

MOTIVATING NON – ENGLISH DEPARTMENT LEARNERS TO STUDY ENGLISH THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA

Riyatno Riyatno

Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Telematika Telkom Purwokerto

riyatno@st3telkom.ac.id

Abstract

Development of communication technology makes both English learners and teachers easy to study and to teach. Both of them are flexible to handle teaching and learning English because it can be done not only in the class but also outside the class. The questionnaire is given to know learners' motivation to learn English. Then, the assignment to support learning English in the class is given through social media i.e., telegram and WhatsApp. The result of learning English is good since the English learners can maximize their opportunity to develop their English. They are able to do some activities outside the class using social media agreed by both the teacher and the learners. Learning English becomes interesting and enjoyable. Using social media helps their motivation to learn English since they cannot escape from their gadget. Their gadget becomes one of learning sources that finally makes them motivated

Keywords: Motivating, Non-English Department Learners, Studying English, Social Media.

1. INTRODUCTION

Talking about motivation in learning English language is interesting. One will do something because he or she has the internal desire to do so and the satisfaction derived from it (Gardner, 1985). The effort to do something is mostly affected by how high he or she has the motivation. Strong external drive is meaningless as long as motivation does not appear.

English is a foreign language for Indonesians. English learners do not use English in their daily lives even though it has been taught since they were in secondary schools, even primary schools. It is added by the situation in which the learners belong to non – English department. They usually focus on their major because they think that English does not have a significant role in the future.

For non-English Department students, learning English is still hard because they do not have high motivation. Having low motivation can be caused by some factors, either internal or external factors. In some cases, both internal and external factors influence them. The factors can be the materials, the teachers, the environment, and others. To stimulate students' motivation and interest, teachers should have some strategies to handle the class in order that the students like to learn English. One of the strategies is using social media.

Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Telematika Telkom (ST3 Telkom) Purwokerto was established in 2002. ST3 Telkom has three study programs, namely Diploma III Telecommunications Engineering, Bachelor's degree of Telecommunications Engineering, and Bachelor's degree of Informatics Engineering. ST3 Telkom students have 8 credits of English from semester 1 until semester 4. It means that they have 2 credits in one semester and they have to study English 100 minutes per week. The English course is designed to TOEFL for bachelor's degree and IELTS for diploma degree. Unfortunately, despite the fact that they have 8 credits of English, their English mastery is still unsatisfactory.

To overcome the situation, the English teacher should be able to look for the appropriate strategy. It is commonly found that students around the world have gadget and they always use their gadget to communicate each other through social media. They often lack their focus because they use their gadget even though they are in class. They do not pay attention to

the class. For this reason, it is interesting to say that social media can motivate non – English department learners to study English.

Because social media is commonly used by youngsters, including students, English teachers should wisely use it to support English learners. It can be said that social media can arouse their motivation to study English if it can be applied appropriately. For this reason, social media can be used as one of learning media to study English. Finally, any English learners and teachers are able to apply the media in teaching learning process.

Relating to motivation, according to American proverb, one can force a buffalo to the river, but he or she cannot force it to drink. It means that motivation has an important role to learn any knowledge, including English language. According to Harmer (1991, p.3), motivation is the “internal drive” that pushes somebody to do something. Motivation is also “the energy that prompts a person to act in a certain way” (Graham, 2003, Chapter 16, para. 1) or “goal-directed behavior ... [that] includes three components: (a) a desire to achieve a goal, (b) effort expended in achieving the goal, and (c) favorable attitudes toward this activity” (Bradford, 2007, p. 302).

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The study was conducted to improve the students’ mastery using a different strategy in learning English. To begin the study, I gave a questionnaire, consisting of 12 questions, to the students relating to their perception on English. There were three classes of the second year students who began their study in 2015 and they were from S1 Telecommunications Engineering. The number of Telecommunications Engineering students was 95, but I only got 87 students who completed the questionnaire. Some students did not come to the class so that they did not fill the questionnaire. To know more about the students’ responses, I asked the students randomly to obtain in-depth responses. It was not a real interview done in the class because I asked them after the class was over. Then, to know their English mastery, I gave the students a pretest. Both of the activities were done when they were in the even semester of the first year.

