Multidisciplinary International Journal of Research

Vol 1 (2), 2023, 71-80

Online ISSN: 2985 – 9999

Multidisciplinary International Journasil of Research

Journal homepage: https://publishing.impola.co.id/index.php/MIJR

A Comparison between Computer-Based Learning and Teacher-Based Learning on Students' Writing Comprehension

Lamhot Naibaho[1*], Santosh Kumar Behera[2], Geby Arni Siregar[3]
[1]English Language Education Department, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta
[2]Department of Education, Kazi Nazrul University, Paschim Bardhaman, West Bengal, India
[3]Faculty of Letters and Languages, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

Abstract

This research aims to compare the results of learning writing comprehension when taught through computer-based and teacher-based learning. This research was conducted at Universitas Bina Bangsa from September to December 2022. The research design used was the experimental design. The experimental design chosen in this study is the pre-test and post-test design of the control and experimental groups. The control group was exposed to teaching writing comprehension using teacher-based learning (TBL), while the second experimental group was taught writing comprehension using computer-based learning (CBL). The subjects of the study consisted of third-semester students. They were selected based on the second-semester exam results for writing comprehension results students who scored between 60 and 75 in writing comprehension class, then 64 were selected as this study's subjects. These students were then divided into two groups. The first group representing the experimental group consisted of 32 students, namely 16 boys and 16 girls. In contrast, another group of students was used as a control group of 32, 16 boys and 16 girls. This research instrument includes preparing teaching materials, interactive story software, printed story texts, interactive test sets, and written test sets. The findings show a significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between students with average achievement who follow writing comprehension instruction using CBL and students with average achievement who follow instruction using TBL in the post-test. The findings of this study also prove that the interactive use of story software in teaching writing comprehension can improve the writing comprehension of ordinary students and even improve aspects of Language related to morphology and syntax.

Keywords— Reward and Punishment, learning outcomes

I. INTRODUCTION

The development and progress of information and communication technology in education have attracted educators' attention today [1]. These advances and facilities allow knowledge to be easily accessed, disseminated, and stored. Furthermore, the sophistication and ability of computers to deliver information quickly, accurately, and interestingly in multimedia makes it an attraction towards creating a more enjoyable learning scenario and, at the same time, dramatically influences the current learning pattern [2].

Article info
Received (02/03/2023)
Revised (26/04/2023)
Accepted (15/05/2023)
Corresponding: lamhot.naibaho@uki.ac.id, santosh.behera@knu.ac.in, gebysiregar2@gmail.com
DOI:

English language teaching is, of course, subject to the influence of computerization technology. Although the subject of the English Language only involves mastering language skills that seem relatively easy to master, some issues are still considered to interfere with teaching effectiveness [3]. One of the issues can be seen when students still need help understanding the text being read perfectly. In this regard, a student is only considered to have mastered writing skill if he can develop an understanding of what he writes [4]. Therefore, using computers in teaching writing or computer-based learning (CBL) is seen as an effort to have an impact on the problem of mastery of writing comprehension [5]. Furthermore, computers and interactive storybooks are believed to improve writing skill among students, especially primary school students [6]. There is no point if computers are used, but teachers do not want to use them properly, and students do not benefit from them. Therefore, the effectiveness and stability of the teaching and learning process using computers depend on the teachers' ability to apply the available information technology media to deliver student content interactively [7; 8; 9].

In integrating computer-aided teaching and learning, various multimedia materials are attractive to students, especially elementary school students. These multimedia materials are available in various forms, such as internet-based materials. Multimedia can create active learning because all the students' senses can be stimulated to remember facts better [10]. The use of graphics and video can speed up complicated processes, while audio can give students exposure to the correct pronunciation [11]. However, multimedia materials in the English Language are significantly reduced compared to English [12]. This material needs to be improved for English teachers to teach writing using multimedia. The problem related to the ability of teachers to use computers in English language teaching is caused by several factors, such as teachers' lack of knowledge and expertise, causing difficulties in preparing computer-aided materials [13]. Due to such things, teachers are less interested and motivated to integrate computer-aided teaching in teaching and learning, even though most teachers in this country have a favorable view and perception towards using computers in teaching and learning [14].

