



Register journal

ISSN (PRINT) : 1979-8921
ISSN (ONLINE) : 2502-940X

LANGUAGE & LANGUAGE TEACHING JOURNALS

The Influence of Students' Creativity to Construct Sentences toward Their Speaking Skill

Mukminatuz Zuhriyah, Ria Karnifah Agustina, Maskhurin Fajarina

Veil or Evil? Spotlighting Women Portrayal through Semiotics Analysis

Ika Apriani Fata

Utilization of Edmodo as an Online Tool in EFL Writing Class to Increase Students' Writing Ability

M. Zaini Miftah

Photovoice: A Tool of Reflective Learning to Enhance Students' Speaking Ability

Amirah Husnun, Aprilia Wulandari, Atika Munawwaroh, Nur Arifah Drahati

Vol. 11, No. 1, June 2018

Editorial Team

Editor in Chief

1. [Faizal Risdianto](#), SCOPUS ID:57213518975, Google Scholar H-index: 5, Web of Science ResearcherID □ AAN-5614-2020, IAIN Salatiga, Indonesia

Managing Editor

1. [Norwanto norwanto](#), SCOPUS ID:57204006221, State Institute for Islamic Studies Salatiga, Indonesia

Editors

1. [Dr. Haerazi Haerazi](#), Scopus ID : 57212109753, Sinta ID: 6720929, ID Scopus: 57212109753 , Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika, Indonesia
2. [Arina Isti'annah](#), SCOPUS ID: 57218872674, ORCID ID : 0000-0003-4273-1330, Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia
3. [Fahmi Gunawan](#), Scopus ID: 57199720154, IAIN Kendari, Sulawesi
4. [Hanung Triyoko](#), SCOPUS ID: 57223873252, State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga,, Indonesia
5. [Fahrus Zaman Fadhly](#), Scopus ID: 57200496108, Universitas Kuningan, Indonesia., Indonesia
6. [Misdi Misdi](#), SCOPUS ID: 51564312900, Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, University of Swadaya Gunung Djati., Indonesia
7. [Ms. Lilik Istiqomah](#), SCOPUS ID:57200983436, IAIN Surakarta, Indonesia
8. [Choiril Anwar](#), ORCID ID:0000-0002-1057-4310, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Indonesia
9. [Kaspul Anwar](#), Scopus ID: 57199358594, IAI Muhammad Azim/Universitas Jambi
10. [K Khristianto](#), Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Indonesia
11. [M. Zaini Miftah](#), (Scopus ID: 57220785045), Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palangka Raya, Indonesia
12. [Diana Rozelin](#), Sultan Thaha Saifuddin State Islamic University, Indonesia
13. [Marisa Fran Lina](#), (SINTA ID : 6643162, Google Scholars), Dosen IAIN Salatiga, Indonesia

Regional Handling Editor for Asia and Other Regions

1. [Saira Kazmi, Ph.D](#), SCOPUS ID:57211395994, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1306-8381,Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Batu Pahat, Malaysia, Adjunct Asst.Prof. of media sciences department. Department of English Linguistics & Literature, University: Riphah International University, I-14, Islamabad, Pakistan., Pakistan
2. [Noor Malihah](#), (Scopus ID: 57204496362; Google Scholars) State Institute of Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga, Indonesia

Regional Handling Editor for Africa and Other Regions

1. [Dr. Saad Boulahnane](#), Scopus ID: 57205120294, EFL lecturer at Al Akhawayn University, Ifrane, Morocco

