PJEE
Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics
https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english
Putra, Ikhsanudin & Bunau

CORRELATION BETWEEN VOCABULARY MASTERY AND FLUENCY IN SPEAKING AT UNIVERSITAS TANJUNGPURA

by

Diyas Herdian Putra
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, UNIVERSITAS TANJUNGPURA
violettavizeriuz@gmail.com

Ikhsanudin Ikhsanudin
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, UNIVERSITAS TANJUNGPURA
ikhsanudin@fkip.untan.ac.id

Eusabinus Bunau
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, UNIVERSITAS TANJUNGPURA
eusabinus.bunau@fkip.untan.ac.id

Received: December 3, 2020
Reviewed1: February 6, 2021
Accepted: April 5, 2021
Sent to reviewer: February 3, 2021
Reviewed2: April 4, 2021
Published: April 29, 2021

Abstract:

This research, entitled "Correlation Between Vocabulary Mastery and Fluency in Speaking" was carried out to the fifth semester students of English Education Study Program. The population of this research is fifth semester students of English Education Study Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty at Tanjungpura University with the sample size of 30. The result of data analysis revealed the correlational between both variable from the samples is showing the correlational coefficient (r) value of 0.19. This value showed vocabulary mastery has low correlation with fluency in speaking. The contribution of vocabulary mastery to fluency in speaking is 3.6% which is almost non-existent. The hypothesis was tested by comparing the r value with r table, with the degree of freedom (df = n-2) of 28 and 1% level of significance. The r value (0.19) is lower than r table (0.463). It means, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. With this research done, students should improve their speaking ability and remember more vocabularies to become a more and better speaker. The writer hopes this research may be beneficial to the readers and might resulting in newer research with different aspect and better concepts.

Key Words: correlation research, vocabulary mastery, speaking fluency.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a medium to communicate to the world, yet it is a thing that be learnt before anybody is able to use it. Morehouse (2017) stated that four skills of language (also known as the four skills of language learning) are a set of four capabilities that allow an

individual to comprehend and produce spoken language for proper and effective interpersonal communication. These skills are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The skills are not only to comprehend spoken language, but also the written language as well in any context. It is important for EFL learners to master these skills (Turmudi, 2017). In a previous similar research, Koizumi & In'nami (2013) found out that vocabulary knowledge (size, depth, and speed) explains the speaking proficiency of novice to intermediate students in Japan. The word 'explain' means that it 'reveals' students' speaking proficiency based on their own vocabulary knowledge, size, depth and speed, which making a better view on relation between vocabulary and speaking. Oya et al., (2009), in their research found out that vocabulary knowledge correlated with fluency, accuracy, complexity, and global impression aspect of speaking performance. In addition, language contact outside of school was also has positive impact on speaking performance. Other similar research, Ali (2010), vocabulary mastery affects the ability to comprehend text passages in books, and other written sources, which also indirectly improving and enriching knowledge by reading written sources. Another research conducted by Uzer (2017), suggested that mastering vocabulary has significant role to improve students speaking ability, based on the observation and research on SMAN 12 Palembang students' vocabulary mastery.

This research is focusing on vocabulary mastery and speaking fluency. Unlike the previous studies, vocabulary knowledge (size, depth, speed) was simplified to vocabulary mastery to measure the number of vocabularies known or mastered by an individual as the independent variable. For the speaking part, this research took speaking fluency specifically as the dependent variable for this research, concerning the writer's curiosity to English Education Study Program students' vocabulary mastery and speaking fluency. In short, this research is focusing on the non-specific and specific matters of language which are vocabulary mastery in general and fluency in speaking which is a specific term of speaking activity.

The objective of this research is to find out the correlation value between vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking of fifth semester students of English Education Study Program of Universitas Tanjungpura, while also finding out the contribution value of vocabulary mastery to fluency in speaking, respectively. In addition, the result of the research is expected to promote the linkage between the curriculum and materials of vocabulary building and teaching of speaking, as well as the importance of linkage to vocabulary class and speaking class, especially

to this department, Universitas Tanjungpura. Furthermore, it may also be important for material developers, whom specifically adept in speaking material to refer to vocabulary teaching so it would be possible for a strong collaboration to be conducted between lecturer whom teaching vocabulary and those teaching speaking, integrating the teaching of vocabulary and speaking.

