

# The Use of Edmodo in Teaching Learning English in Non-English Department

Riyatno

Telecommunications Engineering  
Institute of Technology Telkom  
Purwokerto, Indonesia  
[riyatno@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id](mailto:riyatno@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id)

**Abstract**—In line with the development of technology, teaching learning English can be done not only in the class but also outside the class, as if there were no barriers in terms of time and place. It means that both English learners and teachers are flexibly easy to study and to teach. Edmodo was chosen as a medium to teach and to learn General English in the first semester students of Electrical Engineering and Telecommunications Engineering Study Programs, Institute of Technology Telkom Purwokerto. By using Edmodo, I delivered the assignments and the quizzes as well as the materials so that the students could be more discipline because I designed the due date without being worried to be neglected. There were four classes that I handled last semester, namely 1 class from Electrical Engineering and 3 classes from Telecommunications Engineering. The study showed that the average of final score of those classes was 68.19. By looking at the average of final score, I understood that there were some obstacles that I had to overcome for betterment and improvement.

**Keywords:** *Edmodo, development of technology, teaching learning English, General English, non-English department*

## I. INTRODUCTION

English is one of subjects in higher education level that students have to study in order that they are able to finish their study. Meanwhile, teachers have to prepare the materials containing all skills in such a way that the students can learn English successfully. Teaching and learning English needs to be designed not only in the class but also outside the class by using technology.

The problem to teach and to learn English is complicated so that both teacher and students should discuss it. Teacher has to prepare the materials, the strategies, the activities in the class, and the evaluation well. Actually, what the teacher should do to improve students' skills is not only in the class, but also outside the class. The time to English class is only 100 minutes. It means that the teacher has to think deeply in order that the students have the same time to learn. If the number of students is less than 25 per class, each student has enough time to perform the English ability guided by the teacher. The situation will be different if the number of students joining the English class is more than 35 per class. If the situation happens, students have to be active to collaborate with their teacher so that the English class runs well.

The study was an action research that I conducted in Odd Semester, Academic Year 2018/2019. This odd semester was also the change of the curriculum in which the content of the English subject differed from the previous academic year, namely from TOEFL to General English. Consequently, the topics in the teaching learning English were different, as stated in the table 5. For this reason, I tried to use social media to handle the class.

The use of social media, more or less, helps students and teachers handle English class. One of social media I use was Edmodo. According to Asnawi (2015) "advances in ICT and multimedia now allow for a linguistically rich learning environment." Edmodo enables teachers, students, and parents to interact among others. Based on the agreement, the teaching learning process did not include students' parents since they thought that they had been adult so that they tried to manage themselves. Besides, Edmodo has the students do the assignments and submit them on time if they want to get score. In general, students still think that they can submit the assignment late because they also think that they have to fulfill the assignment or test although it has been too late. Discipline is important. That is why I have to design this strategy because students are mostly familiar with gadget.

## II. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The class that I handled was General English. It consisted of 4 classes, namely 1 class of Electrical Engineering (EE) and 3 classes of Telecommunications Engineering (TE). Here were the students that joined with the class.

Table 1 The Class of Electrical Engineering

No.	Students' Number	Name
1.	18107001	Alif Nur Kholiq
2.	18107002	Andrik Rohmatuloh
3.	18107003	Arif Sumaryanto
4.	18107004	Catur Rinix Ragil Saputri
5.	18107005	Deka Ramdan Setiawan
6.	18107006	Fasrianto Manik
7.	18107007	Firdaus Fathurrohman
8.	18107008	Hanin Latif Fuadi
9.	18107009	Hari Setiawan
10.	18107010	Henok Martogap Setiawan Purba
11.	18107011	Izha Yudha Prasetya Kuway
12.	18107012	Janry Adum Rejeki Lumbantoruan

13.	18107013	Lukman Priyambodo
14.	18107014	Lutfi Widiyansyah
15.	18107015	Muhammad Farras Yulianto
16.	18107016	Muhammad Husein Abdillah
17.	18107017	Muhammad Sulthon Rivansyah
18.	18107018	Nezar Febri Alfani
19.	18107019	Nuaim Rifkillah
20.	18107020	Nur Alfian Dion Syahputra
21.	18107021	Octavian Ery Pamungkas
22.	18107022	Raynaldi
23.	18107023	Ridho Bilhaq Hadi Putra
24.	18107024	Teuku Rafli Curaish
25.	18107025	Toni Lasius Sinaga
26.	18107026	Yudhistira Anashuda

Among those students, there was an inactive student, namely Hari Setiawan, that finally resigned from the class because he never came to the class. For this reason, he did not belong to the next table that consisted of the score.

