P-ISSN 2656-9094
E-ISSN 2721-9011

STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE IN THE CONTEXT OF LANGUAGE LEARNING APTITUDE

Indra Sudrajat[1*], Ninda Destiani[2]
[1,2]*STKIP Pasundan, Indonesia*
Email: indra.sudrajat22@gmail.com[1], destianininda@gmail.com[2]

First Received: February 2021 Final Proof Received: March 2021

ABSTRACT

The language learning aptitude research has become popular again lately after some redefining efforts to include creative and practical language-acquisition abilities. Therefore, this study is designed by involving students' creativity and part of language acquisition (i. e. speaking performance). Recent works have shown that the discussion on aptitude is very much alive after a relatively silent period of about thirty years. Early studies have shown that the established language learning aptitude tests show high correlations with intelligence and controlled language production, but low correlations with free oral production and general communication skills. The conventional aptitude tests do not tell the whole story of a person's second-language learning ability. To challenge the old findings, in this research, the students' language learning aptitude which is measured by an aptitude test is correlated with their speaking performance. It is an extending work to be up-to-date with the present trend of English teaching-learning in classroom which plays an important role in second-language acquisition as well, i. e. free oral production and general communication skills. A well-established test format and instruments by expert involving some relevant elements has been adapted for the selected students and the feasibility of assessing speaking performance in an English course is evaluated empirically. The results showed that the test and the instrument provide a reliable and efficient method of assessing the students' aptitude and speaking performance. Evidence of validity was obtained from various tasks, and from an analysis of the scores in terms of some aspects, which is known to be associated with different levels of aptitude and speaking performance.

Keywords: *Language learning aptitude, language acquisition, performance.*

INTRODUCTION

Language Learning Aptitude Research

At the early studies of language learning aptitude, a number of tests have been developed to assess language aptitude. Much of the early work on aptitude focused on developing tests to measure it (Ellis, 1994). The most frequently quoted aptitude tests are the Modern language Aptitude Test (MLAT) by Carroll & Sapon (2002) and the Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery (PLAB), develop by (Pimsleur et al., 2004). Both tests have shown high correlations with proficiency scores in schools. However, the tests are completely geared towards formal second-language learning and particularly towards the way in which languages were taught in the classroom of the 1960s. These tests contain a wide range of tasks. For example, phonemic coding ability is tested by

sound-symbol association tests in which the learner has to make a link between a sound and a symbol. Grammatical sensitivity is tested by recognizing the function that a word fulfills in a sentence. The tests largely overlap, but Pimsleur et al. (2004) includes intelligence as one aspect of aptitude, whereas Carroll & Sapon (2002) claims that intelligence must be seen as distinct from aptitude.

Not until the early 1990s did research on language aptitude comes into vogue again. Second, the tests need to be revised to more strongly reflect the kind of abilities involved in basic interpersonal communication skills. Third, research needs to be conducted in a variety of learning contexts including informal ones. Recent approaches take into account that aptitude has shown to be a good predictor of achievement in classroom second-language learning.

Language aptitude can also emphasize its information-processing side and consider the different components separately rather than as a fixed combination of factors.

(Speaking) Performance Research

At the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, there was a great deal of interest in the USA in recording Indian languages, as much 'empirical evidence' as possible needed to be collected for analysis. Even some experts published their books containing their study of this issue such as Skinner (1957) in his book entitled *Verbal Behavior* which are supported by recent research.

It has been demonstrated that the processes involved in producing language can be quite different than those involved in comprehending language. Van Dijk & Kintsch (1983) have shown with native speakers that comprehension will sometimes rely on comprehension strategies rather than on a closed, logical system of rules required to produce a grammatical utterance. Swain (1995) who are similar to Krashen (1982) has pointed out that 'In many cases, we do not utilize syntax in understanding – we often get the message with a combination of vocabulary, or lexical information plus extra-linguistic information'. Comprehension – at least all but the most advanced levels – allows many linguistic signals to be ignored: redundant grammatical and semantic functions such as concord, definite/ indefinite distinctions, singular/ plural distinctions, singular/ plural distinctions, etc., can very often be ignored without seriously distorting the message being comprehended.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W. and Verspoor (2005) state in their book that research is beginning to accumulate evidence supporting the theoretical claim that 'pushing' learners beyond their current performance level can lead to enhanced performance, a step which may represent the internalization of new linguistic knowledge, or the consolidation of existing knowledge.

