

WHY WERE PRESERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS RELUCTANT TO SPEAK ENGLISH? Case in IKIP PGRI Pontianak

By:

Dedi Irwan¹, Faryah Anshariyah², Maliqul Hafis³

^{1,2,3}IKIP PGRI Pontianak

¹dediirwanphd@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aimed to find out factors affecting the reluctance of preservice English teachers who were studying in English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak to speak English. Descriptive research with quantitative approach was applied in this research. To collect the data, online questionnaire through google form was adopted. Sixty-five preservice English teachers were involved in the data collection process. The finding of this research showed three factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English, namely linguistic factor, sociocultural factor and psychological factor. Furthermore, correlation analysis found out that there were no significant correlation between preservice teachers' responses regarding the factor affecting their reluctance to speak English.

Keywords : Preservice English Teachers, Speaking Reluctance, Psychological Factor, Linguistic Factor, Sociocultural Factor.

1. INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a productive skill which one should master in order to master English actively (Fulcher, 2003). Since it is an active skill, to master, it needs to be practiced regularly in every possible occasion (Asrobi, 2013). For preservice English teachers who are studying in English education departments, classroom is considered to be one of the best places for them to practice. Classroom is not just a place, but a learning community where groups of students come together for one purpose, mastering English actively. With this common goal, students should be able to take advantages of the community, to practice their English speaking skill intensely.

Unfortunately, our pre-observations and initial interviews showed that preservice English teachers tended to be reluctant to speak English in their classrooms. It was an irony. Preservice English teachers who should have taken advantages by using such opportunity to practice their English speaking, chose to be more passive and unwilling to speak English. For students of non-English departments, it was understandable that they did not practice their speaking skills intensely, as mastering English was not the main purpose of their learning. However, that sounded strange to us if students of the English department do so. We believed that there must be something wrong.

Nevertheless, we cannot impose blame only on those preservice English teachers. A comprehensive evaluation should be initiated in order to improve the condition by involving lecturers and all other stakeholders. To do so, a comprehensive data regarding factors affecting the preservice teachers' reluctance to speak English in the classroom interaction should firstly be made

available. The data would be a baseline for all relevant stakeholders in evaluating and planning every strategic step to address the condition. This research was conducted in order to provide such data, by conducting comprehensive empirical survey about factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English in their classroom interactions. This research focused on two main questions, namely about factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English in their classroom interactions and the variation of such factors by their background information.

A number of previous researches has been conducted in this issue in various countries, such as in Iran (Baktash (2015), Saudi Arabia (Hamouda, 2013). Those researches investigated factors affecting non-English department students' reluctance to speak English in their context. In Indonesia, previous researches in this issue have also been conducted by a number of researchers, such as Nugroho (2017), Rahmawati (2014), Hafsa (2017), Wandika (2014), and Arista (2019). Overall, those researches involved general university students and secondary school students as their subjects of research. None of them involved preservice English teachers in West Kalimantan province, Indonesia. In addition, neither one of them conducted further researches to describe the variation of factors affecting student reluctance by preservice English teachers' backgrounds.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This research is a survey research with a quantitative approach. In this case, the survey was adopted because it allowed researchers to involve respondents in large number (see: Cohen, Manion, & Morrison 2005; Creswell, 2012; Creswell, 2014; Fitzgerald, Rumrill, & Schenker, 2004; Fraenkel &

Wallen, 2009) and enabled us to describe people's beliefs, opinions, characteristics, and behaviours (Ary, Lucy, and Asghar, 2002). Therefore, this method was believed to be able to collect data on the factors that had influenced pre-service English teachers' reluctance to speak English on campus.

Population and Sample

The population in this research was second year preservice English teachers studying in English Education Study Program of IKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the academic year of 2020/2021. The population was selected because their reluctance to speak English on campus was indicated to be at the highest level, compared to those who were in other years. Furthermore, since the preservice English teachers were still in their second year, there will still be plenty of time for stakeholders to develop strategic steps to improve their learning. The preservice English teachers in the second year were divided into five classes, with a total of 150. This study involved two classes, with 65 pre-service English teachers as the sample. The selection of the two classes was carried out using cluster random sampling.

