The analysis of the third-year students' speaking performance in classroom presentation of English Education Department at UIN Alauddin Makassar

Dewi Sahruni[1], Serliah Nur[2], Multazam Abubakar[3]

[1,2,3] English Education Department, UIN Alauddin Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Contact: Dewi Sahruni   ✉ dwsahruni@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The oral presentation is part of speaking as performance, and the ability of it is needed by students because it will be very useful during study and career periods. This research aimed at analyzing the third-year students' speaking as performance in classroom presentations. The method used was descriptive research with a qualitative approach, and the subjects consisted of 15 students who were third-year students at the English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar in the academic year 2022/2023. The research instruments used in this study was observation, and the observation guidelines were adopted from Ewen (2006). The result of this study was that the third-year students at the English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar in the academic year 2022/2023 had low proficiency of speaking as performance in classroom presentation. This indicated that students' ability to master the material and deliver it to the audience were still lacking. Based on the findings of this study, the researchers concluded that the aspect of "delivery" was more challenging than the aspect of "content". The implication of this study is that the findings can serve as a reference regarding the extent of students' presentation skills, and it can help address their weaknesses so they can improve their presentation abilities in the future.

KEYWORDS:
Speaking performance;
Classroom presentation;
Aspect of content;
Aspect of delivery

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the essential skills in language, thus it holds significant importance to develop proficiency in oral communication (Nurmamatovich & Dushayevna, 2021). Speaking is a productive aural and oral skill (Rangkuti et al., 2022). Speaking can be categorized as an action, speech, or discourse from the person who is speaking to convey or ask for some information (Lubis & Siregar, 2021). Thus, it can be concluded that speaking is a form of

communication. Moreover, communication is divided into verbal and nonverbal communication (Ezeh et al., 2021). Two participants are included in communicative situation, namely the speaker and listener (Ahmada & Munawaroh, 2022). Based on those opinions, the researchers assumed that speaking is a process of conveying information between speaker and listener using verbal and non-verbal symbols among people in social life due to speaking skill is very important.

Speaking is considered the most important skill to master when compared to the other three main skills in learning a foreign or other languages (Rao, 2019) because the point of success in learning a foreign language is expected to be able to speak that language (Rangkuti et al., 2022). Besides, in communicating with others, everybody uses speaking skills in exchanging information. This is in line with Q.S. Ar-Rum verse 22:

$$\text{وَمِنْ اٰيٰتِهٖ خَلْقُ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ وَاخْتِلَافُ اَلْسِنَتِكُمْ وَاَلْوَانِكُمّْ اِنَّ فِيْ ذٰلِكَ لَاٰيٰتٍ لِّلْعٰلِمِيْنَ ٢٢}$$

Translation:

22. And among His Signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the variations in your languages and your colours: verily in that are Signs for those who know (Ali, 2001).

Based on the interpretation by Shihab (2002) states that one of the meanings of this verse is that we can recognize the signs of Allah's power through observing the diversity of languages, dialects, and intonations. According to this verse, we can understand that there are so many languages in the world, so it is important for us to learn foreign languages in order to communicate with others.

In everyday life, speaking based on its function is divided into three main functions, namely speaking as interaction, transaction, and performance (Richards, 2008). Speaking as performance is the ability to deliver information to the audience in a formal manner, such as making speeches and oral presentations (Kaharuddin et al., 2018). Therefore, speaking as performance tends to take the form of monologues rather than dialogues, and the language used is not conversational but closer to written language (Richards, 2008). Monologue can be said as a communication process that involves the speaker in conveying information to the listeners or the audience (Kamaliah et al., 2018).

The oral presentation is part of speaking as performance, and it is useful for conveying ideas and information to the audience. An oral presentation is usually done in a room, and it can be done in groups or individually. The ability to make presentations is needed by students because it will be very useful during study and career periods. It is supported by Kittiyano (Thaipattana) & Siabthaisong (2021), the ability to make oral presentations in public is an important skill and competency in a variety of careers.

Hadi & Fauziah (2018) state that communication is generally divided into two types: verbal communication, which involves using language, and nonverbal communication, which involves using symbols, gestures, and body language. It can be seen that two things must be considered in making a presentation, the first is what the presenter conveys or is referred to as content, and the second is how to deliver the content or is referred to as delivery.

