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.
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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.

| No. | Students’ Number | Name                |
|-----|------------------|---------------------|
| 1.  | 18107001         | Alif Nur Kholiq     |
| 2.  | 18107002         | Andik Rohmataloh    |
| 3.  | 18107003         | Arif Sumaryanto     |
| 4.  | 18107004         | Catur Rinix Ragil Saputri |
| 5.  | 18107005         | Deka Ramdan Setiawan |
| 6.  | 18107006         | Fastrianto Manik    |
| 7.  | 18107007         | Firdaus Fathurohman  |
| 8.  | 18107008         | Hanif Latif Fuadi   |
| 9.  | 18107009         | Han Setiawan        |
| 10. | 18107010         | Henok Martogap Setiawan |
| 11. | 18107011         | Izha Yudha Prasetya Kuway |
| 12. | 18107012         | Janry Adum Rejeki Lumbantoruan |
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 Raski Wachidyantri |
| 2.  | 18101001         | Aang Fajar Yulianto |
| 3.  | 18101002         | Ahmad Yusuf Faiz Azmi |
| 4.  | 18101003         | Aldy Febrinaisyah |
| 5.  | 18101004         | Anandaya Safurrnahman |
| 6.  | 18101005         | Annaz Vatica Zahratun Nissa |
| 7.  | 18101006         | Bagas Dwi Wibowo |
| 8.  | 18101007         | Budiman Christian Willy Stanturi |
| 9.  | 18101008         | Dhany Maulana Suriadi |
| 10. | 18101009         | Dimas Andika Pratama |
| 11. | 18101010         | Dwi Yogyo Setya Nugraha |
| 12. | 18101011         | Erwin Yuliansyah |
| 13. | 18101012         | Fauzi Afrin Maulana |
| 14. | 18101013         | Fitrnyah |
| 15. | 18101014         | Hafizul Khair |
| 16. | 18101015         | Iklar Safullah |
| 17. | 18101016         | Izhangam |
| 18. | 18101017         | Kania Rahmanaputri |
| 19. | 18101018         | Lefri Nur Anggraeni |
| 20. | 18101019         | Meliena Vanesha S. Hutagalung |
| 21. | 18101020         | Mohammad Fahmi Mubarak |
| 22. | 18101021         | Muhammad Khoerul Anam |
| 23. | 18101022         | Muhammad Naufal Ammar Aziz |
| 24. | 18101023         | Muhammad Sofyan Afandi |
| 25. | 18101024         | Nareza Ocha Safira |
| 26. | 18101025         | Nunik Irmawati |
| 27. | 18101026         | Prima Yogaswara |
| 28. | 18101027         | Rafiika Hanum |
| 29. | 18101028         | Rendy Patra Julriansyah |
| 30. | 18101029         | Rifqi Lucky Anggoro |
| 31. | 18101030         | Rizky Hidayatullah |
| 32. | 18101031         | Sapitri |
| 33. | 18101032         | Thirafri Dzezi Fadilla |
| 34. | 18101033         | Ulla Fitria |
| 35. | 18101034         | Walyu Adji Prakoso |
| 36. | 18101035         | Yopi Hermawan |
| 37. | 18101036         | Zahid Zaidi |

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 3 The Class B of Telecommunications Engineering

| No. | Students’ Number | Name |
|-----|------------------|------|
| 1.  | 18101037         | Abdi Fauzan |
| 2.  | 18101038         | Ahin Permana Wijaya |
| 3.  | 18101039         | Alemina Aprilina Br Milala |
| 4.  | 18101040         | Anantha Bayu Suprianto |
| 5.  | 18101041         | Ari Sukarno |
| 6.  | 18101042         | Bajur Buriyan |
| 7.  | 18101043         | Chaterine Angelica Dwi Putri |
| 8.  | 18101044         | Dihan Fadhillah Dwi Prasetyo |
| 9.  | 18101045         | Dimas Agil Nurfauzi |
| 10. | 18101046         | Dyas Dendi Andika |
| 11. | 18101047         | Fanny Syarifudin |
| 12. | 18101048         | Febri Arif Setiauw |
| 13. | 18101049         | Fuad Dikri Ramadhani |
| 14. | 18101050         | Hanin Naufah |
| 15. | 18101051         | Iklasius Amal |
| 16. | 18101052         | Jatmiko Wibisono |
| 17. | 18101053         | Khafid Syafii Mairif |
| 18. | 18101054         | Levina Anora |
| 19. | 18101055         | Melimania Tiffani |
| 20. | 18101056         | Mohammad Mahreza Baskara |
| 21. | 18101057         | Muhammad Akbar Al Fatih |
| 22. | 18101058         | Muhammad Rafik Syahaputra |
| 23. | 18101059         | Muhammad Yusuf Firmanasyah |
| 24. | 18101060         | Nasir Amansyah |
| 25. | 18101061         | Nur Azizah |
| 26. | 18101062         | Pupi Maulani |
| 27. | 18101063         | Rafil Indra Almabhandy |
| 28. | 18101064         | Reza Fajrati |
| 29. | 18101065         | Rina Ridana |
| 30. | 18101066         | Rizky Syafriullah |
| 31. | 18101067         | Satrio Utomo |
| 32. | 18101068         | Thobih Khoirul Annas |
| 33. | 18101069         | Vendianto Bayu Saputra |
| 34. | 18101070         | Widad Barhamuddin |
| 35. | 18101071         | Yulia Vironica |
| 36. | 18101072         | Zaidan Rizqullah |

