

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. Description of Data

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data description of Language Development Unit at Antasari State Islamic University at Banjarmasin about using storytelling in teaching listening. The purpose are to find out students score who used storytelling in teaching listening and to find out the efectivenness of using storytelling on students' listening comprehension. The instument that is used by the resercher to get the data is test. The resercher collected the data and the described about the resercher result of Language Development Unit at Antasari State Islamic University at Banjarmasin.

Before doing this resercher in experiment class, the resecher analyzed the instrument whether it is valid and reliable or not before using the instrument to expeiment class using SPSS 23 program.

Table 4.1 Analysis of Validity

Case processing summary

	N	%
Valid	24	100
Total	24	100

Correlation by Pearson

Item	r hitung	r tabel	Decision
		$\alpha = 0,05 ; n = 24$	
X1	0,564	0,388	Valid
X2	0,545	0,388	Valid
X3	0,572	0,388	Valid
X4	0,460	0,388	Valid
X5	0,686	0,388	Valid
X6	0,594	0,388	Valid
X7	0,410	0,388	Valid
X8	0,620	0,388	Valid
X9	0,572	0,388	Valid
X10	0,576	0,388	Valid

Based on table 4.1. the writer used SPSS 23 program test the validity of the instrument. Those 10 items; 0.564, 0.545, 0.572, 0.460, 0.686, 0.594, 0.410, 0.620, 0.572, 0.576. to test whether those instruments are valid or not, the writer compared value of (r_{hitung}) and (r_{tabel}). If (r_{hitung}) is higher than (r_{tabel}) those items of instruments are valid. Based on case processing summary the number of sample validity instrument was 24 students. Comparing to (r_{tabel}), 24 students with significance 5% is (0,388). The conclusion, 40 items of

instruments were valid because those items higher than (r_{table}) ($r_{\text{hitung}} > (r_{\text{table}})$). (See Appendix 7).

Tabel 4.2 Analysis of Realibility

Realibility Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,95	40

Based on table 4.2 realibility coefficient (r) which stated that a realibility test is high if Cronbach's Alfa moe than 0,404. Then, resercher did realibility test by using SPSS 23 and got 0,95. Thus, the interpretation for Cronbach's Alfa is very high. (See Appendix 8)

Table 4.3 Normality of Pretest And Posttest of Experimental Class

Test of Normality

	Shapiro-Wilk	Significant
	Df	
Pretest	26	0,495
Posttest	26	0,062

Based on table 4.3 , the resercher compared the normality test in retest and posttest from exsperiment class which canculated by SPSS 23. From table 4.3 significant of normality test consists of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk. Kolmogorov-Smirnov significant is used if the sample more than 30 and Shapiro-Wilk significant is used if the sample less than 30. In this

research, the researcher had sample less than 30. It means that the researcher using Shapiro-Wilk to be the standard of normality test.

The result that *p-value* from both pretest and posttest experiment class were 0,049 and 0,062. The result of pretest was 0,495 with significant 0,05. It means that the result of pre-test of experiment class was higher than the significant ($0,495 > 0,05$). Then, the result of posttest was 0,062 with significant 0,05. It means that the result of posttest of experiment class was higher than the significant ($0,062 > 0,05$). From the calculated data above, it showed that result of pretest and posttest experiment class were normality distributed. (*See Appendix 9*).

Tabel 4.4 Homogeneity from Experiment Class
(Pre-Test)

	Significant
Pretest	0,725

Based on table 4.4, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class who calculated by SPSS 23 was 0,725. Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05. So, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class was higher than the significant ($0,725 > 0,05$). It means the data was homogeneous. (*See Appendix 10*).

Tabel 4.5 Homogeneity from Experiment Class**(Post-Test)**

Significant	
Posttest	0,135

Based on table 4.5, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class who calculated by SPSS 23 was 0,135. Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05. So, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class was higher than the significant ($0,135 > 0,05$). It means the data was homogeneous. (*See Appendix 10*).

