



Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345

<https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english>

DOI: [10.24127/pj.v12i1.5690](https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v12i1.5690)

PERSPECTIVES OF INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ON READING PROFICIENCY AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

by

Patrick Adtya Pratama Sinom*

English Education Study Program, Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

Jiksau04@gmail.com

Ouda Teda Ena

English Education Study Program, Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

Ouda@usd.ac.id

*Corresponding author

(Article History: Received: 2022-07-12 Revised1: 2023-01-19 Revised2: 2023-02-07 Accepted: 2023-02-14
Published: 2023-02-27)

Abstract:

The transformation of the world has brought communication into a complex system. This research focused on understanding communication from reading proficiency and communicative competence perspectives. It is aimed to find a correlation between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2. The quantitative method with the correlational study was employed to analyze the data collected. The study was conducted at a private university in Yogyakarta. Thirty students participated in this research. The study employed a survey design using a questionnaire to collect the data. The result indicated a strong connection between reading proficiency and communicative competence. It implies that reading proficiency and communicative competence are connected.

Keywords: reading proficiency, communicative competence, language learning, correlational study

Abstrak:

Transformasi dunia telah membawa komunikasi ke dalam sistem yang kompleks. Penelitian ini berfokus pada pemahaman komunikasi dari perspektif kemampuan membaca dan kompetensi komunikatif. Hal ini bertujuan untuk menemukan korelasi antara kemampuan membaca dan kompetensi komunikatif dalam bahasa Inggris sebagai L2. Metode kuantitatif dengan studi korelasional digunakan untuk menganalisis data yang dikumpulkan. Penelitian dilakukan di sebuah universitas swasta di Yogyakarta. Tiga puluh siswa berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain survei menggunakan kuesioner untuk mengumpulkan data. Hasilnya menunjukkan hubungan yang kuat antara kemampuan membaca dan kompetensi komunikatif. Ini menyiratkan bahwa kemahiran membaca dan kompetensi komunikatif terhubung.

Kata kunci: kemampuan membaca, kompetensi komunikatif, pembelajaran bahasa, studi korelasional

INTRODUCTION

In this era, the transformation in communicative competence is considered an essential aspect of the teaching system. Henry (2017) mentioned that communicative competence should be

How to cite this article

Sinom, P. A. P., & Ena, O. T. (2023). Perspectives of Indonesian undergraduate students on reading proficiency and communicative competence. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 176–193. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v12i1.5690>

Sinom & Ena (2023)

the objective of language teaching as it needs to be the fundamental focus of classroom practice. Conversely, a positive attitude toward language or communicative competence provides students with a better understanding of cultural differences (Tolochko et al., 2017). Consequently, by considering the changes in communicative competence as a root of social needs and educational growth, the educational field is expected to contribute to the changes in communicative competence for students to be equipped for the current situation's needs.

The transformation of communicative competence is affected by exchanging information, commonly known as 'globalization.' Therefore, it brought the world into diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Consequently, communication is becoming more familiar in daily life due to the variety of communication. Language speaking, an example, is related to the ability of someone to be able to have a variety of communicative purposes (Renandya et al., 2018). Therefore, communication complexity creates a condition that sociocultural context cannot be separated from the communication itself (Craig, 1999). Old literature stated that communicative competence works in three aspects of social sciences: Weber's sociology, Chomsky's linguistic theory, and functional-pragmatic tradition (Klieme et al., 2008). So, communicative competence is considered a complex system. In modern linguistics, communicative competence is a balance of linguistical understanding of a specific social-cultural setting (Tolochko et al., 2017). Byram (1997, 2000) defined communicative competence as the ability of someone to establish and maintain a relationship with other people from different cultures. In addition, Fantini (2000) also specified an intention of communicative competence into components: (1) the ability to develop and maintain a relationship, (2) the ability to set up an effective and appropriate language considering the loss-track of conversation, (3) the ability to attend and join together to the social setting. Indeed, skill and knowledge are required to contribute appropriately in a social setting (Messick, 1984).

