LEVEL AND SOURCES OF SELF-EFFICACY IN SPEAKING SKILLS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 2012/2013 ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS FACULTY OF LETTERS, JEMBER UNIVERSITY,

TINGKATAN DAN SUMBER EFIKASI DIRI DALAM KEMAMPUAN BERBAHASA INGGRIS MAHASISWA SASTRA INGGRIS ANGKATAN 2012/2013 FAKULTAS SASTRA, UNIVERSITAS JEMBER

Yesi Puspita, Reni Kusumaningputri, Hari Supriono
Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Jember
Jln. Kalimantan 37, Jember 68121
E-mail: r.kusumaningputri@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Akhir-akhir ini, banyak mahasiswa jurusan Satra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Jember yang enggan untuk berbicara menggunakan bahasa Inggris baik di dalam maupun di luar kelas. Hal ini disebabkan karena mereka merasa bahwa kemampuan bahasa Inggris mereka kurang. Peneitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki bagaimana keyakinan mahasiswa terhadap kemampuan berbahasa Inggris, mengetahui apakah ada hubungan antara efikasi mahasiswa dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan prestasi mereka dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris dan untuk mengeksplorasi sumber-sumber yang mempengaruhi efikasi mahasiswa terhadap kemampuan berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini melibatkan 92 mahasiswa Sastra Inggris Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Jember, tahun ajaran 2012/2013 dan menggunakan dua jenis kuesioner untuk mengumpulkan data. Kuesioner pertama digunakan untuk mencari nilai efikasi mahasiswa dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris yang meliputi kemampuan fonologis, kosa kata dan grammar, sementara kuesioner kedua digunakan untuk menjaring jawaban per-individu mengenai sumber-sumber efikasi tersebut. Penelitian ini juga menggunakan nilai kemampuan berbahasa Inggris untuk mencari korelasi antara keyakinan efikasi mahasiswa dan prestasi mereka dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris menggunakan penghitungan Korelasi Koefisien Pearson. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa ada 11 siswa yang memiliki efikasi diri yang tinggi terhadap kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris, 65 siswa dengan efikasi sedang dan 16 siswa dengan efikasi rendah. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, efikasi terhadap kosa kata dan tata bahasalah yang berpengaruh dalam pembentukan efikasi diri yang rendah. Hal ini disebabkan oleh kurangnya akses dan latihan yang dijalani mahasiswa mengingat mereka belajar bahasa Inggris di lingkungan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing. Penelitian ini juga menemukan korelasi positif lemah (r = 0.437) antara efikasi mahasiswa terhadap kemampuan berbicara dalam bahasa inggris dan prestasi berbicara bahasa Inggris mereka. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa ada hubungan yang kurang konsisten antara dua variabel tersebut. Dan yang terakhir, ada empat sumber utama efikasi diri yaitu prestasi masa lampau, prestasi semu, dorongan sosial dan keadaan emosi yang bervariasi berdasarkan perbedaan individu masing-masing mahasiswa.

Kata Kunci: *Efiksasi, kemampuan berbicara, korelasi koefisien pearson*

ABSTRACT

In recent years, many students of English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University are reluctant to speak English. They do not want to speak English because they feel that their English is not very good. This paper aims to investigate what is students' self-efficacy belief of speaking like, to examine whether there is a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs of speaking and speaking performance and to explore what factors are influencing their self-efficacy of speaking. This research involves 92 English Department students of 2012/2013 academic year and uses two kinds of questionnaire to gather the data. Self-efficacy questionnaire is used to seek students' self-efficacy score of speaking based on phonology, vocabulary and grammar, while source of efficacy questionnaire is used to gather individual answer of source of efficacy. It also uses speaking performance score to find the correlation between self-efficacy beliefs of speaking and speaking performance by recapitulating those variables using Pearson Correlation Coefficient calculator. The results of this study show that there are 11 highly self-efficacious students, 65 medium self-efficacious students and 16 lowly self-efficacious students that are mostly influenced by grammatical and vocabulary efficiencies. Second, there is a weak positive correlation (r=0,437) between English speaking self-efficacy beliefs and English speaking performance indicating inconsistent correlation between the two variables. And the last, There are four main sources of self-efficacy namely performance accomplishment, vicarious experience, social persuasion and emotional state that are varied based on participants individual differences.