Tabel 4.6 The Result of Eksperiment Class**(Pretest and Posttest)**

	Eksperiment class	
	Pretest	Posttest
Mean	36,25	73,94
Median	37,5	73,75
Mode	37,5	70
Minimum	22,50	65
Maximun	50	85
Sum	942,5	1922,5

**Pre-test Frequency
of Experiment Class**

Score	Frequency
22,5	1
25	2
27,5	1
30	4
35	3
37,5	5
40	4
42,5	2
45	3
50	1
Total	26

**Post-test Frequency
of Experiment Class**

Score	Frequency
65	1
67,5	2
70	9
72,5	1
75	5
77,5	2
80	3
82,5	2
85	1
Total	26

Based on table 4.6, the result of pre-test and post-test from experiment class was difference. (*See Appendix 5*). The mean score of post-test (71,92) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (36,25). In addition, the mode of post-test (70) was higher than mode of pre-test (37,5). The median of post-test (70) and pre-test (37,5). Then, sum of pre-test was 942,5 with the minimum score was 22,5 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum score was 50 and the frequency is 1. The sum of post-test was 1870 with the minimum score was 65 and the frequency is 5 and the maximum was 82,5 and the frequency is 2. (*See Appendix 11*).

**Tabel 4.7 Levene Test for Homogeneity
of Variance of Experiment Class (Pretest And Posttest)**

Test of Homogeneity of Variance		
Based	df	Significant
Mean	50	0,231
Median	50	0,231
Median And With Adjusted Df	41,697	0,354

Based on table 4.7 significant value of based on mean is 0,238. If the significant table 0,05, so the significant value 0,238 higher than 0,05. It means the difference between variances is not significant. As the result of pre-test and posttest from experiment class are homogenous. Then t-test can be applied. (*See Appendix 13*).

Hypothesis Test

Table 4.8 Paired Sample Statistic

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Pretest	36,2500	26	7,04450
Posttest	73,9423	26	5,34664

Based on table 4.8, it seen that the result paired sample statistic for pretest and posttest. The number of students are 26, the mean score for pretest 36,25 with standart deviation 7,044, while the mean score for posttest is 73,94 with standart deviation 5,346.

Table 4.9 Paired Sample T Test

	T	df	Critical t Value
Pretest - Posttest	19,934	25	1,708

Based on table 4.9, it can be seen that the result of analysis using T-test. Because t count (19,934) is higher than t table (1,708). It means the mean difference from pretest and posttest is significant.

Interpretation toward t value conducted by two methods:

1. Based on the test score t compared with tv (t value) with tt (t table), where $df = 25$, the result of numeral: 1.708 for standard significant 5%. With $t_0 = -19.934$, it means that more large from ttable (symbol minus in this matter ignored at standard significant 5% as well at standard significant 1%, it means the hypothesis null was rejected).

2. Based on the large of digit significant. In this case decision taken from the following consideration:

- a. If probability > 0.05 then hypothesis null was accepted
- b. If probability < 0.05 then hypothesis null was rejected

With the numeral of significant value $0.000 < \text{than significant level } 0.05$, then the hypothesis null stated that there is no significant different score by using Storytelling on students' listening learning Language Development Unit Antasari State Islamic University at Banjarmasin was rejected.

The hypothesis testing of this study was as follows:

1. If the significant value $< \text{significant level}$, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected. It means that there was different score on the students' vocabulary achievement before and after being taught by Short Stories. The different was significant.

2. If the significant value $> \text{significant level}$, the null hypothesis (H_o) was accepted and alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected. It means that there was not different score on the students' vocabulary achievement before and after being taught by Short Stories. The different was not significant.

Based on statistical calculation using SPSS 23, the researcher gave interpretation to significant value. The significant value of the research was 0.000, significant level 0.05 and the ttable 1.708 the $df : 25$ whereas the tcount 19.934. When the significant value (0.000) $< \text{significant level } (0.05)$ the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected. While significant value (0.000) $> \text{significant level } (0.05)$ the null hypothesis (H_o) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected. Because significant value (0.000) was smaller than significant level (0.05), it can be concluded that alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected. It means that there is different score on

the students' listening achievement before and after being taught by storytelling.

There was different on *Paired Sample Statistic* that the mean before taught Short Stories is 36.25, and after being taught using Short Stories was 73.94, it means that the mean before being taught using storytelling was lower than after being taught using storytelling. Thus, it can be concluded that the storytelling is effective used on the students' listening achievement in Language Development Unit Antasari State Islamic University at Banjarmasin.

The hypothesis as follows:

Ho : $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant result of students' listening who taught by using storytelling.

Ha : $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant result of students' listening who taught by using storytelling.