Advisory International Editorial Boards

1. Professor Jumanto Jumanto, SCOPUS ID: 57200086067, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Indonesia, Indonesia
2. Professor Joseph Foley, Scopus id: 37082716000, Assumption University, Thailand
3. Hjalmar Punla Hernandez, University of the Philippine Los Banos, Philippines
4. Dr. Vahid Nimehchisalem, Scopus id:37029013600, University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
5. Prof.Dr Djatmika M.A, SCOPUS ID:57193243004, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
6. Prof. Dr. Rudi Hartono, Sinta ID: 385, Scopus ID: 57212033540, Google Scholar ID: HAw_8ycAAAAJ&hl , H-Index 11, ORCID ID : <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7806-4202>, Semarang State University, Indonesia
7. Dr. Ismail Suardi Wekke, (SCOPUS ID: 35076859100) (ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0996-4928>) Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Sorong, Indonesia
8. Professor Gusti Astika, Scopus id: 6506594036, Satya Wacana Christian University, Indonesia., Indonesia
9. Dr. Ekawati Marhaenny Dukut, (Scopus ID: 57201982540),Universitas Katholik Soegijapranata, Semarang, Indonesia
10. Professor Ali Saukah, Scopus id: 57192897357, State University of Malang
11. Dr. Anuncius Gumawang Jati, Language Center of Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB)

Technical Support

1. Muhammad Istiqlal, IAIN Salatiga

Graphic & Layout Editor

1. Sigied Himawan Yudhanto, prodi D3 DKV Sekolah Vokasi Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
2. Helmi Suyanto, Relawan Jurnal Indonesia Pengda Jawa Tengah; Bengkel Jurnal Semarang, Indonesia ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0084-6511> Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=en&user=HSWFKIQAAAAJ>, Indonesia

Vol 11, No 1 (2018)

REGISTER JOURNAL

Table of Contents

Articles

The Influence of Students' Creativity to Construct Sentences toward Their Speaking Skill DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.1-18 <i>Mukminatus Zuhriyah, Ria Kamilah Agustina, Maskhurin Fajarina</i>	PDF 1-18
Veil or Evil? Spotlighting Women Portrayal through Semiotics Analysis DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.19-36 <i>Ika Apriani Fata</i>	PDF 19-36
Utilization of Edmodo as an Online Tool in EFL Writing Class to Increase Students' Writing Ability DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.37-58 <i>M. Zaini Miftah</i>	PDF 37-58
Photovoice: A Tool of Reflective Learning to Enhance Students' Speaking Ability DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.59-78 <i>Amirah Husnun, Aprilia Wulandari, Atika Munawwaroh, Nur Arifah Drajadi</i>	PDF 59-78
A Descriptive Analysis of Young Learners' Behaviours toward TEFL DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.79-100 <i>Choiril Anwar, Wa Ode runi Kusumawarni</i>	PDF 79-100
The Effectiveness of Skimming and Scanning Strategies in Improving Comprehension and Reading Speed Rates to Students of English Study Programme DOI : 10.18326/rgt.v11i1.101-120 <i>Iwan Fauzi</i>	PDF 101-120

The Influence of Students' Creativity to Construct Sentences Toward Their Speaking Skill

Mukminatus Zuhriyah
Hasyim Asy'ari University
zoehrea@gmail.com

Ria Kamilah Agustina
Hasyim Asy'ari University
riakamilah88@gmail.com

Maskhurin Fajarina
Hasyim Asy'ari University
emfajarina@gmail.com
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v11i1.1-18>

Submission

Track:

Received:

29-03-2018

Final Revision:

19-05-2018

Available online:

01-06-2018

Corresponding

Author:

Mukminatus

Zuhriyah

zoehrea@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Having capability to speak English well is not an easy task. There are some factors influencing the speaking competence. One of them is creativity. Therefore, this research concerns on investigating the influence of students' creativity in arranging sentences toward their speaking skill. This quasi-experimental research discusses whether the students having high creativity have high speaking skill. The population of the research was 109 students (5 classes). The research used cluster randomnessampling to choose two classes as the samples of this research. The data of this research consisted of scores of creativity test and speaking test. The data of thespeaking scores comprises of the scores of the students having high and low creativity. After those data were normal and homogeneous, then, the data were analyzed using F-test ANOVA. The difference between rows is significant because F_o between rows (1125.64) is higher than F_t (4.11) at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$. The mean score of speaking test of students having

high creativity (78.9) is higher than that of students having low creativity (60.85). It means that the speaking skill of students having high creativity is higher than those who have low creativity. Thus, it can be concluded that students' creativity influences their speaking skill.

