CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of test given to the experimental and controlled group, and the questionniare responses given to the experimental group. Further, there are discussions of the test results to be analyzed for getting empirical evidence of the effect of presentation method on e-learning environment towards students' speaking proficiency at the eleventh-grade of MAN 1 Kudus in academic year 2020/2021.

A. **Research Results**
   1. **Description of Research Object**
      a. **History of MAN 1 Kudus**

      MAN 1 Kudus is one of islamic state senior high schools in Kudus. It is located on Conge Street, Ngembalrejo Bae Kudus regency, postcode 59322. MAN 1 Kudus was registered to the department of Education and Culture.

      Furthermore, solidarity of MAN 1 Kudus was built by its vision and mission that highly dedicated as the main starting point to carry out the system. The vision of MAN 1 Kudus is:

      Terbentuknya Generasi Islami, Unggul dan Terampil dalam Ilmu Pengetahuan Teknologi

      Moreover, the specific missions of MAN 1 Kudus are generated as follows:

      a. *Membentuk peserta didik kepribadian Quran, beriman dan bertakwa kepada Allah dalam implementasi kehidupan sehari-hari.*
      b. *Membentuk peserta didik unggul dan berprestasi dalam bidang akademik dan non-akademik.*
      c. *Membentuk peserta didik yang terampil dan mampu berinovasi, serta berkompetisi dalam ilmu pengetahuan teknologi pada era globalisasi.*

2. **Data Analysis**

The research data on simple paired T-test was carried out by distributing pre-test, treatment and post-test to 30 students of both class XI MIPA 3 and XI MIPA 4 at MAN 1 Kudus. The data were processed by using SPSS with the Comparative Hypothesis Test using Paired T Test and Associative HypothesisTest. The first step to determine the simple paired T-test must be carried out 2 test requirements, namely the normality test, homogeneity (non mutlak) and then paired T test.

The test was the primary data source for this research. The test was administrated at the beginning and the end of research. Those tests were given to both experimental and controlled groups. Furthermore, the result of the test would be presented in the following explanation.

Researcher has conducted paired T-test research by distributing pre-test, treatment and post-test to 30 students from both class XI MIPA 3 and XI MIPA 4 at MAN 1 Kudus. The research data consist of scores and descriptive statisctic analysis from both experimental and controlled classses are as follows.

Table 4. 1 Experimental Class

No	Name	PRE-TEST SCORE	PRESENTATION SCORE	POST-TEST SCORE
1	Adelia Salsabela	74	95	85
2	Ainun Nabilla Mariana Safitri	87	93	95
3	Chasa Amila Afrida	77	95	90
4	Dwi Indah Musyiatun	74	78	85
5	Fadlila Nailis Saadah	87	95	95
6	Khiyarotun Nisak	75	91	90
7	Khofifah Diana Pangestuti	79	95	90

8	Khoirin Nisatun Nazilah	77	82	85
9	Nikhlatus Suroyya	78	95	90
10	Nilam Nur Aini	83	95	95
11	Niswatul Azkiya	73	80	90
12	Rana Rosida	77	89	90
13	Saffanatul Hikmah	73	80	85
14	Safira Salsabila	90	93	95
15	Uliya Rosyida	79	91	90

Table 4. 2 Controlled Class

No	Name	PRE-TEST SCORE	POST-TEST SCORE
1	Aldila Anwar Ridlo	79	85
2	Eka Kurnia Putri Apriliana	77	85
3	Fita Aprilia Putri	75	80
4	Istifaiya Velayali	74	85
5	Lutfiana Rahmadhani	78	85
6	Muhammad Asyrofi Asygaf	72	80
7	Muhammad Iqtada Aliyyuddin Hanif	74	85
8	Muhammad Rifqy Yazid	84	85
9	Nor Chalimatus Sa'adah	81	85
10	Putri Fartika Sari	73	85
11	Ratna Khoirunnisa	80	85
12	Risma Putri Cahyani	81	85
13	Sela Amalia	71	85
14	Sri Nur Kayati	73	85
15	Umi Amalia	72	85