The last, from the descriptions above the mean score pre-test was 36,25 it changed in post-test after the researcher gave treatment about storytelling was 73,94 of class experiment. Then, from pre-test and post test score to get a normality and homogeneity.

B. Discussion

From observation, the researcher got the results in experiment classes of pretest and posttest. For posttest, it was given treatment meanwhile for

pretest without the treatment. It can be concluded that posttest was more effective than pretets.

Based on table 4.6, posttest was given treatment about storytelling in teaching listening and it was more effective than without treatment.

Based on the result above, teaching listening by using stoytelling makes the students understand the meaning of storytelling, they can write correct of vocabulary and add improve students' listening. Through regular storytelling, children develop a story schema that has been proved to be a scaffolding mechanism for reading and listening comprehension and information retrieval (**Jennings, 1991**). Questions and retelling strategies, storytelling enhances literal, inferential and critical aspects of learning (Mallan, 1991). So, storytelling is alternative for the students in learning English especially in listening. This reason is based on the result of test after getting treatment.

Before conducting the test by the instrument, the researcher should get validity and reliability. Based on table 4.1, analysis of validity showed the test was valid. According to Cronbach (1990), to the question “what is a good validity coefficient?” the only sensible answer is “the best you can get”, and it is unusual for a validity coefficient to rise above 0.60, though that is far from perfect prediction. Arikunto (2012), a test will be called to be valid if there is sufficient evidence that test score correlated fairy highly with actual ability in the skills being tasted, and then we may feel reason ably safe in assuming that the test is valid for our purpose.

Based on table 4.2, it showed that the test was reliable. Sugiyono (2013: 121) "Reliability is the instrument when used several times to measure same object who will generate same data. Gay (1987) Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it measures. Errors of measurement that affect reliability are random errors and errors of measurement that affect validity are systematic or constant errors.

After getting the validity and reliability, the next was about normality. Based on the table 4.3, it showed the data of pre-test and posttest of experiment class which was normal in distribution. The Shapiro–Wilk test (Shapiro andWilk, 1965) is a test of the composite hypothesis that the data are i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) and normal, i.e. $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for some unknown real μ and some $\sigma > 0$. If the p-value is less than, say, the conventional level 0.05, then one rejects the normality hypothesis, otherwise one doesn't reject it.

Based table 4.4, it showed the data of pre-test of experiment class was homogeny. Also, table 4.5 showed homogeneity test of post-test of experiment class was homogeny.

Table 4.6 showed the result of pre-test and post-test of experiment class where the mean of posttest was increased after treatment.

Table 4.7, showed the pre-test and posttest of experiment class. The result was homogenous but variances are not significant. Thus, the researcher must apply t-test.

Table 4.8 showed t-count was higher than t-table it means pretest and posttest of exsperiment class was significant difference in the means. H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. This result agreed with the result of almost all previous studies like Barzqe (2009) when she had feedback , she emphasized that children will be familiar to main elements when listening to stories and they will enhance their study skills in recognizing the elements of any text of knowledge . Phillips (2000) agreed and emphasized that stories are an excellent source of developing the main idea and a source of worldly knowledge.

Based on the result above, teaching listening by using stoytelling makes the students understand the meaning of storytelling, they can write correct of vocabulary and add improve students' listening. Through regular storytelling, children develop a story schema that has been proved to be a scaffolding mechanism for reading and listening comprehension and information retrieval (Jennings, 1991). Questions and retelling strategies, storytelling enhances literal, inferential and critical aspects of learning (Mallan, 1991). So, storytelling is alternative for the students in learning English especially in listening. This reason is based on the result of test after getting treatment.

It means that the storytelling technique has a positive effect on the experimental group. This is agreed with the Barzqe (2009), she ensured that when stories are returned and summarized , it will be more understandable and enjoyable, and she explained that retelling stories with a purpose allows new

language to be learned. Glazer & Burke (1994: 144) stated many positive effect of the storytelling technique and said that when students listen and comprehend they can easily recall and summarize the events. Additionally, in Kortner (1988) study, he emphasized that when storytelling takes a place, summarizing and retelling is a basic narrative form, so he considered that summarization is one important skill when listening to stories.

The activity using storytelling makes the students are easy to understand the material. In addition, this activity invites the students to be active and creative. Active here means that the students participate in studying of English and they feel fun. Meanwhile, creative here means that the students practice in image the story. Consequently, they can improve their listening ability through the using storytelling.