

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO LEARN ENGLISH AND SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AT SMKN 1 NGASEM KEDIRI

Rikha Niswatul Auliya¹, Agus Edi Winarto², Ary Setya Budhi Ningrum³

¹ IAIN Kediri

¹ auliyarikhaniswatul@gmail.com, ² gusedi@iainkediri.ac.id, ³ ary_oyesip@yahoo.com

Abstract

Motivation is crucial in the learning process. Motivation is also support and satisfaction in the serious attempt to reach the goal. The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there is a significant relationship between students' motivation to learn to English and their speaking achievement at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri. The researcher selected 67 participants as a sample from a total population of 702 students. SPSS version 26.0 was used to analyse the data. The tool was a questionnaire with 26 items and one question in a speaking assessment. The researcher used descriptive statistics and Kendall's Tau calculation to analyse the data. According to the research findings, students' motivation to learn to English was classified as extremely poor (value = 0,193). The value result revealed that the probability level was 0,024. It is possible to claim that 0,024 < 0,05 indicated that H₀ was rejected and H_a was accepted. Thus, in SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri, there is a very low significant correlation between students' motivation to learn English and speaking achievement. As a consequence of various variables, such as a lack of sample to the population, students' potential or naturally intelligent, and many intelligence characteristics to speak English effectively, the outcome is a very low correlation.

Keywords: Correlation, Learning, Motivation, Speaking, Achievement

INTRODUCTION

Aside from writing, listening, and reading, one of the language abilities is speaking. Speaking is a fundamental ability that humans have been learning since they were children. According to Qasim (2021), one of the most important language skills that most language learners want to acquire as soon as possible is speaking. It can be shown from people's experiences that everyone is always taught to talk when they are children by listening to the speakers. According to Leong and Ahmadi (2017), humans are born with the ability to communicate before learning to read and write. According to Leong and Ahmadi (2017), humans spend significantly more time speaking verbally with language than they do using it in its written form at any given time. The essential topic of this study is English for senior or vocational high school students. Senior high school English is more important than the preceding level. Students in senior high school are typically emotional, which means they need interact directly their feelings, opinions, and so on. Senior high students should be able to express themselves or dispute in order to meet their competency goals while altering their level. It may be inferred that senior high students' core and fundamental competency are suited to their objectives as well as age-related features. However, many learners fail to meet the teachers' expectations of competency. It is caused by a variety of reasons, which may be classified as either internal or external. Learning motivation is the total of the intern and extern elements. According to Gustari (2019), motivation is essential in the learning process for students to achieve their objectives. Learning motivation may help students reach their goals. According to Purnama et al. (2019), motivation is the key to success in the learning process. Purnama et al. (2019)) also said that motivation is a

combination of effort and desire that offers the reasons for people's behaviours, desires, and needs in order to attain the goal of learning towards an objective. Based on the previously described general concerns, the researchers needed to know whether students' motivation to learn to English corresponds with their speaking achievement. The researchers focused on vocational high school students as research participants and speaking as the ability that was connected with students' willingness to acquire English in this study. As a result, the researchers carried out a study entitled "The Correlation Between Students' Motivation to Learn English and Speaking Achievement at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri." Brown (2001) defines motivation as the degree to which you decide which goals to pursue and how much effort you will put into that pursuit. It signifies that if a person takes a decision to accomplish anything, he or she should work hard to get what that person has chosen. Motivation is described as the quality of hard work required to achieve goals. According to Gredler, Broussard, and Garrions, motivation is defined broadly as "the quality that pushes us to do or not do something." Motivation has four functions, according to Sadirman (cited by Monika, 2021). The first step is to persuade others to do something. The second step is to select how to proceed. The third step is to choose an effort that specifies what effort is required to achieve the goal by eliminating activities that are ineffective for this aim. The final is for business motivation and performance. Motivation is essential in the teaching learning process, particularly in English learning, because many language learners continue to struggle with it. Both internal and external motivation are essential in the teaching-learning process. In addition, Fatimah et al. (2019), said that motivation is one of the essential elements that make learners interested in speaking English since motivation is the most crucial component effecting English learning.

Dörnyei (2013), on the other hand, proposed a hypothesis that divided motivation into two categories. They are intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

1. Intrinsic Motivation

According to Deci and Ryan (cited by Dörnyei, 1994), intrinsic motivation occurs when students' innate interest and excitement invigorate their studies. Maulana et al. (2019), define intrinsic motivation as the desire to participate in tasks that are exciting and rewarding.

