

BETESEB HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' SELF PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Atlabachew Getaye, Sara Mesfin, Dawit Alelign

Arsi University

Abstract

Teachers' and students' perceptions of their English proficiency affect both teaching and acquisition. It is also related to the academic achievement of students. This study was therefore conducted to examine the perception of students' and teachers' English proficiency. It also tried to identify the level of students' proficiency and its relation to final examination and students' and teachers' perceptions. The study used quantitative method. Correlational and predictive designs were used. The sources of the study were primary. All English teachers and 120 12th grade students from a total of 170 population were sampled as subjects of the study with census and simple random sampling techniques respectively. Questionnaires were the data gathering tool. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Mean and standard deviation from descriptive statistics and Pearson moment product correlation, T-tests and simple regression from inferential statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data. The findings showed that both students and teachers had very high English language proficiency perception, and students rated their teachers' English proficiency as very high. The level of the IELTS result was 6.3 which is labeled as competent. The mean score of the IELTS exam was 63 whereas that of the final-exam was 81. The T-test results of the students' and the teachers' self-reported English proficiency perception showed a statistically significant difference. The IELTS and the first semester final-examination displayed a statistically significant moderate relationship. However, the students' self-reported and the teachers' self-reported English proficiency had low negative relationship. The students' self-reported English proficiency perception predicted their final-examination but not their IELTS scores. The recommendations of the study are discussed.

Key-words: Teachers self-reported proficiency, students self-reported proficiency, IELTS, and English Final-Examination

INTRODUCTION

Modern education in Ethiopia started in 1908, and English language had been the medium of instruction in schools. Then, the education system of the country was interrupted due to the Italian occupation. After the expulsion of Italy from Ethiopia, with the assistance of England in 1941, Ethiopia reintroduced English language as medium of instruction.

With regard to the quality of English language teaching and learning process, Tekeste (2006) pointed out that it had had quality during the Imperial regime, compared to the subsequent two regimes. This was the case because most of the English teachers at that time were native speakers and the student-teacher ratio was 40:1. In fact, as a result of the good relationship which existed between the United States of America and Ethiopia, there were about 400 Peace Corps American teachers. Since English was the key to secure jobs, the attitude and motivation on the part of students to learn the English language was positive and high.

In Ethiopian secondary schools, English language is used as a medium of instruction. All subjects except local languages are offered in English. Having a poor English proficiency, while being required to learn school subjects in English, leads to the poor understanding of the contents of the subjects being offered in high schools.

The inefficiency of secondary school students' language proficiency stems from different factors. According to Sisay (1999) and Berhanu (1999), English language instruction in Ethiopia is characterized by a lack of qualified teachers, inappropriate and inefficient language teaching methodology, large class size, and a lack of books and facilities. Thus, it is obvious that English language teaching in Ethiopia needs improvement since it suffers from traditional teaching methods, poor teacher training and inadequate teaching materials which do not help either to facilitate students' language acquisition or enhance their communicative competence (Dejene,1990).

Realizing the above problems, the New Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia changed the textbooks of both primary and secondary schools of Ethiopia. According to Alemu (2004), the new textbooks differ in both content and approach. The new textbooks give due regard to speaking and writing skills, and the materials are designed in a learner-centered manner,

covering all the major and minor skills. In spite of the above modifications in terms of materials and approach, the English proficiency of students remains very low (Birahnu, 1999). This is partly due to the fact that teachers follow a teacher- centered approach despite the training they had taken (Sisay, 1999).

Compared to state- owned high schools, private- schools students have better English proficiency due to different factors. By and large, the students come from better socio-economic class. Private schools have also better supervision, supplementary materials, technology access, small class size, school discipline and standard, training access, quality teachers, subject specialists, etc. Due to this, the demand for private schools in Addis Ababa is growing speedily. Out of 120 high schools found in Addis Ababa in 2021, 175 of them were owned privately (MoE Abstract, 2021). However, it does not mean that they offer quality education in all aspects.

BeteSeb school is one of the private high schools, established to offer quality education. In fact, to improve the language proficiency of students, it employed better English teachers from the available market. It produced a number of supplementary English materials from Pre- KG to high school. It also has an English Subject Specialist who produces and edits supplementary materials, makes supervision, offers training, checks different exams and conducts quality and language proficiency related researches. The School also organizes different presentations and essay contests.

