

HINDERING FACTORS IN THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ENGLISH COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN TOURISM ACADEMY STUDENTS

FAKTOR-FAKTOR PENGHAMBAT KETERCAPAIAN KOMPETENSI KOMUNIKATIF BAHASA INGGRIS MAHASISWA AKADEMI PARIWISATA

Sebastianus Menggo^a, I Nyoman Suparwa^b, I Gede Astawa^c

^aDepartment of English Education, STKIP Santu Paulus
Jalan A. Yani 10, Ruteng, Flores, Indonesia
Telephone (0385) 22305, 22194, Facsimile (0385) 21097

^bDepartment of Linguistics, Universitas Udayana Denpasar
Jalan Nias 13, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
Telephone (0361) 461714, Facsimile (0361) 463656

^cDepartment of Tourism, Akademi Pariwisata Denpasar
Jalan Tukan Balian 15, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
Telephone (0361) 249396, Facsimile (0361) 238150
Email: sebastian.pradana@gmail.com

Article accepted: May 6th, 2018; revised: May 5th, 2019; approved: June 21st, 2019

Permalink/DOI: 10.29255/aksara.v31i1.235.137- 152

Abstract

English communicative competence is one of the prime preferences for learners in this current century, including tourism academy students. The aims of this research were to analyze the hindering factors in communicative competence and disclose the micro and macro component problems of English communicative competence at the fourth semester of hotel department students enrolled in three-year diploma program in Denpasar tourism academy. This was a descriptive-quantitative study and involved 30 students and one English lecturer as the respondents at this college. Data were collected through in-depth interview, questionnaire, field observation, and students' English communicative competence document. Then, data were analysed by using software program, Excel Chart Data Series. The result indicates that student's internal factors were more affecting than other factors and micro components were more complicated than macro components in the students' English communicative competence.

Keywords: communicative competence, hindering factors, micro-macro component

Abstrak

Kompetensi komunikatif dalam berbahasa Inggris merupakan preferensi utama dari para mahasiswa ada saat ini, tidak terkecuali mahasiswa akademi pariwisata. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi kompetensi komunikatif dan mengungkapkan permasalahan komponen mikro dan makro dari kompetensi komunikatif berbahasa Inggris mahasiswa D-3, semester IV, Jurusan Perhotelan Akademi Pariwisata Denpasar. Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian deskriptif-kuantitatif dan melibatkan 30 mahasiswa dan satu orang dosen bahasa Inggris sebagai responden di kampus ini. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara mendalam, angket, observasi lapangan, dan dokumen kompetensi komunikatif mahasiswa dalam berbahasa Inggris. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan program software, Excel Chart Data Series. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan

bahwa faktor-faktor internal para mahasiswa lebih berpengaruh daripada faktor yang lainnya dan komponen mikro lebih sulit daripada komponen makro pada kompetensi komunikatif mahasiswa dalam berbahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: faktor penghambat, kompetensi komunikatif, komponen mikro-makro

How to cite: Menggo, S., Suparwa, IN., & Astawa, IG. (2019). Hindering Factors in The Achievement of English Communicative Competence in Tourism Academy Students. *Aksara*, 31(1), 137-152 (DOI: 10.29255/aksara.v31i1.235.137- 152).

INTRODUCTION

English communicative competence as key roles nowadays including in tourism. It is an essential to the creation of network and to the tourism organizational management (Reddy, 2016). Communicative competence can gain students' confidence, cultivate their sense of the language and create an atmosphere during the process of communication (Fang, 2010).

Communicative competence as the main component in the second/foreign language teaching methodology (Bissenbayeva, Ubniyazova, Saktaganov, Bimagambetova, & Baytucaeva, 2013). It enables students to participate actively in the professional communications. Consequently, communicative competence is not only as an inherent grammatical competence (linguistic competence) but also as the ability to use grammatical competence (linguistic performance) in a variety of communicative situations.

Communicative competence as a construct which is made up from four components (Canale & Swain, 1980). The first two components reflect the use of linguistic systems; the two components related to the functional aspects of communication. The four components are grammatical competence which refers to knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology; discourse competence concerns with the ability to connect sentences in stretches of discourse and to form a meaningful whole out of a series of utterance;