In the second year, the students got English 3 in the third semester and English 4 in the fourth semester. When they were in the third semester, they did not have any special strategy. They did not use any social media to learn English. Their learning process was designed in such a way that they studied English conventionally. They had to submit their paper-based assignment and there was no instruction in advance where and when they had to submit their assignment.

In the fourth semester, the students had to prepare their social media, namely Telegram and WhatsApp. These media were chosen because they were simple and common for students. Other media were intentionally ignored to avoid complexity and difficulty to manage.

Before the class began, the students were divided into some groups consisting of 4 students for each group. Each group had to make WhatsApp Group (WG) and Telegram Group (TG). They had to manage their group. One of them became the admin to handle the group. Of course, I became the member of all groups to give instruction, to give assignment, and so on.

WG was designed to speaking and listening assignments while TG was designed to reading and writing assignments. In the group, all participants had to use English in their communication and they felt free to say or write without being afraid of making any grammatical mistakes. However, they had to be careful when they did grammar’s assignment because they should relate to the topics in the course design.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Among the students of Telecommunications Engineering Study Program, 13 students or 14.94 % of 87 liked English very much. The students who liked English were 59 students or 67.82%. Those who liked English less were 12 students or 13.79% and the students who did not like English were 3 students or 3.45%. It can be concluded that most of students like English, namely 82.76%.

The result of the questionnaire also showed that most of them enjoyed or liked having English class. The students who stated that they liked to have English class very much were 13 students or 14.94%. The students who liked to have English class were 67 students or 77.01%. Those who liked to have English class less were 6 students or 6.90% and the students who did not like to have English class were only 1 student or 1.15%. It can be concluded that most of students like to have English class, namely 91.95%.

Actually, the teaching learning process attracts their interest to study English. It can be seen in the following table.

Table 1 Students' Perception on English

No.	Question Item	Telecommunications Engineering			
		Like very much	Like	Less like	Dislike
1.	Do you like English?	13	59	12	3
2.	How do you feel when you have English class?	13	67	6	1

The next data, however, did not correspond with what the students stated. If people like things, they will mostly conduct activities that relate to what they like. Unfortunately, the personal relationship between the students and the lecturer was not covered by the questionnaire. When the students had a class and made a straight relationship with their lecturer, they were eager to know all materials conveyed along the teaching learning process. Seemingly, they still looked at the figure of their lecturer in the class. However, when they did not have a class, they disliked to "look at" the English materials that could be applied to help their English. Most of the students did not like to have the outdoor activities to support their interest in studying English. It can be seen in the following table.

Table 2 Students' Response to Study English

No.	Question Item	Telecommunications Engineering			
		Always	Often	Sometimes	Never
1.	How often do you read English books?	1	7	68	11
2.	How often do you discuss things with your friends in English?	1	0	55	31
3.	How often do you communicate via social media in English?	0	22	50	15
4.	How often do you study English at home after class?	0	5	62	20
5.	How often do you study English at home before class?	0	8	52	27
6.	How often does your lecturer help you study English?	13	43	26	5
7.	How often does your lecturer use various methods while teaching English?	13	50	22	2
8.	How often do you pay attention while having English class?	17	51	19	0

9.	How often do you have difficulties while studying English?	15	34	38	0
10.	How often do you join with extra-curricular English?	1	4	28	54

There were 68 (78.16%) students who sometimes read English books and there were 11 (12.64%) students who never read English books. When I asked them if they really sometimes read English books, they said that they almost never read them. Then I asked them for the rest responses relating to their choice of sometimes. They honestly said that they were actually almost never.

The second data said that only 1 (1.15%) student who discussed things with their friends in English. There were 55 (63.22%) students who sometimes used English to discuss things with their friends. The rest or 31 (35.63%) students never used English to communicate with their friends. This condition happened because they were non-English department students who did not keep in touch in English. They focused more in their own major even though English Club, namely *Astralic*, was available.

The third data showed that 22 (25.29%) students often used their social media to communicate in English. They still used English for daily communication and it was still simple expression. The TOEFL materials was still hard for them to discuss. The number of students who sometimes used their social media to communicate in English was 50 or 57.47%. There were some reasons they said. Most of them stated that they avoided communicating in English much to avoid misunderstanding among others. There were 15 (17.24%) students who never communicated in English through their social media.