An effective school should check its weaknesses and strengths when it comes to language proficiency of students and teachers. The initial step is to look into teachers' and students' self-perception of language proficiency and identify the level of students' proficiency. Thus, the driving force behind conducting this study is to examine the self-perceived and student- reported language proficiency of English teachers and students, so as to make corrective measures if there are gaps.

Statement of the Problem

English is an international language. The English language plays a pivotal role in Ethiopian educational institutions. To increase students' language proficiency, various factors must be taken into consideration when teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), for instance,

choices about which language skills to teach, how to teach, the roles of students, the learning environment, the choices of content and materials, and assessment criteria (Graddol, 2006).

Teachers are the pillars of the teaching-learning process since they play immense roles in implementing the curriculum. While implementing the curriculum, their language proficiency is the most important factor. Perceived language proficiency is an important issue for non-native English speaking teachers, and has an impact on their professional self-esteem and confidence. If they have poor perception, they will not have self-confidence and efficacy to run their classes properly. Their self-perception may directly affect how they talk to themselves, the way they present themselves to others, and their ability to communicate competently with others. Teachers' self-perceptions not only have a substantial effect on their teaching practices and classroom behavior, but are also related to their students' attainment (Grossman, Reynolds, Ringstaff & Sykes, 1985).

Language learners' self-perception of the target language ability is also one of the important factors which may affect both language teaching and acquisition. It has been discussed in relation to learners' affective factors such as debilitating language anxiety and strength of motivation (Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, and Daley 1999, Kitano 2001, and MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan 2002). These researchers suggest that self-perception of language ability is negatively related to levels of anxiety and positively associated with strength of motivation.

Positive self-perception of students and English teachers leads to self-confidence and intrinsic motivation, impacting their attitude and behavior positively and resulting in very high language proficiency and achievement of students. On the other hand, negative self-perception of students' and English teachers' proficiency can lead to lack of self-confidence and demotivation, having its own negative repercussions on the teaching-learning process of English and students' achievement. An IELTS test focusing on reading and writing skills was given, and students' English classroom achievement results of a semester were gathered from the Office of the Registrar to check students' proficiency and correlate to their self-reported perception. Hence, this study is conducted to address the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. Do BeteSeb English teachers have positive or negative perceptions towards their English language proficiency?
2. Do BeteSeb 12th-grade students have positive or negative perceptions towards their English language proficiency?
3. Does the English teachers' self-rated language proficiency has positive or negative correlation with the students' reported proficiency of their English teachers?
4. Does the students' self-rated language proficiency has positive or negative correlation with the students' English average score examinations achievement and the IELTS score?
5. What is the level of English proficiency attributed to 12th - grade students of BeteSeb High School?
6. Does the self-rated proficiency of BeteSeb 12th-grade students' predicts the first semester final-exam and IELTS scores?

Methodology

The study used correlational and predictive designs. The research aimed at checking whether both English teachers and students had either positive or negative perception. It also correlated the teachers' self-reported perception with the students' perceived report of their teachers' English proficiency. The study also correlated the students' self-reported English language proficiency with the classroom English average scores achievement and IELTS scores. Further, it tried to see the predictive powers of the students' self-rated proficiency over their first-semester examination and IELTS scores.

Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary data were used for this study. Teachers and students were sources of primary data since they filled out the questionnaires, and the students' English average scores were taken from the Office of the Registrar which was secondary data. Additionally, an IELTS test was given to 12th-grade students.

Population

BeteSeb High School teachers and students of Addis Ababa were the population of this study.

Subjects

Both BeteSeb English teachers (all included) and Grade 12 students were selected using purposive sampling. English teachers' self-perception matters since it affects their classroom performance either negatively or positively. Grade 12 students are assumed to be the final output of BeteSeb School, who can represent the English language proficiency of the students and the school.

Instruments

The study used questionnaires to gather data from respondents. The instruments had a five point Likert Scale. The questionnaires incorporated both general proficiency and skills proficiency for teachers and students. The teachers' questionnaire had 50 items, and the students' questionnaire had 29 items. Both questionnaires covered all the four skills and general proficiency. The reliability of the instruments was checked by different scholars with Cronbach Alpha and the results were above the required value, namely .943 and .856 for teachers and students respectively. The present researcher also checked their reliability and found out .889 and .845 for teachers' and students' instruments respectively. As to validity, both instruments were developed by experts of English language.

Document analysis was the other tool used to gather data. The students' English scores of a semester final-examination were taken, and the scores were correlated with the self-reported English proficiency of students and their IELTS scores.

