CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the description of finding and discussion that was covered during the research. The descriptions of finding were students' optimism, students' speaking achievement, hypothesis research and the correlation between optimism and speaking achievement. The researcher presented them is based on the data collected and the procedure described in the chapter III. Since there were some results in this study, the researcher presented them as follow:

A. Research Findings

1. The Optimism of Second Semester Students in Speaking Class of English Education Department UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

a. Sudents' Optimism in Speaking Class

To know the students' optimism of the first-year of English education department UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, the researcher used questionnaire to measure the students' optimism. Research procedure used the questionnaire of optimism which was developed based on Seligman's theories. It could be seen below:

1) Permanence (Permanence) consisted favorable and unfavorable items.

a. Favorable item contained

1. Every success I have achieved is the starting point of any successful that will I be in the future.

14. If I'm not desperate I am sure I will get a good achievement in speaking class.

17. When I get a good score in speaking, I will try to maintain it.

b. Unfavorable item contained

4. Because I did not have a good English experience, so the effort I do is not work up.

18. I made a mistake when having conversation with my friend in front of the class it will make me shy in a long way.

19. I have been practicing speaking but my score is bad and I am not going to practice again.

2) Permanence (Temporary) consisted favorable items and unfavorable item

a. favorable items

13. I have been practicing speaking, but the test today did not go well, and I am sure that the next test will succeed.

22. I believe bad luck can be changed with effort and prayer.

b. unfavorable items

16. When I do not study and I succeeded in my test, I believe that success is a coincidence.

3) Pervasiveness (Universal) consisted favorable and unfavorable items

a. Favorable items

2. To my ability, I deserve a good achievement in speaking

3. I was able to adjust speaking class because I spent much time to practice and study.

b. Unfavorable item

11. My ability makes me hesitate to get a good speaking achievement.

4) Pervasiveness (Specific) consisted of favorable and unfavorable items

a. Favorable items

8. I was speechless when doing the conversation in front of the class, but I remain confident.

9. I am not good in grammar, but I remain confident speaking English.

15. Although I get bad score today, I keep the spirit through the day.

b. unfavorable items

5. I find it difficult to follow and get a good grade on speaking class because I did not have a good English background.

10. If today I fail, it will hamper me to get a good speaking achievement.

5) Personalization (internal) consisted favorable and unfavorable items.

a. Favorable item

7. If I practice speaking hardly, I will get a good achievement in speaking class.

b. Unfavorable items

6. I am not sure with my speaking ability.

12. I was not confident when I speak in front of the class or speak with my lecturer by English language.

6) Personalization (external) was consisted of unfavorable items

20. I got a good achievement because my lecturer feels pity for me.

21. I don't get a good score because the lecturer did not know me.

The researcher defined the categorization of students' optimism score in the speaking class. To ease counting the maximum, minimum, moderate, standard deviation and sum, the researcher used computer counting by using SPSS version 21 program. It was took maximum, minimum, mean, standard deviation and sum score as in the table follows:

Table 4.1 The Descriptive Statistics of Optimism

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Optimism	53	65	101	4183	78.92	7.496
Valid N (listwise)	53					

From the table we know that the minimum score of optimism was 65, maximum score 101, mean score was 78.92, standard deviation was 7.496, and sum score was 4183.

The researcher categorized the samples into three category grade of students' optimism in the speaking class, which was high, moderate, and low.

The way to get the first dominant optimism was looked for mean score (M) and standard deviation (SD). Then mean and standard deviation score were applied to this form. The form was derived from saifuddin azwar *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi*, that cited by Muharnia Dewi in her thesis[58]. The result of category distribution score as follow:

Table 4.2 The Category of Optimism

Category		Interval	Frequency	%
High	≥ M + 1SD	≥ 86	9	17.0%
Moderate	M – 1SD < X <M + 1SD	72 – 85	36	67.9%
Low	≤ M – 1SD	≤ 71	8	15.1%
Total			53	100%

From the table above could be known that there were 17% students, who have high optimism in interval class 86 to the highest, 67.9% who have moderate optimism in interval 72-85, and 15.1% who have low optimism in interval the lowest to 71. It could be concluded and interpreted that most of students have moderate optimism, and who have the low and high optimism was almost the same amount.

