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Abstract
This research aimed to find out the correlation between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability at grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang. This research was quantitative research which used correlational technique design. The sample of the research was 30 students of grade eight selected by clustering sampling. The instruments used in the research were vocabulary test and speaking test. Vocabulary test consisted of 50 questions of multiple choices, and speaking test in the form of role play. The research data were in the form of interpretation of students’ vocabulary and speaking test results, and their correlation. Based on data analysis, it was found that students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability were fair. They were proved by the mean score 65 for vocabulary mastery and 68 for speaking ability. Moreover, there was strong correlation between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability. It was shown by the r value = 0.703.
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A. INTRODUCTION
Speaking has a crucial role in the English instruction. Speaking as productive skill produces language through sound which requires us to use vocal track and brain. Moreover, the purpose of speaking is to communicate effectively. In many contexts, people often judge person’s language competence from speaking rather than any of the other language skills. This phenomenon happens because people are aware that speaking has important role in many aspects of life. McDonough (2013) stated that people want to speak something to achieve a particular goal. This activity involves expressing ideas and opinion, expressing wish or desire to do something, negotiating or solving problem, or establishing and maintaining the relationship. Furthermore, speaking skill is found as the most enjoyable learned skill for students. However, it also becomes the hardest one (Darancik, 2018).

However, there are many factors influencing students’ English-speaking ability. According Adila & Refnaldi (2019) found that there were 6 kinds in consonant sounds made by students’ speaking performance: alveolar, interdental,
alveo-palatal, labiodental, velar, and bilabial. Most pronunciation errors were in alveolar and the lowest pronunciation errors was in velar. These errors were generally influenced by their mother tongue, less using English in their daily life, unchallenging lesson, being passive learners, and less confidence while performing. Furthermore, Suryatiningsih (2015) and Sembiring and Ginting (2016) stated that the other reason of problem in pronunciation is the unfamiliarity words. Students mostly used familiar words or common words in speaking. When they meet unfamiliar words, they also become unfamiliar to their pronunciation.

Besides, word becomes the key of the language to communicate. Vocabulary mastery could be one of factors influencing students’ English speaking ability. The students’ limited number of vocabularies may affect their speaking ability. Students cannot build a sentence, they do not know an English word they are going to say, they also do not know the function of a word. Thus, this problem may cause the slow progress in speaking. They could not build sentences without knowing the vocabulary to represent their mind, feeling and ideas.

There were several studies that conducted about vocabulary and speaking in the past. Seffar (2015) and Khan (2018) analysed teacher and students’ perception of the role of vocabulary and students’ speaking performance. Moreover, Fhonna (2014), Yuwinda (2015) and Uzer (2017) have conducted the study to investigate the correlation between vocabulary mastery and English-speaking ability for senior high school students. Fhonna (2014) used two instruments to collect the data: observing and test to measure students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking skill. The vocabulary test consisted of translation words English to Indonesia and Indonesia to English, matching items, and finding meaning from reading text. Besides, for speaking test students were asked to speak monologue about their experience or family for 3-4 minutes. Then, Yuwinda (2015) have conducted the similar or MAN MODEL Palangkaraya. The researcher used vocabulary test and speaking test. For speaking test students were asked to perform in the form of monologue by choosing one focus they interested. Moreover, Uzer (2017) has conducted the similar research for senior high school and used same tools: test. However, the form of speaking tests is different with Fhonna’s and Yuwinda’s research which used speech (monologue) to assess studeresearch fnts’ speaking skill. Uzer (2017) used role play in theme of “Giving Compliment” as speaking activities which was used to assess students speaking skill by following the terms of its pronunciation, Grammar, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Furthermore, Albar (2016) investigated the correlation between students’ vocabulary size, foreign language anxiety, and their speaking skill. He used speaking test to collect the data in which students were asked to deliver a speech about descriptive text by choosing one theme from describing your house, describing your close friend, or describing the most beautiful place you have visited.

From, the previous research, most researcher used monologue to assess students’ speaking skill. However, the objective of teaching spoken language is the development of the ability to interact successfully in that language, (Hughes, 2003). Afriani, Ratmanida, & Syafei (2017) also found that most frequently used activity in English teaching speaking class was role play. This concept is in line
with Nunan (2003) who believe that people learn languages by interacting, then learners should interact during lesson.

