# The Comparative Study in Teaching Speaking Through Story Telling and Discussion

Eka Agustina

*STKIP of Nurul Huda Sukaraja OKU Timur Sumatera Selatan*
*ekaagustina@stkipnurulhuda.ac.id*

Keywords: Teaching, Speaking, Discussion and Storytelling.

Abstract: The aim of the present research was to find out is there any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students taught by using discussion and those are taught by using story telling. Experimental method was used to conduct this research. The result of data analysis showed that the implementation of discussion is more effective to use in teaching speaking than story telling. It is proved that there was any significant different score between post-test of discussion and post-test of storytelling in both of experimental class. The average score of discussion in first experimental class was 20.80 and than the average score of storytelling in the second experimental class was 17.89. In addition, the value of t-obtained was 7.10, while the value of t-table in level of significance 5% (df 64) was 2.00. Based on the findings above, it could be concluded that the use of discussion method in teaching speaking enable the students to get better score and motivation on learning speaking. It means that the use of discussion in teaching speaking could improve the students' mastery in speaking.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In learning English, there are four skills which must be mastered for the English learner. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among them speaking is the most important skill.

Speaking is expressing ideas, taught and felling in oral language. Good speaking ability is eventually supported by language components such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. To improve speaking ability is supported by the mastery above. So, if the speaker lacks of knowledge for that mastery it make speaker faces many problems in their communication. Beside that many teachers who teach speaking often does not know the method in teaching speaking. And then the student also lack of confident to speak because they are afraid to make mistake. It is the job of English teacher to use some methods in teaching speaking skill which make the students interested and motivated to speak in the classroom activity.

There are many kinds of methods that can be used by English teachers when they teach speaking. Those methods are discussion, conversation, drama, dialogue pairs, and story telling. Each of those methods has each weakness and strangeness.

Discussion method is one of teaching speaking method when the English students want to deliver their opinion or question to respond about some problem. This method also builds students' thinking to think about the solution of the problem. The other method is story telling. If in the discussion method, the students must deliver their opinion, so they must have a good knowledge. While, in this method students must has a good competence in acting, it means that the story teller try to make their voice almost the same with characteristics in that story.

Based on the researcher observation in SMK Negeri I Buay Pemuka Bangsa Raja, English teacher have used conversation method in teaching speaking skill. They asked to the student to practice some dialogues which available in their handout book or that have been prepared by them. The English teachers also practiced some expressions in their material, for example some expressions which used in thanking. The teacher read that expressions and followed by all the students.

## 2 TEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 Concept of speaking

Setiyadi (2006) states that listening and speaking come first, and reading and writing come later. This

assumption seems to be inspired by the process of a child who learns his/her mother tongue. According to Siahaan (2008), speaking is a productive language skill. It is a mental process. This means that it is a psychological process by which a speaker puts a mental concept into some linguistics form, such as word, phrases, and sentences used to convey a message to a listener. Pollard (2008) states that speaking is one of the most difficult aspects for students to master. This is hardly surprising when one considers everything that is involved when speaking: ideas, what to say, language, how to use grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation as well as listening to and reacting to the person communicating with.

So, based on the theory above the writer can conclude, speaking means that the second process of language learning where used to convey the message orally into linguistics form such as word, utterances, phrases, and sentences to the listener.

According to Artanti (2009) there are several factors which can influence ability in using English language they are: vocabulary, pronounciation, listening, grammar, and braving in using English language.

## 2.2 Concept of Teaching Speaking

There are two key elements to remember when planning and setting up speaking activities, which are language use and preparation.

## 2.3 Concept of Discussion

Discussion is one of formal activity in speaking. Because, the theme that we talk focus to the material (Solahudin, 2008, p.92)

According to Baker (2005, p.84), discussion involves several elements of democratic. Discussion also different with talk, because in discussion the students given free chance to develop their idea.

## 2.4 The Concept of Story Telling

According to Hill (2008, p.105), story-telling is completely different from reading aloud. There are no pictures or text to focus on, props such as puppets or a toy may make a brief appearance, but just as it was in times gone by, the art is the telling.

Storytelling is a task shared by storyteller and story listeners,- it is the interaction of the two that makes a story come to life.

# 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research used quasi-experimental study. According to Cohen (2005, p. 214) quasi experimental study is compromise design, an apt description when applied to much educational research where the random selection or random assignment of schools of classroom is quite impracticable. In this design there are two experimental groups which both of them gave pre-test and post-test design. Those of group also received treatments. The sample of this research are administration class of SMK Negeri 1 Buay Pemuka Bangsa Raja. Each of class consists of 33 students. Sample taken by using cluster random sample.

