

IMPROVING THE TENTH GRADERS' WRITING AND SPEAKING ABILITIES IN RETELLING NARRATIVE STORIES THOROUGH STORYBOARD AT MAN 3 PALEMBANG

Heru Setiawan
Universitas Tridianti Palembang
herusetiawan@univ-tridianti.ac.id

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to find out whether or not there was a significant improvement in writing and speaking abilities in narrative stories of the students who were taught by using Storyboard and those who were not. This study applied a quasi experimental design. The population of the study was the tenth graders with the total number of 224, where sixty-four students were taken as the sample by using purposive sampling. The data were collected by using writing and speaking tests and analyzed statistically by using paired-sample t-test and independent sample t-test. Based on the result independent sample t-test for writing test and the value of t_{obtained} (6.042) was higher than critical value of t-test (2.000 and 1.994). In addition, the value of t_{obtained} of speaking (4.649) was higher than critical value of t-test (2.000 and 1.994). This means that there was significant improvement in the abilities to write and speak narrative stories between the students who were taught by using Storyboard and those who were not. Thus, the use of storyboard could improve the students' writing and speaking abilities in retelling narrative stories.

Keywords: Improving, writing, speaking, abilities, and storyboard

MENINGKATKAN KEMAMPUAN MEMBACA DAN MENULIS KELAS X DALAM CERITA NARATIF DENGAN MENGGUNAKAN STORYBOARD PADA MAN 3 PALEMBANG

ABSTRAK: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui adakah peningkatan kemampuan menulis dan berbicara dalam cerita naratif terhadap siswa yang menggunakan dan tidak menggunakan storyboard. Penelitian ini menerapkan Quasi-experimental desain. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas X yang berjumlah 224 siswa. 64 siswa sebagai subjek penelitian yang diambil dengan menggunakan *purposive sampling technique*. Teknik Pengumpulan data yang digunakan adalah tes menulis dan berbicara. Analisis data penelitian ini dilakukan cara uji *paired sample t-test* and uji *independent sample t-test*. Hasil penelitian *independent sample t-test* menulis adalah the value of t_{obtained} (6.042) lebih tinggi daripada *critical value* of t-test (2.000 and 1.994). Hasil *independent sample t-test* berbicara menunjukkan the value of t_{obtained} of berbicara (4.649) lebih tinggi daripada *critical value* of t-test (2.000 and 1.994). Dengan demikian dapat dikatakan terjadi perbedaan kemampuan menulis dan berbicara siswa dengan menggunakan dan yang tidak menggunakan *storyboard*. Hal ini disimpulkan adanya peningkatan siswa dalam menulis dan berbicara dengan menggunakan *storyboard*.

Kata Kunci: Peningkatan, menulis, berbicara, kemampuan, dan storyboard

INTRODUCTION

English is one of the compulsory subjects in Indonesian schools. One of the aims in English teaching and learning process is the mastery of the four language skills. Those skills are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In Indonesia, English is taught at secondary school level as a compulsory subject. English has been considered as a foreign language in Indonesia, meaning that it is a language for communication, both in written and in oral (Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011). Thus, it cannot be denied that mastering writing and speaking is challenging tasks for students because both of them are difficult to learn. However, it is true to say that being able to communicate in English can help students to compete with others in a global community.

Writing is one of the ways to communicate. Lannon (2004) views writing as the process of transforming material discovered by research inspiration, trial or error, or whatever into a message with a definite meaning. Writing is an important subject at school because through writing students can share ideas (Suryana, 2012). Through writing students can

communicate, give information, and explore their ideas in written form. Therefore, the students must have a good mastery in writing to be able to write.

However, there are some considerations why writing is regarded as a difficult skill. Richards and Renandya (2002) mention that difficulties in writing arise not only in generating and reorganizing ideas but also in translating the ideas so that the readers can be easily able to understand about what is the writing about. They also proposed that second language writer should pay attention to the higher skills of writing; they are generating and reorganizing ideas.