Many researchers have contributed to developing communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Celce-Murcia, 2007; Hymes, 1971, 1972, 1974). Thus, Cloudia Ho (2020) summed up their theories into five elements of communicative competence. They cover linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociocultural competence, strategic competence, interactional competence, and formulaic competence. Linguistic competence refers to the ability of

Sinom & Ena (2023)

someone to interpret grammatical knowledge (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980), such as vocabulary, spelling, semantics, syntax, phonology, and other elements (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Discourse competence is the ability of someone to infer meaning in communication (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980). Sociocultural competence is the ability of some to get involved in social life, such as language sensitivity, relevant topic discussion, individual relationships, cultural awareness, and etiquette (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980); Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Strategic competence is evaluating and fixing the miscode transmission and communication efficiency (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980). Formulaic competence refers to the systematic communication pattern correlated with language constructs such as vocabulary, phrases, and sentences (Celce-Murcia, 2007). As a result, someone who is good in their language proficiency can convey their goals or purposes in communicative action, such as having a clear understanding of topic discussion, drawing meanings of ideas, and smoothly interacting with the culture of a specific target. In other words, the goal of communicative competence requires social understanding.

On the other hand, reading as one of four basic language learning skills contributes enormously to meeting the cultural aspect of second language acquisition. Therefore, it is assumed that reading proficiency is projected to contribute a lot to communicative competence (Oced, 2016). Accordingly, as reading plays a role in constructing communicative competence, teaching reading is estimated to achieve the needs of communicative competence objectives. Usó-Juan and Martínez-Flor (2008) stated that there are four aspects of successful communicative competence called discourse competence, and all the elements are connected to the others. The four aspects are linguistic, pragmatic, intercultural, and strategic. In addition, the most recent research, Cloudia Ho (2020), summarized theories from Bachman (1990), Canale (1983), Canale and Swain (1980), Celce-Murcia (2007), Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) into five elements of communicative competence. They are linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociocultural competence, strategic competence, interactional competence, and formulaic competence. Thus, reading proficiency and communicative competence are connected regarding cultural understanding or learning.

The researcher uses reading proficiency as a sub-sequence of language proficiency in this research. Therefore, reading takes a basic foundation in academic success in cultural society (Whitehurst Grover J.; Lonigan Christopher J., 2001). In addition, individual (origin,

Sinom & Ena (2023)

age, socioeconomic status, and first language) and systemic variables (family and communities) are influencing students reading proficiency (García & Jensen, 2007; Strickland, 2010). On the other hand, Stanovich (1980, 1986) asserted that multiple components are involved in reading, such as decoding skills, vocabulary, morphosyntax, and listening. The components are connected to help students improve in reading. Therefore, reading proficiency refers to an individual's ability to decode a word to understand its meaning (Arnesen et al., 2019). Thus, literacy has become a powerful tool for students to develop reading proficiency; it creates an environment where students can experience the function of language applications (Mart, 2017).

As a result, social-cultural or communicative competence and reading proficiency are essential aspects of successful academic and non-academic performance. In a classroom or academic setting, reading offers students comprehensible input on cultural aspects (Mart, 2017), which would help students develop their communicative competency skills. On the other hand, oral language is essential for upper-level students. Oral language is used when students produce, receive/comprehend spoken language. Oral language ability involves skill and understanding of grammar and vocabulary (Panel, 2008). Therefore, the ability to produce and comprehend is essentially interrelated with a reading ability (Kim, 2021). Thus, while students interpret the reading, it develops their critical thinking (Mart, 2017), which would benefit students in real-world conditions.

This research aims to find the correlation between students' reading proficiency and communicative competence in ESL. Therefore the research questions are:

1. How do students perceive their communicative competence and reading proficiency in English?
2. What is the correlation between students' reading proficiency and communicative competence in the English language?

METHOD

Design

This research aimed to determine the relationship between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2 learners. The researchers employed a

Sinom & Ena (2023)

quantitative method to respond to the research problems. According to Creswell (2003), quantitative data involves the data collection to be quantified to statistical information to support or refute the hypothesis. Also, quantitative research focuses on finding the general picture of some population characteristics (Creswell, 2012). In addition, the Likert scale indicator used is presented as follows:

Table 1. Likert scale indicator (Sugiono,2013)

Likert scale interval	Indicator
1,00-1,80	Strongly Disagree
1,81-2,60	Disagree
2,61-3,40	Neutral
3,41-4,20	Agree
4,21-5,00	Strongly Agree

Consequently, the rationale of conducting quantitative research was to collect participants' perceptions through statistical information and then analyze them to see the relationship between the variables (reading proficiency and communicative competence). Thus, a quantitative method employing a correlational design was considered suitable to respond to the discussion topic. In addition, Senthilnathan (2019) stated that a correlational study is appropriately used to find the degree of relationship between variables.

