

Publisher: English Education Department Faculty of Education and Teacher Training Universitas Tidar, Magelang - Indonesia

e-ISSN: 2580-2720 p-ISSN: 2580-2712

The Correlation of Growth Mindset and Speaking Ability

Eni Suriyah^{1*}, Aprilian Ria Adisti²

^{1,2} Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga, Pulutan, Salatiga 50176, Indonesia

¹ enisuriyah100@gmail.com ² aprilian@iainsalatiga.ac.id

*corresponding author

History	Abstract
Received	Growth mindset and students' achievement have linearity in the previous
6 January, 2023	studies. In EFL setting students' achievement is related to English skills.
	Success in language learning is discovered by acquiring speaking ability.
Revised	Thus this research aims to find out the correlation between students'
21 October, 2023	growth mindset and students' speaking ability at the Second Semester
	Students of English Education Department of State Islamic University
Accepted	of Salatiga in t.rhe Academic Year 2021/2022. The methodology used
19 March, 2024	in this study is quantitative method with correlational design. The
	techniques of collecting data are documentation and questionnaire.
Published	Data is analyzed in two ways. First, quantitative data was analyzed
30 April, 2024	using statistical description and inferential descriptive. This study
	revealed that there is correlation between students' growth mindset and
	students' speaking ability. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) in the person
	correlation test is 0,027 which is bigger than 0,05 and it means that
	there is significant correlation between students' growth mindset and
	students' speaking ability. Meanwhile the correlation value is 0,27 that
	indicated the correlation is weak based on the degree of correlation table
	that correlation value between 0,21-0,40 is weak correlation. Further
	discussion is presented in this study.
Keywords:	growth mindset, speaking ability, mindset, intelligence theory, english
	education

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v8i1.377



INTRODUCTION

As English is a crucial thing for many countries where English is a foreign language including Indonesia, it becomes a subject in school and university. At school and university all students are charged to have good speaking English ability. It is believed that success in language learning is discovered by affecting speech acquisition (Dionar & Adnan, 2018). When there is an assessment of speaking English in a class, there must be certain students who have good scores in speaking English ability while others get bad scores. Those who have not too good scores used to say "I'm not smart. I don't have any courage. I can't speak." "I am not that smart. Can't catch what I just heard. Can't speak." Those utterances can be found among students who learn English especially learn speaking. It is said by high school students and college students. For teacher, it is a form of pessimism and somehow break his heart. Other bad conditions that are experienced by teenage students such as lack of confidence, engagement, and undesirable behavior make this situation worse (Blackwell & Trzesniewski, 2007; Eccles, 2004; Watt, 2004). On the other side there are students who make the maximum effort to get good speaking ability and a good score, whether they are clever or not. These could be attributed to "mindsets," "implicit theories of intelligence," or "self-theories of ability" (Dweck, 1986). Many students believe that they cannot have good English speaking ability because they think they were born with low intelligence, meanwhile intelligence and ability is not something inherent (Gauthreaux, 2015) and only several students believe that their intelligence can be changed. When students feel that their public speaking skills are weak and unchanged, they may particularly tend to react with great fear to public speaking assignments (Stewart et al., 2019). Something that gives insight into how the student views the world, and how they cope with challenges is called mindset (Dweck, 2007). Their faith about intelligence makes them to define impressions in the everyday classroom as intimidation and sign of lack of skill (fixed mindset) or fun and sign of potential development (growth mindset) (Jacovidis et al., 2020).

The analysis of PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) results confirm the growth mindset literature that shows a good association between growth mindset and academic performance. More importantly, it strengthens that a growth mindset benefits more for vulnerable students who are most at risk for bad performance (Burnette et al., 2013; Dweck & Yeager, 2019). Most students have presented a growth mindset at PISA, however a few international locations are lagging behind. More than two-thirds of students within the Indonesia, Philippines, Kosovo, Panama, and the Republic of North Macedonia (hereinafter referred to as North Macedonia) have a fixed mindset.

Based on the observation on second semester students of English Education Department of State Islamic University of Salatiga, the students have different way in response speaking ability and it is based on their belief of their intelligence and skill ability. Since corona virus pandemic is still going on, students learn by online. Mostly they use What's App group as a media to communicate with their lecture. They also use to have presentation orally using What's App group by voice notes because most of lecturers ask them to use English when presenting task or materials. Researcher sees how several students underestimate others' presentation by not listening the presenter's voice and they are indifferent because the important thing for them is that fulfilling the presence list. They also do not try to speak English in class. The way they think which can be seen from their behavior makes them unable to improve their speaking skill, decrease their performances, and decrease academic achievement. In the other side, several students attempt to participate actively in class by paying attention to the presenter, and trying to speak English in asking question or giving feedback. It impacts their speaking ability, performances, and academic achievement increasing significantly. These two kinds of students cannot be said as stupid and clever students because even though they have different intelligence level but they have the same opportunity to improve their speaking skill or academic achievement. They can maximize opportunities they have in learning to speak English because what someone does is a reflection of their mindset.