Table 2 The Class A of Telecommunications Engineering Study

No.	Students' Number	Name
1.	17101023	May Riski Wachidiyanti
2.	18101001	Aang Fajar Yulianto
3.	18101002	Ahmad Yusuf Faiz Azmi
4.	18101003	Aldy Febriansyah
5.	18101004	Anandya Saifurrahman
6.	18101005	Annaz Vatica Zahratun Nissa
7.	18101006	Bagas Dwi Wibowo
8.	18101007	Budiman Christian Willy Sianturi
9.	18101008	Dhany Maulana Supriadi
10.	18101009	Dimas Andika Pratama
11.	18101010	Dwi Yogha Setya Nugraha
12.	18101011	Erwin Yuliansyah
13.	18101012	Fauzi Arif Maulana
14.	18101013	Fitriyah
15.	18101014	Hafizul Khair
16.	18101015	Ikbar Saifullah
17.	18101016	Izhanggani
18.	18101017	Kania Rahmanaputri
19.	18101018	Lefi Nur Anggraeni
20.	18101019	Meliena Vanesha S. Hutagalung
21.	18101020	Mohammad Fahmi Mubarak
22.	18101021	Muhammad Khoerul Anam
23.	18101022	Muhammad Naufal Ammar Azi
24.	18101023	Muhammad Sofyan Affandi
25.	18101024	Nareza Ocha Safira
26.	18101025	Nunik Irmawati
27.	18101026	Prima Yogaswara
28.	18101027	Raffika Hanum
29.	18101028	Rendy Patra Julriansyah
30.	18101029	Rifqi Lucky Anggoro
31.	18101030	Rizky Hidayatullah
32.	18101031	Sapitri
33.	18101032	Thirafi Dzaki Fadilla
34.	18101033	Ulfa Fitria
35.	18101034	Wahyu Adji Prakoso
36.	18101035	Yopi Hermawan
37.	18101036	Zahid Zaidi

Among those students in Class A, Wahyu Adji Prakoso was an inactive so that he finally resigned from the class because he never came to the class. For this reason, he did not belong to the next table that consisted of the score.

Table 3 The Class B of Telecommunications Engineering

No.	Students' Number	Name
1.	18101037	Abda Fauzan
2.	18101038	Ahnaf Permata Wijaya
3.	18101039	Alemina Aprilina Br Milala
4.	18101040	Anantha Bayu Suprianto
5.	18101041	Ari Sukarno
6.	18101042	Bagus Burhan
7.	18101043	Chaterine Angelica Dwi Putri
8.	18101044	Dhian Fadillah Dwi Prasetyo
9.	18101045	Dimas Aqil Nurfauzi
10.	18101046	Dyas Dendi Andika
11.	18101047	Fanny Syarifudin
12.	18101048	Febri Arif Setiawan
13.	18101049	Fuad Dhikri Ramadhan
14.	18101050	Hanin Nafi'ah
15.	18101051	Ikhlasul Amal
16.	18101052	Jatmiko Wibisono
17.	18101053	Khafid Syafii Ma'arif
18.	18101054	Levina Anora
19.	18101055	Melliana Tiffani
20.	18101056	Mohammad Maheza Baskara
21.	18101057	Muhammad Akbar Al Fatih
22.	18101058	Muhammad Rafik Syahputra
23.	18101059	Muhammad Yusuf Firmansyah
24.	18101060	Nasir Anansyah
25.	18101061	Nur Azizah
26.	18101062	Puji Maulani
27.	18101063	Rafli Indara Almahhandy
28.	18101064	Reza Fajritama
29.	18101065	Rina Ridara
30.	18101066	Rizky Syafrullah
31.	18101067	Satrio Utomo
32.	18101068	Thobib Khoirul Annas
33.	18101069	Vendianto Bayu Saputra
34.	18101070	Wildan Burhannudin
35.	18101071	Yulia Vironica
36.	18101072	Zaidan Rizqullah

All the students in Class B were active, different from other classes. None of them resigned from the class so that all of them belong to the next table that consisted of the score.

