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Abstract: The objective of the study was to find out the effect of using the storyboard technique on students’ reading comprehension in narrative text at the tenth grade of SMAN 2 Krakatau Steel Cilegon. The researcher used a quantitative approach by implementing a true experimental design. The sample of the research was 36 students in 10 MIA 3 as experimental group and 36 students in 10 MIA 4 as the control group which selected through cluster random sampling. The storyboard technique, that is used as the treatment was administrated for the experimental group. The instrument in collecting the data was pre-test and post-test. The result of independent t-test computation of the post-test score showed that the t count was more than the t table (6.274 > 1.994). Based on the data analysis score, the Ho (null hypothesis) was rejected and Ha (alternative hypothesis) was accepted. In other words, there was an effect of using the storyboard technique on students’ reading comprehension in the narrative text at the tenth grade of SMAN 2 KS Cilegon.
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INTRODUCTION

In learning English, reading is usually found by students in books, school tests, national examinations, magazines, newspapers, and so on. As stated by Richard and Renandya (2007: 277), to get a good comprehension, the students have to determine the aim of the text. In the same line, Woolley (2011: 15) stated that the process to understand the content of the text called reading comprehension. Moreover, the aim of reading itself is to fulfill the purposes based on the kind of text. It is supported by Kintsch’s (2013) as cited in Fariduddin and Parlindungan (2018: 141) the main goal of teaching reading is aiming the activeness of students in understanding the text. Thus, reading is really necessary for students, because the aim of reading is comprehending the text. In reading, the teacher should engage in the activity of reading which is done by students. It raises the students’ interest in the reading activity and also it helps the students to understand what is described in the text.

Based on the English syllabus in the 2013 curriculum, the text should be understandable by students, one of the text is narrative text. Rebecca (2003: 11) defined narrative text as a text which relates a progression of consistently and sequentially dependent on the occasion that is caused or experienced by factors. This means that a story which has the sequences of events could be called as narrative text. It makes the students should know about the chronological story to fulfill the needs of the aim of narrative text.

Based on the researcher’s observation, the researcher got some difficulties in learning reading text: First, the students have difficulties to understand the text properly. As stated by Crawley and Merrit (2000: 40) said that the students may not know or understand that comprehension is the major purpose for reading and they may read without setting a purpose. Second, the students had low achievement in reading comprehension because the text is too long to be understood. In a similar case, Satriani (2018: 24) she said that many students failed to comprehend the text correctly because the sentence in reading text too long and uses complicated sentence.

Third, the students confused in choosing the appropriate meaning of the word. Hasanah (2016: 3) found the same case in her observation, she said that if the students come across with the difficult words, they tend to ignore the words and it makes them discouraged and stop reading. The last, most English teachers used conventional technique in the teaching and learning process. It seems monotonous technique in reading so that in many cases, the students did not enjoy the process of learning reading which makes them
bored when learning process, Montano (2014).

Since comprehending narrative text is one of the standard competence syllabus 2013 curriculum, there should be the appropriate technique, methods, or models of learning to help students in comprehending the text. In this situation, the researcher employed a storyboard technique in the process of learning in the classroom. Doherty and Coggeshall (2005: 38) stated that the storyboard showed the students’ knowledge of the content by telling the story by a fusion of their drawings and words from the story.

Based on the theory above, it can be concluded that the storyboard technique showed the students’ understanding of the text and engaged the students to focus on their reading text because it is not easy to make sketches without really understand the chronological story.

Due to the background above, the researcher applied this technique with the formulation problem is “Is there any effect of storyboard technique on reading comprehension of narrative text at tenth grade of SMAN 2 Krakatau Steel Cilegon?”