From that observation and previous studies, the gap among previous researches is that there are many researches exploring about speaking and psychological aspects such as anxiety and self-esteem, but growth mindset and fixing speaking through mindset is very limited. Therefore, researcher is interested in finding if there is any correlation of the way students think that intelligence is malleable or growth mindset toward students' speaking ability. Growth mindset as one kind of mindset is the main focus in doing this research because researcher hopes that this research will give new perspective in English education and can be a way out for students with fixed mindset to grow more. Carol Dweck (2008) in Brooks (2017) states that students' of second semester of an Islamic University in Salatiga, Central Java whether there is any effect of growth mindset toward students' speaking ability or not.

METHOD

The method used in this study is quantitative and correlational design was used. It is a non-experimental research method. Researcher conducts correlational research to find the level of relationship between two or among more variables without altering, adding, or manipulating existing data (Arikunto, 2010). In correlational research design, variables are related to parameters, and theories are formulated on the basis of systematically integrated data (Cohen et al., 2007). The correlational design compares subjects in one group who have been exposed to a stimulus to those who have not in order to establish cause and effect relationships (rather than creating cause and effect relationships by manipulating an independent variable in a laboratory or field setting). This design is completed after a phenomenon has occurred, and it is impossible to manipulate the phenomenon or the problems.

The research conducted at one of Islamic University in Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia. The research was conducted in the second semester of the English Education Department in the academic year 2021/2022. The students are chosen because they have already gotten subject Speaking 1 and now have a subject called Speaking 2 or Speaking in Professional Context in the college. It was started in May and ended in October 2022.

The sample is chosen using a random sampling since it is mostly used in quantitative method (Rukminingsih et al., 2020). The sample is taken from the 2nd semester students of the English Education Study Program of the State Islamic University for the 2021/2022 academic year. Researcher choses two classes, A and B classes, of three classes. The total sample is 69 which has fulfilled the minimum sample used in correlational research as said by Fraenkel et al. (2012) that the minimum sample size for correlational study is 50.

To collect the data, researcher used two techniques. Those are questionnaire and documentation. In this research instrument of questionnaire that is used to measure students' mindset especially growth mindset is Dweck's Mindset Instrument (DMI). It is a mindset quiz that consists of 16 statements and students are asked to fulfill a Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree scale. Score chart of Dweck Mindset Instrument is also used as an instrument to determine the score of students' growth mindset level. Then the score will be counted using 1-6 scale whether students have a high level of growth mindset or not. Documentation is used in this research to attain students' speaking score. Researcher takes document of students' speaking score from the lecturer. The lecturer measures the students' speaking ability by using a test. Researcher took a speaking practice score. Each student was graded based on the IELTS rubric used by the lecturer. The aspects graded include pronunciation, grammar and structure, vocabulary or lexical resources, fluency and cohesion, and comprehension. Each of the components graded has 1 to 9 rating score or 1-100 score.

Validity is the concept of advisability and accuracy as used in the process of conducting research (Kumar, 2011). It is critical criterion to know that the instrument used measures what should be



Table	e I. Result of Val	idity Test of Ques	tionnaire
No	R. Value	R. Table	Validity
1	0,680	0,4227	Valid
2	0,742	0,4227	Valid
3	0,506	0,4227	Valid
4	0,520	0,4227	Valid
5	0,395	0,4227	Invalid
6	0,756	0,4227	Valid
7	0,514	0,4227	Valid
8	0,370	0,4227	Invalid
9	0,783	0,4227	Valid
10	0,718	0,4227	Valid
11	0,622	0,4227	Valid
12	0,816	0,4227	Valid
13	0,634	0,4227	Valid
14	0,715	0,4227	Valid
15	0,485	0,4227	Valid
16	0,608	0,4227	Valid

measured (Kothari, 2004). Here is the result of validity test of questionnaire with two-tailed test which has significance 0,05 and N=22:

Questionnaire of Mindset Quiz was distributed to 22 students of Speaking for Professional Context C Class. The result of the questionnaire then is converted into scale 1-6. Using SPSS application, Pearson product moment is used to know the instrument validity. The result shows among 16 statements, there are 14 statements which are valid and there are 2 statements that are invalid. This can be seen from the results of Pearson product moment, the value that is bigger than R table 0,4227 can be said as valid, meanwhile those who have the value smaller than 0,4227 can be said invalid. Statements number 5 and 8 are invalid so that they are omitted from the questionnaire.