EFL learners, by slowly indulging in words, will eventually ascend to the level where they will understand vocabulary, before practicing the four language skills intensely. There are some definitions regarding what vocabulary is. Vocabulary is a list of words for a particular language or a list or set of word that individual speakers of language might use (Hatch & Brown, 2000). In addition, vocabulary is a collection of words which acts as the most basic building blocks and understanding of sentences. In short, vocabulary can be defined as every saying or words understood, known, and used by particular person or group. Many EFL learners experienced difficulty in learning vocabulary. The single most problematic thing many learners found is the acquisition of vocabulary (Meara, 1980). Even though it is difficult, it is essential for learners to understand as many vocabularies as possible, as it plays a prominent role in mastering English (Faliyanti, 2015).

Lexical knowledge is vital to communicative competence and to second language acquisition (Schmitt, 2000). Which means, the more frequent a learner is exposed to vocabulary, the more they will be able to understand and interpret the meaning of words unknown to them more from context (Viera, 2017). In other word, it means vocabulary mastery. An individual said to 'know' a word if they are able to recognize its meaning immediately when they see it (Cameron, 2001). Therefore, vocabulary mastery is the number of understood vocabularies in an individual's mind and able to communicate and utilize those vocabularies with ease, such as in speaking activity.

Speaking is a process that deal with interactions, and contexts, yet socially that delivers a number of use (Martı´nez-Flor, 2006). Most experts agreed that speaking is an important skill in English and every language. As it presents the language before written language is invented. Some also believe that a speaker is good if they have numbers of words mastered in their mind. Speakers can be assumed as intelligible if they are able to identify many words accurately when listening to the other speakers (Kenworthy, 1987). There are some ways implemented to improve one's capability in communication.

The most challenging thing to improve communication skill is by speaking up in front of many audiences; for short, a presentation. Through presentations, students are able to enlarge the range and improvement of their communicative skill (vocabulary, grammar, speaking, etc.) (Agustina, 2019). Presentation also indirectly improves students' self-confidence, which also improve speaking ability to an extent. With this statement however, EFL learners usually afraid in starting a conversation in English. Afraid of making mistakes in English conversation is the problem the EFL learners ever had (Wang & Yang, 2013). Wang & Yang also added that 'awkwardness' hinders the progress in enhancing speaking skills for EFL learners, as the aim of speaking is able to speak correctly, accurately, and fluently.

There are some definitions of fluency in which defines what fluency really is. Speaking fluency should be more broadly defined as the learners' ability to produce a speech that is rapid and comprehensible (Brand & Götz, 2011; Crowther et al., 2015) in (Albino, 2017). The second, fluency concerns the learner's capacity to produce language in real time without undue pausing or hesitation (Skehan, 1996) in (Willis & Willis, 1996). Another definition, fluency is the ability to connect units of speech together with ease and without hindrance or inappropriate slowness or excess hesitation (Hedge, 1993). Lastly, fluency is the ability to speak spontaneously without having to stop and pause a lot, which can be done by habit (Kusumawardani & Mardiyani, 2018).

From these definitions, it can be safely assumed that fluency concerns to the ability to produce speech with ease, with almost no pause, hesitations and also comprehensible. Learners who already learned English and practice for extended period of time will at least speak faster and with tiny or even without any mistakes. However, to measure fluency, there are some factors to be included. "To assess "fluency," one would have to decide on its operationalization, for example, using performance features such as "pauses," "fillers," and "false starts" as indicators of this construct (Brown et al., 2005) in (Bøhn, 2015).

Upon all the definitions of the fluency mentioned, the fluency concerns to speech rate and accuracy. These two things are actually inseparable, or can be said they are not independent, in which many research regard them as different aspect of fluency measuring. Thus, this research is solely focusing on the "speech rate" part of speaking fluency as English is learned as a foreign language in Indonesia, which in this case is in Universitas Tanjungpura. The amount of fluency demanded in the campus is to be able to speak in normal manner with

decently comprehensible speech articulation. While this research is currently just focusing on the speech rate of the students instead with the accuracy, in which students may find it uncomfortable if stressed to speak accurately, especially by their peers and upperclassmen. One of the factors affecting speaking fluency learning progress is learning anxiety.