Key words: efficacy, speaking ability, Pearson Correlation Coefficient

1. Introduction

Self-efficacy has been broadly studied in recent decades since it was introduced by Albert Bandura (1977). It has gained attention in various fields of knowledge such as educational psychology, health, medicine, business, and social politic. In the field of education, especially language learning, self-efficacy has been attested an essential contributor to success in English language learning.

Self-efficacy is often correlated with language performance. Self-efficacy is elaborated with writing performance (Teo & Hettong, 2013). The result of Teo and Hetthong's study indicates a positive correlation between overall writing self-efficacy and overall writing performance (r=0.71). This study proves that highly-efficacious students achieve good score in writing test and the lowly-efficacious students achieve lower score in the same test. The same result is also observable in different language skill test. Rahimi and Abedini (2009) explored whether listening self-efficacy correlates with listening proficiency of 61 students from University of Kashan and Payamenur University of Naragh, Iran. The result of their study shows that listening achievement differed significantly across the EFL students with high self-efficacy and those with low self-efficacy. Another study is conducted by Azrein *et al*. (2011) from Malaysia. The study is designed to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy, learning strategy and performance in four basic skills. The result of the study reported that there was a significant relationship between learning strategy and student achievement. The study showed that self-efficacy was the best predictor in determining students' learning strategy. Highly self-efficacious students were found to have a good learning strategy; in contrast, lowly self-efficacious students would have a weak learning strategy. The level of correlation between self-efficacy and the learning strategies of language is strong (r = 0,539). On the other side Cubukcu (2008) found a different result on his study that attempted to investigate the correlation between self-efficacy and foreign language learning anxiety. The results of Cubukcu's study demonstrate that the third year teacher trainees feel anxious in the language classes but this has nothing to do with their self-efficacy levels. Cubukcu found that regardless if the students levels of self-efficacy, their performances do not change. The anxiety and efficacy levels are uncorrelated.

Based on the findings of the previous researches, the writer is interested to solve a problem arises in English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University. The problem is that there are many students of English Department who are reluctant to speak English. They would rather to speak their native language than English. From little observation, most of English Department Students Faculty of Letters Jember University said that they do not want to speak English because they feel that their English is not very good. This paper aims to investigate how is students' self-efficacy beliefs of speaking like and examine whether there is a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs of speaking and speaking performance. Lastly this research wishes to explore factors that are influencing students' self-efficacy of speaking.

1. Research Methodology

This research is a mixed-method research that involves 92, 2012/2013 academic year English Department students, Faculty of Letters, Jember University as the participant. To gather the data, two kinds of questionnaire are used. Self-efficacy questionnaire is used to seek students' self-efficacy score based on three aspects of language namely phonology, vocabulary and grammar, while sources of efficacy questionnaire is used to gather some individual answer of source of efficacy from each participant. Besides, speaking performance score is also needed to find the correlation between self-efficacy beliefs of speaking and speaking performance. Both of them are then recapitulated using Pearson Correlation Coefficient Calculator to find the relation between students' self-efficacy belief of speaking and speaking performance. This study also uses interview and observation in data collection since questionnaire cannot provide enough data for further discussion. Open ended questionnaire is chosen because it can provide structural information needed that relate to four main sources of efficacy in this study, and give participants space to express their individual opinion based on their real condition. Observation and interview are used to gather informations about the condition of student in English Department Faculty of Letters, Jember University environment.

2. Result

The results of this study are first there are only 11 students who have high self-efficacy beliefs of speaking, 65 students who have medium self-efficacy belief of speaking and 16 students with low self-efficacy beliefs of speaking. Second, from three aspects of speaking skills that are presented on self-efficacy questionnaire, students' self-efficacy of grammar and vocabulary have a big influence on constructing learner's low self-efficacy belief. Third, there is a weak positive correlation (r=0,437) between English speaking self-efficacy beliefs and English speaking performance indicates that there is inconsistent correlation between two variables. And the last, There are four main sources of self-efficacy that influence learner's self-efficacy beliefs namely performance accomplishment, vicarious experience, social persuasion and emotional state that are varied based on each participants individual differences.