Using computers in English language teaching is not accessible if the teachers lack knowledge and expertise in information and communication technology. The level of knowledge and expertise of English Language teachers is still at a moderate level [15; 16]. In this regard, some English Language teachers do not have the skills and in-depth knowledge to use computers such as the internet, websites, and computers that can be used as aids in teaching the English Language. Due to this limited knowledge and expertise, the teachers were found unwilling to use computers as teaching aids in the classroom. This influences teachers to continue to choose the conventional approach in English Language teaching.

This study was conducted English Education Department at Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena. Therefore, this study was carried out to achieve the following objectives: a) Assess the students writing comprehension using TBL and interactive stories through CBL; b) Study the effects of the interactive story through CBL when teaching writing comprehension among students with moderate achievement, and c) Studying the effects of the interactive story through CBL when teaching grammar (morphology and syntax) among students with moderate achievement.

A study on the effect of interactive story software while teaching writing comprehension skills among primary school students is essential to provide exposure to English Language teachers. The purpose is to provide ideas for diversifying teaching materials for writing comprehension using CBL so as not to rely solely on textbooks. This study can guide teachers to develop various multimedia materials more appropriate to their student's needs and ability levels to improve writing comprehension and grammar mastery. Accordingly, the construction of materials and the application of computers in teaching should be encouraged. The school and the head teacher need to think of appropriate incentives for the teachers as encouragement and motivation so that they do not feel stressed and burdened with the responsibilities given.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design used was the experimental design to evaluate the effects of CBL in teaching writing comprehension. The experimental design chosen in this study is the pre-test and post-test design of the control and experimental groups, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Pre-Post Test Design of Medium Group

Group	Pre-Test	Treatment	Post-Test
Experiment	Test 1	Computer-Based Learning	Test 2
Control	Test 1	Teacher-Based Learning	Test 2

By selecting this design, the researcher wants to see the effect of two types of writing comprehension teaching methods on two groups of students with moderate achievement. First, the control group was exposed to teaching writing comprehension using TBL, while the second experimental group was taught writing comprehension using CBL. This design also determines the extent of the difference in the achievement of writing comprehension, mastery of morphology, and syntax between the two groups in the pre-and post-test. By using the design of Table 1, the effect of CBL will be able to be determined by comparing the mean pre and post-test scores (Test 1, Test 2). Likewise, to determine the effect of the TBL, the mean pre-and post-test scores were compared using the design of Table 1. While to determine if there was a significant difference in the CBL and the printed story text used effect on both groups (experimental and control) in the pre-and post-test, the t value for both groups was compared at a significant level of 0.05. The subjects of the study consisted of third-semester students. They were selected based on the second-semester exam results for writing comprehension results students who scored between 60 and 75 in writing comprehension class, then 64 were selected as this study's subjects. These students were then divided into two groups. The first group representing the experimental group consisted of 32 students, namely 16 boys and 16 girls. In contrast, another group of students was used as a control group of 32, 16 boys and 16 girls. This research instrument includes preparing teaching materials, interactive story software, printed story texts, interactive test sets, and written test sets. All the data obtained from the comprehension test is quantitative. These data were collected and analyzed using The Statistical Package For The Social Science or SPSS. To see the distribution of the writing comprehension scores obtained by the students of the experimental and control groups in the pre-and post-test, a descriptive analysis of mean frequency was performed. This study used inferential statistics to test the hypothesis and explain the study's findings. The testing of research hypotheses involves the calculation of mean-mean comparisons using the t-test. The Unrealised Sample t-test was used to compare the mean achievement of male and female students. Mean pre-and post-test was compared for both experimental and control groups. The probability level for all these tests is $\alpha = 0.05$, a non-directional test.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis was conducted to determine the mean of students' writing comprehension for the experimental and control groups before the teaching session was conducted. Both groups were given a pre-test based on comprehension questions prepared to cover three categories of questions: comprehension, morphology, and syntax. Therefore, in order to identify the significant mean difference in the achievement of writing comprehension between students of the experimental group and the control group in the pre-test, an Independent Sample t-Test T-test analysis was performed.

