The Professional and Pedagogic Competences of English Teachers With Different UKG (Teaching Competence Test) Achievement Levels

Iis Siti Aisyah[1✉], Issy Yuliasri[2], Warsono[2]

[1.] SMP Muhammadiyah 3 Bandung, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	Professional and pedagogic competences are the basic aspects for effective teaching and learning to take place in classrooms. They are dealing with the quality of teaching-learning process. However, the average score of UKG (Teacher Competence Test) in Indonesia did not achieve standard expected target. This mixed-methods study is aimed to reveal professional and pedagogic competences of English teachers with different UKG achievement levels. Quantitative method was employed in the first phase through student questionnaire to investigate students' perception on their English teachers' professional and pedagogic competences performed in classrooms. 14 classes students of six junior high schools in Bandung, West Java, were chosen as participants. The total number of students was 474 with 14 English teachers as subjects of the study. In the second phase, this study employed a descriptive qualitative method through classrooms observation and documentation to reveal how English teachers with different UKG chievement levels performed their competence in classrooms. Five teachers out of the 14 teachers under study were chosen as participants. The finding reveals that based on students' perception, professional and pedagogic competences demonstrated by English teachers in classrooms do not fully reflect their UKG achievement levels. In some aspects, the teachers with lower UKG achievement are not perceived worse than those with higher UKG achievement. This finding is in line with the finding based on classrooms teaching performance of the five English teachers' under study. In some parts of lessons, the lower achievers could even perform better than the highers.

✉Correspondence Address:
PHH Mustopha No.90/209 C, Bandung, Indonesia
E-mail: iis28sitiaisyah@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Teaching English as foreign language is not an easy task. According to Richards (2011), not everyone who speaks English can teach English. English language teaching is seen a career in a field of educational specialization. This profession requires a specialized knowledge base obtained not only through academic study but also practical experience (Richards, 2011). Moreover, English teachers have more burdens because the curriculum not only emphasizes on the mastery of linguistics competence but also communicative competence in written and oral skill. It is supported by Agustien (2014) who contends that the main purpose of language learning is to develop the ability to communicate (Communicative Competencies) and discourse competence is the core of the ability to communicate.

The statement contended by Agustien above also prescribed in Indonesia department of education regulation that communication in English is intended to understand and express information, thought, feeling, and develop science, technology, and culture by using the language. The ability to communicate in a full understanding is the ability of discourse. Furthermore Celce-Murcia, et al. (1995) in Agustien (2014) explains that the ability of discourse is "choice, sequence, word order, structure, and text of speech to achieve coherent oral and written texts".

From the statements above, it can be concluded that teaching English is not only about transferring knowledge to students in the classrooms. English teachers need to conduct effective and efficient learning therefore their students can gain good communicative competences. In order to make students learn effectively and efficiently, teaching English does not only require English speaking skill but also teaching competences.

Regulation number 14 of Indonesian Ministry of National Education (2005) about Teachers and Lectures defines competence as "a set of knowledge, skill, and attitudes a teacher must have, fully comprehend and master to perform his/her professional task". Regulation

of Indonesian Ministry of National Education (2007) also develops four core competences of teacher competence standards. They are pedagogic, personal, social, and professional competence acquired through professional education.

Pedagogic competence is the competence in managing students' learning. Personal competence includes having good and steady personal characteristics. Professional competence is a competence in mastering the subject matter broadly and deeply. Whereas social competence means competence in communicating and interacting effectively and efficiently with learners, colleagues/fellow teachers, parents/guardians, and community (Minister of National Education Number 16, 2007).

Theoretically stated, teacher competence affects many aspects of education. It is one of the factors determine the quality of learning and the quality of students, which in turns determine the quality of education.