[58]Muharnia Dewi A, Undergraduate Thesis: "*Hubungan Self-esteem dengan Optimisme Meraih Kesuksesan Karir pada Mahasiswa Fakultas Psikologi UIN Syarif HidayatullahJakarta"* (Jakarta: UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, 2010)

The table was derived from the SPSS 21 computation as follow.

Table 4.3 Table of SPSS computation of Optimism Category

Category

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High	9	17.0	17.0	17.0
	Moderate	36	67.9	67.9	84.9
	Low	8	15.1	15.1	100.0
	Total	53	100.0	100.0	

Then, to percentage each item of statements, the researcher used the following formula and it could be seen below:

$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$

Description:

P = Precentage

F = Frequency

N = Responden

Table 4.4 The component of permanence (favorable) no. 1, 14, and 17

No	Options	N	F	%
1.	a. Strongly agree		22	41.5%
	b. Agree		26	49%
	c. Neutral	53	3	5.7%
	d. Disagree		1	1.9%
	e. Strongly disagree		1	1.9%
			53	100%
14.	a. Strongly agree		14	26.4%
	b. Agree		23	43.4%
	c. Neutral	53	11	20.8%

	d. Disagree e. Strongly disagree		5 -	9.4% -
			53	100%
17.	a. Strongly agree b. Agree c. Neutral d. Disagree e. Strongly disagree	53	22 20 8 1 2	41.5% 37.7% 15.1% 1.9% 3.8%
			53	100%

From the table above could be known that the question number 1 there were 41.5% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 49% of the students answered “agree”. There were 5.7% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 1.9% answered “disagree”. For answer “strongly disagree” there were 1.9% students. On other hand the question no 14 could be known there were 26.4% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 43.4% of the students answered “agree”. There were 20.8% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 9.4% of students answered “disagree” and no one answered “strongly disagree”. And the question number 17 could be known that there were 41.5% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 37.7% of the students answered “agree”. There were 15.1% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 1.9% of the students answered “disagree” and 3.8% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. It could be concluded and interpreted that the students mostly choose the answer agree and strongly agree from the aspect of permanence. It

meant that most of the students were believed that the cause of good things were permanent.

Table 4.5 The component of temporary (favorable) no. 13 and 22

No.	Options	N	F	%
13	a. Strongly agree		14	26.4%
	b. Agree		23	43.4%
	c. Neutral	53	11	20.8%
	d. Disagree		3	5.6%
	e. Strongly disagree		2	3.8%
			53	100%
22	a. Strongly agree		33	62.3%
	b. Agree		11	20.8%
	c. Neutral		6	11.3%
	d. Disagree		3	5.6%
	e. Strongly disagree		-	
			53	100%

From the table above that the question number 13 could be known that there were 26.4% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 43.4% of the students answered “agree”. There were 20.8% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 5.6% of the students answered “disagree”. And there were 3.8% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand the question number 22 could be known that there were 62.3% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 20.8% of the students answered “agree”. There were 11.3% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 5.6% of the students answered “disagree” and no one answered “strongly disagree”. It could be concluded that most of students answered

"strongly agree and agree" on the aspect of temporary. It could be interpreted that most of students believed that the cause of bad things were temporary.

