

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study relevant to the objective of the research. The purposes of this research were to develop students' oral presentation skill and to investigate whether or not the students' oral presentation skills improve after being trained through language learning strategies. The target group of the study was 27 students taking AE 102 or English 2, but after the midterm exam one student dropped out of the course. There were also four students who attended class less than 60 percent of the total class time, therefore, the researcher focused only on the twenty-one students who attend class more than 70 percent of the class hours.

The researcher gathers the data's result from different data collecting tools which are lesson plans, criteria of assessment for an oral presentation, questionnaire, checklist of useful words and phrases when giving an oral presentation, classroom observation and semi-structure interview. This chapter presents the data analysis of the study of reliability of the lesson plan, students' oral presentation skills, students' used of useful words and phrases in giving an oral presentation, students' usage of language learning strategies, and students' preferred strategies in giving an oral presentation. Thus, the results will be discussed in detail as follows:

4.1 The analysis of internal validity of lesson plans

The result analysis of the lesson plans aims to train the students to use different language learning strategies in giving an oral presentation. The researcher wrote these lesson plans through studying and researching from different sources. The lesson plans consist of objectives of the lesson, strategies objectives, content and activities and evaluation.

The researcher created criteria of assessment for each lesson plan namely terminal objectives, enabling objectives, content, activities, teaching materials and evaluation. The researcher then handed the criteria of assessment for the lesson plan to the thesis supervisor to check. After that, the researcher improved the criteria of assessment of the lesson plan. The researcher gave the improved criteria of assessment for lesson plans along with the lesson plans to two experts (including the thesis supervisor) to check for whether each topic in the lesson plans; objectives, content, teaching activities, teaching material and evaluation in the lesson plans are relevant to the objectives of the lessons, interesting, and relevant to the strategies which would be used for teaching.

The criteria of assessment for the lesson plan are a five-mark scale ranging from 1-5: 1 is the least and 5 is the most. The researcher pre-determined the mean score and standard deviation result from the criteria of the assessment that the lesson plans are believed to be effective when the mean score is between 2.50 and 5.00. The lessons needed to be improved if the mean score is below 2.50. See the table below for the interpretation of the

mean score by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002), and the result of the analysis of the criteria of assessment for lesson plans 1-6 are as followed:

Table 4.1: An interpretation of mean scores. (Mokhtari and Reichard, 2002)

Ranges from mean score	Degree of strategy usage
3.5 or higher	High
2.5-3.4	Medium
2.4 or lower	Low

Table 4.2: The result of the reliability of the lesson plans being taught through language learning strategies.

Topic	Objectives		Content		Teaching Activities		Teaching Materials		Evaluation	
Lesson No.	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	4.75	0.29	4.00	0.50	4.20	0.77	4.50	0.00	4.33	0.29
2	4.50	0.58	3.75	0.50	4.20	0.27	5.00	0.00	4.33	0.29
3	4.50	0.00	3.87	0.54	4.10	0.22	4.50	0.00	3.99	0.58
4	4.75	0.29	4.25	0.29	4.30	0.50	5.00	0.00	3.83	0.29
5	4.50	0.00	4.37	0.25	4.30	0.50	4.50	0.00	3.83	0.58
6	4.50	0.00	4.12	0.25	4.40	0.55	4.50	0.00	3.66	0.29
Total	27.50	1.15	25.51	2.33	27.82	2.80	28.00	0.00	23.97	2.30
Mean	4.58	0.19	4.25	0.39	4.64	0.47	4.67	0.00	4.00	0.38

Table 4.2 demonstrates the result of the six lesson plans on promoting students' oral presentation through language learning strategies which were assessed by the two experts were effective to be used for training. The average of mean score for the lesson plans was 'high' (4.00-4.67). The most effective part of the lesson was teaching material (mean=4.67), then teaching activities (mean=4.64), objectives (mean=4.58), content (mean=4.25) and evaluation (mean=4.00). The total mean of all the lesson plans was 'high', the mean of all the lessons were in between (4.00-4.67). It can be interpreted that the lesson plan on training students to apply language learning strategies in improving students' oral presentation skills was very effective.