However, the fact indicates the lack of teachers' comprehension of professional and pedagogic competences. The national average results of teacher competence test or *Uji Kompetensi Guru* (UKG) in Indonesia for two areas (professional and pedagogic competences) is below the minimum competence standards (http://www.thejakartapost). This fact is supported by several previous studies both in domestic and international frame. In domestic frame, the findings reveal that English teachers' competences have not been developed as they were expected (Syahrudin, Ernawati, & Ede, 2013; Husin, 2013; Siki, 2013; Febriana & Faridi, 2016). Meanwhile in foreign frame, the results report that teachers' utmost weakness area is to make the subject matter applicable to the real world situation (Ghazi et al, 2013). Other studies uncover that not all competences required by curriculum are demonstrated by English teachers and English student teachers (Cubukcu, 2010; Kizilaslan, 2011; Tawalbeh & Ismail, 2014; Zhao & Zhang, 2016).

Based on the fact supported by previous studies as outlined above, this study focusses on

investigating whether the teachers' achievement of UKG represents their teaching skill with the aim to describe teacher competence performed in classrooms by English teachers with different UKG achievement levels in four point of views. They are; 1) students' perceptions of professional competence performed in the classrooms by their English teachers, 2) students' perceptions of pedagogic competence performed in classrooms by their English teachers 3) professional competence performed in classrooms by English teachers, 4) pedagogic competence performed in classrooms by English teachers.

METHODS

This study employed a mixed-methods design that implementing sequential which quantitative data come first in the first phase followed by qualitative data in the second phase (Cresswell, 2009).

Questionnaire was used in the first phase in order to measure or describe any generalized pictures which matches this study aim: to explore students' perception of English teachers with different level of UKG perform their professional and pedagogic competences in the classrooms. In the second phase, this study included a descriptive qualitative method through classroom observation and documentation to complement the qualitative components from teacher and also as triangulation in order to help get a full picture of how English teachers with different achievement levels of UKG perform their professional and pedagogic competences in the classrooms.

In the first phase, the participants were six junior high school students in Bandung, East Java, Indonesia. The total number of students was 474 of 14 classes from state and private schools. These students participated in this study by perceiving their English teachers in performing their professional and pedagogic competences in the classrooms. the total number of English teachers under study was 14. and named T1 (teacher 1) to T14 (teacher 14). The

classes were chosen purposively based on their English teachers' agreement.

The English teachers under study were grouped into three groups based on the level of their UKG score. They are group 1, 2, and 3. The UKG score levels are classified based on assessment standard prescribed in Decree of National Education Department (2017). The obtained scores are converted into scale 1-100 and then classified into four levels from very poor to excellent. Level 1 is classified "very poor" with score 1-50, level 2 is "fair" with score 51-70, level 3 is "good" with score 71- 90, and level 4 is excellent with score 90-100 (National Education Department, 2017). Since the obtained score of the perceived English teachers are at a range of 1 - 90, in this study, the teachers are grouped into three. Group 1 (level 1) and group 2 (level 2) are represented by five teachers. Meanwhile group 3 (level 3) is represented by four teachers.

In the second phase, five teachers out of 14 teachers under study were chosen as participants, namely, T1 from Group 1, T6 and T9 from Group 2, T11 and T12 from Group 3. They were observed in relation to their classroom practices.

The same 45 items in four likert scale are developed in questionnaire and observation checklist to explore two components of professional competence and eight components of pedagogic competence as prescribed in Rule Of Minister Of National Education Number 16 (2007). The components of professional competence explored includes: 1) mastering the materials, structural, concept, and knowledge mindset of subject matter, and 2) developing learning materials creatively. Meanwhile the components of pedagogic competence include: 1) mastering students' characteristic, 2) mastering learning theories and learning principles, 3) developing the curriculum related to subject matter 4) implementing effective teaching and learning, 5) integrating ict in teaching and learning process, 6) developing students' learning potential, 7) communicating effectively, emphatically, and mannerly with students, and 8) assessing students' learning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Professional and pedagogic competences performed by English teachers with different UKG achievement levels presented and discussed as follow.

Students' Perception of English Teachers Professional Competence Performed in Classrooms

English teachers professional competence performed in classrooms based on students' perception is described in two components.