In addition, the preliminary study that the writer conducted at State Islamic Senior High School 3 of Palembang showed that writing was also a difficult task for students. From their writing, the writer found that there were some problems that occurred in it. First, lacking of ideas became the most crucial problem. They got confused what to write because they were not accustomed to it. Conventions also became the next problem because some mistakes were found in their punctuation, capitalization, and grammar. Another problem was

concerned with organization. The paragraph had no organizing structure and it still blurred. Moreover, their problem in writing was supported by the English teacher's statement saying that he was more emphasize to teach reading than writing in the class.

The teaching of writing as one of the English language skills should be done integrately. According to Oxford (2001), integrated skills can expose English learners to an authentic language and challenge them to interact naturally in the language. In addition, Ozturk (2007) states that integrating the language skills provide meaningful content for students and makes them use the language in a real context provided with task based activities. In integration of language skills, listening and reading are categorized as receptive skills means that the skills in which meaning is extracted from the discourse; on the other hand, speaking and writing are categorized as productive skills means that skills in which students have to produce language themselves (Harmer, 2007).

As previously mentioned, in addition to writing, speaking is also a productive language skill. It serves as a means of communication. Harmer (2007, p. 123) states that there are three

main reasons for getting students to speak in the classroom. Firstly, speaking activity provide rehearsal opportunities – chances to practice real-life speaking in the safety of the classroom. Secondly, speaking task in which students try to use any or all of the language they know provide feedback for both teacher and students. The last, the more students have opportunities to activate the various elements of language they have stored in their brains, the more automatic their use of these elements become.

Problems concerning in English speaking ability in retelling occurred in MAN 3 Palembang. The informal interview with the English teachers conducted by the writer showed that there were four problems related to it. First, the students still pronounced the words incorrectly. Second, their grammar was not well organized; they got confused what correct tenses they should use. Third, the students were passive during speaking activities because they did not have fluent English speech. Fourth, the students were not confident enough to speak because they were afraid of making mistakes in front of their friends. The result of the informal interview with some of students also showed that they have

problems with pronunciation, grammar, vocabularies, sentence building and comprehending the idea of speaking.

Referring to the problems associated with English speaking ability in retelling, it can be argued that giving students the opportunities to practice their speaking is one of the ways to help them develop their fluency and confidence in speaking. Encouraging students' interaction is also very important. In addition, the teachers have to motivate the students to speak so they will get involved in the activities in classroom. The teachers should also teach English speaking through many interesting and innovative ways.

The teaching of writing and speaking for English subject is outlined in 2013 curriculum. There are three kinds of texts the students have to learn and one of them is narrative text. Narrative text is central to students' learning. It is a tool to help them organize their ideas and to explore new ideas and experiences. Composing stories both in written and oral forms is also an essential means for students to express themselves in communicative and interactive setting (Bamberg, 2010). Moreover, narrative text could also engage students actively involved in story building activities.

Referring to the problems that the students of MAN 3 Palembang encountered in English writing and speaking, the writer wants to apply storyboard. Storyboard is a graphic organizer in the form of illustrations or images displayed in sequence for the purpose of pre-visualizing a picture. It uses a sequence of images to tell a more complete story about people's interaction over time, where each image in the Storyboard represents a particular event (Greenberg, 2012).

According to study done by Lillyman, Guteridge, and Berridge (2011) said that storyboard is useful by committing the story through the written word and pictures onto paper and it encourages all students to be engaged in the story being told and became practically involved. Similar to writing, storyboard is also effective for speaking; students are able to tell the narrative story easily. They can tell it by showing the storyboard they made. The students do not need to memorize the text word by word because they are able to tell the sequence of the text from it. In thus, this study aimed to find out whether or not there was a significant improvement in writing and retelling narrative stories abilities of the students who were taught by using storyboard

and those who were not. It was hoped by doing this study, it could solve the students' problems in writing and retelling story in terms of recognizing the chronologies in narrative text. Learning by using storyboard can contribute to students' motivation in learning English. By using this media, students can develop their idea and vocabulary. In addition, the using of media in teaching writing can make the students interested in the lesson.

