of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The writer will discuss the two problems that have been formulated based on the research that the writer did.

At what level of students' self-efficacy aspect posed by higher, moderate, and lower speaking achievement?

The researcher used used questionnaire. Self-Efficacy Scale taken from Children's Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy Questionnaire by Pastorelli, *et al* (2001). Further, the questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS 25.0 to interpret the data. SPSS was employed in this study since it was thought to be more practical and efficient, as well as providing more accurate analysis results. After the data were analyzed, the questionnaire was processed through the ordinal classification to determine the range of the student's self-efficacy level, from high to low.

The data were further processed in this step using the ordinal category formula. It was intended to establish the range of three degrees of self-efficacy aspect among students. From here the researcher will only display data from nine students who are categorized as low-level achievers, moderate-level achievers, and high-level achievers. Table 5. below shows the self-efficacy score of each of the nine students.

Table 5. The Result of Self-Efficacy Aspect

No. Resp	Score	Classification
S7	27	
S24	26	**Low**
S15	33	
S10	57	
S4	68	**Moderate**
S11	63	
S20	70	
S17	73	**High**
S30	96	

Table 5. above shows that students in the low-level achievers category belong to S7, S24, and S15. Meanwhile, students S10, S4, and S11 students were moderate-level achievers. Self-efficacy scores were 57, 68, and 63. Finally, students with high-level achievers were 70, 73, and 96. To answer the first research question, the table above shows that the three students namely S7, S24, and S15 had low-level achievers. Three students in medium-level achievers namely S10, S4, and S11 meanwhile the three students namely S20, S17, and S30 were at the high-level achievers. The questionnaire used a Likert scale for the self-efficacy aspect. A Likert-scale also ranged from 1-7 whereas '1' indicates not quite sure, '2' a little sure, '3' somewhat sure, '4' sure, '5' very sure, '6' really sure and '7' completely sure. See the discussion section for further analysis of these findings.

Table 6. Students' Speaking Test

No. Resp	Score					Total Score	Criteria
	G	V	P	F	C		
S24	1	1	1	1	1	20	Low
S7	1	2	1	1	1	24	
S15	2	2	2	2	2	40	
S11	3	2	3	2	3	52	Moderate
S4	3	3	3	2	4	60	
S10	4	4	3	3	4	72	
S30	5	4	4	4	5	88	High
S17	5	5	5	4	5	96	
S20	5	5	5	4	5	96	

From table 6. above it can be concluded that students who have a low level of self-efficacy also have a low speaking score. Low-level achievers have scores of 20, 24, and 40, indicating that they tend to have difficulty explaining or describing the pictures they will explain in the speaking test because their grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension are very limited.

Students with a medium level of self-efficacy got scores of 52, 60, and 72. Where they tend to be able to explain and describe even though their vocabulary is still limited. The pronunciation they get is quite good, but there are still limitations in conveying understanding regarding what they mean. Apart from that, students with a high level of self-efficacy achieved the highest scores on the speaking test. There are 88 and 96. They tend to be able to explain the descriptions of the images they see with a good level of understanding. Their vocabulary is also quite diverse and their fluency in conveying their opinions can be categorized as good.

What is the correlation between the level of students' self-efficacy aspects and their English-speaking performance?

The normality test was used to determine whether or not the questionnaire and speaking test scores were normally distributed. Because the variables were classified as interval data, the data normality should be assessed. Therefore, Kolmogorov-Smirnov was chosen to calculate the data. The data is regularly distributed if the Sig. is greater than 0.050. The data, however, did not follow the normal distribution if the Sig. was less than 0.050.

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
SELF-EFFICACY	.110	32	.200[*]	.959	32	.262
SPEAKING PERFORMANCE	.233	32	.000	.892	32	.004

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 1. Test of Normality

Figure 1. shows the results of the normality test. Based on the calculation above, it can be seen that the data from the self-efficacy questionnaires were normally distributed because the Sig. of data was greater than 0.050, whereas the data from the speaking test were not normally distributed because the Sig. of data was less than 0.050. When data are not regularly distributed, the reason for this should be discovered. Because the data from this study included ordinal and ranking data, the data distribution was not normal. A non-parametric test was recommended since it could handle ordinal and ranking data.

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982, p. 205), when the variables in the correlation analysis are measured on an ordinal (ranking) scale, the appropriate statistic to utilize is Spearman's rank-order correlation (represented by rho, p). Spearman's rank-order correlation is the Pearson product-moment correlation's nonparametric counterpart. Spearman's correlation coefficient measures how closely two ranked variables are related.

Figure 2. The Result of Nonparametric Correlations

The table above shows that the value Sig. (2-tailed) between students' self-efficacy and the speaking test was 0.000. According to the value of the Sig. (2-tailed) 0.000 < 0.05. It indicated that there was a correlation between students' self-efficacy and the speaking tests. Meanwhile, the correlation between the two variables was 0.805. It indicated that there was a correlation meaning, the level of strength of the relationship between the variables students' self-efficacy and the speaking test is 0.805 or very strong.

Table 7. Guidelines of the Correlation Value Interpretation

R	Strength
0.00 – 0.19	Very Weak
0.2 – 0.39	Weak
0.4 – 0.59	Moderate
0.6 – 0.79	Strong
0.8 – 1.00	Very Strong

(Evans, 1996)

As already mentioned above, a correlation value of r was 0.805. By looking at the guidelines above, it can be concluded that there was a strong positive correlation between students' pself-efficacy and their speaking performance. Besides, the data were calculated to find the coefficient of determination denoted as r^2, so the calculation as it follows;

$$0.805^2 = 0.648$$

The coefficient correlation is useful because it gives the proportion of the variance (fluctuation). Of one variable that is predictable from the other variable. The coefficient of determination is the measurement that determines how certain model or graph.

In this study, the value $r = 0.805$, the $r^2 = 0.648$, it means that:

- 64% of the total variation in speaking tests can be predicted by students' self-efficacy level.
- The other 36% of the total variation in the speaking test was predicted by other factors.

The test of hypothesis is needed to find out the contribution of students' self-efficacy to students' speaking performance. The interpretation of the hypothesis is presented below.

H_0 =   There is no statistically significant correlation between students' self-efficacy level and their speaking performance for twelfth-grade students of senior high school in Subang.
H_1 =   There is a statistically significant correlation between students' self-efficacy level and their speaking performance for twelfth-grade students of senior high school in Subang.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, it can be concluded that there was a strong positive correlation between students' self-efficacy and their speaking performance. However, the value *r* on the speaking test was 0.805 and the value was on the strong positive level. It indicated that the findings support the existence of a correlation between self-efficacy beliefs and academic performance.

REFERENCES

Amsori, H., Nugraha, M.A., & Sibarani, J. (2021). The Effect Of Task Based Learning Method Using Anchor Podcast Application On Students' Speaking Ability. *Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia.*

Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1983). Self-efficacy determinants of anticipated fears and calamities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 464–469. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.464

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* 2(1), 21-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00024

Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan(Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 1-43). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* Educational research: (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Dinther., Dochy., & Segers. 2011. *Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education*. ScienceDirect. Volume 6, Issue 2, 2011, Pages 95-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.10.003

Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *Spss for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.

Hsieh, P.-H. (2008). Why are college foreign language students' self-efficacy, attitude, and motivation so different? *International Education*, 38(1), 76–94.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals,* 39(2), 276–295.

Mitchell. 2019. *Teacher Self-Efficacy and Classroom Managment*. ScholarWorks. Walden University

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited

Richards, Jack C. 2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sugiono, (2011). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*; Alfabeta. Bandung.