

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' SELF ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND THEIR ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

Nery Eka Pratiwi, Hery Yufriзал, Muhammad Sukirlan
FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No. 1
email: neryeka2701@gmail.com. Telp. 082373934300

Abstrak: Hubungan Antara Penilaian Siswa Tentang Kompetensi Komunikatif Dan Performa Bahasa Siswa. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui ada tidaknya hubungan yang signifikan antara penilaian siswa terhadap kompetensi komunikatif dan performa mereka. Penelitian ini menggunakan kuesioner dan beberapa tes kemampuan produktif berbahasa. Data yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan *Pearson Product Moment*. Subjek penelitian ini adalah 72 mahasiswa jurusan pendidikan bahasa Inggris Universitas Lampung. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa secara statistik, penilaian siswa terhadap kemampuan komunikasi komunikatif mereka memiliki korelasi yang signifikan terhadap beberapa kemampuan produktif berbahasa mereka ($\alpha < 0.05$). Akan tetapi, pada kemampuan berbicara, nilai korelasinya masih lemah (0.256). Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa masih ada perbedaan antara penilaian siswa dan guru dalam kemampuan berbahasa. Lebih dari itu, siswa membutuhkan waktu untuk memperoleh kompetensi berbahasa Inggris agar mereka lebih siap untuk memberikan performa yang lebih baik.

Abstract: The Relationship Between Students' Self Assessment Of Communicative Competence And Their Actual Performance. The research aimed to find out whether there is significant correlation between students' self assessment of communicative competence and their actual performance or not. The research was conducted by using a set of questionnaire and several productive skill tests. The collected data were analyzed by using *Pearson Product Moment*. The subjects of the research were 72 English department students of Lampung University. The result reveals that students' self assessment of communicative competence has significant correlation for some actual performances ($\alpha < 0.05$) at significant level. Though, the size of correlations of students' self assessment of communicative competence and their speaking performance is still low (0.256). It indicates that there is still a gap between students and teacher judgment particularly in speaking performance. Moreover, the students need time to acquire English competences in order to make they are ready to have a good performance.

Keywords: *Communicative competence, students' language performance, students' self assessment.*

INTRODUCTION

The goal of learning English for learners is being able to communicate successfully. To master English, sufficient exposure is needed for learners to notice and acquire the language input and chances to use the knowledge, communicative competence is likely to be promoted (Larsari, 2011). In addition, among the awareness and many skills required for competence at formal schools even in the university, communicative competence is crucial (Yufrizal, 2016; Al Alami, 2014). Unfortunately, although many students communicate more in English, they still cannot find out how well they are able to communicate in English despite their length of studies at formal school.

Yufrizal (2017) argues that the use of national examination for each degree of education does not show the realistic mastery of English. It means that even the result of examination is high; it is not guarantee that the students can maintain their interest and autonomy learning. Technically, assessment in education gives a general picture of the quality of the effectiveness of educational curriculum which is normally in a form of a report resulted from evaluator judgments. However, learner-center pedagogy allows students to take part in assessing their quality of performance using self assessment.

The current trends in learner-centered language teaching approaches, and a growing interest in authenticity and interactiveness (Bachman and Palmer, 1996) have led to a greater interest in expanding the use of second language self-assessment. Mahmoodi

and Shahrebabaki (2014) note that students self assessment can play a crucial role in helping learners become more dedicated and motivated.

In Indonesian context, it is not familiar for students or teachers to get the use of students' self assessment. By using self assessment, the students appraise their work individually in which it requires higher level thinking. Also, the student has opportunities for feedback and revision during the task for example by responding to discrepancies between students' judgment and teacher judgment.

Ito, Kawaguchi, and Ohta (2005) have conducted the study on the relationship between TOEIC score and self assessment toward functional job Performance. They found that there is substantial relationship between TOEIC scores and the scores of functional job activities in the self assessment questionnaire.

How about students in university? Particularly English department students who will be future English teachers. As pre-service teachers, they are expected to have good performance whether in language learning or in assessment part.

El-Koumy (2010) studied about students' self assessment in higher education. His findings provided evidence that statistically significant improvement in knowledge achievement and academic thinking can occur only when the teacher assesses students self assessment. He suggested university teachers that should not expect students to demonstrate expert assessment skills without support. Other study is from

Bolivar-Cruz et al (2012) who stated that students can be good to assess other students but they are not good at assessing themselves.

Based on the important of communicative competence, the use of self assessment and the study of students' language performance, the current research try to investigate students' self assessment of communicative competence then correlate the result with the students' actual performance. Other intention is to find out the level of achievement of students' actual performance based on the length of language learning.

METHODS

The research employed quantitative design which is ex post facto correlational research. The subjects of the research were 72 English department students of Lampung University (16 freshmen, 31 sophomores, and 25 juniors). The Instruments were a set of self assessment questionnaire consisting 40 items of communicative competence criteria and several actual language performance tests. The questionnaire was a modified questionnaire from Yufrizal (2016) and the performance tests were developed with respect to productive skills of communicative competence. Each statement should be fulfilled with the range of 10 – 100 score. Table of specification was provided to achieve the construct validity and the reliability of the questionnaire was very high reliability (0.963).

The performance tests are speaking performance in a form of role play, writing argumentative essay, structure and vocabulary, and pronunciation tests. The content validity was measured based on the syllabus in English Education

Department Lampung University in year 2017. The reliability tests for students' language performance tests were investigated using inter-rater reliability.

The steps of research were firstly, administering questionnaires to the subjects of the research for about 30 minutes for each years of the study. Then conducting performance tests which had 60 minutes for each tests in different years of study. The collected data from questionnaire and performance tests score then were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation in SPSS 23.00.

RESULTS

In order to have the correlation between students' self assessment of communicative competence and their actual performance, firstly, a set of questionnaire were administered to the subjects of the research. The result of the students' self assessment of communicative competence was as follow:

Table 1. Students' Self Assessment of Communicative Competence

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev
Lingcom	72	15	88	61.84	17.20
socioling	72	16	91	64.63	18.21
Discom	72	11	89	60.53	19.60
Strgcocom	72	10	87	60.26	20.04
Valid N	72				

Table 1 shows that the mean of students' self assessment of linguistic competence is 61.84. The maximum score of linguistic competence is 88 and the minimum score of students' self assessment is 15. The Mean of students' self assessment of sociolinguistic competence is 63.56. This score is the highest mean of all. The maximum score of sociolinguistic competence is 91 and

the minimum score is 16. The mean of students' self assessment of discourse competence is 60.53. The maximum score of discourse competence is 89.50 and the minimum score is 11. The mean of students' self assessment of strategic competence is 60.27.

Table 2. The Students' Self Assessment of Communicative Competence According to the Length of Language Learning

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Linguistic competence	1*	16	40.66	17.01
	2	31	65.14	10.51
	3	25	71.28	12.27
	Total	72	61.84	17.20
Sociolinguistic competence	1	16	42.09	19.70
	2	31	67.14	11.37
	3	25	72.85	18.09
	Total	72	63.55	19.67
Discourse competence	1	16	35.66	17.92
	2	31	65.97	11.21
	3	25	69.69	15.54
	Total	72	60.53	19.60
Strategic competence	1	16	32.58	18.75
	2	31	65.24	11.69
	3	25	71.81	10.75
	Total	72	60.26	20.04

Note: 1 = Freshmen 2 = Sophomores
3 = Juniors

As shown in the Table 2, the ability of students' communicative competence, according to students' assessment, from three difference years, are various. The students from the first years (16) have 40.67 for the mean of linguistic competence; 42.09 for the mean of sociolinguistic competence; 35.67 for the mean of discourse competence; and 32.59 for the mean of strategy competence. This result shows that the students from the first years have the lowest mean score of all.

The students' score from the second years (31) have 65.15 for the mean of linguistic competence; 67.14 for the mean of sociolinguistic competence; 65.98 for the mean of

discourse competence; and 65.25 for the mean of strategy competence. This result shows that the students from the second years have relatively moderate mean score of all.

The students' score from the third years (25) have 71.29 for the mean of linguistic competence; 72.85 for the mean of sociolinguistic competence; 69.70 for the mean of discourse competence; and 71.81 for the mean of strategy competence. This result shows that the students from the third years have the highest mean score of all.