The main purpose of an oral presentation or making a presentation in a classroom is that the audience can understand what the speaker is saying. In addition, a speaker must be able to convey it formally because it is academic speaking. Therefore, it is necessary to use formal language and avoid colloquial words and expressions (Santoso & Taufiq, 2020).

Based on the curriculum at UIN Alauddin Makassar, there are three courses regarding speaking. The first semester is speaking for general communication for as many as 2 credits, the second semester is speaking in professional contexts for as many as 2 credits, and the

third semester is speaking for academic purposes for as many as 3 credits. After students pass 3 semesters to study speaking courses, students are expected to be able to speak well. Especially in the speaking for academic purposes course, students are not only expected to be able to speak well in general but can speak in an academic context.

Based on the preliminary research carried out in May 2022 regarding the presentation performance of the third-year students of English Education Department, the researchers drew conclusion that there were still students who had not been able to make presentations properly as they should. Several students only read the slides that they displayed, did not fully use English, made presentations only as a form of formality to fulfill assignments, did not use appropriate intonation, did not use good eye contact with the audience therefore the speaker did not deliver the material well so that the audiences felt bored and did not get precise information. This was certainly not in line with the educational background and experience of students who had completed many presentation tasks while their presentation skills were still lacking.

This showed that not all English students, after several lessons, can communicate correctly, formally, and fluently. Therefore, with such a phenomenon, the researchers thought that it was necessary to conduct this research to find out more in-depth information regarding the speaking as performance of the third-year students of English Education in the classroom presentation at UIN Alauddin Makassar. By bringing up this topic, the researchers hoped that students can take lessons therefore that can have a good effect, such as encouraging optimality in students' speaking as performance in classroom presentations.

METHOD

In conducting this research, the researchers used descriptive research with a qualitative approach. The researchers selected a qualitative approach because qualitative research results were more in-depth than a quantitative approach. This was supported by Sidiq & Choiri (2019) that qualitative research can be defined as research that aims to understand the phenomena experienced by research subjects and research that produces findings that cannot be achieved using statistical procedures or quantitative methods.

The subject of this research was the third-year students of English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar. It was located at Jl. H.M. Yasin Limpo No. 36 Romangpolong, Somba Opu, Gowa, South Sulawesi. Gay & Diehl (1992) states that the minimum acceptable sample size for descriptive research is 10% of the population, and ideally it is as large as it could be. Based on the explanation above, the sample participated in this research were 15 students out of the total population of 90 students.

This research used a simple random sampling technique. Simple random sampling can be defined that there is an equal chance of being selected for each element of the entire population (Hardani et al., 2020). A simple random sampling technique used because the researchers did not specify specific criteria for the sample in this study therefore that individuals had the same opportunity to be selected as the sample. Besides, members were also considered homogeneous. This is in line with the statement by Rawung (2020) states that simple random sampling is a fairly easy method and is commonly used in populations that contain relatively homogeneous unit characteristics.

A research Instrument is designed to collect data (Hutasoit & Tambunan, 2018). The instrument also functioned to examine and investigate a problem being researched therefore that the existence of the instrument was considered very important (Sidiq & Choiri, 2019). In qualitative research, the researcher collect data commonly used observation, interview, field

notes and analytical memos, document elicitation, personal experience, and participation in follow-up studies (Harahap, 2020). In this research, to obtain valid data, the researchers used observation.

Observation is a process of seeing, observing as well as "recording" behavior systematically to be used in providing a conclusion or diagnosis (Sidiq & Choiri, 2019). Therefore, observation was one of the instruments chosen by the researchers to collect information about students' speaking as performance in a classroom presentation. In data collection, observation can be divided into participant observation, namely observers participating in ongoing activities, and non-participant observation, namely, observers only play a role in observing activities or not participating in activities (Hardani et al., 2020). Furthermore, in terms of the instrumentation used, observation is divided into two, namely structured and unstructured observation. Structured observation is the researcher knows with certainty about what would be observed, and when and where the variables will be observed. In addition, the researcher also uses research instruments that have been tested for validity and reliability. While the unstructured observation is the researcher does not know for sure what variables will be observed so he is not prepared systematically about what will be observed, therefore the researcher is only guided by the observation signs (Sukendra & Atmaja, 2020). In line with that explanation, the observation used by the researchers in this study was non-participant observation, and the instrument used was structured observation. Observation completed with an observation sheet that had been prepared in advance consisting of the name of the researchers, research title, time, place, and rubric for the assessment.