Table 2. CBL and TBL R-test Result in the Pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Experimental group	32	16.11	4.624	0.393	0.694
Control group	32	15.57	5.208		

The table shows that the mean of writing comprehension of the experimental group was 16.11, and the standard deviation (SD) was 4.624. At the same time, the control group obtained a mean writing comprehension of 15.57 and an SD of 5.208. The mean difference between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test was only 0.5. The t-test analysis showed that there was no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups, $t(64) = 0.393$, p-value > 0.05. Therefore, the first null hypothesis for this study, which is that there is no significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test, cannot be rejected. Both groups have the same level of understanding before the treatment or teaching session. Data analysis was also carried out to determine the effect of the two methods of teaching writing comprehension for the experimental and control groups. After four teaching sessions were conducted, students' writing comprehension based on comprehension, morphology, and syntax questions from the story material read was measured using a post-test.

Table 3. CBL and TBL R-test Result in the Pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Experimental group	32	24.64	2.636	4.482	0.012
Control group	32	19.91	4.689		

The table shows that the writing comprehension of the experimental group who followed the teaching using CBL was 24.64 and SD 2.636. At the same time, the treatment group that followed TBL instruction obtained a mean of 19.91 and an SD of 4.689. The mean difference between the experimental and control groups in the post-test was 4.7. This t-test analysis also shows a significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between the experimental and control groups' scores, t (64) = 4.482, p-value < 0.05. These results show that the writing comprehension of the experimental group sample that was taught using CBL was higher than the control group sample that was only taught using TBL. There is no significant difference in the mean of writing comprehension between students who follow comprehension instruction using CBL and those who follow writing comprehension instruction using TBL in the post-test. It means the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4. T-test for writing comprehension of the control group in the pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	16	15.45	3.885	-0.110	0.912
Female	16	15.68	6.433		

The table shows that there is no significant difference in writing comprehension between male and female samples which follow writing instruction using printed story texts, t (32) = -0.110, P-Value > 0.05. Therefore, the third null hypothesis for this study, which is that there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between male and female students for the control group in the pre-test, is accepted. This result also means that the understanding of male and female students in the control group is the same before the teaching or treatment session. Descriptive analysis was also conducted to see the mean frequency distribution of scores of male and female students in the control group in the post-test and the findings, as shown in the table below.

Table 5. T-test for writing comprehension of the control group in the post-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	16	19.45	3.820	-0.493	0.631
Female	16	20.37	5.545		

The table shows that the mean of writing comprehension of the male sample is 19.45 and SD 3.820. The mean writing comprehension for the female sample is 21.38 and SD 5.545. The mean difference is 0.9. The t-test analysis also shows no significant difference between the male and female samples' mean writing comprehension, t (32) = -0.493, p-value > 0.05. Because of that, the fourth null hypothesis in this study, which is that there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between male and female students for the control group in the post-test, is accepted. The results of this t-test also show that the writing comprehension between male and female students in this study is the same after the teaching session. It means that the approach of writing using printed text has a similar effect on both groups of students regardless of gender differences.

Table 6. T-test for writing comprehension of the experimental group in the pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	16	15.91	4.070	-0.209	0.836
Female	16	16.30	5.281		

The table shows that the mean of writing comprehension of the male sample is 15.91 and SD 4.070. Meanwhile, the mean writing comprehension for the female sample is 16.30 and SD 5.281. The mean difference is only 0.39. This t-test analysis shows no significant difference between male and female samples' mean writing comprehension, t (32) = - 0.209, p-value > 0.05. Because of that, the fifth null hypothesis in this study, which is that there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between male and female students for the experimental group in the pre-test, is accepted. The results of this t-test also show that the writing comprehension between male and female students in this study is the same before the teaching session. Descriptive mean frequency analysis was also conducted to determine the distribution of accumulated writing comprehension scores between male and female students in the experimental group who followed writing instructions using CBL in the post-test.