Language Learning Aptitude

Regardless of all other factors like age and motivation, some people happen to be better at learning a second language than others. In the literature about second-language learning, a person's inherent capability of second-language learning is labeled *language learning aptitude*. Language learning aptitude is one of the general factors that characterize individual learner differences. And according to Stern (1994), language learning aptitude is one of the factors among learner characteristics which is frequently presented in the literature. Traditionally, the concept of an aptitude for languages is

derived from everyday experience that some language learners appear to have a 'gift for languages' which others lack.

Aptitude can be seen as a characteristic that is similar to intelligence, which cannot be altered through training. However, John Bissell Carroll doesn't follow the traditional view of aptitude which said that it is as a characteristic that correlates with a student's achievement (the high aptitude one has, the better he or she is likely to learn). Carroll comes up with his own idea. He views aptitude as the *amount of time* takes someone to learn any given material, rather than his or her capacity to master it. In Carroll's view, students with very low aptitude with respect to a particular kind of learning simply take a much longer time to reach mastery than students with a higher aptitude.

This view is optimistic in the sense that it suggests that it is possible for nearly all students to master any given set of objectives, if sufficient time (the opportunity to learn) is provided along with appropriate materials and instruction.

As different skills are involved in language learning, aptitude needs to include several factors. In the literature, aptitude is usually described as a combination of four factors:

- The ability to identify and remember sounds of the foreign language;
- The ability to recognize how words function grammatically in sentences;
- The ability to induce grammatical rules from language examples; and
- The ability to recognize and remember words and phrases.

(Speaking) Performance

Chomsky is the expert who introduces the term 'performance' which is similar to the Saussurian notion of 'parole'. *Performance* refers to the infinitely varied individual acts of verbal behavior with their irregularities, inconsistencies, and errors.

It was Ferdinand de Saussure, an early-twentieth-century Swiss linguist who is the pioneer, made a useful distinction between 'parole' (the raw linguistic data) and 'langue' (the underlying, more theoretical system).

Influenced by the writings of Ivan Pavlov, a nineteenth-century Russian scientist, John Watson, and Edward Thorndike (both early twentieth-century American scientist), Skinner (1957) published a famous book called *Verbal Behavior* in 1957 adopted a strictly behavioristic point of view and argued that the only observable object of scientific study is the verbal behavior, the speech utterances and texts. In the behaviorist tradition, learning is seen as the product of teaching: conditioning and habit formation. The most famous example of 'conditioning' is the Pavlov dog experiment. Because dogs had been taught to associate a bell with food, dogs were 'conditioned' to salivate when hearing the bell. Learning was thus seen as making a series of connections, called stimulus-response bonds. When more complex learning was involved, the teaching was done in smaller successive separate steps, referred to as 'shaping'. Learning in general, but also learning of a language, was thus seen as pure habit formation.

It is a debatable issue in linguistics whether to lay emphasis mainly or exclusively on *competence* or equally on *performance*, or perhaps on the relationship between the two. In language teaching theory, too, the question of language system versus use goes to the heart of the debate on teaching methods where the distinction between a 'formal' treatment of the language as an abstract system and a 'functional' or communicative

treatment of the language in use is a crucial issue. However, such performance-based assessment as oral production, written production, open-ended responses, integrated performance (across skill areas), group performance, and other interactive tasks are time-consuming and therefore expensive, but those extra efforts are paying off in the form of more testing because students are assessed as they perform actual or simulated real-world tasks.