Reliability is a term used for research instrument to see if a research instrument is adamant and stable, so that it measures accurately and is predictable (Kumar, 2011). From the questionnaire instrument trial, the data was analyzed using Alpha Cronbach's to see the reliability. The results show that the mindset quiz or questionnaire is reliable because the value of Cronbach's Alpha 0,89 > 0,6. The reliability is good based on George & Mallery's (2003) interpretation since it is over 0,8.

Table 2. Result of Reliability Test of Questionnaire				
Reliability Statistics				
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items			
.890	16			

Based on George & Mallery (2003) the value of reliability test can be interpreted using this following table:



	endonity rest
Value of Cronbachs's Alpha	Interpretation
> 0,9	Excellent
> 0,8	Good
> 0,7	Acceptable
> 0,6	Questionable
> 0,5	Poor
< 0,5	Unacceptable

Table 3. Value of Reliability Test

The reliability degree of the instrument is good because the Cronbach's Alpha is 0,890 that is included in >0,8 and <0,90.

The data gotten in this study, were analyzed by statistics descriptive and inferential statistics. Statistics descriptive describes and summarizes data collected in research so that the data makes sense and the key of characteristics is easily understandable. It includes frequency distribution, graphic presentation, central tendency (mode, mean, median), categorization of speaking score and mindset score, and measure of viability (range, variance and standard deviation). By using sample data to infer population features, inferential statistics aims to move beyond the immediate set of data (Christensen et al., 2014). Researcher uses sampling distribution, estimation (point estimation), and hypothesis testing using t-test for correlation coefficient. This analysis consists of normality test using Kolmogorov-smirnov, homogeneity test using one-way ANOVA test, linearity test using linear regression, and hypothesis test using pearson correlation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

Statistics Description of Students' Growth Mindset

Based on the result of the growth mindset questionnaire scores distributed to class 3A and 3B, the following are their scores after being included in the frequency distribution:

No	Score	Frequency
1	22-27	2
2	28-33	11
3	34-39	19
4	40-45	13
5	46-51	16
6	52-58	7
7	59-64	1
Total		69
	No 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Total	No Score 1 22-27 2 28-33 3 34-39 4 40-45 5 46-51 6 52-58 7 59-64 Total

Table 4. 1	Frequency	Distribution	of Students'	Growth	Mindset

There are 2 students who get a questionnaire score between 22-27, 11 students get a score between 28-33, 19 students get a score between 34-39, 13 students get a score between 40-45, 16 students get a score between 46-51, and 7 students get scores between 52-58.

The growth mindset value of the questionnaire from 69 students can be depicted in the histogram below:





Figure 1. Histogram of Students' Growth Mindset

After getting the data from the growth mindset questionnaire, it can be seen that the central tendency is the mode or value that comes out the most, the average value, and the median. In addition, the researcher also conducted an assessment of viability which consisted of range, variance, and standard deviation. The following is a table of results of central tendency and measure of viability:

	Table 5. Central Tendency of Students' Growth Mindset					
Variable	Mode	Mean	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Growth Mindset (X)	46	41,10	40	37	68,740	8,291

Table 5. Central Tendency of Students' Growth Mindset

From the table above, it is known that the growth mindset value with the most exits or modes is 46. The average growth mindset value of 69 students is 41.10. The median is 40. The range or range of values obtained by students is 37 with a variance of 68.740 and a standard deviation of 8.291.

The grouping of growth mindsets owned by the students from class A and B are as follows:

Table 6. Categorization of Students' Growth Mindset				
Category	Point Value	Frequency		
Strong Growth Mindset	53-70	6		
Growth Mindset with some	36-52	45		
Growth Mindset)				
Fixed Mindset with some	18-35	18		
Growth Mindset (Weak Growth				
Mindset)				
No Growth Mindset	1-17	0		
Total		69		

A total of 6 students have a strong growth mindset. A total of 45 students have a growth mindset with some fixed mindset. A total of 18 students have a fixed mindset with some growth mindset.



Meanwhile, there are no students who do not have a growth mindset at all. From this data, the majority of students have a growth mindset with some fixed mindset, as many as 45 students out of 69 students.

