Artikel Correlational Study

by Gusti Nur Hafifah

Submission date: 11-Nov-2021 09:59AM (UTC+0700)
Submission ID: 1699394972
File name: Gusti_Nur_Hafifah_Sofi_Yunianti_CORRELATIONAL_STUDY.pdf (199.61K)
Word count: 5216
Character count: 29236

Correlational Study of Students' Speaking Competence and Writing Competence and the Impact in students' Performance in English.

Gusti Nur Hafifah and Sofi Yunianti,
gustihafifah@yahoo.com&sofiyunianti88@gmail.com
UniversitasMuhammadiyah Surabaya

This research is intended to answer question whether there is correlation between students speaking competence and writing competence and the impact toward students' performance in writing and speaking. This research was preceded with early assumption that students with high competence in speaking will surely have high competence in writing, since both are productive skills which demand students to produce language orally or written. But in the reality, researcher found several evidences that someone with high competence in writing usually do not have good speaking performance. Similarly, most students who are active in speaking cannot write very well.

This research is done to English Department students in Muhammadiyah University. The data of the research is students' final scores in Speaking IV and Writing III. Both of the subjects are chosen because they are reflected to have equal measurement on students' competence on productive skills. In speaking IV (Public Speaking), students are assessed their ability to speak in front of public with different contexts. While Writing III (Essay Writing) students are trained to write several topics of essay.

Key Words: Speaking Competence, Writing Competence, English Performance, Public Speaking, Essay Writing

INTRODUCTION

There are four skills of English that a language learner should acquire and practice in order to improve the language competence. Language competence consists of four skills. The four skills are reading, writing, speaking and listening. The four skills are the most essential part in teaching language, especially on the teaching second language because they are used for communication. However, the second language learners comprehend the second language if they only obtain advance skill on productive skill. Brown (2001:267) stated that second language learners accomplish the second language if they can communicate for interaction by using speaking skill. Furthermore, Nurgiyantoro (1988: 30) stated that writing skill is the most complex and difficult to understand because it does not only organize idea but also create the understandable text.

Based on the previous explanations, writing and speaking are productive skills and both of them are the most essential and difficult part. This research will analyze further about speaking and writing. However, this research focuses on writing III (writing essay) and speaking IV (public speaking) because both of them discuss how to communicate in spoken and written. Based on the syllabi, speaking IV (public speaking) requires the ability of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation that will be presented in public speaking which demand the students to construct ideas and deliver them in a proper manner and expressions. While, Writing III (essay writing) also requires the ability of vocabulary and grammar that will be written in essay such as narrative, descriptive and comparison essay. It means that the ability of speaking and writing acquire similar ability.

However, there are inversely between the student's ability of writing and speaking. Students who get good score in speaking cannot obtain good score in writing. Furthermore,

students who get good score in writing cannot obtain good score in speaking. There is also the phenomenon of some figures such as some colleagues and lecturers who have produced some books and articles which are very easy to understand. However, in the process of verbal communication is difficult to understand. Based on the phenomenon, this research will analyze further on :

1) how is the student's competency in the lesson speaking IV(public speaking)?
2) how is the student's competency in the lesson writing III(essay writing)?
3) how is the correlation of the student's competency in speaking and writing?
4) how is the correlation of student's speaking and writing skill to improve their performance in English?

Speaking and writing are as productive skill. Brooks (in Tarigan, 1983:12) stated that speaking is a form of human behavior that utilizes physical factors, psychological, neurologist, semantic and linguistic. Meanwhile, writing is ability to express ideas, feelings, and his thoughts by written text as the media (Tarigan, 1983:15). Writing and speaking are as the ways of communicating, both of them acquire communicative competence. Hymes introduced the theory of communicative competence because his dissatisfaction with Chomsky's term *competence and performance.*

We thus make a fundamental distinction between *competence* (the speaker hearer's knowledge of his language) and *performance* (the actual use of language in concrete situations). (Chomsky, 1965:3). in *language and mind,* Chomsky give further explanation about the term *competence* as follows:

the technical term competence refers to the ability of the idealized speaker-hearer to associate sounds and meanings strictly in accordance with the rules of the language. The grammar of a language, as a model for idealized competence, establishes a certain relation between sound and meaning. (Chomsky 1968:116)

Based on the term *competence and performance*, Hymes (1971:16) states that the communicative competence relates to communicate as a whole and it is not only grammatical, but also pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence. Hymes defines Linguistic performance as a communicative competence that learners have in applying language. Communicative competence is referred to as pragmatic or sociolinguistic competence, especially when the emphasis is on how to interpret the speaker's intended meaning in a particular utterance, apart from the literal meaning. Linguistic competence should descent under the domain of communicative competence since it comprises four competence areas, namely, linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence.