Participant

In selecting the participants, the researchers asked whether the participant candidates wanted to contribute, which means that all the chosen participants volunteered to contribute to this research. Also, they were asked to fill out the consent form if they were interested in participating in the research. Although forty students were being approached at first, only 30 students responded to the questionnaire. The voluntary sampling was taken from a private university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Moreover, the participants or samples represent general undergraduate students in Indonesia. In addition, this research involved 30 students as participants (n=30). The number of participants was considered enough to run a correlational study (Creswell, 2012). All the participants are undergraduate students of the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department of a private university in Yogyakarta. The participants

Sinom & Ena (2023)

were in the first semester of education. Based on gender, the participants are 16 females and 14 males. The age range of the participants is from 17-20 years old.

Instrument

A questionnaire was used in this research. To be precise, the close-ended or Likert scale was employed. The questionnaire is divided into two parts: reading proficiency and communicative competence. The questionnaire on reading proficiency was adapted from Integrity Language Roundtable (1988). It was used to measure students reading capability in an L2 language (Interagency Language Roundtable, 2014). Still, due to the objective considerations of this research, some changes needed to be made. To be precise, the simplified words and focus scope were conducted to match the participants and the aim of the research, which is the English language. The original questionnaire employed reading in an extensive scope (reading in all languages as L2). In this research, the scope was specified in the English language. Moreover, the words were simplified (i.e., ‘common, occurring characters in a character system’ to ‘a writing system’). As a result, there were 21 items on the reading proficiency questionnaire.

Furthermore, the questionnaire on communicative competence was adapted from (Claudia Ho, 2020). The original questionnaire measured students’ perspectives on English language competence in tourism. In this research, the researcher changed some items to get the items appropriate to the intended meaning of this research which is in the field of English Education-communicative competence in English as L2 language learners. According to Claudia Ho (2020), the questionnaire focuses on five aspects: overall (1 item), linguistic competence (5 items), discourse competence (4 items), sociocultural competence (4 items), strategic competence (2 items), interactional competence (9 items), and formulaic competence (2 items).

Data collecting technique

In collecting the data, the researchers employed a survey data-collecting technique. According to Creswell (2012), the survey data collecting technique is that the researcher deals with a survey or questionnaire to a group representing a population to understand their tendency of behaviors, opinions, perceptions, and attitudes. Moreover, a cross-sectional survey is utilized as a method of collecting data. According to Creswell (2012), the cross-

Sinom & Ena (2023)

sectional is the researcher surveying to collect the data of the samples/participants at a certain point in time. In simple terms, to collect the data, the researchers distributed a questionnaire to the participants, undergraduate students of the ELT Department of a private university in Yogyakarta, at one time.

Data analysis technique

A paired sample t-test and Pearson correlational study were used to analyze the data. According to Ross and Willson (2017), paired sample t-test is the use of means to be compared to see the difference between the two variables. In this research, the paired sample t-test was used to see the different perspectives of the participants on both variables. Therefore, it was mainly used to see whether participants' perceptions were monotone or not on one variable and another. The following data analysis technique used was Pearson's correlational study. According to Creswell (2012), the Pearson correlational study measures the relationship between two variables. In other words, it is used to see whether one variable is connected. Contextually to this research, the Pearson correlation was used to understand the relationship between Indonesian undergraduate students' reading proficiency and their communicative competence.

Furthermore, related to question number two, the researchers expected that the two variables are correlated. Moreover, the dependent variable could be either positive or negative. In other words, a two-tailed Pearson correlation was used in this research. The researchers stated a hypothesis as follows:

- There is no correlation between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.
- A robust positive/negative correlation exists between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.
- A strong positive/negative correlation exists between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.
- A moderate positive/negative correlation exists between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.
- A weak positive/negative correlation exists between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.

Sinom & Ena (2023)

- A very weak positive/negative correlation exists between reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Descriptive statistics and students' perceptions

To answer research question number one, the researchers employed the SPSS 25 application to find the mean of each item and used the Likert scale to indicate students' perceptions.