When teaching practice changed to include practice in actual communication, aptitude testing went out of fashion. Several studies have shown that MLAT and PLAB show high correlations with intelligence and controlled language production, but low correlations with free oral production and general communication skills. As the latter do play an important role in second-language acquisition as well, the conventional aptitude tests do not tell the whole story of a person's second-language learning ability. Consequently, as from the late seventies hardly any studies have been carried out on aptitude (De Bot, K., Lowie, W. and Verspoor, 2005).

As it is mentioned above, in the early 1990s research on language aptitude come into vogue again. Recent approaches take into account that aptitude has shown to be a good predictor of achievement in classroom second-language learning. Language learning aptitude needs to be redefined to include creative and practical language-acquisition abilities. Whatever the future of research into language aptitude may be, recent work has shown that the discussion on aptitude is very much alive after a relatively silent period of about thirty years. The focus of recent study of language learning aptitude is on attempts to redefine it in such a way that it includes communicative skills. To respond this phenomena and demand, this study is conducted.

Therefore, the purposes of the research are reflected in the following research questions: (1) Is there any correlation between the students' language learning aptitude and their speaking performance? (2) Can the result of the language learning aptitude become a predictor to the success of performing spoken English properly?

METHOD

Respondents

A big group of students, as population, attending an English course taught by the researcher were randomly assigned. The numbers of the assigned students, as samples, consisted of 25 persons. The students were selected from the English for Teens (ET) level at an English course in Cimahi. They were asked to take language learning aptitude test which is adapted from the MLAT and one-way information exchange and two-way information exchange. The average age of the students was 13.88 years-old (see Table 1).

Instruments

Students took the language learning aptitude test which is adapted from MLAT. The test is divided into five elements which are number learning, phonetic script, spelling cues, words in sentences, and paired associates. In paired associates' section, students are tested to know numbers in the second language (in this case English) by listening to them and then choosing one of the options in the first language (Indonesian). Students have to match English words with their pronunciation by listening as well in *phonetic script* section. *Spelling cues* section assesses students' knowledge of English spelling

by reading the word and picking up one of the choices in a test item. Students are expected to find a word function in a sentence which has the same function in a sentence example in *words in sentences* section by reading the sentences. Last but not least, students' memory of English vocabulary is tested in *paired associates'* section. This was used to determine the levels of the students' language learning aptitude.

Procedures

After the results of their aptitude were collected, they were asked to perform their speaking ability. The students were asked to perform six different tasks, three of them involving one-way information exchange (giving instructions, speech, and discuss a given topic) and three involving two-way information exchange (making conversation and playing two communication games) (Ellis, 1994). In the first task, students were asked to give three different instructions to their each partner. After that they gave speech based on their favorite topic. The last activity in the first task was that they discussed a given topic with their partners. The given topic in this discussion was entitled 'My Ambition'. Students talked about their each hobby in making conversation in the first activity in the second task. Then they played two communication games which demanding them to interact each other. In the first game one of them had a secret object which had to be guessed correctly by the other whereas the second game asked them to continue their partners' sentence by making the last word of a sentence as their first word to start a new sentence. The students' speaking performance was measured by three scales: their fluency, pronunciation, and accuracy.

The results of this activity were converted into three different scores. The fluency, pronunciation, and accuracy score which is adapted from Chomsky's definition of *performance.* Next, a correlation between the result of their aptitude test and speaking performance are determined to discover whether there is any correlation between the students' language learning aptitude and their speaking performance and if the result of the language learning aptitude can become a predictor to the success of performing oral English properly.

Data Analysis

As it is mentioned above, a language learning aptitude test as the first instrument was administered to measure the students' language learning aptitude score. The test is divided into five elements which are number learning, phonetic script, spelling cues, words in sentences, and paired associates.