Tools of data collecting used in this research is rubric and video recorder. The researchers applied a scoring rubric that adapted from Ewen (2006) to assess the assessment of component of content and component of delivery.

Table 1. Rubric for the Assessment of Content

Indicators of Effective Content	Levels of Achievement			
	Beginning (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Competent (3 points)	Accomplished (4 points)
Introduction: gains attention, connects to topic, establishes credibility	No attention getting strategy was evident. No clear or relevant connection to the topic or speech purpose. No credibility was established.	Use of attention getting strategy but did not seem to adequately capture audience attention and/ or lead to the desired outcome. Credibility was implied.	An effective strategy to capture listeners' attention. Adequate introduction of the topic. Credibility was established by the speaker.	Creative attention getting strategy captures listeners' attention to introduce the topic. It is relevant to the topic and clearly gains the desired response from the audience. Credibility was established by the speaker.
Thesis Statement: explicit, identifies topic, previews main points	No thesis statement. The main points are not clearly identified, the audience is unsure of the direction of the message.	A thesis is implied, although not explicitly stated. The topic is clearly identified, but the main points are not clearly previewed.	The thesis statement identifies the topic and lists/previews the main points.	The speaker clearly stated a well-formulated thesis statement during the speech introduction. The thesis statement identifies the topic and lists/previews the main points.

Connection to Audience: needs & interest, demonstrates an understanding	The topic seems irrelevant to the audience's needs and interests. No attempt was made to connect a topic to the audience.	The topic seems somewhat relevant to the audience. A vague reference to audience needs and or interests. Identifies target audience.	Clearly stated the relevance of the topic to audience needs and interests. Expresses an understanding of their target audience.	The connection of the topic to the audience's needs and interests is stated with sophistication. Identifies and expresses a deep understanding of their target audience.
Subject Knowledge: depth of content, relevant support, clear explanation	Provides irrelevant or no support. The explanation of concepts is inaccurate or incomplete.	Provides some support for main points, but needed to elaborate further with explanations, examples, descriptions, etc. Support is relevant, but not timely.	The main points are adequately substantiated with timely, relevant, and sufficient support. Accurate explanation of key concepts.	Depth of content reflects thorough understanding of the topic. The main points are well supported with timely, relevant, and sufficient support. Provided precise explanations of key concepts.
Organization: main points distinct from support, transitions, coherence	Lack of structure. Ideas are not coherent. No transitions. Difficult to identify the introduction, body, and conclusion.	The general structure/ organization seems adequate. The difference between the main points and supporting details is blurred. Logical flow, but no clear signposts for transitions.	Clear organizational pattern. The main points are distinct from the supporting details. Smooth transitions differentiate key points.	Effective organization is well suited to the purpose. The main points are clearly distinct from the supporting details. Graceful transitions create coherent progress toward a conclusion.

Table 2. Rubric for the Assessment of Delivery

Indicators of Effective Delivery	Levels of Achievement			
	Beginning (1 point)	**Developing (2 points)**	**Competent (3 points)**	**Accomplished (4 points)**
Eye Contact: establish rapport; expand the zone of interaction	Read speech from notes/ manuscript. Avoids eye contact with the audience.	Conspicuous use of speaker notes. Only occasional sporadic glances at the audience.	Eye contact establishes rapport with the audience. Unobtrusive use of speaker notes. Scanning of the audience to establish a zone of interaction.	Consistently uses eye contact to maintain rapport with the audience. Inconspicuous use of speaker notes. Effective use of scanning to expand the zone of interaction.
Movement: expressive, comfortable, enhances message	Body language is not supportive of the message, may contradict it. Gestures, facial expressions, and posture are stiff or distracting.	Body language is a minimal support of the verbal message. Gestures, facial expressions, and posture reflect the speaker's discomfort that occasionally interferes with the message.	Body language is an adequate support of the message. Movement and gestures clarify key points. Facial expressions and posture seem comfortable.	Gestures, facial expressions, and posture reinforce and enhance the verbal message. Body language is expressive, dynamic, natural, and comfortable.