Usually, students repeat the subjects that have been delivered by their teacher at home. The next data stated that only 5 (5.75%) students who studied English at home after the class was over. It was also stated that 62 (71.26%) students sometimes studied English at home and 20 (22.99%) students never studied English at home. Again, the students thought that English did not give a direct contribution to their major. Besides, their subjects are mostly written Indonesian language so that their English has no effect to them.

The following data is almost the same as the previous one. Before the students went to the English class, 8 (9.20%) students were well-prepared by studying English at home. 52 (59.77%) students sometimes studied English at home before they had a class and the rest, or 27 (31.03% students) never studied English at home. The number of students who never studied English at home increased if compared with the previous data.

The last data relates to extracurricular English. It showed that most of them, namely 54 (62.07%) students, never joint with extracurricular English. 28 students sometimes joint it, 4 students often joint it and only 1 student always joint the extracurricular English.

From the explanation above, the big problem was the students' motivation to learn English. The factor of English lecturer did not influence them in terms of teaching learning process.

The following table, then, is the result of English mastery pretest. The pretest was given when the students were in semester 2. There were 95 students participating the pretest. It was intentionally given because they had got English 1 and English 2. Hopefully, they had the same treatment on English when they were in semester 1 and semester 2 so that they were seemingly homogenous in English.

Table 3 The Pre Test of English Mastery

No.	Student's Number	Name	Score
1.	15101001	Abdul Sholeh	71.20
2.	15101002	Adinda Zakiyatul Jannah	72.90
3.	15101003	Adli Al Hafizh	71.25

4.	15101004	Ahmad Iqbal	57.05
5.	15101005	Ajun Wicaksono	67.75
6.	15101006	Andika Eka Purnama	70.65
7.	15101007	Anggita Sindy Wulandari	65.90
8.	15101008	Arnanda Satria Wibawa	82.90
9.	15101009	Azwar Riza Pangestu	70.35
10.	15101010	Bayu Hadi Putra	67.60
11.	15101011	Bondan Wicaksana	66.20
12.	15101012	Deni A. Hendriawan	75.30
13.	15101013	Dinar Ahmad Harish	78.60
14.	15101014	Duwi Utami	79.15
15.	15101015	Evan Sigit Kurniawan	73.50
16.	15101016	Fatria Ikram Majid	67.60
17.	15101017	Ghifar Rachman Nugraha	69.70
18.	15101018	Hayumas Shalimar	53.55
19.	15101019	Indra Setiawan Jati	50.00
20.	15101020	Julita Pramesti	73.90
21.	15101021	Melly Sri Ulina Ginting	71.30
22.	15101021	M. Faisal Rizqiansyah	68.70
23.	15101023	Muhammad Ismail	62.90
24.	15101024	Nida Nurvira	70.90
25.	15101025	Nurul Aziz Pamungkas	80.80
26.	15101026	Patricia Sitanggang	69.55
27.	15101027	Raditya Priyo Sembodo	69.55
28.	15101028	Rastra Andryan Noor	59.40
29.	15101029	Ricky Febrian	72.30
30.	15101030	Rizki Adhi Saputra	65.70
31.	15101031	Shafira Fajrin Arumsidi	70.90
32.	15101032	Viona Octaviani Citra	75.00
33.	15101033	Yusuf Syakir S. P.	68.25
34.	15101034	Achmad Fadhlan Septian	73.60
35.	15101035	Aditya Rachman	72.80
36.	15101036	Agita Purwandani	74.80
37.	15101037	Ahmad Nawawi	71.70
38.	15101038	Ananda Suci Rosalina	69.05
39.	15101039	Angga Pambudi	77.50
40.	15101040	Arief Perdana Putra	59.00
41.	15101041	Asamta Ria Br. Sitepu	69.70
42.	15101043	Bayu Mukti Wijaya	76.65
43.	15101044	Candra Adi Winarno	66.90
44.	15101045	Dettia Wenny Brigitta	70.35
45.	15101046	Dinda Wahyu Anggraeni	80.45
46.	15101047	Dwi Giovanni	75.05
47.	15101048	Fadhli Dzil Ikram	66.10
48.	15101049	Firmansyah P. Wibawa	78.00
49.	15101050	Guntur Bhima A. Putra	71.25
50.	15101051	Hendra Gusti M.	65.65

