Lexical Collocation, Writing, Listening, Reading, Grammar and Their Relation to Speaking Proficiency

Jupri *

State University of Malang, Indonesia

Ali Saukah

State University of Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

The current research investigated the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar toward speaking ability. An ex-post facto analysis was adopted to find a relation between the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and their speaking ability, as well as the dominated contribution between the subjects' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and their speaking performance. The research was conducted in Institute of Teacher Training and Education (IKIP Mataram), involving 30 participants out of total population. They were tested using paper-based IBT test that measured their writing, listening, reading and grammar. The knowledge of lexical collocation was tested using written test, and their speaking ability was tested using an interview test. It was found that the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability have positive contribution to the increase of students' speaking ability. Yet, the most dominant factor that contributes to the students' speaking performance is the students' knowledge of lexical collocation. The findings implied that EFL teachers should develop learners' proficiency to particular linguistic features by using lexically-based approach. Grammaticalized words, sources of lexis, corpus, concordance, and dictionaries of collocations should be promoted, guiding learners to have direct exposure to chunks of English and learn to extract and use patterns of lexical collocations effortlessly.

Keywords: lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar, speaking

INTRODUCTION

Reviewing the literatures reveals that there are many unanswered questions regarding the construct of planning, one of which was the focus of the present study; namely, whether it is possible to predict learners' oral proficiency from particular linguistic features by presenting skills and components of English, and, if so, what linguistic features affect the areas of language performance (i.e. lexical knowledge, grammar, writing, listening, or reading) (Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2010). In this study, I investigated the effects of lexical knowledge, writing, listening, reading and grammar on the oral production of English of intermediate and pre-advanced EFL learners. I also attempted

---

to explore the potential effects of lexical knowledge, writing, listening, reading and grammar of EFL learners toward their oral production. The graduates of English education in Indonesia are aware that their English is still not native-like which might indicate that there are some skills that lecturing cannot provide. To the best of my understanding, the main problem among the lecturing is how students acquire the English skills and components, and produce them in oral production.

Literatures report that the task planning on the aspects of learner performance can be seen as constituting a learner's language proficiency. That is why it is assumed that a proficient speaker will be able to perform tasks fluently and accurately, using complex language. Ellis (2009) argues that speakers of a language possess both a lexicalized system consisting of exemplars in the form of words and formulaic sequences and a rule-based system consisting of knowledge of underlying, abstract patterns, and that performance involves drawing variably on both depending on the task conditions. A corollary of this claim is that proficiency needs to be flexible to allow learners to vary how they draw on their lexicalized and rule-based systems according to the performance conditions. A second corollary is that learners can compensate for inadequacy in one system by drawing on the other. A third corollary is that there are likely to be trade-offs as, for example, when a learner focuses on structural components, lexical knowledge is adversely affected. However, this last claim has been challenged by Robinson (2001), who argues that such a trade-off is not inevitable as components and skills can be positively correlated in task-based performance (i.e. when a task is complex in terms of the number of elements involved and there is an opportunity for pre-task planning). Robinson's theories of task-based performance also acknowledge the role that individual difference factors (such as the learner's tendency for risk-taking or working memory) have on performance.

In this study, firstly I examined the relationship among learners' knowledge of lexical collocation, knowledge of grammar, writing, listening and reading skills of learners' performance of oral tasks with a view to identifying the mediating variables and the impact they have on performance. Secondly, I considered the implications of these findings for a theory of the role that lexically-based teaching plays in L2 oral performance. In fact, there is a connection between a developed technique of teaching method and the development of English components such as lexical knowledge and grammar, writing, listening, and reading certainly by looking at the ways to evaluate the nature and strength of this connection. For instance, a research on developing a certain method toward speaking ability by using "small talk" formerly had been conducted by Hunter (2011). It was found out that there is a connection between method of the small-talk and the development of oral production in speaking performance.