Table 4.6 The component of universal (favorable) no. 2 and 3

No.	Options	N	F	%
2.	a. Strongly agree		13	24.5%
	b. Agree		19	35.9%
	c. Neutral	53	20	37.7%
	d. Disagree		-	-
	e. Strongly disagree		1	1.9%
			53	100%
3.	a. Strongly agree		9	17%
	b. Agree		21	39.6%
	c. Neutral	53	21	39.6%
	d. Disagree		2	3.8%
	e. Strongly disagree		-	-
			53	100%

From the table above that the question number 2 could be known that there were 24.5% of the students answered "strongly agree". There were 35.9% of the students answered "agree". There were 37.7% of the students answered "neutral". For the option "disagree" there were no one chose. And there were only 1.9% student chose the answer "strongly disagree". On other hand the question number 3 could be known that there were 17% of the students answered "strongly agree". There were 39.6% of the students answered "agree". There were 39.6% also the students answered "neutral". There were 3.8% of the students answered "disagree". And no one answered "strongly disagree". It could be concluded that the most answer were strongly

agree and agree. It meant that most of students believed that the bad events have specific causes, while good events will enhance everything they did.

Table 4.7 The component of specific (favorable) no. 8, 9, and 15

No.	Options	N	F	%
8.	a. Strongly agree		8	15.1%
	b. Agree		17	32%
	c. Neutral	53	18	34%
	d. Disagree		8	15.1%
	e. Strongly disagree		2	3.8%
			53	100%
9.	a. Strongly agree		10	18.9%
	b. Agree		14	26.4%
	c. Neutral	53	21	39.6%
	d. Disagree		6	11.3%
	e. Strongly disagree		2	3.8%
			53	100%
15.	a. Strongly agree		23	43.4%
	b. Agree		23	43.4%
	c. Neutral	53	5	9.4%
	d. Disagree		2	3.8%
	e. Strongly disagree		-	-
			53	100%

From the table above it could be known that the answer for the question number 8 as follows. There were 15.1% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 32% of the students answered “agree”. There were 34% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 15.1% of the students answered “disagree”. And 3.8% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand for the question number 9, there were 18.9% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 26.4% of the students answered “agree”. There were 39.6% of the students answered “neutral”.

There were 11.3% of the students answered “disagree” and there were 3.8% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On the question number 15 it could be known that there were 43.4% of the students gave the answer “strongly agree”. There were also 43.4% of the students gave the answer “agree”. For the option “neutral” there were 9.4% of the students chose. There were 3.8% of the students answered “disagree” and no one answered “strongly disagree”. It could be concluded and interpreted that most of the students answered strongly agree and agree for specific aspect. It meant that the students had optimism that the experience of bad events only have specific explanation that the bad events was caused of the specific cause and will never dilating to other event.

Table 4.8 The component of internal (favorable) no 7

No	Options	N	F	%
7.	a. Strongly agree	53	42	79.2%
	b. Agree		7	13.2%
	c. Neutral		2	3.8%
	d. Disagree		2	3.8%
	e. Strongly disagree		-	
			53	100%

From the table above it can be known that there were 79% of students gave the answer “strongly agree”. There were 13.2% of the students answered “agree”. There were 3.8% of the students answered “neutral and disagree” for each option. And there were no one answered the option “strongly disagree”.

From the explanation above it could be interpreted that the students believed the events was caused by internal factor.

Table 4.9 The component of permanence (unfavorable) no. 4, 18, and 19

No.	Options	N	F	%
4.	a. Strongly agree		1	1.9%
	b. Agree		12	22.6%
	c. Neutral	53	6	11.3%
	d. Disagree		23	43.4%
	e. Strongly disagree		11	20.8%
			53	100%
18.	a. Strongly agree		5	9.4%
	b. Agree		11	20.8%
	c. Neutral	53	15	28.3%
	d. Disagree		17	32%
	e. Strongly disagree		5	9.4%
			53	100%
19.	a. Strongly agree		4	7.5%
	b. Agree		9	17%
	c. Neutral	53	4	7.5%
	d. Disagree		18	34%
	e. Strongly disagree		18	34%
			53	100%

The table above was the unfavorable items of permanence aspect. It could be known that for the question number 4 there were 1.9% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 22.6% of the students answered “agree”. There were 11.4% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 43.4% of the students answered “disagree”. And there were 20.8% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand the question number 18 could be known that there were 9.4% students answered “strongly agree”. There were 20.8% of the students answered “agree”. There were

28.3% of the students answered “neutral”. For the option “disagree” there were 32% of the students. And there were 9.4% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. The question number 19 could be known that there were 7.5% of the students chose the answer “strongly agree”. There were 17% of the students answered “agree”. There were 7.5% of the students answered “neutral”. For the option “disagree and agree” each option had 34% from the students answer. Unfavorable item had the inverse calculation method with favorable. So, the high answer of disagree and strongly disagree show the higher optimism of the students.