3. Discussion

There are three discussions which are analysed in this study. They are level of speaking self-efficacy, correlation between efficacy and performance, and Sources of self-efficacy. Each of which will be elaborated below.

1). Level of Speaking Self-Efficacy

Level of self-efficacy is important to know students' self-efficacy belief of speaking. In this study, the level of self-efficacy of speaking is divided into three linguistic aspects namely phonology, vocabulary and grammar. Those three aspects of languages are chosen since they are the aspects that make learners difficult to speak English. The discussion of each aspect is as follows:

a) Level of Phonological Self-efficacy

The foreign language environment that cannot provide sound patterns of native speaker does not make learners' self-efficacy to become low. In some students (38.04%) foreign language context lower their phonological self-efficacy. It is possible due to the limitation of the sources of target language phonological system and the difficult access to practice it on conversation in foreign language context. This context lets them to have lack of knowledge on how to pronounce English word with the standardized English

required by English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University as the goal of study. The differences between Indonesian sound pattern and English sound pattern lead learners to mispronounce some English words in speaking . Furthermore, the firm requirement of some teachers who ask learners to speak based on British English makes learner more conscious on their speech production. The knowledge of British English that can be learnt from dictionary or multimedia exposure strengthens their monitoring to their speech. However the availability of native sound pattern in multimedia exposure becomes the alternative way to acquire native sound pattern on foreign context. Sadly, not all multimedia exposure the learners have are based on British English. It can be Australian English, American English etc. Here the standard form of English becomes ambiguous. The regulation of English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University that is different from the application in deciding the standard form of English used makes learners confused to choose the standard form to use. The limitation of learners' engagement with native speaker makes them difficult to find native-like sound system. Thus, they acquire English from environment that is influenced by Indonesian sound pattern. Finally, the learners' "English" is different from the native English (Southern English, according to Buku Pedoman Akademik Fakultas Sastra, 2012). When learners speak in English, they are corrected by teacher's standard English (supposedly British English). As the result, they will get some bad feedbacks from environment (teacher, friend, and people) that further decrease their self-efficacy. On the contrary, most participants in this study (48,37%) have high level of phonological efficacy. The unavailability of native sound system makes them difficult to access target language sound system, from personal observation during the process of writing this report, they adopt target language sound system form non-native English speaker such as teachers and friends. The difficulty to find target language sound system causes them not to have any native language sound pattern source to check their pronunciation. Thus, they feel that their pronunciation performance is good without correction with the actual native sound system. As the result, they do not have native English sound pattern reference to do the correction. With little consideration on standard

form, learners can deliver speech fluently that brings positive feedback such as applause and compliment that can increase their efficacy.

b). Level of Vocabulary Self-Efficacy

The result of this study concludes that most students' vocabulary self-efficacy is considered low. This condition happens because the position of English as foreign language makes learners' engagement with vocabulary knowledge and practice restricted. To get rich vocabulary knowledge learners need to access the knowledge of vocabulary and practice it in natural environment (Nakata, 2006; Takac, 2008). In English Department Faculty of Letters, Jember University, the knowledge of vocabulary can be accessed in the classroom during effective class. In early level, vocabulary is taught mostly by drilling. In intermediate level, vocabulary is taught by incidental learning that is mostly done by reading or writing. Besides, learner can also access vocabulary knowledge from internet, film, and song they hear. The various accesses on vocabulary knowledge may help learners in learning and acquiring it.

Practice is also the most crucial activity to improve vocabulary ability. It requires continual repetition to make effective vocabulary learning. This is important because in obtaining new information, in this case vocabulary, most of it is forgotten immediately. So practice will help learners to engage in productive use of words that increases their vocabulary knowledge. The more frequent learner practices in multiple tasks and encounters varieties of words will make up more systemic coverage of various aspects of lexical knowledge and build up an adequate lexical knowledge and consolidate in long-term memory (Nakata, 2006; Takac, 2008). Unfortunately, during the writing of this study, vocabulary practice in English Department Faculty of Letters, Jember University is limited in classroom context and mostly toward writing activity. Most of vocabulary practices in the classroom are applied by writing some stories or/and filling the written vocabulary tasks. There are some teachers who apply vocabulary acquisition and learning on speaking, but it is limited. Furthermore, the lack of practice, especially speaking, becomes a burden to get vocabulary enrichment. However the sources of vocabulary knowledge are available in the environment, the lack of the frequency of practice makes learners' acquired