Voice: rate, pitch, volume, and tone are natural and authentic	Fails to maintain audience interest and support the verbal message due to excessive monotone, inappropriate rate, and volume. The pitch may be strained or flat.	Inconsistent use of voice to support message. Monotone passages interfere with audience interest. The rate may be too fast or slow; volume too high or low. The pitch is strained at times, too artificial, or too nervous.	Tone fits verbal message, changing for emphasis at appropriate moments. Rate and volume allow the audience to follow the message. The pitch seems natural to the speaker.	Tone is authentic and appropriate to the topic. Rate, pitch, and volume vary at key points to support the verbal message and keep audience interest. Voice is natural to the speaker and topic, talking with rather than at the audience.
Fluency: pronunciation, enunciation, and articulation are smooth; lack of fillers	Incoherent presentation due to many factors that undermine fluency including poor pronunciation. Long pauses interrupt the flow of speech. Excessive use of vocalized fillers distracts the audience.	Pronunciation is mostly correct yet enunciation and articulation are still tentative. Speaker recovers from awkward pauses and proceeds. Vocalized fillers are noticeable but not excessive.	Careful pronunciation supports coherence of presentation. Enunciation and articulation of words are mostly clear. Pauses were momentary and did not interrupt fluency of speech. Vocalized fillers are minimal and do not distract the audience.	Coherence of presentation is strongly supported by correct pronunciation, confident enunciation, and articulation. Pauses are purposeful and enhance the fluency of speech. Virtually no vocalized fillers are noticeable.

Adopted from Ewen (2006)

Calculating the score for each student based on the average analysis,

Table 3. The Average Analysis

Qualification	Description	Range Score
High	Always or almost always used	2.6 – 3.0 ≥
Moderate	Usually used	2.1 – 2.5
Low	Sometimes used	≤ 1.5 – 2.0

Adopted from Naimie & Naimie (2007)

        Data collection carried out through in-class activities by observing 15 students who were making presentations to find out how far their speaking as performance skills were. The researchers in collecting the data applied several steps. 1) the researchers found out about courses that give individual presentation assignments to English Education students. 2) then asked for permission and consulted with the lecturer concerned to be allowed to conduct research in the lecturer's class. 3) the researchers observed all of the students' classroom presentation activities. In this case, the researchers took pictures and videos of students as documentations to make it easier for the researchers. 4) then, the researchers identified the data collected. It was done to find out the ability of students' presentations. 5) the last, the researchers made results and conclusions from the research that had been carried out to explain clear information about the extent of the students' speaking as performance in classroom presentation.

RESULT

The findings were obtained after conducting this research in class through observation when students made presentations which were conducted on April 6th – May 25th, 2023. These research findings relate to the results of data analysis of the level of students' speaking as performance in class presentations.

Table 4. Result Aspect Analysis of the Content

Students	Aspect of Content Analysis					
	Introduction	Thesis Statement	Connection to Audience	Subject Knowledge	Organization	
01	3	2	3	3	2	
02	1	2	2	2	2	
03	2	2	2	3	3	
04	1	2	2	2	2	
05	2	2	2	2	2	
06	2	2	2	2	2	Total
07	2	2	2	2	3	
08	1	1	2	2	2	
09	3	2	2	3	2	
10	2	2	2	2	1	
11	1	2	2	2	2	
12	1	2	2	2	3	
13	1	1	2	1	1	
14	3	2	2	2	3	
15	2	2	2	2	3	
Total	27	28	31	32	33	**151**
Mean	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.2	**30.3**
Qualification	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	

Based on table 4 above, there were 5 aspects analysis in assessment of "Content". Aspect 1 was introduction, the total scoring in this aspect was 27 score with the mean score 1.8, it was indicated that the students did not used strategy to get the audience's attention, and can be qualified to Low frequency. Aspect 2 was thesis statement, the total scoring in this aspect was 28 score with the mean score 1.9, it was indicated that the students were not able to identify topic and list main points, and can be qualified to Low frequency. Aspect 3 was connection to audience, the total scoring in this aspect was 31 score with the mean score 2.1, it was indicated that the students were able connect the topic to the audiences, and can be qualified to Moderate frequency. Aspect 4 was subject knowledge, the total scoring in this aspect is 32 score with the mean score 2.1, it was indicated that the students were able to explain the main points accurately, and can be qualified to Moderate frequency. The last aspect 5 was organization, the total scoring in this aspect was 33 score with the mean score 2.2, it was indicated that the dominant students were able to explain with smooth transitions differentiate key points, and can be qualified to Moderate frequency. The total score in assessment of content was 151 score.