The first main problem the EFL learners encounter is the insufficiency of vocabulary. If we investigate further then another problem that is encountered by the EFL learners is that they have insufficient knowledge of lexicogrammatical units Kweldju (2001). The learners tend to ignore the grammaticalised words that certainly belong to the important apparatus in introducing the patterns of the words order into units of

grammaticalised words. Kweldju, (2004) also postulates that Lexically-based language teaching teaches L2 through lexicogrammatical units, conscious learning, repetition and memorization which play important role, because according to research findings the learning of L2 vocabulary must be contrived. Despite the host of research conducted on the effects of planning the teaching methods on L2 production, relatively little attention has been paid to the impacts of lexical knowledge, grammar, writing, listening and reading ability on the English oral production. Thus, based on these findings, I was interested to conduct a further research to find out the relationship between the knowledge of lexical collocation, the knowledge of grammar, the students' ability in writing, listening and reading toward speaking performance.

L2 language teaching must be contrived because, as the first constraint, L2 learners often lack sufficient, highly contextualized input in L2. This often makes it extremely difficult for L2 learners to extract and create semantic, syntactic, and morphological specifications about a word and integrate such information into the lexical entry of that word in the mind. The second constraint is the presence of an established conceptual/semantic system with an L1 lexicon, which an L2 learner relies and makes them less motivated to use contextual cues for meaning extraction (Jiang, 2000). The more vocabulary the learners have, the greater effect on the improvement of language proficiency in reading, listening, speaking, and writing, especially at beginning levels. Thus, rote memorization of word lists as a decontextualizing or direct technique of vocabulary teaching/learning is better than sentence-making practice as a contextualizing or indirect technique, particularly for learners at the beginning levels of language instruction. This implies that a deeper attention (direct instruction) should be paid to choosing and implementing appropriate vocabulary teaching/learning techniques in EFL classes.

Since vocabulary development enhances EFL students to connect new words to their prior knowledge and choose their own words and images to represent the underlying concepts, then a potential instructional model for teachers in similar settings must be promoted to stimulate the learners' motivation in improving their vocabulary knowledge. It is the teachers' duties to apply more sophisticated technique to improve students' understanding of target vocabulary and attitude toward vocabulary instruction. Approaches to vocabulary teaching and learning in EFL context must be developed to trigger the students' attitude toward vocabulary and collocation instruction, for instance, incidental learning, explicit instruction, and independent strategy development. Incidental learning is learning vocabulary as a product of doing other language activities, for example, reading and writing (contextualized-learning). Explicit instruction refers to intentional learning of vocabulary through rote memorization (decontextualized-learning). Independent strategy development concerns equipping learners with strategies for vocabulary, Cahyono and Widiati (2008).

A collocation, in its simplest definition, consists of two words which are linked together in the memory of native speakers and occur together with some frequency in both

written and oral discourse (Nation, 2001). For example, *catch a cold* and *severe cold* are two commonly used word combinations that qualify as collocations. The verb *catch* and the adjective *severe* recurrently co-occur with the noun *cold*. In addition, many also believed that knowing a word includes knowing its collocations (Lewis, 2000; Nation, 1990, 2001).

If the knowledge of lexical collocations is associated with EFL learners' proficiency particularly in productive skills, the teachers should provide EFL learners sources of lexical collocations, providing EFL learners to have direct exposure to chunks of English and to use the patterns of lexical collocations. EFL teachers should provide concordance consultation and corpora use that can bring about a great deal of achievement in learners' proficiency. Teachers should take into account the collocations of each particular word and the frequency account of words in real communication. The teachers also can at least try to provide EFL learners sources of lexis, such as corpus, concordance, and dictionaries of collocations, ensuring these learners to have direct exposure to chunks of English language and learn to extract and use patterns of lexical collocations easily. Direct vocabulary and collocation instruction is a new field in EFL settings where very few former collocation-related studies have touched upon. Teachers can try to provide EFL learners direct collocation instruction and sources of lexis; and provide a direct exposure to chunks of English language. The direct instruction of lexical collocations will be beneficial to English majors of all academic levels in vocabulary learning particularly in EFL context such as our country. Also, collocations should be brought to the attention of the learners and deliberately learned, because excessive exposure and over-learning are crucial for retaining.