Besides, the IELTS test was the other instrument which was used in order to know the learners' English proficiency. The test focused on reading and writing skills. And the reliability and validity of the test are already certain which do not require consistency and content checking. The IELTS test was developed and administrated by the British Council, the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the International Development of Program of Australian universities and colleges. The IELTS is administrated over 135 countries and the scores are accepted by over 7000 educational institutions (www.ielts.org). IELTS measures scores using band scores, ranging from 9 to 0. 9 refers to expert users, 8 to very good users, 7 to

good users, 6 to competent users, 5 to modest users, 4 to limited users, 3 to extremely limited users, 2 to intermittent users, 1 to non- users and 0 did not attempt to take the test (<https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/teach-ielts/test-information/ielts-scores-explained>.)

Sample Size

All English teachers and 120 students were selected as sample size of the study. The teachers were selected with census, but the students were selected using simple random sampling. Out of 170 students, 120 students were selected using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) Table of calculated sample size quoted in Cohen, Manion and Morrison's (2000).

Method of Data Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean, standard deviation, Pearson Correlation, simple regression and T- test were used to analyze the findings.

Analyses of Results

In this section, analyses and interpretations of the findings regarding students' and teachers' English proficiency, learners' English proficiency, the correlation of students' self- reported proficiency, teachers' self- reported proficiency, IELTS and first-semester final English examination, mean differences of students' self- reported proficiency and teachers' self- reported proficiency were made.

A. Students' Self-Rated English Language Proficiency

Items	N	Min	Max	Mean	Meaning	Std. Deviation
1. I can understand and use familiar everyday English expressions, and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type.	120	2	5	4.17	Agree	.792

2. I can introduce myself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details.	120	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	.833
3. I can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.	119	1	5	4.28	Strongly Agree	.802
4. I can understand English sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance.	119	1	5	4.11	Agree	.871
5. I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters.	118	2	5	4.20	Agree	.769
6. I can describe in simple terms aspects of my background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.	119	1	5	4.05	Agree	.901
7. I can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in school.	118	1	5	4.32	Strongly Agree	.846
8. I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	120	1	5	4.40	Strongly Agree	.814
9. I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance.	120	2	5	3.97	Agree	.961
10. I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.	117	2	5	4.15	Agree	.854
11. I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in school.	120	1	5	4.08	Agree	.866

12. I can understand the main point of radio or TV programs on current affairs when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	120	2	5	4.30	Strongly Agree	.846
13. I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example, on notices and posters or in catalogues.	119	3	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.671
14. I can read very short and simple texts.	118	1	5	4.60	Strongly Agree	.730
15. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material.	118	1	5	4.28	Strongly Agree	.856
16. I can understand short simple personal letters.	119	2	5	4.55	Strongly Agree	.661
17. I can evaluate true from false when I read reading passage.	118	1	5	4.35	Strongly Agree	.871
18. I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say.	119	1	5	4.06	Agree	.876
19. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	118	1	5	4.21	Strongly Agree	.783
20. I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities.	119	1	5	4.13	Agree	.873
21. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.	120	1	5	4.02	Agree	1.000
22. I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	116	3	5	4.38	Strongly Agree	.706

23. I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes, and ambitions.	119	1	5	4.05	Agree	.862
24. I can write a short and simple postcard.	120	2	5	4.23	Strongly Agree	.857
25. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name and nationality.	119	1	5	4.54	Strongly Agree	.779
26. I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate need.	120	1	5	4.18	Agree	.917
27. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.	120	2	5	4.26	Strongly Agree	.921
28. I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest.	120	2	5	4.22	Strongly Agree	.801
29. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	120	2	5	4.23	Strongly Agree	.857

The descriptive statistics for the students' self-rated English language competency levels perception are shown in the above table. The general proficiency items ranges from number 1 up to 7 and the mean scores indicated that students agreed and strongly agreed to their overall proficiency. For items 2 and 3 which read, "I can introduce myself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details.", and "I can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.", respondents mean scores were (M=4.38) and (M=4.28) respectively which showed that they strongly agreed to the items. They believed that they could introduce themselves and others by asking personal questions and interact in a simple way. For the rest five items, students agreed. They said that they could understand familiar everyday expressions (M=4.17); they could communicate in simple and routine tasks (M=4.20), and they could understand English sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (M=4.11). Besides, they claimed that

they could describe the immediate environment (M=4.05) and understand the main points of familiar inputs (M=4.32).