Table 5. Result Aspect Analysis of the Delivery

Students	Aspect of Delivery Analysis				
	Eye Contact	Movement	Voice	Fluency	
01	3	3	3	3	
02	1	1	1	2	
03	2	2	2	2	
04	2	2	2	2	
05	2	1	1	2	
06	1	1	1	1	
07	1	1	2	2	Total
08	2	1	1	1	
09	2	2	2	1	
10	2	1	1	1	
11	1	1	1	2	
12	1	2	1	2	
13	1	1	1	1	
14	3	3	2	3	
15	2	1	1	1	
Total	26	23	22	26	97
Mean	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.7	24
Qualification	Low	Low	Low	Low	

Based on table 5 above, there were 4 aspects analysis in assessment of "Delivery". Aspect 1 was eye contact, the total scoring in this aspect was 26 score with the mean score 1.7, it was indicated that the dominant students were not able to establish eye contact rapport with the audience, and can be qualified to Low frequency. Aspect 2 was movement, the total scoring in this aspect was 23 with the mean score 1.5, it was indicated that the students did not used body language to support the message, and can be qualified to Low frequency. Aspect 3 was voice, the total scoring of this aspect was 22 with the mean score 1.5, it was indicated that the students were not able to speech with rate, pitch, volume, natural tone and authentic tone that allow the audience to follow the message, and can be qualified to Low frequency. Aspect 4 was fluency, the total scoring in this aspect was 26 with the mean score 1.7, it was indicated that the pronunciation, enunciation, and articulation of the dominant students were not fluent and used many fillers, and it can be qualified to Low frequency. The total score in assessment of delivery was 97 score.

Based on two table above, the mean score of aspects analysis content was 30.3 while the mean score of aspects delivery was 24. It means that to deliver the content to audience was more difficult than content itself.

Table 6. Students' Speaking as Performance Qualification in Classroom Presentations

Students	Content	Delivery	Mean	Qualification
Student 1	2.6	3	2.8	High
Student 2	1.8	1.25	1.5	Low
Student 3	2.4	2	2.2	Moderate
Student 4	1.8	2	1.9	Low
Student 5	2	1.5	1.8	Low
Student 6	2	1	1.5	Low
Student 7	2.2	1.5	1.9	Low
Student 8	1.6	1.25	1.4	Low

Student 9	2.4	1.75	2.1	Moderate
Student 10	1.8	1.25	1.5	Low
Student 11	1.8	1.25	1.5	Low
Student 12	2	1.5	1.8	Low
Student 13	1.2	1	1.1	Low
Student 14	2.4	2.75	2.6	High
Student 15	2.2	1.25	1.7	Low

Based on table 6 above, it can be seen that the presentation ability of student 1 and 14 were in high level, because the mean score of their "content" and "delivery" were high. The presentation ability of student 3 and 9 were in moderate level, because the mean score of their "content" and "delivery" were moderate. While the presentation ability of student 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 were in low level, because the mean score of their "content" and "delivery" were low. The general result of this research was showed in the following table.

Table 7. Result of Students' Speaking as Performance in Classroom Presentations

Number of Students	Percentage	Qualification
2	13.33	High
2	13.33	Moderate
11	73.33	Low

Based on the presented data in table 7, the results were as follows, 2 students (13.33%) were indicated in "high" level, 2 students (13.33%) were indicated in "moderate" level, and 11 students (73.33%) were indicated in "low" level.

DISCUSSION

This research conducted based on students' presentation issues faced by students of English Education Department intake 2020 at UIN Alauddin Makassar. The descriptive qualitative method was used to determine the results of this study with the support of an instruments, namely observation, and it was collected in a classroom when the students did presentation. The total numbers of respondents were 15 students, consisting of 2 male students and 13 female students.

Based on the result of data analysis, there were 2 students (13.33%) in high level, which means that the students were good to apply aspect of content and aspect of delivery in their presentation. There were 2 students (13.33%) in moderate level, which means that the students were fairly good to apply the aspect of content and aspect of delivery in their presentation. There were 11 students (73.33%) in low level, which means that the dominant students who were weak to apply aspect of content and aspect of delivery in their presentation. The finding revealed that the level of students' presentation in low level dominantly, it contradicts with the previous studies by Aminullah et al. (2015) that the third semester students of English Education Study Program of FKIP Untan Pontianak in academic year 2014/ 2015 especially the students who were in Class B of Speaking for Academic Presentation have moderate abilities of speaking as performance in giving presentation, and Fujiani (2019) whose research also shows that the fourth semester students of English Study

Program at University Bengkulu in academic year 2018/2019 have presentation ability in moderate level.