Tool of Data Collection

To collect the data, as suggested by Edekin (2018) & Sugiono (2014), online questionnaire through google form adopted from Juhana (2012) was used. The link of the google form was sent to each respondent to ease them to respond the survey. The questionnaire consisted of 30 questions, regarding common factors affecting students to be reluctant to speak English. The questionnaire was a close ended, with five Likert scale options; Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Uncertain, Agree, and Strongly Agree.

Technique of Data Analysis

To analyse data collected in this research, descriptive and inferential statistics were implemented. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the factors affecting pre-service teachers' reluctance to speak English, in relation to research question one. In this regard, central tendency, such as mean, median, modes, minimum and maximum score calculation were adopted. In addition, inferential statistics in the form of correlational analysis was applied in order to investigate the variation of preservice teachers' responses with regard to factors affecting their reluctance to speak in English, by their genders, region of origins, and grade point average (GPA) ranges.

3. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Factor Affecting preservice English teachers' Reluctance to Speak English

Data analysis of this research proved that there were three dominant factor affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English, in relation to research question one, namely linguistic factor, sociocultural factor and psychological factor, with mean score of, respectively, 3.6, 3.5 and 3.4, out

of 5.0. Linguistic factors were developed by three indicators; pre-service teachers' lack of understanding on English grammar, lack of vocabulary, and pronunciation mastery. From those indicators, pronunciation mastery was recorded to have contributed most significantly on pre-service teachers' reluctance to speak English, with mean score of 3.7 out of 5, followed by lack of vocabulary (3.6) and lack of understanding on English grammar (3.3).

In sociocultural factor, there were two aspects found; attitudes toward teacher and classroom condition, with mean score of, in respective order, 3.4 and 3.5. In this regard, it was found that the preservice English teachers preferred to participate in a comfortable class. In addition, they felt more relaxed to speak English in small group rather than in front of the whole students in the class.

Furthermore, psychological factor consisted of five indicators, namely the lack of motivation, shyness, fear of making mistake, lack of confidence and anxiety. Out of all, anxiety, lack of confidence and fear of making mistake were three most influential indicators on this factor, with mean score of 3.8 for anxiety and 3.5 for the lack of confidence and fear of making mistake. Meanwhile, shyness and lack of motivation were the two least influential indicators on the list, with the mean scores of 3.4 and 2.7.

Variation of Factor Affecting Preservice English Teachers' Reluctance to Speak English by Their Background Classifications.

Information regarding variation of factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English by respondents' background was gathered in order to answer research question two. To do so, the relationship of each factor towards gender, region of origin, and grade point average (GPA) range was calculated. The significant values of each correlation are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Significant Values of correlational analysis between factor affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English and their background.

	Gender	Region of Origin	GPA Range
Linguistic	0.309	0.268	0.284
Sociocultural	0.896	0.971	0.440
Psychological	0.099	0.432	0.220

As can be observed from table 1 above, none of the respondents' background classifications influence their responses on factors affecting their reluctance to speak English. In more detailed the result if each correlational analysis is presented below.

Variation of Factor Affecting Preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English by Gender

Overall, correlational analysis conducted in this research found that the factors which had been found to have affected preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English (i.e., psychological factors, linguistic factors and sociocultural factor) did

not vary by their gender, as can be seen on table 2, 3, and 4.

Table 2. Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Psychological Factor by Gender

		Psychological Factor	GENDER
Psychological Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.099
	N	65	65
Gender	Pearson Correlation	.207	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.099	
	N	65	65

As can be observed from Table 2 above, significant value of the correlation (sig.) is 0.099, which is bigger than alpha value of 5% ($0.099 > 0.05$). The result indicated that there was no significant correlation between gender and their responses regarding psychological factor. This result could be interpreted that there is no significant variation on preservice English teachers' responses regarding psychological factor as a factor affecting their reluctance to speak in English by gender. On the other words, both male and female preservice English teachers had similar view regarding psychological factors' impact toward their reluctance to speak English.