In relation to students' listening proficiency, the mean scores indicated that learners strongly agreed and agreed to the five items. Respondents strongly agreed to items 8 and 12 with mean scores of (M=4.40) and (M= 4.30) respectively which read, "I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly." And "I can understand the main point of radio or TV programs on current affairs when the delivery is relatively slow and clear." respectively. Student respondents also said that they could understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary; catch the main points of simple messages, and standard speeches of schools.

Next, reading skill had six items, and students strongly agreed to all the items with mean scores, ranging from 4.28 to 4.60. Respondents believed that they could understand short texts; familiar names, words and very simple sentences, find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material, understand short simple personal letters, and evaluate true from false when reading passage.

The speaking skills had six items of which for two of them respondents strongly agreed and for the rest they agreed. Respondents strongly agreed with mean scores of 4.21 and 4.38 to items 19 and 22 which read, "I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics." and "I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know." respectively. Student respondents also asserted that they could interact in simple way; they could ask and answer simple questions; they could communicate and exchange information on familiar topics, and they could handle short social exchanges.

Similarly, the writing skill had six items and respondents strongly agreed to five of the items and agreed to one of them. The mean scores of strongly agreed responses to the five items range from 4.22 to 4.54. Respondents strongly agreed that they could fill in forms with personal details (M=4.54); write personal simple letters (M=4.26); write short postcards (M=4.23); and write personal letters describing experiences and impressions (M=4.23), and write simple connected texts on topics of personal interest (M=4.22). They also agreed that they could write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate need (M=4.18).

All in all, the mean scores showed that students had positive self- perception of their English proficiency. Of all the four skills, reading skill got the highest mean scores, followed by writing skill. Speaking and listening skills came next to writing skill. Hence, students rated their reading skill as the most positive skill compared to other skills.

B. Teachers' Self-Rated English Language Proficiency

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mi ni	Ma x	Mean	Meaning	Std. Deviation
Reading Proficiency						
1. I can read English text with ease.	23	1	5	4.52	Strongly Agree	.947
2. I am comfortable with reading long texts in English.	23	1	5	4.61	Strongly Agree	.891
3. I can understand most of the vocabulary in English texts.	23	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	1.158
4. I can identify the main idea of a text in English.	23	1	5	4.57	Strongly Agree	.945
5. I can comprehend the nuances and figurative language in English texts.	23	1	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.992
6. I can read and understand academic texts in English.	23	1	5	4.57	Strongly Agree	.945
7. I can easily comprehend technical terms and jargon in English.	22	2	5	4.18	Agree	.795
8. I can read and interpret complex graphs and charts in English.	23	1	5	4.17	Agree	.887
9. I can effectively scan and skim through texts in English to locate specific information.	23	1	5	4.48	Strongly Agree	.898

10. I can comprehend the main ideas and details of a passage in English materials I read.	23	1	5	4.52	Strongly Agree	.898
Writing Proficiency						
11. I can write grammatically correct sentences in English.	23	1	5	4.61	Strongly Agree	.891
12. I can write coherently organized paragraphs in English.	23	1	5	4.48	Strongly Agree	.947
13. I can use appropriate vocabulary and tone in my writing in English.	23	1	5	4.35	Strongly Agree	.982
14. I can write clear and concise emails, reports, and other professional documents in English.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	1.058
15. I can write creatively and expressively in English.	22	1	5	4.36	Strongly Agree	.902
16. I can express my ideas and thoughts clearly in written English.	23	1	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.992
17. I can write cohesive and coherent paragraphs in English.	22	1	5	4.36	Strongly Agree	.953
18. I can effectively use grammar and vocabulary in writing English sentences	23	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	.941
19. I can write effective business emails in English	21	3	5	4.29	Strongly Agree	.717
20. I can write academic papers that meet international standards in English.	21	3	5	4.05	Agree	.669
Speaking Proficiency						
21. I can speak English fluently and confidently.	23	2	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.788