Based on the observation, from the result of assessment content, first it can be seen that the students had moderate level in aspect of organization, subject knowledge, and aspect of connection to audience. The second, it can be seen that the students had low level in aspect thesis statement and introduction. Meanwhile, from the result of assessment delivery, it can be seen that all of the aspects namely eye contact, fluency, movement, and voice were in low level. If the aspects of presentation are sorted by ranking, it can be seen that the highest ranking is in organization aspect with mean 2.2 (total 33 points) and were in moderate proficiency. It was indicated that the dominant students were able to explain with smooth transitions differentiate key points, and could manage the structure of the presentation. But some of the students did not clearly use the transition signal. There were 5 students with competent level, 8 students with developing level, and 2 students with beginning level.

The second, aspect of subject knowledge with mean 2.1 (total 32 points) and were in moderate proficiency. It was indicated that some the students were able to explain the main points accurately. There were 3 students with competent level, 11 students with developing level, and 1 student with beginning level.

The third, aspect of connection to audience with mean 2.1 (total 31 points) and were in moderate proficiency. It was indicated that the students were able connect the topic to the audiences. There were 1 student with competent level, and 14 students with developing level.

The fourth, aspect of thesis statement with mean 1.9 (total 28 points) and were in low proficiency. It was indicated that the students were not able to identify topic and list main points. There were 13 students with developing level, and 2 students with beginning level.

The fifth, aspect of introduction with mean 1.8 (total 27 points) and were in low proficiency. It was indicated that the students did not used strategy to get the audience's attention. There were 3 students with competent level, 6 students with developing level, and 6 students with beginning level.

The sixth, aspects of eye contact and fluency with each mean 1.7 (total 26 points) and were in low proficiency. In aspect of eye contact, it was indicated that the dominant students were not able to establish eye contact rapport with the audience. While in aspect of fluency, it was indicated that the pronunciation, enunciation, and articulation of the dominant students were not fluent and used many fillers. In each aspect, there were 2 students with competent level, 7 students with developing level, and 6 students with beginning level.

The seventh, aspect of movement with mean 1.5 (total 23 points) and were in low proficiency. It was indicated that the dominant students did not used body language to support the message. There were 2 students with competent level, 4 students with developing level, and 9 students with beginning level.

The eighth, aspect of voice with mean 1.5 (total 22 points) and were in low proficiency. It was indicated that the students were not able to speech with rate, pitch, volume, natural tone and authentic tone that allow the audience to follow the message. There were 1 student with competent level, 5 students with developing level, and 9 students with beginning level.

CONCLUSION

The researchers have done all the processes of the research. The conclusion of this research is about whether the students have high, moderate or low abilities in using effective content and delivery aspect while giving presentation. In reference to the research finding, it can be

concluded that the third-year students of English Education Department UIN Alauddin Makassar in academic year 2022/2023 had low proficiency of speaking as performance in classroom presentation. This indicates that students' ability to master the material and deliver it to the audience are still lacking. Based on the findings of this study, the researcher can conclude that the aspect of "delivery" is more challenging than the aspect of "content".

Based on the result of this research, there are some recommendations suggested by researchers, they are: (1) For students, the researchers suggest using the findings of this study as a reference to assess the extent of their presentation skills and improve areas that are lacking. (2) For the lecturer, considering the importance of the content and delivery aspects in developing students' presentation skill in front of audience, the researcher suggests lecturers to find out teaching techniques that suitable with students' needs, to maintain the good of aspects and to improve the weak of aspects. () For further researchers, the findings of this study can serve as a reference to understand aspects related to students' presentation skills in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Ahmada, A., & Munawaroh, L. (2022). The Use of Role Play Method to Improve Speaking Skills. *Darussalam English Journal*, *2*(1), 55–82. https://doi.org/10.30739/dej.v2i1.1506

Ali, A. Y. (2001). *The Holy Qur'an Translation & Commentary*. Islamic Vision Ltd. https://archive.org/details/quran-english-translation-and-commentary-by-yusuf-ali

Aminullah, F., Apriliaswati, R., & Arifin, Z. (2015). An Analysis on the Students' Speaking Performance in Giving Presentation. *Jurnal.Untan.Ac.Id*, *4*(9), 1–14. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v4i9.11515