Table 4 The Class C of Telecommunications Engineering

No.	Students' Number	Name
1.	18101073	Aditya Nurcahya
2.	18101074	Aji Pangestu
3.	18101075	Alwin Fauzan
4.	18101076	Aneta Syahputri
5.	18101077	Arya Fikri Alamsyah
6.	18101078	Bahtra Ferdinan Barus
7.	18101079	Deva Ourelia Ayunindya
8.	18101080	Dhuja Handika Yondri Pratama
9.	18101081	Dimas Tantra Eswaryapada
10.	18101082	Egi Akbar Fahlavi
11.	18101083	Farah Dina Oktaviabi
12.	18101084	Feni Widianti
13.	18101085	Garnish Hasna Ifinan APS
14.	18101086	Helmy Fauzan Dwinanto

15.	18101087	Ikwanda Chairil Fitroh
16.	18101088	Jeremi Owen N.Nahampun
17.	18101089	Khelvin Widi Nurfaqih
18.	18101090	Lintang Salsabilla Abdillah
19.	18101091	Miftahul Rohmah
20.	18101092	Muh. Fahmi Faza
21.	18101093	Muhammad Aldi Prayogi
22.	18101094	Muhammad Raul Ramadhan
23.	18101095	Murwanjani Tejo Riyono
24.	18101096	Natasya Nur Khalika
25.	18101097	Nurli Setyo Pambudi
26.	18101098	Puspa Rahmawati
27.	18101099	Rahma Nur Azizah
28.	18101100	Reza Firmansyah
29.	18101101	Rio Anddika
30.	18101102	Rizqi Khairul Mufied
31.	18101103	Seffa Harya Artika
32.	18101104	Thofan Maliyano
33.	18101105	Victory Herawidatama Esa
34.	18101106	Wulan Tarru' Padang
35.	18101107	Yulianto Tri Atmojo
36.	18101108	Zianatul Khoeriyah

In Class C, there were 3 students who did not join the class until the end of the semester. One student, namely Mohammad Aldi Prayogi passed away, and Farah Dina Oktaviabi resigned after Mid Term test, while Khelvin Widi Nurfaqih resigned before Mid Term Test. For this reason, they did not belong to the next table that consisted of the score.

In the first three meetings, I had not used Edmodo to handle the class yet because the students had to prepare it first. Some students had to wait for some weeks in order that they could buy the gadget. It was not fully successful since some students had not succeeded in joining Edmodo.

What I did to handle the class was that the students had to discuss a given topic and the class was divided into groups. Here are the topics that I had arranged for the semester.

Table 5 The Topics

Session	Topic	Sources
1.	Present Tenses	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002.
2.	Past Tenses	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002.
3.	Future Tenses	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002.
4.	Sentence with One Clause	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002. Deborah Philips. <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
5.	Complex Sentence with One Clause	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup></i>

		<i>Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002. Deborah Philips. <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
6.	Complex Sentence with Multiple Clauses	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002. Deborah Philips. <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
7.	Complex Sentence with Multiple Clauses	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002. Deborah Philips. <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
8.	Mid Term Test	
9.	Reading Scientific Writing	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002. Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue. <i>Introduction to Academic Writing 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2007.
10.	Agreement Expressions	Andrew Betsis and Lawrence Mama. <i>Succeed in IELTS</i> . Jakarta: Erlangga.2016
11.	Modal Auxiliaries	Betty Schramper Azar. <i>Understanding and Using English Grammar 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Longman. 2002 Andrew Betsis and Lawrence Mama. <i>Succeed in IELTS</i> . Jakarta: Erlangga.2016
12.	Reading Strategies	Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue. <i>Introduction to Academic Writing 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2007. Deborah Philips <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008 Andrew Betsis and Lawrence Mama. <i>Succeed in IELTS</i> . Jakarta: Erlangga.2016
13.	Summarizing	Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue. <i>Introduction to Academic Writing 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2007. Deborah Philips <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008 Andrew Betsis and Lawrence Mama. <i>Succeed in IELTS</i> . Jakarta: Erlangga.2016

14.	Comparative and Superlative Expressions	Deborah Philips <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
15.	Conditional Sentences	Deborah Philips <i>Preparation Course for TOEFL Test</i> . New York: Pearson Education. 2008
16.	Final Exam	

Based on the topics above, I really understood that the curriculum was still fully influenced by TOEFL since grammatical topics fully colored the topics. Based on agreement among the lecturers and the head of study program, the curriculum should have run and would be reviewed later.