vocabularies to be forgotten. As the result, when they need to recall the words, they may forget and find difficulty to recall the word from their memory. Finally they get a bad mastery experience that, then, decreases their self-efficacy belief. This phenomenon happens to most participants in this study (59,06%) who choose the second choice on the Likert scale while some participants judge their self-efficacy on vocabulary high (31,89%). this shows that the limitation of vocabulary application toward speaking does not make learners give up practicing vocabulary in speaking. They may join or even create their own speaking environment to improve and maintain their vocabulary knowledge. By this their vocabulary ability is developed and it facilitates them to express their idea in every condition. This case gives them good experience in applying vocabulary on speaking that further raises their self-efficacy in vocabulary. Even when they actually do not have enough vocabulary knowledge; they never engaged on various topic of conversations and often do the monotonous conversation with monotonous issues. As the result, they feel that their vocabulary knowledge is very good because of relatively limited standard of attainment in vocabulary extension.

c) Level of Grammatical Self-efficacy

Grammar in spoken language is considered less formal than in the written form that makes them different (Burns *et al.,* 2012: Leech and Svartik, 2002). But ironically, the materials on teaching speaking have traditionally dealt with grammar on written form (Burns *et al.,* 2012:75). As it happens to English Department Faculty of Letters Jember University. This condition can rise burden for students since Indonesian and English grammatical system are different (see Khee: 2012:19-25).

Eventhough grammar in speaking is less firmer, some English Department lecturers require their students to speak with grammatically correct sentence. By this, students have to have a good grammatical control on their performance. This requirement may increase the monitor use in performance. As the result learners become more careful and think a lot to do correction. Unfortunately, spoken communication requires fast, spontaneous and understanding (Leech and Svartik, 2002:11) so learners never have enough time to think about grammar.

Furthermore, the different systems of Bahasa Indonesia and English enforce learner to spend more time to transfer. As the result an over monitor users run out of time to think about the grammatically correct sentence they want to speak (Krashen, 2002, 2009). By this, learners' performance will be full with pauses or even stutter. This may rise some negative feedbacks such as mockery and laughter that then can decrease learners' self-efficacy.

This study also shows some students judge their grammatical efficacy as high. In this case, the characteristics of spoken communication that is understandability takes part. In spoken communication, grammar is more flexible and is not always constantly applied such as in writing because it is based on the circumstance of spoken language taking place to ease the act of conveying meaning (Leech *et all.*, 2002:11). Whereas, grammar in participants' understanding is grammar in writing. The flexibility of grammar in speaking activity that is different from writing may be understood as the absence of grammar in speaking. This makes grammar seem not very important for learners. Thus, they do not care about grammar when they speak and concern on the meaning to get understandable speech. As the result, they do not spend a lot of time to think about grammar when they speak and it makes their speech fluent without too many pauses or stutters and understandable. This brings up the positive feedback such as applause, good mark and compliment from partner or audience that increase their self-efficacy. The "fluency" of learners' speech does not mean that their speech is all grammatically correct. The differences between Indonesia and English systems allow learners to make a lot grammatical errors in their speech, but the partner's low awareness of grammatical correction decreases negative feedback such as error correction.

2). Correlation between efficacy and performance

As stated in chapter one, the purpose of this study is to know whether there is a correlation between self-efficacy belief of speaking and speaking performance or not. This study uses Pearson's Correlation Coefficient Calculator that is applied in IBM SPSS Statistics 20 program.

The result of correlation coefficient is 0.437. It means that there is a positive correlation between self-efficacy belief of speaking and speaking performance. This finding supports the existence of the relationship between self-efficacy belief of speaking and speaking performance proposed by Bandura (1977). However, this correlation falls between the range of r=0 to +/- 0.5 that is regarded as weak correlation (Higgins, 2005; Mackey and Gass, 2005). Furthermore, Asaad (2008:153) explains that the correlation coefficient between 0.31 – 0.50 is considered as moderate low. It means that there is a correlation but it is not very strong. By this result it could be known that one variable (self-efficacy) increases when another variable (speaking score) increases such as what happens to students 86 and 76. But it also shows that one variable (self-efficacy) decreases when another (speaking score) increases such as found in students 63, 66, 90, and so on.