sociolinguistic competence emphasizes on the knowledge of sociocultural rules of language and of discourse. This competence requires an understanding of social context in which language is used; the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction; and strategic competence refers to the verbal and nonverbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication because of performance variables or in sufficient competence. Besides that, communicative competence is defined as an ability of a speaker to use the language correctly and appropriately in the given situation (Hymes, 1972). A speaker is sued to have not only linguistic competence but also sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. According to Hymes linguistic competence is the knowledge of the language code, i.e. its grammar and vocabulary, and also of the conventions of its written representation (script and orthography). The grammar component includes the knowledge of the sounds and their pronunciation (i.e. phonetics), the rules that govern sound interactions and patterns (i.e. phonology), the formation of words by means of e.g. inflection and derivation (i.e. morphology), the rules that govern the combination of words and phrases to structure sentences (i.e. syntax), and the way that meaning is conveyed through language (i.e. semantics). Furthermore, Sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of sociocultural rules of use, i.e. knowing how to use and respond to language

appropriately. The appropriateness depends on the setting of the communication, the topic, and the relationships among the people communicating. Moreover, being appropriate depends on knowing what the taboos of the other culture are, what politeness indices are used in each case, what the politically correct term would be for something, how a specific attitude (authority, friendliness, courtesy, irony etc.) is expressed, etc. Then, discourse competence is the knowledge of how to produce and comprehend oral or written texts in the modes of speaking/writing and listening/reading respectively. It's knowing how to combine language structures into a cohesive and coherent oral or written text of different types. Thus, discourse competence deals with organizing words, phrases and sentences in order to create conversations, speeches, poetry, newspaper articles, etc. And strategic competence is the ability to recognize and repair communication breakdowns before, during, or after they occur. For instance, the speaker may not know a certain word, thus will plan to either paraphrase, or ask what that word is in the target language. During the conversation, background noise or other factors may hinder communication; thus, the speaker

must know how to keep the communication channel open.

In this paper, English communicative competence is indicated by the ability of speakers to perform micro and macro components correctly and appropriately in oral language ability context. Micro components is representative into linguistic competence and macro components refer to performance competence. Micro and macro components are basis for a speaker in supporting communicative competence (Fromkin, 2003). According to Fromkin, micro components (linguistic competence) represent, how speaker's knowledge of their language is performed in the particular interaction, such as lexicon production, morphology, syntax, semantics and the phonetics and phonology. Meanwhile, macro components (performance competence) represent, how speaker's knowledge of language interacts with non-linguistic knowledge, namely pragmatic and sociolinguistic competences.

Researchers adapted components of communicative competence from research findings done by (Poolsawad, Kanjanawasee, & Wudthayagorn, 2015) as shown in this following table.

Table 1 Components of Communicative Competence in Language Use

Canale & Swain (1980) Canale (1983)	Celce – Murcia (1995)	Bachman & Palmer (1996)	Fulcher (2003)	Brown (2004)
Micro components				
- Linguistic Competence or Grammatical	- Linguistic Competence	- Organizational Knowledge	- Language knowledge	- Language competence
- Discourse Competence	- Discourse Competence	• Grammatical Knowledge	• Phonology	• Phonology
	- Formulative Competence	• Textual Knowledge	• Fluency	• Syntax
			- Textual knowledge	• Fluency
			• The structure of talk	• Accuracy
				• Discourse
				• Vocabulary

Macro components				
Sociolinguistic Competence	- Sociocultural Competence - Interactional Competence	- Pragmatic Knowledge • Functional Knowledge • Sociolinguistic knowledge	- Pragmatic knowledge • Appropriacy • Implicature • Expressing - Sociolinguistic knowledge • Situational • Topical • Cultural	- Sociolinguistic Competence - Pragmatic Conventions - Communication Strategy

Previous researches present convincing evidence that communicative competence must be mastered by fresh graduates including hotel department of tourism academy students so that they can cope better with the communication problems they encounter in their lives (Keyton et al., 2013). However, the concept of the micro and macro components of communicative competence and factors are hindering students' achievement of communicative competence have not been strongly supported by recent communicative competence research findings.

While the assumption that micro and macro components of communicative competence that hamper students' English communicative competence achievement and the factors obstruct that achievement is commonly accepted, the essential toward classification of micro and macro components of communicative competence and disclose the factors affecting communicative competence have increasingly become the centre of attention (Dumitriu, Timofti, & Dumitriu, 2014). In this paper, the concept of micro and macro components of communicative competence is highly supported. We assume that the achievement of communicative competence of hotel department students in tourism academy is affected by relevant factors.

Some studies have provided evidence that the achievement of English communicative competence is determined by some factors. For example, (Chang & Goswami, 2011) presented

the factors that hamper students' English communicative competence achievement were teachers' professional training, sufficient learning resources, teachers' persistence, school support, appropriate curriculum, students' willingness to participate in the class, students' need to use English for communication and modified exams. Similarly, (El-Omari, 2016) reported that the factors affect toward communicative competence are attitudinal, socioeconomic, social, and extra-curricular activities. Moreover, performance factor, affective factor, listening ability, and feedback during speaking tasks also as the factors affected toward students' achievement in the communicative competence (Hoang, Tran, & Mai, 2015).