Table 7. T-test for writing comprehension of the experimental group in the post-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value

Male	16	24.45	2.846	-0.364	0.717
Female	16	24.84	2.511		

The table shows that that the mean of writing comprehension of the male sample was 24.45 and SD 2.846. Meanwhile, the mean writing comprehension for the female sample is 24.84 and SD 2.511. The mean difference is 0.39. This t-test analysis shows no significant difference between male and female samples' mean writing comprehension, t (32) = -0.364, p-value > 0.05. Because of that, the sixth null hypothesis in this study, which is that there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between male and female students for the experimental group in the post-test, is accepted. The results of this t-test also show that the writing comprehension between male and female students for the experimental group is the same after the teaching session. It means that the writing approach using story text using CBL also has a similar effect on both groups of students regardless of gender differences.

Table 8. T-test in writing comprehension between experimental and control group samples in the pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	32	5.45	1.173	0.305	0.760
Female	32	5.34	1.521		

The table shows that the mean of writing comprehension obtained by the experimental group is 5.45 and SD 1.173. At the same time, the control group obtained a mean writing comprehension of 5.34 and an SD of 1.521. This t-test analysis shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups, t (64) = 0.305, p-value > 0.05. Therefore, the seventh null hypothesis for this study, which is that there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test, is accepted. It means that both groups have the same level of writing comprehension before the teaching session.

Table 9. T-test in writing comprehension between experimental and control group samples in the post-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	32	8.57	0.757	5,001	0.002
Female	32	6.76	1.680		

The table shows that the mean of writing comprehension of the experimental group who followed the teaching using interactive stories through CBL was 8.57, and SD was 0.757. At the same time, the treatment group that followed TBL instruction using printed story texts obtained a mean of 6.76 and an SD of 1.680. This t-test analysis shows a significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between the experimental and control groups' scores, t (64) = 5.001, p-value < 0.05. These results also show that the students' writing comprehension for the experimental group that was taught using interactive stories through CBL was higher than the control group's students that were only taught using TBL. Therefore, there is no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between students who follow writing instruction using interactive stories through CBL and those who follow writing instruction using TBL in the post-test, which is rejected.

Table 10. T-test in morphological mastery between experimental and control group samples in the pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	32	4.97	1.801	1.088	0.283
Female	32	4.39	2.022		

The table shows that the that the mean morphological mastery obtained by the experimental group was 5.97 and SD 1.801. At the same time, the mean morphological mastery for the control group is 4.39 and SD 2.023. The mean difference between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test was only 0.57. This t-test analysis shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups, t (64) = 1.088, p-value > 0.05. Therefore, the ninth null hypothesis for this study, which is that there is no significant difference in the mean of morphological mastery between the experimental and the control groups in the pre-test, is accepted. It means that the level of morphological mastery for both groups is the same before the teaching or treatment session is conducted.

Table 11. T-test in morphological mastery between experimental and control group samples in the post-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value

Male	32	7.41	1.801	2.813	0.008
Female	32	6.18	2.020		

The table shows that the mean of morphological mastery obtained by the experimental group who followed the teaching using the interactive story through CBL was 7.41, and SD was 1.801. At the same time, the treatment group that followed TBL instruction using printed story texts obtained a mean mastery of morphology of 6.18 and SD of 2.020. This t-test analysis shows a significant difference in the mean of morphological mastery between the experimental and control groups' scores, $t(64) = 2.813$, p-value < 0.05. These results also show that the morphological mastery of students in the experimental group who were taught using interactive stories through CBL was higher than students in the control group who were only taught using TBL. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the mean of morphological mastery between students who follow writing instruction using interactive stories through CBL and those who follow writing instruction using TBL in the post-test, which is rejected.

Table 12. T-test for the mean difference in syntactic mastery between experimental and control group samples in the pre-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	32	5.70	2.258	-0.234	0.814
Female	32	4.84	2.460		

The table shows that the mean of syntax mastery obtained by the experimental group is 5.70 and SD 2.258. At the same time, the mean syntax mastery for the control group is 4.84 and SD 2.460. The mean difference between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test was only 0.15. Based on the t-test analysis, this shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups, $t(64) = -0.234$, $p > 0.05$. Therefore, the eleventh null hypothesis for this study is that there is no significant difference in the mean of syntax mastery between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test. It means that the level of syntax mastery for both groups is the same before the teaching or treatment session.