3). Sources of Self-Efficacy

According to Bandura (1977), people's belief of self-efficacy can be developed by four main sources of influence. They are performance accomplishment, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional states. The results of source of efficacy questionnaire are discussed below:

a). Performance Accomplishment

Performance accomplishment is believed as the most influential source to build self-efficacy belief and perception (Bandura, 1977:195). He further explains that success on doing a given task, in this case is speaking, increases people's self-efficacy belief. As it happens to student 3, 43, 53, 75 and 86. From those 5 students, three of them answer the question 1a of QW2, that deals with learner's failure experience, lesser in frequency than answering the question 1b of QW2, that deals with learners' success. It suggests that they have much experience of success rather than failure. This lets them to construct high expectation on success in doing the given task that is shown by their answer in responding question 3a in QW2 "which experience, success or failure, that takes your mind a lot?". As the result, they have a high self-efficacy. Two students have success and failure in the same frequency who then build high expectation of success. This is caused by effect of

failure and success on personal efficacy which partly depends on the time of occurrences (Bandura, 1997). For instance, those three students have the same frequency of success and failure, but the latest experience they have before observed is success. It increases their success expectation.

On the contrary, failure, according to Bandura (1977), will decrease someone's self-efficacy. It happens to 11 students who have high expectation on failure such as: failure in pronouncing English words (student 10, 16, 91 and 93), failure in using vocabulary and diction (student 38, 73, 84, 87, and 94), failure in applying grammar (student 10, 16 and 93), and having some nervousness that increase their state of being blank (student 39, 41, 42, 45, 51 and 72). These lead participants to have low self-efficacy beliefs. From those 11 students, 9 students have more experiences on failure rather than success that make them built a strong expectation of failure. Two students have success and failure in the same frequency who then build high expectation of failure. This is caused by effect of failure on personal efficacy which partly depends on the time of occurrences (cf. Bandura, 1997). For instance, those two students have the same frequency of success and failure, but the latest experience they have before observed is failure. It increases their failure expectation.

In a few cases of the participants in this study, there are 6 participants who have high self-efficacy belief but their expectations are on failure. This condition is contrary to what Bandura (1977, 1994) explains about mastery experience as source of efficacy. However, the result of source of efficacy questionnaire shows that most of the students' response to the failure serves as a hint to motivate themselves in increasing their performance. The same case also happens to 4 participants who have high expectation on success, but their self-efficacy is low. This may happen because learners may feel their self-efficacy is high as the result of their (presumably) recent success on their performance. Unfortunately, performance accomplishment is not the sole source to build someone's self-efficacy. However it is considered to be the most influential source (Bandura, 1977).

b). Vicarious Experiences

Vicarious experience is believed to be the most influential source of efficacy after performance accomplishment. It deals with the learners' perception toward social model's performance accomplishment. According to Bandura (1977), observing social model's success will increase learner's efficacy, while observing model's failure will decrease it. In assembling participants' opinion and response to their vicarious experience, the participants are asked to explain what is going on in their mind when they see their friend's (the models') success and failure. The result of these questions shows that there are only 8 students whose responses are similar with Bandura's theory about vicarious experience. When they are faced with friend's success achievement, they say that they have enthusiasm because they also believe in their success. It means that they believe in being success with their good ability. While, in responding to friend's failing achievement, they say that they are afraid of making mistake as such. It means that their fear of making mistake is the mirror of their lowly perceived self-efficacy.

As a result, in some cases, students' positive vicarious experience (model's success) let them to believe that they will also achieve success, but the negative vicarious experience seems not to bring any effect toward efficacy. It happens to 31 participants who admit that they have enthusiasm because they also can achieve the success. Meanwhile they still believe that they can do the given task better from their friends. It means that their self-efficacy remains high even though they have seen their friend's failure. This shows that friend's failure has no impact on the 31 students' self-efficacy belief. This case may happen because of the lack of clarity of the similarity of model and learner performance. According to Bandura (1994:2) the impact of modeling on perceiving self-efficacy belief is strongly influenced by perceived similarity to the model. Furthermore, he explains that the more assumed similarity, the more persuasive are the models of success and failure. In the case of the 31 students above, the assumed similarity of the model may be low so their efficacy is not strongly influenced.