Other factors also affected toward the achievement of students' communicative competence were students (learner inhibition, lack of motivation, lack of topical knowledge, limited vocabulary, lack of confidence, listening ability, poor non-verbal communication and anxiety), teacher (class activities are dominantly done by students), family background (parents encouragement), rural background (lack of English learning access), excessive use of mother-tongue, L1 phonology interference and curriculum (lack of proper orientation) (Bashiruddin, 2018).

Based on the aforementioned literature reviews, it is obvious that analyzing factors affected English communicative competence

is very essential to be understood by students and lecturers at hotel department in tourism academy Denpasar, Indonesia. Students and lecturers are encouraged to reflect the dominant factors which are highly influential to improve their English communicative competence. Instruction atmosphere can be altered in line with the communicative competence problems found in this study. Thus, the prime aim of this current research is to disclose the real problems faced by hotel department students in tourism academy toward the achievement of their English communicative competence; both micro and macro components then factors affected those. This research, then, aims to answer the following questions. What components do hamper the achievement of students' communicative competence and what factors are hindering the achievement of students' communicative competence.

METHOD

This is a descriptive-quantitative study which was conducted on May 2017 and involved 31 respondents. Furthermore, data were collected through in-depth interview, questionnaire, field observation and students' English communicative competence document. Then data were analyzed by using software program, Excel Chart Data Series.

Researchers classified the components of English communicative competence. Then researchers analyzed the hindering factors in the achievement of their English communicative competence.

Questionnaire instrument was used to identify micro and macro components of English communicative competence and the factors hindering the achievement of English communicative competence. The data was collected from questionnaire then re-validated through in-depth interview which was done


toward all students (30 students) and one English lecturer. The questionnaire was checked by two expert judgments for giving their agreement and disagreement toward the content validity.

Data were collected through some procedures namely; (1) the questionnaire was distributed to all respondents at the same time spending around 40 minutes and (2) in-depth interview involved 30 students was conducted about one hour after the questionnaire distribution and it was recorded on the tape in order to have accurate data for analysis. 30 students were divided into 4 groups and they were seated in a circle seating arrangement. The researchers proposed each question from the list of interview and then all of them could freely answer as what they wanted to say about their problems in achieving English communicative competence. Respondents voluntarily responded any given questions. Data were then analyzed by using software program, Excel Chart Data Series and it was continued by qualitative interpretation. Data from the questionnaire deployed numerical calculation of the percentage, meanwhile data from in-depth interview were presented qualitatively, rely on respondents' responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION


The aims of this research are to describe the components that hamper the achievement of English communicative competence and factors hindering that achievement. The researchers found out that those micro components are the prime problems of the respondents' English communicative competence. It was (63,30%) and the problem of macro component is only 5,40%. Micro and macro problems can be seen through the following figure.

Figure 1 Micro and Macro Problems



Furthermore, micro components as a major problem as stated at the figure 1 above was the linguistic competence represented phonology which was the highest problem (15,20%), syntax problem (13,80%), fluency (12,40%), discourse (11,60%) and less of vocabulary mastery (10,30%). The micro components described can be more understood through the following figure.

Figure 2 Micro Component Problems



The matter of each micro component has the logic and unique argumentation. Respondents have shown different ability in each micro component and had equality in macro components. The accuracy of pronunciation (phonology) which focuses on the ability of a speaker to produce a variety of phoneme (intonation, rhythm, accent) so that it can be easily understood by interlocutor was the

prime matter (15,20%). This problem caused by insufficient time allocation for practicing English directly with English speakers at tourism objects in Bali and lack of students' initiative in utilizing the use of modern technology to minimize the pronunciation problem. These were caused by respondents' activities. Respondents highlighted that their interlocutor were quite confused about the meaning of words or phrases because of bad pronunciation. Phonology is a difficult aspect of language learning for EFL learners (Mahripah, 2014). Generally, English is not a phonetic language. That is, pronunciation of English words is not similar to their spellings. Words with similar spellings are sometimes pronounced differently because of their surrounding contexts like tenses and phonemes that come after them. This can cause a lot of problems for non-native speakers of English and they sometimes get confused in producing the English words. Mahripah further claimed that some linguistic components of language like syntax, vocabulary, semantics and psychological factors such as motivation and personality also affected toward students' achievement in learning a language. Modern technologies such as communication lab, speech recognition software and quicktionary can be utilized in developing learners' pronunciation (Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). These technological tools are much more interesting and provide fun and enjoyable learning, motivating the students, and help them to enhance their language learning in a fruitful way, moreover, these tools help students learn at their own pace and promote autonomy in them. Other modern technologies include computers, laptop, PDAs, media players, you tube, teacher tube, webquest and the like have been a great inspiration for students and made them want to learn more about learning material

(Suwannakhun & Taniteerapan, 2017).