Levels of the students' speaking performance were determined by adapting Long's method in his research in 1980. Some steps were taken to get the score of the elements in this instrument. First, the students' mistakes and errors were counted when they were performing the tasks. In fluency section, a pause means a mistake. The longer pauses the students made in seconds, the worse score they have. The numbers of mispronounced words were counted during students' performance. And it is put in pronunciation section. Let alone the students' grammatical mistakes and errors which were recorded in accuracy section. The analysis is based on Chomsky's definition of *performance.* The results of this record were converted into a new scale (1-100) by using a grading score table (see table 6).

To measure the correlation between the results of students' language learning aptitude and speaking performance, a correlational analyzes from (Hatch, E., and Farhady, 1982) was chosen (see table 8). After the data collected, the following action was that the data was put into a formula to find the correlational coefficient and then it was interpreted.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section is divided into three parts. They are the language learning aptitude test findings, the speaking performance task findings, and the correlational analyzes. The findings which are revealed from each section of the study is interpreted and followed by discussion from several relevant points of views. To give easier illustration, numerous tables are provided.

Language Learning Aptitude Test Findings

The first table which put forward the result of the language learning aptitude test.

Table 1. The Result of Language Learning Aptitude Test

N	Name	Sex	Age	School	Score
1.	Annisa Fitri Shaumi	F	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	94.2
2.	Ronaldo Christian	M	14	SMPK 1 BPK Penabur Bdg	92.0
3.	Fikri Ghani S.	M	13	MTS Asih Putra	90.8
4.	Diyah Hayu W.	F	13	SMPN 2 Cimahi	88.6
5.	Nury Rana Naufa	F	13	SMPN 47 Bandung	87.6
6.	Irfan Nur R.	M	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	87.4
7.	Sarah Almas Sadrina	F	13	SMPN 1 Cipatat	87.4
8.	Alief Kuntoro	M	13	SMPN 2 Cimahi	86.6
9.	Ihsan Amartyadi	M	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	85.0
10.	Drebya S. R.	F	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	85.0
11.	Maulana Yusuf A.	M	13	SMPN 1 Cimahi	84.5
12.	M. Irvan Darajat	M	15	SMPN 2 Cimahi	84.5
13.	Rica May Wella	F	15	SMPN 2 Cimahi	84.6
14.	Mustika A. W.	F	15	SMPI Al-Azhar	84.6
15.	Rizky Rizalulhaq	M	15	SMPN 6 Cimahi	84.4
16.	Rachel Sandra Dwio	M	15	SMPN 2 Cimahi	84.4
17.	Silmi Fauziyah	F	14	SMPN 1 Haurwangi	83.2
18.	Gema Darmawan	M	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	83.0
19.	Elghiffari H.	M	13	SMPIT Fitrah Insani	82.0
20.	Ibrahim Muhammad	M	15	SMPN 1 Bandung	82.0
21.	Adri Aghniansyah	M	14	SMPN 1 Cimahi	80.8
22.	Adinda Siwi Utami	F	13	SMPN 2 Cimahi	78.8
23.	Siti Noor Nolina A.	F	13	SMPN 3 Cimahi	78.6
24.	Joses Adyatma P.	M	14	SMPN 6 Cimahi	77.6
25.	Christophorus Ivander	M	14	SMPK Santa Angela	76.6
Average age			13.88	**Average score**	84.57

From the average score of this table (84.57), it can be interpreted that all of the samples have high aptitude and its level is elaborated in the following table. The students' each score is converted into some predicates (i. e. very high, high, moderate, low, and very low). These divisions are taken from the scale of the score (1-100) divided into five to be equal to its categorization.

P-ISSN 2656-9094
E-ISSN 2721-9011

Table 2. Aptitude Level Predicate

Aptitude Level Predicate				
Very high	**High**	**Moderate**	**Low**	**Very low**
Score				
81-100	61-80	41-60	21-40	0-20

To know whether there is any difference between male and female students, the next table shows the average score of male and female students. From its result, we can compare who have higher aptitude between those two groups of students. And then it is followed by a discussion from gender point of view.