To run teaching learning General English, I divided the class into some groups based on the number of the students in the class in order that each group was able to present the topics. It means that each meeting contains a presentation followed by discussion and all the students have to be active in the discussion by giving questions, comments, and answers as well as suggestions. As the teacher, I made the discussion on the track in line with the sub topics that they were presenting and discussing.

When the class was over, I gave the students the assignments they had to submit in the next meeting. The assignments were given, either individually or in group, in Edmodo and the students understood the due date. I did not ask them to type their assignments using computer because I wanted them not merely to copy and to paste other assignments.

Another scoring to get the students' grade was quiz. There were 4 quizzes held in the fourth, seventh, eleventh, and fourteenth meetings. The duration of each quiz was 15 until 20 minutes, depending on the number of the quiz. The quiz materials were taken from the previous three meetings. The last two scorings, then, were got from Mid Term and Final Exam that had the same percentage since the numbers of materials tested were the same.

As having explained in the first meeting, the scoring of General English was attained from students' attendance (10%), quiz (10%) assignment (20%), Mid Term Test (30%) and Final Test (30%). The scores of General English can be seen in the following.

Table 6 The Final Score of Electrical Engineering

No.	Students' Number	Name	Final Score
1.	18107001	Alif Nur Kholiq	70.64
2.	18107002	Andrik Rohmatuloh	52.09
3.	18107003	Arif Sumaryanto	73.60
4.	18107004	Catur Rinix Ragil Saputri	64.90
5.	18107005	Deka Ramdan Setiawan	47.86
6.	18107006	Fasrianto Manik	41.03
7.	18107007	Firdaus Fathurrohman	50.18
8.	18107008	Hanin Latif Fuadi	68.59
9.	18107010	Henok Martogap S. Purba	57.87
10.	18107011	Izha Yudha Prasetya Kuway	36.00
11.	18107012	Janry A.R. Lumbantoruan	90.51
12.	18107013	Lukman Priyambodo	74.45
13.	18107014	Lutfi Widiyansyah	61.73
14.	18107015	Muhammad Farras Yulianto	71.16
15.	18107016	Muhammad Husein Abdillah	59.21
16.	18107017	Muhammad Sulthon Rivansyah	33.45

17.	18107018	Nezar Febri Alfani	61.84
18.	18107019	Nuaim Rifkillah	73.90
19.	18107020	Nur Alfian Dion Syahputra	57.07
20.	18107021	Octavian Ery Pamungkas	75.08
21.	18107022	Raynaldi	85.06
22.	18107023	Ridho Bilhaq Hadi Putra	74.10
23.	18107024	Teuku Rafli Curaish	20.79
24.	18107025	Toni Lasius Sinaga	42.80
25.	18107026	Yudhistira Anashuda	86.97

Based on the data that were not written here, the average score of attendance was 88.14, that of assignment was 75.97, that of quiz was 66.08, that of mid-term test was 56.66, and that of final exam was 47.29. The average score of Electrical Engineering was 61.24. Compared with other classes, this class was the lowest which got the average score. There were 6 students who contributed the lowest score. Those students had under 80.00 for the attendance score. Although Edmodo could overcome the limitation of the teaching learning time, attendance still had an important role in terms of students' understanding. They, of course, could discuss personally or in group through Edmodo, but they could not understand what they discussed deeply. The topics in the curriculum were discussed comprehensively in the class and the students usually had prepared them well if they were still confused. There were 6 students who got under 50.00 so that they were categorized unsuccessful.