2. Extrinsic Motivation

External motivation, according to Dwinalida & Setiaji (2022), is motivation that comes from outside of the learners. This suggests that extrinsic drive arises as a result of external influence. Because they are on purpose, the learners will remain to deal with the learning challenge. According to Maulana et al. (2019), extrinsic motivation is the desire to execute something for the purpose of a certain objective consequence.

Speaking is an active linguistic activity that allows people to orally convey their ideas or thoughts, according to Maryanti and Syarif (2018). Thus, speaking is an activity in which two or more individuals exchange messages or information. Speaking is an oral talent that is both productive and valuable, according to Bailey & Nunan (2019). Speaking may also be defined as a method for people to develop words in order to convey their views with one another. Speaking is a talent that also has a social component. According to Hughes & Reed (2017), this capacity is referred to as "communicative" or "interactional" competence. This indicates that developing this ability is necessary not simply to achieve the learning goal of speaking smoothly, but also for the speaker to understand the messages contained within it. According to Dwinalida & Setiaji (2022), accomplishment is the final success of attaining goals. Haryono (2015) also said that learning accomplishment includes behavioural changes such as cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning. Finally, speaking achievement is the fruitfulness of learners to learn speaking that they have decided by score, behaviour, or other means.

METHOD

The researchers employed quantitative research methods and a correlational study as their research design. The independent variable was students' motivation, while the dependent variable was speaking achievement. The population is 702 students, and the sample is 67 students. To construct the study instrument, the researchers adopted Jones theory in the questionnaire blueprint which was acquired from Maulana et.al (2019) and the speaking scale rating from David P. Harris (1969). SPSS was used to examine the validity of the instruments, and researchers requested an English instructor to assess students' speaking skills as a second rater beside the researchers to ensure that the score was not subjective. Meanwhile, SPSS assessed its reliability using Cronbach's Alpha and Kappa (inter-rater reliability). Because the data was not normally distributed, the researcher applied Kendall's Tau method to analyse it. As a result, the data was organised ordinal by ordinal.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

a. Students' Motivation to Learn English

The researchers collected data by distributing questionnaires including both positive and negative statements. Favorable denoted a positive orientation, whereas unfavourable denoted the inverse. Each statement received a maximum score of 5 points. The table below shows the students' motivation score:

Table 1. The Score of Students' Motivation (Variable x)

No	Name	Score	No	Name	Score
1	CFS	81	35	MYNM	123
2	AFB	90	36	MSR	79
3	APS	116	37	MRR	82
4	AP	72	38	MVAZ	99
5	ASA	80	39	NNR	91
6	ABEP	72	40	NMU	107
7	APH	82	41	NA	85
8	AVM	108	42	NA	109
9	AMAV	86	43	NSS	102
10	ASD	88	44	NCR	115
11	AA	86	45	OS	96
12	AS	90	46	PDH	89
13	ADQ	80	47	PNP	94
14	API	91	48	PAS	103
15	ARP	95	49	PPA	103
16	AWRA	97	50	RHR	87
17	ADF	100	51	RPF	95
18	AACS	75	52	RJ	106
19	BRA	108	53	RW	97
20	BAM	94	54	RQ	90
21	BSA	78	55	RYS	82
22	CCT	96	56	RBP	96
23	DSY	80	57	RGP	72

24	DSP	88	58	RMNW	92
25	DS	82	59	SBI	77
26	DPS	77	60	SEP	106
27	DCPA	83	61	SA	86
28	DAE	118	62	SMN	81
29	DP	86	63	SWP	109
30	DEAP	92	64	SA	87
31	DBA	91	65	TF	97
32	DK	77	66	VO	81
33	DVN	112	67	WAH	97
34	EL	95		n=67	Σx=6161

The researchers employed the Widoyoko technique (cited by Lismayana, 2019) to categorise the amount of motivation and discovered that scores of 30-60 (low), 61-90 (mid), and 91-120 (high) were appropriate (high). There were no students with poor motivation to study English based on the students' motivation category since the minimal motivation score was 72. Then there were 33 students with a medium level and 34 students with a strong desire to learn English.