4.2 The result of the students' oral presentation score

The students gave 2 oral presentations during the class in order to compare whether there were any improvement after being trained through language learning strategies. The students were given the criteria of assessment before hand so they know what they were expected to perform. Both of the students' oral presentations were assessed by using the same criteria of assessment and the same raters.

There were also some factors which could influence students' oral presentation skills, these factors are such as, presentation topic. The students were given three main topics according to the lessons in the course outline in giving the 1st oral presentation. The three main topics were entertainment, career, and future. In giving the 2nd oral presentation, the students chose there

own topic. Times given for the students giving the 1st and 2nd oral presentation were about five minutes. Some drawback which could influence the students' low score in giving the 1st oral presentation was that the students were not familiar with the other students in the class, and they were not confident in speaking in front of the people they did not familiar with.

In order to enhance the reliability of the score, the researcher used three raters to assess the students' oral presentation and the score was calculated for inter-rater reliability. Each of the student's presentation was recorded on a video camera in order to avoid any problems that the raters may encountered while watching the actual presentation. The raters consisted of the researcher, co-teacher of the course and a native English speaker. The raters watched the actual presentation in class and watched the video of each student's presentation and rated the students' performance.

The score results from the assessment were totaled from the three raters and calculated for percentage and t-test in order to see whether there is any significant difference between the score result before and after training through language learning strategies. The percentage of the score result was also compared with the University grading system from an official transcript in order to measure the students' performance when comparing to the students' University grading system. It is beneficial to compare the participants' score to their own university grading system because the result can indicate whether or not this training is necessary and is really beneficial to the University as well as the English department.

Table 4.3: Participants’ university grading system

Symbol	Percentage (%)	Quality
A	80%-100%	Excellent
B+	75%-79%	Very Good
B	70%-74%	Good
C+	65%-69%	Average
C	60%-64%	Fair
D+	55%-59%	Below Average
D	50%-54%	Poor
F	0-49%	Fail

According to the second objective of this study which is to investigate students’ oral presentation skills before and after training, the result of the first and second presentation is as followed.

Table 4.4: The comparison of students' oral presentation score assessed by three raters before and after training N=21. (See appendix H for the score given by each rater)

Student ID	Pre-Training			Post-Training		
	Score (80)	(%)	Description	Score (80)	(%)	Description
S1	23.33	29.16	Fail	72.33	90.41	Excellent
S2	33.67	42.09	Fail	63.17	78.96	Very Good
S3	26.00	32.50	Fail	61.67	77.09	Very Good
S4	25.67	32.09	Fail	40.50	50.63	Poor
S5	20.67	25.84	Fail	56.17	70.21	Good
S6	32.67	40.84	Fail	52.67	65.84	Average
S7	27.33	34.16	Fail	58.33	72.91	Good
S8	52.00	65.00	Average	67.83	84.79	Excellent
S9	55.00	68.75	Average	68.67	85.84	Excellent
S10	44.67	55.84	Below Average	77.50	96.88	Excellent
S11	39.33	49.16	Fail	74.33	92.91	Excellent
S12	43.33	54.16	Poor	64.17	80.21	Excellent
S13	48.67	60.84	Fair	72.67	90.84	Excellent
S14	29.33	36.66	Fail	49.83	62.29	Fair
S15	44.00	55.00	Below Average	38.67	48.34	Fail
S16	30.67	38.34	Fail	52.00	65.00	Average
S17	40.00	50.00	Poor	68.50	85.63	Excellent
S18	32.67	40.84	Fail	59.33	74.16	Good
S19	22.67	28.34	Fail	65.17	81.46	Excellent
S20	50.33	62.91	Fair	70.00	87.50	Excellent
S21	33.33	41.66	Fail	64.17	80.21	Excellent
Total	35.96	44.96	Fail	61.79	77.24	Very Good

The above table demonstrated that 13 students 'fail', 2 students 'poor', 2 students were 'below average', 2 students were 'fair', 1 student 'average' and no students were above average. Consequently, the overall quality of the students' first oral presentation was 'Fail' when compared with the university grading system.