Through the process of diving the literature, I thought I found a discrepancy that the oral proficiency can be constructed by measuring its components (lexical knowledge and grammar) and skills (writing, listening and reading). Therefore, I felt obliged to challenge the previous findings by presenting deeper construct of planning in language proficiency (speaking). That is by measuring how far the participants' knowledge of lexical collocations (KLC), grammar, writing, listening and raeding are related with their speaking performance. By accomplishing this research, it is expected that the knowledge of lexical collocations is associated with EFL learners' spoken proficiency in English that implies that teachers can provide EFL learners sources of lexis, such as corpus, concordance, and dictionaries of collocations, ensuring the learners to have direct exposure to chunks of English language and learn to extract and use patterns of lexical collocations effortlessly. It was based on this curiosity; I can promote the following research questions to be regarded as the problems that I will answer throughout this research.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent do students' knowledge of lexical collocation (KLC), writing, listening, reading and grammar contribute to speaking ability?
2. Which one among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar has dominant contribution to speaking ability?

SIGNIFICANT OF THE STUDY

This study was intended to provide a contribution to the body of knowledge on the improvement of EFL students' speaking skill. The result of this study will hopefully be a model of a Lexical Collocation Task which is applicable to EFL setting to improve the students' speaking skill. Also, this study was intended to facilitate the students in learning English with enjoyment, and increase students' proficiency in speaking. The university can also take benefit from the result of this study; the verified method will be applicable to the teaching of speaking and also to the other teaching of English skills (writing, reading, and listening) which are taught in that university. For other researchers, this study will provide valuable reference; especially those interested to carry out the studies in a similar field.

The knowledge of lexical collocations is expected to be significantly associated with EFL learners' spoken English. Expectedly, the result of this research will provide contribution to the body of knowledge particularly in the field of EFL setting that will imply that teachers can provide EFL learners sources of lexis, such as corpus, concordance, and dictionaries of collocations, ensuring the learners to have direct exposure to chunks of English language and learn to extract and use patterns of lexical collocations effortlessly.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This research was limited to the contribution among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar and their speaking ability. The subjects of the study were taken from the seventh semester pre-service English language teachers of English department, Institute of Teacher Training and Education Mataram. The focus of the study was limited to the finding the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar, and the students' speaking ability by relating it to find the contribution among variables.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopted an ex-post facto analysis of knowledge of the lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and their relation to pre-service English language teachers' speaking proficiency. The goal is to find the contribution among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, and grammar in speaking, and to find whether there is any dominant contribution among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and speaking ability.

This ex-post facto analysis has been conducted in Institute of Teacher Training and Education Mataram (IKIP Mataram) which is located at Jl. Pemuda 59A, Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara Province (NTB). I took the seventh semester students of English Education Department to be the population of the research. There were eight active classes of this semester and each of the classes has 30 students. I utilized random sampling (systematic randomization) among the eight classes to be the subjects of this research. I gathered the data from two tests, written and spoken tests. The research was

conducted on the 23ʳᵈ, 24ᵗʰ, 27ᵗʰ, and 28ᵗʰ of February 2015. The researcher applied the systematic random sampling to gain the participants out of the total population. The researcher took 30 participants out of 240 (total population) to be the sample of this study.

Instruments

The knowledge of lexical collocation was tested by using written test, and the students' speaking performance were tested by using and interview test. They were my own test. The written test was utilized to measure the students' knowledge of collocation and the spoken test was administered to measure the students' proficiency in speaking. The written test was a fill-in-the-blank lexical collocation test, and interview test was an English Speaking Test.

Lexical Collocation Test

The fill-in-the-blank lexical collocation test consisted of 50 items. The participants were expected to provide the best answer for the target collocate in the blank. In this specific test, the first letter/phoneme of the items number 1 to 30 are provided because it can help participants trigger the appropriate target collocate, and reduce the possibility of guessing by test takers. A sample question for L2 type is "If you want to have a b____ future, you need to set your goals in advance, and turn your plan into actions." The anticipated collocate for the question is "bright." The items number 31 to 50 are provided by giving the test takers chance to choose the selection between the two optional answers. A sample question for L2 type is "The drug company should not have put a new product on the market with potentially/partially fatal side-effects." The best anticipated collocate for the question is "potentially."

The test includes five major types of lexical collocations as categorized by Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1997), and Kwledju (2012). Each type has 10 test items. Table 1 summarizes the distribution of the number for lexical collocations in the test. The underlined part of speech in the test indicates the missing part in the test which the participants need to fill in.