Table 3. Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Linguistic Factor by Gender

		Linguistic Factor	Gender
Linguistic Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.309
	N	65	65
Gender	Pearson Correlation	.128	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.309	
	N	65	65

Table 3 above presents the result of correlational analysis conducted on preservice English teachers' responses on linguistic factors and their gender. As can be seen from the table, significant value is bigger than alpha (sig. $> \alpha$). In this regard, the significant value is .309, which is bigger than alpha, 0.05. Such figures prove that there were no correlations between preservice English teachers' responses regarding linguistic factor and gender. Therefore, we can assume that preservice English teachers' responses regarding linguistic factors, which had been found to have influenced their reluctance to speak English, were statistically the same among male and female preservice English teachers.

Table 4. Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Sociocultural Factor by Gender

		Sociocultural Factor	Gender
Sociocultural Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.896
	N	65	65
Gender	Pearson Correlation	.016	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.896	
	N	65	65

Bivariate correlation was employed to examine the relationship between sociocultural factor and gender. From the result, it was identified that there was no significant correlation between mean

sociocultural factor and gender, Sig. (2-tailed) = $0.896 > \alpha$ (0.05). This result could be interpreted that there were no different responses regarding the impact of sociocultural factors among male and female preservice English teachers.

Variation of Factor Affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English by Regions of Origin

To describe factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctant to speak English, sixty-five students from various regencies in west Kalimantan province had been involved in the data collection processes. In order to find out whether such various regions of origin influenced the preservice English teachers' responses regarding the factors affecting their reluctance to speak English, correlational analyses were conducted. We present the findings of such processes in this section.

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Psychological Factor by Region of Origin

As presented in Table 5 below, correlational analysis found that there was no correlation between preservice English teachers' responses regarding the impact of psychological factors on their reluctance to speak English by region of origin (sig. $.432 > \alpha$). In this regard, the alpha value was set 0.05. It means that preservice English teachers' responses were statistically similar even though they came from different regions in west Kalimantan province.

Table 5. Correlational analysis output; Psychological Factor by Regions of Origin

		Psy. Factor	Region_of_ origin
Psychological Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.432
	N	65	65
Region_of_ origin	Pearson Correlation	.099	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.432	
	N	65	65

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Linguistic Factor by Region of Origin

As was found in the correlational analysis between psychological factor and regions of origin, the correlational analysis between Linguistic Factor and regions of origin also showed that there was no relation between those both variables. As presented in table 6, the significant value of the correlation was 0.268, which was bigger than alpha (0.05). It can be interpreted that preservice English teachers' responses regarding the impact of linguistics factor on their reluctance to speak English was statically equal across region of origin.

Table 6 Correlational analysis output; Linguistic Factor by Regions of Origin

		Linguistic Factor	Region of origin
Linguistic Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.140
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.268
	N	65	65
Region_of_ origin	Pearson Correlation	.140	1

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.268	
	N	65	65

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Sociocultural Factor by Region of Origin

As shown in Table 7, correlational analysis revealed that preservice English teachers' *Region of Origin* did not influence their responses regarding the impact of sociocultural factors on their reluctance to speak English. It was evident from the significant value (0.971) which was bigger than alpha (0.05).

Table 7. Correlational analysis output; Sociocultural Factor by Regions of Origin

		Sociocultural Factor	Region_of_origin
Sociocultural Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.971
	N	65	65
Region_of_Origin	Pearson Correlation	.005	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.971	
	N	65	65

Variation of Factor Affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English by Grade Point Average (GPA) Ranges

Information about preservice English teachers' GPA ranges were collected during the data collection process in order to classify respondents by their academic achievement levels. Such information was gathered in order to find out whether such academic levels interfered preservice English teachers' responses regarding factors affecting their reluctance to speak English. As was presented earlier, this research had found three factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English, namely psychological factors, linguistic factors and sociocultural factors. To reveal whether the academic achievement levels had influenced the factors affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English, a number of correlational analysis were conducted, as presented below.