Table 13. T-test in morphological mastery between experimental and control group samples in the post-test

Sample	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p-value
Male	32	6.64	1.521	3.243	0.001
Female	32	4.95	2.180		

The tables shows that the mean of syntactic mastery obtained by the experimental group that followed the teaching using the interactive story through CBL was 6.64 and SD 1.521. At the same time, the treatment group that followed TBL instruction using printed story texts obtained a mean syntax mastery of 4.95 and SD 2.180. This t-test analysis also shows a significant difference in the mean of syntactic mastery between the experimental and control groups' scores, $t(64) = 3.243$, p-value < 0.05. These results also show that the syntactic mastery of the experimental group taught using interactive stories through CBL is higher compared to the control group students who were only taught using TBL. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the mean of syntactic mastery between students who follow writing instruction using interactive story through CBL and those who follow writing instruction using TBL in the post-test is rejected.

The result of the t-test analysis for the pre-test is $t(64) = 0.393$, p-value > 0.05. Therefore, these results show that there is no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups. Furthermore, the score distribution of writing comprehension scores for all students in control and experimental groups was almost the same when the pre-test was conducted. This result indicates that both groups have the same writing comprehension level before the teaching session and the treatment process. The result of the t-test analysis for the post-test is $t(64) = 4.482$, p-value < 0.05. These results show a significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between the scores of the experimental and control groups. This result proves that there is an improvement in the understanding of the students in the experimental group after four times of teaching and the treatment process. A group of the experimental group who were taught to read using an interactive story through CBL was found to show higher writing comprehension than a control group who were only taught using printed story texts. The findings of this study show that teaching writing using an interactive story through CBL can improve students' understanding, as has been proven by other researchers [17; 18]. The results of these studies also show the effect of better writing comprehension when students are taught to read using interactive stories through CBL compared to only using printed text. The findings of this study also prove that using interactive stories through CBL can increase the mastery of average students in writing comprehension. Students with writing difficulties will more easily understand writing texts in the form of stories delivered interactively compared

to TBL [19]. Teaching writing comprehension using this interactive story through the CBL application is holistic. It is suitable for improving students' understanding with moderate achievement.

A t-test analysis was also performed to determine if there was a significant difference in writing comprehension between male and female students for the control group, which is the group exposed to teaching writing using TBL. The result of the t-test analysis for the pre-test is t (32) = -0.110, P-VALUE > 0.05. Therefore, these results show no significant difference between the of male and female students in the control group exposed to TBL. The same thing happened in the post-test. The result of the t-test analysis for the post-test is t (32) = -0.493, p-value > 0.05. These results also show no significant difference between the of male and female students in the control group who were taught to read and understand using traditional printed story texts. The mean frequency descriptive analysis results also show that the distribution of the scores for male and female students in the TBL group is also almost the same. The findings of this study show that the approach to teaching writing comprehension using printed story materials delivered traditionally has the same effect on every student in the sample of this study regardless of gender differences.

A t-test analysis was also conducted for both pre-and post-tests to see the significant difference in writing comprehension between male and female students following writing instructions using the application computer. The result of the t-test analysis for the pre-test is t (32) = -0.209, p-value > 0.05. The results of the t-test analysis of the pre-test show that there is no significant difference between male and female students in the experimental group. The scores distribution for male and female students obtained in the pre-test was almost the same. The result of the t-test analysis for the post-test is t (32) = -0.364, p-value > 0.05. These results also show no significant difference in mean writing comprehension between male and female students in the experimental group despite being taught to read and understand using CBL. The findings of this study show that the approach of teaching writing comprehension using Interactive stories through CBL has a similar effect on every student in the sample of this study, regardless of gender differences. The results of this study are consistent with the study of Volman et al., who found that the gender factor will not cause significant differences in CBL, especially among primary school students. However, this study proved that the use of interactive stories through CBL positively affected male and female students when it was found that the mean score of the experimental group in the post-test was higher than the mean score of the control group. The increase in scores for this group shows that teaching using Interactive stories through CBL positively affects male and female students compared to TBL teaching. Using CBL positively motivates male and female students in teaching and learning [20].