Keywords: *Influence, Students' Creativity, Speaking Skill*

INTRODUCTION

This quasi experimental research discusses whether or not the students who have high creativity have high speaking skill. Some researchers have conducted the research about the relationship between the creativity and the students' achievement (e.g. Trivedi and Bhargava (2010), Baghaei and Riasati (2013), and Ramezani, Larsari, and Kiasi (2016)). However, a few researchers focused on the students' creativity toward their speaking skill. There have been limited studies concerned on exploring the influence of students' creativity to create sentences toward their speaking skill. Therefore, this research focuses on the neglected influence of students' creativity to construct sentences toward their speaking skill.

Trivedi and Bhargava (2010), Baghaei and Riasati (2013), and Ramezani, Larsari, and Kiasi (2016) have found the significant relation between the creativity and the students' achievement. Trivedi and Bhargava (2010) in their study found that adolescences who have high achievement have higher level of creativity than those who have low achievement. Other three studies inform the existence of creativity in teaching. Yager, Dogan, Hacieminoglu, and Yager (2012) concludes that teachers using Science/Technology/Society (STS) approach are aware of the capability of their students to use their creativity in their classrooms. The study conducted by Baghaei and Riasati (2013) suggests that the the creativity of the teachers

may affect the achievement of students. Additionally, Ramezani, Larsari, and Kiasi (2016) find that English learners having higher critical thinking had better speaking skill.

Creativity has close relation with the ability of someone to produce and create something new or different from others. Eragamreddy(2013) defines creativity as a kind of thinking that can bring us to something new, novel, and fresh consisting of insight, approaches, perspectives, ways of understanding and conceiving of things. Trivedi and Bhargava (2010) say that creativity is a critical aspect of human's lifebeginning from the embryonic level up to adult people. Meanwhile, Lin (2011) argues that in the beginning of the twentieth century, the perception about the creativity source has undergone the shifting from inherited genius owned by the individuals with high talents to diverse human abilities. Additionally, Mkpanang (2016) states that creativity is a process involving some cognitive and affective factors which influence one another. Furthermore, Thakur and Shekhawat (2014) present five levels of Taylor's hierarchy of creativity, namely (1) an expressive creativity, (2) a technical creativity, (3) an inventive creativity, (4) an innovative creativity, and (5) an emergent creativity.

Another significant aspect in communication, particularly in English classes, is speaking competence. As human being, people always interact with others in fulfilling their daily need. In this case, they communicate one another. People commonly express and communicate their willingness, feelings, ideas, and thoughts to others through speaking. Mulya, Adnan, and Ardi (2013) state that someone can deliver his or her information and ideas, and keep his or her social relationship by communicating with others through speaking. Speaking is one of the communication ways to express ideas and thoughts orally(Efrizal, 2012). Thus, it can be said that speaking becomes an

important part in human daily life. Afrizal (2015) argues that speaking is a process which is interactive to make and receive information. Meanwhile, Becker and Roos (2016) state that speaking is usually considered as the language skill which is reproductive and imitative in the classroom so that the activities done are prepared to produce the output which is closely supported accurate. With regard to speaking English for EFL learners, Oradee (2012) presents the idea that EFL learners usually do not use the language in authentic situations so that they often speak incorrectly and inappropriately. Afrizal (2015) presents five components of speaking skill, namely communication, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension

Speaking is one of the basic skills for English students. With regard to the role of English, Arham, Yassi, and Arafah (2016) argue that speaking skill is the requirement to interact and communicate in this globalization era, e.g. Indonesian workers must master English speaking skill to work overseas. Therefore, It is very important to teach English as Foreign Language (EFL) to Indonesian students. Ramezani, Larsari, and Kiasi (2016) point out that, for EFL learners, speaking skill becomes the most important skill because of technology improvement and the need to interact with others in their community. Additionally, Dewi, Kultsum, and Armadi (2017) say that EFL learners must master speaking skill as the basic English language skill because it is useful for their knowledge improvement and making them easier to get a job. Kaminskiene and Kavaliauskiene (2014) state that in the twenty first century, English learners should be able to talk about professional issues. In line with this condition, most of universities in Indonesia put English as one of compulsory courses for non English department students.