51.	15101052	Irfan Muhammad Ghani	77.80
52.	15101053	Khairul Bariyat	71.25
53.	15101054	Mohamad Ikrom Nafi	68.20
54.	15101055	M. Faiz Syahputra	71.20
55.	15101056	M. Rizky Utama Lubis	74.35
56.	15101057	Nur Amalliah I. Cahyani	81.15
57.	15101058	Olivian Bagas Pradana	72.25
58.	15101059	Permata Lisia B. S.	71.00
59.	15101060	Rafiendra Bagas A.	71.60
60.	15101061	Roudhatul Jannah	72.75
61.	15101062	Rico Satrio Yuwono	87.80
62.	15101063	Rosy Wahyu Mustika	67.85
63.	15101064	Syahrul Ramdani	75.40
64.	15101065	Wasis A. Rezki Baskoro	65.80
65.	15101066	Adi Indra Firmansyah	66.60
66.	15101067	Aditya Sanubari	74.65
67.	15101068	Agung Prabowo	33.00
68.	15101069	Aji Insan Permadi	66.90
69.	15101070	Andika Agus Pranata	66.20
70.	15101071	Anggip Nurjagi	62.80
71.	15101072	Arifia Hudan Hasrinda	66.10
72.	15101073	Asep Ripai	75.50
73.	15101075	Bidadariana Y. U. Putri	65.50
74.	15101076	Deiana Hasan	57.60
75.	15101077	Dhimas Prabowo S.	59.15
76.	15101078	Dita Wahyu Sabrina	65.35
77.	15101079	Egistian	78.30
78.	15101080	Faisal Aji Pradana	36.20
79.	15101081	Fitria Dwi Utami	77.45
80.	15101082	Haris Fadilah	65.60
81.	15101083	Ilham Adha Sulaeman	54.80
82.	15101084	Irfani Aditya	65.90
83.	15101085	Laksmi Intan Pertiwi	83.95
84.	15101086	M. Arif Syaifurrahman	65.30
85.	15101087	M. Iqbal Al Kholili	61.25
86.	15101088	Nanang Yulianto	65.00
87.	15101089	Nur Fina Saraswati	80.55
88.	15101090	Pancar Nova Lailafitra	60.15
89.	15101091	Puspita Septika Jati	73.60
90.	15101092	Rafri Abiansyah Rahman	62.70
91.	15101093	Reyhan Maulana Yafi	58.40
92.	15101094	Rinaldi Depari	75.95
93.	15101095	Samuel Panggabean	71.60
94.	15101096	Triyono Subekti	65.30

95.	15101097	Yunila Rahmi	84.95
	Average		69.30

The English pretest was designed in written test and measured students' skills in speaking, listening, and reading. Those skills were mostly used in teaching learning process, such as instructions, comments, suggestions, questions, etc. The students sometimes watched film to practice their listening skill. Besides, the pretest was also designed to bridge the TOEFL materials in the second year. The average result of the pretest was 69.30.

Based on the score of the pretest, I designed the course of English 3 in such a way that it related to TOEFL materials. The following table is the materials of English 3.

Table 4 The Materials of English 3

Meeting	Topics	Sub Topics
1.	Problems with the Form of the Verb	a. After <i>have</i> , use the past participle
2.	Problems with the Form of the Verb	a. After <i>be</i> , use the present participle or the past participle b. After <i>will</i> , <i>would</i> , or other modals, use the base form of the verb
3.	Problems with the Use of the Verb	a. Know when to use the past and the present
4.	Problems with the Use of the Verb	a. Use <i>have</i> and <i>had</i> correctly
5.	Problems with the Use of the Verb	a. Use the correct tense with time expressions b. Use the correct tense with <i>will</i> and <i>would</i>
6.	Problems with Passive Verbs	a. Use the correct form of the passive
7.	Problems with Passive Verbs	a. Recognize active and passive meanings
8.	Problems with Nouns	a. Use the correct singular or plural noun b. Distinguish countable and uncountable nouns
9.	Problems with Nouns	a. Recognize irregular plural of nouns b. Distinguish the person from the thing
10.	Problems with Pronouns	a. Distinguish subject and object pronouns b. Distinguish possessive adjectives and pronouns c. Check Pronoun reference for agreement
11.	Vocabulary Questions	a. Find definitions from structural clues b. Determine meanings from word parts
12.	Vocabulary Questions	a. Use context to determine meanings of difficult words.