Among those students in Class A, Wahyu Adji Prakoso was an inactive student 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 4 The Class C of Telecommunications Engineering

| No. | Students’ Number | Name |
|-----|------------------|------|
| 1.  | 18101073         | Aditya Nurcahy |
| 2.  | 18101074         | Aji Pangestu |
| 3.  | 18101075         | Alwin Fauzan |
| 4.  | 18101076         | Aneta Syahputri |
| 5.  | 18101077         | Arya Fikri Alamsyah |
| 6.  | 18101078         | Bahtra Ferlina Barus |
| 7.  | 18101079         | Deva Ourelia Asyinindya |
| 8.  | 18101080         | Dihan Handika Yondri Pratama |
| 9.  | 18101081         | Dimas Tantra Eswaryapada |
| 10. | 18101082         | Egi Akbar Fahli |
| 11. | 18101083         | Farah Dina Oktaviyah |
| 12. | 18101084         | Feni Widiyanti |
| 13. | 18101085         | Garnish Husna Ifinun APS |
| 14. | 18101086         | Helmy Fauzan Dwiananto |
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 Nurfaqi 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.

| Session | Topic | Sources |
|---------|-------|---------|
| 1.      | Present Tenses | Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| 2.      | Past Tenses | Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| 3.      | Future Tenses | Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| 4.      | Sentence with One Clause | Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| 5.      | Complex Sentence with One Clause | Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |

6. Complex Sentence with Multiple Clauses

| Sources |
|---------|
| Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |

7. Complex Sentence with Multiple Clauses

| Sources |
|---------|
| Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |

8. Mid Term Test

| Sources |
|---------|
| Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |

9. Reading Scientific Writing

| Sources |
|---------|
| Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |

10. Agreement Expressions

| Sources |
|---------|
| Andrew Betts and Lawrence Mama. Succeed in IELTS. Jakarta: Erlangga 2016 |

11. Modal Auxiliaries

| Sources |
|---------|
| Betty Schrampfer Azar. Understanding and Using English Grammar 3rd Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. |
| Andrew Betts and Lawrence Mama. Succeed in IELTS. Jakarta: Erlangga 2016 |

12. Reading Strategies

| Sources |
|---------|
| Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue. Introduction to Academic Writing 3rd Edition. New York: Pearson Education, 2007. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |

13. Summarizing

| Sources |
|---------|
| Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue. Introduction to Academic Writing 3rd Edition. New York: Pearson Education, 2007. |
| Deborah Philips. Preparation Course for TOEFL Test. New York: Pearson Education, 2008 |
| Andrew Betts and Lawrence Mama. Succeed in IELTS. Jakarta: Erlangga 2016 |
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         | Alfr Nur Kholik           | 70.64       |
| 2.      | 18107002         | Andri Rohmatuloh          | 52.09       |
| 3.      | 18107003         | Arif Sumaryanto            | 73.60       |
| 4.      | 18107004         | Catur Rinix Ragil Saputri | 64.90       |
| 5.      | 18107005         | Deka Rransition Setaawan  | 47.86       |
| 6.      | 18107006         | Fasrianto Manik            | 41.03       |
| 7.      | 18107007         | Farida Fathurrohm    | 50.18       |
| 8.      | 18107008         | Hanin Latif Fudi           | 68.59       |
| 9.      | 18107010         | Henok Marteng S. Purba    | 57.87       |
| 10.     | 18107011         | Iiza Yudha Prasetya Kaway | 36.00       |
| 11.     | 18107012         | Janey A.R. Lumbantoranua  | 90.51       |
| 12.     | 18107013         | Lukman Priyambodo         | 74.45       |
| 13.     | 18107014         | Lutfi Widiansyah           | 61.73       |
| 14.     | 18107015         | Muhammad Farras Yulianto  | 71.16       |
| 15.     | 18107016         | Muhammad Husein Abdullah  | 59.21       |
| 16.     | 18107017         | Muhammad Sulthon Rivansyah | 33.45       |