Table 4. 3 Descirptive Statisctic analysis of Experimental Class

Descriptives

			Statistic	Std. Error
XI_MIPA3 _PreTest	Mean		78.8667	1.40701
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	75.8489	
		Upper Bound	81.8844	
	5% Trimmed Mean		78.5741	
	Median		77.0000	
	Variance		29.695	
	Std. Deviation		5.44933	
	Minimum		73.00	
	Maximum		90.00	
	Range		17.00	
	Interquartile Range		9.00	
	Skewness		.924	.580
	Kurtosis		-.260	1.121
XI_MIPA3 _PostTest	Mean		90.0000	.97590
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	87.9069	
		Upper Bound	92.0931	
	5% Trimmed Mean		90.0000	
	Median		90.0000	
	Variance		14.286	
	Std. Deviation		3.77964	
	Minimum		85.00	
	Maximum		95.00	
	Range		10.00	
	Interquartile Range		10.00	
	Skewness		.000	.580
	Kurtosis		-1.077	1.121

Table 4. 4 Descirptive Statisctic analysis of Controlled Class
Descriptive

			Statistic	Std. Error
PRE-TEST XI MIPA 4	Mean		76.2667	1.03954
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	74.0371	
		Upper Bound	78.4962	
	5% Trimmed Mean		76.1296	
	Median		75.0000	
	Variance		16.210	
	Std. Deviation		4.02611	
	Minimum		71.00	
	Maximum		84.00	
	Range		13.00	
	Interquartile Range		7.00	
	Skewness		.450	.580
	Kurtosis		-1.028	1.121
POST-TEST XI MIPA 4	Mean		84.3333	.45426
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	83.3590	
		Upper Bound	85.3076	
	5% Trimmed Mean		84.5370	
	Median		85.0000	
	Variance		3.095	
	Std. Deviation		1.75933	
	Minimum		80.00	
	Maximum		85.00	
	Range		5.00	
	Interquartile Range		.00	
	Skewness		-2.405	.580
	Kurtosis		4.349	1.121

a. Presentation Method

The data of this part is the result of presentation method conducted in experimental class. The standard of minimum completeness was 80. Further, the researcher determine how is the quality of presentation method on e-learning environment at MAN 1 Kudus. The following are statistic analysis of XI MIPA 3 students' scores of presentation method using SPSS 16.0 to get the normality test and the result of sample T-test.

1) Normality Test

The normality test on the data sample of presentation method of is to find out whether the sample comes from a normal population or not. The steps for the normality test are as follows:

a) H_0: the sample comes from a normally distributed population

H_1: the sample does not come from a normally distributed population

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 5 Normality Test of Presentation Method

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PRESENTATION XI MIPA 3	.241	15	.019	.773	15	.002

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
> If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

Because sign (0.019) < α (0.05) then H_0 is rejected

45

e) Conclusion

The data sample of XI MIPA 3 students' scores of presentation method at MAN 1 Kudus does not come from a normally distributed population.

2) One Sample T-Test

One Sample T-test on the data sample of presentation method of is to find out whether the sample the mean score of the students' presentations was 80 or not. The steps for the One Sample T-test are as follows:

a) H_0: the mean score of the students' presentations were = 80

H_1: the mean score of the students' presentations were $\neq$ 80

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PRESENTATION XI MIPA 3	15	89.8000	6.42762	1.65960

Table 4. 6 One-Sample Test of Presentation Method

	Test Value = 80					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
PRESENTATION XI MIPA 3	5.905	14	.000	9.80000	6.2405	13.3595

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
> If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

46

Because sign $(0.000) < \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is rejected

e) Conclusion

The mean score of XI MIPA 3 students' scores of presentation method at MAN 1 Kudus were $\neq 80$

b. Students' Pre-Test Score

The data of this part is the result of pre-test conducted in experimental and controlled class. The scores were classified based on the score of speaking with five aspects. The standard of minimum completeness of English mastery was 80. Therefore, the low scores were below the standard of minimum completeness.