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Psychological Factor by Grade Point Average (GPA) Ranges

Table 8 below shows that the significant values of the correlation is 0.220, which is higher than alpha value (0.05). It is interpreted that was no correlation between GPA ranges with preservice English teachers' responses on social factors, which was found to have affected their reluctance to speak English. On the other words, the preservice English teachers' responses were statistically similar across different GPA ranges.

Table 8 Correlational analysis output; Psychological Factor by GPA Ranges

		Psychological Factor	GPA_Ranges
Psychological Factor	Pearson Correlation	1	-.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.220
	N	65	65
GPA_Ranges	Pearson Correlation	-.154	1

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.220	
	N	65	65

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Linguistic Factors by Grade Point Average (GPA) Ranges

To find out the variation of preservice English teachers' responses, correlational analysis was conducted. As presented in Table 9, the significant values of the correlation is 0.284, which was higher than alpha value (0.05). It proved that there was no association of GPA ranges on preservice English teachers' responses regarding linguistics factors, when it came to finding out factors affecting their reluctance to speak English.

Table 9. Correlational analysis output; Linguistic Factors by GPA Ranges

		Linguistic Factors	GPA_Ranges
Linguistic Factors	Pearson Correlation	1	-.135
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.284
	N	65	65
GPA_Ranges	Pearson Correlation	-.135	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.284	
	N	65	65

Variation of Preservice English teachers' responses on Sociocultural Factors by Grade Point Average (GPA) Ranges

Correlational analysis was employed in this process in order to reveal the correlation between preservice English teachers' gender and their responses on sociocultural factors. The analysis, as presented on Table 10 below, show significant value of the correlation was 0.440, which was higher than alpha value. The alpha values had been set to 0.05. Such figures were interpreted as that preservice English teachers' GPA ranges did not contribute to their responses on sociocultural factors.

Table 10 Correlational analysis output; Sociocultural Factors by GPA Ranges

		Sociocultural Factors	GPA_Ranges
Sociocultural Factors	Pearson Correlation	1	.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.440
	N	65	65
GPA_Ranges	Pearson Correlation	.097	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.440	
	N	65	65

Discussion

The finding shows that the most affecting factor of preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English (with regard to research question one) was linguistic factor. We summarized that the preservice English teachers might reluctance to speak English because of their limited vocabulary, lack of pronunciation mastery and lack of understanding on English grammatical. The overall mean scores of Linguistic Factor indicated that this factor indeed affect preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English. Furthermore, the factor which was moderately affect preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English was Sociocultural Factor.

Last but not least, the factor which affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English the least was Psychological Factor.

In a certain extent, the findings were in line with those found by Baktash (2015), who found linguistic and psychological factor, such as, low English proficiency, low practice, fear of mistake, and self-confident as the most influential factors of preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English. Overall, the findings of this research show another variation and combination of factor affecting preservice English teachers' reluctance to speak English, compared to those found by the previous researchers. The combination and order found by the previous researchers are Psychological, Linguistic and Sociocultural (Nugroho, 2017), Psychological, Sociocultural and Linguistic (Wandika, 2014), lack of confidence, anxiety, low English proficiency, and fear of making mistake (Hamouda, 2013), grammar mastery, lack of vocabularies, lack of motivation, and inhibition (Hafsah, 2017), and anxiety, lack of motivation, fear of making mistakes, and lack of trust (Arista, 2019). Such variations are seen as a common occurrence to happen, since the learning processes, especially in learning English speaking as a foreign language, is in a close relation to each context of learning community, and tend to be found difficult (Luoma, 2004). Therefore, to be competent in speaking English tend to take a long time.