Table 2. The Statistic Descriptive of Variable x

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Motivation Score	67	72	123	6161	91.96	12.055	145.316
Valid N (listwise)	67						

According to the descriptive statistics table above, there were 67 scores of student motivation in the data, with the minimum and maximum scores being 72 and 123, respectively. The total number of the students with motivation scores from 67 respondents was 6161, with a mean score of 91,96. The descriptive data also included the standard deviation and variance score, which were 12,055 and 145,316, respectively.

b. Students' Speaking Skill

The data was collected by the researchers using an oral test in which each student told the legend narrative for five minutes. Students were given time to prepare before taking the test. The average score from two raters, the researchers and the English teacher, was used to calculate the speaking test score. The table below shows the students' motivation score:

Table 3. The Score of Students' Speaking Achievement (Variable y)

No	Name	Score	No	Name	Score
1	CFS	36	35	MYNM	46
2	AFB	58	36	MSR	50
3	APS	92	37	MRR	42
4	AP	42	38	MVAZ	94
5	ASA	60	39	NNR	80
6	ABEP	54	40	NMU	48

7	APH	68	41	NA	46
8	AVM	82	42	NA	98
9	AMAV	74	43	NSS	50
10	ASD	62	44	NCR	58
11	AA	60	45	OS	88
12	AS	62	46	PDH	84
13	ADQ	46	47	PNP	96
14	API	66	48	PAS	64
15	ARP	92	49	PPA	46
16	AWRA	100	50	RHR	58
17	ADF	88	51	RPF	58
18	AACS	90	52	RJ	50
19	BRA	90	53	RW	82
20	BAM	72	54	RQ	70
21	BSA	60	55	RYS	52
22	CCT	96	56	RBP	62
23	DSY	48	57	RGP	84
24	DSP	80	58	RMNW	46
25	DS	56	59	SBI	96
26	DPS	40	60	SEP	56
27	DCPA	62	61	SA	68
28	DAE	90	62	SMN	60
29	DP	82	63	SWP	72
30	DEAP	64	64	SA	62
31	DBA	46	65	TF	82
32	DK	66	66	VO	76
33	DVN	42	67	WAH	88
34	EL	72		n=67	Σy=4510

To determine the category of students' speaking ability, the researcher calculated the average score and compared it to the students' speaking scores shown above.

Table 4. The Statistic Descriptive of Variable y

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Speaking Score	67	36	100	4510	67.31	17.662	311.946
Valid N (listwise)	67						

According to the descriptive statistics table above, there were 67 scores of students' speaking ability in the data, with the least and highest scores being 36 and 100, respectively. The researchers manually counted the number of students' speaking scores from 67 respondents, and the mean score was 67,31. The descriptive data also included the standard deviation and variance score, which were 17,662 and 311,946 respectively. Furthermore, children with speaking scores less than 67 were classified as having a poor score. Meanwhile, if the scores

exceeded 67, it was classified as a high score. According to the data collected on students' speaking scores, 37 students had poor scores and 30 students had great scores in the speaking English test.

c. Hypothesis Testing

The researchers calculated the coefficient correlation score and used SPSS Kendall's Tau to evaluate the hypothesis. The outcome is shown in the table below:

Table 5. The Correlation of Students' Motivation and Speaking Achievement

		Correlations		
			Students' Motivation	Speaking Achievement
Kendall's tau_b	Students' Motivation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.193*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.024
		N	67	67
	Speaking Achievement	Correlation Coefficient	.193*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.
		N	67	67

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The coefficient correlation score was calculated using the SPSS measurement table above, and it was 0.193. This was the manual measurement adjustment. It meant that the researcher's manual measurement was not wrong. Then two variables were categorise as extremely low level. In addition, the researcher would look into whatever theory was approved. The researcher utilised a probability value comparison. The researcher compared sig. 2-tailed with a degree of freedom of 5% (0,05) as shown in the data analysis section. The outcome was 0.024 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. As a result, there was a very poor correlation between students' motivation to learn to English and their achievement in speaking at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri.

Discussion

As previously stated, the goal of the study was to determine whether or not there was a relationship between students' motivation to learn English and speaking achievement at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri. Based on the data analysis, the researcher obtained a correlation coefficient score of 0.193. The category of connection between students' motivation and speaking achievement was relatively low, as 0.193 was in the range of 0,00 - 0,199. This finding was valid because the correlational investigation should not have produced a high level coefficient correlation. This study's findings were consistent with those of Maulana et al. (2019), who discovered a weak correlation between variables. Furthermore, after discovering the amount of correlation between students' motivation and speaking achievement, the researcher tested the hypothesis with Kendall's Tau. The researcher discovered the probability value of 0.024. This 2-tailed sig. value was less than 0.05 It means that at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri, there was a significant correlation between students' motivation to learn to English and their speaking achievement. As a consequence of the extremely low significant correlation, the researcher investigated further to discover more about some other aspects that influenced the students' ability to learn to speak English. It might be discovered by comparing it to other studies that