English learning anxiety is an individual characteristic which has an important role and of factors of element that hamper learning of foreign language especially in writing and speaking skills (Richards, 2008). Student when feeling anxious, may face several feelings, such as nervous, shy, worrying unnecessary things, fearing something may happen if they are unable to speak better (Fitriati & Jannah, 2016). It is as stated in previous paragraph, 'awkwardness' may hinder the progress of enhancing speaking ability due to students' anxiety. Students are sometimes feeling shy and uneasy to speak English outside class and afraid of being mocked or corrected by their peers (Pakpahan et al., 2017). It may plummet students' confidence and even their motivation in learning English.

Yet, motivation itself differs from a person to person, rendering it as the drive of the students. Motivation in learning English comes from many aspects, such as being praised by others, self-eagerness to learn, looking up to someone with better knowledge, etc. (Maulana et al., 2020). By being afraid of making mistakes, of being corrected, or else as stated before, may once again plummet or lower their learning motivation. Which is why most students especially for EFL students tend to be reluctant to speak in English unless they are in class, rendering speaking ability to be improved only in formal setting. However, these are just another factor, considering there are many kinds of students with their own level of confidence and motivation. How vocabulary affect the outcome of speaking performance can be explained with proper testing of those students.

As mentioned before, the objective of this study is to find out whether there is any correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking fluency of fifth semester students of English Education Study Program at Universitas Tanjungpura. Therefore, there are two research problems formulated for this research:

1. Is there any correlation between vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking of fifth semester students of English Education Study Program of Tanjungpura University?

2. What is the size of the correlation between vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking of fifth semester students of English Education Study Program of Tanjungpura University?

METHODOLOGY

Design

This research used correlational research as its design, with explanatory research as the design. A correlation is a statistical test to figure out the likelihood or figures for two (or more) variables or two sets of data to consistently diverse (Creswell, 2014).

The characteristics of explanatory correlational study, as described by Creswell (2014) are: (1) Correlate two variables or more, (2) Collect data at once, not more than one session, (3) Analyze every participant as a single and undivided group, (4) Obtain at least two scores for each participant in the group, (5) Report the use of the correlational statistical test (or an extension of it) in the data analysis, (6) Interpret or draw conclusions from the statistical test results.

As it is a correlation research, hypothesis testing is used to determine the end result of this research. There are 2 hypotheses: (1) Null Hypothesis (Ho), or no correlation between variables, (2) Alternative Hypothesis (Ha), or correlation exist between variables.

Variables

This study employs two variables: independent and dependent variables. The independent variable as x variable is vocabulary mastery or called predictor, whereas the dependent variable as y variable is speaking fluency.

Participant

The participants of this research were English Education Study Program students of Tanjungpura University in their fifth semester, academic year of 2019/2020. They were chosen as participants as they have taken speaking classes in earlier semesters and can be considered competent in speaking and vocabulary collection after all the study.

Second, as they are studying to become English teachers in the future, they will be aware of who they are and trying to be a role model for every individual around by enhancing

their English abilities, thus, making them capable and confident in English to fulfill the goal of becoming an English teacher. The total population was tested entirely with the end result of 30 sample size by using convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling (also known as Haphazard Sampling or Accidental Sampling) is a type of nonprobability or nonrandom sampling where members of the target population that meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate are included for the purpose of the study (Dörnyei, 2007), as cited in (Etikan, 2016).

Instrument and data source

Instrument is needed in order to support the progress this study. In this study the first instrument is vocabulary test and the second is speaking fluency test. They are under the frame work of expert (Cresswell & Cresswell, 2017). Three pages of vocabulary tests were used to collect vocabulary mastery of research samples. The test adopted the concept proposed by Hughes (2003), which is," recognizing appropriate words for context". The questions were made by the research her with some references to give the writer ideas for the questions. There were forty-two in which each seven questions represents one of the six types of vocabulary testing by Hughes, in multiple choices form of tests. However, from the reliability test conducted by the writer, the number of questions were reduced by 12, due to the difficulty, and ability to discriminate of each of the test items. In short, there are thirty multiple choices questions used in the test.