METHODOLOGY

This study applied a quasi experimental design. A quasi experimental design is a study which is aimed at discovering the influence of particular treatment. This design covers quantitative data and statistical technique in analyzing the data (Sugiyono, 2012). In this study, the writer used the non equivalent-control group design in which there were two groups, namely experimental group and control group. Both groups were given a pre-test and a post-test.

The basic schema of this study was described by Creswell (2005) as follows:

Experimental group	O₁	X	O₂
Control group	O₃	-	O₄

In this study, both groups were given the pretest. The experimental group was given a treatment by using storyboard, while the control group did not receive any treatment. At the end of the meeting, both groups were given the posttest.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In order to verify the hypotheses proposed, the statistical analysis was applied. The writer conducted paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test. Paired sample t-test was used to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in ability before and after treatment in the experimental group and control group. In order to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in writing and retelling scores of the post-test between the experimental group and control group, independent sample t-test was proposed.

The Result of Paired Sample t-test of Writing and Speaking in Experimental Group

The result of paired sample t-test showed that the value of t-obtained was 10.849 at the significance level of 0.000 with degree of freedom (df) 31, and the

critical value of t_{table} was 2.040. In addition, p-value was 0.000 lower than alpha value 0.05, and the value of $t_{obtained}$ was higher than the critical value of t_{table} , in which $10.849 > 2.040$, it indicated that there was a significant improvement in students' writing ability after the treatment given. Furthermore, it could be seen that the mean score of students' pre-test was 9.20, and the mean score of the students' writing post-test was 15.63. It was found that the mean difference between pre-test and post-test was 6.422. Therefore, there was a significant improvement in students' writing ability after the treatment given.

Next, in speaking test, the value of $t_{obtained}$ was 8.877 at the significance level of 0.000 testing with degree of freedom (df) 31, and the critical value of t_{table} was 2.040. Since the p-value 0.000 was lower than alpha value 0.05, and the value of $t_{obtained}$ was higher than the critical value of t_{table} , in which $8.877 > 2.040$, there was a significant improvement in students' speaking ability after the treatment given. It was also found that the mean score of the students' retelling pre-test was 8.69, and the mean score of the students' retelling post-test was 13.33. Therefore, the mean difference between

pre-test and post-test was 4.641. It could be concluded that there was a significant improvement in students' speaking ability after the treatment given. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Paired Sample t-test of Writing and speaking abilities for Experimental Group

Variable	Experiment				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Pre-test	Post-test	Mean	Sd			
Writing	9.20	15.63	6.42	3.34	10.849	31	0.00
Retelling	8.69	13.33	4.64	2.95	8.877	31	0.000

The Statistical Analysis of Paired Sample t-test of Writing and Speaking Abilities for Control Group

In terms of writing test, the value of $t_{obtained}$ was 1.554 at the significance level of 0.133 with degree of freedom (df) 31 and the critical value of t_{table} was 2.040. Since the p-value 0.133 was higher than alpha value 0.05, and the value of $t_{obtained}$ was lower than the critical value of t_{table} , in which $1.544 < 2.040$, there was not any significant improvement in students' writing ability. In addition, to find out which set of writing scores was higher, whether it was pre- or post-test, both mean scores were compared. The data below shows that the mean score of

students' writing pre-test was 8.69, and the mean score of writing post-test was 13.33. It could be concluded that the mean difference in students' writing was not significant.

Next, the result of paired sample t-test of retelling ability showed that the value of t-obtained was 11.214 at the significance level of 0.000 with degree of freedom (df) 31, and the critical value of t-table was 2.040. Since the p-value 0.000 was lower than alpha value 0.05, and the value of t-obtained was higher than the critical value of t-table, in which $11.214 > 2.040$, there was a significant improvement in students' retelling. In addition, to find out speaking scores was higher, whether it was pre-test or post-test, both mean scores were compared. The data below shows that the mean score of students' speaking pre-test was 6.91, and the mean score of students' speaking post-test was 11.28. The mean difference between pre-test and post-test was 4.375. It could be concluded that there was a significant improvement in students' speaking ability.