This view also happens to 16 students who have conversed effect of vicarious experience. They feel inferior when they see their friend's success. The inferiority in their mind indicates low self-efficacy belief that they perceived. While, on the other side, they still believe that they can do the given task better

from their friends. In this case, learner's self-confidence may take part. Learners have high self-efficacy belief and want to prove it by comparing with the model they choose. When they find model's performance is better than theirs, their self-efficacy become low, whereas when they find model's performance is worse, they feel that their ability is much better than the model.

The last case that is found in this research that relates to vicarious experience is the negative response that learners give both in model's success and failure. This case happens to 23 participants who feel inferior if they see model's success; feeling inferior because the other friend is smarter and afraid to get the same failure when they saw model's failure (student 48, 80, 27, 19, 55, 9, 83, 90, 38, 51). The other answer that has similarity to that answer is found in student 10, 50, 41, 57, 77, 22, 26, 15, 56, 21, 93, 87, and 91. This happens because the assumed similarity of model for themselves is low. Or even, they have a problem with self confidence, optimism and low spirit that let them believe their ability is under-rated.

From the open ended questionnaire it can be found that dominantly highly-efficacious students respond both friends' success and failure with positive responses (student 75, 43, 54, 53, 79, 62, 72, 86 and 11). One highly-efficacious student (student 45) feels inferior when she sees friend's success and feels enthusiasm when she sees friends' failure. One highly-efficacious student (student 57) responds both friends' success and failure with negative responses. She feels inferior when she saw friends' success and feel afraid when she saw friends' failure. And there is not any student whose response agrees Bandura's (1977, 1984) theory.

On the contrary, dominantly low-efficacious students response both friends' success and failure with negative response (student 10, 41, 51, 58, 93, 87, and 91). Two low-efficacious students respond friends' success and failure positively (student 16 and 50) and only one student (student 35) responds as Bandura's (1977, 1994) theory, while there are 4 students whose answers are contrary to Bandura's (1977, 1994) theory (student 94, 39, 42, and 28).

c). Social Persuasions

The third source of efficacy is social persuasion or mostly in the form of verbal persuasion. This kind of self-efficacy source works by giving suggestion to the learners that they can successfully do the given task (Bandura, 1994:2). Bandura further explains that people who are socially persuaded that they can do or possess capability to master difficult situation; they will have strong sense of efficacy. While people who are persuaded that they cannot do or have no capability in doing task, they will quickly give up and perceive low self-efficacy. This study presents two social persuasions namely support, and mockery that are believed as verbal persuasion that usually learners have. The discussion of each social persuasions is spared in the next paragraphs.

Support is one of social persuasions that learners usually get. It usually comes from the closest people they have such as parents, friend, relation and teacher. It belongs to positive social persuasion. The question of support is used to know learners' responses to the support and to know its effect on learners' self-efficacy belief. The results of the questionnaire show that most participants in this study get some supports from their parents, friend, relation and teacher. The supports are verbal persuasions such as "Yes, You can do it" (student 39, 58, and 51), "Your English is good" (student 12, 33, 37 and 66); suggestion such as "Do not give up" (student 91), "Keep spirit, You can do that" (student 51); material aid such as book and money (student 54 and 64); and action such as invitation to practice English together (student 93, 84. 82, 7). Of all these supports, verbal persuasion is the most effective way to increase learners' self-efficacy belief. It is proven by participants' responses toward verbal persuasion that they become more enthusiastic to do the given task and believe that they are able to do it. It suggests that their self-efficacy belief increases after having positive verbal persuasion. However, there is only one student who does not feel anything when he receives positive verbal persuasion.