Furthermore, students' perceptions of their reading proficiency and communicative competence are shown in the tables below:

Table 4.1 Students' perception of reading proficiency

No	Item	Mean	Students' perception	SD
1	I can recognize and identify all the letters in the printed version of an English alphabetic writing system.	3,90	Agree	,960
2	I can read some words and phrases, such as numbers and commonplace names, that I see on signs, menus, and storefronts and in simple everyday material such as advertisements and timetables.	4,30	Strongly Agree	,750
3	I can understand concise, simple texts' purpose and primary meaning, such as printed personal notes, business advertisements, public announcements, and maps.	4,13	Agree	,776
4	I can comprehend simple instructions, such as very straightforward street directions	4,30	Strongly Agree	,837
5	I can understand concise, simple written descriptions of some familiar persons, places, and things, like those found in many tourist pamphlets.	4,17	Agree	,834
6	I can understand texts mainly of straightforward factual language, such as short news reports of events, biographical information, descriptions, or simple technical material.	3,90	Agree	,803
7	I can understand the main idea and some details of clearly organized, short, straightforward texts about places, people, and events that I am familiar with.	3,97	Agree	,850
8	I can understand very concise reports about current and past events.	3,93	Agree	,868
9	I can understand simple typed correspondence in familiar contexts, including descriptions of events, feelings, wishes, and plans for the future.	3,80	Agree	,847
10	I can usually understand the main ideas of authentic prose on topics I am familiar with, either because they pertain to my work experience or	3,77	Agree	,858

Sinom & Ena (2023)

	to topics I am interested in.			
11	I can usually read and understand all of the material in a major daily newspaper published in a city or country with which I am familiar.	3,87	Agree	,819
12	Reading a newspaper or magazine that contains editorial or opinion content, I can “read between the lines” and understand meanings that are not directly stated.	3,53	Agree	,937
13	I can understand the author’s intent and follow the reasoning in texts that include hypothesis, persuasion, supported opinion, or argument for a position (e.g., editorials, debates, and op-ed pieces) with little or no use of a dictionary.	3,50	Agree	,900
14	I can understand contemporary expository essays and recent literary prose with little or no use of a dictionary,	3,10	Neutral	,995
15	I can understand the main ideas and essential details of almost all material written within my particular professional field or area of primary interest (e.g., reports, analyses, letters, and arguments).	3,60	Agree	,968
16	I can read fluently and accurately all styles and forms of the language pertinent to professional needs or personal interests without reference to a dictionary,	3,47	Agree	,973
17	I understand long and complex analyses, factual reports, and literary texts.	3,27	Neutral	,980
18	I can understand the meaning and intent of most uses of idioms, cultural references, wordplay, sarcasm, and irony in highly abstract and culturally “loaded” texts.	3,33	Neutral	1,06 1
19	I can understand language specially adjusted for different situations, audiences, or purposes, such as a political essay, humorous anecdote or joke, sermon, or inflammatory broadside. I can also appreciate distinctions in style.	3,40	Neutral	1,00 3
20	I can read virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, linguistically complex texts such as technical articles, essays, and literary works, including prose works from earlier periods recognized as masterpieces.	3,63	Agree	,890
21	I can read reasonably legible handwriting without difficulty	3,47	Agree	,900
Average		3,73	Agree	

Based on the table above, the researchers found that the average mean of students’ reading proficiency is 3,73. This finding indicates that most of the students agreed with the statements in the questionnaire. Therefore, it could be concluded that students’ perceptions of their reading proficiency in English as L2 are good. Moreover, in statements number 2 and 4, students strongly agreed with the statements, which means that students’ perceptions of the specific terms are perfect. However, in questions 14,17,18,19, students neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, which indicates that students are neutral about the statements.