Hasyim Asy'ari University, as other universities in Indonesia, put English as a compulsory course for non English department students. English skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) as a compulsory course for

non English department students is taught integratedly. They usually focus on speaking skill when they are studying English. Learning speaking skill enables them to study listening, reading, and writing indirectly. Listening occurs when they listen to their lecturer's speech and other students' talk. Reading, then, takes place when they read the materials of the speaking topics. Meanwhile, students learn writing skill happens when they write their ideas and thoughts or scripts to prepare their talk.

The speaking materials studied by non English department students are still the basic one. It is still about how to express their ideas, feelings, and thoughts in their daily conversations and discussions. They often practice speaking by talking with their partners and sometimes by discussing some topics in their groups. Although it is still speaking about the daily life, the students also need to use their creativity to produce the comprehending conversations and discussions with their friends. The students' creativity has an important role in their speaking. Mkpanang (2016) states that creativity can contain the ability of a person to think and to imagine. Meanwhile, Trivedi and Bhargava (2010) explain that something to be done for creativity is to keep and encourage it in order that its appearance can be full and real.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is a quasi experimental research. Quasi experimental research is done with the consideration that it is impossible to create an experimental group in the school with a full control (Amir, 2015). Meanwhile, the independent variables of this study is teaching models, the attributive variable is students' creativity), and the dependent variable is students' speaking skill. The teaching models used in this research were problem-based learning (PBL) which was implemented in an experimental

group and direct instruction which was implemented in a control group. The design of this research is a simple factorial design 2×2 .

Population, Sample, and Sampling

It is important for the researcher to determine the population before the sample is taken and treatments are given. The population of this research was the second semester students of Non English Departement of Education Faculty of Hasyim Asy'ari University (UNHASY) in the academic year of 2017/2018. The total number of the population in this research was 109 students who are divided into 5 classes. Based on the characteristics of the population, which were grouped into classes, the sample of this research was class or cluster. There were two classes as the samples of this research. One class was the experimental group and the other class was the control group. In determining the sample, the researcher took cluster random sampling because it was impossible to change the classroom arrangement or to use random assignment. Because of this condition, this research is classified as a quasi experimental research. Meanwhile, the steps to take the samples in this research were (1) making a list of the five classes; (2) writing the name of each class on five pieces of paper; (3) rolling five pieces of paper and then put them into a can and shake the can well; (4) dropping the two rolled pieces of paper. The next step after getting the two classes was to determine which class would be the experimental group and the control group by using the lottery. The number of the students who became the sample in both experimental class and control class in this research was 40 students. The experimental class consisted of 20 students and the control class comprised of 20 students.

Techniques of Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data of this study was collected from creativity test and speaking test. The first test was conducted to collect the primary data of the students'

creativity scores. The creativity test was about the test of making sentences based on given criteria. This test consisted of four main questions to create sentences. Of all, the students should write twenty sentences in creativity test. The detail of these four main questions were (1) five questions asking the students to make sentences based on the initial letters of the provided words; (2) five questions requesting them to make sentences based on the middle letters of the given words; (3) five questions instructing them to make sentences based on the final letters of the prepared words; and (4) five questions telling them to make sentences which contained the last words of the previous sentences.

The second test, i.e. speaking test, was administered to get the primary data of the students' speaking scores. The speaking test was the test of making conversations in English with their partners. The lecturer provided the topics of the test and the students were able to choose one of them to be the topic of their conversations with their partners. The tests were conducted after the students attended four sessions of each treatment and control classes. There were five indicators of speaking test's scoring, namely comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and pronunciation.