Table 4.10 The component of temporary (unfavorable) no 16

No.	Options	N	F	%
16.	a. Strongly agree		8	15.1%
	b. Agree		19	35.8%
	c. Neutral	53	15	28.3%
	d. Disagree		9	17%
	e. Strongly disagree		2	3.8%
			53	100%

From the table above, shown that there were 15.1% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 35.8% of the students answered “agree”. There were 28.3% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 17% of the students answered “disagree” and there were 3.8% of students answer “strongly disagree”. It could be interpreted from the question number 16 that the students regarded the success without any effort was the coincidence.

Table 4.11 The component of universal (unfavorable) no. 11

No.	Options	N	F	%
11.	a. Strongly agree	53	1	1.9%
	b. Agree		13	24.5%
	c. Neutral		18	34%
	d. Disagree		14	26.4%
	e. Strongly disagree		7	13.2%
			53	100%

From the table above it could be known that there were 1.9% of the students agreed with "strongly agree". There were 24.5% of the students answered "agree". There were 34% of the students answered "neutral". There were 26.4% answered "disagree" and there were 13.2% of the students answered "strongly disagree". It could be interpreted that the students believed in their ability to get good score of speaking.

Table 4.12 The component of specific (unfavorable) no.5 and 10

No.	Options	N	F	%
5.	a. Strongly agree	53	1	1.9%
	b. Agree		12	22.7%
	c. Neutral		14	26.4%
	d. Disagree		19	35.8%
	e. Strongly disagree		7	13.2%
			53	100%
	a. Strongly agree	53	10	18.9%
	b. Agree		11	20.8%
	c. Neutral		16	30.1%
	d. Disagree		8	15.1%
	e. Strongly disagree		8	15.1%
			53	100%

From the table above that the question number 5 could be known that there were 1.9% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 22.7% of the students answered 22.7% of the students answered “agree”. There were 26.4% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 35.8% of the students answered “disagree”. And there were 13.2% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand on the question number 10, it could be known that there were 18.9% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 20.8% of the students chose “agree”. There were 30.1% of the students chose “neutral”. For option “disagree” there were 15.1% of the students chose. And there were also 15.1% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. It could be interpreted that the students believe that the bad event only happen to specific aspect and will never dilating to other event.

Table 4.13 The Component of Internal (unfavorable) no 6 and 12

No.	Options	N	F	%
6.	a. Strongly agree		2	3.8%
	b. Agree		12	22.7%
	c. Neutral	53	22	41.5%
	d. Disagree		12	22.7%
	e. Strongly disagree		5	9.4%
			53	100%
12.				
	a. Strongly agree		9	17%
	b. Agree	53	9	17%
	c. Neutral		17	32%
	d. Disagree		15	28.3%
	e. Strongly disagree		3	5.7%
			53	100%

From the table above, could be known that the question number 6 there were 3.8% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 22.7% of the students answered “agree”. There were 41.5% of the students answered “neutral” and 22.7% of the students answered “disagree” while 9.4% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand, from the question number 12 it could be known that there were 17% of the students answered “strongly agree and agree”. There were 32% of the students chose “neutral”. There were 28.3% of the students answered “disagree” and 5.7% of the students chose “strongly disagree”. Since there were most of student answer strongly disagree and disagree on the favorable question, so that the students could be concluded that their internal optimism was good. It inferred that they were optimistic person.