Concerning the first component of professional competence (mastering the materials, structural, concept, and knowledge mindset of subject matter), the findings uncover that generally English teachers of all groups show good performance in three indicators, namely: mastering of knowledge of subject matter as the essence of teacher's quality; providing samples of English words and grammatical structures; monitoring his/her own speech and writing for accuracy. Nevertheless they are considered have the lack of English proficiency due to the poor performance of other three indicators, namely: maintaining use of English; maintaining fluent use of English in the classroom; giving explanations and instructions in English.

This findings indicate that the teachers need improvement in English proficiency. They must be encouraged to activate their passive English by starting to speak and use English in class and school environment. Therefore, they are more confident to use the language in classrooms.

In performing the second component of professional competence (developing learning materials creatively in classrooms as perceived by students), all groups demonstrated good classroom practices in providing learning material creatively that meets the level of students' progress but still need improvement in using various learning resources creatively.

This finding indicates that the teachers were likely to use monotonous learning resources. This is not in line with Wachidah, Gunawan, and Diyanti (2017) who state that in language learning, the experience of using various learning resources enables students to realize that different texts can have the same social function and purpose or vice versa. They are also supposed to aware that various kinds and contents of text are caused by different purposes and context of communication.

Students' Perception of English Teachers' Pedagogic Competence Performed in Classrooms.

Teachers' pedagogic competence classroom performance based on students' perception is presented in eight components.

Concerning the first component (mastering students' characteristics), the teachers of all groups failed to know their students' characteristics well; need improvement in calling students' by name; need improvement in identifying students; demonstrating good identifying student's learning difficulties.

Based on the findings above, it is obvious that this mastering students' characteristics appears as a big challenge to the perceived English teachers. Collecting this information is not an easy thing. In Indonesia, in order to be a certified teacher and able to receive teacher certification allowance, teachers are required to teach at least 24 periods in a week which last 40 minutes of each period. Since English language class of Junior High School is held 4 periods in a week, the English teachers must teach at least six classes with about 30-36 students in each class to fulfil the requirement. This condition becomes an obstacle in mastering the big number of students' characteristics.

In performing the second component (mastering learning theories and learning principles), all groups need improvement in applying student-centered approach, making use of teaching methods creatively, and making use of various teaching technique creatively. This fact is supported by Leo (2013) who stresses that some teachers who claim their classroom

activities to be students-centered are actually still teachers-centered. Kuma (2016) suggests school administrators support student-centered management and provide training and skills to their teachers because teachers and their students will have higher outcomes and success. More various teaching methods and tecniques should be adopted, modified, or varied by teachers since according to Forsyth and McMillan in Leo (2013), variety reawakens students' involvement in the course and their motivation.

In developing curriculum related to subject matter (the third component), lesson topic was well-introduced by all groups. Nevertheless, all groups demonstrated the lack of awareness of the importance of clarifying students the learning objectives before the lesson begins. On the other hand they performed good classroom practice in evaluating whether the objectives have been achieved at the end of the lesson. This finding is not in line with NSW Education and Communities (2014) who contends that "at the beginning of the lesson, it is crucial to share the specific learning objective and explain how it contributes to achievement of the global goals in the learning sequence". This helps students see the 'big picture', make connections, understand the purpose of and reason for the lesson.

In accordance with the fourth component of pedagogic competence (implementing effective teaching and learning), it can be concluded that all groups are perceived well-implemented safe learning environment in the classrooms. They are also categorized 'very good' in managing effective teaching-learning time. Nevertheless, they need improvement in performing lesson material readiness and using various media. On the other hand, all groups are perceived good in performing taking a transactional decision in the learning of teaching appropriate with the evolving situation.

These findings indicate that the teachers need to go to class with good preparation since students are able to identify whether the lesson are well prepared or not especially by students who want to learn seriously. Furthermore Leo

(2013) stresses that 'teachers may lose students' respect if they do not prepare the lesson well'. They also need to explore and utilize more various media in order to make teaching-learning process more interesting and avoid boredom.

Concerning the fifth component (integrating ICT in teaching and learning process), all groups performed unsatisfying classroom practice in utilizing projector, gadget, and internet. This finding is not in line with the curriculum applied in Indonesia, namely Revised 2013 Curriculum that integrates ICT in teaching-learning process. A crucial factor that had prevented the teachers and students from using ICT in teaching and learning is the lack of ICT tools such as computers, slide projectors, and limited internet access.