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Reading is one of the important skills in language learning that should be learned by students, besides listening, speaking, and writing. Reading is not only part of language skills but all of the subjects involve in reading. Linse and Nunan (2005: 69) stated that reading is a skill that involves deriving meaning from the text. Thus, to get the information from the text, the readers must be able to comprehend the text first. Moreover, Snow (2002: 11) defined that three elements in reading comprehension are the reader, the text, and the activity. The first is the reader who is doing comprehending. When a reader tries to comprehend the text, it also brings all their capacities, abilities, knowledge, and experience to the activity of reading. The second is the text. The text is to comprehend reading comprehension. The last is an activity. This involves the purpose, process, and consequences that relate to the activity of reading comprehension. The three elements relate to each other in the reading process.

From all definitions above, it can be summarized that reading for comprehension is the main purpose of reading. It was because, in reading activity, the learners not only learn about identifying the construction of the text but understanding the meaning is also important to get more information about the text. The main point of reading comprehension is to find the stated or unstated main idea in the text. Hence, the readers should
understand all information in the text to get the main idea conveyed in a text.

The Narrative text is one of the English text types that should be learned in Senior High School as stated in the curriculum 2013. Pardiyono (2007: 94) explained that narrative text is the text that tells about the activity and experience of story to amuse the readers by showing the problematic events, resolution, and give a moral value for the readers. This study used the legend as one of the genres in narrative text. The researcher wanted the students more to know about the legend in Indonesia or foreign. So, the students not only know, such as; Sangkuriang, or Malin Kundang. When they learned about a narrative text but also got to know other legends in Indonesia or foreign and took moral value from the text.

To help the students in reading comprehension, there should be ways to help the students to comprehend the text. In this case, the researcher used a storyboard technique to help the students in comprehending the text. A Storyboard is one technique in the teaching and learning process. Wiesendanger (2001: 161) stated that the storyboard technique is a prewriting activity emphasizing elaboration, prediction, brainstorming, and sequencing-based on the text. It is used to motivate students to express themselves by first using art and then adding words.

Meanwhile, Doherty and Coggeshall (2005: 38) stated that storyboard is a post-reading activity with a great number of advantages for students.

So, both of them deals with a storyboard is an activity in reading to make the story looks real with combine the image form and text. It can show the students’ understanding of the text because the students retelling and illustrating the story on a storyboard.

However, David L. Bruce used a storyboard in a reading activity in his class. Bruce (2011: 78) explained that the storyboard is like pre-writing activity to help the students to interact with the text. Because, when students composed storyboards, they were reading, too. Besides storyboards help the readers to visualize a print text. This technique allows students to interpret the text such as narrative text into a series of thumbnail sketches after reading the text. It means that the storyboard helps the students to think creatively and critically by illustrating the story.
From the definition above, it can be concluded that the storyboard showed the students’ understanding of the text because when students composed storyboard, students often go back and forth between the texts because they are reading and also creating the visual of the story. Therefore, Smaldino et al (2002: 98) said that the storyboard technique in learning activity facilitates the student to interpret the materials such as narrative text into a series of thumbnail sketches after reading the text.

A Storyboard can be called as mental imagery. To support that, Clark et al (2014: 108) said that there are two activities to support thinking in pictures:

a. Representational: creating pictures with detailed and accurate are representations of information in the text.

b. Transformational: creating pictures with more flexible and can be edited to support memory to find key ideas or specific details in the text.

So, it can be concluded that the students being trained with representational or transformational, it helps the students not only understand the general idea but also remember detailed information in a text.

According to Naar (2013: 154), storyboard technique has advantages in teaching reading narrative text:

a. A Storyboard can improve the students’ organization, time management, and planning because it facilitates the students to arrange their ideas into sketches.

b. It also facilitates the students to use different reading strategies, such as previewing, visualizing, illustrating, summarizing, and so on.

c. A Storyboard can improve not only in reading comprehension but also in writing ability because they are asked to make a detailed illustration during classroom activities.