Next, 13,80% respondents showed their syntax matter which was far from the expectation. This component engages respondents to be able to implement the appropriate patterns of target language, such as word category, word formation, tenses, plurality, etc. They need to have 'a greater effort' to obtain an effective communication skill. Respondents are encouraged to create English verbal communication habit with the appropriate pattern. Grammar rules can help students to develop a habit of thinking logically and clearly. A speaker who knows the rule of a language, he/she will be able to communicate that language in a smooth and skilful way (Alhaysony & Alhaisoni, 2017). Thus, mastering pattern is the foundation of proficiency communication.

Moreover, fluency problem which emphasizes on producing utterances (pauses, stressing, voice purity, etc) was 12,40%. This percentage was supported by respondents' bravery and self-efficacy. Their top priority was the easiness of utterances to be understood by interlocutor in the conversation. Fluency facilitates any speakers to produce or comprehend utterances smoothly, rapidly, and accurately (Mirzaei, 2012). By improving fluency, learners can strengthen their motivation to use the language.

Then, discourse problem was at fourth position (11,60%) where the respondents are suggested to be able to produce cohesion in form and coherence in meaning. Most of respondents are unable to use coherently various kinds of discourse in English course such as the use of appropriate synonym words, pronouns, substitution, repetition words and phrases, coordinating conjunctions in their conversation, etc. However, the ability of discourse supports the speakers to construct

the organizing structure of the text, identify the logical linkage of contents thus processing the flow of information more easily and can also activate those conceptual schemas involved in communication of the meaning. Metadiscourse helps a speaker in constructing a good connecting sentences, shift topics, recognize an introduction, transition, and a conclusion, recognize the relevance signals and circumstances, which define the rhetorical situation of the text (Tavakoli, 2010).


And vocabulary was 10,30%. Regarding vocabulary problem, the respondents are highly suggested to be able to provide the relevant lexicon on the topic given and be able to use the conjunctions (words cohesive devices). The respondents are encouraged to be able to construct the words which are in line with the topic, use the appropriate conjunctions, meaning (synonym & antonym), differentiate between passive and active vocabulary, etc. They were unable to show the words of indicators cohesively in their utterances; i.e. respondents are unable to use conditional conjunctions (if and unless); additional (moreover, then, furthermore, etc); and conclusion (so, thus, it means that, sum up, etc) appropriately. Vocabulary is recognized as a vital factor for the communication development. Vocabulary knowledge may determine the quality of speaker' listening, speaking, reading and writing performances (Mokhtar et al., 2010).

More than that, in the field observation of the macro components, problems in sociolinguistics and communication strategy have been implemented up to 94.60% as shown at figure 3. The respondents were able to use sociolinguistics competence (48,32%) such as communication functions which rely on setting, participant, aim, norms, and genre, be able to perform a variety of language style (verbal and non-verbal) and other

sociolinguistic features. The English lecturer disclosed that the ability of students in using sociolinguistic features is caused by the usage of various language expressions in informal and formal interaction settings. These are perhaps unconscious sociolinguistic behaviour in their daily life. Besides that, communication strategy is the second macro component which makes emphasis on the ability of the speakers to perform the battery of pre-communication, whilst, and post-communication tactic. During the interaction, addresser and addressee sometimes struggle to find the appropriate words or phrases to communicate, express and understand the intended messages. It seems that this struggle is due to a gap between what the addressers (speakers) want to say and their available linguistic resources. So, they try to fill in this gap through resorting to different ways and strategies which are commonly referred to as ‘communication strategies’. These strategies enable the speakers to compensate for and to cope with problems resulting from their lack of linguistic, communicative and cultural codes of the target language.

The English lecturer claimed that the students have known how to keep the communication channel open. If the communication was unsuccessful due to external factors (such as interruptions), or due to the message being misunderstood by addressee (interlocutor), the students understood how to restore his/her communication. The students have performed the strategies in terms of requests for repetition, clarification, slower speech, or the usage of gestures, taking turns in the conversation, etc. Regarding this, the component was well implemented by respondents (46.28%).