Furthermore, with regard to the variation of responses by respondents' background (gender, region of origin, and GPA), in relation to research question two, this research found that there were no correlation between those background variables with such responses. We assumed that the university learning experiences which they had acquired have made their willingness to speak English be in similar vein, therefore, their backgrounds showed no effect to their responses regarding their reluctance factors.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings of this research enrich references regarding the patterns of factors affecting pre-service English teachers' reluctance to speak English. This research concludes that they had moderate level of reluctance to speak English, which indicated that they tended to be passive and afraid to speak English within their classroom interactions. Linguistic factor is concluded to have affected their reluctance the most. In this respect, their limited vocabulary, lack of pronunciation mastery and lack of understanding on English grammatical had been their main reason to be unwilling to speak in English.

Furthermore, the pre-service teachers who were involved in this research were selected based on three criteria of their background; gender, region of origin, and GPA range. Nonetheless, none of the background has been found to correlate with their responses regarding factor affecting their reluctance to speak English. Their university learning

experiences have been believed to have made such backgrounds having no relation to the variation of factors affecting preservice teachers' unwillingness to speak English.

5. REFERENCES

- Arista, N. (2019). *Factors Contributing to Students' Reluctance To participate In English Class*. Study to the Eight Grade of SMPN 12 Pontianak in Academic Year of (2018/2019).
- Ary, D., Cheser, L., Lucy, R., Asgar., & Sorensen, C.. (2002). *An introduction to research in education (6th ed.)*. Belmonth: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Asrobi, M., K. Seken, And W. Suaramajaya. "The Effect Of Information Gap Technique And Achievement Motivation Toward Students' Speaking Ability (An Experimental Study of The Tenth Grade Students of Man Selong). " *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris* (2013).
- Baktash, F. & chalak A. (2015). *An Investigation on Iranian university students' reluctance to participate in EFL classroom*.
- Coetzee, Louise Rolene. (2011). *The Relationship Between Student's Academic Self Concept, Motivation and Academic Achievement At The University of The Free State*. Diakses pada 1 Januari 2013 dari http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4346/dissertation_coetzee_1.pdf?sequence=1
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research Method in Education*, 5th Ed. London: Routledge-Falmer
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. *Educational Research* (Vol. 4). Cambridge: Pearson. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Edekin, Julius. (2018). *Type of Research Instruments*. <https://www.quora.com/what-are-some-type-of-research-instruments> (updated July, 29).
- Fitzgerald, S. M., Rumrill, P. D., & Schenker, J. D. (2004). Perspectives on scientific inquiry causal-comparative research designs. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 20, 143–150.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fulcher, G. (2003). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Granger, C.A.(2004).*Silence insecond language learning:Apsychoanalytic reading*.Clevendon: MultilingualMatters.

- Granger, C.A.(2004).*Silence in second language learning: A psychoanalytic reading*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hafsah, S. (2017). *The Factors causing Students' Reluctance in English Oral Performance in Classroom activities*. Pontianak: Tanjungpura University.
- Hamouda, A. (2013). *An Exploration of Causes of Saudi Students' Reluctance to Participate in the English Language Classroom*. International Journal of English Language Education. 1.1 : 17
- Juhana,(2012).*Psychological Factors That Hinder Students from Speaking in English*. Journal of Education and Practice. South Tangerang. Banten, Indonesia. Indonesia Open University.
- Luoma, S. (2004).*Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahmawati, T. P. (2014). *An Analysis on the English Speaking Difficulties Faced by Second Grade Students' of MAN 1 Pontianak* : Language and Art Education Faculty Institute of Teacher Training and Education Teacher Association of the Republic of Indonesia (IKIP-PGRI) Pontianak.
- Sugiyono, (2009). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung : Alfabeta, CV.
- Wandika, F. (2014). *Students' Reluctance To Speak in English Classroom Interaction At Senior High School*. A Study at SMA Pertiwi 2 Padang.