Concerning the seventh component (communicating effectively, emphatically, and mannerly), the teachers performed outstanding performance in ensuring relaxed atmosphere, giving clear explanation and instructions, checking students' understanding and maintaining rapport. They also showed good performance in checking whether students' completing their assignment and providing comprehensive review of important lesson content. These findings indicate that the teachers are percieved as a good communicator in transfering knowledge supported by classroom relaxed atmosphere and good mutual respect among students and their teacher.

Concerning the last component of pedagogic competence (assessing students' learning in the classrooms) performed by teachers based on students' perception, feedback on students 'performance including praises is provided sufficiently by all groups. Group 3 performed the best classroom practice of all since it is categorized 'very good'. Meanwhile the other groups are categorized 'good'. In using varied assessment tools for students' learning and progress, all groups performed 'good' classroom practice. In keeping accurate records of students' learning and progress according to the intended learning objectives, all teachers are perceived need improvement because the scores

fall in low level of good. In providing self-assessment and peer-assessment, group 1 and group 2 are perceived failed to demonstrate good performance since they fall in level 'poor'. Meanwhile group 3 is considered almost poor because it falls at low range of 'good'. In giving remedial test to the students who do not achieve minimum standard criteria, all groups performed 'good' classroom practice with score range. Unfortunately, with respect to giving enrichment to the students who have achieved good progress), the teachers show "poor" and "very poor" performance.

English Teachers' Professional Competence Performed in Classroom

In mastering the materials, structural, concept ,and knowledge mindset of subject matter (component 1) the findings show that all teachers under observation succeeded in mastering teaching materials (Indicator 1) and providing examples of English words and grammatical structures (Indicator 5). Nevertheless, in several indicators, namely, maintaining use and fluent of English (Indicator 2 and 3), giving explanation and instructions in English (Indicator 4), and maintaining English environment (Indicator 7), T1, T9, and T12 still need improvement since they are categorized 'poor'. Meanwhile T6 is successful since she is categorized 'very good' and T11 are categorized 'good'. Concerning indicator 6 (monitoring his/her own speech and writing for accuracy, T1 and T9 still need improvement. Meanwhile T6, T11, and T13 showed 'good' classroom performance.

Concerning developing learning materials (the second component), all teachers under observation provided sufficient learning materials creatively (Indicator 1). T1, T6, and T9 provided sufficient various learning resources as well (Indicator 2). Meanwhile T11 and T12 need improvement in indicator 2.

The finding above indicates that English was less used by three out of five teachers under observation including the teacher with good UKG achievement in giving explanation and instruction. According to them, mother tounge was used to ease communication. Consequently, students tended to speak their own language in classroom. This is not appropriate since according to Lunberg as cited in Coburn (2016), the English input the teachers produce is important for development of learner oral production. She also notes "how the teachers' code switching (between L1 and L2) seems to negatively affect learners' oral production and how the teachers' lack of language confidence may "rub off" on learning".

Based on the evidences, during teaching, all teachers happened to made language inaccuracy covering pronunciation, confusion of gender, tenses, and preposition as stated by Nell and Muller (2010). Corrections on their speech and writing were done immediately when they realized doing mistakes. Nevertheless these mistakes still occurred unconsciously especially in pronunciation. This evidence is supported by Sukrisno (2015) who reveals that English pronunciation inaccuracy has often made by English teachers without being aware of it. Consequently, their students will receive a wrong model in the early process of learning which will be copied and employed by them for the rest of their lives (Sukrisno, 2015). The findings above suggest that the teachers need improvement in English proficiency.