Futhermore, Hymes (1972:281) has parameters of social-cultural aspects as follow:

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available;
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails.

While, Communicative language competence by Halliday (1978) consists of two parts :

1. linguistic competence, which include :(a) lexical competence, (b) grammatical competence, (c) phonological competence, (d) orthographic competence, (e) sociolinguistic competence
2. Pragmatic competences includes; (a) Functional Competence, (b) discourse competence

Furthermore, Newby (2011) analyses the various definition and description of performance as follow:

1. the behavioral potential to perform
2. the act of performing
3. the output(product) of performance

This concept is appropriate in language teaching. Canale and Swain (1980:3) simply the concept as follows:

1. grammatical competence: language system,
2. sociolinguistic competence:
   a. sociocultural rules of use: appropriateness,
   b. rules of discourse: coherence and cohesion of groups of utterances,
3. strategic competence: compensatory verbal and non-verbal communication strategies.

It means that the language competence is not only about the grammatical but also about the sociolinguistic and strategic competence.

The language competence also need evaluation to measure the student's ability. Each Language skills has own ways and component for assessing. Writing as one of language skill has component and ways for assessing in order to obtain valid measurements. Brown (2004:220) divided four categories of written performance that capture range of written production. They are imitative, intensive, responsive, and extensive. Imitative writing assessment is in the beginning level of learning, the test are tasks in hand writing letters, words, and punctuation and spelling tasks and detecting phoneme-grapheme correspondences (Brown, 2004:221). The next level of writing performance is intensive writing. Intensive writing assessment focuses on the competence in grammar, vocabulary, or sentence formation but does not give emphasize on meaning for authentic purpose (Brown, 2004:225). The types of the test are dictation and dicto-comp, grammatical transformation tasks, ordering tasks and short-answer and sentence completion tasks. Responsive and extensive writing are more open-ended tasks, such as paraphrasing, guided question and answer, paragraph construction tasks, and stratagic option (Brown, 2004: 233). According to Brown (2004: 202) there are three main ways for responsive and extensive writing assessment, holistic scoring, analytic scoring and primary trait scoring method. Meanwhile, Heaton (1989:136) stated that there are five component in assessing writing, content; organization; vocabulary; grammar and mechanic.

If writing has component for assessing, speaking is also has component for assessing. Speaking has categories for assessment based on the performance, they are imitative, intensive, responsive, interactive and extensive (Brown, 2004141-142). Each categories of speaking has different type of text. At the intensive level, the tests only requires the students to produce a simply sentence such as directed-response tasks, read-aloud tasks, sentence/dialogue completion tasks and oral questioners, pictured-cued tasks and translation (Brown, 2004:147-149). Responsive assessment also has own test's types which is different from intensive. Responsive assessment give emphasize on interaction with an interlocutor, increasing creativity of test-taker and limited length of utterance (Brown, 2004:159). The types of test are question and answer, giving instructions and directions, paraphrasing and Test of Spoken English (Brown, 2004:159-162). The last two categories have similarity and difference. The similarity is both of interactive and extensive assessments obtain the test that involve relatively long interactive discourse and require long duration. However, the difference degree of interaction with an interlocutor, if interactive tasks describes as interpersonal, extensive assessment tasks describes as transactional speech event (Brown, 2004:167). It means that the types of test are different. Interactive assessment has types of test such as interview, role play, discussions and conversations, and games (Brown, 2004:167-175). Meanwhile, extensive assessment has oral presentation, pictured-cued

storytelling, retelling a story, retelling news event and translation of extended prose (Brown, 2004:179-182). Assessment instruments should reflect instruction and be incorporated from the beginning stages of lesson planning. It should be clearly defined and understandable to both the teacher and learners.