Based on the table above, the number of students in experimental class who get score classified into the low score was 11 students (73%) with lowest score was 73, the middle score was 3 student (20%), and the high score was a student (7%) with the highest score was 90. While, in the controlled class, student who got low score was 11 students (73%) with the lowest score was 71, middle score was 4 students (27%) with the highest score was 84. Therefore, the classification of low, middle, and high score showed that most of students in both classes got middle score ranged from 20% to 27%.

The table also showed the mean score of pretest in experimental class was 78 and in the controlled class were 76. Hence, the mean score of experimental class was higher than the mean of controlled class. The following are the statistic analysis of pre-test scores of experimental and controlled class using SPSS 16.0 to get the result of the normality test and homogeneity test:

1) Normality Test

The normality test on the Comparative Hypothesis Test between pre-test from experimental and controlled class is to find out

whether the sample comes from a normal population or not. The steps for the normality test are as follows:

a) H_0: the sample comes from a normally distributed population

H_1: the sample does not come from a normally distributed population

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 7 Normality Test of Pre-Test

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Class	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PreTest_Score	Experimental Class	.224	15	.042	.875	15	.040
	Controlled Class	.180	15	.200[*]	.930	15	.270

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

d) Decision

If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

(1) Pre-Test of experimental class = because of sign. (0.042) <α (0.05) then H_0 is rejected

(2) Pre-test from controlled class = because sign. (0.200) > α (0.05) then H_0 is accepted

e) Conclusion

The data sample of pre-test from experimental class at MAN 1 Kudus does not come from a normally distributed population. While pre-test from controlled

class at MAN 1 Kudus comes from a
normally distributed population.

3) Homogeneity Test

The Purpose of homogeneity test is to
know whether the data was in homogeneous
variance or not. The steps to acquire the
homogeneity test are as follows:

a) H_0: the data was homogeneous
   H_1: the data was not homogeneous
b) α (alpha) = 0,05
c) Count

Table 4. 8 Homogeneity Test of of Pre-Test

PreTest_Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.628	1	28	.435

ANOVA

PreTest_Score

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	50.700	1	50.700	2.209	.148
Within Groups	642.667	28	22.952		
Total	693.367	29			

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
> If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

Pre-Test between experimental and
controlled classes = because of sign.
(0.148) > α (0.05) then H_0 is accepted

49

e) Conclusion

The pre-test between experimental and controlled classess at MAN 1 Kudus was homogeneous.

c. Students' Post-Test Score

The data presented in this part was the result of post-test in both experimental and controlled class. The score was classified into three categories like in the previous explanation of pre-test score. However, none of the students had low score both in experimental and controlled class. Therefore, all students had fulfilled the standard of minimum completeness of English score and all students' scores were classified into middle and high score.

The number of students who got middle score in experimental class was 4 students (27%) with the lowest was 85 and the number of students who got high score was 11 students (73%) with the highest score was 95. Then, students in controlled class who got score classified into the middle score were 15 students (100%) with the lowest score was 80 and the highest score was 85. Therefore, the students' score distribution was still dominant in the middle score. However, the portion of middle score and high score in the post-test were more balance than in the pre-test. Furthermore, the table showed the mean score of post-test experimental class was 90 and in the controlled class were 84.