Sinom & Ena (2023)*Table 4.2 Students' perception of communicative competence*

No	Item	Mean	Students' perception	SD
1	I am good at communicative competence in English.	3,50	Agree	,938
2	I am competent in vocabulary to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,33	Neutral	,758
3	I am competent in grammar to maintain smooth communication in English.	2,93	Neutral	1,048
4	I am competent in pronunciation to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,57	Agree	1,104
5	I am competent in spelling to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,57	Agree	,935
6	I am competent in accent to keep smooth communication in English.	3,37	Neutral	1,033
7	I can utilize coherence and cohesion of dialogues/texts to maintain smooth English communication.	3,27	Neutral	1,015
8	I am competent in following cause-effect, sequences, and logic to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,50	Agree	,861
9	I am competent in inferring meanings from disconnected dialogues/texts to maintain smooth English communication.	3,57	Agree	,858
10	I am competent in using transitional signals to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,40	Neutral	,894
11	I am competent in sensing social status in the language used to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,33	Neutral	,959
12	I am competent in sensing cultural differences in language use to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,57	Agree	,858
13	I am competent in sensing proxemics, and social distance in the language used to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,20	Neutral	1,064
14	I am competent in small talk to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,67	Agree	,758
15	Strategic competence I am competent in discerning miscommunication to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,40	Neutral	1,003
16	I am competent in repairing miscommunication to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,60	Agree	,814
17	Interactional competence I am competent in inquiring about maintaining smooth communication in English.	3,43	Agree	,898
18	I am competent to apologize to keep smooth communication in English.	3,90	Agree	,759
19	I am competent in requesting to keep smooth communication in English.	3,63	Agree	,850
20	I am competent in informing to keep smooth communication in English.	3,63	Agree	,765
21	I am competent in complaining to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,47	Agree	,860
22	I am competent in pacifying to maintain smooth communication in	3,27	Neutral	,944

Sinom & Ena (2023)

	English.			
23	I am competent in negotiating to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,33	Neutral	,959
24	I am competent in arguing to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,40	Neutral	,855
25	I am competent in clarifying to keep smooth communication in English.	3,47	Agree	,860
26	I am competent in pairing up phrases to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,30	Neutral	,877
27	I am competent in pairing up sentences to maintain smooth communication in English.	3,43	Agree	,898
Average		3,45	Agree	

Based on the table above, the researchers found that the average mean of students' communicative competence is 3,45. This finding indicates that most of the students agreed with the statements in the questionnaire. Therefore, it could be concluded that students' perception of their communicative competence in English as L2 is good.

In a brief conclusion of the data analysis from the questionnaires distributed (n=30), the total mean of students' perception of reading proficiency in English as L2 is 78,33 (SD=14,445), and students' perception of communicative competence in English as L2 is 93,03 (SD=19,429).

Paired sample t-test

There were thirty participants in this research. The participants were taking both variables of the questionnaire. Thus, to see the different perspectives on reading proficiency and communicative competence, the paired t-test is done.

Table 2. The difference in students' perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Mean	Lower			
Pair 1	Reading proficiency - communicative competence	-14,700	10,732	1,959	-18,708	-10,692	-7,502	29	,000

Sinom & Ena (2023)

The paired t-test showed that the significant number is 0,000 (2-tailed). Therefore, the significant number is lower than 0.05, indicating a significantly different perspective of students in reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.

Correlation between reading proficiency and communicative competence

In answering the second research question, the researcher employed Pearson’s correlational study by using SPSS 25 application. The result of the test is shown as follows:

Table 3 The correlation of student’s perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence

		total x	total y
total x	Pearson Correlation	1	,839**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	30	30
total y	Pearson Correlation	,839**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	30	30

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

Based on the table above, the significant correlation between students’ perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence is 0,000 (2-tailed). Therefore, the correlation (sig. 0,000) indicates a relationship between student perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence. The decision-making is made based on the sig. 0,000 <0,01. Another validity was tested by the r-table (n=30). The r-table compared the Pearson correlation to see the connection. The Pearson correlation of student perception of reading proficiency and communicative competence is 0,839, and the r-table for n=30 is 0,463. As a result, the Pearson correlation number of this research is higher than the r-table (0,839>0,463), which indicates a correlation between students’ perception of reading proficiency and communicative competence.

However, the Pearson correlation number is used to see the strength of the connection between students’ perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2. The correlation coefficient range measures the Pearson correlation. In addition, the result shows that the Pearson correlation number is in a range of a strong correlation (r=0,839). In other words, a strong positive relationship exists between students’ perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2.

Sinom & Ena (2023)

Discussion

This study described undergraduate students' perceptions of a private university in Yogyakarta toward reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2. Based on the study's result, most students/participants perceived that their English reading proficiency and communicative competence are good (the average mean of reading proficiency is 3,73 and communicative competence is 3,45).