The Statistical Analysis of the Independent Sample T-test for Writing Score

To find out whether there was a significant improvement in students' writing ability of the two groups, the writer presented the results of writing post-tests in both groups. It is shown in table 2.

Table 2. Independent Sample T-Test Of Writing

Group	Mean Score of Post-test for Writing	Mean Difference	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental	15.625	3.875	6.042	0.000
Control	11.750			

Based on the table above, the value of t-obtained was 6.042, at the significant level $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.000$). Since the significant value (0.000) was less than 0.05, and the value of t-obtained was higher than critical values of t-table, in which $6.042 > 2.000$ and $6.042 > 1.994$, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was rejected and research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It meant that there was a significant improvement of writing ability of the students who were taught by using storyboard and those who were not.

The Statistical Analysis of the Independent Sample T-test for Speaking Score

To find out whether there was a significant improvement in speaking ability of the two groups, the writer

presented the results of post-tests in both groups. The writer used independent sample t-test. Table 3 shows the result of the independent sample t-test for speaking test.

Table 3. Independent Sample t-test of Speaking

Group	Mean Score	Mean Difference	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental	13.328			
Control	11.281	2.05	4.649	0.000

Based on the table above, the value of t_{obtained} was 4.649, at the significant level $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.000$). Since the significant value (0.000) was less than 0.05, and the value of t_{obtained} was higher than critical values of t_{table} , in which $4.649 > 2.000$ and $4.649 > 1.994$, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was rejected and research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It meant that there was a significant improvement between speaking ability in retelling narrative stories of the students who were taught by using Storyboard and those who were not.

Discussion

Based on the findings, there was a significant improvement in writing ability between the students who were taught by using storyboard and those who were not. This was supported by the result of the writing tests; the

students in experimental group, who were taught by using storyboard, got better writing scores than the students in the control group, who were not taught by using storyboard. It means that storyboard successfully improved the students' ability to write narrative stories. In other words, the storyboard taught by the writer to the experimental group for 15 meetings worked well to improve the students' writing ability. In those 15 meetings, the students wrote the stories guided by the storyboards given and they learned to make their own Storyboard.

This significant difference was supported by some possible reasons. First, during the treatment, the use of storyboard helped the students develop their ideas in writing narrative stories. Therefore, the results of their writing during the treatment showed the significant improvement. The second reason, the storyboard could help students to write well organized stories. During the treatment, their writing got better. Whereas, in the beginning of meeting, they could not write a story and the organization was very bad. In conclusion, storyboard assisted the students to organize the stories well. The third reason, during the implementation of storyboard, the

vocabularies of students in experimental group also got improvement. They could use the varieties of vocabulary in their narrative stories. As Doherty and Coggeshall (2005) state, students can demonstrate their understanding of the material by writing the story through combination of words and imagery. It means that, by imagining the stories through storyboard, the students can write the stories well. It was in line with the result of writing test that showed the significant improvement in post-test.

The students in control group also had a progress in their writing, although it was small. There could be some factors that influence the progress. There was a possibility that they did writing activity that might give contribution to their writing during their learning with their English teacher. The writer also assumed that the students in control group had good prior knowledge in writing. Some students in the control group probably had mastered writing aspects.

However, although students in control group had a progress, it was not significant because the writer did not give any treatment in control group, so they did not know how to write and speak the narrative stories easily.

In speaking, the findings also showed that there was a significant improvement in speaking ability through retelling stories between students who were taught by using storyboard and those who were not. The findings showed the mean score of students in experimental group was higher than the mean score of students in control group. It meant that storyboard successfully improved the students' speaking ability to retell the narrative story. In short, the significant improvement between those two groups was because of the storyboard that the writer implemented in experimental group.

As a matter of fact, it was found that there were some factors in which storyboard could improve the ability of students in experimental group to retell narrative stories. The most influencing factor was storyboard could make students in experimental group easy to comprehend the story. At the first meeting of treatment, the students were still confused to retell the narrative stories because they did not know the plot of the stories. However, at the third meeting, they had comprehended the stories well so they could tell them in front of the class. It means that storyboard made the students in

experimental group to comprehend the stories became easier.