		b. Use context to determine meanings of simple words.
13.	Listening Comprehension	a. Expressions of agreement b. Expressions of uncertainty and suggestion
14.	Listening Comprehension	a. Emphatic expressions of surprise

The class was designed to presentation so that each class was divided into 12 groups. The first meeting and the second meeting were designed to the lecturer to explain the materials. The first group presented the third sub topic, the second group presented the fourth sub topic, and so on. Each student had to be active in the presentation in the form of asking, commenting, and suggesting, as well as answering. Besides, the students had to submit some assignments.

The score of English 3 was obtained from students' attendance (10%), quiz (10%) assignment (20%), Mid Term Test (30%) and Final Test (30%). The average score of English 3 was 73.48. It can be seen in the followings.

Table 5 The Score of English 3

No	Student's Number	Name	Score
1.	15102001	Abdul Sholeh	67.01
2.	15102002	Adinda Zakiyatul Jannah	63.71
3.	15102003	Adli Al Hafizh	73.70
4.	15102004	Ahmad Iqbal	64.61
5.	15102005	Ajun Wicaksono	76.51
6.	15102006	Andika Eka Purnama	69.91
7.	15102007	Anggita Sindy Wulandari	61.99
8.	15102008	Arnanda Satria Wibawa	76.90
9.	15102009	Azwar Riza Pangestu	74.49
10.	15102010	Bayu Hadi Putra	67.39
11.	15102011	Bondan Wicaksana	65.00
12.	15102012	Deni Anggara Hendriawan	71.90
13.	15102013	Dinar Ahmad Harish	78.70
14.	15102014	Duwi Utami	69.10
15.	15102015	Evan Sigit Kurniawan	81.30
16.	15102016	Fatria Ikram Majid	80.20
17.	15102017	Ghifar Rachman Nugraha	65.11
18.	15102018	Hayumas Shalimar	68.51
19.	15102019	Indra Setiawan Jati	66.90
20.	15102020	Julita Pramesti	64.79
21.	15102021	Melly Sri Ulina Ginting	64.49
22.	15102022	M. Faisal Rizqiansyah	62.80
23.	15102023	Muhammad Ismail	67.40
24.	15102024	Nida Nurvira	76.50

25.	15102025	Nurul Aziz Pamungkas	78.91
26.	15102026	Patricia Sitanggang	77.19
27.	15102027	Raditya Priyo Sembodo	78.00
28.	15102028	Rastra Andryan Noor	69.41
29.	15102029	Ricky Febrian	75.91
30.	15102030	Rizki Adhi Saputra	71.41
31.	15102031	Shafira Fajrin Arumsidi	68.31
32.	15102032	Viona Octaviani Citra	67.50
33.	15102033	Yusuf Syakir Sarwo Pradana	72.19
34.	15101034	Achmad Fadhlán Septian	73.00
35.	15101035	Aditya Rachman	72.40
36.	15101036	Agita Purwandani	71.50
37.	15101037	Ahmad Nawawi	70.60
38.	15101038	Ananda Suci Rosalina	73.79
39.	15101039	Angga Pambudi	83.20
40.	15101040	Arief Perdana Putra	61.00
41.	15101041	Asamta Ria Br. Sitepu	63.70
42.	15101043	Bayu Mukti Wijaya	78.10
43.	15101045	Dettia Wenny Brigitta	73.00
44.	15101046	Dinda Wahyu Anggraeni	80.05
45.	15101047	Dwi Giovanni	76.00
46.	15101049	Firmansyah Pandu Wibawa	75.70
47.	15101050	Guntur Bhima Adytama Putra	65.84
48.	15101051	Hendra Gusti Mardikacandra	64.30
49.	15101052	Irfan Muhammad Ghani	82.30
50.	15101053	Khairul Bariyat	77.20
51.	15101054	Mohamad Ikrom Nafi	69.70
52.	15101055	M. Faiz Syahputra	66.10
53.	15101056	M. Rizky Utama Lubis	75.70
54.	15101057	Nur Amalliah Indah Cahyani	82.30
55.	15101058	Olivian Bagas Pradana	67.45
56.	15101059	Permata Lisia Br. Silitonga	63.85
57.	15101060	Rafiendra Bagas Aryandika	68.69
58.	15101061	Roudhatul Jannah	64.67
59.	15101062	Rico Satrio Yuwono	85.60
60.	15101063	Rosy Wahyu Mustika	72.89
61.	15101065	Wasis Anggraita Rezki Baskoro	70.90
62.	15101066	Adi Indra Firmansyah	77.09