For the second presentation, the result from table 4 indicates the improvement of students' oral presentation skills that the quality of 11 students' oral presentation skills is 'excellent'. Two students were 'very good' and three students were 'good'. The other three were 'average' and 'fair'. There was only one student who got 'poor' and there was only one student who 'failed'.

The mean score of the class after giving the 1st oral presentation was 35.96 out of 80 and the percentage for the mean score was 44.96 which is 'fail'. On the other hand, the mean score of the class after giving the 2nd oral was 61.79 out of 80, and the percentage of the mean score was 77.24 which is 'very good' when comparing to the university grading system.

Table 4.5: Paired samples test of the students' oral presentation score pre and post training and t-test under their own categories; delivery, content and language. (N=21)

Description (Pre and post training)	Total	Mean	t	sig (two tails)
Delivery (pre)	40	20.31		
Pair 1			-7.939	.000
Delivery 2 (post)	40	31.79		(significant)

Table 4.5 (Continue)

Description (Pre and post training)		Total	Mean	t	sig (two tails)
Pair 2	Content 1(pre)	28	10.52	-11.528	.000 (significant)
	Content 2 (post)	28	20.81		
Pair 3	Language (pre)	12	5.00	-11.873	.000 (significant)
	Language (post)	12	9.33		

The above table indicates that the students' performance in delivery, content and language of the students' oral presentation post-training is higher than pre-training. A significant result is indicated when the level of significance is less than .05 ($* < .05$). The results shown in table 4.5 gave the level of the significance between the pre and post training through language learning strategies score in delivery, content, and language at the significant level of .000 which demonstrated that the students developed in giving an oral presentation after training through language learning strategies.

Table 4.6

Mean score of the overall students' oral presentation pre and post training and t(t-test). (N=21)

Oral presentations Score	Total	Mean	(%)	t	sig
Before training (80)	35.96	44.96			
				-10.498	.000
After training (80)	61.79	77.24			

The above table showed that the result of the students' oral presentation after being trained through language learning strategies was higher than before they were trained. The mean score after training was 58.84 and the mean score of pre training was 35.95. A significant result is indicated when the level of significance is less than .05 ($* < .05$). There was significant different at .000. It can be infer that the students overall performance in giving an oral presentation improved after they were trained through language learning strategies.

4.2.1. The inter-raters reliability (See appendix I and J for more detail)

The reliability of the score gained from the three scorers was also calculated for the inter-rater reliability using Ebel's (1951) method of estimation of the reliability of rating. According to Ebel (1951), the reliability of ratings in theory 'ranges between zero and one', the result gained from the

inter-raters reliability showed that the score based on the 3 raters pre and post training is reliable. The reliability for a score based on the 3 raters before training is 0.95, and after training is 0.75.

4.3 The result of students' usage of useful phrases when giving an oral presentation.

Besides the criteria of assessment for oral presentation, the researcher also watched each student's presentation that were recorded in order to find whether the students improved in the area of using useful phrases for giving an oral presentation after they were trained how to use them. The researcher made a tally on all the words and phrases which has been used by the students during the first and second presentation. The researcher made one mark for each word they used and not on how many times they used it. For example, the students may have used the word 'moreover' three times, but the researcher made one mark to show that the student had used that word. The researcher then totaled up the number of words and phrases that were used by each student and then calculated for the mean on how many useful words phrases were used by the students in this class before and after they were trained.