Figure 3 Macro Components



The proportionality between micro and macro components in the verbal communication is ‘the exact technique’ in achieving English communicative competence. Both components are reciprocal. A speaker cannot be separated from *competence* (micro component) and *performance* (macro component) in the speech activity (Chomsky, 1965). Competence is a speaker’s knowledge of language and performance refers to the implementation in the conversation. Cooper (Munby, 1989) said that effective communication requires more than linguistic competence. A speaker must know not only how to produce any and all grammatical utterances of language, but also how to use them acceptably and appropriately. The speaker must know what to say, with whom, and when, and where. Since both components (micro and macro) are included in the interaction settings, a speaker may have good guarantee to be involved actively in the interaction. Effective communication is like functional communication (Tarigan, 2015). Functional communication sues a speaker to perform both micro and macro components in the interaction. Functional refers to a speaker is not only sued to possess the sufficiency knowledge of the target language but also be sufficient for effective usage in the real

communication in that target language. Savignon (Yu, 2001) stated that there is a hypothetical integration of micro and macro components of communicative competence. Those components are interrelated. They cannot be developed or measured in isolation and one cannot go from one component to the other as one strings beads to make a necklace. Micro components consist of grammatical competence and discourse competence while sociocultural competence and strategic competence included macro components. Moreover, speaker's language ability is indicated by two components: micro and macro (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). Micro components or language knowledge consist of grammatical knowledge and textual knowledge. Grammatical knowledge encourages speaker to possess the knowledge of linguistic competence, such as vocabulary, syntax, phonology and graphology. They enable recognition and production of grammatically correct sentences as well as comprehension of their propositional content. In other hand, textual knowledge refers to the ability of a speaker to develop and well interpret the coherence and consistency in the real interaction. For example, a speaker is able to interpret the knowledge of cohesion (ways of marking semantic relationships among two or more sentences in a written text or utterances in a conversation) and knowledge of rhetorical organization (way of developing narrative texts, descriptions, comparisons, classifications, etc.) or conversational organization (conventions for initiating, maintaining and closing conversations). Whereas macro components are functional knowledge (pragmatic) and sociolinguistic knowledge. Functional knowledge encourages speaker to be able to use language functions appropriately, i.e. emotive, referential, expressive, directive and so forth. Then sociolinguistic knowledge focuses on how

speaker understands the aim of communication, interlocutor (hearer), context, setting, and timing as well. Furthermore, speaker is engaged to be able to perform the lexicon and oral types of expression in line with the context and culture of the target language.

The achievement of communicative competence is also determined by some factors such as students (learner inhibition, lack of practicing, lack of motivation, lack of confidence, listening ability and anxiety), teachers (teaching materials, methods, medias, assessments, creating learning atmosphere), curriculum (students' target needs), peers' support, parent's endorsement, and the like.

The first factor revealed in this research shows that there was an insufficiency of practicing English after class with English speaking communities although there are lots of English speaking communities close to their living places. The number of reached 41, 18%. This percentage was caused by students' busyness. Respondents were very busy with their part time job before class. They had afternoon class and there was opportunity in the morning to seek a part time job. Respondents are from different backgrounds and they recognized that the most of them had to work in the morning before class to aid their living allowance. Students disclosed that some of them did not have enough monthly living allowance. There were parents allocated their monthly living allowance only IDR 5000000. It is *anxious* living in this city. This limited monetary allocation engages them to have a part time job and insufficiency practicing English after class with their peers or English-speaking communities. They were sued to classify primary, secondary and tertiary needs in the academic and non-academic. Some of them left their non-academic habits which disturb their primary fulfillment such as snack time,

weekend pub, wine consuming, motorbike/car racing, and cigarette. But academic budgeting such as books, seminars, relevant workshops and conferences certainly they never cancelling. If the respondents had strong commitment and practice English regularly after class with their peers and English-speaking communities, it was possible for them having English speaking habitual to support their oral English ability. The frequency of practicing English outside the classroom significantly correlated with the ability of the use of oral communication skill (Huang, 2010). It is believed that someone who is more often involved to functional practice constantly may increase one's linguistic outcomes. Other factors affected toward the achievement in the oral communication according to Huang were learner's language proficiency, self-perceived oral proficiency and their motivation in speaking English. Furthermore, learners' lack of practical experiences, limited course time and length, unsupportive English learning environment and limited access to English co-curricular activities are also the factors that hinder the development of communicative competence (Xie, 2016). To overcome the matter of learners' lack of practical experiences and to enhance teaching English speaking effectiveness, it is suggested to increase learners' out-of-class learning activities by developing a specially designed self-access learning platform so that they will be able to learn English whenever wherever they need. Inhibition to speak English in the classroom caused by lack of students' initiative to practice English after class (Ur, 1996). According to Ur the factors which hinder students' achievement of English communicative competence consist of inhibition to practice English in daily life, lack of topical knowledge (students may be bored or feel that the topic is unrelated to anything

they know), low or uneven participation in classroom activity, nothing to say (the students don't find one to fit into the context/content. This is because of lack of exposure to a variety of vocabulary. This also leads to fail speaking fluently in English Language, which again leads to lose confidence) and mother-tongue use (when the learners are asked to perform a speaking activity, they immediately start thinking about the topic in their mother tongue, concept what they want to say in their mother-tongue and then translate it into English, which often results in mistakes).