To check the readability of the tests materials, the researcher administered test to students outside the treatment and control classes. It was to know the readability of those two tests. Meanwhile, the creativity test itself was first validated by two experts. After getting the result of the preliminary test informing that the creativity test was readable, the creativity test was distributed and tested to the experimental class and the control class. Then, the scores of creativity test were used to classify the students into students having high creativity and students having low creativity. This kind of classification was applied in the experimental class and the control class.

Hence, there were two classifications of students in those two classes: students who have high creativity and students who have low creativity. The speaking test also got the same treatment as the creativity test. This speaking test was tested to the other class to know its readability before it was distributed and tested to the experimental class and the control class. Then, the speaking scores were analyzed based on high creativity and low creativity.

After knowing that the data of students' speaking skill of students who have high creativity and students who have low creativity in both the experimental class and the control class was normal and homogeneous, then the research hypothesis was tested. To test the research hypothesis, inferential analysis was used. It was also used to test whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. H_0 is rejected if $F_o > F_t$ or F_o is higher than F_t . If H_0 is rejected, the analysis is continued to know the significant difference of mean using Tukey test. The speaking scores of both the experimental and the control groups were first analyzed using the F-test ANOVA. The result of data analysis was consulted to the F_t at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ to know whether the result is significant or not. If F_o between rows is higher than F_t at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the difference between rows is significant. It means that the students who have high creativity differ significantly from those who have low creativity in their speaking skill. After that, the data was also analyzed by using Tukey test to know the significance between rows.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The normality and the homogeneity of the data of speaking test of students who have high creativity and students who have low creativity in both the experimental class and the control class were firstly analyzed. It was

done as the prerequisite before analyzing the data by using F-test ANOVA. After knowing that the data of the experimental class and the control class (the data of speaking test scores of students having high creativity and students having low creativity) were in normal distribution and homogeneous, then the data was analyzed by using F-test ANOVA. The result is described as follows.

Table 1. Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Sources of Variances	SS	df	MS	Fo	Ft
Between Rows (Creativity)	2892.9	1	2892.9	1125.6	4.11
Between Groups	3241.1	3	114.04	4	
Within Groups	92.4	36	2.57		
Total	3333.5	39			

Based on the table above, it can be seen that Fo between rows (1125.64) is higher than Ft (4.11) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, so that Ho is rejected. This result means that the difference between rows is significant. Thus, it can be concluded that the difference between the speaking skill of the students who have high creativity and those who have low creativity is significant. Because the mean score of speaking test of students who have high creativity (78.9) is higher than the mean score of speaking test of students who have low creativity (70.25), thus, it can be said that the students who have high creativity have better speaking skill than the students who have low creativity. Next, to find the significance of the difference between rows, the data was analyzed by using Tukey test. The result of Tukey test shows that qo between rows (50.14) is higher than qt at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95). It means that the difference between rows is significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity in constructing sentences have better speaking skill than those who

have low creativity. The students' creativity in creating sentences has significant influence toward their speaking skill.

Based on the above result, it can be said that students' speaking skill was influenced by their creativity. Creativity relates to the ideas and products which are unusual, new, and effective (Runco and Jaeger, 2012). Creativity which is discussed in this study is students' creativity. It is closely related to their creativity in their learning. In line with this, Lin (2011) argues that students can learn and think creatively when they are given opportunity to do them. Then, creativity which is possessed by students gives a great influence to their ability in learning, especially in learning to speak. It is because learning to speak requires the students to be more creative and critical. The learning to speak needs the ability to analyze and determine whether the ideas are appropriate with the topics of conversations or discussions and whether the vocabularies used are suitable with the topics of conversations or discussions. In this case, the students who have high creativity speak better since they have high ability to analyze and determine the appropriate ideas for their talk. They may also choose appropriate vocabulary so that they can produce the meaningful and comprehensive conversations having a lot of argumentations and opinions based on the topics given by the lecturer.