See the tables below for the result of the number of useful phrases used by each student and the comparison of the number of useful phrases when giving an oral presentation before and after they were trained through language learning strategies.

Table 4.7: The number of useful phrases used by each student when giving an oral presentation pre and post training.

Test Type	Pre- training							Post-training						
Student No.	Introduction	Linking Words	Transitional words	Giving Example and Opinion	Concluding	Leave Taking	Total	Introduction	Linking Words	Transitional words	Giving Example and Opinion	Concluding	Leave Taking	Total
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	1	0	1	9
2	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	7
4	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	2	8
6	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
7	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	1	0	1	5
8	3	2	1	0	0	1	7	3	1	1	0	0	1	6
9	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	1	3	1	1	1	12
10	2	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	1	1	1	1	1	11
11	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	1	1	8
12	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	1	1	1	1	7
13	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	0	0	0	1	7
14	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	0	1	1	1	7
15	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
16	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
17	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	2	3	1	1	11
18	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	2	0	1	7
19	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	9
20	2	1	0	1	0	1	5	2	2	0	2	0	1	7
21	2	2	0	2	1	1	8	3	1	1	0	0	1	6
Total	36	19	2	4	2	13	76	67	22	3	18	8	20	148
Mean							4							7

Table 4.7 indicated that students used more useful words and phrases in giving an oral presentation after they were trained. The average of the

students (N=21) in the class in using useful words and phrases when giving an oral presentation before training were totaled of 76 words and phrases. However, after the students were trained through language learning strategies, the students used totaled of 148 words and phrases on all the area which are giving introductory, using liking words and transitional words to signal the change of the topic, giving example and personal opinion, concluding the presentation and leave taking.

Table 4. 8: Mean score, SD and t-test of students' usage of useful phrases when giving an oral presentation pre and post training. (N=21)

Description	Mean	SD	t	sig
(Pre and post training)				
Pair 1 Introductory				
Pre-training	1.81	.602	-5.260	.000 (sig)
Post-training	3.19	.981		
Pair 2 Linking words				
Pre-training	.95	.865	-.462	.649 (no sig)
Post-training	1.05	.921		
Pair 3 Temporal Transitions				
Pre-training	.10	.301	-2.950	.008 (sig)
Post-training	.62	.865		

Table 4.8 (Continue)

Description	Mean	SD	t	sig
(Pre and post training)				
Pair 4 Give examples and opinion				
Pre-training	.19	.512	-2.870	.009 (sig)
Post-training	.86	.854		
Pair 5 Concluding				
Pre-training	.10	.301	-2.335	.030 (sig)
Post-training	.38	.498		
Pair 6 Leave Taking				
Pre-training	.71	.561	-1.746	.096 (no sig)
Post-training	.95	.384		
Pair 7 Others				
Pre-training	.00	.000	-2.169	.042 (no sig)
Post-training	.19	.402		
Total	-1.90	2.047	-4.264	.000 (sig)

The significant level was pre-set at 0.05 therefore a result was significant when the level of significant is less than .05 ($* < .05$)., the total result of the students' usage of useful phrases when giving an oral presentation showed that there was a significant different at .000 which means that the students improved in using useful words and phrases during oral presentations after they were trained through language learning strategies.

The students were trained how to use these phrases when giving an oral presentation as follows: introductory, linking words, temporal transitions,

giving examples and opinion, concluding and leave taking. The results showed that there were significant difference in giving introductory (.000), giving examples and opinion (.009), concluding (.030) and others (.042)

There were no significant difference of students using linking words (.649) and leave taking (.096) and others (.042) when giving oral presentations.

4.4 The questionnaire's result.

In order to discover whether the students used more strategies in giving an oral presentation after being trained on how to use language learning strategies, the researcher categorized each strategy used by the students after the first and second oral presentation. The comparison result of the questionnaire for each strategy is as followed:

4.4.1 Students’ usage of meta-cognitive strategies before and after training
(result from the questionnaire- appendix E)

Planning Strategy

Table 4.9: Hours students spent in preparing an oral presentation. (N=21)

No. of hours spent in preparing presentation	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
1 hour	6	28.57	1	4.76
2-4 hours	11	52.38	8	38.09
5-10 hours	4	19.04	8	38.09
More than 10 hours	0	0	4	19.04

The above table indicated that 52.38% of the students spent about 2-4 hours in preparing the first oral presentation, 28.57% of the students spent 1 hour, 19% of the students spent 5-10 hours and none of the students spent more than ten hours in preparing the first presentation.

After the students gave second oral presentation, 38.09% of the students spent 2-4 hours in preparing an oral presentation, 38.09% spent 5-10 hours, 4.76% of the students spent more than ten hours and there were only 19.04% of the students who spent 1 hour in preparing the oral presentation.

The results also indicated that 57.13 % of the students spent 5-10 hours or more in preparing the second oral presentation while only 19.04% of the students spent 5-10 hours in preparing the first presentation. When comparing the result of hours students spent in preparing their second

presentation, it can be seen that the significant difference in the higher number of students' criteria of assessment for oral presentation results (see table 9). It can therefore be inferred that the students had spent more hours, or in other words, had put more effort in preparing their second oral presentation.

Evaluation Strategy

Table 4.10: The comparison of students' usage evaluation strategy.

Description	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Yes	21	100	21	100
No	-	-	-	-

From the above table, the students employed evaluation strategy after giving the 1st and 2nd oral presentation (100%).

4.4.2 Students' usage of cognitive strategies

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively. The purpose of the study was to better understand what degree of students used strategies while planning an oral presentation. In examining the language learning strategy usage of individual participant, these scores can then be interpreted using the interpretation guideline, which ranges from 1 to 5. Three levels of usage were identified in Table 12, as suggested by Mokhtari

and Reichard for strategy usage: high (mean of 3.5 or higher), medium (mean of 2.5 to 3.4), and low (2.4 or lower). See table 4.12 for the results of the analysis.

Table 4.11: Interpretation of mean scores by Mokhtari and Reichard, 2002

Ranges from mean score	Degree of strategy usage
3.5 or higher	High
2.5-3.4	Medium
2.4 or lower	Low

Directed Attention Strategy

Table 4.12: Comparison of the mean score and degree usage on different aspects of directed attention strategy. (N=21)

Descriptions	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	Mean	Degree of usage	Mean	Degree of usage
consider the audience	2.90	Medium	3.42	Medium
knowledge about the topic	3.09	Medium	3.76	High
difficulties in searching information	3.15	Medium	3.23	Medium
topic of interest	3.23	Medium	3.71	High

The above table shows that the overall degree of strategy usage in planning the first presentation was medium. The students first considered the topic of interest (mean=3.23). Secondly, the students considered the knowledge about the topic (mean=3.15), then they considered the level of difficulty in researching information (mean=3.09), and the students considered the audience last (mean=2.90).

The result of the degree of strategy usage after the second oral presentation was medium and high. The students first considered knowledge about the topic (mean=3.76), then they considered the topic of interest (mean=3.71). After that they considered the audience (mean=3.42) and they considered the difficulties in researching information last (mean=3.23)

The comparison of the mean score of the first and second presentation demonstrated that the students attended in much higher degree in considering the knowledge about the topic, topic of interest, the audience, and difficulties in searching information respectively. To summarize, the students used higher degree of directed attention strategy after being trained.

Selective Attention Strategy

Table 4.13: Percentage of students’ usage selective attention strategy.

Students’ usage selective attention strategy	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Yes	15	71.42	20	95.23
No	6	28.57	1	4.76

From the above table 71.42 % of the students said ‘yes’ for using selective attention strategy in planning the first oral presentation and 28.57% of the students said ‘no’.