Table 3. Gender Average Score

Gender Average Score	
M (N=15)	F (N=10)
84.11	85.26

Table 3 shows that the female students have slightly higher language learning aptitude than the male students. This particular finding supports an assumption that says women are better than men in terms of language intelligence which is proposed by Gardner (1983) with his multiple intelligence theory.

Table 4. The score of the language learning aptitude from its elements

No.	Name	number learning	Phonetic script	Spelling cues	words in sentences	paired associates	Total	Score
1.	Annisa Fitri Shaumi	100	88	100	83	100	471	94.2
2.	Ronaldo Christian	100	77	100	83	100	460	92.0
3.	Fikri Ghani S.	100	88	100	66	100	454	90.8
4.	Diyah Hayu Wijayanti	100	77	83	83	100	443	88.6
5.	Nury Rana Naufa	100	55	100	83	100	438	87.6
6.	Irfan Nur R.	100	88	83	66	100	437	87.4
7.	Sarah Almas Sadrina	100	88	83	66	100	437	87.4
8.	Alief Kuntoro Hadi	88	88	100	50	100	433	86.6
9.	Ihsan Amartyadi	100	79	84	62	100	425	85.0
10.	Drebya S. R.	100	78	85	62	100	425	85.0
11.	Maulana Yusuf A.	100	79	84	61	100	424	84.5
12.	M. Irvan Darajat	100	78	85	61	100	424	84.5
13.	Rica May Wella	100	79	84	60	100	423	84.6
14.	Mustika A. W.	100	79	82	62	100	423	84.6
15.	Rizky Rizalulhaq	100	76	84	62	100	422	84.4
16.	Rachel Sandra Dwio	100	79	81	60	100	422	84.4
17.	Silmi Fauziyah	100	100	66	50	100	416	83.2
18.	Gema Darmawan	100	66	83	66	100	415	83.0
19.	Elghiffari H.	100	77	83	50	100	410	82.0
20.	Ibrahim Muhammad	100	77	100	33	100	410	82.0
21.	Adri Aghniansyah	100	88	66	50	100	404	80.8
22.	Adinda Siwi Utami	100	44	100	50	100	394	78.8
23.	Siti Noor Nolina A. A.	100	77	66	50	100	393	78.6
24.	Joses Adyatma P.	100	55	83	50	100	388	77.6
25.	Christophorus Ivander	100	100	33	50	100	383	76.6
Average scores		99.3	78.4	83.92	60.76	100	423	84.7

Table 4 shows that overall, the students don't have any problem with acquiring the second language target vocabulary and numbers except one student. However, in

acquiring target written and oral English words pronunciation, the students still have a little difficulty. And the worst part of the students' acquisition is the ability to know the function of a particular word in a sentence. In this task, the students are asked to analyze the structure of a sentence.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As it is mentioned in the previous section, the speaking performance test was conducted by asking students to perform six different tasks. Three of the tasks involving one-way information exchange (giving instructions, speech, and discuss a given topic) and three involving two-way information exchange (making conversation and playing two communication games) (see *procedure* section). The students' speaking performance was measured by three scales: their fluency, pronunciation, and accuracy which is adapted from the definition of *performance*. The first step of students results (see *procedure* section) are shown in the table 5 below.

Table 5. Accuracy

No.	Name	Numbers of Mistakes and Errors			Total
		Fluency	Pronunciation	Accuracy	
1.	Ronaldo Christian	0	3	4	7
2.	Ibrahim Muhammad	2	3	4	9
3.	Silmi Fauziyah	1	3	5	9
4.	Christophopus Ivander	2	3	4	9
5.	M. Irvan Darajat	2	3	4	9
6.	Diyah Hayu Wijayanti	1	3	5	9
7.	Sarah Almas Sadrina	1	3	6	10
8.	Ihsan Amartyadi	2	3	5	10
9.	Gema Darmawan	3	3	4	10
10.	Rica May Wella	3	2	6	11
11.	Fikri Ghani Somantri	3	3	5	11
12.	Adri Aghniansyah	2	4	5	11
13.	Nury Rana Naufa	3	3	6	12
14.	Annisa Fitri Shaumi	3	4	5	12
15.	Alief Kuntoro Hadi	3	3	6	12
16.	Elghiffari H.	3	5	5	13
17.	Irfan Nur Riadi	5	3	5	13
18.	Adinda Siwi Utami	3	4	6	13
19.	Rizky Rizalulhaq	4	3	6	13
20.	Siti Noor Nolina A. A.	3	4	6	13
21.	Mustika A. W.	4	3	7	14
22.	Maulana Yusuf Azhari	3	4	7	14
23.	Drebya S. R.	4	4	6	14
24.	Rachel Sandra Dwio	6	4	6	16
25.	Joses Adyatma P.	7	6	7	20
Average scores		2.88	3.48	5.40	11.76