22. I can express my ideas and opinions clearly in English.	23	1	5	4.61	Strongly Agree	.891
23. I can participate effectively in English discussions and conversations.	23	1	5	4.48	Strongly Agree	.947
24. I can use appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation in English.	23	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	.891
25. I can adjust my speaking style to fit different situations and audiences in English.	23	1	5	4.35	Strongly Agree	.935
26. I can communicate effectively with native speakers of English.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	1.014
27. I can clearly articulate my ideas and thoughts in spoken English.	23	1	5	4.35	Strongly Agree	.935
28. I can use a wide range of vocabulary in spoken English.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	.920
29. I can effectively use intonation and stress in spoken English.	23	2	5	4.09	Agree	.949
30. I can use appropriate gestures and facial expressions when speaking English	23	1	5	4.30	Strongly Agree	1.020
Listening Proficiency						
31. I can understand English speakers of different accents and dialects.	23	1	5	4.00	Agree	1.000
32. I can follow English conversations and lectures without difficulty.	23	1	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.992
33. I can distinguish between literal and implied meanings in English conversations.	23	1	5	4.17	Agree	.937

34. I can extract key information from English audio recordings.	23	1	5	4.30	Strongly Agree	.974
35. I can listen, recognize, and use English idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	1.014
36. I can listen and comprehend spoken English in a variety of accents and dialects.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	1.180
37. I can understand complex instructions and directions given in English.	23	1	5	4.22	Agree	.951
38. I can listen and comprehend different genres of English speech (news, interviews, presentations, etc.)	23	1	5	4.26	Strongly Agree	1.010
39. I can effectively listen for specific details and main ideas in English.	23	1	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.945
40. I can listen with 100 percent comprehend English spoken at a normal conversational speed.	23	1	5	4.04	Agree	1.065
General Comprehension Proficiency						
41. I can understand English language materials related to my professional field.	23	1	5	4.43	Strongly Agree	.992
42. I can understand English-language media, including news articles, TV shows, and movies.	23	1	5	4.26	Strongly Agree	.964
43. I can understand English texts on a wide range of topics.	23	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	.941
44. I can infer and interpret meaning from English texts.	23	1	5	4.26	Strongly Agree	.964

45. I can critically evaluate English texts and arguments.	23	1	5	4.17	Agree	.984
46. I can understand English idioms and figurative language.	23	1	5	3.83	Agree	1.029
47. I can effectively comprehend the use of English collocations and phrasal verbs.	23	1	5	4.13	Agree	1.014
48. I can understand the nuances and subtleties of English language use.	22	1	5	3.95	Agree	1.090
49. I can use context clues to comprehend unknown words in English.	23	1	5	4.39	Strongly Agree	.988
50. I can effectively use dictionaries and other reference materials to comprehend unknown words in English.	23	1	5	4.70	Strongly Agree	.926

The descriptive statistics for the teachers' self-rated English language proficiency levels perception are shown in the above table. It covered the four major skills and general comprehension skill. The reading proficiency items ranges from number 1 up to 10, and the mean scores indicated that teachers agreed to two of the items and strongly agreed to 8 of the items of the reading proficiency measures. Instructors strongly agreed that they could read longer texts (M=4.61) with ease (M=4.52), understanding any academic text (M=4.57) and main ideas (M=4.57) written in English. They also strongly agreed that they could skim and scan to identify specific ideas of texts written in English (M=4.48), understanding the vocabulary used in texts that they were reading (M=4.39), comprehending the tones of figurative languages (M=4.43) used in English. With regards to comprehending technical words and jargons (M=4.18) and interpreting complex graphs and charts (M=4.17), respondents also expressed their agreement. Thus, instructors had high positive reading proficiency perception.

Similarly, teachers agreed to two of the writing proficiency items and strongly disagreed to eight of the proficiency items. They agreed that they could write academic papers that met international standards ($M=4.13$), and write clear and concise emails, reports, and other professional documents in English ($M=4.05$). They strongly agreed that they could write grammatically correct statements ($M=4.61$), and write coherently organized paragraphs. Teachers also expressed their strong agreement that they could express their ideas in English effectively ($M=4.43$) and could write creatively and expressively in English ($M=4.36$).

Further, while answering items for the speaking proficiency, English teachers strongly agreed to seven of the items and agreed to two of the items. Teacher respondents expressed their strong agreement that they could express themselves their ideas and thoughts clearly ($M=4.61$), and participate effectively in English discussions and conversations ($M=4.48$), using appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation ($M=4.39$). Respondents also agreed that they could communicate effectively with native speakers of English ($M=4.13$); use a wide range of vocabulary in spoken English ($M=4.13$), and use effectively intonation and stress in spoken English ($M=4.09$).

