

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is dealing with the description of data, analysis of the data, hypothesis testing, findings and discussion.

A. Description of data

In this chapter, the researcher presented the students' writing score of two classes involve experimental and control group in developing narrative text. The researcher presented and analyzed the data which had been collected through post-test. It was conducted for two classes, experimental group which consist of 37 students and control group which consist of 37 students. There were no absent students in both of classes.

As mentioned before, the researcher used test as the instrument in collecting data. It was given to class X TP 1 and X TP 2 students of SMK Sore Tulungagung. The both of classes were given post-test meanwhile the treatment of Storybird platform only given for experimental group, that was X TP 1. The both classes were given an instruction to write narrative text about urban legend. The researcher provided 4 topics that were famous in Indonesia. To know whether the students' score good or not, the researcher used the criteria of scores as follows:

Table 9. The criteria of scores

No	Criteria	Range of Scores
1	Excellent	81-100
2	Good	61-80
3	Average	41-60
4	Poor	20-40

The post-test was given to both classes on March, 11th 2020 for X TP 1 class and on March, 2nd 2020 for X TP 2. The students' score of post-test was as follows:

Table. 10. Post-test Score of experimental group

No	Name	Score
1	ARS	84
2	AJR	88
3	AK	84
4	ABPPA	80

5	AFN	84
6	ADR	80
7	AF	84
8	AAP	88
9	ANA	80
10	AF	84
11	AFF	80
12	ACYS	80
13	AW	84
14	ARF	84
15	AJ	80
16	AIA	80
17	AP	80
18	ADK	80
19	AMN	80
20	ADS	84
21	ANOP	84
22	AF	80
23	DDC	84
24	BA	84
25	BS	84
26	BTA	84
27	BAY	84
28	BKA	84
29	BPR	84
30	BNR	88
31	BD	84
32	DAR	80
33	DAM	80
34	DBS	80
35	DCW	92
36	DS	84
37	DSD	84

Table. 11 Post-test of control group

No	Name	Score
1	DWS	80
2	DGW	76
3	DDR	76
4	DEPR	76
5	ERN	80
6	FL	76
7	FDK	80
8	FS	80
9	FPW	76
10	FNS	84
11	GTW	76
12	HN	76
13	HP	80

14	HAW	76
15	IF	76
16	IRK	80
17	JSB	80
18	KSN	76
19	LE	76
20	MDSM	76
21	MY	80
22	MVA	76
23	MAS	76
24	MIMA	76
25	MH	80
26	MAZM	76
27	MNA	80
28	MRA	76
29	MAS	76
30	MFZ	76
31	MFAH	80
32	MAC	76
33	MMB	76
34	MAFN	76
35	MRNZI	80
36	MCA	80
37	MFAW	80

1. The Descriptive Statistic of the Data

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the presented of students' score in post-test. The result of descriptive statistic was as follows:

Table 12. The descriptive statistic of post test

		POSTTEST_ EXP	POSTTEST_ CTRL
N	Valid	37	37
	Missing	0	0
Mean		83.03	77.73
Median		84.00	76.00
Mode		84	76
Std. Deviation		2.891	2.219
Minimum		80	76
Maximum		92	84
Sum		3072	2876

The data above presented the two scores of post-test from experimental and control group. The mean of experimental group post-test was 83.03, while the mean of control group post-test was 77.73.

2. Frequency of Data

To analyze the frequency of the data both pre-test and post-test, the researcher uses SPSS version 16.0. The description of frequency is used to see how many times the score of the students appear. The frequency of post-test data both experimental and control group are displayed in the table below:

Table 13. Post-test of Experimental Group

POSTTEST_EXP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	80	14	37.8	37.8	37.8
	84	19	51.4	51.4	89.2
	88	3	8.1	8.1	97.3
	92	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	100.0	100.0	

The table of post-test of experimental group showed the frequency distribution of post-test by considering on qualification of criteria students' score:

- a. There are 14 students who got 80, it means that the students' writing achievement was good.
- b. There are 19 students who got 84, it means that the students' writing achievement was good.
- c. There are 3 students who got 88, it means the students' writing achievement was good.
- d. There is a student who got 92, it means the students' writing achievement was excellent.

Table. 14. Post-test of Control Group

POSTTEST_CTRL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	76	22	59.5	59.5	59.5
	80	14	37.8	37.8	97.3
	84	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	100.0	100.0	

The table of post-test of control group showed the frequency distribution of post-test by considering on qualification of criteria students' score:

- a. There are 22 students who got 76, it means that the students' writing achievement was good.
- b. There are 14 students who got 80, it means that the students' writing achievement was good.
- c. There is 1 student who got 84, it means the students' writing achievement was good.