The speaking fluency was taken and recorded by audio recording. It is a device or gadget to record and replay sounds. This smartphone was chosen as the device that acts as audio recording for this research. It was also used in the process of speaking test which will act as data and proof of the research. The audio recording will be a monologue of each research sample with hobby as the theme, with the length of about 3 to 5 minutes each.

The topic of this research, the type of data collected were quantitative, while the source of data was the performance score of vocabulary mastery and speaking fluency of fifth semester students of English Education Study Program of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak. The location of data collection was at one of the classrooms at Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak.

Data Collecting Technique

In collecting data for research, the choice in technique usage is important in a way. In this research, the writer used test. A test is a measuring device intended to describe numerically the degree or amount of learning under uniform, standardized conditions. In educational testing, most tests contain a single item or set of test items intended to measure a domain of knowledge or skills or a cognitive ability (Haladyna, 2004). The test was used to measure the vocabulary mastery, which is one of the variables of this research, and was traditionally carried out in a classroom.

1. The writer gathers the participants in a classroom
2. Writer handed out the test sheets to participants.
3. The participants read the instructions written on the first page of the test sheets.
4. Participants started answering the questions which are 30 multiple choice questions in 45 minutes.
5. Participants who finished answering, submitted the test sheets back to the writer and may leave the classroom earlier.

For the speaking fluency test, the writer asked for permission and assistance from professional individual who is an experienced teacher to measure the speaking fluency of the research samples. The measurement was carried out by experienced teacher.

1. The writer asked the participants to record a monologue with the theme of hobby with the length of about 3 to 5 minutes as the speaking fluency test data.
2. After collecting the recordings from all participants, the writer compiled the recordings, to be measured by the experienced teacher
3. The writer asked for permission from the experienced teacher to measure samples' speaking fluency.
4. The writer provided the recordings, list of participants and scoring criterion to the experienced teacher.
5. The teacher measured the samples' speaking fluency with provided necessities
6. The teacher finished the measuring and gave the result to the writer

Data Analysis Technique

In analyzing the data, Pearson Product Moment is used by the writer, following the formula provided by Syofian Siregar (2013) to measure the correlational value between vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking. In measuring, zero value indicates no correlation between variables while if correlation coefficient (r) shows the score of 1 (or negative 1), it indicates a perfect correlation.

$$r = \frac{n(\Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X.\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[n\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2][n\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

r = Correlation Coefficient
$\sum X$ = Sum of score in independent variable
$\sum Y$ = Sum of score in dependent variable
$\sum XY$ = Sum of each X independent variable times each Y independent variables.
$\sum X^2$ = Sum of squared score of independent variable
$\sum Y^2$ = Sum of squared score of dependent variable
n = Total samples

In addition, the writer also used Coefficient of Determination formula to figure out the contribution value of independent variable to dependent variable of this research, which are vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking, respectively. The result will be considered as internal contribution, which also means the independent variable has its contribution in percentage strength while the rest is external contribution.

Further, the data presentation in the findings use MS Word and the whole process of citation Mendeley-Desktop under the frame work of "offline automatic system by using **Mendeley desktop"** (Turmudi, 2020, p. 60) while the statistical testing uses **MS excel** (Microsoft, 2016)**.**

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

After processing data gathered from the tests to the research samples, it was later found out that there was a positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and fluency in speaking of the fifth semester students. The details will be shown by following the first research question

(is there any correlation between the variables) and the second research question (the size of the correlation between the variables) respectively.

