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Abstract

Based on the explanation of the theory by Gardner the state is motivation comes from within a person as a driving force to achieve goals for more advanced change. This study aims to determine how enthusiastic for student's Eighth grade in the SMPN 03 Bengkulu Tengah are in learning English, especially speaking English. Researchers used a quasy-experimental research method, namely a control group posttest only design which showed in a significant difference between 74.92% and 61.96% of the experimental class in the control class. From this hypothesis, the researcher obtained a comparison of the experimental class in the treatment using the storytelling method of 4.34% and the control class with the narrative picture method of 3.58%. So the researcher can conclude that there is a significant difference between the two methods with or without the use of treatment compared to the motivation to learn English in class VIII students at SMPN 03 Bengkulu Tengah.
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A. Introduction

Motivation is a person's motivation from within or from outside to achieve a certain goal (Nunan, 1983). Students motivation in learning is able to influence the entire learning and teaching process in the classroom, motivation is formed from within these students. In 2018, Nadiem Karim said that English was abolished at the junior high school (SMP) and senior high
school (SMA) levels. Therefore, many teachers, especially teachers of English subjects, apply several new methods to be able to increase students’ enthusiasm in learning English especially in speaking because speaking is a skill which could be useful for students whether in academic or non-academic setting (Syafryadin, 2020; Syafryadin, 2020). This study applies the storytelling method to train students’ English in speaking English. According to Harmer (2007) & Syafryadin, et al. (2019), storytelling is a method of teaching speaking skills so that students can briefly summarize a story or story they have heard from someone or media listeners before, or they can create their own stories to tell their classmates. This study aims to determine whether there is student motivation to learn English after notification of English subjects.

Then, researchers looked back at several previous studies such as Zuhriyah’s (2017) study entitled ‘Storytelling to Improve Students’ Speaking Skills; The result showed that there was an improvement in students’ speaking skills after the implementation of storytelling. The speaking test result in cycle two explained that the students’ speaking aspects got good progress. Storytelling improved their comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Thus, it can be said that storytelling could improve students’ speaking skills with good motivation. There are also those who discuss student motivation in learning English such as research by Akhyak and Indramawan (2013: 18) in a study entitled "Improving students' English competence through storytelling", storytelling that is applied in teaching speaking can improve student fluency, grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and content contained in the content of the story the fable.

In this study, researchers received research questions in the form of: is there any influence of storytelling to increase the motivation of students to practice speaking the language of English. Answer questions research is answered in chapter discussion that there are two possibilities, is there an influence of storytelling on the motivation of the students in learning the language, but otherwise did not exist the influence of methods.

B. Research Method

The researcher used the storytelling method to collect data. The research design was quasi-experimental research used Sugiono modification design. One of them in the form of an experimental design used by researchers was the Control Group Posttest Only Design. In this design, either the experimental group or control group was given without in experiment group (Sugiono, 2015; Creswell, 2014; Ary, et al. 2010), speaking in structure to be employed by the teacher was through the implementation of storytelling technique. The researcher conducted the research by Choosing the right place is important in a study; therefore it was able to influence the results of research with a period of 6 meetings a month. So, the researcher chose SMP Negeri 03 center of Bengkulu as the background for the study. It was located on Kembang Seri Street,
Bengkulu - Curup, Center of Bengkulu. Meanwhile, the sample in this study consisted of 2 classes VIII, namely the control class in class VIII A and the experimental class in class VIII B with 26 students in both of them.

To obtain valid data, the researcher used three instruments namely;

a) The speaking test

The researcher gave an oral test at the treatment session. The treatment used by researcher is to provide treatment in the form of knowledge and also choose what fairy tales were retold using appropriate media.

b) Questionnaire

The researcher was provided questionnaires to students to measure students' initial motivation and research what are the motivational points. In this study, the researcher conducted a division of questionnaires as one of the data collection techniques.

c) Interviews

Researchers conduct interviews of the two positions namely from the opinion of the students and also the opinion of teachers. Interview intended as a data addition to research this, because taking the data directly in private about the motivation of students to learn the language of English that uses methods storytelling.

The researcher used several steps of data analysis collected from document analysis and interviews. It was a drawing of conclusions / verification: conclusions were supplemented using supporting evidence and the results of data collection.

In this study, researchers used an online system due to the Covid 19 pandemic that is currently sweeping around the world, researchers used zoom meetings and WhatSapp chat as an alternative to carry out treatment and also provide questionnaires to students. In a study this, researchers use the something like record, photos, and also a document from the school.

C. Results and Discussion

Based on the results of the research conducted and analyzing the results of the pretest and posttest. The posttest is given to students in the Eighth Grade (8B) as the treatment class using storytelling with a total of 26 students and (8A) as a control class using picture narrating with a total of 26 students. The first instrument was given to students before the researchers conducted the study with metacognitive strategies and the posttest was given to students at the end of the study after using the method.

The questionnaire sheets data were obtained using the online Google form and the results of the treatment using the storytelling method were done via online video call WhatsApp
and zoom meeting online, then the data results were published in the form of documentation in the form of a screenshot treatment using the storytelling method and voice notes from students. Based on field notes, namely from the results of interviews conducted by researchers with English teachers at SMPN 03 Bengkulu Tengah (DV) said that in dealing with lazy students, there needs to be a lot of evaluation in terms of teaching methods, methods and motivating students when learning to speak English. On the other side, the school has met the standards of media (audio, books, and projectors).

From the results of the above data, the researcher found a comparison between the experimental class and the control class in answering the speaking test distributed by the researcher. The data is described in the T-test analysis table below:

**Table 1. Analysis of the T test of student's motivation**

|                          | Class B (treatment class) | Class A (control class) |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| **Sample**               |                            |                          |
| **Mean**                 | 75.03846                   | 61.96154                 |
| **Variance**             | 73.07846                   | 47.31846                 |
| **Observation**          | 26                         | 26                       |
| **Pearson Correlation**  | -0.03538                   |                          |
| **Hypothesized Mean Difference** | 0                       |                          |
| **Df**                   | 25                         |                          |
| **t Stat**               | 5.974667                   |                          |
| **P (T <= t)** one-tail  | 1.54E-06                   |                          |
| **t Critical one-tail**  | 1.708141                   |                          |
| **P (T <= t)** two-tail  | 3.08E-06                   |                          |
| **t Critical two-tail**  | 2.059539                   |                          |

The average or mean the difference between classes B and A after doing the speaking test in the table above is between 75 and 61, so there is a difference between the treatment and not giving the treatment. The variant results also experienced differences, namely 73 and 47 with a
sample of 26 students and $df = 26-1$ is 25. Then the $t$ state description of 5.97 is obtained which is the same as the difference between the two. The hypothesis using two tails with the result of $t$ table is 2.0590539 with ap value of 3.08E-06. Therefore, the p value is smaller than alpha 5%, the result is accepted H1. Hypothesis H1 concluded that there is a significant difference between treatment and not given treatment. The researcher also analyzed the results received when doing the speaking test based on the procedure. It is described in the table below:

Table 1. Result of Treatment Class and Control class

| o.  | Criteria          | Treatment class | Control class |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| .   | Fluency           | 4.44            | 3.07          |
| .   | Pronunciation     | 4.47            | 4.37          |
| .   | Accuracy          | 4.14            | 3.09          |
| .   | Clarity           | 4.39            | 4.10          |
| .   | Performance skills| 4.30            | 3.29          |
| .   | Total             | 4.34            | 3.58          |

From the table above, it can be seen that the effect of treatment and not being given treatment is between 4.34 to 3.58%. The difference is about 76% per aspect. The overall results of the data above, the researcher concluded that the students' motivation in learning English in the classroom, especially when speaking test in class B, got had a **high degree of motivation** and class A got had a **moderate degree of motivation** with scala likert explanation.

After the explanation above, the researcher also analyzed data from the motivation questionnaire given to students totaling 20 questions, which were analyzed using the unit analysis method, the activities given at the end of the treatment. It is described in the table below:

Table 1. Analysis unit questionnaire test of student's motivation

| Statistics         | Experiment class | Control class |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------|
| N                  | 26               | 26            |
| Valid              | 26               | 26            |
| M                  | 2                | 2             |

474
The overall results of the data from the experimental class which had a percentage of 75.50% and while the control class had a percentage of 60.00% showed that students had high motivation towards learning English in class, especially in the field of questionnaires, but this comparison was different from the results class A and B about choosing answers about their motivation in learning English.

Then, based on the results of the hypothesis with the 1-way ANOVA test conducted by the researcher using the SPSS version 25 program, the significance value of 0.000 < α = 0.05 was obtained, so H0 was rejected, which means that there was an influence between the learning method on the motivation to learn English of class VIII students at SMPN 03 Central Bengkulu. So it can be said that the difference between the method and also the provision of treatment in the teaching and learning process is very important, because sometimes teachers in class face students who are lazy, bored, bored, and so on. so that this situation cannot be ignored because this can reduce student motivation when the teaching and learning process takes place.

### D. Conclusion

Based on the explanation above, there is no significant influence between the pictures narrating method or without prior simulation on the learning motivation of class VIII A students in English subjects at SMPN 03 Bengkulu in the middle of the 2020/2021 academic year. H1 =
there is at least one \( \tau_i \neq 1 \), which means that the method without treatment only affects 1% of student learning motivation. Meanwhile, There is an influence on the storytelling method by providing treatment on the motivation to learn English of class VIII B students in English subjects at SMPN 03 Bengkulu in the middle of the 2020/2021 academic year. This is indicated by the results of the data hypothesis test with a value of \( P = 0.000 < 0.05 \), then \( H_0 \) is rejected. After the research done, the researcher want to give some advice for the next researcher are teachers should use appropriate learning methods, and it would be better if they use media aids in the learning process so that children become more motivated in learning, For students, it can foster enthusiasm for learning because the use of media tends not to be boring so that students are motivated to continue learning, and For students, learning English can compete in world education.
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