63.	15101067	Aditya Sanubari	70.11
64.	15101069	Aji Insan Permadi	73.79
65.	15101070	Andika Agus Pranata	77.20
66.	15101071	Anggip Nurjagi	75.29
67.	15101072	Arifia Hudan Hasrinda	69.32
68.	15101073	Asep Ripai	73.64
69.	15101075	Bidadariana Yunia Utami Putri	65.65
70.	15101076	Deiana Hasan	76.49
71.	15101077	Dhimas Prabowo Setyanugroho	70.00
72.	15101078	Dita Wahyu Sabrina	63.70
73.	15101079	Egistian	76.67
74.	15101081	Fitria Dwi Utami	77.50
75.	15101082	Haris Fadilah	78.70
76.	15101083	Ilham Adha Sulaeman	79.30
77.	15101084	Irfani Aditya	79.79
78.	15101085	Laksmi Intan Pertiwi	92.05
79.	15101086	Muhammad Arif Syaifurrahman	77.35
80.	15101087	Muhammad Iqbal Al Kholili	76.26
81.	15101089	Nur Fina Saraswati	87.40
82.	15101090	Pancar Nova Lailafitra	77.99
83.	15101091	Puspita Septika Jati	88.49
84.	15101092	Rafri Abiansyah Rahman	76.37
85.	15101093	Reyhan Maulana Yafi	76.07
86.	15101094	Rinaldi Depari	82.07
87.	15101095	Samuel Panggabean	78.81
88.	15101096	Triyono Subekti	84.10
89.	15101097	Yunila Rahmi	91.45
	Average		73.48

The course designed of English 4 was the continuation of English 3. The following table is the materials of English 4.

Table 4 The Materials of English 3

Meeting	Topics	Sub Topics
1.	Lecturing Contract	a. Lecturing Contract
2.	Contrary Meanings	a. Listening for wishes b. Listen for untrue conditions
3.	Idiomatic Language	a. Two-part verbs and Three-part verbs b. Idioms

4.	Adjectives and Adverbs	a. Basic adjectives and Adverbs b. Adjectives after linking verbs c. Position of adjectives and adverbs
5.	Adjectives	a. <i>-ly</i> adjectives b. Predicate adjectives c. <i>-ed</i> and <i>-ing</i> adjectives
6.	Articles	a. Articles with singular nouns b. A and An articles
7.	Articles	a. Article agreement with nouns b. Specific and general ideas
8.	Prepositions	a. The use of prepositions b. Incorrect prepositions
9.	Prepositions	a. Recognizing when prepositions have been omitted
10.	Word Usage	a. The use of <i>make</i> and <i>do</i> b. The use of <i>like</i> , <i>alike</i> , and <i>unlike</i>
11.	Word Usage	a. The use <i>too</i> , <i>so</i> , <i>either</i> , and <i>neither</i> b. The use of <i>between</i> and <i>among</i>
12.	Word Usage	a. The use of <i>other</i> , <i>another</i> , and <i>others</i> b. The use of <i>both...and</i> , <i>either ... or</i> , and <i>neither ... nor</i> .
13.	Overall Review Questions	a. Determine where specific information is found
14.	Overall Review Questions	a. Determine the tone, purpose, or course.