Table 1. Help Table

No	Sample	X	Y	X^2	Y^2	XY	No	Sample	X	Y	X^2	Y^2	XY
1	FS-01	43	90	1878	8100	3900	16	FS-16	57	80	3211	6400	4533
2	FS-02	53	84	2844	7056	4480	17	FS-17	50	92	2500	8464	4600
3	FS-03	63	90	4011	8100	5700	18	FS-18	43	90	1878	8100	3900
4	FS-04	57	90	3211	8100	5100	19	FS-19	53	84	2844	7056	4480
5	FS-05	43	68	1878	4624	2947	20	FS-20	60	65	3600	4225	3900
6	FS-06	80	95	6400	9025	7600	21	FS-21	63	75	4011	5625	4750
7	FS-07	53	85	2844	7225	4533	22	FS-22	37	95	1344	9025	3483
8	FS-08	37	65	1344	4225	2383	23	FS-23	53	75	2844	5625	4000
9	FS-09	43	80	1878	6400	3467	24	FS-24	40	80	1600	6400	3200
10	FS-10	50	90	2500	8100	4500	25	FS-25	43	84	1878	7056	3640
11	FS-11	50	95	2500	9025	4750	26	FS-26	53	85	2844	7225	4533
12	FS-12	47	90	2178	8100	4200	27	FS-27	63	95	4011	9025	6017
13	FS-13	67	90	4444	8100	6000	28	FS-28	43	90	1878	8100	3900
14	FS-14	40	85	1600	7225	3400	29	FS-29	63	87	4011	7569	5510
15	FS-15	60	80	3600	6400	4800	30	FS-30	40	80	1600	6400	3200
TOTAL				X = 1550		Y = 2534		X^2 = 83167			Y^2 = 216100		XY = 131407

The table above shows the result of the test done by participants. X represents vocabulary mastery test and Y represents speaking fluency test. The mean or average score of vocabulary test from every student is 52 while the speaking test is 84. The total score of the vocabulary test from every samples was 1550, with the highest score attained of 80 and the lowest of 37. As for the speaking test, the total score was 2534, with the highest score attained of 95 and the lowest of 65.

Figure 1. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

$$r = \frac{n(\Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X.\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[n\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2][n\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

$$r = \frac{30(131407) - (1550.2534)}{\sqrt{[30(83167 - (1550)^2][30(216100 - (2534)^2]}}$$

$$r = \frac{30(131407) - (1550.2534)}{\sqrt{[30(83167 - (1550)^2][30(216100 - (2534)^2]}}$$

$$r = \frac{14510}{\sqrt{[92510][61844]}}$$

$$r = \frac{14510}{\sqrt{5721188440}}$$

$$r = \frac{14510}{75638}$$

$$\mathbf{r = 0.19}$$

Figure 2. Coefficient of Determination

CD = r^2 x 100 %

CD = 0.0361 x 100%

CD = **3.6%**

Coefficient of Determination or contribution value is a value of which the first variable contribute to the second variable. From the data analysis, it has been found out that the contribution of vocabulary mastery to speaking fluency is 3.6%, which is very small and insignificant. The decision to take the level of correlation is based on the Pearson Correlation Table (critical value) as attached in the appendix-1 Table 2.

Figure 3. Hypothesis Testing

r = df (n-2)

r = df (30-2)

r = df (28)

r_{table} = 0.462

r_{obt} 0.19 < r_{table} 0.462

The value of r-Product Moment Correlation is 0.46 at the level of significance of 1% for two tailed test and degree of freedom (df = 28). The correlation coefficient value is lower than the r table (0.19 < 0.46), which indicates the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) was to be rejected and Null Hypothesis (Ho) was to be accepted. In other meaning, the fifth semester students' vocabulary mastery has no correlation to their fluency in speaking.

Discussion

From the findings conveyed, there are various results surfaced from the correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking fluency. In addition, this section will cover important part found from the data analysis.

Koizumi & In'nami (2013)with more complex form of assessment, has vocabulary knowledge explained the speaking proficiency of novice to intermediate level Japanese students, with the percentage of 32% to 44% in study 1 and 84% in study 2. The skill level of

the participants between this research and their research is different as this research takes students at the age of 20 to 22 years old (More than 12 years of learning English), while Koizumi & In'nami is 14 to 18 years old (2 to 5 years of learning English). However, by comparing the research result, Koizumi & In'nami defines vocabulary knowledge and speaking proficiency, which are more complex and cover more than this research which just generalize it as vocabulary mastery and a specific one of speaking fluency. It can be explained that vocabulary knowledge (size, depth, antonym) has its own correlation with speaking proficiency (fluency, accuracy, etc.)