There were some steps to apply the storyboard technique:

a. Instruct students to divide the blank white paper into many (six to eight) sections.

b. Ask the students to read the narrative text given by the teacher. Then, instruct the students to re-create key events on the text into storyboard (add words) in 45 minutes. The students may allow using markers, crayons, and colored pencils or just use regular pens or pencils.

c. After the students have finished their storyboard, ask them to share their drawings with their classmates, so they can discuss, both similarities and differences, and how they visualize the events of the text.
d. Let the students correct their storyboard after discussing it with their classmates.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design
The research used quantitative with true experimental as a design. Gay (2012: 7) claimed that describing the problem by using or analyzing numerical data is the aim of conducting a quantitative study. Creswell (2012: 309) said that true experimental is if the participants are randomly taken to different conditions of the experimental variable. Beside the participants in the experimental group receive the treatment, but in the control group do not receive the treatment.

After getting the sample, the researcher gives a pre-test in the experimental and control group before the treatment. Then, the researcher gives a post-test in the last. It is supported by Creswell (2012:309), he added that after given the treatment, the researcher should give an average (or mean) scores on a post-test. This design is to get a score of pre-test and post-test. Alternatively, the researcher compares the pretest scores in control and experiment groups and then compare the post-test in experimental and control group scores to check whether there are differences or not in pre-test and post-test in both of classes.

Here, the design of experimental with randomized pretest and post-test based on Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2011: 272) that applied in this research can be described as follow:

Treatment Group (Experimental)
R____O1____X____O2
Control Group (Control)
R____O1_____C___O2

Population
Fraenkel et al (2011: 91) explained that the population is all individuals from the object of the research which has the same characteristics. The numbers of the population of this research were all of the students of MIA at SMAN 2 KS Cilegon. It consists of six classes, each class has approximately 34-36 students and the population was 214 students.

Sample
Creswell (2012: 142) defined that sample is a part of the target from the population that the researcher wanted to study. The sample in this research was X MIA 3 as an experimental class and X MIA 4 as a control class. The researcher used the cluster random sampling technique. Kumar (2011: 186) stated that cluster sampling is the sampling population into groups (clusters).

The researcher used cluster random sampling because the subject in a population is the same. So, they
have the same chance to be selected. It means that there is no specialization for each member of the population. It is supported by Fraenkel et al. (2011: 93), random sampling is when every member of the population had an equal chance to be selected. Then, the researcher selected for each cluster random sampling by using the lottery and took only two classes. The two classes became an experimental group and control group.

**Data Collection Technique**

To collect data about students’ reading comprehension of narrative text, the researcher used tests as the instrument to collect the data. The tests were pre-test, and post-test. Creswell (2012: 297) stated that a pretest provides a measuring on students that the researcher assesses in an experiment before they receive treatment. Meanwhile, Creswell (2012: 297), a post-test is a measure on some attributes or characteristics to assess the participants in an experiment after a treatment. The post-test to find out the growth of score as the measurement of achievement in both classes. It was used to see whether there is any effect of the storyboard technique on students’ comprehension of narrative text. The researcher used multiple-choice tests with 20 items as the pre-test and 20 items as the post-test for the experimental and the control group.

**Data Analysis Technique**

To analyze the data, the researcher used several steps based on quantitative analysis and statistical procedures. The score of pre-test and post-test in the experimental and control group analyzed by using a t-test. The procedure for analyzing the data as follows:

First, the researcher analyzed the validity and reliability of the test. According to Field (2013: 57), validity refers to if the instrument matches the learning objectives and what has been taught. To know the validity of the test, the researcher used the Pearson Product Moment:

\[
R_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{(N \sum x^2 - (\sum x^2))(N \sum y^2 - (\sum y^2))}}
\]

Notes:
- \(R_{xy}\) = Pearson Product Moment
- \(N\) = Number of the students in each group
- \(\sum x\) = Sum of the score in X distribution
- \(\sum y\) = Sum of the score in Y distribution
- \(\sum xy\) = Sum of the score in X distribution times Y distribution
- \(\sum x^2\) = Sum of the squared score in X distribution
- \(\sum y^2\) = Sum of squared scores in Y distribution