The t-test analysis for the pre-test is t (64) = 0.305, p-value > 0.05. The results of the t-test analysis for this pre-test prove that there is no significant difference in the mastery of understanding of students in the experimental and control groups before the teaching session is conducted. This result states that the level of writing comprehension for the control and experimental groups is the same before the teaching session and the treatment process. However, the result of the t-test analysis of the post-test is t (64) = 5.001, p-value < 0.05. The results of the t-test analysis for this post-test prove that there is a significant difference in the mastery of the student's understanding of the experimental and control groups after four teaching and treatment sessions were conducted on both groups. Descriptive test analysis also shows that the mean score distribution for the experimental group is higher than the control group's mean score. The findings of this study show that the use of writing materials in the form of stories can improve aspects of student understanding. It is easier for students to understand story-type writing texts (narratives) because most of the vocabulary used in these stories is easy to understand. A story will be more exciting and give a better and deeper understanding effect using characters, settings, plots, and themes related to student knowledge and when presented interactively [21; 22]. Apart from the interactive story through CBL use, the student's mastery in the experimental group was also better than in the control group. It is because the students in the experimental group were exposed to the internet to find information or additional information related to the story being read. This point coincides with the findings of studies that also proved that the use of the internet could not only expose students to various types of information and writing materials but also that the use of the internet in a quality way can improve students' writing comprehension more quickly [23]. Furthermore, the internet facilities could not only improve students' writing comprehension, but the internet can also develop and expand the types of writing materials in a direction that is more interesting and compatible with education today [24; 25].

This result indicates that both groups have the same morphological mastery before the teaching session and treatment. The descriptive analysis and t-test for the post-test prove an increase in the morphological mastery scores for both groups, namely the control and experimental groups. However, the mean score of the experimental group was found to be higher than the mean score of the control group. This study proves that the morphological mastery of average students taught using Interactive stories through CBL and the internet was higher than the morphological mastery of the control group who were only taught traditionally.

This study's findings align with a study that found that CBL can train students to master grammatical structures, such as mastery of morphology, better than traditional drills [26]. Students in the experimental group also found it easier to answer questions related to morphological aspects because their level of understanding of the story presented was high compared to the control group. Students will more easily master other aspects of the Language, such as grammar, when they can master writing comprehension well. Therefore, the story's text presented interactively is seen to help ordinary students understand the content more effectively, thus helping them master grammar better [27; 28].

Teaching writing using an interactive story through CBL is also used to evaluate the effect of syntactic mastery for medium-achievement pupils experimental group. The syntactic aspect (sentence formation) emphasized in this study covers four types of sentences: declarative, command, interrogative, and exclamatory. Pupils are asked to analyze the types of sentences found in the story text and categorize them according to the correct type of sentences. Pupils are also asked to arrange the words into correct sentences interactively. The syntactic mastery of the average students of this group was then compared with the achievement of the average students of the control group who were taught traditionally. A t-test analysis was performed to determine if there was a significant difference for both groups in the pre-and post-test. These results thus state that the level of syntactic mastery for the control and experimental groups is the same before the teaching session. Descriptive test analysis shows that the mean score distribution for the experimental group is higher than the control group's mean score. This study's findings show that using writing materials in the form of stories can improve students' writing comprehension, and even interactive stories through CBL can improve students' mastery of better sentence formation. In addition, students can learn how to pronounce various types of sentences according to the correct intonation through interactive writing. The students could learn various types of sentences and how to pronounce them according to the correct intonation through teaching writing using an interactive story through CBL [29; 30]. Overall, the findings of this study prove that teaching with the help of information and communication technology can positively affect average students in teaching writing comprehension [31; 32]. Using interactive stories through CBL can also improve students' mastery of comprehension aspects. However, it can also improve mastery of other aspects of Language, such as morphology and syntax