Table 1. Number of Items Used in the Test of Lexical Collocations

Types	Patterns	Number of Questions
LC1	Verb + Noun	10
LC2	Adjective + Noun	10
LC3	Noun + Verb	10
LC4	Adverb + Adjective	10
LC5	Verb + Adverb	10
Total Items		50

The lexical collocation test has been tried out to find the reliability of the test. As I think it was difficult to split the lexical collocation test into two, and also to avoid double reliability measures using two correlation coefficient measures (Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Spearman-Brown Correlation Coefficient), then the

reliability of the tests has been measured using KR-20 (Kuder-Richardson 20) reliability test (Saukah, 2013). This KR-20 reliability test is a measure of internal consistency reliability for measures with dichotomous choices.

The Kuder and Richardson Formula 20 test revealed that kr20 = 0.92 which indicated that the test is reliable. However, after further computation on finding the validity of the test, I found 10 invalid items. I dropped that 10 invalid items and checked the reliability again. It was found out that kr20 = 0.93 that signified that the test is reliable and valid. I also compared the result of kr20 manual computation to the result of SPSS v.22 software, it was also found out that the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.92.

The Interview Test

The narrative performance and the task used in this study were derived from a speaking test that I named it the interview test. The interview test took the form of a 10 to 15 minutes structured conversation between an interviewer and a participant, and included a single picture description task, a role-play task, and a narrative task.

The single picture description task was tested by presenting a job picture that the interviewee should describe. In this study, I presented 10 kinds of job pictures that the interviewee should pick one of them. The participants were encouraged to speak as much as possible. In the meantime, the participants' oral descriptions were recorded and later were rated by an independent rater.

A role play task was tested by asking the interviewee to describe the role of a certain job that she/he is going to be. I asked him/her what she/he is going to be and describe the role of the chosen job. They were free to speak as much as possible.

The narrative task was tested by asking the interviewee to narrate his/her father's current job experience. The interviewer asked them narrate their fathers' role of the jobs during the work day. Again, the interviewees were encouraged to speak as much as possible while recorded.

The interview was recorded and rated by an independent rater who listened for certain rating criteria and decided on an overall single level of 1 (Low) to 9 (Advanced). The rater considered how well the candidate was able to handle or demonstrate control over the following 3 criteria: complexity which covered the number of words and collocation per unit and the amount of subordination; accuracy which covered the number of error-free clauses, the number of correct use of collocation, and the number of correct use of grammar; and fluency which covered temporal measures (speed of delivery) and hesitation markers (number of repetition or false start). The following table describes the types of measures for speaking test discussed in this chapter.

Table 2. The Summaries of the Types of Measures in the Standard Speaking Test

Aspects	Measures
Complexity	The number of words and collocation per unit and the amount of subordination
Accuracy	The number of error-free clauses, the number of correct use of collocation, and the number of correct use of grammar
Fluency	Temporal measures (speed of delivery) and hesitation markers (the number of false start)

The test of writing, listening, reading and grammar

In this research, I included the students' ability in writing, listening, reading and grammar as the independent variables. In controlling these variables, the participants have been tested using paper-based IBT test that determined the ability of participants' proficiency in writing, listening, reading and grammar. After testing the participants' proficiency in writing, listening, reading and grammar, the participants' scores were not being announced as I did not split the group. The scores of their proficiency in writing, listening, reading and grammar remained in my notes as these scores were utilized to measure the contribution among the participant's ability in knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and their speaking performance.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

I obtained the data through the administration of the tests. The data were analyzed using statistical computation to see whether the independent variables could affect the dependent variables. In this research, I involved the knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar as the independent variables, and the speaking proficiency which covered complexity, accuracy and fluency as the dependent variables. I utilized multiple regression analysis to examine the influence of different categorical independent variables on one dependent variable. Multiple regression is an extension of simple linear regression. It is used when we want to predict the value of a variable based on the value of two or more other variables. The variable we want to predict is called the dependent variable (or sometimes, the outcome, target or criterion variable). The variables we are using to predict the value of the dependent variable are called the independent variables (or sometimes, the predictor, explanatory or regressor variables).

The analysis would find the contribution among the students' knowledge of lexical collocations (KLC), writing, listening, reading, grammar and the students' proficiency in speaking. The data analysis would determine whether or not the students' knowledge of lexical collocations (KLC), writing, listening, reading, and grammar contributed to their speaking performance. Whether or not there was difference among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar and their speaking performance. The multiple regression would find the dominant contribution among the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading, grammar toward their speaking ability.