Ary et al. (2010: 130)

The Reliability of the test is the next step after counting the validity. Field (2013: 57) defined that the reliability refers to which the test is consistent in its score, and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score is. To know the reliability of the test, the researcher used Cronbach’s Alpha as follow:
Notes:
- \( r_{11} = \left( \frac{K}{K-1} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{\sum \sigma^2_i}{\sigma^2} \right] \)

To know the criteria as follows:
- If \( r_{11} \geq r_{table} \) it indicates that the instrument (test) is reliable.
- If \( r_{11} \leq r_{table} \) it indicates that the instrument (test) is not reliable (Ary et al. 2010: 246)

Second, the normality of the data should be analyzed. The Normality of the distribution test is used to investigate whether or not the distribution of pre-test and post-test are normally distributed. The researcher used the chi-square \((x^2)\) formula as follows:

\[
X^2 = \sum \left( \frac{f_o - f_e}{f_e} \right)^2
\]

Notes:
- \( X^2 \) = Chi-square
- \( f_o \) = the observed frequency
- \( f_e \) = the expected frequency

Therefore, to know the criteria of normality of the distribution data as follows:
- If \( x^2_{count} \geq x^2_{table} \) it means that the distribution of data is not normal.
- If \( x^2_{count} \leq x^2_{table} \) it means that the distribution of data is normal.

After getting the normality of the test, the researcher calculated the homogeneity of the test. The Homogeneity test is to know the variance in the population of research homogeneity or not. The researcher used \( F_{count} \) formula as follow:

\[
F_{count} = \frac{BV}{SV}
\]

Notes:
- \( F_{count} \) = F value
- \( BV \) = the biggest variant
- \( SV \) = the smallest variant

Riduwan (2013: 120)

The criteria of homogeneity test if the value of \( F_{count} \) lower than \( F_{table}(F_{count} \leq F_{table}) \).

Third, if the data normally and homogeneous, the next step was calculating t-test to find out the effect of storyboard on students’ reading comprehension in narrative text, mean of the control class and the experimental class were compared by using t-test as follow:

\[
T_{xy} = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}}
\]

Notes:
- \( T_{xy} \) = T-test
- \( M_x \) = Mean of deviation of the experiment group
- \( M_y \) = Mean of deviation
- \( X_1 \) = Sum of the squared deviation score of the experiment group
- \( X_2 \) = Sum of the squared deviation score of a control group
- \( N_1 \) = the number of student of the experiment group
- \( N_2 \) = the number of student of the control group
- \( 2 \) = Constant number

Ary et al. (2010:171)

The criteria of t-test as follow:
- If \( t_{count} \geq t_{table} \) it means that the null hypothesis \((H_0)\) is rejected. The alternative hypothesis \((H_A)\) is accepted.
If \( t_{\text{count}} \leq t_{\text{table}} \), it means that the null hypothesis \( (H_0) \) is accepted. The alternative hypothesis \( (H_a) \) is rejected.

Finally, the researcher used effect size to assess how far the independent variable in experimental studies affects dependent variable Ary et al (2010:136). The researcher used this formula as follow:

\[
\Delta = \frac{\bar{x}_e - \bar{x}_c}{s_c}
\]

Notes:
- \( \Delta \) = effect size for a difference between means
- \( \bar{x}_e \) = mean of the experimental group
- \( \bar{x}_c \) = mean of the control group
- \( s_c \) = standard deviation of the control group

Ary et al (2010:136)

This research formulates the hypotheses as follows:

a. **Null Hypothesis (Ho):** Storyboard technique is not effective on students’ reading comprehension in narrative text or there is a negative improvement.

b. **Alternative Hypotheses (Ha):** Storyboard technique is effective on students’ reading comprehension in narrative text or there is a positive an improvement.