Table 4.14 The Component of External (unfavorable) 20, 21

No.	Options	N	F	%
20.	a. Strongly agree		3	5.7%
	b. Agree		6	11.3%
	c. Neutral	53	9	17%
	d. Disagree		21	39.6%
	e. Strongly disagree		14	26.4%
			53	100%
21.				
	a. Strongly agree		7	13.2%
	b. Agree	53	5	9.4%
	c. Neutral		8	15.1%
	d. Disagree		21	39.6%
	e. Strongly disagree		12	22.7%
			53	100%

From the table above, it could be known from the question number 20 that there were 5.7% of the students chose “strongly agree”. There were 11.3% of the students chose “agree”. There were 17% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 39.6% of the students chose “disagree”. And there were 26.4% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. On other hand, on the question number 21 could be known that there were 13.2% of the students answered “strongly agree”. There were 9.4% of the students answered “agree”. There were 15.1% of the students answered “neutral”. There were 39.6% of the students chose “disagree”. And there were 22.7% of the students answered “strongly disagree”. It could be concluded that most of the students of second semester looked the problem from the external factor of them.

b. Students’ Speaking Achievement of Second Semester Students of English Education Department

The data of English score was taken from students’ respondent based on the student’s score of students’ academic report in the last semester. The score of students’ report (KHS) was a whole students’ score which was from assessment during one semester.

The teacher assessments during one semester include:

a. Performance

b. Assignment

c. Middle test

d. Final test

The calculation of students' speaking achievement was obtained from 10% performance, 30% assignment, 20% middle test, and 40% final test. So the final score of speaking achievement used the following formula:

NA= 10%PF + 30% ASG + 20% MT + 40% FT

Note:

NA = Nilai Akhir

PF = Performance

ASG = Assignment

MT = Middle Test

FT = Final Test

The classification of students' achievement based on students' report categorized as:

A+ = 91 – 100

A = 86 – 90.99

A– = 81 – 85.99

B+ = 76 – 80.99

B = 71 – 75.99

B– = 66 – 70.99

C+ = 61 – 65.99

C = 56 – 60.99

C– = 51 – 55.99

D = 40 – 50.99

E = 0 – 39.99

Table 4.15 The Descriptive Statistics of Students' Speaking Achievement

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
speaking_achievement	53	76	92	4476	84.45	3.775
Valid N (listwise)	53					

From the table we know that the minimum students' speaking achievement was 76, maximum score 92, mean score was 84.45, standard deviation was 3.775, and sum score was 4476.

Table 4.16 Normality test of data

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Optimism	.059	53	.200*	.981	53	.576
speaking_achievement	.090	53	.200*	.978	53	.432

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The normality test used to determine the category of data and also the form used to analyze the data correlation, whether it used *Pearson* or the other analysis. The data is called as normal data, if the sig value higher than 0.05.

Table 4.17 Homogeneity test of data

ANOVA

speaking_achievement

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	371.049	25	14.842	1.083	.418
Within Groups	370.083	27	13.707		
Total	741.132	52			

From this test, it could be seen that the sig. was 0.418. It could be interpreted that the sig. was higher than significance value 0.05. It meant that variance of two population is homogeny.

2. The Relationship between Optimism and Students' Speaking Achievement at The First-year of English Education Department UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

To collect data of students' optimism and students' speaking achievement were analyzed by using product moment correlation. It was used to know whether or not there was a significant correlation between students' optimism (X) and students' speaking achievement (Y) of the first year students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. To know the computation of

correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement, it could be seen in appendix 3. The computation was used SPSS 21 program. Below was the result of computation.

Table 4.18 The SPSS Computation of Correlation between Optimism and Students' Speaking Achievement.