The results of the analysis were discussed further in the findings of the research by comparing the former research on the same topics as the supporting theory or as the discrepancy to the current research result. The result of this research were expected to provide contribution to the body of knowledge particularly in the field of EFL setting. Overall, the results of the findings would determine the conclusion of the research as well as the implication to the EFL settings and to the future research.

FINDINGS

After selecting the participants, the tests were conducted to measure the students' knowledge of collocation, writing, listening, reading, and grammar. The following table figures the results of them.

Table 3. The results of the test

No.	Students	Score				
		X1-KLC	X2-Writing	X3-Listening	X4-Reading	X5-Grammar
1	LAP	35	120	100	105	125
2	SSA	34	100	125	100	100
3	MAH	34	90	125	125	110
4	RAE	34	90	90	90	80
5	MUH	19	80	90	110	90
6	HAS	33	125	110	100	95
7	HAB	18	100	80	90	90
8	NUR	33	100	100	100	125
9	TUT	33	100	110	100	115
10	SUW	20	120	110	100	95
11	SUH	32	100	100	120	110
12	RAU	32	110	115	100	100
13	RIN	32	110	100	90	125
14	RAH	19	100	105	110	110
15	SUH	32	105	100	110	110
16	NUR	18	100	100	100	100
17	YUN	19	90	90	95	100
18	REN	31	100	110	90	100
19	WAH	19	80	90	110	105
20	DEN	20	100	90	110	110
21	ROB	30	105	110	100	110
22	SAL	20	90	90	95	100
23	NOP	19	90	90	90	85
24	ARO	25	95	95	110	100
25	UMM	18	90	90	90	95
26	FAR	17	90	100	100	90
27	BQI	22	90	90	110	110
28	EDI	17	95	90	90	90
29	ILH	18	90	90	95	100
30	IND	19	100	90	90	100

Interview test

The following table figures the results of the interview test.

Table 4. The results of the participants' measures in the interview test

No.	Students	Score			
		Complexity	Accuracy	Fluency	
1	LAP	9	9	8	8.67
2	SSA	8	9	8	8.33
3	MAH	9	8	9	8.67
4	RAE	8	7	8	7.67
5	MUH	7	7	7	7.00
6	HAS	9	9	8	8.67
7	HAB	6	6	7	6.33
8	NUR	9	9	9	9.00
9	TUT	9	9	9	9.00
10	SUW	8	8	8	8.00
11	SUH	8	9	7	8.00
12	RAU	8	9	8	8.33
13	RIN	9	8	8	8.33
14	RAH	9	8	8	8.33
15	SUH	8	9	8	8.33
16	NUR	6	7	7	6.67
17	YUN	7	6	7	6.67
18	REN	8	8	8	8.00
19	WAH	6	6	7	6.33
20	DEN	8	8	8	8.00
21	ROB	8	9	8	8.33
22	SAL	6	6	7	6.33
23	NOP	5	6	8	6.33
24	ARO	8	8	8	8.00
25	UMM	6	5	6	5.67
26	FAR	6	6	6	6.00
27	BQI	8	8	8	8.00
28	EDI	5	5	6	5.33
29	ILH	6	5	7	6.00
30	IND	6	5	7	6.00

Multiple Regression Analysis

Since an SPSS computation using multiple regression analysis was utilized to examine the results of the research questions, the following results elaborate the results of the statistical computation. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to find out to what extent the contribution of independent variables X1, X2, X3, X4 and X5 to the dependent variable Y. The following table displays the recapitulation of multiple regression analysis.

Table 5. The recapitulation of multiple regression analysis

Independent Variables	B	T	Sig T.	Results
X1 (Lexical Collocation)	0.065	3.214	0.004	Significant
X2 (Writing)	0.028	2.341	0.028	Significant
X3 (Listening)	0.025	2.141	0.043	Significant
X4 (Reading)	0.032	2.437	0.023	Significant
X5 (Grammar)	0.026	2.361	0.027	Significant
Dependent Variable: Y (Speaking Proficiency)				
Constant	= -5.434			
R	= 0.891			
R Square	= 0.794			
Adjusted R Square	= 0.751			
F	= 18.520			
Sig F	= 0.000			

Based on the above table, the following regression equation can be figured.