The second, the personal' inhibition to use English was 20,40%. The most common matter encountered by the English lecturer was the learner's inhibition to speak in English. Lecturer disclosed that students worried about making mistakes and losing face in front of the class. The English lecturer has attempted to minimize students' inhibition to practice English in and after class. Students are obligated to speak in English class whatever they have. This technique provides rehearsal opportunities for students to use any languages they have known to provide feedback for both teacher and students. The more students have opportunities to activate the various elements of language they have stored in their brains, the more automatics of their use of these elements. Accordingly, students require a supportive learning technique in which they are encouraged and challenged to speak with clarity, and moreover engage in purposefully to explore a variety of topics. Students are encouraged to have a lot of time to practice their English speaking. Listening and repeating are simple strategies can be done by students in improving their English-speaking skill. Teachers are asked to provide some guidelines and ask students to repeat/follow. This can remove the learners' shyness. Teachers can use short questions and short dialogues in

the classrooms to develop students' speaking skills (Bashir, 2011). There were three factors affecting students' inhibition to speak English such as motivation, anxiety and self-esteem (Ariyanti, 2016). Motivation is regarded as a great effort to reach their English communicative competence. Motivation is a key factor in learning a language (Nida, 1956). It is an inner source, preference, desire, emotion, reason, need, impulse or purpose that moves a person to a particular action. Motivation is viewed as one of the prime factors that influence the speed and amount of success of foreign language learners. More than that, motivation contributes to learners' attitudes and it should be kept in mind in the learning process (Genc & Aydin, 2017). Motivation is like 'smart processor' in determining student's achievement (Harmer, 2007). He categorized intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation happens inside the classroom, namely teacher's method, students' involvement, or students' perception toward their success or failure. Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is influenced by a number of external factors such as society, family, and peer's support. In short, motivation can influence students' decision on being involved or not to practice their English. Next, speaking English in front of class often leads to anxiety. This is one of the major factors for the inability to speak in English. It is a natural psychological aspect which contains the feeling of fear which sometimes uncontrollable (Javed, Eng, Mohamed, & Sam, 2013). The English lecturer is suggested to help and encourage the students to practice English more and more, in this way the students would be able to minimize the anxiety towards the English language learning. Then, self-esteem which becomes one of the influential factors toward the achievement in the communicative competence. The students who have high self-esteem will perceive better

achievement rather than those who do not.


The third factor, was the fact that there is no peer's eagerness to cooperate for the English practicing in and after class. This factor contributes 24%. Respondents affirmed that they found difficulty to practice English with their colleagues in and after English class. There were two logic reasons for this matter. First, students felt 'ashamed' to practice English with their classmates because of their 'limited' linguistic competence (phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantic). Then, 'academic arrogance'. Some students disclosed that there are many 'capable friends' for English speaking in their class but they did not have 'heart' to share their knowledge of language. For example, when other friends greeted them in English, they replayed it in the first language or national language, however, they wanted to listen their excellent English speaking. Some friends also invited them to join in the English conversation club but they had lots of irrational argumentation to come and join. However, one way to improve communicative competence is to interact with others, learn from others, and the choice of the topics based on the learners' interests (Castillo, 2007). In line with learn from others, learners' cooperation could encourage speaking skills (León & Cely, 2010). León & Cely disclosed that learners' cooperation and involvement, self-confidence and motivation are the factors that influence toward students' English speaking achievement. Additionally, three factors affecting toward students' low achievement include relationship among students, family atmosphere and teachers in terms of method, material design, media, assessment and classroom management (Lozano, 2018).

Then, the insufficiency of parents' endorsement to facilitate their English communicative competence was 14,42%.

Parents' endorsement played a role in overcoming the obstacles of limiting English learning opportunities for students. The English lecturer recognized that some students who got parents' financial support had better the achievement of English communicative competence than those who didn't. Those students might enroll English courses outside and had the frequency of the use English. Students who took English course had greater achievement at learning English language. Socio-economic status of students' households is one of the factors that hinder toward students' academic performance (Mlambo, 2012). Whereas the other factors such as home atmosphere, students' personality (self-esteem and attitude), school management, teacher's method, class size, quality of teaching, the social structure including relationship with peers, parents' involvement in their child's education, gender, aptitude, motivation and entry qualifications and prerequisites also contribute toward students' academic performance. Each percentage of these factors can be seen thoroughly on the following figure 4.