Correlations

		Optimism	speaking_achievement
Optimism	Pearson Correlation	1	.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.275
	N	53	53
speaking_achievement	Pearson Correlation	.153	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.275	
	N	53	53

The correlation showed the same result by manual computation as follow:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\left\{n\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\right\}\left\{n\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\right\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{53.353491 - (4183)(4476)}{\sqrt{\{53.333063 - (4183)^2\}\{53.378752 - (4476)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{18735023 - 18723108}{\sqrt{(17652339 - 17497489)(20073856 - 20034576)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{11915}{\sqrt{(154850)(39280)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{11915}{\sqrt{6082508000}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{11915}{77990{,}435311}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0{,}15277514$$

$$r_{xy} = 0{,}153$$

The purpose of this part was to find out whether there was significant correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement or not. This finding showed that the result of correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement (r_{xy}) were 0.153. It means that there is ***very low*** correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement.

Table 4.19 Table Correlation Product Moment

Coefficient interval	Level of correlation
0,00 – 0,199	Very low
0,20 – 0,399	Low
0,40 – 0,599	Moderate
0,60 – 0,799	Strong
0,80 – 1,000	Very strong

However to know whether there is significant of coefficient correlation, it needs to be calculated with r table. Then to have a strong reliability, researcher used 5% of standard error. If we looked at the critical

value of r table for df 53 was 51, at 0.05 level of significant was 0.271. It showed that the calculated r_{xy} was lower than r table. It meant that the null hypothesis which states: there was no significant correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement at the first-year of English education department was accepted and the alternative hypothesis was rejected.

B. Discussion

This research focused on determining whether there was significance correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement. The first was the researcher found that the result of students' optimism of the first-year of English education UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya through questionnaire of optimism was some students got the same level of optimism and different score of optimism. Based on the result of optimism questionnaire, the minimum score of optimism was 65 and the maximum score was 101. In this research, the students could be said moderate category in optimism because there were 36 students included moderate categories in interval 72-85. It meant that the most of them got 72-85 optimism score. And the other included high and low category in optimism. Moderate optimism meant that sometimes the students felt optimism in an aspect of optimism and sometimes they did not feel optimistic in other aspect of optimism. In this research, the researcher used the aspect of optimism that was permanence, pervasiveness, and personalization to measure the students'

optimism in speaking class. The high optimism meant that they chose mostly answers that indicated to optimistic, and the low optimism meant they chose mostly answers that indicated to pessimistic.

The mean of students' speaking achievement was 84.45, where it shown good achievement or it written as A- in the result of study card (KHS). The last was, the researcher applied product moment to find the correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement. Based on result above, it could be seen that the degree of correlation was 0.153. It meant that the correlation between optimism and students speaking achievement was very low. Then to see whether it is significant or not, the researcher compared the result of r-statistic and r table. It could be seen that r-statistic was lower than r table. It meant there were no significant correlation between optimism and students' speaking achievement at the first-year of English education UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. So, it could be concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis was rejected.

Since the result of research is not significant, it meant that although there was correlation to students' speaking achievement it could not be applied or generalized to all population. This case is caused of the optimism was not the main factor that affected achievement. According to Slameto the factor that affected learning achievement can be classified into two groups, namely internal factor which is based on students and external factor originating from outside the

students. Internal factor consist of intelligence, attention, talents, interests, motivation, maturity, readiness, and fatigue. While external factor, consist of family environment, school environment, and community.[59]

Other from that, optimism could not stand alone, it need commitment. It meant, the optimism person not necessarily got a good achievement without study. In line of the study by Isaacowitz and Seligman which cited in Indoo Singh research said if the optimism doesn't do realistic it can be over-optimistic and may block the performance as an individual may overlook the negative outcomes thus may not be well prepared for unpleasant situations.[60]

In this study, the researcher found that although the students got moderate optimism, but their speaking achievement was good. It caused of the material of the second semester students was about speaking for everyday communication. And although not all students have good background of English, the researcher thinks that they had known the lesson.

[59] Slameto,"*Belajar dan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhinya"*(Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. 1995), 54.
[60] Indoo Singh - Ajeya Jha. *Anxiety, Optimism and Academic Achievement among Students of Private Medical and Engineering Colleges: A Comparative Study*. 2013. Canadian Center of Science and Education