While reacting to the ten listening proficiency items, teachers agreed to six of the items and strongly agreed to four of the items. Teachers strongly agreed that they could follow English conversations and lectures without difficulty ($M=4.43$); extract key information from English audio recordings ($M=4.30$); listen effectively for specific details and main ideas in English ($M=4.43$), and listen and comprehend different genres of English speech such as news, interviews, presentations, etc. ($M=4.26$). They agreed that they could understand complex instructions and directions given in English ($M=4.22$); distinguish between literal and implied meanings in English conversations ($M=4.17$); listen and comprehend spoken English in a variety of accents and dialects ($M=4.13$); listen, recognize, and use English idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms ($M=4.13$), and understand English speakers of different accents and dialects ($M=4.00$).

General comprehension proficiency items had ten items and respondents agreed to four of them and strongly agreed to six of the items. Teacher respondents strongly agreed that they used effectively dictionaries and other reference materials to comprehend unknown words in English ($M=4.70$); understood English language materials related to their professional field ($M=4.43$);

understood English texts on a wide range of topics (M=4.39); used context clues to comprehend unknown words in English (M=4.39). English teacher respondents agreed that they critically evaluated English texts and arguments (M=4.17); effectively comprehended the use of English collocations and phrasal verbs (M=4.13); understood the nuances and subtleties of English language use (M=3.95), and understood English idioms and figurative language (M=3.83).

C. Average Scores and Standard Deviations of the SSRP, TSRP, IELTS, FSFE Analysis

Descriptive Stat.		Student Self- Reported Grand Mean	Teachers Self- Reported Grand Mean	IELTS	final exam
N	Valid	120	23	114	120
	Missing	0	97	6	0
Mean		4.2438	4.3130	62.9798	81.0742
Std. Deviation		.50170	.83570	11.50033	8.39570

The provided table presents statistics related to the students' self-reported perception, the teachers' self-reported perception, the IELTS scores, and the final-exam score. Among the 120 valid cases, students reported a mean self-reported grand mean of approximately 4.24, with a standard deviation of around 0.50. The teachers reported a slightly higher grand mean of about 4.31, with a standard deviation of approximately 0.84, based on 23 valid cases. For the IELTS score, out of 114 valid cases, the mean score was approximately 62.98, with a standard deviation of around 11.50. The score indicates that BeteSeb 12th -grade students have generally an

effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriate usage and misunderstandings. They can use and understand fairly complex language, particularly in familiar situations. In fact, research findings (ETS, 2010) reported that most of the IELTS scores fell in the range of 5.5 to 7.5 on the IELTS examinations. And the results of 12th -grade students fell within the range of most test takers. The final- exam score, based on all 120 valid cases, had a mean of roughly 81.07, with a standard deviation of about 8.40 which can be rated as a very good classroom achievement score. These statistics provided insights into the central tendency and variability within each measure, suggesting variations in both student-reported and teacher-reported grand means, as well as in the IELTS and final-exam scores.

D. Bivariate Correlations among Self- Reported English Proficiency Perception and IELTS and Final-Examinations

		Student Self- Reported Grand Mean	Teachers Self- Reported Grand Mean	IELTS	Final exam
Student Self -Reported Grand Mean	Pearson Correlation	1	-.141	.036	.198*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.521	.708	.030
	N	120	23	114	120
Teachers Self- Reported Grand Mean	Pearson Correlation	-.141	1	.109	.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.521		.628	.603
	N	23	23	22	23

IELTS	Pearson	.036	.109	1	.580**
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.708	.628		.000
	N	114	22	114	114
final exam	Pearson	.198*	.114	.580**	1
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.603	.000	
	N	120	23	114	120

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

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

The correlation analysis, in most cases, revealed several weak associations between the variables. The students' self-reported proficiency demonstrated a weak negative correlation with teachers' self-reported proficiency ($r = -0.141$, $p = 0.521$) but a significant positive correlation with final exam-score ($r = 0.198$, $p = 0.030$). The teachers' self-reported proficiency showed weak correlations with the students' self-reported proficiency ($r = -0.141$, $p = 0.521$), the IELTS score ($r = 0.109$, $p = 0.628$), and the final-exam score ($r = 0.114$, $p = 0.603$). The IELTS score exhibited a significant positive correlation with final-exam score ($r = 0.580$, $p < 0.01$), but negligible correlations with both the students' and the teachers' self-reported proficiency ($r = 0.036$, $p = 0.708$ and $r = 0.109$, $p = 0.628$, respectively). The final-exam score showed a significant positive correlations with the students' self-reported proficiency ($r = 0.198$, $p = 0.030$), teachers' self-reported proficiency ($r = 0.114$, $p = 0.603$), and the IELTS score ($r = 0.580$, $p < 0.01$). These findings suggest that while some weak relationships exist between the variables, the final exam- score is most strongly associated with the IELTS score.