Other, The mean scores of the students' language performances wereas follow:

Table 3. The Mean Score of Students' Speaking Performance

		N	Mean	Std. Dev
Role Play	Freshmen	16	72.25	2.38
	Sophomores	31	72.74	2.68
	Juniors	25	75.52	2.56
	Total	72	73.59	2.91

As seen in the table 3, the mean of speaking performance of students from the first year was 72.25. This could be the lowest mean of speaking performance of all. The students from the third year achieved the highest mean of speaking performance score (75.52).

Table 4. The Mean Score of Students' Writing Argumentative Essay

	Years	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Writing Argumentative Essay	Freshmen	16	62.31	7.18
	Sophomores	31	74.51	5.54
	Juniors	25	76.04	4.89
	Total	72	72.33	7.84

As seen in the table 4, the mean of writing performance of students from the first year was 62.3. This could be the lowest mean of writing performance of all. The students from the third year achieved the highest mean of writing performance score (76.04).

Table 5. The Mean Score of Students' Structure and Vocabulary Performance

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Structure And Vocab ulary	Freshmen	16	28.12	16.11
	Sophomores	31	57.25	11.24
	juniors	25	41.20	15.63
	Total	72	45.20	18.04

Table 4 shows that the mean of structure and vocabulary performance of students from the first year was 28.13. This could be the lowest mean of structure and vocabulary performance of all. The mean of structure and vocabulary performance of students from the second year was 57.29. The mean of speaking performance of students from the third year was 41.20. The students from the second year achieved the highest mean of structure and vocabulary performance.

Table 6. The Means Score of Students' Pronunciation Performance

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Pronoun ciation test	Freshmen	16	81.56	4.36
	Sophomores	31	86.45	2.30
	juniors	25	89.00	2.04
	Total	72	86.25	3.91

As seen in the table 5, the mean of pronunciation performance of students from the first year was 81.56. This could be the lowest mean of structure and vocabulary performance of all. The mean of pronunciation performance of students from the second year was 86.45. The mean of speaking performance of students from the third year was 89. It can be concluded that the students from the third year achieved the highest mean of pronunciation performance.

After having the students' self assessment of communicative competence and their actual performance scores, both data were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The results were as follow:

Table 6. The Correlation between Students' Self Assessment of Linguistic Competence and their Actual Performance

		speaking	writing	Structure	Pronunciation
Linguistic competence	Pearson Correlation	.256	.510	.443	.488
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.000	.000	.000
	N	72	72	72	72

Table 7. The Correlation between Students' Self Assessment of Sociolinguistic Competence and their Actual Performance

		speaking	writing	Structure	Pronunciation
Sociolinguistic competence	Pearson Correlation	.346	.503	.365	.479
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000	.000
	N	72	72	72	72

Table 8. The Correlation between Students' Self Assessment of Discourse Competence and their Actual Performance

		speaking	Writing	Structure	Pronunciation
Linguistic competence	Pearson Correlation	.283	.476	.312	.416
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.000	.000	.000
	N	72	72	72	72

Table 9. The Correlation between Students' Self Assessment of Discourse Competence and their Actual Performance

		speaking	Writing	Structure	Pronunciation
Strategic competence	Pearson Correlation	.295	.565	.428	.479
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.000	.000	.000
	N	72	72	72	72

Table 6 shows that the correlation of students' self assessment of linguistic competence and their each performance, all the *r value* of each performance was higher than *r critical*(0.232) at the significant level at $\alpha < 0.05$. The size of correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation *r* for writing (0.510), structure and vocabulary (0.443), and pronunciation test (0.488) were in the moderate size of correlation. Thus, it can be said that there was a positively moderate significant correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic competence and writing, structure and vocabulary, and pronunciation test. However, the size of correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic competence and speaking (0.256) was low. Thus, it can be said that there was positive correlation even it was not significant correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic and students' speaking performance because the correlation is weak.

Table 7 shows that all the *r value* of each performance was higher than *r critical*(0.23) at the significant level at $\alpha < 0.05$. The size of correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation *r* for

speaking (0,346) and structure and vocabulary (0.365) were in the low size of correlation, but writing (0.503) and pronunciation test (0.479) were in the moderate size of correlation. All of the performance scores were in the level of significant $p < 0.05$. Thus, it can be said that there was a positively significant correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic competence and their speaking, writing, structure and vocabulary, and pronunciation test.