On the contrary, there is mockery. Mockery is one of verbal persuasions that gives negative impact on participants' self efficacy. It is predicted to be a source of self-efficacy that reduces participants' self-efficacy belief. Unfortunately, the result proposes that most participants do not have any experience on getting mockery. The result of the questionnaire shows that only 35 participants have experience on getting mockery. The frequency of mockery

they have varies from frequent (always) to seldom, while others never receive any. But the effect of mockery participants get is based on their response to it. Some participants respond the mockery by negative impact such as feeling bad, feeling fool and feeling upset. It happens to 7 participants in this study (student 4, 9, 15, 21, 55 and 91). While some others respond to it positively (1, 18, 23, 24, 27, 82, 20, 81, 12, 28, and 39). 14 participants respond neutral responses (student 3, 6, 29, 43, 61, 65, 22, 89, 26, 85, 31, 84, 94, and 51). It seems, then, that mockery does not give any effect on learner's self-efficacy as happens to 14 participants. However, there is no warranty that participants answer honestly because to admit something bad happening in one's self is difficult. In conclusion, in this study, participant's self-efficacy belief is not heavily influenced by negative verbal persuasion because most participants do not have any experience in getting mockery particularly in the classroom.

d). Emotional States

Emotional states or emotional arousals are another source of efficacy that affect perceived self-efficacy toward situation (Bandura, 1977). It deals with how people perceive their efficacy based on situation they face. According to Bandura (1994:3) "people interpret their stress reactions and tension as a sign of vulnerability of poor performance". It means that people who interpret stress such as nervousness and fear show that their ability to perform a good performance is bad. Bandura (1994) further explains that people who have high level of self-efficacy belief likely to view their state of emotional arousal as energizing facilitator of performance, while those who are beset by self-doubts perceive the emotional state as a deliberator. This study presents anxiety, fear, personality, and relax situation to assemble the influence of emotional state toward self-efficacy. To describe how self-efficacy is influenced by stressful situation, this study focuses on anxiety and fear.

The results of the questionnaire inform that most highly self-efficacious participants have less anxiety and fear rather than optimism and relax feeling. Anxiety is one of influencing emotional arousals that can decrease learners' self-efficacy. This is proven by learners' failure that is dominantly caused by anxiety and

nervousness. The result suggests that the stronger anxiety learners have the lower self-efficacy they perceive, as it happens to all low-efficacious participants (student 16, 38, 72, 84, 94, 10, 41, 51, 93, 39, 42, 87, 91, 45, and 73) who have more anxiety and fear rather than optimism. Most learners' anxiety appears inside the classroom. And most of them are caused by the fear of making mistake as the results of their presumably poor ability on grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation (see Bandura 1977:199). This proves that learners' high anxiety will lower their perception of self-efficacy. However there are some highly-efficacious students (student 48, 74, and 75) who have high frequency of anxiety and fear but they still belief that their self-efficacy is good. It is based on the response of each participant toward emotional arousal that is different to each other (see Bandura, 1994). In this research, all highly-efficacious students in this study also have anxiety and fear that appear in their mind, but they view the emotional arousal as the energizing facilitator to improve their self-efficacy. It indicates the existence of optimism that leads them to have positive control over their emotional arousal.

4. Conclusion

This study suggests that students' self-efficacy of speaking is dominantly medium (65 participants), low (16 participants), and high (11 participants). From three aspect of language in speaking, self-efficacy of phonology have more influence in constructing high level of self-efficacy while self-efficacy of grammar and vocabulary have more influence in constructing their low self-efficacy belief in speaking. The lack vocabulary practice especially in speaking and learners' perspective of grammar that is exclusive into written English makes learners find some difficulties in recalling vocabulary knowledge and applying English grammar into spoken form. As the result it brings learner to unsatisfactory results and gives them bad feedbacks that then lead to the construction of low self-efficacy belief. This study also finds the weak positive correlation (r=0,437) between English speaking self-efficacy beliefs and English speaking performance that indicates inconsistent correlation between two variables. All in all, this study supports Bandura's (1977, 1994) hypothesis of four main sources of self-efficacy. However there are some differences in their

work. In performance accomplishment, failure that is predicted to bring negative effect is used as a hint to construct students' mood boaster to have a good self-efficacy by some participants. Besides, self-efficacy is also influenced by learner's friends' performance accomplishment. In this study, most highly self-efficacious students react both friend's success and failure positively as the result of strong optimism in themselves. While low self-efficacious students react both of friend's success and failure negatively as the existence high pessimism. Another sources of self-efficacy is verbal persuasion that deals with giving suggestion to the learners that they can successfully do the given task. This study reports that positive verbal persuasion can increase learners' self-efficacy while negative verbal persuasion does not always bring negative effect on self-efficacy. Emotional state is the last sources of self-efficacy. This study reports that negative emotional states do not always bring negative effect that can decrease learner's self-efficacy, while positive emotional states always bring positive effect that help learner to increase self-efficacy.