Table 7 The Final Score of Telecommunications Engineering Class A

No.	Students' Number	Name	Final Score
1.	17101023	May Riski Wachidiyanti	75.29
2.	18101001	Aang Fajar Yulianto	65.30
3.	18101002	Ahmad Yusuf Faiz Azmi	72.09
4.	18101003	Aldy Febriansyah	64.74
5.	18101004	Anandya Saifurrahman	78.86
6.	18101005	Annaz Vatica Zahratun Nissa	92.28
7.	18101006	Bagas Dwi Wibowo	65.36
8.	18101007	Budiman Christian W. Sianturi	75.09
9.	18101008	Dhany Maulana Supriadi	61.46
10.	18101009	Dimas Andika Pratama	22.09
11.	18101010	Dwi Yogha Setya Nugraha	54.23
12.	18101011	Erwin Yuliansyah	75.16
13.	18101012	Fauzi Arif Maulana	63.62
14.	18101013	Fitriyah	60.79
15.	18101014	Hafizul Khair	68.80
16.	18101015	Ikbar Saifullah	77.95
17.	18101016	Izhanggani	80.28
18.	18101017	Kania Rahmanaputri	88.54
19.	18101018	Lefi Nur Anggraeni	76.17
20.	18101019	Meliena V. S. Hutagalung	85.77
21.	18101020	Mohammad Fahmi Mubarak	51.40
22.	18101021	Muhammad Khoerul Anam	71.81
23.	18101022	Muhammad Naufal Ammar Azi	85.98
24.	18101023	Muhammad Sofyan Affandi	62.49
25.	18101024	Nareza Ocha Safira	64.26
26.	18101025	Nunik Irmawati	73.70
27.	18101026	Prima Yogaswara	80.15
28.	18101027	Raffika Hanum	61.12
29.	18101028	Rendy Patra Julriansyah	91.75
30.	18101029	Rifqi Lucky Anggoro	69.80
31.	18101030	Rizky Hidayatullah	57.03
32.	18101031	Sapitri	57.62
33.	18101032	Thirafi Dzaki Fadilla	77.87
34.	18101033	Ulfa Fitria	81.36
35.	18101035	Yopi Hermawan	59.46



36.	18101036	Zahid Zaidi	78.27
-----	----------	-------------	-------

Based on the data that were not written here, the average score of attendance was 96.63, that of assignment was 91.26, that of quiz was 82.57, that of mid-term test was 55.29, and that of final exam was 58.21. As a whole, the average score of this class was better than the previous class. There were 2 students who had under 80.00 for the attendance score. Again, the attendance score had a little bit influence to the other score. The average score of Telecommunications Engineering Class A was 70.22. In general, there was 1 student who got under 50.00 so that he was categorized unsuccessful.

Table 8 The Final Score of Telecommunications Engineering Class B

No.	Students' Number	Name	Final Score
1.	18101037	Abda Fauzan	75.29
2.	18101038	Ahnaf Permata Wijaya	65.30
3.	18101039	Alemina Aprilina Br Milala	72.09
4.	18101040	Anantha Bayu Suprianto	64.74
5.	18101041	Ari Sukarno	78.86
6.	18101042	Bagus Burhan	92.28
7.	18101043	Chaterine Angelica Dwi Putri	65.36
8.	18101044	Dhian Fadillah Dwi Prasetyo	75.09
9.	18101045	Dimas Aqil Nurfauzi	61.46
10.	18101046	Dyas Dendi Andika	22.09
11.	18101047	Fanny Syarifudin	54.23
12.	18101048	Febri Arif Setiawan	75.16
13.	18101049	Fuad Dhikri Ramadhan	63.62
14.	18101050	Hanin Nafi'ah	60.79
15.	18101051	Ikhlasul Amal	68.80
16.	18101052	Jatmiko Wibisono	77.95
17.	18101053	Khafid Syafii Ma'arif	80.28
18.	18101054	Levina Anora	88.54
19.	18101055	Melliana Tiffani	76.17
20.	18101056	Mohammad Maheza Baskara	85.77
21.	18101057	Muhammad Akbar Al Fatih	51.40
22.	18101058	Muhammad Rafik Syahputra	71.81
23.	18101059	Muhammad Yusuf Firmansyah	85.98
24.	18101060	Nasir Anansyah	62.49
25.	18101061	Nur Azizah	64.26
26.	18101062	Puji Maulani	73.70
27.	18101063	Rafli Indara Almahhandy	80.15
28.	18101064	Reza Fajritama	61.12
29.	18101065	Rina Ridara	91.75
30.	18101066	Rizky Syafrullah	69.80
31.	18101067	Satrio Utomo	57.03
32.	18101068	Thobib Khoirul Annas	57.62
33.	18101069	Vendianto Bayu Saputra	77.87
34.	18101070	Wildan Burhannudin	81.36
35.	18101071	Yulia Vironica	5.00
36.	18101072	Zaidan Rizqullah	59.46

Based on the unpublished data here, the average score of attendance was 97.22, that of assignment was 91.74, that of quiz was 73.43, that of mid-term test was 60.86, and that of final exam was 48.24. As a whole, the average score of this class was less than the previous class. There was 1 student who had under 80.00 for the attendance score. The average score of Telecommunications Engineering Class B was 68.14. There was no student who got under 50.00 so that they were categorized successful.