However, after giving the second oral presentation, 95.23 % of the students said ‘yes’ and 4.7 % of the student or only one of the students did not use selective attention strategy in planning the second oral presentation. Therefore, more students in the class used selective attention strategy when giving an oral presentation.

Summary strategy

Table 4.14: Number of students used summary strategy (N=21).

Summary of content from different resources.	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Copy the whole thing	3	14.28	0	0
Summarize the information	18	85.71	21	100

The result from the above table showed that almost all of the students (18 students) had already employed summary strategy in planning the first presentation. 85.71 % of the students copied only some important information of different sources, and the rest of the students (3 students) copied the whole thing for giving their first oral presentation.

The result of students' use of summary strategy in planning after being trained had met the pre-determined goal regarding the fact that the students wrote their own script and none of the students' copied information from the sources they found.

Resources Strategy

Table 4.15: No. of sources used by the students in searching the information for an oral presentation.

No. of resources used by students	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	Frequency	(%)	Frequency	(%)
1	8	32.0	2	8.7
2	4	16.0	6	26.1
3	2	8.0	8	34.8
4	2	8.0	1	4.3
5	3	12.0	1	4.3
6	1	4.0	1	4.3
8	1	4.0	-	-
10	1	4.0	-	-

The above table indicated that after giving the first oral presentation, most students found resources from only 1 source (32%), then they used 2

sources (16%). 12% of the students found information from 5 sources and the rest were 8% of the students found 3-4 sources.

After giving the second presentation, 34.8% of the students researched information from 3 sources, 26.2% from 2 sources and 8.7 % from 4, 5 and 6 sources respectively.

The highest number of the students in finding information of the first presentation was from 1 source. On the other hand, after the students were trained how to use the resource strategy, the majority of the students found information from 3 sources and no students used only one source.

Table 4.16: Students' preferred source of information.

Resources	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Internet	17	80.9	14	66.66
Magazine	3	14.0	3	14.28
Newspaper	-	-	1	4.76
Others	1	4.7	3	14.28

For resources strategy, the students' preferred searching information for giving the first oral presentation from the internet (80.9 %), then from magazines (14.0 %), others (4.7 %), and no students used information from the newspaper.

For giving the second oral presentation the students still also prioritized their searching of information from the internet (66.66 %), magazines (14.28%), newspapers (1%) and others (14.28 %).

Organizational Strategy

Table 4.17: Students' usage of organizational strategy.

Do the students organize the information?	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of Students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Yes	18	85.71	21	100
No	3	14.28	-	-

Table 4.16 shows that 85.71 % of the students used organizational strategy in planning the first presentation while 14.28% said that they did not.

After giving the second oral presentation all of the students used organizational strategy.

Rehearsal Strategy

Table 4.18: Times spent on rehearsing 1st and 2nd presentation.

Times	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
None	2	9.52	2	9.52
1	-	0	1	4.76
2	3	14.28	2	9.52
3	4	19.04	2	19.04
4 >	13	61.90	14	66.66

From the above table, most students (61.90%) spent more than 4 times in rehearsing their first oral presentation, 19.04% of the students rehearsed 3 times, 14.28 % rehearsed two times and 9.52 % did not rehearse.

After training, the majority of students also spent more than 4 times in rehearsing the second oral presentation (66.66 %), 19.04% rehearsed 3 times, 9.52% rehearsed twice and 2 students did not rehearse (9.52%) and 1 student rehearsed 1 time (4.76%).

The result from the above table showed that the students spent more time in rehearsing their second oral presentation.

Note-taking strategy

Table 4.19: Comparison of the mean score and degree of students' usage of note-taking strategy. (N=21)

Description	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	Mean	Degree of usage	Mean	Degree of usage
Students' used of graphic organizer	2.80	Medium	3.57	High

Table 4.19 demonstrated that students highly used note-taking strategy through the use of graphic organizer after giving the second oral presentation (mean=3.57) while moderately used this strategies in giving the first presentation (mean=2.80).