From table 5, it can be seen that the most difficult part of speaking performance is how to perform the language accurately. This finding supports the previous finding in the language learning aptitude.

After the first step is accomplished, the second step (see *procedure* section) of grading score to convert the standard score (scale 1-100) is conducted. It can be seen in the following table.

P-ISSN 2656-9094
E-ISSN 2721-9011

Table 6. The Second Step of Grading

Numbers of mistakes and errors	Score (1-100)
0	100
1-3	90
4-6	80
7-9	70
10-12	60
13-15	50
16-18	40
19-21	30
22-24	20
25-27	10
28-30	0

From the grading score, the final scores of the students' performances are concluded. It can be seen in the table below.

Table 7. Final Score

No.	Name	Score			Total	Final score
		Fluency	Pronunciation	Accuracy		
1.	Ronaldo Christian	100	90	80	270	90.0
2.	Ibrahim Muhammad	90	90	80	260	86.7
3.	Silmi Fauziyah	90	90	80	260	86.7
4.	Christophopus Ivander	90	90	80	260	86.7
5.	M. Irvan Darajat	90	90	80	260	86.7
6.	Diyah Hayu Wijayanti	90	90	80	260	86.7
7.	Sarah Almas Sadrina	90	90	80	260	86.7
8.	Ihsan Amartyadi	90	90	80	260	86.7
9.	Gema Darmawan	90	90	80	260	86.7
10.	Rica May Wella	90	90	80	260	86.7
11.	Fikri Ghani Somantri	90	90	80	260	86.7
12.	Adri Aghniansyah	90	80	80	250	83.3
13.	Nury Rana Naufa	90	90	80	260	86.7
14.	Annisa Fitri Shaumi	90	80	80	250	83.3
15.	Alief Kuntoro Hadi	90	90	80	260	86.7
16.	Elghiffari H.	90	80	80	250	83.3
17.	Irfan Nur Riadi	80	90	80	250	83.3
18.	Adinda Siwi Utami	90	80	80	250	83.3
19.	Rizky Rizalulhaq	80	90	80	250	83.3
20.	Siti Noor Nolina A. A.	90	80	80	250	83.3
21.	Mustika A. W.	80	90	70	240	80
22.	Maulana Yusuf Azhari	90	80	70	240	80
23.	Drebya S. R.	80	80	80	240	80
24.	Rachel Sandra Dwio	80	80	80	240	80
25.	Joses Adyatma P.	70	80	70	230	76.7
Average scores		87.60	86.40	78.80	253.2	84.40

From table 7, it is same as the results in the language learning aptitude, the difficult part for students to perform is the accuracy performance.

To find whether there is any correlation between the results of students' language learning aptitude and speaking performance, a correlational analyzes was chosen from Hatch & Farhady (1982) and it is displayed in table 8 below.