The class was also designed for presentation so that each class was divided into 12 groups. The first meeting was designed to explain what the students should do and what they should not do as well as which group they belonged to. And the second meeting were designed to the lecturer to explain the materials. The first group presented the topic in the third meeting, the second group presented the topic in the fourth meeting, and so on. Each student had to be active in the presentation in the form of asking, commenting, and suggesting, as well as answering. Besides, the students had to submit some assignments.

The difference from English 3 class was that each group had to make Telegram Group (TG) and WhatsApp Group (WG). TG was designed for reading and structure assignments, while WG was designed for listening and speaking. Through the groups, they could communicate and interact among others using English. The sub topic that they had to present could be discussed through the group. The assignments, of course, had to be submitted through the group and I could check anyone who had not submitted the assignment.

The score of English 4 was obtained from students' attendance (10%), quiz (10%) assignment (20%), Mid Term Test (30%) and Final Test (30%). The average score of English 4 was 74.29. It can be seen in the followings.

Table 6 The Score of English 4

No	Student's Number	Name	Score
----	------------------	------	-------

1.	15102001	Abdul Sholeh	77.19
2.	15102002	Adinda Zakiyatul Jannah	76.39
3.	15102003	Adli Al Hafizh	77.26
4.	15102004	Ahmad Iqbal	61.31
5.	15102005	Ajun Wicaksono	84.47
6.	15102006	Andika Eka Purnama	72.46
7.	15102007	Anggita Sindy Wulandari	76.21
8.	15102008	Arnanda Satria Wibawa	85.28
9.	15102009	Azwar Riza Pangestu	71.66
10.	15102010	Bayu Hadi Putra	78.38
11.	15102011	Bondan Wicaksana	78.88
12.	15102012	Deni Anggara Hendriawan	81.19
13.	15102013	Dinar Ahmad Harish	82.90
14.	15102014	Duwi Utami	78.04
15.	15102015	Evan Sigit Kurniawan	80.85
16.	15102016	Fatria Ikram Majid	77.78
17.	15102017	Ghifar Rachman Nugraha	64.86
18.	15102018	Hayumas Shalimar	69.00
19.	15102019	Indra Setiawan Jati	61.69
20.	15102020	Julita Pramesti	72.19
21.	15102021	Melly Sri Ulina Ginting	73.19
22.	15102022	M. Faisal Rizqiansyah	71.92
23.	15102023	Muhammad Ismail	65.95
24.	15102024	Nida Nurvira	72.04
25.	15102025	Nurul Aziz Pamungkas	76.36
26.	15102026	Patricia Sitanggang	71.91
27.	15102027	Raditya Priyo Sembodo	74.31
28.	15102028	Rastra Andryan Noor	75.94
29.	15102029	Ricky Febrian	78.23
30.	15102030	Rizki Adhi Saputra	73.84
31.	15102031	Shafira Fajrin Arumsidi	77.34
32.	15102032	Viona Octaviani Citra	78.47
33.	15102033	Yusuf Syakir Sarwo Pradana	63.88
34.	15101034	Achmad Fadhlan Septian	78.00
35.	15101035	Aditya Rachman	77.49
36.	15101036	Agita Purwandani	80.41
37.	15101037	Ahmad Nawawi	78.61
38.	15101038	Ananda Suci Rosalina	80.19