The second factor that through storyboard, the students might have more times to practice and improve their ability to retell a story in front of the class in which the teacher of English seldom leads them to speak. Having more practice could lead students' exposure on speaking English. The more exposure in speaking might be a good solution to lessen the students' fear of speaking English in the classroom. Therefore, storyboard was an effective way that could give a good atmosphere for the students in experimental group to express and to practice their English in retelling narrative stories in front of the class.

The other factor was that the students in experimental group could think creatively and critically. They had to think about the plot of the story and some roles such as, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. This activity definitely let the students to think creatively and critically. By thinking creatively, they can improve and enrich their vocabularies; and by thinking critically, the student could produce some new utterances spontaneously in retelling a story.

In teaching English, the teacher teaches not only one skill but also they have to teach integratedly. According to Oxford (2001), integrated skills can expose English learners to an authentic language and challenge them to interact naturally in the language. Further, Ozturk (2007) states that integrating the language skills provide meaningful content for students and makes them use the language in a real context provided with task based activities. The experts' statements above showed that the four language skills integrated among others. In this research, the writer could not teach only one skill but integrate two skills, writing and speaking, through retelling narrative stories.

Finally, based on the findings and discussion, the writer could conclude that storyboard was an effective way to improve students' writing and speaking abilities in retelling narrative stories. It could be guidance for students to write and retell the story. Storyboard also made students to think and share their ideas about the stories. This medium can be enjoyable and motivated for the students to write and retell the stories.

However, it is needed a long time process to make them to write and to retell the stories. They were still

seemed confused in choosing the appropriate dictions in expressing their ideas. Otherwise, the students would not be confused if the teacher used certain media to expose them to write and retell. Therefore, the teacher should ask the students to practice their writing and speaking in a real context.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data, the writer concludes that storyboard made a significant difference in ability to write. On the basis of the findings, it was found that that the first null hypothesis (H_{01}) was rejected and the first research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It means that there was a significant improvement of students' writing abilities in narrative stories who were taught by using Storyboard and those who were not.

Meanwhile, in the second hypothesis, the second null hypothesis (H_{02}) was rejected and the second hypothesis (H_2) was accepted. It means that there was a significant improvement of students' speaking ability in narrative stories who were taught by using Storyboard and those who were not.

Furthermore, based on findings and interpretation, it was found that

there were some reasons which influence the result of this study. Those reasons were because storyboard was as as guideline in writing and retelling narrative stories, it could make students to think creatively and critically, it could let students to have much time in writing and practicing their oral communication and it could make students easy to comprehend the stories.

REFERENCES

- Bamberg, M. (2010). *Narrative analysis*. Worcester, MA: APA Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Qualitative, quantitative and mix method approach*. New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Doherty, J. & Coggeshall, K. (2005). Reader's theater and storyboarding: Strategies that include and improve. *Voices from the Middle*, 12(4), 37-43.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Longman.
- Lannon, J. W. (2004). *The writing process: a concise rhetoric, reader, and handbook*. New York: Longman.
- Lillyman, S., Gutteridge, R., & Berridge, P. (2011). Using a storyboarding technique in the classroom to address end of life experiences in practice and engage

student nurses in deeper reflection.
Nurse Education in Practice, 11,
179-185. doi:
10.1016/j.nepr.2010.08.006

Mattarima, K., & Hamdan, A. R.
(2011). The teaching constraints of
English as a foreign language in
Indonesia: The context of school
based curriculum. *Sociohumanika*,
4(2), 287-300.

Oxford, R. (2001). *Integrated skills in
the ESL/EFL classroom*. Retrieved
from
[http://www.cal.org/resources/digest
/digest_pdfs/0105-oxford.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/0105-oxford.pdf)

Ozturk, E. (2007). *Teaching English to
young learners through integrated
skills approach*. Retrieved from
[http://id.scribd.com/doc/29918098/thes
is-of-something](http://id.scribd.com/doc/29918098/this-is-of-something)

Richards, Jack C., and W. A. Renandya.
(2002). *Methodology in Language
Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian
kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D*.
Bandung: Alfabeta.