produced disparate results. First, the researcher claimed that the sample size influences the research findings. According to Kumar (2011), the correctness of your findings is strongly reliant on how you select your sample. According to Kerlinger & Lee (2000), the researchers normally require a sample size of at least 30 individuals. This was in agreement with Yulanda (2019), who had 35 samples (>30), and the research outcome showed a significant correlation. Meanwhile, Melawati (2021), who had just 21 samples (30), found no significant correlation in her study. It indicates that the greater the sample size employed by the researcher, the more accurate the study result. In contrast, this study had a suitable sample size of 67 (>30), and the results showed a very low significant connection. It might be deduced that 30 samples were not always the bare minimum in influencing study results. The researcher summarised in table 6 for ease of understanding. The researchers then used Arikunto's sampling theory, which said that if the study topic was less than 100 persons, the researcher was advised to take it all. If there were more than 100 persons, the researcher may take 10-15%, 20-25%, or more from the population. The researcher attempted to utilise 20% as a general rule, and if it was used in the sample strategy of some other correlational research, as shown in the table below:

Table 6. The Sample Comparison

The Research	The Sample	The Population	General Benchmark ≥ 30	Arikunto's Sampling Technique (based on population) $< 100 = \text{take it all}$ $> 100 = 20\%$	The Research Result
This Research	67	702	$67 > 30$	20% of 702 is 140 $67 < 140$	Very Low Correlation
Melawati (2021)	21	103	$21 < 30$	20% of 103 is 21 $21 = 21$	No Correlation
Yulanda (2019)	35	244	$35 > 30$	20% of 244 is 49 $35 < 49$	Significant Correlation

According to the table above, Melawati (2021) appropriately used Arikunto's sampling approach, but this study should have 140 samples and Yulanda (2019) should collect 49 samples. The findings of the studies varied. As a consequence, the researcher concluded that various population totals and sampling techniques used in the research would provide different results, as Widayanti et al. (2020) stated that the outcome may differ because the sample of respondents changes. Second, the researcher opined that intelligence played a role in the outcome. The shortage of sample could not be totally agreed upon as the cause of the very low significant correlation between the variables. According to table 6, Yulanda (2019) took 35 as the sample and it was less than 49 based on Arikunto's percentage standard, which was 20%, indicating that there was a significant correlation between the variables. As a result, the researchers believed that students' intellect influenced the study's conclusion that there was no correlation between motivation and accomplishment in speaking English. According to the total number of students, 33 were inspired on a medium level and 34 on a high level. However, when compared to the speaking score, only 30 students had a good score and 37 had a low score. That

comparison has nothing to do with the motivation score. Because half of all respondents were extremely driven, the result of speaking achievement should be the same. Although Deci and Ryan (cited by Dörnyei, 1994) said that when students' inner interest and excitement invigorate their study, they demonstrate intrinsic motivation, the results of this study show that motivation does not necessarily improve students' skillfulness in one subject. Following that, the students could be skilled or intelligent, so they did not require any intrinsic or extrinsic drive to speak English successfully. They could have been able to communicate in English.

Third, while discussing intelligence and its possible implications on students' skill and accomplishment, the researchers believe that students did not require desire to attain good results as a consequence of multiple intelligence. Students with multiple intelligences were able to tackle their learning challenges using their own potentials and intelligences. Students were motivated to learn to speak English, but their accomplishment was low since their intelligences did not include linguistic, intrapersonal, and interpersonal intelligences. They possessed other intelligences, for sure. It was consistent with students who had low motivation to learn English but achieved medium to high speaking achievement because they were able to solve their speaking problems such as lack of vocabulary, fear of making mistakes, and learning environment by combining those three intelligences; linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. Even if Brown's motivation concept (2001) was about how much work humans put in to acquire what they want, or Gardner's motivation concept (Gardner, 2010) was about supports and satisfaction in serious endeavour, achievement would not be obtained due to intelligence issues.