Regarding reading proficiency, most students strongly agreed that they could read words and phrases they find daily. Moreover, students stated they could recognize signs, menus, advertisements, and timetables. Also, they strongly agreed that they could understand simple instructions, such as street directions. This finding aligns with the definition of reading proficiency from Stanovich (1980); some components are involved in reading, such as decoding skills, vocabulary, morphosyntax, and listening. However, some students were not sure that they could understand essays and literary prose with little or no use of a dictionary, long and complex reports, and literary texts, the meaning of idioms, cultural references, sarcasm, and irony, and the use of language in adjusted situations or style. As a result, this research indicates that students could find a cultural context discussion or topic of the reading. This finding shares similar ideas with Strawbridge et al. (2019) and Tuomainen (2021). In the research, Strawbridge et al. (2019) revealed that students in the lower semester (semesters two and four) perceived better reading proficiency than other skills.

Moreover, they found that at the end of the semester, students' reading proficiency reached intermediate mid due to the curriculum learning. In his research, Tuomainen (2021) also expressed that students in the first year of education perceived their reading proficiency as good. He found that students could recognize some strategies, apply some skills, and use critical thinking in reading.

Furthermore, most students agreed with the questionnaire's statements in terms of communicative competence. Thus, students/participants of the research perceived that their communicative competencies in English as L2 are good. In other words, most students perceive that they are good at linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociocultural competence, strategic competence, interactional competence, and formulaic competence. This finding indicates that students have good perspectives of understanding communicative competence from a different culture. In a brief inference, this finding reveals that students can

Sinom & Ena (2023)

establish and maintain their social understanding and communication in a specific social-cultural setting. This finding reveals a little resemblance with Vu Van (2017). However, this research was based on students' perspectives, whereas Vu Van's (2017) research was based on a test. In his research, Vu Van (2017) found that college students' communicative competence level is competent-high. However, the research was only focused on linguistic competence and discourse competence. Moreover, he revealed that students were very good at grammar-nouns, pronouns, and prepositions.

Furthermore, a correlational study between reading proficiency and communicative competence in this research revealed that reading proficiency is interrelated to communicative competence (sig. 0,000; 2-tailed). Consequently, there was a strong connection between students' reading proficiency and communicative competence. In the same direction as the finding, Kim (2021) claimed that the capability of producing and comprehending communications is essentially connected to reading ability. Therefore, reading proficiency offers students a cultural context for understanding and producing the topic discussion. Supported by Mart (2017), reading offers students comprehensible input on cultural features. Hence, reading proficiency improves someone's ability to have a variety of communicative competence. In line with the finding, Renandya et al. (2018) also mentioned that language speaking is associated with communicative intentions.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Students differently perceived their reading proficiency and communicative competence in English as L2. However, there were some aspects of both reading and communicative competence that some students believed was good. In contrast, there were also some aspects that they neither agreed nor disagreed on whether they were good or not, in which they became neutral. On the other hand, students' perceptions of reading proficiency and communicative competence are connected, which means that both variables affect each other. Therefore, it shows that if students have good reading proficiency, they have good communicative competence.

Sinom & Ena (2023)

Limitation

The researchers stated that the potential limitations of the study are related to the number of participants and research method. The researchers reflected that adding more participants are expected to provide more valid data analysis. Furthermore, to provide in depth understanding of the relationship between reading proficiency and communicative competence, the researchers reflected that employing qualitative research method must be helpful.

Implication

Suggestions of this research are addressed to students and future researchers. For students, some aspects of this research can be used as a reference in improving reading proficiency and communicative competence. Moreover, this research revealed that reading proficiency and communicative competence are firmly connected, which means that if students improve their reading proficiency, their communicative competence improves. Therefore, students are expected to develop their reading proficiency, especially in this era. For future researchers, this research is limited by the participants and method of the study; hence it is suggested to do research with more prominent participants and do a qualitative method as well. In addition, exploring more aspects of basic skills such as speaking, writing, and listening is suggested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Through this research, the researchers would like to thank the participants who have participated well by providing the data needed for the analysis.

BIO-PROFILE:

Patrick Adtya Pratama Sinom is an M.Pd candidate at Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. He received his S.Pd from English Language Education Study Program, at Sanata Dharma University, in 2021. His research concerns educational psychology, teacher professional development, and language teaching.

Ouda Teda Ena is a senior lecturer at Sanata Dharma University. He got his M.Pd from Malang State University and Ed.D from Loyola University Chicago.