Memory strategy

Table 4.20: Comparison of the mean score and degree of students’ usage of memory strategy. (N=21)

Description	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	Mean	Degree of usage	Mean	Degree of usage
Memorized the script	2.60	Medium	3.43	Medium

Table 4.20 indicated that the students used memory strategy in planning and giving the second oral presentation (mean=3.43) higher than in giving the first oral presentation (mean=2.60)

4.4.3 Students’ usage of social-affective strategy

Self-talk strategy

Table 4.21: The comparison of the number of students and percentage of students’ usage self-talk strategy.

Description	1 st presentation		2 nd presentation	
	No. of students	(%)	No. of students	(%)
Do nothing	1	4.76	-	-
Encourage oneself to do the best.	17	80.95	19	90.47
Others	3	14.28	2	9.52

The above table indicated that the majority of the students used self-talk strategy to tell themselves to do their best when giving the first oral presentation (17 students). 3 students did 'other' things in motivating themselves while 1 student did not say anything to him or herself.

For the second oral presentation, almost all of the students told themselves to do their best (19 students), and 2 students did 'others' thing in motivating themselves. The number however showed that more students used self-talk strategy in giving second oral presentation than in the first presentation.

4.5 The analysis of semi-structure interview. (See appendix K for interview script)

The data obtained from the interview was first transcribed and categorized under its own category which aimed to answers the research question. "Categories should reflect the purpose of the research. In effect, categories are the answer to your research question" (Merriam, 1998). The data gained from an interview focused on students' perception of training and of the language learning strategies of both successful and less successful students in giving oral presentations.

The method used in classifying the students into two groups; a successful and an less successful group was through the comparative result of the students' first and second oral presentation scores. The three students

drawn from the successful group were those who came to class regularly and handed in all the works. The students from the less successful group included one male student and two female students. For this research these three students from the successful group will be called; Somchai (male), Somsri, and Somying (females).

In addition, the two students drawn from the less successful group were those who received “fail” and “poor” on their performance from both presentations and they will be called Tawee and Donchai. The interview results which were obtained from the successful group and less successful group were allocated to five categories which were the students’ previous experience, their struggles, their attitude towards training, their ideal strategies, and their opinion towards giving strategies in the future. The interview results are as follows:

1. “Previous Experience”

The students from the successful group and the less successful group had formerly taken the AE 101 course which was English 1. One of the objectives for English I course is that the students must give an oral presentation and the result will be given 5% towards the total grade. Somchai, Somsri and Somying had experience in giving an oral presentation while Tawee and Donchai said that they have never given an oral presentation before. Somchai, Somsri and Somying all expressed that they had difficulties in giving oral presentations in the past because they had a difficult time memorizing the script.

2. "Difficulties"

Somchai and Somsri admitted that in the past they copied the information they found from the internet and read it as a script when giving an oral presentation. They both agreed that it wasn't going really well for them. Somying always wrote her own script, but she still read the script while giving an oral presentation in the past because it was difficult to memorize. Somchai said that he had only spent one night to prepare for the presentation. Somsri said that her struggle was time management and she did not like the fact that she had to speak in front of the whole class while Somying said that she was too nervous and was not ready for the presentation.

Teacher: Have you ever conducted an oral presentation before this course?

All: Yes

Teacher: How did it go?

All: No. Not so good.

Teacher: Before you were trained, did you write your own script or did you retrieved the info from the internet?

Somchai: No, I copied from the internet and I read it in front of the class.

Somsri: I also copied from the internet.

Somchai: It was very difficult to memorize.

On the other hand both Tawee and Donchai said that their own struggle were 'themselves' and that they do not have enough knowledge and to write their own script. They said:

Tawee: I think the problem was myself. I always wait till the last minute. The second oral presentation I did it the night before. I asked my friend to translate for me."