39.	15101039	Angga Pambudi	76.29
40.	15101041	Asamta Ria Br. Sitepu	69.40
41.	15101043	Bayu Mukti Wijaya	76.59
42.	15101045	Dettia Wenny Brigitta	82.97
43.	15101046	Dinda Wahyu Anggraeni	79.55
44.	15101047	Dwi Giovanni	76.09
45.	15101049	Firmansyah Pandu Wibawa	80.59
46.	15101050	Guntur Bhima Adytama Putra	80.40
47.	15101051	Hendra Gusti Mardikacandra	75.31
48.	15101052	Irfan Muhammad Ghani	81.19
49.	15101053	Khairul Bariyat	77.26
50.	15101054	Mohamad Ikrom Nafi	78.60
51.	15101055	M. Faiz Syahputra	73.45
52.	15101056	M. Rizky Utama Lubis	75.56
53.	15101057	Nur Amalliah Indah Cahyani	82.09
54.	15101058	Olivian Bagas Pradana	78.00
55.	15101059	Permata Lisia Br. Silitonga	70.75
56.	15101060	Rafiendra Bagas Aryandika	69.49
57.	15101061	Roudhatul Jannah	73.21
58.	15101062	Rico Satrio Yuwono	89.10
59.	15101063	Rosy Wahyu Mustika	78.80
60.	15101065	Wasis Anggraita Rezki Baskoro	74.11
61.	15101066	Adi Indra Firmansyah	72.50
62.	15101067	Aditya Sanubari	68.10
63.	15101068	Agung Prabowo	74.03
64.	15101069	Aji Insan Permadi	74.90
65.	15101070	Andika Agus Pranata	55.29
66.	15101071	Anggip Nurjagi	70.48
67.	15101072	Arifia Hudan Hasrinda	68.55
68.	15101073	Asep Ripai	55.73
69.	15101075	Bidadariana Yunia Utami Putri	68.44
70.	15101076	Deiana Hasan	56.48
71.	15101077	Dhimas Prabowo Setyanugroho	71.39
72.	15101078	Dita Wahyu Sabrina	70.36
73.	15101079	Egistian	64.73
74.	15101081	Fitria Dwi Utami	65.40
75.	15101082	Haris Fadilah	68.46
76.	15101083	Ilham Adha Sulaeman	73.60

77.	15101084	Irfani Aditya	80.15
78.	15101085	Laksmita Intan Pertiwi	86.16
79.	15101086	Muhammad Arif Syaifurrahman	76.11
80.	15101087	Muhammad Iqbal Al Kholili	63.49
81.	15101089	Nur Fina Saraswati	81.93
82.	15101090	Pancar Nova Lailafitra	68.53
83.	15101091	Puspita Septika Jati	81.78
84.	15101092	Rafri Abiansyah Rahman	57.26
85.	15101093	Reyhan Maulana Yafi	68.00
86.	15101094	Rinaldi Depari	81.81
87.	15101095	Samuel Panggabean	66.33
88.	15101096	Triyono Subekti	78.29
89.	15101097	Yunila Rahmi	88.30
	Average		74.29

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, students' motivation to study English was available, but their motivation should be stimulated. The indication was that most of them liked English, but activities that showed their interest in English were not by them, such as reading English books, joining English extra-curricular, English discussion, and so on. To encourage them to study English, English teacher should add one of strategies, namely using social media.

The result showed that adding social media in teaching learning process was able to increase the average score, from 73.48 in English 3 to 74.29 in English 4. It increases 0.81 and it is acceptable because TOEFL materials are categorized as difficult ones. By better managing the use of social media in the teaching learning process, both teachers and learners are able to improve English mastery.

5. REFERENCES

- Bradford, A. 2007. *Motivational orientation in under-researched EFL contexts: Findings from Indonesia*, *RELC Journal*, 38, 302-322.
- Gardner, R. C. 1985. *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Arnold.
- Graham, D. L. 2003. *Teaching redemptively: Bringing grace and truth into your classroom*. [Kindle version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1998. *How to Teach English: An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman
- _____. 1998. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed.)*. Harlow: Longman

- Munn, P., & Drever, E., 1990. *Using Questionnaires in Small-Scale Research*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Nichols, Rebekah. 2014. *Motivating English Language Learners: An Indonesian Case Study*. http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1051&context=med_theses Accessed on June 21, 2017
- Riyatno. 2016. *The Use of WhatsApp Group in Teaching Speaking*. Proceedings in Siliwangi International English Conference. Tasikmalaya: English Education Department UNSIL
- _____. 2016. *Traditional Games in Teaching Speaking in Non-English Department Class*. Proceeding in The 63rd TEFLIN International Conference 2016. Surabaya: UNIPA Adibuana.
- Wimolmas, Ratanawalee *A Survey Study of Motivation in English Language Learning of First Year Undergraduate Students at Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology (SIIT), Thammasat University*. http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1051&context=med_theses Accessed on June 21, 2017