E. Students' Self- Reported Proficiency as Predictors of English Final-exam

ANOVA ^a					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

1	Regression	329.951	1	329.951	4.832	.030 ^b
	Residual	8058.099	118	68.289		
	Total	8388.050	119			

a. Dependent Variable: final exam

b. Predictors: (Constant), grand mean of student self- reported

The ANOVA table indicates the results of an analysis of variance for a regression model with the dependent variable being final-exam score. The model includes a single predictor, which is student self-reported score. The table showed that the regression model accounted for a significant amount of variance in the final-exam score, as indicated by the significant F-test ($F = 4.832$, $p = 0.030$). This suggests that student self-reported score is a significant predictor of final-exam performance. The sum of squares for the regression (329.951) compared to the residual sum of squares (8058.099) suggested that the model explained a notable portion of the variance in the final exam score. Overall, these results suggests that the students' self-reported score is a significant predictor of the final-exam performance since it explains 19.8 % of the variance of their English first semester final-examination.

		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	66.989	6.452		10.382	.000
	Student Self- Reported	3.319	1.510	.198	2.198	.030

a. Dependent Variable: final exam

The coefficients table provides estimates for the coefficients in the regression model predicting the final-exam score. The constant term was 66.989, indicating the expected final-exam score when the predictor variable (grand mean of student self-reported scores) was zero. The coefficient for the predictor variable was 3.319, implying that for every one-unit increase in the grand mean of the students' self-reported score, the predicted final exam score was expected to increase by 3.319 units. The standardized coefficient (Beta) for this predictor was 0.198,

suggesting the change in final-exam score in standard deviation units for a one-standard deviation increase in the predictor. The t-value associated with this coefficient was 2.198, with a corresponding p-value of 0.030, indicating that the coefficient for the predictor variable was statistically significant at the conventional significance level of 0.05. Therefore, based on this analysis, there is evidence to suggest that student self-reported score significantly predicts the final exam score.

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.856	1	18.856	.141	.708 ^b
	Residual	14926.247	112	133.270		
	Total	14945.104	113			

a. Dependent Variable: IELTS

b. Predictors: (Constant), grand mean of student self- reported

The ANOVA table suggests that the regression model, which includes the constant term and the students' self-reported score as predictor did not significantly explained the variability in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score, as indicated by a non-significant F-value of 0.141 with a p-value of 0.708. This implies that the observed relationship between the predictors and the IELTS score is likely due to random chance rather than a meaningful association. The majority of the variability in the IELTS score remained unexplained by the model, with a large sum of squared residuals (14926.247) and a mean square of 133.270, indicating substantial variability within the data that was not captured by the predictor.

F. Students' Self- Reported Proficiency as Predictors of the IELTS score

Coefficients ^a				
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.

		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	59.534	9.225		6.454	.000
	Student Self- Reported	.812	2.158	.036	.376	.708

a. Dependent Variable: IELTS

The coefficients table presents the estimated coefficients for the predictors in the regression model predicting the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score. The constant term was 59.534, indicating the expected IELTS score when the predictor variable (grand mean of student self-reported scores) was zero. The coefficient for the predictor variable was 0.812, suggesting that for every one-unit increase in the grand mean of student self-reported score, the predicted IELTS score was expected to increase by 0.812 units. However, the standardized coefficient (Beta) for this predictor was 0.036, which indicated the change in the IELTS score in standard deviation units for a one-standard deviation increased in the predictor. Neither the unstandardized nor standardized coefficients for the predictor variable were statistically significant, as indicated by the t-values of 0.376 and the associated p-value of 0.708. Thus, based on this analysis, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the grand mean of student self-reported score significantly predicts the IELTS score.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn based on the analysis of the research findings:

1. The English teachers had very high self- reported proficiency perception. Similarly, the students had also very high positive self- perception of English proficiency.
2. The students' self- rated reported proficiency perception had a weak negative correlation with teachers' self- rated reported proficiency.
3. The students' self- rated reported proficiency perception had a positive and weak correlation with both the IELTS and first semester final-exam. Similarly, the teachers'

self- rated reported proficiency had a weak and positive correlation with both the IELTS and first semester final-examination.