Oya et al. (2009), with research focusing on students' language contacts outside school (duration of stay, contact with friends, various places outside school) have correlation with speaking ability (fluency, accuracy, and complexity). As the participants are Japanese residing in an English-speaking country, this shows how much language contact outside of education institution has impact on speaking performance. Based on this research, vocabulary is also tested in which the students, who has these language contacts besides at school are performing well in vocabulary test and while also in oral test of retelling story from picture card, assuming they have to construct a story with their vocabulary knowledge. In this case, these language contacts affecting the vocabulary knowledge and speaking ability of the students, while the writer's research is just focusing solely on general term of vocabulary mastery and specific term of speaking fluency, in which explained really well in their research.

Ali (2010) found out in his research, with vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension as variables he found out the result vocabulary mastery test highest score is 86 while the lowest score is 68 with the mean or average score of 74. For the reading comprehension, the highest score is 86 while the lowest score is 68 with the mean score of 74. The correlational value between these variables is 0.641. With almost similar research questions, participants, but with different dependent variable, it shows that vocabulary mastery also has correlation with reading comprehension.

Uzer (2017) with vocabulary mastery and speaking ability as variables, found out that the vocabulary mastery mean score is 98 while the speaking ability mean score is 56 with correlational value of 0.630 from both variables. From this correlational value result, vocabulary mastery correlates with speaking ability of High School students.

From the data collected from the test results and analysis of data in this research, the writer found out some results. Vocabulary is the collection of words that an individual knows (Nunan, 2005). The number of words known by an individual may determine how well that person is able to utilize it in communicating, oral and written. From the result of vocabulary test, it was found out that the highest score attained by research samples is 80 while the lowest is 37. The mean score of every samples' score combined is 52.

For the result of speaking fluency, it was found out that samples performed well in the recordings of 3 minutes with hobby as the topic. From the comments given by assessor, accent played a big role in molding samples' score. As there were some significant number of pauses and hesitations made by some of the samples. Fluency concerns the speaker's ability to produce language directly without excessive pause or hesitation (Skehan, 1996) in (Willis & Willis, 1996). Therefore, affecting the final result of the speaking fluency test. The highest score attained is 95 and the lowest is 65. The mean score is 84. From both variables, the correlational value with the formula of Pearson Product Moment has revealed the value of 0.19 from both variables, resulting in very low correlation. The contribution value or coefficient of determination of vocabulary mastery to speaking fluency is 3.6% which is considered very low or almost non-existent, therefore rendering the vocabulary mastery to contribute almost nothing to speaking fluency. Hypothesis testing also shows that r value (0.19) is lower than r table (0.46). From the result, it can be assumed that null hypothesis will be accepted while alternative hypothesis will be rejected, as the correlational value of the two variables is lower than the r table or in the other words, there is no correlation between both variables. There are some things were assumed by the writer regarding the null hypothesis being accepted. First, the test items used in the testing might not meet the standard of the students' level of ability. The vocabulary test was done with multiple choices format. Not consulting to the syllabus at that time, in which the difficulty of the test was based on writer's assumption on university students' level. As expected, the vocabulary test result consistency varied between participants of this research. Second, the psychological factor. The test was conducted in busy weeks for the students. According to students' comments at the time, they were having a lot of semester project in progress, rendering them too focused on those projects. This factor might affect the students' performance in both vocabulary and speaking test.

Based on the discussion above, there are advantages and disadvantages of vocabulary mastery. From the previous studies, the result of vocabulary mastery test has higher score than the second variables, which results in good correlation. However, from writer's research, samples' vocabulary mastery score is lower than the speaking fluency score, leading to low correlation value, as mentioned in previous paragraph. The single most problematic thing many learners found is the acquisition of vocabulary (Meara, 1980). It means whether the students in this research had difficulty in vocabulary test or were trained in speaking more than their vocabulary counterparts, showing that in this case words are easier to interpret orally than in written form. Therefore, it can be assumed that vocabulary may be used to improve the current speaking ability, or specifically fluency to a more complex type of speaking, such as public speaking, academic presentation, and more, as the building block of a language are words (Webb & Nation, 2017). Speakers can be assumed as intelligible if they are able to identify many words accurately when listening to the other speakers (Kenworthy, 1987).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the data analysis result, Vocabulary Mastery and Fluency in Speaking has a positive correlation. The correlational value is 0.19 and the contribution value is 3.6%. The correlation size is considered low correlation. In addition, the correlation value lower is than r table which ultimately leads to null hypothesis (Ho) to be accepted (No correlation). However, with the small correlational value of 0.19, it is not impossible to assume that vocabulary has impact on individuals' speaking ability, specifically fluency.