The result of t-test can be seen with the criteria:
- If \( t_{\text{count}} \leq t_{\text{table}} \) = Ho accepted, Ha refused
- If \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \) = Ha accepted, Ho refused

**Finding and Discussion**

In this section, the researcher analyzed and described the data based on the result of the pre-test and post-test. This research was quantitative with true experimental design. This research was conducted on April 11\(^{th}\) until 25\(^{th}\), 2019.

This research provides teaching for reading comprehension of using storyboard in the narrative text at the tenth grade of SMAN 2 Krakatau Steel Cilegon. The researcher applied the test as the instrument of this research. The first, tryout test consisted of 50 questions of multiple-choice, the second was pre-test consisted of 20 questions of multiple-choice, and the third was post-test which consisted of 20 questions of multiple choices. Multiple choices are one of the tests for measuring students’ reading knowledge. It is supported by Brown (2003:194), multiple choice is the method to assess students’ reading knowledge.

The researcher conducted a try out to measure the validity and reliability of the test. Try out the test was administrated to the X MIA 2. After conducting a try out the test, the researcher conducted a pre-test and post-test. Pre-test and post-test were administrated to the experimental group (X MIA 3) and control group (X MIA 4). The test administered to get the data score of students’ reading comprehension. There were 20 questions in the pre-test
and post-test. The difficulty level of pre-test and post-test was equal. Before the instrument of the study implemented in the two classes, the try-out test was held on April, 11th 2019.

After getting the data, the researcher analyzed the validity of the tryout test by using Pearson Product Moment and the reliability of the test using Cronbach’s Alpha. From the criterion of the validity, the researcher found was 10 questions invalid. The invalid items caused by the question was easy because almost of the students answered correctly. The difficult questions, because most of students answered incorrectly. Thus, the invalid items were omitted by the researcher. The researcher used 40 valid items for pre-test and post-test. The pre-test consisted of 20 questions and the post-test consisted of 20 questions that were administered as the instrument of this research. After analyzing the validity, the reliability needs to test. Based on the result of data, the reliability of the test \( r_{11} \) was 0.835. After that, the researcher got \( r_{table} \) value with \( df = n-2 \) 32-2 = 30 insignificance 5% (0.05) was 0.349. Based on the result, the tryout test was reliable and could be used as an instrument for this research, because of \( r_{11} > r_{table} \) (0.835 > 0.349).

After analyzed the validity and reliability, the researcher administrated a pre-test in both classes. In the first meeting, a pretest was given to both the experimental and control groups to measure students’ abilities before treatment. The results of the tests showed as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( \overline{X} ) (Mean)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>76.81</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>79.03</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the pre-test is done, the result was the highest score in the experimental group was 90 and the lowest score was 60. In the control group, the highest score was 90 and the lowest score was 95. The average score of the experimental was 76.81 from the ideal score 100 and the mean of the control class was 79.03 from ideal score 100. It can be seen that the average of experimental class was lower than control class. The difference means in both classes was 2.22 points.

Then, the researcher calculated the normality and homogeneity of the test. The result of normality can be seen by
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comparing $x^2_{\text{count}} < x^2_{\text{table}}$ with a significant value of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). The normality of the pre-test in the experimental group was $3.527 < 12.592$. Meanwhile, the result in the control group was $9.157 < 11.070$. From the result of the normality of the pre-test, it can be summarized that the data (pre-test) normally distributed in the experimental and control class. The result of homogeneity can be seen by comparing $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$. The researcher compared the result of $1.77 < 4.121$. So, it can be concluded that the pre-test was homogeneous in both classes.

The treatment was given after the pretest. There were three times of treatment given on both the experiment and control class. Thursday, April 18th 2019, Monday, April 22nd 2019, and Thursday, April 25th 2019, the researcher conducted treatments in the experimental group. The researcher taught the students by using the storyboard technique. Meanwhile, control class in the second until forth meeting on Tuesday, April 16th 2019, Tuesday, April 23rd 2019, and Thursday, April 25th 2019. The researcher taught as a usual method (cooperative learning) in the control class.