In order to add new research for analysing the correlation students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking skill, the researcher used role play as interactive skill to assess students’ speaking ability. This research will be conducted because of some reasons. First, junior high school English Curriculum expects the students are able to communicate effectively, however they face some problems in speaking. One of the crucial problems is the lack of vocabulary. Second. There were few researches which used role play as the activities to assess students’ speaking ability.

Based on the background above, the researcher was interested to analyse the correlation between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of Grade 8 students of SMP Negeri 26 Padang.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was quantitative research which used the correlational technique design. The purpose of a correlational study is to determine the correlation between variable or use these correlation to make prediction (Gay, 2009:195). In this research, the researcher found out the correlation of vocabulary as independent variable through speaking skill as dependent variable.

The population of this research was the grade eight students of SMP Negeri 26 Padang with academic year 2019/2020. The total number of grade eight students is 244 which is the combination of grade eight classes of grade eight of SMP Negeri 26 Padang. The samples of this research were taken by using clustering sampling. Clustering sampling means choosing an intact group of population members as samples of the research with similar characteristics (Gay, 2009:1929). The researcher chose randomly the group of population, then VIII-3 class was selected as the sample of research. The total number of samples was 30 students.

The instruments used to collect data in this research were vocabulary test and speaking test. In the vocabulary test, the students were given a vocabulary test which consisted of 50 questions in form of multiple choices for 50 minutes. Then, the students had speaking test in form of role play. After conducting the vocabulary test and speaking test, the researcher gave a score on students’ answer sheet for vocabulary test and speaking assessment for speaking test.

To analyze vocabulary test and speaking test, the researcher used the formula below:

\[
\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_i}{x_{max}} \times 100
\]

| Score Range | Classifications | Level       |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 90 – 100    | Excellent       | Outstanding |
| 75 – 89     | Good            | Above average |
| 60 – 74     | Fair            | Satisfactory |
| 50 – 59     | Less            | Below average |
To find out the correlation between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability, the researcher used the formula of Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Chee, 2013).

Formula:

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{n \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{n \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2}[n \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]} \]

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

a) Students’ Vocabulary Mastery

Based on computation, the students’ vocabulary mastery in general was fair. It was shown by the mean score 65. In the detail, the students were grouped into 4 categories.

| Score Range | Classification | Level          | Number of Students | Percentage |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|
| 90 – 100    | Excellent      | Outstanding    | 0                  | 0%         |
| 75 – 89     | Good           | Above average  | 5                  | 16.67%     |
| 60 – 74     | Fair           | Satisfactory   | 17                 | 56.67%     |
| 50 – 59     | Less           | Below average  | 8                  | 26.66%     |
| 0 – 49      | Poor           | Insufficient   | 0                  | 0%         |

From the table above, there was no student who had excellent category and poor category in vocabulary mastery. Most students had fair category with percentage 56.67%. From 30 students, 17 students had fair category; it meant most students had satisfactory level. Besides, there were 16.67% students in which 5 from 30 students had good category or above average level and 26.66% students in which 8 from 30 students had less category or below average level in vocabulary mastery.

Table 3. The Percentage of the Scores Obtained from the Real Vocabulary Test

| Indicators     | Students’ Score | Classification | Level          |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Word Meaning   | 73%             | Fair           | Satisfactory   |
| Synonym        | 71%             | Fair           | Satisfactory   |
| Antonym        | 67%             | Fair           | Satisfactory   |
| Complete Sentence | 59%         | Less           | Below average  |

In this research students’ vocabulary mastery in word meaning, synonym and antonym generally was fair. Based on the score range of classification of students achievement by Arikunto (2009), score range 60 – 74 was classified into fair classification and in satisfactory level. Thus, they were in fair classification.
Meanwhile, students’ vocabulary mastery in completing sentence was lee. It was shown by its percentage (59%).

b) Students’ Speaking Ability
Based on computation, the students’ speaking ability in general was fair. It was shown by the mean score 68. In the detail, the students were grouped into 4 categories.

| Score Range | Classification | Level          | Number of Students | Percentage  |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 90 – 100    | Excellent      | Outstanding    | 0                  | 0%          |
| 75 – 89     | Good           | Above average  | 10                 | 33.33%      |
| 60 – 74     | Fair           | Satisfactory   | 15                 | 50%         |
| 50 – 59     | Less           | Below average  | 5                  | 16.67%      |
| 0 – 49      | Poor           | Insufficient   | 0                  | 0%          |

The result showed that there was no student who was in excellent category. However, there were 33.33% students in good category, 50% students in fair category, 16.67% students in less category and no students in poor category. Thus, it showed that half students had good speaking ability.