The factors describe above definitely contribute toward students' achievement in English communicative competence. Those factors are interrelated. Students' learning satisfaction must be in line with their achievement motivation and teachers' teaching performance. Teachers' teaching performance is defined as the ability of a teacher to teach that can be viewed during the learning process. Student learning satisfaction is measured as an attitude and psychological conditions of students in responding to the learning process experience. Then, students' achievement motivation is the psychological driving force from the students themselves, which directs the learning activities into the right direction. Thus, the students can achieve better results. Cognitive, affective and performance are three factors that cannot separated each other toward the achievement of communicative competence (Thornburry, 2005). Cognitive factor refers to familiarity with topic, genre, interlocutors, and processing demands. Familiarity with the topics enable the speakers to be easier in the communication task. Then, genre familiarity means a speech will be easier if the speakers are familiar with those particular genres. Next, familiarity with the interlocutors helps the speaker to have enjoyable communication. Generally communication, the better you know the people you are talking to, definitely the more shared knowledge you can do. And processing demands concerns with the procedure done in the speech event. Affective factor focuses on how speaker has self-confidence and topic interested. Self-confidence has positive effect toward speaker's performance in producing the utterances. Then topic interested refers to speaker's feeling toward topic. If the speakers are interested to the topic we are talking about, the easier speech activity will be. Whereas, performance factor means that a speaker has

Figure 4
Factors affecting Communicative Competence



to understand how the message is delivered, emotional equality, time allocation, participant, setting, aim, and genre as well. Speaker is pushed to be able to monitor interlocutor's responses such as gesture and eye-contact toward message given. Next, a speaker's feeling equality can be done through preparation. The more time to prepare, the easier the speech will be. Moreover, time allocation must be understood by a speaker. How many times (hours or minutes) implicate toward speaker's performance. Besides that, the speaker must know what is the aim of speech activity, what is the context, what to say, with whom, when, and where.

Although this research conducted at tourism academy students but this result can be used by other English teachers (speaking lecturers) in some departments to classify the students' weaknesses of knowledge of language for both micro and macro then become top priority to be solved and handle the factors that hamper students' communicative competence by creating a less threatening classroom atmosphere, employ appropriate techniques and strategies, media, assessment, motivate to speak English and strengthen student's confidence and efficacy.

CONCLUSION

Referring to the data described, this research concludes that the micro components is the prime matter in achieving students' English communicative competence. The accuracy of pronunciation (phonology) contributes the highest percentage (15,20%) then it is followed by syntax problem (13,80%). Fluency is the third component (12,40%), discourse problem, 11,60% then fifth is the problem of limited vocabulary (10,30%). Meanwhile, macro components' problem only 5,4%. In terms of hindering factors in the

achievement of communicative competence highlights that the most affected factor toward the English communicative competence is the insufficiency of practicing English after class with English speaking communities (41,18%). Then followed by lack of eagerness of students' peers to practice their English in and after class (24%). No peer's eagerness to practice English in and after class contributes 20,40 % then closed by lack of parents' endorsement (14, 42%). Based on the findings and discussion elaborated above, below are some recommendations:

- 1) Micro components of communicative competence, particularly on phonology must be the center of attention given by English lecturer. Students also are asked to be familiarized with the speech recognition software in overcoming the accuracy of pronunciation matter.
- 2) It is recommended that English lecturer to be more creative in designing the instructional activities and materials to provide students' linguistic resources. Participatory method, task-based method, direct method and communicative language teaching method are highly suggested and performance-based assessment and peer assessment are possible to be applied in measuring students' oral communication ability.
- 3) Other researchers are expected to explore more other relevant factors that affected toward students' achievement in the communicative competence.

REFERENCES

- Alhaysony, M., & Alhaisoni, E. (2017). EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of grammatical difficulties. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(1), 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.1p.188>.