References

BOOK

Fakultas Sastra Universitas Jember. 2012. *Buku Pedoman Akademik 2012/2013.* Unpublished. Jember: Jember University Press.

Krashen, S. D. 2002. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* [internet edition] http://sdkrashen.com/content/books/sl_acquisition_and_learning.pdf. [May 30th, 2013 at 07.13 p.m.]

Krashen, S. D. 2009. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. [internet edition] http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf. [May 30th, 2013 at 07.16 p.m.]

Mackey, A. & Gass, Susan M. 2005. *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

JOURNALS

Azrein, M., Adnan, M., & Mohamad, S. 2011. Language Learning Strategy and Self-efficacy belief in Arabic Language Learning: A Malaysian Context. *AJTLHE*. Vol. 3(2): 48-59. ISSN : 1985-5826

Bandura, A. 1977. Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological review.* Vol. 84(2): 191-215. [retrieved from] http://www.ou.edu/cls/online/LSPS5133/pdfs/bandura.pdf. [September 12nd, 2013 at 8.00 p.m.]

Bandura, A. 1994. Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998)

Bandura, A. 1997. Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. Freeman: New York (212-258). Retrieved from: http://www.cgu.edu/include/CogFun.pdf. [November 19th, 2013 at 9.46 a.m].

Cubukcu, Feryal. 2008. A Study on the Correlation Between Self-efficacy and Foreign Language Learning Anxiety. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education Makaleler/Articles*. ISSN: 1304-9496. Vol. 4(1):148-158. [retrieved from]http://eku.comu.edu.tr/index/4/1/fcubukcu.pdf

Higgins, J. 2005. The Correlation Coefficient. [retrieved from] http://www.biddle.com/documents/bcg_comp_chapter2.pdf. at 14th December 2013 [February 16th, 2013 at 07.16 p.m.]

Nakata, T. 2006. Implementing optimal spaced learning for English vocabulary learning. *The JALT CALL Journal.* Vol. 2(2): 3-18. ISSN 1832-4215.

Rahimi, A. & Abedini, A. 2009. The Interface between EFL Learner Self-efficacy Concerning Listening Comprehension and Listening Proficiency : Novitas Royal, Research on Youth and Language. *Novitas-ROYAL*. Vol.: 3(1): 14-28.

Teo, A. & Hetthong, R. 2013. Does Writing Self-efficacy Correlate with and Predict Writing Performance?. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature.* Vol. 2(1):157-167. ISSN 2200-3592.

INTERNET

Burns, A. & Goh, C. C. M. 2012. *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach.* Jack C. Richard (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. [retrieved from] http://books.google.co.id/books?id=BUmyAAAAQBAJ&pg=PA139&dq=teaching+accuracy+in+speaking&hl=en&sa=X&ei=UmPsU7mfB4SE8gXIkYG4AQ&ved=0CB4Q6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=teaching%20accuracy%20in%20speaking&f=false. [on June 2014].

Khee, H. 2012. *Bahasa Indonesia Made Easy: Language Made Easy Series (Lmes).* [ebook online] http://books.google.co.id/books?id=WvAj2oq-. [last accessed on June 10th, 2014 at 11.42 p.m.].

Leech, G. & Svartik, J. 2012. *A communicative Grammar of English.* (Third Edition). New York: Routledge. [retrieved from] http://books.google.co.id/books?id=5NIWAgAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&dq=spoken+English+grammar+and+written+English+grammar&hl=en&sa=X&ei=3ifHU4HpJcyJuASZ64KADw&ved=0CE8Q6AEwBw#v=onepage&q=spoken%20English%20grammar%20and%20written%20English%20grammar&f=false. [on June 2014].

Takac, V. P. 2008. *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition.* North York: Multi Lingua Matters, Ltd. [retrieved from] http://books.google.co.id/books?id=PHqqd785IzYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=foreign+language+vocabulary+acquisiton&hl=en&sa=X&ei=3qVwU_25B5Th8AXNhoC4Ag&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=foreign%20language%20vocabulary%20acquisiton&f=false. [on May 2014]