METHOD

This research is quantitative research because the aim of the research is to figure out the correlation between speaking IV (public speaking) and writing III (essay writing). According to Arikunto (2000:310) quantitative research is the research that describes variable that is as a focus of the research. Furthermore, quantitative method is a research proposal or study which focuses on survey and experimental modes of inquiry that examining the relationship between and among variables (Creswell, 2003:153). The two variables are the speaking competence and the writing competence of students in the fourth semester. It is because variable is central to answering questions and hypotheses through surveys and experiments (Creswell, 2003:153). The sample of the study was taken from the speaking IV (public speaking) and writing III (essay writing) classes with the total number of 36 students from three parallel classes. Each class was taught by the same lecturer in different subjects. So, one lecturer taught three parallel classes of speaking IV. And another lecturer taught three classes of writing III. The data was taken from the final score of speaking IV and writing III and measured using Pearson correlation formula.

To know the level of coefficient correlation empirically, the data was analyzed using Pearson Correlation. With the formula as follow: (Arikunto, 2009:72)

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

Note :

r_{xy} = coefficient correlation between X variable and Y variable, the two variables that are correlated.

N = Numbers of data

X = Speaking Score

Y = Writing Score

The researcher can determine the result coefficient correlation and the relation or description by using the interval value of coefficient correlation and the relation or description. The strength correlation of the tested variables can be seen from the coefficient correlation result. Table 1 bellow explains the value of correlation coefficient and the relation between them as follow:

Table 1. Interval value of coefficient correlation and the relation or description between them

Score Interval Result	The Correlation Interpretation
cc = 0.00	No Correlation
0.00 <cc ≤ 0.20	Very low Correlation
0.20 < cc ≤ 0.40	Low / weak Correlation
0.40 < cc ≤ 0.70	Medium Correlation
0.70 < cc ≤ 0.90	Strong / High Correlation
0.90 < cc ≤ 1.00	Very high and strong correlation
cc = 1.00	Perfect correlation

Hasan (2006:44)

FINDINGS

Correlation Result of Writing and Speaking Competence

The result of correlation test between speaking and writing used the statistic test Pearson Correlation, with the sample of 36 students. The researcher does not take all of students who have writing and speaking lesson. The researcher only examines 36 students as the sample. They are the students in batch 2012 of English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya university. Furthermore, the researcher only examines Writing III (writing essay) and Speaking IV (public speaking) because it focuses on communication. If speaking focuses on organizing communication in public speaking, writing focuses on organizing written communication by using writing essay. The researcher also utilizes SPPS for examining the Correlation result. Based on the calculation result using SPSS software17.0 version for windows, it has result in the following data, in table 2.

Table 2. Correlation Result of Writing III (writing essay) and Speaking IV (public speaking)

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
WRITING	71.5556	6.89697	36
SPEAKING	72.4722	8.19228	36

Correlations

		WRITING	SPEAKING
WRITING	Pearson Correlation	1	.377*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.023
	N	36	36
SPEAKING	Pearson Correlation	.377*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	
	N	36	36

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The hypothesis formulation of the correlation was described as follow:

H_0 : No Correlation between Writing and Speaking

H_1 : There is correlation between Writing and Speaking

On the tested hypothesis, the criteria to be accepted or rejected based on the result of the following *p-value*:

1. If *p-value*> α, then H_0 accepted
2. If *p-value*< α, then H_0 rejected

In SPSS program uses the term *significance* (*Sig.*) for *p-value*. In which the significance rate used is 5% $(\alpha = 0{,}05)$.

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the value of significance score (Sig) which lead to Pearson Correlation gained value of correlation score that is significant between Writing and Speaking. The value of correlation score *p-value* is 0.023 less than α= 0.05, it means that H_0 rejected. It can be concluded that there is correlation between writing and speaking with coefficient correlation score is 0.377. Furthermore, Based on the analysis result, if the score is 0.377, it can be concluded that the coefficient correlation between writing and speaking is low or weak but it is definite. It is because the sore is in the range of $0.20 < cc \leq 0.40$.

Correlation Result between Speaking Competence and English Performance

This section examines the correlation speaking competence and English Performance. The researcher examines the students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University. There two kinds of hypothesis. They are null hypothesis and alternate hypothesis. The hypothesis formulation:

null hypothesis (Ho) : there is no correlation between speaking and English Performance of students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University.

alternate hypothesis (H_1) : there is correlation between speaking and English Performance of students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University.