| Indicators | Students’ Score | Classification | Level          |
|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Grammar    | 74%            | Fair           | Satisfactory   |
| Vocabulary | 73%            | Fair           | Satisfactory   |
| Fluency    | 59%            | Less           | Below Average  |
| Pronunciation | 52%        | Less           | Below average  |
| Interaction | 83%            | Good           | Insufficient   |

Students’ speaking ability is assessed based on five indicators: grammar, vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, and interaction. Regarding the result of the research, students’ speaking ability in grammar and vocabulary were fair. It was shown by the percentage of them 74% and 73%. Moreover, the highest percentage was obtained by the interaction (83%). Students’ speaking ability in interaction was classified into good category. In the other hand, students’ speaking ability in fluency and pronunciation were still less. They were proven by the percentages score 59% and 52%.

c) Correlation Between Students’ Vocabulary Mastery and Speaking Skill
The research used Pearson Product Moment Correlation calculation with the significant level of the refusal of null hypothesis $\alpha = 0.05$. The writer calculated by using manual calculation and also SPSS 26 Program to test the hypothesis using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The criteria of $H_a$ was accepted when $t_{observed} > t_{table}$, and $H_0$ was rejected when $t_{observed} < t_{table}$.
Table 6. The Calculation of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Using SPSS 26 Program.

| Vocabulary | Pearson Correlation | Speaking |
|------------|---------------------|----------|
|            |                     | 1        |
|            |                     | .703**   |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |                  | .000     |
| N          |                     | 30       |
|            |                     | 30       |
| Speaking   |                     | .703**   |
|            |                     | 1        |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |                  | .000     |
| N          |                     | 30       |
|            |                     | 30       |

**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the calculation by using SPSS 26 Program, it was found that $r_{value} = 0.703$. It meant that $H_a$ was accepted and $H_0$ was rejected. It was found that the result of $r_{value} = 0.703$ was higher than $r_{table} = 0.361$ at $df$ 28 with the significant level of 5% and 0.462 at $df$ 28 with the significant level of 1% as explained in the table below:

Table 7. The Result of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Test Observed.

| Variable | $r_{value}$ | $r_{table}$ | 5%    | 1%    | $df = n-2$ |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|------------|
| X – Y    | 0.703       | 0.361       | 0.462 | 28    |             |

Then, the $r_{value}$ was consulted with the table of the interpretation coefficient correlation as follows:

Table 8. The Interpretation of Coefficient Correlation $r$.

| Interval Coefficient | Level of Correlation |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 0.80 – 1.000         | Very strong          |
| 0.60 – 0.800         | Strong               |
| 0.40 – 0.600         | Moderate             |
| 0.20 – 0.400         | Weak                 |
| 0.00 – 0.200         | Very weak (No correlation) |

(Arikunto, 2014)

Therefore, coefficient correlation $r_{value} = 0.703$ was categorized into strong correlation. It meant that there was a significant positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of grade 8 students at SMP Negeri 26 Padang.

2. Discussion

Based on the findings, the students’ vocabulary master of Grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang was fair. It was shown by the mean score 65. Students’ vocabulary mastery was assessed by some aspects: word meaning, synonym, antonym, and completing sentence. Word meaning was the highest indicator.
This is due to word meaning means the basic level to assess vocabulary knowledge. In line with Thornburry (2002:130) the most basic level of knowing a word involves knowing its form and its meaning. Gasparri, L and Marconi, D (2019) also stated word meaning has played a somewhat marginal role in early contemporary philosophy of language, which was primarily concerned with the structural features of sentence meaning and showed less interest in the nature of the word-level input to compositional processes. However, the lowest indicator was completing sentence. It was in below average level.

Relating to this study, Yuliastuti (2009) found that students’ vocabulary mastery of second grade students at MTSN N Gemplak was fair with the ability of word meaning (73.5%) and sentence construction (72.3%). Moreover, Aristi (20017) found that the second year students of SMPN 12 Bintan got good level with the average 83.16 in vocabulary mastery. Furthermore, Andriani & Sriwahyuningsih (2019) found that students had good ability in mastering vocabulary. Meanwhile, they had difficulties which were caused by grammar and spelling such as in comparison degree and past tense, and other difficulties are caused by meaning of word.