Table 9 The Final Score of Telecommunications Engineering Class C

No.	Students' Number	Name	Final Score
1.	18101073	Aditya Nurcahya	77.38
2.	18101074	Aji Pangestu	72.05
3.	18101075	Alwin Fauzan	77.08
4.	18101076	Aneta Syahputri	68.43
5.	18101077	Arya Fikri Alamsyah	53.70
6.	18101078	Bahtra Ferdinan Barus	78.18
7.	18101079	Deva Ourelia Ayunindya	77.58
8.	18101080	Dhuja Handika Yondri Pratama	92.10
9.	18101081	Dimas Tantra Esuaryapada	53.24
10.	18101082	Egi Akbar Fahlavi	68.35
11.	18101084	Feni Widiati	76.15
12.	18101085	Garnish Hasna Iftinan APS	66.89
13.	18101086	Helmy Fauzan Dwinanto	51.55
14.	18101087	Ikwanda Chairil Fitroh	84.90
15.	18101088	Jeremi Owen N.Nahampun	76.79
16.	18101090	Lintang Salsabilla Abdillah	89.33
17.	18101091	Miftakul Rohmah	91.45
18.	18101092	Muh. Fahmi Faza	72.40
19.	18101094	Muhammad Raul Ramadhan	63.70
20.	18101095	Murwanjani Tejo Riyono	85.18
21.	18101096	Natasya Nur Khalika	78.30
22.	18101097	Nurli Setyo Pambudi	55.09
23.	18101098	Puspa Rahmawati	78.68
24.	18101099	Rahma Nur Azizah	54.97
25.	18101100	Reza Firmansyah	67.15
26.	18101101	Rio Anddika	50.05
27.	18101102	Rizqi Khairul Mufied	81.00
28.	18101103	Seffa Harya Artika	93.15
29.	18101104	Thofan Maliyano	84.80
30.	18101105	Victory Herawidatama Esa	74.83
31.	18101106	Wulan Tarru' Padang	61.95
32.	18101107	Yulianto Tri Atmojo	63.63
33.	18101108	Zianatul Khoeriyah	94.20

Based on the unpublished data here, the average score of attendance was 98.70, that of assignment was 88.57, that of quiz was 75.28, that of mid-term test was 68.17, and that of final exam was 58.65. As a whole, the average score of this class was the highest among other classes. There was 1 student who had under 80.00 for the attendance score. The average score of Telecommunications Engineering Class C was 73.16. There was no student who got under 50.00 so that they were categorized successful.

### III. CONCLUSION

The use of social media, in this case Edmodo, was helpful for both the teacher and the students since they could teach and learn English although they were outside the class. The interaction between teacher and students was not only in the class but also outside the class. The confusing materials could be discussed later together in group or personally between the teacher and the student. They had enough time because they could manage their own time without disturbing other activities. Besides, they felt enjoyable while doing their English activity.

The study showed that the average of final score of those classes was 68.19. By looking at the average of final score, I understood that there were some obstacles that I had to overcome for betterment and improvement. Some students still

neglected the due date so that they could not submit their assignments because Edmodo had been locked. Some students did not attend the class regularly so that they could not fully understand what they had to do. Discipline is important to be successful.

- [5] Richard P. Amato, *Making It Happen, Interaction in the Second Language Classroom: From Theory to Practice*, New York: Longman, 1998.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Asnawi, "The Effects of Immersive Multimedia Learning with Peer Support on Speaking Skill among Male and Female Students," 2015, Retrieved March 29, 2019 from <http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/SiELE/article/view/2694>.
- [2] E.A. Diyyab, E.M. Abdel-Haq, and M.A.S Aly, "Using Multimedia-Based Programs for Developing Student Teachers' EFL Speaking Fluency Skills," 2013, Retrieved March 31, 2019 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539987.pdf>
- [3] Jeremy Halmer, *How to Teach English: An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching*, Harlow: Longman, 1998.
- [4] Jeremy Halmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Harlow: Longman, 1998.