REFERENCES

- Arnesen, A., Braeken, J., Ogden, T., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2019). Assessing children's social functioning and reading proficiency: A systematic review of the quality of educational assessment instruments used in norwegian elementary schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(3), 465–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2017.1420685>
- Bailey, K. M. (2020). Language proficiency and communicative competence. in *teaching listening and speaking in second and foreign language contexts*. Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350093560.ch-003>
- Byram, M. (2000). Assesing intercultural competence in language teaching. *Sprogforum*, 18(6), 8–13.
- Byram, M. (2020). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. In *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/byram0244>
- CANALE, M., & SWAIN, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. A. Soler & M. P. S. Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning* (pp. 41–57). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0_3
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L462005216>
- Cloudia Ho, Y.-Y. (2020). Communicative language teaching and English as a foreign language undergraduates' communicative competence in Tourism English. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 27(1), 100271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2020.100271>
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. in *communication theory* (Vol. 9, Issue 2, pp. 119–161). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fantini, A. E. (2000). A central concern: developing intercultural competence. *About Our Institution*, 1(1), 25–42.
- García, E. E., & Jensen, B. (2007). Helping young Hispanic learners. In *Educational Leadership* (Vol. 64, Issue 6, pp. 34–39).
- Hery, Y. (2017). Teachers and students perceptions of communicative competence in English as a foreign language in Indonesia. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 12(17), 867–883. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2017.3243>
- Interagency Language Roundtable. (2014). *Interagency Language Roundtable Language Skill*

Sinom & Ena (2023)

- Level Descriptions*. 2014(February 24), 9–11.
<http://www.govtilr.org/skills/ILRscale2.htm>
- Kim, H. (2021). *Factors influencing english reading proficiency among Korean elementary school students*. Seoul National University.
- Klieme, E., Hartig, J., & Rauch, D. (2008). The concept of competence in educational contexts. *Assessment of competencies in educational contexts, May 2014*, 3–22.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dominique_Rauch/publication/232495759_The_concept_of_competence_in_educational_contexts/links/00b7d537c6f1c7ec23000000/The-concept-of-competence-in-educational-contexts.pdf
- Mart, C. T. (2017). Literary texts: A Means to Promote Language Proficiency of Upper-Intermediate Level EFL Students. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 2(2), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeps.v2i2.41>
- MESSICK, S. (1984). The psychology of educational measurement. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 21(3), 215–237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.1984.tb01030.x>
- Michael, C. (2014). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 1–27). Longman Group Limited. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836027-6>
- OCED. (2016). PISA 2015 Assessment and analytical framework. In *OECD publishing*. OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264255425-en>
- Panel, N. E. L. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the national early literacy panel*. Retrieved from <http://www.nifl.gov/earlychildhood/NELP/NELPreport.html> (p. 231). Nation Institute for Literacy.
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Joko, N. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia : issues and prospects. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 15(3), 618–629.
<https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618>
- Ross, A., & Willson, V. L. (2017). Paired samples t-test. In *Basic and Advanced Statistical Tests* (pp. 17–19). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-086-8_4
- Senthilnathan, S. (2019). Usefulness of correlation analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3416918>
- Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16(1), 32.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/747348>
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 360–407.
<https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.21.4.1>
- Strawbridge, T., Soneson, D., & Griffith, C. (2019). Lasting effects of pre-university language exposure on undergraduate proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(4), 776–797.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12430>
- Strickland, D. S. (2010). *Essential readings on early literacy*. International Reading Association.
- Tolochko, S., Khomych, V., & Deda, R. (2017). Language Communicative Competence in

Sinom & Ena (2023)

- the system of postgraduate education. *Edukacja – Technika – Informatyka*, 20(2), 118–125. <https://doi.org/10.15584/eti.2017.2.14>
- Tuan, V. Van. (2017). Communicative competence of the fourth year students: Basis for proposed english language program. *English Language Teaching*, 10(7), 104. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n7p104>
- Tuomainen, S. (2021). Academic English reading skills to support finnish nursing science students. *NERP*, 11(2), 32–37.
- Usó Juan, E., & Martínez Flor, A. (2008). Teaching intercultural communicative competence through the four skills. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21(21), 157. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2008.21.09>
- Whitehurst Grover J.; Lonigan Christopher J. (2001). *Emergent literacy: Development from prereaders to readers | Research Connections* (S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (eds.)). Handbook of Early Literacy Research; The Guildford Press. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/2768>