IV. CONCLUSION

The findings show a significant difference in the mean writing comprehension between students with average achievement who follow writing comprehension instruction using CBL and students with average achievement who follow instruction using TBL in the post-test. The findings of this study also prove that the interactive use of story software in teaching writing comprehension can improve the writing comprehension of ordinary students and even improve aspects of Language related to morphology and syntax. The findings of this study show that using interactive stories through CBL positively affects the understanding of ordinary students at the primary school level. Therefore, this interactive story through CBL can allow English Language teachers to diversify their teaching materials so as not to rely too much on printed writing materials only. The interactive story through CBL used in this study was also found to help simple students interpret the meaning of words more easily. This study also shows that teaching writing comprehension using interactive stories through CBL can increase the interest and motivation of students with moderate achievement to continue writing and can even be used as a model and guide for students to build meaning. Their understanding is in line with the learning approach suggested by constructivist theory. In addition, students can be given guidance and encouraged to build writing materials in the form of the interactive story through CBL, as has been done in western countries. With the help and guidance of skilled teachers, primary school students can also build writing materials in electronic talking books according to their creativity. In addition, the electronic talking book these students produce helps students improve their writing comprehension. The materials produced by these students can then be shared with other students and used as English Language teaching materials

V. REFERENCE

Lim MH. How Singapore teachers in a pioneer ‘School of the Future’context ‘deal with’the process of integrating information and communication technology into the school curriculum. The Australian Educational Researcher. 2015 Mar;42(1):69-96.

Ota K, Dao MS, Mezaris V, Natale FG. Deep learning for mobile multimedia: A survey. ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM). 2017 Jun 28;13(3s):1-22.

Hong YC, Ganapathy M. To Investigate ESL Students' Instrumental and Integrative Motivation towards English Language Learning in a Chinese School in Penang: Case Study. English Language Teaching. 2017;10(9):17-35.

Keller SD, Fleckenstein J, Krüger M, Köller O, Rupp AA. English writing skills of students in upper secondary education: Results from an empirical study in Switzerland and Germany. Journal of Second Language Writing. 2020 Jun 1;48:100700.

Glazewski KD, Ertmer PA. Fostering complex problem solving for diverse learners: engaging an ethos of intentionality toward equitable access. Educational Technology Research and Development. 2020 Apr;68(2):679-702.

Williams C, Beam S. Technology and writing: Review of research. Computers & education. 2019 Jan 1;128:227-42.

Kononets N, Ilchenko O, Mokliak V. Future teachers resource-based learning system: experience of higher education institutions in Poltava city, Ukraine. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education. 2020 Jul;21(3):199-220.

Ozdemir D, Ozturk F. The Investigation of Mobile Virtual Reality Application Instructional Content in Geography Education: Academic Achievement, Presence, and Student Interaction. International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction. 2022 Mar 25:1-7.

Schulte S, Richter T, Grantz T. Digital media as support for technical vocational training: expectations and research results of the use of Web2. 0. Int. J. Adv. Corp. Learn.. 2014 Aug 1;7(3):29-32.

Tomljenovic Z, Vorkapic ST. Constructivism in Visual Arts Classes. Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal. 2020;10(4):13-32.

Xhaferi B, Karavidaj V. The effectiveness of Audio Books on pronunciation skills of EFL learners at different proficiency levels'.

Vivekananda GN, Khapre S. Multimedia-based English teaching and practical system. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2021 Dec 3:101706.

Li Y. Current problems with the prerequisites for flipped classroom teaching---a case study in a university in Northwest China. Smart Learning Environments. 2018 Dec;5(1):1-23.

Konecki M. Impact of distance learning on motivation and success rate of students during the COVID-19 pandemic. In2020 43rd International Convention on Information, Communication and Electronic Technology (MIPRO) 2020 Sep 28 (pp. 813-817). IEEE.

Macaro E, Akincioglu M, Han S. English medium instruction in higher education: Teacher perspectives on professional development and certification. International journal of applied linguistics. 2020 Mar;30(1):144-57.

Rose H, Curle S, Aizawa I, Thompson G. What drives success in English medium taught courses? The interplay between language proficiency, academic skills, and motivation. Studies in Higher Education. 2020 Nov 1;45(11):2149-61.

Ameta D, Tiwari S, Singh P. A Preliminary Study on Case-Based Learning Teaching Pedagogy: Scope in SE Education. InProceedings of the 13th Innovations in Software Engineering Conference on Formerly known as India Software Engineering Conference 2020 Feb 27 (pp. 1-12).