Statistics Description of Students' Speaking Ability

Data on students' speaking scores were obtained from speaking for professional context lecturer in the second semester of English education students at State Islamic University of Salatiga. The following are the speaking scores of second semester students from classes A and B which are grouped in the frequency distribution table:

		-
No	Score	Frequency
1	20-29	2
2	30-39	0
3	40-49	1
4	50-59	0
5	60-69	7
6	70-79	32
7	80-89	27
Total		69

Table 7	Frequency	Distribution	of Students'	Speaking	Score
10010 /.	requercy	Distribution	of bruuents	Speaking	50010

A total of 27 students have speaking score ranged from 80-89, 32 students have speaking score ranged from 70-79, 7 students have speaking score ranged from 60-69, 1 student scored between 40-49, and 2 students received scores in the range of 20-29.

Student scores can be depicted in the following histogram image:

Figure 2. Histogram of Students' Speaking Score



The data of students' speaking scores were analyzed to determine the central tendency and viability which is presented below:



Table 8. Central Tendency of Students' Speaking Score						
Variable	Mode	Mean	Median	Range	Variance	Standard
						Deviation
Speaking	78	75,16	78	68	150,754	12,278
(Y)						

The student's speaking score has a mode of 78. The average value of student speaking is 75.16. The mean or median value is 78. The viability value has a range of 68 and the variance is 150.745, and the standard deviation is 12.287.

Students' speaking ability based on each aspect being assessed is presented below:

Table 9. Mean Score of Speaking's Aspects				
Aspects Mean Score				
Fluency and Coherence	65			
Lexical Resource	79			
Grammar and Structure	79			
Pronunciation 77				

In the speaking practice assessment, the Fluency and Coherence aspect has a mean score 65 and becomes the lowest score among other aspects. Aspects which have mean score 79 and become as the highest score are Lexical Resource aspect and Grammar and Structure aspect. Meanwhile the mean value of Pronunciation aspect is 77.

The students' speaking scores were then grouped based on their predicate scores. There are 14 score categories, namely:

Table 10. Categorization of Students' Speaking Score					
Category	Ran	ge	Frequency		
	From	То			
А	85	100	1		
A-	81	84	14		
AB	77	80	33		
B+	73	76	10		
В	70	72	1		
B-	67	69	1		
BC	64	66	0		
C+	62	63	0		
С	60	61	6		
C-	57	59	0		
CD	53	56	0		
D+	49	52	0		
D	45	48	0		
E	0	44	3		
Total			69		

Table 10 Categorization of Students' Speeking S

Among 69 students, only 1 student received an A grade. A total of 14 students received Agrades, 33 students AB grades, 10 students B+ grades, 1 student B- grades, 1 student B-, 6 students



got a grade C, and the remaining 3 students got an E grade. From this data, it represents that the second semester students of English education have good speaking skills.

Inferential Statistics

1) Normality Test

Table 11. Result of Normality Test					
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
Unstandardized					
		Residual			
Ν		69			
Normal Paramatarsa h	Mean	.0000000			
Inolillal Palallelelsa,0	Std. Deviation	7.99105379			
	Absolute	.058			
Most Extreme Differences	Positive	.058			
	Negative	052			
Test Statistic		.058			
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200c,d			

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The data was tested using a one-sample Kolomogorv-Smirnov to see whether the data has normal distribution or not. The final result showed the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0,200 that is bigger than 0,05, accordingly the data is normally distributed. 2) Homogeneity Test

	Table 12. Result of Speaking Homogeneity Test					
	Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
	Levene Sta- df1 df2 Sig tistic					
	Based on Mean	2.846	1	67	.096	
	Based on Median	.336	1	67	.564	
Speaking	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.336	1	41.999	.565	
	Based on trimmed mean	.755	1	67	.388	

The homogeneity test was done using ANOVA test. The result was interpreted that data from students' speaking ability was homogeneous because the value of Sig. (0,096, 0,564, 0,565, 0,388) is bigger than 0,05.



Table 15. Result of Growth Mindset Homogeneity Test						
	Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic df1 df2 Sig.						
	Based on Mean	.431	1	67	.514	
	Based on Median	.442	1	67	.508	
Growth Mindset	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.442	1	63.750	.508	
	Based on trimmed mean	.473	1	67	.494	

Table 13. Result of Growth Mindset Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity for growth mindset data is gotten after doing ANOVA test and the result said that the data was homogeny because the value of Sig. (0,515, 0,508, 0,508, 0,494) is bigger than 0,05. 3) Linearity Test

Linearity test used in this research as one of the requirements to do Pearson correlation test. ANOVA test is done to determine the linearity of the data.