In collecting data, researcher used test. In this research there were two tests, which are: pre-test and post-test. As in analyzing the data, researcher used the following formula:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\left(\sum D\right)^2}{n-1}} \qquad (1)$$

$$SE_{m1} = \frac{SD_1}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}} \qquad (2)$$

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{SE^2{}_{M1} + SE^2{}_{M2}} \qquad (3)$$

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE_{M1-M2}} \text{ (Sudijono, 2008:305)} \qquad (4)$$

Where:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SD | : | standard deviation |
| D | : | Differences |
| N | : | the number of the students |
| SEM1 | : | standard error for the first experimental class |
| SEM1-M2 | : | standard error for the first and second experimental class |
| T | : | t-obtained (Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun, 1993) |

# 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 4.1 The Students' Score in the Pre-test and Post-test in the First Experimental Class through Discussion

In the first experimental through discussion method, the average of pre-test in discussion method was 18.62, and post-test score's was 20.80. The total score of the pre-test of discussion was 614.5 while in post-test was 686.5 (see table 1).

Table 1: The students' score of pre-test and post-test in the first experimental class through discussion method.

| NO | Students' Initial Name | Post-test in the first experimental class ($x_1$) | Pre-test in the first experimental class ($x_2$) | Differences (D) ($x_1 - x_2$) | Differences squared ($D^2$) $(x_1 - x_2)^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ARN | 19.5 | 14 | 5.5 | 30.25 |
| 2. | AA | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. | AM | 14.5 | 14.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. | DV | 23.5 | 20 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 5. | DLA | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. | DKS | 17.5 | 12.5 | 5 | 25 |
| 7. | EO | 19 | 18 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. | EMS | 23 | 21.5 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 9. | EOY | 15.5 | 15.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. | HS | 23.5 | 20 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 11. | IYM | 25 | 21 | 4 | 16 |
| 12. | LF | 24 | 20 | 4 | 16 |
| 13. | LSR | 20.5 | 20 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 14. | MS | 15.5 | 14.5 | 1 | 1 |
| 15. | MT | 18 | 12 | 6 | 36 |
| 16. | MR | 23.5 | 22 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 17. | MA | 17.5 | 17.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 18. | MH | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. | NW | 25 | 20.5 | 4.5 | 20.25 |
| 20. | NK | 15.5 | 15.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. | NA | 22.5 | 22.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. | NQ | 25 | 22.5 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 23. | PJ | 24.5 | 21.5 | 3 | 9 |
| 24. | RS | 25 | 22.5 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 25. | RA | 24 | 20 | 4 | 16 |
| 26. | RO | 24 | 20.5 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 27. | SA | 20.5 | 19 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 28. | SF | 25 | 21.5 | 3.5 | 12.5 |
| 29. | SM | 24 | 20.5 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 30. | SH | 25 | 23 | 2 | 4 |
| 31. | VDA | 20 | 18 | 2 | 4 |
| 32. | YN | 15 | 14.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 33. | YW | 18 | 14 | 4 | 16 |
| | | $\sum = 686.5$ | $\sum = 614.5$ | $\sum = 74$ | $\sum = 275.5$ |
| | Total ($\sum x$) | 1301 | | | |
| | Mean ($M_1$) | 19.71 | | | |

From table 1, the standard deviation of the students in the first experimental class (SD1) was calculated by using the following formula.

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\left(\sum D\right)^2}{n-1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{275.5 - \left(\frac{1}{33}\right)(74)^2}{33-1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{275.5 - (0.03)(5476)}{32}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{275.5 - 164.28}{32}}$$

$$= \sqrt{3.475}$$

$$= 1.86$$

From the calculation of $SD_1$, the researcher got the standard deviation of the students' score in the first experimental class was 1.86. So, it would be found the mean of the standard error ($SE_{M1}$) by using the following formula.

$$SE_{m1} = \frac{SD_1}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}}$$

$$= \frac{1.86}{\sqrt{33-1}}$$

$$= \frac{1.86}{\sqrt{32}}$$

$$= 0.32$$

## 4.2 The Students' Score in the Pre-test and Post-test in the Second Experimental Class through Story Telling

The average of pre-test in story telling method was 16.19, and in post test score was 17.98. The total score of the pre-test of story telling was 534.5 while

in post-test was 593.5. The table below will give detail information about that score (see table 2).