The following are the statistic analysis of post-test scores of experimental and controlled class using SPSS 16.0 to get the result of the normality test and homogeneity test:

1) Normality Test

The normality test on the Comparative Hypothesis Test between post-test from experimental and controlled class is to find out whether the sample comes from a normal population or not. The steps for the normality test are as follows:

50

a) H_0: the sample comes from a normally
     distributed population
     H_1: the sample does not come from a
     normally distributed population
b) α (alpha) = 0,05
c) Count

Table 4. 9 Normality Tests of Post-Test

	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PostTest_Score	Experimental Class	.233	15	.027	.823	15	.007
	Controlled Class	.514	15	.000	.413	15	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was
> accepted

(1) Post-Test of experimental class =
      because of sign. (0.027) < α (0.05)
      then H_0 is rejected
(2) Post-Test of controlled class =
      because sign. (0.00) < α (0.05) then
      H_0 is rejected

e) Conclusion
     The data sample of post-test from
     both experimental class and controlled
     class at MAN 1 Kudus does not come from
     a normally distributed population.

2) Homogeneity Test
     The Purpose of homogeneity test is to
     know whether the data was in homogeneous

51

variance or not. The steps to acquire the homogeneity test are as follows:

a) H_0: the data was homogeneous

  H_1: the data was not homogeneous

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 10 Homogeneity Test of of Post-Test

PostTest_Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
4.111	1	28	.052

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
>
> If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

controlled classes = because of sign. (0.052) > α (0.05) then H_0 is accepted

e) Conclusion

The post-test between experimental and controlled classes at MAN 1 Kudus was homogeneous.

d. Paired T-Test

Paired T test in the Comparative Hypothesis Test is to determine whether there is a difference between two variables, post-test of experimental class and post-test from controlled class or not. The Paired T test steps are as follows:

1) H_0: There is no any difference between post-test of experimental class and post-test from controlled class with teaching method

  H_1: There is a difference between post-test of experimental class and post-test from controlled class with teaching method

2) α (alfa) = 0,05
3) Count

Table 4. 11 Paired Samples Statistics of Post-Test

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	POST-TEST XI MIPA 3	90.0000	15	3.77964	.97590
	POST-TEST XI MIPA 4	84.3333	15	1.75933	.45426

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	POST-TEST XI MIPA 3 & POST-TEST XI MIPA 4	15	.000	1.000

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences								Sig. (2-tailed)
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df		
Pair 1	POST-TEST XI MIPA 3 - POST-TEST XI MIPA 4	5.66667	4.16905	1.07644	3.35793	7.97541	5.264	14		.000

4) Decision

> If Sign. $> \alpha$, then H_0 was accepted
> If Sign. $< \alpha$, then H_0 was rejected

Because sign. $(0.000) < \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is rejected

5) Conclusion

There is a difference between post-test of experimental class and post-test from controlled class with teaching method.

e. The Effect of Presentation Method towards Students' Speaking Proficiency

The research data on the effect of presentation method towards students' speaking proficiency of class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus as the experimental class were processed using SPSS with the Associative Hypothesis Test. The first step to determine the effect must be carried out 3 test requirements, namely the normality test, linearity test and homoscedasticity test. Further, the researcher determine the effect by using simple regression analysis. Here, The dependent variable is students' speaking proficiency while the independent variable is presentation method. The following are the explanation.

1) Normality Test

The normality test on the Associative Hypothesis Test (Correlation) between presentation method and students' speaking proficiency is to find out whether the sample comes from a normal population or not. The steps for the normality test are as follows:

a) H_0: the sample comes from a normally distributed population

H_1: the sample does not come from a normally distributed population

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

54

Table 4. 12 Normality Tests of Associative Hypothesis Test

	Presentation Method XI MIPA 3	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3	80	.260	2	.			
	95	.254	6	.200[*]	.866	6	.212

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

b. Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 is constant when Presentation Method XI MIPA 3 = 78. It has been omitted.

c. Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 is constant when Presentation Method XI MIPA 3 = 82. It has been omitted.

d. Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 is constant when Presentation Method XI MIPA 3 = 89. It has been omitted.

e. Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 is constant when Presentation Method XI MIPA 3 = 91. It has been omitted.

f. Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 is constant when Presentation Method XI MIPA 3 = 93. It has been omitted.

d) Decision

| If Sign. $> \alpha$, then H_0 was accepted |
| If Sign. $< \alpha$, then H_0 was rejected |

(1) Presentation Method = because of sign. $(0.2) > \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is accepted
(2) Students' Speaking Proficiency = because sign. $(0.2) > \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is accepted

e) Conclusion

The data sample of presentation method and students' speaking proficiency in class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus are

the samples which come from a normally distributed population.