The process correlation analysis that the researcher examines, as follows:

Data is tested the correlation by using SPSS software 17.0 version. The researcher utilizes *Bivariate Correlation - Correlation Coefficients Pearson* and *Test of significance two tailed* in order to search the result, the result, as follows:

Table 4. Correlation table of Speaking and English Performance

Correlations

		SPEAKING	ENGLISH PERFORMANCE
SPEAKING	Pearson Correlation	1	.861**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	36	36
ENGLISH PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	.861**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	36	36

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the result analysis on table **4,** *p-value* is 0.000 less than α= 0.05, it can be concluded H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. It means that there is correlation between speaking and English performance. Based on the above result measurement, the researcher explains that speaking and English performance show high correlation. It displays on the **table 4** that the correlation value is 0.861 leads the positive correlation. It means that each increasing and decreasing value of speaking will leads increasing or decreasing student's

English performance. It is because the score 0.861 is in the range of 0.70 < cc ≤ 0.90 that leads high correlation.

Correlation Result between Writing Competence and English Performance

This section examines the correlation writing competence and English Performance. The researcher examines the students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University.

The hypothesis formulation:

null hypothesis (Ho) : there is no correlation between writing and English Performance of students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University.

alternate hypothesis (H_1) : there is correlation between writing and English Performance of students in batch 2012, English education department, faculty of teacher training and education, Muhammadiyah Surabaya University..

The process correlation analysis that the researcher examines, as follows:

Data is tested the correlation by using SPSS software 17.0 version. The researcher utilizes *Bivariate Correlation - Correlation Coefficients Pearson* and *Test of significance two tailed* in order to search the result, the result, as follows:

Tabel 3. Correlation table of Speaking and English Performance

Correlations

		WRITING	ENGLISH PERFORMANCE
WRITING	Pearson Correlation	1	.796**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	36	36
ENGLISH PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	.796**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	36	36

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the analysis, on **tabel 3** *p-value* is 0.000 less than α= 0.05, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. It means that there is correlation between writing and English Performance. Based on the above result, the researcher explains that Writing and English Performance show high correlation. It is because the score 0.796 is in the range 0.70 < cc ≤ 0.90 It displays on the **table 4** that the correlation value is 0.796 leads the positive correlation. It means that each increasing and decreasing value of writing will leads increasing or decreasing student's English performance. Furthermore, it can be concluded that writing and student's English performance can be correlated.

DISCUSSION

Students Speaking Competence

The result of speaking competence that is measured from their speaking performance through their public speaking presentation shows that there are 7 students who have significantly better score of speaking than writing. Meanwhile, there are 6 students who got significantly worse score of speaking than writing. The other 23 students have the same average score between speaking and writing. The highest score of speaking competence is 88, the average is 72, and the lowest score is 56 (Appendix 1). Most students who have the same average score on speaking and writing are below standard. It can be said that only 27,7 % from the numbers of students have marks above average or get " A". 8,3 % from the numbers of students have marks below average or get "C". 63,8 % students get average marks with the score range of "B" , "BC", or "AB"

The students competence on speaking was measured based on the speaking performance rubric (Appendix 2). For the whole one semester the students were trained to do oral presentation of public speaking on several different roles, such as motivator, sales promoter, orator, host of TV show, reporter, tour guide, etc. each of the presentation was evaluated based on their communicative competence on how they produce language orally.

The aspects of communicative competence; Linguistic competence and Pragmatic Competence by Hymes and Halliday were accommodated in the speaking assessment rubric. The students are demanded to be clear and creative in delivering ideas in public speaking. The ideas that are presented would be scored optimally if it is coherent and well organized and completed with beginning, main and ending of the content. The Functional Competence is also measured in a way that the speaking presentation should be meaningful and interesting to be heard by the addressees. Lexical Competence is counted from the correct diction and language that speaker used. The phonological Competence was judged from the speaker's ability in producing outstanding pronunciation and the ability of using a clear voice and proper stressing and intonation. When a speaker speak fluently, convincingly, and use proper gestures confidently he or she practicing the discourse competence and functional competence on how to actualize their speaking competence into a real practice of speaking. Moreover, the students speaking competence can also be seen from their talent to perform language and involve the audience interaction communicatively.

In general students speaking competence is speaking IV class is on the average level. Only few of them have more capability in speaking especially presenting ideas in public speaking context

Students Writing Competence

From the 36 students there are 6 students who have significantly better score of writing than speaking. Meanwhile, there are 7 students who got significantly worse score on writing than speaking. The rest, 23 students have the same average score between writing and speaking. The highest score of writing is 81, the average score is 71, and the lowest score is 50 (Appendix 1). On writing lesson, the students were trained to write narrative, descriptive and comparative paragraph. Futhermore, the students also were trained to develop from paragraph to essay. The lecture measure the competence on writing based on wrting performance rubric (Appendix 3).

Writing Competence also contribute to language competence it involves grammatical competence or language system, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. Canale and Swain (1980:3).The students writing competence was measured from their knowledge of writing a good essay and how they apply their knowledge in real essay production. Students are lead to know the criteria of good essay so that they can write the

essay based on the parameter set by the lecturer. In general students can implement the criteria to their essay production by writing essay suitable with the following criteria: Format, Punctuation and Mechanics, Content, Organization, and Grammar. (Appendix3). The students writing competence was determined by how far they know and apply the regulation of writing proper essay based on the format designed and the writing mechanism with punctuations. The most point was accounted from the organization of the essay, how the students build up the outline into a complete essay which consist introduction, body, and conclusion. The sociolinguistic and discourse competence of writing skill are defined from how the students elaborate the maid idea into topic sentence and develop into paragraph, the coherence and cohesion of sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph. Also, how the students complement the thesis statement with supporting details and information in developing a paragraph. Furthermore, one of the important aspects in evaluating students essay is the grammatical competence that can be seen from the grammar or sentence structure that the students write. Ideas that are being presented written on the essay was also measured based on the critical thinking that students used and to make the essay understandable and interesting for the readers. It is a strategic competence in which demand a compensatory of non-verbal communication through essay.

Students English Performance

The statistic correlation result shows that there is very strong impact within the productive competence in improving the students' language performance. Competence can be measured from the students' performances in acting language orally and written. Language performance is the actualization of language competence, when student apply language and function it for communication. The ability to use the language through their skills is the language competence itself. When students perform language very well meaning they have a good competence of language itself.

Chomsky said that "The real act of competence is performance". The actualization of knowledge in real action is performance. Students with high competence on productive skills would also have high language performance. When the students know what to do to be a good speaker and writer and they internalize it in real practice, showing their language competence in performance. Students with high competence would surely have high performance as well.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

From the 36 students there are 7 students who have significantly better score of speaking than writing. Meanwhile, there are 6 students who got significantly better score on writing than speaking .The rest, 23 students have the same average score between speaking and writing. From this raw measurement supported by the statistic correlation result that shows there is very low correlation between speaking and writing. It can be concluded that students who have competence in speaking doesn't always have the same level of competence in writing, although both skills are the same productive skills that require students to produce language performance. Oral performance and written performance require slightly different competence. To some students who have active and outspoken personality would do better in speaking. The strong character and expression of speaking were also accounted. While, students who have passive personality and tend to be quiet, can express their ideas better through writing which not demand any oral presentation. The evaluation of writing performance would only be seen from the product essay. However both skills speaking and writing gave high contribution to students English Performance.

For some language learners and teachers, it is suggested to support students with high motivation and build students positive attitude toward learning, so that students would do optimally in improving their productive competence orally or written. Futhermore, for futher analysis, the researcher can be examined deeply about the reason why the students in good written communication tends to have low level of speaking or Oral performance.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2001. *Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan*. Jakarta: BumiAksara.

Blaz, Deborah. 2001. *A Collection of Performance Tasks and Rubrics:* Foreign Languages. Eye on Education Inc.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* Oxford:Pearson Education

Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Longman: London

Canale, Michael & Merrill Swain. 1980. *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*. Applied Linguistics.

Chomsky, Noam 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Chomsky, Noam 1968. *Language and mind.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World

Creswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage:London

Djago Tarigan, H.G. Tarigan. 1986. *Teknik Pengajaran Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa

Halliday, M.A.K. 1978 *Language as a socia semiotic. The Social Intrepretation of Language and Meaning.* London: Edward Arnold

Heaton, J. B. 1989. *Writing English Language Test*. Longman: London

Hymes, Dell H. 1971. *Competence and performance in linguistic theory.* In: Renisa Huxley & E.Ingram, (eds.). *Language acquisition: Model and methods.* London & New York: Academic Press

Hymes, Dell 1972. *On communicative competence.* In: John B. Pride & John Holmes, (eds.). *Sociolinguistics. Selected readings*. Harmondsworth etc.: Penguin Books.