English Teachers' Pedagogic Competence Performed in Classrooms

In terms of pedagogic component, the findings are described in eight components. In mastering students' characteristics (the first component), all teachers knew students' characteristics well. Calling students' by their names was well-performed by T1, T6, and T11. Meanwhile T9 and T12 performed 'very good' classroom practice. Concerning identifying students' potential, all teachers performed good classroom performance. It means students' potential were well-identified. This finding indicates that students' strength and weakness are well-explored. In identifying students' background knowledge, the finding reveals that all teachers showed 'good' classroom performance. In identifying students' learning

difficulties, the finding reveals that T1, T9, and T12 performed 'very good' classroom practice. Meanwhile T6 and T11 showed 'good' performance. These findings indicates that their performance is not different significantly.

The findings above show that all teachers realized the important of mastering students' characteristics for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness. They put an effort to call their students' name individually. Therefore students may feel touched, welcome, andrespected by yheir teachers. As a result, a rapport is established (Leo, 2013).

Concerning the second component (mastering learning theories and learning principle), all teachers implemented cooperative learning because their students learned in group as described by Kagan and High in Astuti (2016) that in cooperative learning students work in group. T6 and T11 were successfull in engaging their students equally and interacted simultaneously in the lesson. Nevertheless, T1, T9, and T11still need improvement since they still dominated the lesson activities and flow of information is one way from the teachers to students. This is not appropriate with Yuliasri (2016) who states that the 2013 curriculum postulates student-centered learning, active learning, and learning in groups are used, which also means that cooperative learning is applicable. Apparently, some challenges were faced by the English teachers in practicing cooperative learning in classroom. One among the challenges is unavailability of community of cooperative learning practitioners (Astuti, 2016).

In developing curriculum related to subject matter (the third component), lesson topic was well introduced by all teachers. The finding suggests that the teachers have awareness in introducing what is generally being talked about or theme (Wong and Wong, 2011). However, T9 and T12 failed to clarified lesson objectives. All teachers performed outstanding classroom performance in checking whether objectives have been achieved. T9 and T12 need to improve their classroom practice in clarifying lesson objectives since it helps students focus on what learning is going to be. It is supported by

Hattie as cited in Wong and Wong (2011) who says "simply tell students what they will be learning before the lesson begins and you can raise student achievement as much as 27 percent".

Concerning the fourth indicator (implementing effective teaching and learning in the classrooms), all teachers were outstanding in creating learning environment that ensure standard safety as contended by Indiana Department of Education (2015) that classrooms is free from obstacle i.e cords, learning tools are available but safely displayed and easily accessible. They performed good managing effective learning time and preparing the ready-used lesson material. Nevertheless, T1 need improvement in using various media. T6, T9, T11 are categorized 'very good' and T12 is categorized 'good'. All of them did not perform taking a transactional decision in the learning of teaching appropriate with the evolving situation.

Concerning integrating ICT in classroom (the fifth component), T1 need improvement, T6 and T9 are classified 'very good'. Meanwhile T11 and T12 failed to integrate it. Gadget such as mobile phone was seldom used by T2, T9, and T12. T6 performed 'good' classroom practice and T11 failed to perform it. These findings indicate that ICT was not integrated by all teachers in classrooms. Most of classrooms under observation were not facilitated by slide projectors. The projector was only available in T9's classroom which is a state school. The other problem is inadequate access to ICT resources such as computers, a network infrastructure, and connectivity. This fact becomes the main reason why the teachers were reluctant to use ICT as teaching-learning tool, not because they were not competent in using it. Therefore, the obstacles to access ICT at school must be minimized.

The findings of the sixth component (developing students' learning potential) show that all teachers performed sufficient supporting students' self confidence, encouraging students to do their utmost, providing them with activities to apply knowledge in classroom, andposing questions to encourage thinking.

Nevertheless T1, T9, and T12 need improvement in promoting students' participation in the classroom since only certain students were dominant and the others tended to be passive. Meanwhile T6 and T12 showed very good performance since their students participated actively during the lesson.

Concerning the seventh component (communicating effectively, empathically' and mannerly), all teachers succeeded in performing relaxed atmosphere in class as stated by Grif and Wal (2011) through addressing their students in a positive manner, demonstrating warmth and empathy towards all students, and reacting with humor and stimulate humor (T6 and T11). They also succeeded in giving clear instructions and explanation to students, checking students' understanding, checking students' assignment completion, maintaining rapport, and performing good classroom practice in providing comprehensive review of most important lesson content and vocabulary items time to time.