In addition, Tsai (2012) states that there are some factors affecting creativity, which can be described as (a) personality traits, (b) knowledge and expertise, (c) motivation and self-efficacy, (d) learning styles and thinking styles, (e) teaching approaches, (f) assesment and reward, and (g) environment. Thus, it can be said that the students who have high creativity have more knowledge and expertise, more motivation and self-efficacy, and more thinking styles. All those factors make the students who have high creativity become more active in speaking class. Students having high

creativity give more argumentations and opinions during the speaking class. As the result, the situation of learning speaking in the classroom becomes more interesting.

Having more knowledges and expertise makes the students who have high creativity easier to find and get ideas related to the topics of the conversations. They also can understand the topics of conversations easily. They are able to have conversations with whoever inviting them to talk. They have ability to join the conversations not only as the information takers but also as the information givers. That is why more knowledges and expertise that they possess makes them able to handle the conversations well. The knowledge can be knowledge of the topics of the conversations, knowledges of vocabularies, which are needed in the conversations, and knowledges of grammar to make comprehensive and meaningful sentences, which are produced in the conversations. Knowledges about the topics of the conversations enable the students to have opinions and argumentations as well as the explanations about the topics which are given. Whereas, knowledges of grammar enable the students to produce the meaningful and comprehensive sentences for the conversations. Meanwhile, knowledges about the vocabularies make the students able to express and communicate their feelings, ideas, and thoughts in the right context. Dealing with knowledges of grammar and vocabulary, Mart (2012) states that the knowledge of vocabulary and grammar makes the students able to understand the conversations. When the students are able to understand the conversations, they will be able to create the understandable conversations.

Then, more motivation and self-efficacy which are owned by the students who have high creativity make them able to enjoy joining the speaking class. They are motivated to come to speaking class. It means that

they are voluntarily to join the speaking class, even though they are non-English Department students and it is obligatory course to take. Besides, they are also highly motivated to involve in the conversations which were created in the speaking class. They never feel ashamed of the given topics that they do not fully understand. Thus, they come to the class with high motivation and self-efficacy to be involved in the speaking activities. According to Al Othman and Shuqair (2013), the learners' motivation has great effect to their willingness to be involved in the learning process.

Additionally, students having high creativity has more thinking styles. According to Gacar, Altungul, and Nacar (2015), there are five thinking styles: (a) intuitive thinking style, (b) experiential thinking style, (c) ideational thinking style, (d) conceptual-rational thinking style, and (e) analytical thinking style. Those thinking styles have close relationship with the people's ways to face and solve the problems that they get in their life. Therefore, the students with high creativity are easily able to find the solutions of the problems in their speaking class. By having more thinking styles, the ways how the students have the solutions, opinions, ideas, as well as argumentations in their conversations will be varied. Then, the students are always curious with the problem solving of the topics of the conversations given. This condition makes them have high spirit to present their ideas in the speaking class. Besides, the students are also able to think something new differently with the various ways of thinking that they have. It makes them easier to understand and adapt every knowledge in whatever the condition of the learning process is. So that something new that they get and find is not the problem at all for them. They can adapt and handle this kind of this thing easily. Thus, they can manage and handle whatever they find and face in their conversations without any doubt.

Meanwhile, students who have low creativity have less knowledge and expertise, less motivation and self-efficacy, and less thinking styles. They usually are not interested in joining the teaching and learning process. They just count on the lecturer and their friends and are often passive in learning to speak. They seldom give their argumentations and opinions in their discussions. They follow their friends' argumentations and opinions without any objections. Moreover, some of them also just sit, listen to what their friends say, and keep silent without giving any comments at all. Dealing with this situation, Adriana, Melendez, Gandy, Zavala, and Mendez (2014) state that low English level students often experience shaking, sweating, being silent for long time, sitting back to their seats and not going on their speaking, or crying because of no word coming out from their mouth when they are asked to speak. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students having high creativity have better speaking skill than the students having low creativity. It means that creativity has influence toward students' speaking skill.