Table 2: The students' score of pre-test and post-test in the second experimental class through story telling method.

| No | Students' Initial Name | Post-test in the first experimental class ($y_2$) | Post-test in the first experimental class ($y_1$) | Differences (D) ($y_2$-$y_1$) | Differences squared ($D^2$) ($y_2$-$y_1$)$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ATW | 14 | 13.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 2. | AS | 15.5 | 13.5 | 2 | 4 |
| 3. | AFD | 14.5 | 13 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 4. | DSF | 20.5 | 17.5 | 3 | 9 |
| 5. | DA | 17.5 | 16 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 6. | EEP | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. | FM | 17.5 | 15.5 | 2 | 4 |
| 8. | FY | 20.5 | 19.5 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. | HMK | 14.5 | 14 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 10. | HR | 20 | 18 | 2 | 4 |
| 11. | IRW | 20.5 | 18 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 12. | LL | 20 | 18 | 2 | 4 |
| 13. | MGLSA | 20 | 19.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 14. | ME | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| 15. | MA | 12.5 | 11 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 16. | NL | 21.5 | 19.5 | 2 | 4 |
| 17. | NV | 17.5 | 12.5 | 5 | 25 |
| 18. | OK | 22.5 | 19 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 19. | PR | 20 | 17.5 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 20. | PAH | 15 | 14 | 1 | 1 |
| 21. | PH | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. | RP | 22 | 18 | 4 | 16 |
| 23. | RA | 21.5 | 18.5 | 3 | 9 |
| 24. | RW | 22 | 19 | 3 | 9 |
| 25. | SR | 20 | 18.5 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 26. | SL | 20.5 | 19.5 | 1 | 1 |
| 27. | SAS | 17.5 | 16 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| 28. | SNS | 17.5 | 17 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 29. | TMP | 18 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 30. | WL | 18 | 17 | 1 | 1 |
| 31. | YPS | 16 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 12.25 |
| 32. | YES | 14.5 | 12.5 | 2 | 4 |
| 33. | YP | 14 | 12.5 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| | | 593.5 | 534.5 | 59 | 151.5 |
| | Total | 1127.5 | | | |
| | Mean | 17.08 | | | |

To know the standard deviation of the students' score in the second experimental class.

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\left(\sum D\right)^2}{n-1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{151.5 - \left(\frac{1}{33}\right)(59)^2}{33-1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{151.5 - (0.03)(3481)}{32}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{151.5 - 104.43}{32}}$$

$$= \sqrt{1.426363}$$

$$= 1.19$$

While in the second calculation, the researcher got the standard deviation of the students' score in the second experimental class was 1.19. So, it would be found the mean of the standard error ($SE_{M1}$) by using the following formula.

$$SE_{M1} = \frac{SD_1}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}}$$

$$= \frac{1.19}{\sqrt{33-1}}$$

$$= \frac{1.19}{\sqrt{32}}$$

$$= \frac{1.19}{5.65}$$

$$= 0.21$$

## 4.3 Data Analysis of Matched t-test Formula Between The Students' Score in the First Experimental and The Students' Score in Second Experimental Class

Based on the students' score in the pre-test and the post-test those of method above, the researcher calculated the matched t-test to find out there was any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students taught by using discussion and those are taught by using story telling to the eleventh grade student of SMK Negeri 1 Buay Pemuka Bangsa Raja (see table 3).

Table 3: The result of pre-test and post test in the first experimental class through discussion and the result of pre-test and post-test in the second experimental class through story telling method.