4. The IELTS had a moderate, positive and a statistically significant correlation with first semester final-examination.
5. The students' IELTS score is rated as competent. In other words, students have generally an effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriate usage and misunderstandings. They can use and understand fairly complex language, particularly in familiar situations. The students' first semester final-examination can be rated as very good.
6. The students' self- rated reported proficiency perception predicted the students' first semester final- examination. It explained 19.8% of the variance in their final-examination.
7. The students' self- rated reported proficiency perception did not predict the IELTS test score.

Recommendations

Based on the identified problems, the following recommendations were given to overcome the problems.

1. Both the teachers and the students had high self- rated English proficiency perception. It is the starting point for both groups to be motivated and self- efficacious, leading to positive attitude towards the English language and effective English examination achievement on the part of students and effective teaching on the part of teachers. In fact, the students' self-rated proficiency perception was realized by the very good achievement of first semester English examination score and by the competent IELTS scores. High self-proficiency perception does not mean high actual English proficiency, or it does not mean that teachers have achieved the threshold level. Thus, there is a need to check the actual performance of English language proficiency of the teachers through different mechanisms.

2. Learners IELTS score is 6.3 which is a competent band stage. It can allow them to pursue international universities. To be more proficient and raise their band level to good, very good, excellent and if possible to expert level, the English teachers should arm their learners with

various independent learning strategies of skills and subs kills of English. Besides, they should apply deep learning, eclectic methods and active techniques.

3. The English teachers should be challenged continuously to improve their English proficiency and pedagogical practices by reading contemporary methods and taking different training in order to narrow the gap between their high perception and actual English proficiency. They should not confine themselves to local or national standards.

4. BesteSeb academy should focus on the actual proficiency of English teachers during recruitment, applying rigorous assessment methods on both language skills and pedagogical knowledge. University CGPA should not be the solitary technique to recruit English teachers.

5. To improve the proficiency of students, there is a need to establish the love of reading culture by exposing learners to various genres of English print and digital reading materials such as short story, novel, poem, fiction and drama. Selecting materials graded in line with the appropriate difficulty level of students, teachers should give reading assignments to learners either in group or individually and make them report what they read to class. Students should also continuously perform dramas, deliver speeches and presentations.

6. English classrooms should be technology friendly in such a way that different digital sources should be blended with the lecture method. Exposing learners to native speakers' speech through ICT based teaching can boost their English proficiency.

7. Other subject teachers should be proficient in English, and they should handle the teaching learning in English. Second language can be acquired better if both the content teachers and the English teachers teach in English. Too much code switching should not be allowed to other subject teachers unless the concepts are too difficult or the students look confused in understanding message. Other subject teachers should also feel that they are responsible for the English language development of students.

REFERENCES

Alemu Hailu.(2004). An evaluation study of ELT practices in secondary schools in

- Ethiopia:1994-2004. Unpublished PhD Thesis, General Institute of English and Foreign Languages Hyderabad 500007/India.
- Birhanu Haile. (1999). An Evaluation of the implementation of the current ELT syllabus for grade 9 in terms of communicative language. Unpublished MA Thesis, AAU.
- Cohen, L Manion, L & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group
- Dejene Leta. (1990). Achievement, wash back and proficiency in school leaving examinations: A case study of innovation in an Ethiopian setting, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of English as a Foreign Language*. The British Council. Retrieved from http://vigdis.hi.is/sites/vigdis.hi.is/files/images/einangrun_enskumaelandi_folks.pdf
- Grossman, P. L., Reynolds, J. A., Ringstaff, C., & Sykes, G. (1985). *From English major to English teacher: New approaches to an old problem (Knowledge growth in a profession series)*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the College Japanese Language Classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 549-566.
- Krejcie, R. V and Morgan, D. W. (1970) Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607–10.
- <https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/teach-ielts/test-information/ielts-scores-explained>.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., and Donovan, L. A. (2002). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students. *Language Learning*, 52:3, 537-564.

Ministry of Education. (2021). *Education Statistic Annual Abstract*, Addis Ababa.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., and Daley, C. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 20, 217-239.

Sisay Assefa. (1999). Classroom interaction and its influence on the development of students speaking skills in English at grade 11 level in government schools. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, AAU.

Tekeste Negash. (2006). *Education in Ethiopia: From crisis to the brink of collapse*. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet - 33. Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitute.