

Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

This chapter discusses the result of the research as well as the discussion of the research. The researcher explains the result of the research including the means of pre-test and post-test, testing hypothesis by t-test analysis, and the significances of using storytelling to improve students' English speaking skill.

Result

This study was conducted in One State Junior High School in Yogyakarta. The researcher used quantitative as the approach of the research and quasi-experimental as the research design. In this research, the researcher used two groups namely experimental and control group. The researcher gave pre-test and post-test in every group. The pre-test was used to see students' English speaking skill before the treatment. Then, the researcher gave a treatment by using storytelling in their English learning in experimental group, whereas the control group was not given the treatment. In experimental class (VIII D), the treatment included the comprehension of reading material with some exercises, make a story based on the questions guidelines, make a story based on correct structure, and speaking practice. In control class (VIII C), the researcher taught the students by using a story and some questions only in every meeting. The researcher taught seven meetings with time allocation of 40 minutes for every group. After that, the researcher did the post-test in experimental and control group.

Result 1. To answer the research questions “How is students’ English speaking skill before and after the implementation of storytelling in experimental class”, the researcher presented the result in the following table:

Table 1				
<i>The result of students’ English speaking skill before and after the implementation of storytelling in experimental class</i>				
No	Name	Mean Score		
		Pre-test	Post-test	Gained Score
1	Student 1	63	77	14
2	Student 2	63	73	10
3	Student 3	68	88	20
4	Student 4	75	87	12
5	Student 5	73	83	10
6	Student 6	75	78	3
7	Student 7	68	75	7
8	Student 8	65	77	12
9	Student 9	67	77	10
10	Student 10	67	72	5
11	Student 11	62	68	7
12	Student 12	68	73	5
13	Student 13	68	75	7
14	Student 14	67	77	10
15	Student 15	67	73	7
16	Student 16	65	72	7
17	Student 17	65	77	12
18	Student 18	65	75	10
19	Student 19	68	73	5

20	Student 20	65	73	8
21	Student 21	65	72	7
22	Student 22	68	72	3
23	Student 23	70	73	3
24	Student 24	65	75	10
25	Student 25	65	75	10
26	Student 26	65	73	8
27	Student 27	68	80	12
28	Student 28	68	77	8
29	Student 29	65	72	7
30	Student 30	65	72	7

From the Table 1 above, we could see the students' English speaking skill in pre-test and post-test of experimental class. From the pre-test, the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 62. From the post-test the highest score was 88 and the lowest score was 68.

Tabel 2					
<i>Mean score of pre-test and post-test Experimental class</i>					
Descriptive Statistics					
Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE TEST D	30	66.93	3.118	62	75
POST TEST D	30	75.47	4.392	68	88

From the Table 2, the mean score from the pre-test was **66.93**, and the mean score from the post-test was **75.47**. It meant that the mean score of post-test was higher than the mean score of pre-test. Therefore, it indicated that the students' scores increased in post-test. It was because the researcher gave a treatment to the students. In the treatment, the students answered the questions guidelines related to the story. Then, the students practiced to make a story used their own language. In addition, the students memorized the story that they had made. After that, The

students were assigned to re-tell the story without using script when they performed a storytelling. The students were also asked to use their body language, facial expression, intonation, and pacing when they performed storytelling. In addition, the researcher worked together with the English teacher at the school to correct the pronunciation error and student's fluency when they re-told a story. The researcher also checked the students' comprehension by using questions guidelines given to the students. The participants of experimental class were 30 students of VIII D. In addition, the total participants of both pre-test and post-test were the same. The previous study conducted by Mujizat (2017) also revealed the effectiveness of storytelling in improving students' speaking skill based on the pre-test to the post-test.

Result 2. The result of the research question “How is students' English speaking skill before and after the implementation of storytelling in control class” was shown in the following:

Table 3				
<i>The result of students' English speaking skill before and after the implementation of storytelling in control class</i>				
No	Name	Mean Score		
		Pre-test	Post-test	Gained Score
1	Student 1	68	71	3
2	Student 2	70	70	0
3	Student 3	69	68	-1
4	Student 4	68	70	2
5	Student 5	70	70	0
6	Student 6	65	68	3
7	Student 7	67	68	1
8	Student 8	68	70	2
9	Student 9	63	65	2
10	Student 10	67	67	0

11	Student 11	65	67	2
12	Student 12	62	63	1
13	Student 13	65	67	2
14	Student 14	67	67	0
15	Student 15	65	68	3
16	Student 16	67	67	0
17	Student 17	62	67	5
18	Student 18	70	68	-2
19	Student 19	70	70	0
20	Student 20	73	72	-1
21	Student 21	75	72	-3
22	Student 22	70	67	-3
23	Student 23	70	67	-3
24	Student 24	73	68	-5
25	Student 25	73	70	-3
26	Student 26	73	68	-5
27	Student 27	70	70	0
28	Student 28	73	70	-3
29	Student 29	67	65	-2
30	Student 30	73	68	-5
31	Student 31	73	68	-5
32	Student 32	73	68	-5

From the table above, we can see the score in pre-test and post-test of the control class. The highest score of the pre-test was 73 and the lowest score was 62. After that, in the post-test, the highest score was 72 and the lowest score was 63.

Table 4					
<i>Mean score of pre-test and post-test Control class</i>					
Descriptive Statistics					
Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE TEST C	32	68.88	3.554	62	75
POST TEST C	32	68.25	1.984	63	72

Table 4 above described the mean score of pre-test and post-test in control class. The mean score of pre-test was **68.88** and the mean score of post-test was **68.25**. It meant that the mean score of the pre-test was higher than the post-test. The participants of control class were 32 students of VIII C whereas both of pre-test and post-test had the same total of participant. Based on the result, it was indicated that the students' score decreased from pre-test to post-test. Furthermore, the students answered the questions guidelines and practiced to make a story. There was two days only for the students to practice making the story. The researcher did not ask the students to memorize the story that they had made. Not only that, the researcher also did not teach the students on how to use body language, eye-contact, facial expression, intonation, and pacing. However, the students were asked to perform storytelling in front of the class by using script. In addition, in the teaching learning process, the teacher did not give correction for the students' pronunciation and students' fluency. The researcher only gave some questions guideline to the students for checking student's comprehension related to the reading material.

Result 3. To answer the third research questions about the significant effect of using story telling in teaching speaking skill, the researcher needed to make sure that the test was normal and homogeneous.

Normality of experimental class. Normality meant that the distribution of the test was normally distributed (or bell-shaped) with 0 mean, 1 standard deviation, and a symmetric bell shaped curve. Cohen et al (2011) argued that normality test is used to determine whether or not sample data was normally distributed. Then, the researcher explained the result of normality test from experimental class. The result can be seen in the following table and figure:

Tabel 5
Normality of Experiment Class

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		PRE TEST CLASS EXPERIMENT	POST TEST CLASS EXPERIMENT
N		30	30
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	66.93	75.47
	Std. Deviation	3.118	4.392
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.233	.197
	Positive	.233	.197
	Negative	-.168	-.182
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.275	1.078
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.077	.195

a. Test distribution is Normal.

From Table 5 above, the significance value was higher than the significance level from pre-test of experimental group ($0.077 > 0.05$). It implied that the test of pre-test was normally distributed. After that, the significance value was also higher than significance level from post-test was ($0.195 > 0.05$). It signified that the data distribution from post-test was also normal.

In addition, normal distribution was also shown from the histogram below. *Figure 3* showed normal distribution as the curve showed the bell-shaped curve.

Normality of control class. . Normality meant that If the significance was higher than significance level ($\alpha > 0.05$), it meant that the data distribution was normal. Cohen et al (2011) argued that normality test is used to determine whether or not sample data is normally distributed . The result showed in the table and figure below:

Tabel 6
Normality test of control Class

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		PRE TEST	POST TEST
		CLASS CONTROL	CLASS CONTROL
N		32	32
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	68.88	68.25
	Std. Deviation	3.554	1.984
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.158	.206
	Positive	.095	.206
	Negative	-.158	-.171
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.896	1.168
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.398	.131

a. Test distribution is Normal.

From Kolmogorov-Smirnov test above, the researcher concluded that the test distribution in control group was normal. It can be seen from the significance value in the pre-test was 0.398, and the significance value in post-test was 0.131. Those results were higher than 0.05 which meant that the test distribution was normal. The data was homogeny because it came from the same variance or variable.

In addition, the researcher also analyzed the gained score result used descriptive statistic. The researcher explained the result in the following paragraph:

Tabel 7
Descriptive Statistics of Gained Score for Experiment Class and Control Class

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
GAINED SCORE D	30	8.50	3.540	3	20
GAINED SCORE C	32	-.62	2.791	-5	5

Based on table 7, it showed that the maximum score of variable gained score in experimental class (VIII D) was 20 and the lowest score was 3. Then, in the control class the maximum score of gained score was 5 and the lowest score was -5. Furthermore, the mean score of gained score in experimental class was 8.50, and the mean score of gained score in control class was -0.62. The participants in experimental class were 32 students, and the control class was 30 students. The researcher explained the result of normality test from the gained score of experimental and control class. The result was served in the following table and figure:

Tabel 8
Normality test of Gained Score for Experiment Class and Control Class

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		GAINED SCORE D	GAINED SCORE C
N		30	32
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	8.50	-.62
	Std. Deviation	3.540	2.791
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.136	.151
	Positive	.136	.115
	Negative	-.136	-.151
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.744	.855
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.637	.458

a. Test distribution is Normal.

The output of Kolmogorov-smirnov showed the Sig.(2-tailed) value both of experimental class and control class was 0.673 and the control class was 0.458. It indicated that those Sig.(2-tailed) higher than 0.05 It means that the data was normally distributed.

Homogeneity test for experiment class and control class. After explaining the normality test from experimental and control class, the researcher also tested the homogeneity. The result of homogeneity test was considered homogenous if the significant level was higher than 0.05.

The homogeneity test was explained in Table 7 below:

Table 9					
<i>Homogeneity test Pre – Test of experiment and control class</i>					
<i>Test of Homogeneity of Variance</i>					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Score	Based on Mean	1.752	1	60	.191
	Based on Median	1.635	1	60	.206
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.635	1	59.933	.206
	Based on trimmed mean	1.656	1	60	.203

Based on the output of *Test of Homogeneity of Variance*, it showed that the Sig. value of pre-test in experimental and control class was $0.191 > 0.05$. It implied that the variance of the pre-test both experimental and control class was homogeneous.

Table 10
Homogeneity test Post – Test of experiment and control class
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Score	Based on Mean	8.623	1	60	.005
	Based on Median	7.215	1	60	.009
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	7.215	1	40.457	.010
	Based on trimmed mean	7.144	1	60	.010

Based on the output of *Test of Homogeneity of Variance*, it showed that the Sig. value of based on mean of post-test in experimental and control class was $0.005 < 0.05$. It signified that the variance of the post-test both experimental and control class was not homogeneous. It was because the result between control and experimental class was different. Then, there was no influence if the data was not homogen.

Table 11
Homogeneity test Gained Score of experiment and control class
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Score	Based on Mean	.604	1	60	.040
	Based on Median	.535	1	60	.047
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.535	1	54.682	.047
	Based on trimmed mean	.496	1	60	.044

Based on the output of *Test of Homogeneity of Variance*, it showed that the Sig. value of based on mean score in experimental and control class was $0.040 < 0.05$. It implied that the

variance of the gained score in experimental and control class was not homogeneous. It was because the result between control and experimental class was different.

Table 12 <i>Independent sample t-test of Gained Score</i> <i>Group Statistics</i>					
	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	control class	32	-0.6250	2.79111	.49340
	experiment class	30	8.5000	3.54041	.64639

Based on the output of *Independent sample t-test of Gained Score*, it showed that the mean score of gained score in both control class and experimental class simul was -0.0625 and 8.5. It meant that the mean score of gained score on experimental class was higher than the mean score of gained score in the control class.

Table 13 <i>Independent Samples Test</i>										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	.604	.440	-11.308	60	.000	-9.12500	.80698	-10.73920	-7.51080
	Equal variances not assumed			-11.221	55.131	.000	-9.12500	.81318	-10.75456	-7.49544

The output of *Independent Samples Test* above, it showed that the score of Sig (2-tailed) was 0.000 and the score of *t*-value was 11.308. The requirements were if *t*-value was higher than *t*-table, whereas *t*-table for df60 is 1.6706, then H_a was accepted or if the number of significance is lower than 0.05 (Sig. <0.05) then the data were significant. According to table 12, it indicated that $0.000 < 0.05$ and $11.308 > 1.6706$. It meant that H_a was accepted or there was significant difference of the gained score in experimental and control class. The mean difference in post-test of experiment could be seen on the column of *Mean Difference*. It showed that the mean difference was 9.125 and it was negative value. It implied that the gained score of control class was lower than experimental class. Consequently, storytelling was the effective technique in teaching students' English speaking skill. This research also gave the significant and positive result for the students in experimental class in which their pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension improved after given treatment by using storytelling.

Discussion

Speaking is one of the important skills that should be mastered by the students when they learned English Language. Richard and Renandya (2002) said that "A most people in language learner study English to improve their students. It was because the students could communicate easily and they had to be able to communicate with others by using English Language. Shumin (2002) asserted that speaking is an important instrument used by people to communicate with others. Then, it would help learners to speak English fluently and appropriately. There were some problems that the students faced in learning speaking such as lacked of confident to speak up and pronounce the words. Kurniawan (2013) stated that the factor that influence students to speak was pronunciation. In solving the speaking problem, the teacher must choose appropriate

technique in teaching speaking skill. Then, the appropriate technique was storytelling.

According to Inayah (2015) students who were taught by storytelling had better performance than those who were taught by using other techniques. Based on the result of students 'English speaking skill in experimental class and control class, the researcher concluded that there were some important aspects as follows:

The result of the first research questions showed that there was significant different in experimental class. The student's condition in experimental class was different from the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, the mean score of the students was 66.93. It was because the students did not have preparation to re-tell a story. The researcher came to the class and asked the students to retell a story about the fable without any preparation. Some aspects that the researcher used in speaking test were pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. In pronunciation aspect, it showed that the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 60. The mean score of pronunciation was 66.5. Besides, the result in fluency aspect indicated that the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 60. In addition, the mean score of fluency aspect was 67. Furthermore, the result of comprehension showed that the highest score was 70 and the lowest score was 60 as well as the mean score of comprehension aspect was 67.5. Thus, the mean score for all aspects was 66.93.

To improve students 'English speaking skill, the researcher used storytelling technique. At this rate, the researcher gave the post-test for the students after given the treatment by using storytelling. From the result of the post-test, it indicated that there was significant different between the pre-test and post-test score. The mean score of the post-test was 75.47. The post-test showed that in pronunciation aspect the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 74. On the other hand, the mean score of pronunciation aspect was 73.6. Then, the result of fluency

aspect showed that the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 65 as well as the mean score of the fluency aspect was 73.7. In comprehension aspect the result showed that the highest score was 90 and the lowest score was 75. Meanwhile, the mean score of comprehension was 79. Furthermore, the mean score all of the aspects was 75.47. The score was different because the students performed storytelling without script. The student also used body language when they re-told a story. Besides, the students also used intonation, pacing, and facial expression based on the condition of the story. In teaching learning process, the researcher used some media to support the lesson such as video, picture, text, and power point slide.

The result of the second research questions showed that there was no significant different in control class. The student's condition in control class was different from the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, the mean score of the students was 68.88. It was the same as the experimental class that the students did not have preparation to re-tell a story. The researcher came to the class and asked the students to retell a story about fable without any preparation. Some aspects that the researcher used in speaking test were pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. In pronunciation aspect, it showed that the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 65 with the mean score of pronunciation was 68.9. After that, the result in fluency aspect indicated that the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 65 as well as the mean score of fluency aspect was 68.9. Furthermore, the result of comprehension showed that the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 65. The mean score of comprehension aspect was 68.9. Thus, the mean score for all aspects was 68.88. Not only that, the researcher also used storytelling technique in teaching speaking skill. During implementing this technique, the researcher gave the post-test for the students after giving the treatment by using storytelling. From the result of the post-test it was indicated that there was no significant different between

the pre-test and post-test score. The mean score of the post-test was 68.25. It was indicated that the mean score decreased. The post-test showed that in pronunciation aspect the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 60 as well as the mean score of pronunciation aspect was 69. Then, the result of fluency aspect showed that the highest score was 70 and the lowest score was 65 while the mean score of the fluency aspect was 67. In comprehension aspect the result showed that the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 65. Besides, the mean score of comprehension was 68. Furthermore, the mean score for all of aspects was 68.25. The score was different because the student performed storytelling by using script or only read the text. The student did not use their body language to support the story. Then, the students did not use intonation, pacing, as well as the facial expression when they retold the story that they had created. In the teaching learning process, the researcher only used text and video to support the lesson.

The result of the data analysis showed that storytelling was an effective technique to improve students' English speaking skill. The result of the data analysis showed that $.000 < 0.05$ and $11.308 > 1.6706$. It implied that H_0 was accepted or there was significant difference of the gained score in experimental and control class. The mean difference was 9.125 and it was negative value. It meant that the gained score of control class was lower than experimental class. Then, H_0 was accepted. It was in line with the recent study where Inten Mujizat's study (2017) revealed that the students' speaking skill in experimental class that was given treatment by using storytelling technique enhanced compared to control group. The implementation of storytelling in teaching speaking skill helped the students in facing the difficulties of their pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. Besides, Zuhriyah also (2017) stated that storytelling results a good improvement in all of speaking aspects such as comprehension, pronunciation, fluency,

vocabulary, and grammar. Additionally, this research was focus on storytelling technique to improve students' speaking skill. The pre-test given to students was storytelling so that the post-test given to students storytelling also. It was because the researcher wanted to see the effectiveness of storytelling in improving students' speaking skill. It was used the same test in order to the pre-test and post-test came from the same variable.

As discussed in the chapter two that there were some components of speaking skill. Those were pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. In this research, the researcher took three aspects to be assessed in speaking skill such as pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. The result of this study showed that there was improvement of students' pronunciation from the pre-test to the post-test. It indicated that pronunciation had influence in students' speaking skill. It was in line with Kline (2001) who stated that pronunciation is the way to produce the utterance words clearly when they are speaking. Then, the result also indicated that fluency aspect also had improvement from the pre-test to the post-test. It meant that students speak more fluently in the post-test than the pre-test. It was in line with Nunan (2003) who stated that fluency is the language quickly and confidently with any pauses. It also indicated that fluency had influence in students speaking skill. The last aspect that had improvement from the re-test to the post-test was comprehension. In the post-test the students re-told the story with a good comprehension. It was because the researcher gave one week for the students to understand the story that the students have created. It was in line with Hornby (2000) stated that understanding is the mind; it is testing the power of understanding exercise aimed at improving it. (p.194).

In this research, the result showed that storytelling was the effective technique in teaching speaking skill. There were some aspects of storytelling that the researcher used in teaching and

learning process. Those were body language, eye contact, intonation, and pacing. Those aspects were used to support the students to deliver the material when they re-told a story. Furthermore, some aspects above had benefits for the students to attract interest and attention. It was in line with Jianing (2007) who argued that some ways in teaching speaking skill by using storytelling were showing the visual aids, used intonation based on the character of the story, used body language, and students practice to act it. It would give benefits for the students such as attract other students 'interest , make the students emotionally engaged, make students remember some vocabulary, and improve students' pronunciation and fluency in speaking. Then, Ikramudin (2017) stated that facilitating students with several aspects such as body language to emphasize the story, facial expression, use variation tones, detailing, and practice during implementing story telling technique in the classroom will help the teacher to make students interested and have a good imagination in developing a story.