Concerning Assessing students' learning (the eighth component), the data reveals that all teachers gave sufficient oral feedback including compliment. With respect to written feedback, the evidence reveals that T9 and T12 gave not only score and grade but also the strength and weakness of students' work in terms of communicative purpose of text, structure of text, and language features covering spelling and tenses. This is appropriate because according to Wijayanti, Bharati, and Mudjianto (2015), implementation of the written feedback improve the students' writing skill in grammar practice. It could also improve the students' interest in learning grammar and they will be more careful in writing especially in punctuation and spelling. The other teachers only give eritten feedback in form of scoring and grading. All teachers assessed students' attitude, knowledge, and skill as prescribed on Ministry of Education number 26 year 2016 about assessment standard which covering three competences, namely, attitude, knowledge, and skill.

Other finding reveals that concerning assessment tools, the finding is in line with the research conducted by Mutmainah, Faridi, and Astuti (2017) who find that in practice, the teachers under observation mostly used observation for assessing students' attitude. For assessing knowledge, the teachers preferred applying written test. Meanwhile for assessing skills, the teachers tended to use performance and project-based assessment because of familiar with those two kinds of techniques.

Remedial programm was provided sufficiently by all teachers. However, enrichment was not demonstrated by all teachers during observation. This is not in line with Sudiro (2016) who explains that in mastery learning, struggling learners who have not achieved minimum standard criteria and advance learners need to be provided by equal opportunities to pursue learning based on their strength and weakness. Remedial program is given to struggling students and enrichment is given to advance learners.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on students' perception, the major conclusion of the study is that, in some cases, professional and pedagogic competencess performed by English teachers in classrooms do not reflect their UKG achievement levels. In some aspects, teachers with lower UKG achievement are not perceived worse than those with higher UKG achievement. On the other hand, teachers with higher UKG achievement level are not always perceived better. The study also found that in some aspects, their performance is not different significantly.

The finding above is in line with the finding on teachers' classroom teaching performance. This study had used empirical findings to show that different UKG achievement levels of five English teachers under study were not fully reflected in their classroom teaching performance. In some parts of lesson, the lower achiever could even perform better than the higher achiever.

SUGGESTIONS

This study reveals that different levels of teachers' UKG achievement were not congruent with their classroom performance. It means using UKG could not serve as the basis for teacher competence measurement since competence not only covers knowledge but also skill and attitude. Therefore in order to gain more comprehensive and accurate teacher competence measurement, it is suggested that the assessment should not only use cognitive test. Classroom observation and students' survey should be used as other assessment tools. The results of this multiple measurement implementation are aimed to map teacher competence thoroughly, not only in terms of knowledge but also skill, and attitude.

This study also reveals that teachers performed good classroom practice in mastering subject matter. Nevertheless English was less used in classrooms due to the lack of their English proficiency. It is also recommended that the teacher training conducted to follow up their UKG achievement should be aimed not only to help teachers gain better UKG score as experienced by me but also to improve their teaching skill including English proficiency, applying various student-center teaching techniques, applying assessment, etc to be implemented in classroom.

REFERENCES

Agustine, H. I. R. (2014). The 2013 English Curriculum: the Paradigm, Interpretation and Implementation. FBS: Universitas Negeri Semarang

Astuti, P. (2016). Practitioner of Cooperative Learning as Part of Novice Teachers' Professional Identity. Retrieved from DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v27i2/132-152

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methodsapproaches (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cubukcu, F. (2010). Student Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Competence and Their Attributions for Success and Failure in Learning. *The Journal of International Social Research.3* (10). Retrieved from www.sosyalarastirmalar

Febriana, E., Faridi, A. (2016). The Junior High School English Teachers' Fulfilment of Four Competences. *English Education Journal*, *EEJ6*(1). Retrieved from http://journal.unnes.ac.id