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 Riksi Wachidyanti     | 75.29       |
| 2.      | 18101001         | Aang Fajar Yulianto       | 56.30       |
| 3.      | 18101002         | Ahmad Yusuf Faiz Azmi     | 72.09       |
| 4.      | 18101003         | Aldy Febriansyah           | 64.74       |
| 5.      | 18101004         | Anandya Safirhharmah      | 78.86       |
| 6.      | 18101005         | Anizie Virache Zahiratun Nissa | 92.28 |
| 7.      | 18101006         | Bagas Dwi Wilowo           | 65.36       |
| 8.      | 18101007         | Budiman Christian W. Sianturi | 75.09   |
| 9.      | 18101008         | Dyah Maulana Supriadi      | 61.46       |
| 10.     | 18101009         | Dimas Andika Pratama      | 22.09       |
| 11.     | 18101010         | Dwi Yoghia Setya Nugraha  | 54.23       |
| 12.     | 18101011         | Erwan Yuliansyah           | 75.16       |
| 13.     | 18101012         | Fajar Arif Maulana        | 63.13       |
| 14.     | 18101013         | Fitriyah                  | 60.79       |
| 15.     | 18101014         | Hafizul Khair             | 68.80       |
| 16.     | 18101015         | Ikbar Sufailah            | 77.95       |
| 17.     | 18101016         | Izhanggani                | 80.28       |
| 18.     | 18101017         | Kania Rahmanaputri        | 85.34       |
| 19.     | 18101018         | Lefi Nur Angraeni         | 76.17       |
| 20.     | 18101019         | Meliona V. S. Hutagalung  | 87.20       |
| 21.     | 18101020         | Mohammad Fahmi Mubarak    | 51.40       |
| 22.     | 18101021         | Muhammad Khoerul Anam     | 71.81       |
| 23.     | 18101022         | Muhammad Naifal Ammar Azi | 85.98       |
| 24.     | 18101023         | Muhammad Sofyan Affandi   | 62.49       |
| 25.     | 18101024         | Nareza Ocha Safira        | 64.26       |
| 26.     | 18101025         | Nunik Irwati              | 73.70       |
| 27.     | 18101026         | Prima Yogaswara           | 80.15       |
| 28.     | 18101027         | Rafika Hanum              | 61.12       |
| 29.     | 18101028         | Rendy Patra Juliusanah    | 91.75       |
| 30.     | 18101029         | Rifqi Lucky Anggoro       | 69.80       |
| 31.     | 18101030         | Rizky Hidayatullah        | 57.03       |
| 32.     | 18101031         | Saptri                    | 57.62       |
| 33.     | 18101032         | Tjandra Dzaki Fadilla     | 77.87       |
| 34.     | 18101033         | Ulfia Fitria              | 81.36       |
| 35.     | 18101035         | Yopi Hermawan            | 59.46       |
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.

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

### 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 Fauzani                 | 77.08       |
| 4   | 18101076         | Aneta Syahputri               | 68.43       |
| 5   | 18101077         | Arya Fikri Alamsyah           | 53.70       |
| 6   | 18101078         | Bahtra Ferdinan Batur         | 78.18       |
| 7   | 18101079         | Deva Orelia Ayunniday         | 77.58       |
| 8   | 18101080         | Dhuja Handika Yondri Pratama  | 92.10       |
| 9   | 18101081         | Dimas Tantra Eswaryapada      | 53.24       |
| 10  | 18101082         | Egi Akbar Fahlii              | 68.35       |
| 11  | 18101083         | Feni Wuhantri                 | 76.15       |
| 12  | 18101085         | Garmish Hasna Iftinan APS     | 66.89       |
| 13  | 18101086         | Helnya Fauzan Dwinanto        | 51.55       |
| 14  | 18101087         | Ikwanda Charil Fitroh         | 84.90       |
| 15  | 18101088         | Jeremi Owen N.Nahampun        | 76.79       |
| 16  | 18101090         | Lintang Salsabilla Abdullah   | 89.33       |
| 17  | 18101091         | Midkhalif Rohmah              | 91.45       |
| 18  | 18101092         | Moh. Fahmi Faza               | 72.40       |
| 19  | 18101094         | Muhammad Raul Ramadhan        | 63.70       |
| 20  | 18101095         | Murwaniwani Fejo Ryono        | 85.18       |
| 21  | 18101096         | Natsaya Nur Khalika           | 78.30       |
| 22  | 18101097         | Nurli Setyo Pambudi           | 55.09       |
| 23  | 18101098         | Puspa Rahmatwati              | 78.68       |
| 24  | 18101099         | Rahma Nur Azzah               | 54.97       |
| 25  | 18101100         | Reza Firmansyah               | 67.10       |
| 26  | 18101101         | Rio Andidika                  | 50.05       |
| 27  | 18101102         | Rizqi Khairel Muisfied        | 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 Taru' Padang            | 61.95       |
| 32  | 18101107         | Yulianto Tri Atmojo           | 63.63       |
| 33  | 18101108         | Zainatul Khaireny             | 94.20       |
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.
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