Having less knowledge and expertise makes the students feel not get through with the conversations made in the class. They feel know nothing to contribute in that speaking. Then, they also cannot comprehend the conversations well. They often feel anxious when they are involved in the teaching and learning process because of their low knowledge. Zhu and Zhou (2012) states that many students feel anxious when being asked by their teacher to answer questions. They are afraid if their answers are incorrect. Therefore, what they can do is just listening and agreeing what their friends talk about. Sometimes they will speak one or two sentences as far as what they know about the topics of the speaking.

Meanwhile, less motivation and self-efficacy makes the students feel lazy to involve in the teaching and learning process of speaking in the class. They come to the speaking class since they are obligated to join. It is because they have already taken this course. That is why they attend the meeting. Then, they are less motivated to take a part in the class of conversations. Dislen(2013) states that the students' motivation is damaged because their self-confidence and self-esteem are low and their anxiety and inhibition are high. When the students experience those two things, they are absolutely less motivated. Therefore, they are often just acting as the good listeners by keeping silent or just as the good supporters by saying one or two sentences of expressing agreements in their conversations.

Less thinking styles that the students have also make them difficult to feel free in every situation of conversations created in the class. For instance, the students who only can learn by thinking of what they see, it is very difficult for them to catch and understand something said by others. The students who only can find ideas while moving their parts of their bodies, while loitering for instance, they will get difficulty when they are ordered to express their ideas in their speaking with the setting of a certain place and a certain condition prohibiting them to have many movements. This kind of students cannot find opinions and ideas or argumentations as soon as possible in this condition. This case is supported by Negahi, Nouri, and Khoram (2015) who explain that styles become the stem of the success and the failure of the ability. Thinking styles are included in it. That is why less thinking styles make the students having low creativity fail to have high speaking skill.

Thus, the students who have low creativity tend to have low English level. Considering with the conditions happening to the students having low English level above, it is very necessary to encourage those kinds of students to be able to speak English well and fluently. It can be done by encouraging

their creativity related to their English speaking skill. The questions of creativity test used in this research can be applied to these students. They can be asked to do the creativity test as much as possible. So that they are accustomed to using their creative thinking in expressing their feelings, ideas, thoughts, opinions, as well as argumentations by constructing English sentences. This activity is meant to make them used to having creative thinking. It is because basically everyone can become creative; being creative is the potential that is owned by everybody (Lin, 2011).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research result above, it can be inferred that the students who have high creativity have better speaking skill than those who have low creativity. It happens because the students who have high creativity have more motivation and knowledge, more self-efficacy, more learning styles, and more thinking styles. Because of those, they have high ability to comprehend the topics of speaking and are able to produce different and meaningful ideas and opinions as well as argumentations with the appropriate vocabularies and good grammar. They are able to express what they want to communicate with others fluently. They have ability to produce the meaningful and understandable sentences in their conversations. They have logical ideas and opinions when they held discussions with their partners. They are easy to create comprehensive communications with other people. Thus, it can be known that students' creativity has important role in students' speaking skill. Therefore, it is very crucial to encourage the creativity of the students in order that the students do not feel difficult in speaking anymore.

The result of this study shows that the students' creativity influences their abilities to create sentences in speaking classes. The students who have

high creativity feel as the right men in the right place. It means that they are ready to face anything happening to their speaking class. They are not worried about whatever topics of the speaking that they will get and find. They have the key to solve every problem taking place. They are strongly motivated to be included in the speaking activities. All of those can happen because they have high creativity. But the creativity in this study is still limited to the creativity of the students to create sentences based on the instructions provided by the lecturer. That is why it is recommended for other researchers to explore the other parts of creativity that can influence the students' speaking skill. There are still many areas of creativity that can contribute to the students' speaking skill. It is suggested to the future researchers to explore those areas relating to the students' speaking skill.