Ewen, K. (2006). *TVCAFinals* (pp. 1–2). https://valenciacollege.edu/academics/academic-affairs/learning-assessment/learning-outcomes-assessment/documents/TVCAFinals.pdf

Ezeh, N. G., Anidi, O. C., & Nwokolo, B. O. (2021). Body Language as A Communicative Aid amongst Language Impaired Students: Managing Disabilities. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, *14*(6), 125–134. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p125

Fujiani, S. (2019). *An Analysis of the Fourth Semester Students' Presentation Abilities in the Speaking for Presentation Course* [University Bengkulu]. http://repository.unib.ac.id/21387/

Gay, L. R., & Diehl, P. L. (1992). *Research Methods for Business and Management*. MacMillan Publishing Company.

Hadi, R., & Fauziah. (2018). *Komunikasi Bisnis: Buku Ajar*. CV. Aswaja Presindo. http://eprints.ulm.ac.id/id/eprint/9761

Harahap, N. (2020). *Penelitian Kualitatif* (H. Sazali (ed.); 1st ed.). Wal Ashri Publishing.

Hardani, Andriani, H., Ustiawaty, J., Utami, E. F., Istiqomah, R. R., Fardani, R. A., Sukmana, D. J., & Auliya, N. H. (2020). *Buku Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif* (H. Abadi (ed.); 1st ed.). CV. Pustaka Ilmu Group. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340021548_Buku_Metode_Penelitian_Kualitatif_Kuantitatif

Hutasoit, R., & Tambunan, B. (2018). The Effect of Ice Breaking Technique in Teaching Speaking at the Tenth Grade Students of SMK Dharma Bhakti Siborongborong in Academic Year 2018/2019. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, *3*(5), 700–705. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n1p277

Kaharuddin, A., Arafah, B., & Latif, I. (2018). *Discourse Analysis For English Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Kamaliah, N., Kasim, U., & Azis, Z. A. (2018). Use of the Three-Step Interview Technique in Teaching ESL Speaking. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, *9*(1), 82–101. https://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/11512

Kittiyano (Thaipattana), P. N., & Siabthaisong, W. (2021). English Oral Presentation for Bachelor of Arts of the Four Year International Student at MCU Chiang Mai Campus Thailand. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, *6*(1), 18–35. https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v6i1.5150

Lubis, R. U., & Siregar, I. K. (2021). Improving Students' Speaking Skill Through Debate. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, *2*(1), 1–8.

Naimie, Z., & Naimie, A. (2007). *Field Dependent Students Language Learning Strategies Preference*. http://eprints.um.edu.my/888/1/FP053__ZahraN_Akram_N_Field_Dep%0Aendent_Students_Language_Learning_Strategies_Preference.pdf

Nurmamatovich, J. Z., & Dushayevna, O. G. (2021). Some Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Ability and Teaching Speaking through Debate. *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)*, *2*(4), 269–271.

Rangkuti, L. A., Sihite, M. R., & Jatra. (2022). The Effect of Gallery Walk Technique towards Students' Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language and Education*, *7*(1), 123–129. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v7i1.260

Rao, P. S. (2019). The Importance of Speaking Skills in English Classrooms. *Alford Council of Interantional English & Literature Journal(ACIELJ)*, *2*(2), 6–18. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334283040%0ATHE

Rawung, D. T. (2020). *Metode Penarikan Sampel*. Pusat Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Badan Pusat Statistik RI (PUSDIKLAT BPS RI).

Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking From Theory to Practice* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://repository.bbg.ac.id/handle/623

Santoso, D. R., & Taufiq, W. (2020). *Buku Ajar Speaking For Academic Purposes* (V. Mandarani (ed.); 1st ed.). UMSIDA Press.

Shihab, M. Q. (2002). *Tafsir Al-Mishbah: Pesan, Kesan dan Keserasian Al-Qur'an*. Lentera Hati.

Sidiq, U., & Choiri, M. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif di Bidang Pendidikan* (A. Mujahidin (ed.); 1st ed.). CV. Nata Karya. http://repository.iainponorogo.ac.id/484/

Sukendra, I. K., & Atmaja, I. K. S. (2020). *Instrumen penelitian* (T. Fiktorius (ed.)). Mahameru Press. http://repo.mahadewa.ac.id/id/eprint/1742/1/1. Buku Instrumen Penelitian.pdf