Table 14. Result of Linearity Test								
			ANOV	A Table				
	Sum of Df Mean F Sig. Squares Square							
		(Combined)		1414.016	16	88.376	1.410	.174
Castrath	Between	Linearity		332.018	1	332.018	5.296	.025
Mindset *	Groups	Deviation Linearity	from	1081.998	15	72.133	1.150	.339
Speaking	Within Gro	ups		3260.274	52	62.698		
	Total			4674.290	68			

The output showed that the value of F-Deviation from Linearity is 1,150. Because F>0,05, between the data, there is a linear relationship.

4) Hypothesis Test

	Table 15.	Result of Hy	pothesis	Test using	Pearson	Correl	ation
--	-----------	--------------	----------	------------	---------	--------	-------

Correlations				
		Mindset	Speaking	
	Pearson Correlation	1	.267*	
Growth Mindset	Sig. (2-tailed)		.027	
	Ν	69	69	
	Pearson Correlation	.267*	1	
Speaking	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027		
	Ν	69	69	
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

. Conclution is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

Based on the result of Pearson correlation test, the value of significance is 0,027. To interpret this, if the value of significance (p) < 0,05 it means that there is a correlation, but if the value of significance (p) > 0,05 it means that there is no correlation. The decision taken is that there is



correlation between the variables, growth mindset and speaking, since 0,027 < 0,05, so that H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted. H0 said that there is no correlation between growth mindset and student's speaking ability, meanwhile Ha said that there is correlation between growth mindset and student's speaking ability.

To see the level of relationship between the two variables, the following guidelines for the degree of relationship are used:

Table 16. Degree of Correlation				
Value of Pearson Correlation	Degree of Correlation			
0,0-0,20	No correlation			
0,21 - 0,40	Weak correlation			
0,41 - 0,60	Moderate correlation			
0,61 - 0,80	Strong correlation			
0,81 - 1,00	Perfect correlation			

The value of Pearson correlation test is 0,267 that showed the degree of correlation between variables is weak correlation.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there is a relationship between students' growth mindset and students' speaking ability. The result of the Pearson correlation test, the value of significance is 0.027. It means that there is a correlation between the variables, growth mindset and speaking, since 0.027 < 0.05. Even though there is a correlation between those two variables, the level of correlation is said to be weak.

The ability to speak English for students is quite difficult. Speaking ability requires students to do it directly, both planned in several contexts and spontaneously. Students need to ensure that their English speaking skill is able to convey a message to the other person. Students must therefore be able to pronounce phonemes accurately, utilize appropriate stress and intonation, and speak in connected discourse in order to master speaking abilities (Harmer, 2007). In addition, they are required to be able to communicate using English with different genres and situations.

For second semester students majoring in English education at State Islamic University of Salatiga, they have a Speaking in Professional Context class as a special class that trains and develops students' English speaking skill. During the learning process, the lecturer evaluates students' speaking abilities as material for evaluating student abilities and learning evaluation.

Based on data on the score of speaking practice, a student's speaking score has a mode of 78. The average value of student speaking is 75.16. The mean or median value is 78. Based on the rubric used by the lecturer in assessing students' speaking abilities, it can be concluded that students have fairly good speaking skills. As for the components assessed, the average aspect of Fluency and Coherence is 65, the aspect of Lexical Resource is 79, the aspect of Grammatical and Structure is 79, and the aspect of Pronunciation is 77.

The lowest score, 65, is the aspect of Fluency and Coherence where the student is willing to speak for a long time, yet occasionally repetition, self-correction, or reluctance can cause him to lose his focus. Additionally, albeit not always accurately, they employ a variety of connectives and discourse markers. The maximum score, 79, is for the value of the grammatical and structural component and the lexical resource aspect.

From the perspective of lexical resources, students make effective use of paraphrases, less common and idiomatic vocabulary, and more awareness of style and collocation with some inappropriate choices. They also use vocabulary resources flexibly to discuss a range of topics. Despite



the fact that certain grammatical errors still exist, pupils regularly generate error-free sentences and use a variety of sophisticated structures with some flexibility.

The average score pupils received in the pronunciation category was 77, indicating that they exhibited all the desirable qualities of Band 6 and some desirable qualities of Band 8, but not all. Band 6 is defined as when a student uses a variety of pronunciation features with varying degrees of control, demonstrates some effective use of features but this is not sustained, and can generally be understood throughout despite sporadically mispronouncing specific words or sounds that reduce clarity. Students in Band 8 are said to employ a variety of phonological features, maintain flexibility in the use of features with only rare lapses, and consistently speak in a way that is easy to understand. The impact of L1 accent on intelligibility is minimal.