2) Linearity Test

The linearity test in the Associative Hypothesis Test (Correlation) between presentation method and speaking proficiency is to determine whether the relationship between the two variables is linear or not. The linearity test steps are as follows:

a) H_0: The relationship between variables is linear

H_1: The relationship between variables is not linear

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 13 Linearity Test of Associative Hypothesis Test

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3 * Presentatio n Method XI MIPA 3	Between Groups	(Combined)	116.667	6	19.444	1.867	.203
		Linearity	72.657	1	72.657	6.975	.030
		Deviation from Linearity	44.009	5	8.802	.845	.554
	Within Groups		83.333	8	10.417		
	Total		200.000	14			

d) Decision

If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

Because sign. (0.554)> α (0.05) then H0 is accepted

e) Conclusion

The relationship between the two variables, namely presentation method and speaking proficiency of class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus is linear.

3) Homoscedasticity Test

Homoscedasticity test on the Associative Hypothesis Test (Correlation) between presentation method and speaking proficiency is to find out whether the data is homoscedastic or not. The steps are as follows:

a) H_0: Data is homoscedasticity

H_1: The data are not homoscedastic

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 14 Homoscedasticity test on the Associative Hypothesis Test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.757	1	3.757	1.250	.284[a]
	Residual	39.071	13	3.005		
	Total	42.828	14			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Presentation Method XI MIPA 3

b. Dependent Variable: RES_2

d) Decision

> If Sign. > α, then H_0 was accepted
> If Sign. < α, then H_0 was rejected

Because sign. $(0,284) > \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is accepted

e) Conclusion

Data on presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus is homoscedasticity.

4) Simple Linear Correlation Test

After the 3 requirements (Normality Test, Linearity Test and Homoscedasticity Test) are fulfilled, the next step is to calculate the simple linear correlation test between presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus. The steps are as follows:

a) H_0: There is no positive linear relationship between presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus

H_1: There is a positive linear relationship between presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus

b) α (alpha) = 0,05

c) Count

Table 4. 15 Simple Linear Correlation Test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	72.657	1	72.657	7.417	.017[a]
	Residual	127.343	13	9.796		
	Total	200.000	14			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Presentation Method XI MIPA 3

b. Dependent Variable: Speaking Proficiency XI MIPA 3

d) Decision

If Sign. $> \alpha$, then H_0 was accepted
If Sign. $< \alpha$, then H_0 was rejected

Because sign. (0,017) $< \alpha$ (0.05) then H_0 is rejected

e) Conclusion

There is positive linear relationship between presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus.

f. **Students' Opinion of The Implementation of Presentation Method**

Beside using t-test to investigate the effect of presentation method towards speaking proficiency, the researcher also used questionnaire to get students' opinion of using presentation method on e-learning environment. The questionnaires consisted of six open ended questions. The researcher attempted to ask their feeling and impression during the researcher applied the presentation method in online class. The respondents were the students in experimental class. Then, the result of the questionnaire was presented on appendices pages.

B. **Discussion**
   1. **Presentation Method on E-learning Environment**

Based on the data analysis of presentation method on e-learning environment using SPSS 16.0, it showed the results of One Sample T-Test that sig. 2-tailed of XI MIPA 3 Students' presentations was 0,000 $< \alpha$ (0,05). It showed that mean scores of presentation method on e-learning environment at MAN 1 Kudus were $\neq$ 80. The result stated that the quality of presentation method on e-learning environment at MAN 1 Kudus was good. This is in accordance with their score of presentation method which is assessed by using Brown's speaking assessment theory. There are two aspects to assess oral presentation, there are content and delivery.[1]

---

[1] H. Douglas Brown, *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices* (USA: Pearson Education, 2004), 180.