Beside students’ vocabulary mastery, the research also analyzed students’ speaking ability of SMP Negeri 26 Padang. From the finding, the students’ speaking ability was fair, it was shown by the mean score 68. Students’ speaking ability was assessed based on five indicators: grammar, Vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, and interaction. For grammar and vocabulary aspects, students had fair categories; and interaction had good category. Meanwhile, fluency and pronunciation had less category. This finding was similar with Harahap (2015) which found that students’ speaking skill of SMP 8 Rambah Hilir was fair. However, he assessed it based on pronunciation, intonation, fluency, and content. Most students got the highest score in content. It meant all students master the content which was tested. In the other hand, Khairani, Rusdi, & Syafei (2017) assessed speaking ability based on grammatical features and lexical features. They found that grammatical and lexical features obtained fair and very good category. In grammatical features, students were able to use the correct present perfect tense, modal auxiliary, and personal pronouns. Then, in lexical features, students are able to use correct choice of words, use discourse markers, and social formula in their speaking appropriately. Moreover, Naskah, Refnaldi, & Syafei (2018) found that based on grammar and knowledge of genre, students’ speaking ability of grade 10 Marketing 2 SMK Negeri 3 Padang was very good with mean score of grammar 73.81 and knowledge of genre 69.27.

Furthermore, Kartika (2019) found overall students’ speaking ability of grade eight students in one of Public Junior High School in academic year 2018/2019 was fair. Students’ speaking skill in grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension were fair. Meanwhile, in fluency, they were poor.

After finding the students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang, the researcher analyzed the correlation between of them. Regarding to the computation of both their scores and
calculation of Pearson Product Moment Correlation, there was significant correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang. The findings of the study indicated that alternative hypothesis stating that there is a significant positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of the grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang was accepted and the null hypothesis stating that there is no a significant positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of the grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang was rejected. It meant that the students with large vocabulary performed comparably with the students with much smaller vocabulary in speaking activities. The r value was 0.703 it was interpreted as strong correlation, so there was a high positive correlation between the students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability. On the other hand, when the vocabulary increased, the speaking ability increased at the same time.

These findings were suitable with Milton (2009) that the volume of vocabulary a learner knows is driving the acquisition of other aspects of language and overall proficiency; then a much closer association might be expected. Learners with small or poorly developed vocabularies could not be as proficient or as fluent in performing through the foreign language. It could be assumed that the students’ vocabulary stock gave much contribution in their acquisition of other aspects of learning the language skills. As the result of calculating the scores of vocabulary and speaking test showed the mean vocabulary scores was 65 and the mean of speaking scores was 68. Vocabulary played an important role in improving the four skills in English especially for communication purposes. The students with large vocabulary performed comparably with the students with much smaller vocabulary in speaking activities. In line with Seffar (2015) and Khan (2018) found that both teacher and learners indicated vocabulary deficiency as the major factors in students’ inability to speak English.

Relating to this research, Aristi, N, et al (2017) found that there is a positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and speaking ability in describing people. It was shown by the r value was 0.68 with the mean score 83.16 in vocabulary and 73.56. Both vocabulary and speaking were in excellent score and good score. Besides, Uzer (2017) found that there was significant correlation between students’ vocabulary mastery and students’ English speaking ability. The result showed that the coefficient correlation of them was 0.630, respectively with the significance level 5% was 0.320. It has been analyzed by test of vocabulary mastery and English speaking ability test in form of role play.

D. CONCLUSION
Based on the finding and discussion above, it could be concluded that the students’ vocabulary mastery of grade 8 of SMP Negeri 26 Padang was categorized as fair or in satisfied level with the mean score 65. Specifically, word meaning obtained the highest score percentage as the indicator of vocabulary mastery (73%). Moreover, based on the result of the test students’ speaking ability
was categorized as fair or in satisfied level with the mean score 68. Students had sufficient vocabulary to speak. It was proved by the percentage of students’ vocabulary as indicator of speaking ability 72%. Therefore, regarding to the result of students’ vocabulary and speaking tests, it was found that there was a significant correlation in strong level between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability of SMP Negeri 26 Padang based on $r_{value} = 0.703$ was higher than $r_{table} = 0.361$ at df 28 with the significant level of 5% and 0.462 at df 28 with the significant level of 1%. It mean that there was strong significant between students’ vocabulary mastery and speaking ability.

Therefore, the researcher suggested to teachers to concern to the ability of students to mastering vocabulary because it gives contribution to the ability of students’ speaking. Moreover, teacher should develop and improve their teaching learning strategies for delivering their material to make students more excited in learning English, especially in speaking. Teacher also should use target language in classroom activities and maintain to use media or other sources in teaching learning process to increase students’ vocabulary.
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