- Ariyanti, A. (2016). Psychological Factors Affecting EFL Students' Speaking Performance. *ASIAN TEFL: Journal of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.21462/asiantefl.v1i1.14>.
- Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bahadorfar, M., & Omidvar, R. (2014). Technology in teaching speaking skill. *Acme International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(4), 9–13. Retrieved from <http://www.ajjmr.net>
- Bashir, M. (2011). Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skill. *British Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 2(1), 34–50.
- Bashiruddin, M. N. (2018). Factors Affecting Learning Speaking Skills in English among Rural Students in India, 4(5), 115–118.
- Bissenbayeva, Z., Ubniyazova, S., Saktaganov, B., Bimagambetova, Z., & Baytucaeva, A. (2013). Communicative Competence Development Model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 82, 942–945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.375>.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistic*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Castillo, C. Y. P. (2007). Improving Eleventh Graders' Oral Production in English Class through Cooperative Learning Strategies. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 8(1), 75–90. Retrieved from <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc13a&NEWS=N&AN=2014-34222-005>.
- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p3>.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dumitriu, C., Timofti, I. C., & Dumitriu, G. (2014). Communicative Skill and/or Communication Competence? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 489–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.085>.
- El-Omari, A. H. (2016). Factors Affecting Students' Achievement in English Language Learning. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 6(2), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2016.v6n2p9>.
- Fang, F. (2010). A Discussion on Developing Students' Communicative Competence in College English Teaching in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(2), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.2.111-116>.
- Fromkin, A. V. (2003). *Linguistics: An introduction to linguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Genc, Z. S., & Aydin, F. (2017). An Analysis of Learners' Motivation and Attitudes toward Learning English Language at Tertiary Level in Turkish EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 10(4), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p35>.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English* (2nd Ed.). England: Pearson Longman.
- Hoang, N., Tran, T., & Mai, N. (2015). Mobile-Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance at Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 8–23. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0029-1220681>.
- Huang, C.-P. (2010). Exploring Factors Affecting the Use of Oral Communication Strategies. *Lunghwa University of Science*

- and *Technology*, 30, 85–104. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/468a/7212e4d3bb4e359f84160c32fe3ef253bfa8.pdf>.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In *Pride, J.B.; Holmes, J. Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Javed, M., Eng, L. S., Mohamed, A. R., & Sam, R. (2013). Comparative Study of the Pakistani and Indonesian Student 's Anxiety Towards the English Language Learning. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 18(11), 1563–1572. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.18.11.12456>.
- Keyton, J., Caputo, J., Ford, E., Fu, R., Leibowitz, S., Ghosh, P., & Wu, C. (2013). Investigating verbal workplace communication behaviors. *Journal of Business Communication*, 50(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943612474990>.
- León, W. U., & Cely, E. V. (2010). Encouraging Teenagers to Improve Speaking Skills through Games in a Colombian Public School. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 12(1), 11–31. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1051534&site=ehost-live>.
- Lozano, A. (2018). Personal , Family , and Academic Factors Affecting Low Achievement in Secondary School. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy*, 1(1), 43–66.
- Mahripah, S. (2014). The Third UAD TEFL International Conference Proceedings “ ELT Materials Development in Asia and Beyond: Directions, Issues, and Challenges “. English Education Department, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Mirzaei, A. (2012). Exploring the Use of Oral Communication Strategies by (Non) Fluent L2 Speakers. *The Journal of Asia Tefl*, 9(3), 131–156.
- Mlambo, V. (2012). An Analysis of Some Factors Affecting Student Academic Performance in an Introductory Biochemistry Course at the University of the West Indies. *The Caribbean Teaching Scholar*, 1(2), 79–92.
- Mokhtar, A., Raiwan, R., Yahaya, M., Abdullah, A., Mansor, M., Osman, M., & Mohamed, A. (2010). Vocabulary knowledge of adult ESL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 71–80.
- Munby, J. (1989). *Communicative Syllabus Design: A sociolinguistic Model for Defining the Content of Purpose-Specific Language Programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nida, E. A. (1956). Motivation in Second Language Learning. *Language Learning*, 7(3–4), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>.
- Ounis, T. (2016). Exploring the Use of Oral Communication Strategies by High and Low Proficiency learners of English: Tunisian EFL students as a case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 1077–1098. Retrieved from <https://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/article/view/1410>.
- Poolsawad, K., Kanjanawasee, S., & Wudthayagorn, J. (2015). Development of an English Communicative Competence Diagnostic Approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 759–763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.462>.
- Reddy, M. S. (2016). Importance of English Language in Today's World. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(4), 33–45. Retrieved from www.ijar.org.in.
- Riemer, M. (2007). Communication skills for

- the 21 st century engineer. *Global Journal of Engineering Education*, 11(1), 89–100.
- Suwannakhun, S., & Taniteerapan, T. (2017). Design and development of distance laboratory package for teaching basic electronics via cloud computing. *International Journal of Online Engineering*, 13(8), 60–78. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijoe.v13i08.6985>.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2015). *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa* (Edisi Rev.). Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tavakoli, M. (2010). The Effect of Metadiscourse Awareness on L2 Reading Comprehension : A Case of Iranian EFL Learners. *Teaching Language Teaching*, 3(1), 92–103.
- Thornburry, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. England: Pearson Educated Limited.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in Language Teaching. Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge Uiniversity Press.
- Xie, Q. (2016). Developing Communicative Competence for the Globalized Workplace in English for Occupational Purposes Course in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(6), 1142–1152.
- Yu, L. (2001). Communicative Language Teaching in China: Progress and Resistance. *TESOL Quartly*, 35(1), 194–198. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587868>.