The writer suggested some points about this research. There are still room for improvement for the vocabulary test items for further research, whether the material and the difficulty range based on the target participants. The scoring criterion for speaking test may be added with more points to better score the participants. Lastly, similar research with bigger number of participants is recommended for better objectivity and variety in data collection.

BIO-PROFILE

Diyas Herdian Putra is completing his study at the department of English language teaching of the faculty of teacher training and education of Universitas Tanjungpura. He is well-versed

in written English and adequate in spoken English. His corresponding email: violettavizeriuz@gmail.com

Ikhsanudin is a lecturer at Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak. He teaches EFL philosophy and ELT curriculum, materials design, and listening skills development at the faculty of teacher training and education. He studied linguistics and language pedagogy in Universitas Lampung, Universitas Indonesia, and Universitas Negeri Jakarta. His corresponding email: ikhsanudin@fkip.untan.ac.id

Eusabinus Bunau is a lecturer at Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak. He teaches Introduction to Linguistics, English Morphology, and Reading Skill Development at the faculty of teacher training and education. He studied English Language Education in Universitas Tanjungpura, and Morphology (Linguistics) in University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur. His corresponding email: eusabinus.bunau@fkip.untan.ac.id

REFERENCES

Agustina, L. (2019). Stimulating students to speak up through presentation in business English class. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v3i1.1148

Albino, G. (2017). Improving Speaking Fluency in a Task-Based Language Teaching Approach: The Case of EFL Learners at PUNIV-Cazenga. *SAGE Open*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017691077

Bøhn, H. (2015). Assessing Spoken EFL Without a Common Rating Scale. *SAGE Open*, *5*(4), 215824401562195. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015621956

Brand, C., & Götz, S. (2011). Fluency versus accuracy in advanced spoken learner language. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *16*(2). https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.16.2.05bra

Cresswell, J. W., & Cresswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design* (Issue September).

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Educational research : planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth edition, Pearson new international edition.). In *Pearson*.

Crowther, D., Trofimovich, P., Isaacs, T., & Saito, K. (2015). Does a speaking task affect second language comprehensibility? *Modern Language Journal*, *99*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12185

Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Faliyanti, E. (2015). The Correlation Between Students' Vocabulary Mastery and Their Interest in English Toward Reading Comprehension in Descriptive Text. *PREMISE JOURNAL:ISSN Online: 2442-482x, ISSN Printed: 2089-3345*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v4i2.301

Fitriati, S. W., & Jannah, M. (2016). Psychological problems faced by the year – eleven students of MA Nuhad Demak in speaking english. *English Educational Journal*, *6*(1).

Koizumi, R., & In'nami, Y. (2013). Vocabulary Knowledge and Speaking Proficiency among Second Language Learners from Novice to Intermediate Levels. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(5). https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.900-913

Kusumawardani, S. A., & Mardiyani, E. (2018). THE CORRELATION BETWEEN ENGLISH GRAMMAR COMPETENCE AND SPEAKING FLUENCY. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *1*(6), 724. https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i6.p724-733

Martı´nez-Flor, E. U.-J. A. (2006). Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills. In *Library of Congress*.

Maulana, F., Ikhsanudin, I., & Suhartono, L. (2020). STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO

SPEAK IN A GROUP DISCUSSION. *Journal of English Education Program*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v1i1.40025

Meara, P. (1980). Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning. In *Language Teaching* (Vol. 13, Issues 3–4). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800008879

Microsoft. (2016). *MS Office 2013 Professional Plus. 8 22*. Office 2013. https://www.microsoft.com/id-id/microsoft-365/previous-versions/microsoft-office-2013.