$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5$
$Y = -5.434 + 0.065 X_1 + 0.028 X_2 + 0.025X_3 + 0.032X_4 + 0.026X_5$

After computing the regression equation, the following findings elaborate the result of the regression analysis.

1. The constant value of -5.434 means that if the variables X1, X2, X3, X4 and X5 are equal to 0 (zero), then Y is -5.434 (negative number means no value of Y (speaking proficiency).

2. X1 regression coefficient of 0.065 indicates that X1 has a positive contribution (direction) to Y, meaning that the increase of X1 by 1 unit will cause Y to increase by 0.065 and vice versa.

3. The regression coefficient of X2 is 0.028 indicates that X2 has positive contribution (direction) to Y, it means X2 increment of 1 unit will cause Y increase equal to 0.028 and vice versa.

4. X3 regression coefficient of 0.025 indicates that X3 has positive contribution (direction) to Y, meaning that increase of X3 as much as 1 unit will cause Y increase equal to 0.025 and vice versa.

5. X4 regression coefficient of 0.032 indicates that X4 has a positive contribution (direction) to Y, meaning that the increase of X4 by 1 unit will cause Y to increase by 0.032 and vice versa.

6. X5 regression coefficient of 0.026 indicates that X5 has positive contribution (direction) to Y, it means that increase of X5 as much as 1 unit will cause Y increase equal to 0.026 and vice versa.

From the above analysis, it can be stated that the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar positively contributed to the students' speaking ability.

F-Test

F test is used to prove whether the variables X1, X2, X3, X4 and X5 simultaneously affect the variable Y. The recapitulation of F test results can be seen in the following table.

Table 6. The recapitulation results of F-test analysis

Independent Variables	F	Sig. F	Result
X1 (Lexical Collocation) X2 (Writing) X3 (Listening) X4 (Reading) X5 (Grammar)	18.520	0.000	Significant

The table above shows that the value of F is 18.520 with a significance value of 0.000, which means the significance of F is less than 0.05, indicating that the variables X1, X2, X3, X4 and X5 simultaneously contribute the variable Y. therefore, it can be stated that the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar simultaneously contributed to the students' speaking ability.

T-Test

T-test was utilized to examine the regression coefficient partially. The results of T-test can be seen in the following table.

Table 7. The recapitulation results of T-test analysis

Independent Variables	T	Sig. T	Results
X1 (Lexical Collocation)	3.214	0,004	Significant
X2 (Writing)	2.341	0,028	Significant
X3 (Listening)	2.141	0,043	Significant
X4 (Reading)	2.437	0,023	Significant
X5 (Grammar)	2.361	0,027	Significant

Based on the table of the recapitulation of T-test, the following findings were obtained.

1. Variable X1 shows that the significance value of t is 0.004 < 0.05, meaning there is significant contribution from variable X1 to variable Y. Thus, it can be concluded that H_i is accepted.

2. Variable X2 shows that the significance value of t is 0.028 < 0.05, meaning there is significant contribution from variable X2 to variable Y. Thus, it can be concluded that H_i is accepted.

3. Variable X3 shows that the significance value of t is 0.043 < 0.05, meaning there is significant contribution from variable X3 to variable Y. Thus, it can be concluded that H_i is accepted.

4. Variable X4 shows that the significance value of t is 0.023 < 0.05, meaning there is significant contribution from variable X4 to variable Y. Thus, it can be concluded that H_i is accepted.

5. Variable X5 shows that the significance value of t is 0.027 < 0.05, meaning there is significant contribution from variable X5 to variable Y. Thus, it can be concluded that H_i is accepted.

Partial Correlation

The dominant influence is tested is by calculating the effective contribution of each variable. The formula used is:

SE = Beta x Zero Order x 100%

The following table displays the results of calculating the partial correlation of each independent variables.