Deng L, Wu S, Chen Y, Peng Z. Digital game-based learning in a Shanghai primary-school mathematics class: A case study. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning. 2020 Oct;36(5):709-17.

Yang YT, Chen YC, Hung HT. Digital storytelling as an interdisciplinary project to improve students' English speaking and creative thinking. Computer Assisted Language Learning. 2020 Apr 7:1-23.

Simbolon N, Simanjuntak EB, Simanjuntak MP, Purba JT. The effectiveness of ICT-based learning in improving English skills of elementary school teacher college students. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies. 2020 Sep 21;9(5):217-26.

Hava K. Exploring the role of digital storytelling in student motivation and satisfaction in EFL education. Computer Assisted Language Learning. 2021 Sep 3;34(7):958-78.

Machov R, Korcsmáros E, Šeben Z, Fehér L, Tóth Z. Developing the Competences of Generation Z with Innovative Teaching Methods in the Context of the Requirement of Labour Market by Industry 4.0. International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning. 2021 Apr 1;14(2).

Kazazoglu S, Bilir S. Digital Storytelling in L2 Writing: The Effectiveness of" Storybird Web 2.0 Tool". Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET. 2021 Apr;20(2):44-50.

Castillo-Cuesta L, Quinonez-Beltran A, Cabrera-Solano P, Ochoa-Cueva C, Gonzalez-Torres P. Using Digital Storytelling as a Strategy for Enhancing EFL Writing Skills. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning. 2021 Dec 2;16(13).

Naibaho L. Improving Students' Essay Writing Ability through Consultancy Prewriting Protocol at Christian University of Indonesia. The Asian ESP Journal. 2018;14(3):67-80.

Parsazadeh N, Cheng PY, Wu TT, Huang YM. Integrating computational thinking concept into digital storytelling to improve learners' motivation and performance. Journal of Educational Computing Research. 2021 Jun;59(3):470-95.

Naibaho L. The integration of mind mapping strategy on students' essay writing at universities kristen Indonesia. JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia). 2022 Jun 16;8(2):320-8.

Bailey D, Southam A, Costley J. Digital storytelling with chatbots: mapping L2 participation and perception patterns. Interactive Technology and Smart Education. 2021 Feb 1.

Gürsoy G. Digital Storytelling: Developing 21st Century Skills in Science Education. European Journal of Educational Research. 2021;10(1):97-113.

Özüdoğru G, Çakır H. Non-linear digital storytelling: Effect on technology utilization and writing self-efficacy. Technology in Society. 2021 Nov 1;67:101798.

Leuchter I, Kurtz G. Effects of Instructions, Assistance, Narrative, Competition, Challenge, and Age on Performances in Digital Learning Games. International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning. 2022 Apr 1;15(2).

Friedl M, Ebner M, Ebner M. Mobile learning applications for android und iOS for German language acquisition based on learning analytics measurements. Int. J. Learn. Anal. Artif. Intell. Educ. 2020 Mar 3;2(1):4.

Dr. Lamhot Naibaho, S.Pd., M.Hum is an Associate Professor at the English Teaching Study Program of the Christian University of Indonesia. Besides being a lecturer, he is also a senior researcher, and his research interests are L1, L2, Language Teaching, Language Testing, Curriculum, Psycholinguistics, and Linguistics. He has been invited as a speaker to some national and international conferences. Besides being an invited speaker, he has also presented at national and international conferences. He has published many articles in the National Accredited Journal and Repute International Journal such as Asian ESP Journal, Asian EFL Journal, IJPR, IOP, JET, TEFL ASIA Journal, TESOL International Journal, IAFOR Journal, and ICALLE, APKASI, and Arisuta Research Center. He has been a reviewer in some national and international Journals and had got some national and international Grants.

Dr. Mardhatillah, S.Pd.I., M.Pd., is an Associate Profesor at the Primary Education Study Program of the Universitas Bina Bangsa Banda Aceh. Besides being a lecturer, he is also a senior researcher, and his research interests are L1, L2, Language Teaching, and Curriculum. He has been invited as a speaker to some national and international conferences. Besides being an invited speaker, he has also presented at national and international conferences. He has published many articles in the National Accredited Journal and Repute International Journal.