In the last, the researcher gave a post-test to know how far the students’ scores increased. The post-test was conducted on April, 25th 2019 in both classes. The results of the post-test showed that as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$ (Mean)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>86.39</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the post-test is done, the result was the highest score in the experimental group was 100 and the lowest score was 70. In the control group, the highest score was 95 and the lowest score was 60. The average score of experimental was **86.39** from the ideal score 100 and the average of control class was **80.14** from the ideal score 100. It can be seen that the mean of the experimental class was lowest than the control class. The difference means in both of classes was **6.25** point. It showed that students’ reading comprehension after giving a treatment increased by using the storyboard technique in the experimental class. The significant different score can be seen as follow:

Next, the researcher calculated the normality and homogeneity of the post-
test. The result of normality can be seen by comparing $x^2_{\text{count}}<x^2_{\text{table}}$ with a significant value of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). The normality of the post-test in the experimental group was $2.413 < 12.592$. Meanwhile, the result in the control group was $4.086 < 11.070$. From the result of the normality of the post-test, it can be summarized that post-test normally distributed in the experimental and control class. The result of homogeneity can be seen by comparing $F_{\text{count}}<F_{\text{table}}$. The researcher compared the result of $1.13<4.121$. So, it can be concluded that the post-test was homogeneous in both classes.

To determine the score between the two groups, the researcher analyzed the t-test to answer the hypothesis in this research. The researcher used an independent t-test. Based on the result of the t-test that $t_{\text{count}} = 6.274$. The level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) with df $= (N_x + N_y - 2)$ or $(36 + 36 - 2) = 70$. The Value of $t_{\text{table}}$ 70 was 1.994 (see appendix 7). It was obtained that the $t_{\text{count}}$ was higher than $t_{\text{table}}$ ($6.274 > 1.994$). It means that $H_0$ was rejected and $H_a$ was accepted. In other words, there is the effect of the storyboard technique on students’ reading comprehension in the narrative text at the tenth grade of SMAN 2 KS Cilegon.

To know how far the effect of the storyboard technique, the researcher analyzed the effect size with the criteria the effect size were:

a. An effect size of 0.20 is small.
b. An effect size of 0.50 is medium.
c. An effect size of 0.80 is large.

To know the result of the effect size on the storyboard technique, the researcher calculated several steps. first, the researcher found out the mean of the post-test in both classes. The mean of the post-test in the experimental class was 86.39 and the control class was 80.14. After that, the researcher determined the standard deviation of the post-test in the control class was 8.84. Based on the calculation, the result of the effect size was 0.71. The result showed that the storyboard technique had a medium effect size on students’ reading comprehension.

Based on the interpretation of the data, the experimental group had a better result of the test since that group used the storyboard technique. They trained by giving an interesting text to make storyboards and quizzes in the last time before class ends. It always like that in every English class. Besides that, the control group only was given the text or compiled the picture to acquire a summary of the text. Thus, it showed that there was a significant difference result between the experimental group and the control group.
CONCLUSION

From the result of the data, it can be proven from the statistical computation result of the independent sample t-test which showed that the $t_{\text{count}}$ was higher than $t_{\text{table}} (6.274 > 1.994)$. Based on the result were 6.274 on the post-test while on $T_{\text{table}}$ with the level significance 0.05 was 1.994. So, it can be concluded that there was an effect on using the storyboard technique on students’ reading comprehension.

Based on the research question about “is there an effect of using storyboard technique on reading comprehension in the narrative text at the tenth grade of SMAN 2 Krakatau Steel Cilegon”, the researcher found that storyboard technique gives positive effect and helped the students to get better comprehension in their reading activity. In other words, the storyboard was effective on students’ reading comprehension.
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