59

The logistics of presentation which the students made can include:

a. Date for presentation

Date for presentation was about 2 meetings exactly on third and fourth meetings for XI MIPA 3 at IAIN Kudus.

b. Time of day the presentation is to commence (AM or PM). It was 7.00-9.00 AM.

c. Duration, period of time available for the presentation. The group had 15 minutes to present their material through their PowerPoint file which they shared screen.

d. Location

Location is online class by using Google Meet conference. The teacher and the researcher had teamwork to make schedule to meeting and create the google meet link.

e. Style of venue such as auditorium, office, workplace department. Each place of students and teacher.

f. Content and topic identifying: what the presentation is intended to cover, parameters for the presentation, level of detail to be addressed.[2] The students presented the materials about explanation text.

2. Students' Speaking Proficiency

Based on the data analysis of students' speaking post-test using SPSS 16.0, it showed the results of using Simple Paired T-Test that sig. 2 tailed of experimental and controlled classes was $0,000 < α$ $(0,05)$. It showed that there is a difference between post-test of experimental class and post-test from controlled class with teaching method. The result stated that the quality of students' speaking proficiency at MAN 1 Kudus was high because there is a difference between post-test scores of experimental and controlled class.

---

[2] Manual, *Prepare and Deliver a Presentation*, 10.

Based on the statistic analysis, students' speaking proficiency assessed based five categories, they are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.[3] Scores of its all components determined their scores. It made the differences between post-test of experimental and controlled class. As result, speaking proficiency at MAN 1 Kudus was high.

3. The Effect of Presentation Method towards Students' Speaking Proficiency

Based on the data analysis of simple regression analysis to determine the effect of presentation method towards students' speaking proficiency using SPSS 16.0, it showed the results that sign. is $(0,017) < \alpha$ (0.05). the results stated that there is positive linear relationship between presentation method and speaking proficiency for class XI MIPA 3 at MAN 1 Kudus.

In addition, this research also analyzed questionnaire to get students' point of view after doing the presentation performance and speaking test. This was same with the previous study that has been conducted by Rahayu which used reflections on her research in tenth graders at SMAN 1 Tangerang Selatan 2015/2016 academic year to get students' perspective on video-recorder speaking task.[4] This research conduct the questionnaire to get the students' opinion about presentation method on e-learning environment to improve their speaking proficiency. They argued that the presentation method was acceptable and fascinating to practice speaking.

The students also stated that the task helped them to practice speaking, to explore their speaking skill without feeling embarrased, to provide sufficient time to speak, to know their ability in speaking, and to

---

[3] Iwashita et al., "Assessed Levels of Second Language Speaking Proficiency : How Distinct?," 25.

[4] Rahayu, "The Effectiveness of Using Video-Recording Speaking Task on Students' Speaking Skill," 57.

61

express their idea with good arrangement of material to improve their confidence.[5] It can make the students to comprehend new words, best approach to pronounce the words in new experience in learning English, and train their discipline.[6] Further, these positive respond could be additional information why the presentation method on e-learning environment can improve students' speaking proficiency. Students had the opportunities to train speaking outside of class.[7]

On the other hand, the use of presentation method on e-learning environment also had weakness. Most students stated that the task was less effective. Some students also had complain, such as low of internet quota, the problem with their device, less pratice of pronunciation and their low motivation in doing the assignment because of dense of their school assignment.

Finally, the result and students' responds of the presentation method on e-learning environment corresponds to the previous study. The task was actually effective because it drills students' speaking proficiency. However, it also weakness which could be consideration for teacher or facilitator.

---

[5] Wallwork, *English for Presentations at International Conferences Skills*, 1.

[6] Iwashita et al., "Assessed Levels of Second Language Speaking Proficiency : How Distinct?," 25.

[7] Basilaia and Kvavadze, "Transition to Online Education in Schools during a SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic in Georgia," 2.