Table 8 shows that all the *r value* of each performance was higher than *r critical*(0.232) at the significant level at $\alpha < 0.05$. However, in interpreting the strength of correlation, the size of correlation would be related to the guideline of correlation coefficient in chapter III. The size of correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation *r* for speaking (0,346) and structure and vocabulary (0.365) were in the low size of correlation. However, writing (0.476) and pronunciation test (0.416) were in the moderate size of correlation. Thus, it can be said that there was a positively moderate significant correlation between students' self assessment of discourse competence

and their speaking and writing, but there is not significant correlation among students' self assessment of discourse competence and structure and vocabulary, and pronunciation test because the correlation of them were weak.

Table 9 shows that all the *r value* of each performance was higher than *r critical*(0.232) at the significant level $\alpha < 0.05$. The size of correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation *r* for writing (0.565), structure and vocabulary (0.428), and pronunciation test (0.479) were in the moderate size of correlation. Thus, it can be said that there was a positively moderate significant correlation between students' self assessment of strategic competence and writing, structure and vocabulary, and pronunciation test. However, the size of correlation between students' self assessment of strategic competence and speaking (0.295) was low. Thus, it can be said that there was positive correlation even it was not significant correlation between students' self assessment of strategic competence and students' speaking performance because the correlation is weak.

DISCUSSION

Even there is significant correlation between students' self assessment of some communicative competence and their actual performances, some competences still have low correlation toward students' speaking performance for instance linguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.

In linguistic competence, there was a positively moderate significant correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic competence and writing, structure and vocabulary,

and pronunciation test. However, the size of correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic competence and speaking (0.256) was low. Thus, it can be said that there was positive correlation even it was not significant correlation between students' self assessment of linguistic and students' speaking performance because the correlation is weak. This was, however, not overly for surprising for the following reasons.

According to Yule (1996), there are some difficulties in getting the brain and speech production to work together. In fact that people who make occasional "slips of tongue" in everyday conversation does not mean that they do not know their language or do not have fluency in it. The performance errors trait to a variety of performance factors like tiredness, boredom, drugs, external distraction and so forth (Radford, 1988).

The other reason is due to the differences between teacher judgment and students' self assessment. The teacher judgment can be not equivalent with the students' judgment because the teachers have greater experience in judging oral presentations (De Grez et al, 2012 cited in Bolivar-Cruz et al, 2013). Moreover, the speaking performance in this research is in the form of role play, this makes that there is not sufficient accuracy when students acted as peers. Therefore, it can be stated that students' judgment of their ability in linguistic competence was not as good as the result of their speaking performance.

This finding is also related to the study of Langen et al (2008) who conducted the study of the relationship between students, peers, and tutor evaluations of oral presentation. The students are fairly

advanced students at the end of their second-year undergraduates. The students' numbers varied between courses ($n_{2002} = 41$, $n_{2003} = 19$). At the end of the course they delivered five minute presentation summarizing their research projects which were assessed by tutors, a subset of peers and themselves. The result of their study indicates that students self assessment was not strongly associated with tutor grades unlike peer grades.

However, overall, the findings of the present research about the correlation between the competence and performance proved the Chomskyians who believed that the study of competence can not be separated from performance (Taha and Reishan, 2008). Specifically, it can be stated that the ability of university students to assess their selves has correlation to their performance assessment marked by tutor or teacher. The finding is also in line with the study of previous researches (e.g. Stefani, 1994; Falchikov and Boud, 1989; and Falchikov and Goldfinch, 2000 see Langen 2008) who have found strong associations between self- and tutor assessments.

In particular, self assessment was a challenge to many students, reflected in part by the high variability in self assessment marks and their lack of congruence with tutor and peers. Understanding the process of self and peer assessment requires an appreciation of students' perceptions of themselves and others. In the current research, during self assessment of communicative competence, students have evaluated themselves in a broad range of marks; linguistic competence (15 – 88), sociolinguistic competence (16 – 91),

discourse competence (11 – 89.5), strategy competence (10 – 87). This is an indication that the students have lack of confidence or ability to discriminate high or low their achievement. High self-assessment marks may reflect high levels of confidence or poor understanding of academic level in relation to the requirements of the assessment.

Additionally, before the students meet standardized test, students need to practice assessment which requires some forms of testing. The test or assessment measure, to a great extent, students' knowledge of the English language and if the students' level is in pre-intermediate, based on the data in this findings, he or she will not perform well on the test. Sometimes, students know the subject matter but they do not know enough English so the outcome of the assessment could indicate that they have not mastered the subject matter when in fact it is a language issue. Therefore, language learners still need length of time to acquire academic language in order to make they are ready for good performance.

CONCLUSION

The result indicates that even the study of competence cannot be separated with the performance, it remains differentiation between what students know in their mind with what students act as their performance. This concludes that there is still a gap between students and teachers' experience in giving judgement. In the process of teaching and learning, it requires more speaking performance to be practiced by the students. When they are good in performance, it means that they have better competence of language

skills. Moreover, the students are not confident to judge their self so they need more experience in assessing their quality especially in their speaking performance.

Additionally, before the students meet standardized test, students need to practice assessment which requires some forms of testing. The test or assessment measure, to a great extent, students' knowledge of the English language and if the students' level is in pre-intermediate, based on the data in this findings, he or she will not perform well on the test. Sometimes, students know the subject matter but they do not know enough English so the outcome of the assessment could indicate that they have not mastered the subject matter when in fact it is a language issue. Therefore, language learners still need length of time to acquire academic language in order to make they are ready for good performance.

There are also some recommendations for university English teachers and further research;

1. It is recommended in the process of language learning for pre-service English teachers to increase the number of students' self assessment experiences in order to facilitate students' capacity to evaluate them.
2. It is suggested to have the use of self assessment during the students self assessment training then practice the language performance particularly in oral performances such as debates, group discussion, public speaking, etc.
3. It is also suggested to explore more about the impact of self assessment on receptive skill

and productive skill performance with respect to sub competence of communicative competences.

REFERENCES

- Al Alami, E. 2014. Promoting Communicative Competence within EFL Contexts: A U E A Case Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 5 No. 6 pp. 1245-1255.
- Bachman, L.F. and Palmer, A.S. 1996. *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bolivar-Cruz, A, Verano-Tacaronte, D, and Gonzales-Betancor, S. 2012. Is University Students' Self Assessment Accurate?. *Journal* retrieved on http://www.researchgate.net/publication/267441832_Is_University_Students'_Self-Assessment_Accurate? At February 1, 2017.
- El-Koumy, A. 2010. Student Self Assessment in Higher Education: Alone or Plus?. Paper Presentation at the CPLA Conference. Lebanon.
- Ito, T, Kawaguchi, K and Ohta, R. 2005. A Study of the Relationship between TOEIC Scores and Functional Job Performance: Self-assessment of Foreign Language Proficiency. The Institute for International Business Communication. Japan.
- Langen, M, Shuker, M, Cullen, R, Preziosi, and Wheeler, P. 2008. Relationship between Student Characteristics and Self-, Peer, and Tutor Evaluations of Oral Presentation. *Assessment &*

- Evaluation in Higher Education.
Vol. 33 No. 2
- Larsari, N.V. 2011. Learner's
Communicative Competence in
English as a Foreign Language.
Journal of English and literature
Vol. 2(7)
- Mahmoodi and Shahrehabaki.
2014. Using Self-Assessment
Checklists To Make English
Language Learners Self-Directed.
International Journal for
Research in Education Vol. 3.
- Radford, A. 1988. *Transformational
Grammar. A First Course*.
Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Taha and Reishaan. 2008. The
Relationship between
Competence and Performance:
Towards a Comprehensive TG
Grammar. *Adam Al Kulfa
Journal Vol. 1 No. 2*.
- Yufrizal, H. 2017. Students' Self
Appraisal on Communicative
Competence by ELT Students in
Indonesia. Presented in TESOL
15th Annual International
Conference. Philippines: 9-11
April 2017 (Forthcoming).
- Yule. 1996. *The Study of Language
2nd ed.* Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.