Some scientists relate the results of students' speaking abilities not only to what is in the classroom but also to what is inside the students themselves psychologically. This is better known as psycholinguistics. A multidisciplinary field of study that combines linguistics and psychology is known as psycholinguistics. It investigates the psychological and neurological mechanisms underlying language learning, language usage, and language comprehension in humans.

In the past, psychological studies on intelligence conducted by researchers like Howard Gardner, Robert Sternberg, and Daniel Goleman have started to upend the psychometric realm. Among several types of intelligence, there is linguistic intelligence. Once upon a time, intelligence was seen as the exclusive capacity for (a) linguistic and (b) logical-mathematical problem solving. (Brown, 2004). Students are said to have linguistic intelligence where they have the intelligence to learn languages. Every child has a different level of language intelligence.

There is another factor that can psychologically affect students' ability to develop their language skills. This is the emotional quotient where emotions affect students' cognitive processes. Students who effectively manage their emotions, particularly those that can be harmful, are typically more capable of completely intellectual thinking. Anger, grief, anger, self-doubt, and other emotions can readily hinder optimum performance in both routine and complex problem solving (Brown, 2004). Nonetheless, Romero et al. (2014) imply that emotional theories are different from theories of intelligence and that they foresee different but equally important consequences.

This is seen by a psychologist, Carol Dweck as a gap in how students see their own intelligence and talents. This is called the Mindset, which is a person's belief in his intelligence and talents. In her book, Dweck writes about two types of mindset, namely fixed mindset and growth mindset. This study focuses on a growth mindset where students see their intelligence and talents can be changed with effort. The growth mindset has a positive impact on the student learning process. In a study involving 373 seventh graders, over the course of the two years of junior high school, an improvement in grades was expected by the incremental theory, which makes the premise that intellect is adaptable (Blackwell & Trzesniewski, 2007). Moreover, strong growth mindsets are consistent regardless of where students reside (Barquero & Leis, 2019).

Regarding English speaking ability, the findings of this study suggest that there is a connection between students' growth mindset and students' speaking ability. The result of the Pearson correlation test, the value of significance is 0.027. There is a correlation between the variables, growth mindset and speaking, since 0.027 < 0.05. Even though there is a correlation between those two variables, the level of correlation is said to be weak. This result is contrary to the results of previous research but on the other hand also supports previous research because not all academic communities accept this theory (Brown, 2004).

Several studies that contradict this study state that the growth mindset has a relatively high and positive correlation with student learning outcomes. There is an influence of growth mindset on academic grit with an effective contribution of 18.6% (Mas'udah, 2019). In three locations of Costa Rica, students have a growth mindset for English that is greater than that for other subjects (Barquero & Leis, 2019). A mindset intervention may have kept the GPA of the experimental



group from declining throughout the course of the year (Gauthreaux, 2015). The significance of a growth mindset is not whether a student achieved success or failure, but rather that he or she made their best effort (Zintz, 2018). Students who thought intelligence could be enhanced did better academically and were more likely to enroll in advanced math courses in the future. If middle schoolers had worse wellbeing when they started, they were more likely to improve over time if they had the belief that they could control their emotions. These students also reported fewer depressive symptoms (Romero et al., 2014). Adolescents with stronger learning objectives, more optimistic views of effort, and fewer ability-based, "helpless" attributions are more likely to support a more incremental theory of malleable intelligence. As a result, they also choose more optimistic, effort-based failure strategies, which improves mathematics performance during the junior high school transition (Blackwell & Trzesniewski, 2007). According to teacher reports, an experimental examination found that motivating pupils to learn mathematics by introducing them to a dynamic conception of intelligence (Blackwell & Trzesniewski, 2007).

Previous research which is in line with the results of this study shows doubts about the relationship between growth mindset and students' speaking ability. Froedge (2017) stated in his conclusion that a student's Mindset Scale score has a low predictive value for the reading and mathematics SGPs, indicating that teachers cannot anticipate student learning outcomes based on mindset scores. According to meta-analytic study, the association between growth mindset and academic achievement is poor. This may be because few interventions fulfill the established requirements for rigor required to demonstrate an impact on success (Jacovidis et al., 2020). It is impractical to expect a single growth mindset intervention to result in significant improvements in student views about their intelligence or academic achievement, especially if nothing else in the school or classroom environment changes (Jacovidis et al., 2020). However, consistent and comprehensive efforts within the student support network could result in large, long-term advantages and maintained effects over time (Jacovidis et al., 2020). When students have a fixed mindset, they focus on competing for the highest grade and comparing themselves to other students, rather than pursuing the satisfaction of mastery (Burnette et al., 2013).