Oya, T., Manalo, E., & Greenwood, J. (2009). The Influence of Language Contact and Vocabulary Knowledge on the Speaking Performance of Japanese Students of English. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913500902010011

Pakpahan, M., Ikhsanudin, & Sada Clarry. (2017). Factors Affecting Efl Students ' Unwillingness. *Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak*, *6*(6).

Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*.

Syofian Siregar. (2013). Metode penelitian kuantitatif: dilengkapi dengan perbandingan perhitungan manual & spss. In *Statistika deskriptif untuk penelitian: dlengkapi perhitungan manual dan aplikasi SPSS Versi 17*.

Turmudi, D. (2017). Rethinking Academic Essay Writing : Selected Genres in Comparison. *Premise Journal*, *6*(2), 119–138. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v6i2.1052

Turmudi, D. (2020). English Scholarly Publishing Activities in the Industrial Revolution 4 . 0 : What , Why , and How ? *ELTEJ*, *3*(1), 52–62. http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/eltej/article/view/1890

Uzer, V. Y. (2017). The Correlation Between Vocabulary Mastery and English Speaking Ability of the Tenth Grade Students of Senior High School 12 Palembang. *ANGLO-SAXON (Jurnal Ilmiah Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris)*, *8*(2).

Viera, R. T. (2017). Vocabulary knowledge in the production of written texts : a case study on EFL language learners. *Revista Technologica ESPOL - RTE*, *30*(3).

Wang, Y., & Yang, J. (2013). *Steven Krashen s SLA Theories and Vocabulary Teaching in College Oral English*. https://doi.org/10.2991/iaw-sc.2013.195

Appendices

Appendix-1 **Table 2. Pearson Correlation Table (Critical Value)**

df \ α	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.001
1	0.951057	0.987688	0.996917	0.999507	0.999877	0.999999
2	0.800000	0.900000	0.950000	0.980000	0.990000	0.999000
3	0.687049	0.805384	0.878339	0.934333	0.958735	0.991139
4	0.608400	0.729299	0.811401	0.882194	0.917200	0.974068
5	0.550863	0.669439	0.754492	0.832874	0.874526	0.950883
6	0.506727	0.621489	0.706734	0.788720	0.834342	0.924904
7	0.471589	0.582206	0.666384	0.749776	0.797681	0.898260
8	0.442796	0.549357	0.631897	0.715459	0.764592	0.872115
9	0.418662	0.521404	0.602069	0.685095	0.734786	0.847047
10	0.398062	0.497265	0.575983	0.658070	0.707888	0.823305
11	0.380216	0.476156	0.552943	0.633863	0.683528	0.800962
12	0.364562	0.457500	0.532413	0.612047	0.661376	0.779998
13	0.350688	0.440861	0.513977	0.592270	0.641145	0.760351
14	0.338282	0.425902	0.497309	0.574245	0.622591	0.741934
15	0.327101	0.412360	0.482146	0.557737	0.605506	0.724657
16	0.316958	0.400027	0.468277	0.542548	0.589714	0.708429
17	0.307702	0.388733	0.455531	0.528517	0.575067	0.693163
18	0.299210	0.378341	0.443763	0.515505	0.561435	0.678781
19	0.291384	0.368737	0.432858	0.503397	0.548711	0.665208
20	0.284140	0.359827	0.422714	0.492094	0.536800	0.652378
21	0.277411	0.351531	0.413247	0.481512	0.525620	0.640230
22	0.271137	0.343783	0.404386	0.471579	0.515101	0.628710
23	0.265270	0.336524	0.396070	0.462231	0.505182	0.617768
24	0.259768	0.329705	0.388244	0.453413	0.495808	0.607360
25	0.254594	0.323283	0.380863	0.445078	0.486932	0.597446
26	0.249717	0.317223	0.373886	0.437184	0.478511	0.587988
27	0.245110	0.311490	0.367278	0.429693	0.470509	0.578956
28	0.240749	0.306057	0.361007	0.422572	0.462892	0.570317
29	0.236612	0.300898	0.355046	0.415792	0.455631	0.562047
30	0.232681	0.295991	0.349370	0.409327	0.448699	0.554119