Table 8. The partial correlation of each independent variables

Variables	Beta	Zero Order	SE (%)
X1 (Lexical Collocation)	0.33	0.594	19.60
X2 (Writing)	0.268	0.545	14.61
X3 (Listening)	0.251	0.661	16.59
X4 (Reading)	0.272	0.461	12.54
X5 (Grammar)	0.261	0.614	16.03

The partial correlation test is used to determine which variables contribute predominantly on the Y variable. It was based on the table above, the conclusion that can be raised that the independent variables that get the highest SE value are declared as dominant variables. It can be seen that the most dominant variable of the independent variables is the variable X1 (knowledge of lexical collocation) dominantly contributes the variable Y (speaking proficiency), by considering the SE value of 19.60%, which is higher than other independent variables (X2, X3, X4, and X5). Therefore, this final finding concludes that the most dominant factor that contributes to the students' speaking performance is the students' knowledge of lexical collocation.

DISCUSSION

The first research question proposed in this study is "to what extent do students' knowledge of lexical collocation (KLC), writing, listening, reading and grammar contribute to speaking ability?". After analyzing the data, I found that the X1 (knowledge of lexical collocation) regression coefficient is 0.065 indicating that the students' knowledge of lexical collocation has a positive contribution (direction) to students' speaking ability. The regression coefficient of X2 (writing ability) is 0.028 indicating that the students' writing ability has a positive contribution (direction) to students' speaking ability. The regression coefficient of X3 is 0.025 indicating that the students' listening ability has a positive contribution (direction) to students' speaking ability. The

regression coefficient of X4 is 0.032 indicating that the students' reading ability has a positive contribution (direction) to students' speaking ability. The regression coefficient of X5 is 0.026 indicating that the students' grammar ability has a positive contribution (direction) to students' speaking ability. Surely, these findings conclude that all independent variables (the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability) have positive contribution to the increment of dependent variable (students' speaking ability). Thus, the first research question has been answered and solved. This finding is in line with the former theory stating that in the world of second language acquisition (SLA), the effects of different types of measures on teaching speaking can be promoted (Ellis, 2009).

The second research question proposed in this study is "which one among students' knowledge of lexical collocation (KLC), writing, listening, reading and grammar has dominant contribution to speaking ability?". After analyzing the data, I found that the value of F is 18.520 with a significance level of 0.000, which means the significance of F is less than 0.05. This indicates that the variables X1 (knowledge of lexical collocation), X2 (writing ability), X3 (listening ability), X4 (reading ability) and X5 (grammar ability) simultaneously have positive contribution to variable Y (the students' speaking ability). Surely, these findings conclude that all independent variables (the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability) positively and simultaneously contribute to the dependent variable (students' speaking ability) and thus, the second research question has been answered.

The multiple regression analysis proved that the significance level of X1 (knowledge of lexical collocation) is 0.004 < 0.05. This indicates that there is significant contribution from variable X1 (the students' knowledge of lexical collocation) to variable Y (the students' speaking ability). The variable X2 (the students' writing ability) shows that the significance level is 0.028 < 0.05. This indicates that there is significant contribution from variable X2 (the students' writing ability) to variable Y (the students' speaking ability). The significance level of X3 (the students' listening ability) is 0.043 < 0.05. This means there is significant contribution from variable X3 (the students' listening ability) to variable Y (the students' speaking ability). The variable X4 (the students' reading ability) shows that the significance level is 0.023 < 0.05. This indicates that there is significant contribution from variable X4 (students' reading ability) to variable Y (students' speaking ability). The variable X5 (the students' grammar ability) shows that the significance level is 0.027 < 0.05. This indicates that there is significant contribution from variable X5 (grammar ability) to variable Y (the students' speaking ability).

After computing the effective contribution of each independent variables, the most dominant variable of the independent variables is the variable X1 (knowledge of lexical collocation) dominantly contributes to the variable Y (speaking proficiency), by considering the SE value of 19.60%, which is higher than other independent variables (X2, X3, X4, and X5). Therefore, this final finding concludes that the most dominant factor that contributes to the students' speaking performance is the students' knowledge of lexical collocation. Thus, the second research question has been solved.

This finding is in line with the former research finding proposed by Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2010) who argue EFL teachers should develop learners' proficiency to particular linguistic features by using lexically-based approach. Kweldju (2001) stated that to make the teaching of English more directed, it should be lexically-based language teaching, that is by introducing units of grammaticalized words and or the words patterns.