In research that showed a weak correlation between growth mindset and students' academic grades, especially speaking, found other factors that were stronger than the growth mindset factor. Achievement is strongly predicted by family income (Claro et al., 2016). Extending earlier research, they found that achievement is positively correlated with having a growth mindset, which is the belief that intelligence is not fixed and can be improved, across all socioeconomic strata in the United States. These results suggest that student viewpoints may either lessen or increase the systemic effects of economic disadvantage (Claro et al., 2016). Students from affluent backgrounds demonstrated a growth mindset more frequently (The OECD, 2021).

The poor correlation between the two variables is also influenced by cultural factors. A growth mindset can be integrated into the prevalent cultural ethos of working hard (as opposed to working smart, or diligently as opposed to cleverly), according to research done in Hong Kong (China), the findings of which can be extrapolated to other Asian societies with a Confucian cultural heritage (The OECD, 2021). This could result in widespread acceptance of a "false growth attitude" focused on diligence (OECD - Yidan Prize Foundation, 2020), and it suggests that even students with fixed mindsets have internalized the value of putting forth a lot of effort in situations like these. This could help to lessen the negative effects of a fixed mindset (The OECD, 2021). Even so, the positive effect of the growth mindset on learning is still suggested to be applied in the classroom. Multiple classroom models and messages can activate, support, or challenge students' assumptions about the nature of ability and intelligence (Jacovidis et al., 2020). This procedure influences motivation and engagement, as well as the learning results that occur (Jacovidis et al., 2020). In addition, it fosters more positive school attitudes, greater academic confidence and psychological



well-being, enhanced motivation and school involvement, and greater academic resilience and persistence (Jacovidis et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

14

This study found that there is correlation between students' growth mindset and students' speaking ability. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) in the person correlation test is 0,027 which is bigger than 0,05 and it means that there is significant correlation between students' growth mindset and students' speaking ability. Meanwhile the correlation value is 0,27 that indicated the correlation is weak based on the degree of correlation table that correlation value between 0,21-0,40 is weak correlation. Growth mindset has an average of 41 which shows that the majority of students, 45 students, have a moderate growth mindset. Speaking ability has an average of 75 with a mode of 33 students having AB scores ranging from 77-80.

Researcher suggest to three parties. First, English education lecturers, especially in the speaking class, should pay attention to the psychological factors of students, especially the student's mindset. The mindset can be instilled by lecturers through improving aspects of growth mindset. The growth mindset can positively affect students' confidence in their speaking skills. This will have an impact on how students face self-confidence, effort, problems and challenges, and criticism. Instilling a growth mindset is also more effective in a more stable and long term compared to just providing motivation. Second, student should improve their mindset into better growth mindset. It is obvious that students with growth mindset can acquire speaking skills and more soft skills and hard skills because they do not transfixed on their intelligence level. Changing mindset into growth mindset helps improving student' self-confidence and effort and improving how they perceive problems and challenges and criticism positively. Good environment is suggested to be had by students to support this. It is crucial that changing mindset takes time and is not an instant process. Third, Other researchers. Further research on another type of mindset, namely the fixed mindset and its relationship to students' speaking skills, is suggested that this research can be completed holistically because this research only focuses on the growth mindset and its aspects. In addition, how the growth mindset affects other fields or abilities is also recommended so that these findings do not become generalizations to other fields or abilities. This is because the limitation of this research is that it only focuses on students' speaking skills.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2010). Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. PT. Rineka Cipta.

- Aronson, J., Fried, C., & Good, C. (2002). Reducing The Effect of Stereotpe Threat on African American College Students by Shaping Theories of Intelligence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38(2), 113–125. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2001.1491
- Barquero, L., & Leis, A. (2019). Costa Rican Students 'Mindsets Toward Studying English 1 (Mentalidades de estudiantes costarricenses para el estudio del inglés). *Letras*, 1, 129–162. https://doi.org/10.2307/330107
- Blackwell, L. S., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2007). Implicit Theories of Intelligence Predict Achievement Across an Adolescent Transition: A Longitudinal Study and an Intervention. *Child Development*, 78(1), 246–263.
- Brooks, A. (2017). *How Mindsets Matter: Second Grade, English Language Learners' Reportings Of Their Experiences With A Growth Mindset Curriculum In Colombia* [Hamline University]. https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse all/4270

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Pretince Hall. Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Longman. Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E. H., VanEpps, E. M., Pollacc, J. M., & Funkl, E. J. (2013). Mind-



set Matter: A Meta-Analytical Review of Implicit Theories and Self-Regulation. *Psychologycal Bulletin*, 566–701.

- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking*. National centre for English and Language Teaching Research.
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2014). *Research Methods, Design, and Analysis* (Twelfth Ed). Pearson.
- Claro, S., Paunesku, D., & Dweck, C. S. (2016). Growth Mindset: Tempers the Effect of Poverty on Academic Achievement. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113. https:// doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1608207113
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (Sixth Edit). Routledge.
- Dionar, W. S., & Adnan, A. (2018). Improving Speaking Ability of Senior High School Students by Using Truth or Dare Game. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 369–374. http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt%0AIMPROVING
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational Processes Affecting Learning. *American Psychologist*, *41*(10), 1040–1048.
- Dweck, C. S. (2007). The Perils and Promises of Praise Fixed or Malleable? *ASCD*, 65(2), 34–39.
- Dweck, C. S. (2016). *Mindset: The New Psychology of Succes, How Wecan Learn to Fulfill Our Potential* (J. Sutton, Caroline; Hershey (ed.); Updated Edition. Random House.
- Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2019). Mindset: A View From Two Eras. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *14*(3), 481–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618804166
- Eccles, J. S. (2004). Schools, Academic Motivation, and Stage-Environment fit. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg. In *Handbook of Adolecent Psychology* (pp. 125–153).
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (Eight Edit). McGraw-Hill.
- Froedge, K. L. (2017). The Effect of a Growth Mindset on Student Achievement among Students with a Disability [Western Kentucky University]. In *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (Vol. 78, Issues 11-A(E)). https://search.proquest.com/ docview/1927182047?accountid=29018%0Ahttp://pqdd.sinica.edu.tw/twdaoapp/servlet/ advanced?query=10600034%0Ahttp://lbdiscover.ust.hk/uresolver?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft val fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&genre=dissertations+
- Gauthreaux, E. E. (2015). *Effect of Specific Feedback on Growth Mindset and Achievement* [Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College]. https:// digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/3259
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference (11.0 updat). MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Haris, D. (1974). Testing English as a Second Language. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Harmer, J. (2007). The Practice of English Language Teaching (Fourth Edi). Pearson Longman.
- Jacovidis, J. N., Anderson, R. C., Beach, P. T., & Chadwick, K. L. (2020). Growth Mindset Thinking and Beliefs in Teaching and Learning. In *Policy Paper: The Growth Mindset in Education*.:
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (Second Rev). New Age International Publishers.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners* (3rd Editio). SAGE Publications.
- Mas'udah, I. (2019). Pengaruh Growth Mindset Terhadap Grit Akademik pada Mahasiswa yang Mengikuti Organisasi [Universitas Negri Semarang]. http://lib.unnes.ac.id/id/eprint/336



- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking From Theory to Practice* (First Edition). Cambridge University Press.
- Romero, C., Master, A., Paunesku, D., Dweck, C. S., Gross, J. J., Romero, C., Master, A., Paunesku, D., Dweck, C. S., & Gross, J. J. (2014). Academic and Emotional Functioning in Middle School : The Role of Implicit Theories Academic and Emotional Functioning in Middle School : The Role of Implicit Theories. *American Psychological Association*. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035490
- Rukminingsih, M. P., Dr. Gunawan Adnan, MA., P. ., & Prof. Mohammad Adnan Latief, M.A.,
 P. D. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Penelitian Kuantitatif, Penelitian Kualitatif, Penelitian Tindakan Kelas* (E. Munastiwi & H. Ardi (eds.); Cetakan Pe). Erhaka Utama.
- Stewart, C. O., Iii, J. R. M., Stallings, L. A., & Roscoe, R. D. (2019). Growth Mindset: Associations with Apprehension, Self-Perceived Competence, and Beliefs about Public Speaking Growth Mindset: Associations with Apprehension, Self-Perceived. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 31(1), 44–69. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol31/ iss1/6
- The OECD. (2021). Sky's the limit: Growth mindset, students, and schools in PISA.
- Watt, H. M. G. (2004). Development of Adolescents' Self-perception, Values, and Task Perceptions According to Gender and Domain in 7th-through 11th-grade Australian Students. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1556–1574. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.111/ j.1467-8624.2004.00757.x.
- Zintz, S. (2018). Effectiveness of A Growth Mindset in Education [Northwestern College]. In *NWCommons*. https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/education_masters/76/