Hymes, Dell. (2000 [1965]) *On communicative competence.*In Alessandro Duranti (ed) Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader (pp 53-73). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Newby,David. 2011. *Competence and Performance in learning and teaching theories and practices*. Selected Papers from the 19 ISTAL

Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. 1988. *Penilaian Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. Yogyakarta : BPFE

Novia, T. 2002. *Strategy to Improve Student's Ability in Speaking*. Skripsi. Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.

Oshima, Alice & Hogue, Ann. 2007.*Introduction to Academic Writing.*3rd Edition.Longman. Pearson Education, Inc. p:197

Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian: Pendekatan Kuantitatif*, *Kualitatif, dan R & D.*Bandung: Alfabeta

Appendix 1.

TEST SCORE RESULT

NO	STUDENTS NAME	SPEAKING IV	WRITING III	PERFORMANCE SCORE
1	GUNAWAN PEBRUONO	**82**	68	75
2	WATIM	56	59	57.5
3	EKO PRASETYO PAMUJI	70	69	69.5
4	ICMI NOVIA BALQIS	59	**73**	66
5	NURUL ADHIYAH	70	70	70
6	NURUL ANISAH	70	78	74
7	RISKA OKTAVIANA	70	77	73.5
8	LIBAS PERFECTA	63	50	56.5
9	KURNIA RAHMAWATI	76	75	75.5
10	NUR ARDIANA SHOLEHATI	70	**80**	75
11	GITA FEBRIANI	83	81	82
12	NURUL HIDAYATI	70	78	74
13	RIZQINA RACHMAN	66	68	67
14	ENDAH KUSUMA WARDANI	70	**80**	75
15	AS AMARIZULHAQ	85	78	81.5
16	OKY FAJAR SUGIYANTI	**80**	68	74
17	DEBBY DWI LUTFIANI	67	**75**	71
18	SRI DIAH AGUSTININGSIH	80	73	76.5
19	ISTEFFANY CHINDYLIANY	77	75	76
20	SELVIKA RATNA DEWI	**78**	68	73
21	ANIS MARCHAMAH	68	65	66.5
22	MARSAVIANY	**80**	65	72.5
23	AIDA FARAH FIRDAUSY	**80**	68	74
24	ANDHITA RACHMAN	81	78	79.5
25	HAY CITRA NINGRAT	66	69	67.5
26	FIKA FAUZIYAH	**83**	69	76
27	EKA FITRIA NOVITA SARI	66	68	67
28	IFFON NUR HAMUDAH	65	62	63.5
29	NUR JANNAH	83	82	82.5
30	FITRI EKA WAHYUNI	73	76	74.5

31	AFDILA FIDDINI RACHMAWATI	67	66	66.5
32	JENITA AYU PRATIWI	75	77	76
33	YUNITA PURNAWATI	68	**74**	71
34	DARA RIZKY AMALIA	**88**	76	82
35	ACHMAD FARIS ILHAM	56	**75**	65.5
36	PUTRI SETYANINGSIH	68	63	65.5
	Average Score	**72**	**71**	**72**
	The Highest Score	**88**	**82**	**82.5**
	The Lowest Score	**56**	**50**	**56.5**

(The data was taken from 3 parallel classes on speaking IV and writing III, June 20, 2014)

Appendix 2.

ORAL PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
(SPEAKING IV - PUBLIC SPEAKING)

NAME :
STUDENT NO:

NO	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS
1.	Ideas are clear and creative supported with accurate examples/details	
2.	Ideas presented in coherence and well organized (beginning, middle, and end)	
3.	Presentation is interesting and meaningful	
4.	Presentation supported with visual aids and creativity	
5.	Speaker speak fluently, communicatively and convincingly	
6.	Speaker use a clear voice and proper stressing and intonation	
7.	Speaker use outstanding pronunciation	
8.	Speaker use correct dictions and languages	
9.	Speaker use proper gestures/mimic/body language confidently	
10.	Speaker involve/get the audiences interaction	
Total score X 2 = 100		**50 X 2= 100**
Comment/ feedback :		