Table 8. The Correlation

	LLAT*	**SP***			
S	*X*	*Y*	X^2	Y^2	*XY*
1	94.2	83.3	8873.64	6938.89	7846.86
2	92.0	90.0	8464.00	8100.00	8280.00
3	90.8	86.7	8244.64	7516.89	7872.36
4	88.6	86.7	7849.96	7516.89	7681.62
5	87.6	86.7	7673.76	7516.89	7594.92
6	87.4	83.3	7638.76	6938.89	7280.42
7	87.4	86.7	7638.76	7516.89	7577.58
8	86.6	86.7	7499.56	7516.89	7508.22
9	85.0	86.7	7225.00	7516.89	7369.50
10	85.0	80.0	7225.00	6400.00	6800.00
11	84.5	80.0	7140.25	6400.00	6760.00
12	84.5	86.7	7140.25	7516.89	7326.15
13	84.6	86.7	7157.16	7516.89	7334.82
14	84.6	80.0	7157.16	6400.00	6768.00
15	84.4	83.3	7123.36	6938.89	7030.52
16	84.4	80.0	7123.36	6400.00	6752.00
17	83.2	86.7	6922.24	7516.89	7213.44
18	83.0	86.7	6889.00	7516.89	7196.10
19	82.0	83.3	6724.00	6938.89	6830.60
20	82.0	86.7	6724.00	7516.89	7109.40
21	80.8	83.3	6528.64	6938.89	6730.64
22	78.8	83.3	6209.44	6938.89	6564.04
23	78.6	83.3	6177.96	6938.89	6547.38
24	77.6	76.7	6021.76	5882.89	5951.92
25	76.6	86.7	5867.56	7516.89	6641.22
Totals	X=2114.20	Y=2110.20	X^2=179239.22	Y^2=178357.80	XY=178567.71

The data which is got from the table then is calculated by using the formula for the correlation coefficient (called the Pearson product moment correlation):

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

$$= \frac{25(178567.71) - (2114.2)(2110.2)}{\sqrt{[(25)(179239.22) - (2114.2)^2][(25)(178357.8) - (2110.2)^2]}}$$

$$= \frac{25(178567.71) - 4461384.8}{\sqrt{[4480980.5 - 4469841.6][4458945 - 4452944]}}$$

$$= \frac{4464192.8 - 4461384.8}{\sqrt{[11138.9][6001]}}$$

$$= \frac{2808}{\sqrt{66844539}}$$

$$= \frac{2808}{8175.851}$$

$$= 0.34$$

$df = N - 2$
$df = 25 - 2$
$df = 23$

Level of significance = 0.05
Critical values of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient = 0.4227 (based on the table of the critical values). 0.34 < 0.4227 It means that there is any correlation between students' language learning aptitude and their speaking performance.

CONCLUSION

It must be acknowledged that the present sample is relatively small and that the findings cannot be generalized since it is contextual study. However, the evidence from this study has shown that, as it is mentioned above, there is any correlation between students' language learning aptitude and their speaking performance. Therefore, the result of the language learning aptitude can become a predictor to the success of performing oral English properly. If students' language learning aptitude is conducted before they take an English subject, as they are in this study, the teacher can have preliminary feedback about his or her students' strength and weaknesses in learning English as a second or foreign language. The feedback can be data-based information for the teacher to prepare class syllabus to improve either his or her students' skills or their knowledge of the target language.

Another conclusion is that from the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) point of view, learning the structure (the form) of the second language should be done explicitly since from the result of the language learning aptitude and the speaking performance test, it is a difficult part in which the score of this part is the lowest one (see table 4 and 5).

In summary, the present research with its setting provides strong support for the success of English teaching-learning in classroom by giving data of students' language learning aptitude and further research may focus on aptitude-based syllabus.

REFERENCES

Carroll, J. B., & Sapon, S. (2002). *Modern Language Aptitude Test: Manual 2002 Edition*. Bethesda.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W. and Verspoor, M. (2005). *Second Language Acquisition: An Advanced Resource Book.* Routledge Applied Linguistics.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Hatch, E., and Farhady, H. (1982). *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Pergamon Press.

Pimsleur, P., Reed, D. J., & Stansfield, C. W. (2004). *Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery: Manual, 2004 Edition*. Bethesda.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs.

Stern, H. H. (1994). *Fundamental Concept of Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. In *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. Academic Press.