Ghazi, S. R., Shah, M. T., & Shauhib, M. (2013). Teacher's Professional Competencies in Knowledge of Subject Matter at Secondary Level in Southern District of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Journal of Educational and Social Research.3* (2) *May*. Retrieved from http://www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/jesr/issue/view/4

Grift, W. F. D. & Wal, M. F. D. (2011). Measuring the Development of Professional Competence among Teachers. Retrieved from http://www.icsei.net/icsei2011/fullpapers/0127_A.pdf

Husin, A. (2014). Teacher Understanding of Pedagogy Competency in Tangerang. Presented at *The Second International Conference of Education and Language.* Retrieved from. artikel.ubl.ac.id/index.php/icel/article/download/290/835

ndiana Department of Education. (2015). Classroom Observation Success Indicator: A Companion Guide to the Classroom Observation. Retrieved from http://www/doe.in.gov

Kizilaslan, I. (2011). ELT Student Teachers' Competence for teaching Language Skills: A Qualitative Exploration. *International Journal of Social Science and humanity Studies, 3*(1). Retrieved from www.sobiad.org/ejournals/journal/irem_kizilaslan.pdf

Kuma, K., M. (2016). Challenges of Implementing Student-centered Strategies. *International Research Journal of*

Engineering and Technology (IRJET), 03 (12). Retrieved from www.irje.net

Leo, S. (2013). *A Challenge Book to Practice Teaching in English*. Yogyakarta: Andi

Ministry of National Education (MoNE), Republic of Indonesia. (2007). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 16 Tahun 2007 Tentang Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Standar Kompetensi Guru*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Mutmainah, Faridi, A., Astuti, P. (2017).Junior High School English Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Authentic Assessment in the Revised 2013 Curriculum. *English Education Journal*. Retrieved from http://journal.unnes.ac.id

Nell, N. & Muller, H. (2010). The Impact of Limited English Proficiency on English Second Language Learners in South Africa. *South of African Journal of Education*, *30*, 635-650. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1137111/pdf

Richards, J. C. (2011). *Competence and Performance in Language Teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Sikki, E. A. (2013). The Competence of Primary School English Teachers in Indonesia. *Online paper, 4*(11). Retrieved from http://www.iiste.org

Sukrisno, A.(2015). *Cyclic Spelling Patterns of English Word Groups Spellophonetically Enabling English Learners to Determine Segmental and Suprasegmental Realisations in Pronunciation*. Doctoral Dissertion. Universitas Negeri Semarang. Semarang: Indonesia

Syahrudin, Ernawati, A. & Ede, M. N. (2013). Teachers' Pedagogical Competence in School-Based Management: A Case Study in a Public Secondary School at Pare-Pare, Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Learning, 7*(4), 213-218. Retrived from www.journal.uad.ac.id>Home>vol7,No4 >Syahrudin

Tawalbeh, T. I., & Ismail, N. M. (2014).Investigation of Teaching Competencies to Enhance Students' EFL Learning at Taif University International Education Studies. *Canadian Center of Science and Education, 7*(11). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071025.pdf

The Jakarta Post. (2015, November 25), Portrait of Teachers behind Competency Test. Retrived from http://www.thejakartapost.comcompetence.html

Wachidah, S., Gunawan, A., Diyantri, & Noorman, S. (2017). *When English Rings a Bell*: *Buku Guru Bahasa Inggris*. Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia

Wijayanti, P., Bharati, D.A.L., Mujiyanto, J. (2015). The Use of Written Feedback Technique to Improve the Practice of Grammar for Sentence Writing Competence. *English Education Journal, EEJ5*(1). Retrived from http://journal.unnes.ac.id

Wong, H. & Wong, R. (2011). The Heart of Every Lesson. Retrieved from https://www.teachers.net/wong/MAR11/

Yuliasri, I. (2016). Cooperative Learning for Undergraduate Translation and Interpreting Classes. Paper Presented at the *1st English Language and Literature International Conference*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang. Retrieved from https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/viewfile/2604/2572

Zhao, W. & Zhang, H. (2016). Investigation into and Analysis on Middle School English Teachers' Competencies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(3), 613-618. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0703.25.