Note:
5 point : always done in the presentation
4 point : mostly done in the presentation
3 point : sometimes done in the presentation
2 point : little done in the presentation
1 point :never done in the presentation

Adapted from Blaz, Deborah. 2001. A Collection of Performance Tasks and Rubrics: Foreign Languages. Eye on Education Inc.(page 51)

Appendix 3

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
ESSAY WRITING

NAME :
STUDENT NO:

Assessment Criteria	Maximum Points	Score
FORMAT : (5 points)		
• Title centered	2	
• First line of each paragraph intended	1	
• Margin left on both sides	1	
• Text double-spaced	1	
PUNCTUATION and MECHANICS (5 points)		
• Periods, commas, apostrophes, and quotation marks	3	
• Capital Letters	1	
• Spelling	1	
CONTENT (20 points)		
• The Essay fulfills the requirements of the assignment	5	
• The essay is interesting	5	
• The essay shows that the writer used care and thought	10	
ORGANIZATION (45 points)		
• The Essay follow the outline, and it has an introduction, body, and a conclusion	5	
• *Introductory Paragraph* : begins with several general sentences and ends with a thesis statement	5	
Body:		
• Each paragraph of the body discusses a new point and begins with a clear topic sentence	5	
• Each paragraph has supporting material: facts, examples, quotations, paraphrased or summarized information, and so on.	10	
• Each paragraph has unity	5	
• Each paragraph has coherence	5	
• Transition are used to link paragraphs	5	
• *Concluding Paragraph:* It summarizes the main points or paraphrases the thesis statement, begins with a conclusion signal, and leaves the reader with the writer's final thoughts on the topic	5	
GRAMMAR and SENTENCE STRUCTURE (25 points) Estimate a grammar and sentence structure score	25	
TOTAL	**100**	

Adopted from :Oshima, Alice & Hogue, Ann. 2007. Introduction to Academic Writing.3rd Edition.Longman. Pearson Education, Inc. p:197

Artikel Correlational Study

ORIGINALITY REPORT

15%	12%	6%	7%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	en.wikipedia.org Internet Source	1%
2	repository.um.edu.my Internet Source	1%
3	Submitted to Hellenic Open University Student Paper	1%
4	Submitted to Western Governors University Student Paper	1%
5	Submitted to College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE), Polytechnic University Student Paper	1%
6	www.rug.nl Internet Source	1%
7	repository.uhn.ac.id Internet Source	1%
8	elearningcsusb.wordpress.com Internet Source	1%
	Submitted to Roosevelt University	

9	Student Paper	1 %
10	Tosan Okoro, Polina Mironova, Thrmiga Sathiyamoorthy, Jermey Hall et al. "Correlation of Residents' Performance in Competency-Based Exams and Orthopaedic In- Training Examinations (OITE)", Research Square Platform LLC, 2021 Publication	1 %
11	idoc.pub Internet Source	1 %
12	Submitted to Assumption University Student Paper	1 %
13	repository.uin-suska.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
14	Submitted to CSU, Los Angeles Student Paper	1 %
15	journal.uhamka.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
16	www.coursehero.com Internet Source	<1 %
17	Submitted to Tarlac State University Student Paper	<1 %
18	donggoagus.wordpress.com Internet Source	<1 %

19	id.123dok.com Internet Source	<1 %
20	journal.stkippgritrenggalek.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
21	www.academypublisher.com Internet Source	<1 %
22	A. Azadeh, S. M. Hatefi, H. Kor. "Performance improvement of a multi product assembly shop by integrated fuzzy simulation approach", Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing, 2011 Publication	<1 %
23	Submitted to Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar Student Paper	<1 %
24	repository.stiedewantara.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
25	dissertations.mak.ac.ug Internet Source	<1 %
26	searchworks.stanford.edu Internet Source	<1 %
27	www.e-repository.unsyiah.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
28	Submitted to Segi University College Student Paper	<1 %

29	vig.pearsoned.com Internet Source	<1%
30	repository.iainpurwokerto.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
31	journal.uinmataram.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
32	Tri Yuli Ardiyansah. "ANALYSIS OF SPEAKING ASSESSMENT IN ESP SPEAKING CLASS", Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics, 2019 Publication	<1%
33	pt.scribd.com Internet Source	<1%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	< 1 words
Exclude bibliography	On		