REFERENCES

- Adriana, R., Melendez, M., Gandy, M., Zavala, G. Q., & Mendez, R. F. (2014). Teaching Speaking Strategies To Beginners. *European Scientific Journal*, 1(February), 1857–7881.
- Afrizal, M. (2015). A Classroom Action Research: Improving Speaking Skills Through Information Gap Activities. *English Education Journal*, 6(3), 342–355.
- Al Othman, F. H. M., & Shuqair, K. M. (2013). The Impact of Motivation on English Language Learning in the Gulf States. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(4), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v2n4p123>
- Amir, M. F. (2015). *Menulis Tesis & Disertasi*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Arham, R., Yassi, A. H., & Arafah, B. (2016). The Use of Role Play to Improve Teaching Speaking. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(3), 239–241.
- Baghaei, S. & Riasati, M.J. (2013). An Investigation into the Relationship Between Teachers' Creativity and Students' Academic Achievement: A Case Study of Iran EFL Context, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14 (12): 1576-1580. doi: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.14.12.803
- Becker, C., & Roos, J. (2016). An approach to creative speaking activities in the young learners' classroom. *Education Inquiry*, 7(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v7.27613>

- Dewi, R. S., Kultsum, U., & Armadi, A. (2017). Using Communicative Games in Improving Students' Speaking Skills. *English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n1p63>
- Dislen, G. (2013). The Reasons of Lack of Motivation from the Students' and Teachers' Voices. *Asos Journal, The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 1(1), 35-45.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving Students' Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at MTS Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 127-134.
- Eragamreddy, N. (2013). Teaching Creative Thinking Skills. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Study*, 1(2), 124-145.
- Gacar, A., Altungul, O., & Nacar, E. (2015). Examination of Thinking Styles of Trainers from Different Branches. *Annals of Applied Sport Science*, 3(4), 01-08.
- Kaminskienė, L., & Kavaliauskienė, G. (2014). Attitudes to Improving Speaking Skills By Guided Individual Activities. *Coactivity: Philology, Educology*, 22(1), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.3846/cpe.2014.04>
- Lin, Y.S. (2011). Fostering Creativity through Education – A Conceptual Framework of Creative Pedagogy. *Creative Education*, 2(3), 149-155. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2011.23021>
- Mart, C. T. (2012). Developing Speaking Skills through Reading. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(6), 91-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n6p91>
- Mkpanang, J. T. (2016). Influence of Creative Style and Gender on Students' Achievement in Physics. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(12), 42-46.
- Mulya, R.A., Adnan, A., & Ardi, R. (2013). The Effect of Problem Based Learning Strategy Toward Students' Speaking Ability At The First Grade Of SMAN 1 Enam Lingsung. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 314-323.
- Negahi, M., Nouri, N., & Khoram, A. (2015). The Study of Learning Styles, Thinking Styles, and English Language Academic Self-efficacy among the Students of Islamic Azad University of Behbahan Considering Their Field of Study and Gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1722-1729. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.25>
- Oradee, T. (2012). Developing Speaking Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem-Solving, and Role-Playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 533-535. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.164>

- Ramezani, R., Larsari, E. E., & Kiasi, M. A. (2016). The Relationship between Critical Thinking and EFL Learners' Speaking Ability. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 189-198. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p189>
- Runco, M. A. & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The Standard Definition of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92–96. doi: 10.1080/10400419.2012.650092.
- Thakur, D. A., & Shekhawat, M. (2014). Importance of Teaching Innovation & Creativity in Engineering and Management. *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology*, 14(3), 153–157. <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315381/IJETT-V14P230>
- Trivedi, K., & Bhargava, R. (2010). Relation of Creativity and Educational Achievement in Adolescence. *Relation of Creativity and Educational Achievement in Adolescence*, 1(2), 85–89.
- Tsai, K., C. (2012). The Value of Teaching Creativity in Adult Education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 1(2), 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v1n2p84>
- Yager, S. O., Hacieminoglu, E., & Yager, R. E. (2012). The Role of Student and Teacher Creativity in Aiding Current Reform Efforts in Science and Technology Education. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 25(3), 1–24.
- Zhu, B., & Zhou, Y. (2012). A study on students' affective factors in Junior high school English teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n7p33>