CONCLUSION

The researcher would want to complete this investigation after analysing the data and discussing the findings in the previous chapter. According to the study of hypothesis testing using Kendall's Tau method, the significance 2-tailed value is less than 5% (0,05) as well as 0,0204 0,05, indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. However, $r = 0,193$, indicating that the correlation between students' motivation and speaking achievement is classified as extremely poor. As a result, the researcher believes that at SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri, there is a very low significant correlation between students' motivation to learn English and speaking achievement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Alhamdulillah, the writers are grateful to Allah SWT for bestowing His favour on us, allowing us to finish this work in good health. The authors would like to express their heartfelt appreciation to the article supervisors who provided us with invaluable assistance over the course of this study. Thanks a lot for Mr. Suyoko Eko Budiono as an English teacher of SMKN 1 Ngasem Kediri also the second rater and all students of X DPIB 1, 2, 3 of SMKN 1 Ngasem in the year 2021/2022 that makes writers easier to obtain the data for this research. In addition, the authors would like to thank IKIP Siliwangi Bandung for providing us with the chance to publish this research. Also, thank you to the blind reviewer that evaluated this content for the editing staff, so that it can be published flawlessly.

REFERENCES

Bailey, K., & Nunan, D. (2019). *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking* (p. 104). McGraw-Hill.

- Brown, H. D. (2001). TEACHING by PRINCIPLES: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. In *Longman* (second).
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation Foreign Language Motivating in Classroom the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2013). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=2_OdBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Dwinalida, K., & Setiaji, S. (2022). Students' Motivation and English Learning Achievement in Senior High School Students. *English Education, Linguistics, and Literature (Educalitra) Journal*, 1(1), 1–9. <http://10.0.61.242/engtea.73.1.201803.135%0Ahttp://ezproxy.stir.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=129598345&site=ehost-live>
- Fatimah, W. O., Sale, F., & Sapan, Y. T. (2019). the Correlation Between Students' Motivation and Their Speaking Achievement At English Department of Halu Oleo University. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 3(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.36709/jte.v4i4.13972>
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation And Second Language Acquisition (The Socio-Educational Model)*. PETER LANG.
- Gustari, R. Y. (2019). The Correlation Between Students Motivation and Their Speaking Skill at MAN 2 Padang. *JIPS (Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic)*, 3(3), 52–57.
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language*. Mc.Grew-Hil. <https://archive.org/details/testingenglishas00harr/page/n3/mode/2up>
- Haryono. (2015). Learning Achievement Improvement Efforts Course Learn and Learning Using the Jigsaw Method and Card Media in STKIP PGRI Ngawi 2014/2015 Academic Year. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(30), 94–102. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1773226302?accountid=13963>
- Hughes, R., & Reed, B. S. (2017). Teaching and researching speaking: Third edition. In *Teaching and Researching Speaking: Third Edition* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692395>
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (C. Wada (ed.); Fourth). Harcourt College Publishers. https://archive.org/details/foundationsofbeh0000kerl_x7k9/page/n5/mode/2up?q=sample+size&view=theater
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners* (Third). SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd.
- Leong, L., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34–41.
- Lismayana. (2019). Hubungan Motivasi Belajar Dengan Prestasi Belajar Pada Peserta Didik Kelas Viii Di SMP Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung [UIN Raden Intan Lampung]. In *Repository Raden Intan*. <http://repository.radenintan.ac.id/6605/1/SKRIPSI LISMAYANA.pdf>
- Maryanti, U. D., & Syarif, H. (2018). The Effect of Numbered Heads Together Strategy Toward Students' Speaking Skill. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on English Language and Teaching*, 6(2015).
- Maulana, D., Wahyuni, W. S., & Siregar, D. (2019). The Correlation Between Motivation Behaviour and Speaking Ability. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(2), 115. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i2.p115-124>
- Melawati, R. (2021). *The Correlations of EFL Students' Public Speaking Anxiety, Self-Efficacy*

- And Achievement*. IAIN Palangka Raya.
- Monika, S. (2021). The Correlation Between Students' Motivation and Speaking Ability of The Eleventh Grade Students in SMK N 03 Kotabumi Academic Year 2020/2021. *Jurnal Griya Cendikia*, 6(2), 342–353.
- Purnama, N. A., Rahayu, N. S., & Yugafiati, R. (2019). Students' Motivation in Learning English. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(4), 539. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i4.p539-544>
- Qasim, A. Y. (2021). A Study of the Factors Affecting the Learning of English Speaking Skills. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*, 10(1), 193. <https://doi.org/10.25007/ajnu.v10n1a1078>
- Widayanti, A., Nafisah, D. A., Munawwaroh, A., Fadilah, N., & Islamiyah, M. (2020). The Correlation Between Students' Motivation and Their Speaking Ability. *International Conference on English Language Teaching (ICONELT 2019)*, 434(Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200427.031>
- Yulanda, O. (2019). *The Correlation Between Students' Motivation in Learning and Their English Achievement at The Second Grade of SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Terpadu Pekanbaru*. UIN Suska RIAU.