As a result, the participants' knowledge of lexical collocation contributes dominantly to the participants' speaking ability. This finding definitely can be the source for EFL teachers particularly the countries where English is still considered as a foreign language for making a better planning and preparation for the targeted English lesson in class as this will lead to a more effective and better achievement particularly in the field of speaking. This is surely in line with the former theory postulated by Ellis, (2009) who stated that in the world of second language acquisition (SLA), the effects of different types of planning on teaching speaking must be promoted.

CONCLUSION

The multiple correlation between the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability is 0.891, which means that the students' speaking ability is contributed by the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability, or 79.4 percent of the students' speaking ability is contributed by the students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability. The students' knowledge of lexical collocation, writing, listening, reading and grammar ability positively and simultaneously contributed to the students' speaking ability. The research reveals that the contribution of the students' knowledge of lexical collocation is 19.60%, writing 14.61%, listening 16.59%, reading 12.54% and grammar 16.03%. The students' knowledge of lexical collocation has the highest SE value (19.60%), which means that the students' knowledge of lexical collocation has the highest contribution to the students' speaking ability.

IMPLICATIONS

EFL teachers can make a better planning and preparation for the targeted English lesson in class as this will lead to a more effective and better achievement particularly in the field of speaking. By providing well designed strategies, EFL teachers can provide effects on different types of planning on teaching English through lexically-based teaching. EFL teachers should develop learners' proficiency to particular linguistic features by using lexically-based approach. Teachers should consider the effects of language performance such as speaking or writing within each language skills. These findings enable the EFL teachers to have direct penetration to the students' need of collocation within the teaching learning process.

The teaching of English in the EFL world should be more directed. The current research findings should awaken and enhance the EFL teachers to be aware that the teaching of English should be lexicogrammatical units by introducing units of grammaticalized

words and or the words patterns. The teaching of English words should be designed as conscious as possible, lexically-based, repetition mode, and memorization mode. the learning of L2 vocabulary should be well-contrived. Strategies in teaching English words for EFL learners should be developed and designed independently with interesting strategies to attract EFL learners absorbing the essence of teaching learning purpose, particularly when aiming to improve EFL learners' productive performance. Teachers are obliged to challenge the current research findings by presenting deeper construct of investigation in language proficiency during the teaching and learning process. Teachers should provide EFL learners sources of lexis, such as corpus, concordance, and dictionaries of collocations. Learners are exposed to have direct exposure to chunks of English language and learn to extract and use patterns of lexical collocations effortlessly.

Furthermore, for institutions, the current research findings are expected to provide beneficial input in decision making that the teaching of English in university level should utilize more developed, creative and independent strategy in encouraging the students to learn English. Finally, for future researchers, the findings of this research can probably become beneficial reference to conduct research on the same domain. The future researchers should have more developed and creative methods in conducting the similar field of research.

REFERENCES

Ahmadian, M. J. & Tavakoli, M. (2010). The Effects of Simultaneous Use of Careful Online Planning and Task Repetition on Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity of EFL Learners' Oral Production. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 35–59.

Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin's.

Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2008). The Teaching of EFL Vocabulary in the Indonesian Context: The State of The Art. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, *19* (1), 1—17.

Ellis, R. (2009). The Differential Effects of Three Types of Task Planning on the Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy in L2 Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics,* 30, 474–509.

Hunter, J. (2011). Small Talk: Developing Fluency, Accuracy, and Complexity in Speaking. *ELT Journal Advance Access,* 10.

Jiang, N. (2000). Lexical Representation and Development in a Second Language. *Applied Linguistics*, *21* (1), 47—77.

Kweldju, S. (2001). Autonomous Learning of Vocabulary for-Life-Long Learning of Stylistic English. *Jurnal Penelitian Kependidikan*, *11*(1), 37—58.

Kweldju, S. (2004). The Neuropsychological Basis of Lexically-Based Language Teaching. *TEFLIN Journal, 15* (1), 74—90.

Kweldju, S. (2012). *Workbook: English for Professionals and Students of Psychology and Education. Based on Lexicogrammatical Approach*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.

Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching Collocation: Further Developments in the Lexical Approach.* London: Language Teaching Publications.

Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in another Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task Complexity, Cognitive Resources, and Syllabus Design: A Triadic Frame-Work for Examining Task Influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saukah, A. (2013). *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa.* Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang (UM Press).