Donchai: I am the same as Tawee. I like to wait till the last minute. I only prepared two hours before the actual presentation.

Tawee: I like to party at night that's why I did not have time to prepare.

Donchai: I need to know more vocabulary. I do not know enough vocabulary to be able to write my own script.

3. "Attitude towards training"

Somchai, Somsri and Somying were rather satisfied with the training. They all felt 'proud' of themselves for the fact that they wrote their own script and they spoke with no script. Somchai said that the training helped to develop his skills in writing, grammar, and speaking. Somsri said that the training develop her writing skills both writing in paragraph and sentences, as well as her speaking skills of pronunciation. Similar to Somsri, Somying said that the training also developed her speaking skills by improving her pronunciation.

Teacher: How do you feel about your 2nd presentation?

Somchai: I was more satisfied with it than the 1st oral presentation, even though I made some mistakes.

Somchai: I was proud of myself.

Teacher: Did writing your own script help make the memorizing of the script easier?

Somchai: Yes.

Somsri: I was so proud of myself because it was the first time I put effort into memorizing the oral presentation script and gave the oral presentation with no notes.

Somying: I was also proud with myself because I did not use the script at all. In the past, I needed to read the script to help me because I could not memorize the script.

Teacher: Are you satisfied with the training?

All: Very much.

Tawee and Donchai were not really happy because they got low scores from the assessment. Tawee felt that he needed to concentrate more and he needed more time to work. In contrast, Donchai felt that he did not have enough knowledge of vocabulary.

Teacher: What do you think about your second oral presentation?

Tawee: I got a low score.

Tawee: Time, I need more time. I need to be more focused. I took three classes and I have to study 6 hours a day this summer.

Donchai: I need to know more vocabulary. I do not know enough vocabulary to be able to write the script on my own.

4. "The Ideal Strategies"

The interview results indicates that Somchai, Somsri and Somying found that graphic organizing (note-taking strategy) was the most helpful strategy in helping them with both writing script and giving an oral presentation with no script and with confidence.

Teacher: Out of all the strategies that you were trained, which are the strategies that helped you the most?

Somying: graphic organizer

Somchai: It helped built my confidence and I spoke with better grammar and it was easier to remember.

Teacher: When you were giving an oral presentation did you picture the diagram that you made in your mind.

Somchai: Yes I could see that clearly in my mind, and I remembered it very well.

Somsri: It helped me to write the script easier.

Somying: It helped me with speaking and reporting the script.

The three students also felt that rehearsal with a native English speaker also helped them with their pronunciation and accent.

Teacher: What about practicing with foreigners? Did it help?

Somsri: Yes.

Somying: A lot. It helped us pronounce better.

For the students from the less successful group; Tawee and Donchai agreed that friends helped them the most.

Teacher: What was your technique in planning the presentation?

Tawee: Friends' help. The first time I wrote my own script and I didn't know enough vocabulary.

Donchai: Yes I did, but there was too little content. I needed to get my friends to help translate the information from the website.

5. "The Future"

The researcher also asked the students about their confidence towards giving an oral presentation in the future. Somchai, Somsri and Somying all said that they felt more confident if they have to give another oral presentation and they will use a graphic organizer in helping them planning and giving an oral presentation in the future.

Teacher: Would you feel more confident if you have to give another oral presentation?

Somsri: Yes, I think I should do better.

Teacher: If you have to give another presentation, would you or would you not make a graphic organizer about the topic?

All: Yes.

Teacher: So, did everyone think that making a diagram helped in writing the script?

All: Yes, much easier.

Tawee and Donchai were both agreed that if they have to give another presentation, they will need more time and more vocabulary knowledge to write the script on their own.

Teacher: What do you think will help you with giving oral presentation in the future?

Tawee: Time, I need more time. I need to be more focused. I took three classes and I have to study 6 hours a day this summer.

Donchai: I need to know more vocabulary. I do not know enough vocabulary to be able to write the script on my own