| NO | Students' Code | Post-test (D) | Pre-test (D) | Students' Code | Post Test (S) | Pre-test (S) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ARN | 19.5 | 14 | ATW | 14 | 13.5 |
| 2. | AA | 15 | 15 | AS | 15.5 | 13.5 |
| 3. | AM | 14.5 | 14.5 | AFD | 14.5 | 13 |
| 4. | DV | 23.5 | 20 | DSF | 20.5 | 17.5 |
| 5. | DLA | 18 | 18 | DA | 17.5 | 16 |
| 6. | DKS | 17.5 | 12.5 | EEP | 12 | 12 |
| 7. | EO | 19 | 18 | FM | 17.5 | 15.5 |
| 8. | EMS | 23 | 21.5 | FY | 20.5 | 19.5 |
| 9. | EOY | 15.5 | 15.5 | HMK | 14.5 | 14 |
| 10. | HS | 23.5 | 20 | HR | 20 | 18 |
| 11. | IYM | 25 | 21 | IRW | 20.5 | 18 |
| 12. | LF | 24 | 20 | LL | 20 | 18 |
| 13. | LSR | 20.5 | 20 | MGLSA | 20 | 19.5 |
| 14. | MS | 15.5 | 14.5 | ME | 14 | 14 |
| 15. | MT | 18 | 12 | MA | 12.5 | 11 |
| 16. | MR | 23.5 | 22 | NL | 21.5 | 19.5 |
| 17. | MA | 17.5 | 17.5 | NV | 17.5 | 12.5 |
| 18. | MH | 23 | 23 | OK | 22.5 | 19 |
| 19. | NW | 25 | 20.5 | PR | 20 | 17.5 |
| 20. | NK | 15.5 | 15.5 | PAH | 15 | 14 |
| 21. | NA | 22.5 | 22.5 | PH | 22 | 22 |
| 22. | NQ | 25 | 22.5 | RP | 22 | 18 |
| 23. | PJ | 24.5 | 21.5 | RA | 21.5 | 18.5 |
| 24. | RS | 25 | 22.5 | RW | 22 | 19 |
| 25. | RA | 24 | 20 | SR | 20 | 18.5 |
| 26. | RO | 24 | 20.5 | SL | 20.5 | 19.5 |
| 27. | SA | 20.5 | 19 | SAS | 17.5 | 16 |
| 28. | SF | 25 | 21.5 | SNS | 17.5 | 17 |
| 29. | SM | 24 | 20.5 | TMP | 18 | 16 |
| 30. | SH | 25 | 23 | WL | 18 | 17 |
| 31. | VDA | 20 | 18 | YPS | 16 | 12.5 |
| 32. | YN | 15 | 14.5 | YES | 14.5 | 12.5 |
| 33. | YW | 18 | 14 | YP | 14 | 12.5 |
| | **Total** | $\sum$ =686.5 | $\sum$ =614.5 | | 593.5 | 534.5 |
| | **Mean** | **20.80** | **18.62** | | **17.98** | **16.19** |
| | **$M_1$** | **19.71** | | **$M_2$** | **17.08** | |

Table 3 shows that by using the students' score that they got from the pre-test and post-test both of method, the researcher found that the result of the matched t-test of discussion in experimental class and story telling in experimental class was 7.10. The value of t-table for df = 66 in level of significance 5 % is 2.00. So it could be concluded than $t_o$ more than $t_t$ ($t_o > t_t$) ; 7.10>2.0, it means that there was a difference between the students' average score of discussion score in first experimental class and students' average score of story-telling in second experimental class.

To calculate the standard error was obtained by using the following formula.

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{SE^2_{M1} + SE^2_{M2}}$$
$$= \sqrt{(0.32)^2 + (0.21)^2}$$
$$= \sqrt{0.10 + 0.04}$$
$$= \sqrt{0.14}$$
$$= 0.37$$

To calculated the t-obtained the researcher use the following formula.

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE_{M1-M2}}$$
$$= \frac{19.71 - 17.08}{0.37}$$
$$= \frac{19.71 - 17.08}{0.37}$$
$$= \frac{2.63}{0.37}$$
$$= 7.10$$

Based on the result of the investigation, it was found that the students' average score in the first experimental class through discussion method. In the pre-test of discussion were 18.62 the highest was 23 reached by two students while the lowest score was 12 reached by one student. And post test score was 20.80 the highest score was 25 reached by five students. And then, the lowest score was 14.5 reached by one student.

Beside the average score of second experimental class through story telling. In the pre-test of story telling were 16.19 the highest score was 22 reached by one student. And post test score was 17.98 the highest score was 22.5 reached by one student. While, the lowest score was 12 reached by one student.

In addition, the researcher got 7.10 as t obtained. While, the value of t-table for df = 64 in level of significance 5 % is 2.00. So it could be concluded than $t_o$ more than $t_t$ ($t_o > t_t$) ; 7.10>2.00, it means that there was significant difference speaking achievement between the students' taught by using discussion and those are taught by using story telling method.

## 5 CONCLUSION

Calculation above showed that the students' average score in the first experimental class through discussion higher than the students' average score in second experimental class. It means that discussion method was more effective applied in teaching speaking than story telling especially to the eleventh grade students of SMK Negeri I Buay Pemuka Bangsa Raja.

## REFERENCES

Artanti, N.R., 2009. *Ngomong Inggris gak pake mikir*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Widyatama

Baker, E., 2005. *Teknik mengajar secara sistematis*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta

Cohen, L., 2005. *Research method and education*. New York, NY: London and New York.

Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E. and Hyun, H.H., 1993. *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Vol. 7). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hill, S., 2008. *Developing early literacy: assessment and teaching*. Australia: Eleanor Curtain

Pollard's, L., 2008. *Guide to teaching English*.

Setiyadi, B., 2006. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

Siahaan. S., 2008. *Issues in Linguistics*. YogYakarta: Graha Ilmu

Sudijono, A., 2008. *Pengantar Statistika Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada

Solahudin, M., 2008. *Kiat-kiat Praktis Belajar Speaking*. Jogjakarta:Diva Press.