3. Normality Testing

The normality testing used to check the data is normally distributed or not. The formula used to test the normality of the data was Kolmogorov - Smirnov test by the value of significant (α) = 0.05. The result can be seen below:

Table 15. Normality Testing

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Post_1	Post_2
N		37	37
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	83.03	77.62
	Std. Deviation	2.891	2.152
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.260	.369
	Positive	.260	.369
	Negative	-.253	-.226
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.582	2.245
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.013	.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Table above showed students' scores of post-test from experimental group and control group. Post_1 represented experimental group and Post_2 represented control group. Both group had a sig value that less than 0.05. The data above can be concluded as data that were not normally distributed.

4. Hypothesis Testing

The last step in analyzing the data was testing the hypothesis of research. The criteria to test the hypothesis of this research which is use in SPSS 16.0 were:

- a. If sig. value <0.05 , the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, while the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.
- b. If sig. value >0.05 , the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted, while the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected.

The hypotheses of this research were as follows:

- 1 Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant difference score of students' writing ability of narrative text who are taught by using *Storybird* platform and those who are not taught by using *Storybird* platform.
- 2 Alternative Hypothesis (H_a): There is significant difference score of students' writing ability of narrative text who are taught by using *Storybird* platform and those who are not taught by using *Storybird* platform.

From the result of normality testing, the data of post-test both classes were not normally distributed. Thus, the researcher used non-parametric test to calculate the data. The researcher used *Mann-Whitney U Test* in the SPSS 16.0. The result can be seen on the table below:

Table 16. Hypothesis Testing using Mann Whitney

Ranks				
	Class	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Students' score	1	37	53.09	1964.50
	2	37	21.91	810.50
	Total	74		

Test Statistics^a

	Students' score
Mann-Whitney U	107.500
Wilcoxon W	810.500
Z	-6.537
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Class

The result above showed the rank of the two classes. For experimental group was 53.09, and for control group was 21.91. The U score was 107.500 and the W score was 810.500. The sig result was 0.000, that meant $0.000 < 0.05$. Thus, alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted.

B. Discussion

From the research method in the Chapter III in this research, the design of this research is quasi-experimental design with post-test only design. Before conducting the research, the researcher asked for newest scores of students that were chosen as sample. After that, the researcher made sure that the sample was equal class. The classes chosen were equal because those two classes had the same mean. That was 76.54 for experimental group and 76.54 for nonequivalent control group.

After knowing the result that the classes chosen were equal, the researcher gave treatment to experimental class. It was done twice. Besides, the researcher also taught nonequivalent control group by using conventional media. It was also done twice. In the third meeting, each class got evaluation of writing a narrative text with urban legend theme.

From the hypothesis testing in Chapter IV, the mean rank of the classes was different. For experimental group was 53.09 and for nonequivalent control group was 21.91. The result of sig. value was 0.000. It is shown that sig. value < 0.05 . So, it can be concluded that there is significant different score of students who are taught by using *Storybird platform* and those who are not taught by using *Storybird platform*. It means *Storybird platform* is an effective media to be applied. The implementation of *Storybird platform* in this research brought successful improvements in

the students' writing skills in developing narrative text especially in the urban legend theme.

The use of *Storybird platform* in teaching writing ability was effective. It can help students to express their ideas in writing narrative because there are many pictures that are ready to use. Students can freely choose what they want that is suitable for their writing. The pictures that provided by *Storybird platform* attract students' interest and make students can write what they are thinking. It is supported by Wright (1989) pictures contribute to improve the students' interest and motivation in the teaching learning process. Furthermore, he explains that pictures have a sense of the context of the language and it can be a specific reference point or stimulus to the students.

Furthermore, the use of *Storybird platform* gives some benefits to the students. The first benefit is makes students easier in developing a story. Before writing a story, students must have a theme or exact title. For example, if they want to write a story entitled "The Legend of Surabaya", they must imagine what is Sura and Baya. Then they can choose the picture of fish and crocodile. However, they must choose an appropriate picture for their story. They can express freely what they want in writing. It is supported by Hull (2006) that stated *Storybird* allows students to express themselves, their sense of humor, and understanding of the world in a new manner. Furthermore, he said through *Storybird*, students become more conscious of and confident in telling stories that will hold the attention of the audience.

The second benefit is simple, does not costly, and relatively easy to use. *Storybird* allows students to practice their writing skills in the context of technology. Nowadays, most of students have smart phone and also have data or internet connection. The use of *Storybird* is as easy as social media that always they use. According to Menezes (2012), *Storybird* is easy to use because it requires minimal preparation and allows them to create individual user accounts for students.

The effectiveness of *Storybird platform* has been proven by the previous researchers. In Tri Hapsari et al's research (2016), they stated that *Storybird*

platform was effective to improve students writing skill in recount text. In their study, the use of *Storybird* helps students improve their writing. According to Anderson (2014), students developed creative thinking and experienced more fun process in writing. Along the process, the participants felt encouraged to create their stories because *Storybird* offers the possibility to do collaborative writing using art galleries to create storyboards, and that was new for the groups of learners. Moreover, in the research of Hidayat (2019), he stated that *Storybird platform* had some benefit for both teacher and students. Teacher can use *Storybird platform* as a new teaching media and students can be helped by *Storybird platform* in developing their writing, especially in writing narrative text.