CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Research Finding

The finding of this research described that there was different result between experimental class which was taught by using picture series and control class which was taught without using picture series in writing narrative text. The writer had conducted started on 25 until 24 November in MA Darul Hikmah Menganti Jepara which was located in Banggan Indah Street at the Tenth Grade in the Academic year of 2017/2018.

The subject of this research was tenth grade students. The writer divided in to two classes, X.IPS 1 as experimental class and X.IPS 2 as control class. The experimental class consisted of 33 students and the group of control class consisted of 33 students. To get the score of the students' writing ability in narrative text by using picture series and without using picture series, the writer gave pre-test, treatment and post-test. After all the data had been collected, the writer conducted accounting the data. The result could be seen as follows:

1. Writing Ability of the Students who are Taught Using Picture Series Media

The writing ability of the students who were taught using picture series media was concluded in pre-test and post-test. The following result of pre-test and post-test was described sequentially.

a. Pre-test score of the students who were taught using picture series media could be seen in the following table:

Table 4.1.

Pre-test Score of Experimental Class

| No | Code | Pre-Test | Grade |
|----|------|----------|-------|
| 1 | C-1 | 62 | D |
| 2 | C-2 | 60 | D |
| 3 | C-3 | 55 | Е |
| 4 | C-4 | 66 | D |
| 5 | C-5 | 70 | С |
| 6 | C-6 | 65 | D |
| 7 | C-7 | 69 | D |
| 8 | C-8 | 66 | D |
| 9 | C-9 | 56 | Е |
| 10 | C-10 | 63 | D |
| 11 | C-11 | 64 | D |
| 12 | C-2 | 71 | С |
| 13 | C-13 | 70 | С |
| 14 | C-14 | 60 | D |
| 15 | C-15 | 68 | D |
| 16 | C-16 | 64 | D |
| 17 | C-17 | 80 | В |
| 18 | C-18 | 60 | D |
| 19 | C-19 | 62 | D |
| 20 | C-20 | 71 | С |
| 21 | C-21 | 63 | D |
| 22 | C-22 | 69 | D |
| 23 | C-23 | 71 | С |
| 24 | C-24 | 71 | С |
| 25 | C-25 | 62 | D |
| 26 | C-26 | 56 | E |
| 27 | C-27 | 60 | D |
| 28 | C-28 | 66 | D |

| 29 | C-29 | 61 | D |
|------|------|------|------|
| 30 | C-30 | 80 | В |
| 31 | C-31 | 66 | D |
| 32 | C-32 | 67 | D |
| 33 | C-33 | 71 | С |
| Sum | | 2165 | |
| Mean | | 65 | 5.61 |

According to the individual score above, the mean of pre-test was got by using this formula:

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$
$$= \frac{2165}{33}$$
$$= 65.61$$

Based on the computation above, the mean of pre-test was 65.61. Then, it was consulted to the following level of achievement:

Table 4.2

Levels of Achievement

| Mark | Score | Level Achievement |
|------|----------|-------------------|
| А | 90-100 | Excellent |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate |
| E | Below 60 | Fail |

(Brown, 2004:287)

From the table above, it could be seen that the mean of pre-test in experimental class (65.61) was in the range of 60-69 which was categorized into Inadequate. It could be concluded that the writing ability of the students before taught using picture series was inadequate level of achievement.

Table 4.3

The Percentage of the Students' Pre-test Score in Experimental Class

| | | | Number | Percentage |
|------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Mark | Score | Level | of Student | |
| А | 90-100 | Excellent | 0 | 0% |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good | 2 | 6.06% |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate | 7 | 21.21% |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate | 21 | 63.64% |
| E | Below 60 | Fail | 3 | 9.09% |
| | Total | | 33 | 100% |

The percentage of the students' pre-test score in experimental class above was obtained by using the following formula proposed by Cohen (2000:36):

$$P = \frac{A}{N} \ge 100\%$$

where:

P = the percentage of students' grade

A = the number of students who got the certain score

N = the total number of students

The calculations of the pre-test percentage of students' mark in experimental class were as follows:

a. The percentage of excellent grade (A)

$$P = \frac{0}{33} \ge 100\% = 0\%$$

b. The percentage of very good grade (B)

$$P = \frac{2}{33} \ge 100\% = 6.06\%$$

c. The percentage of adequate grade (C)

$$P = \frac{7}{33} \ge 100\% = 21.21\%$$

d. The percentage of inadequate grade (D)

$$P = \frac{21}{33} \ge 100\% = 63.64\%$$

e. The percentage of fail grade (E)

 $P = \frac{3}{33} \ge 100\% = 9.09\%$

From the calculation above, it could be found that there were 0 students who got excellent grade (0%), 2 students who got very good grade (6.06%), 7 students who got adequate grade (21.21%), 21 students who got grade inadequate grade (63.64%), and 3 students who got fail grade (9.09%). It meant that the writing ability of the experiment class was categorized in standard level, because most of the students had inadequate grade.

Table 4.4

The Students' Post- test Score of Experimental Class

| No | Code | Post-Test | Grade |
|----|------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | C-1 | 69 | D |
| 2 | C-2 | 80 | В |
| 3 | C-3 | 66 | D |
| 4 | C-4 | 79 | С |
| 5 | C-5 | 86 | В |
| 6 | C-6 | 79 | С |
| 7 | C-7 | 83 | В |
| 8 | C-8 | 76 | С |
| 9 | C-9 | 63 | D |
| 10 | C-10 | 79 | С |
| 11 | C-11 | 80 | В |
| 12 | C-2 | 89 | В |
| 13 | C-13 | 83 | В |
| 14 | C-14 | 71 | С |
| 15 | C-15 | 80 | В |
| 16 | C-16 | 72 | С |
| 17 | C-17 | 94 | А |
| 18 | C-18 | 75 | С |
| 19 | C-19 | 69 | D |

| 20 | C-20 | 88 | В |
|------|------|----|-----|
| 21 | C-21 | 76 | С |
| 22 | C-22 | 78 | С |
| 23 | C-23 | 82 | В |
| 24 | C-24 | 90 | А |
| 25 | C-25 | 77 | С |
| 26 | C-26 | 70 | С |
| 27 | C-27 | 77 | С |
| 28 | C-28 | 79 | С |
| 29 | C-29 | 67 | D |
| 30 | C-30 | 90 | А |
| 31 | C-31 | 79 | С |
| 32 | C-32 | 78 | С |
| 33 | C-33 | 89 | В |
| | Sum | 25 | 93 |
| Mean | | 78 | .58 |

The description from the table above presented the score of post-test in experimental class. The score was got after the treatment of picture series was done. The data showed that the mean score of post-test of experimental class was 78.58 from 33 students. The mean of pre-test was got by using this formula:

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$
$$= \frac{2593}{33}$$
$$= 78.58$$

From the computation above, the mean of pre-test was 78.58. Then, it was consulted to the following level of achievement:

| Mark | Score | Level Achievement |
|------|----------|-------------------|
| A | 90-100 | Excellent |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate |
| E | Below 60 | Fail |

Table 4.5Levels of Achievement

(Brown, 2004:287)

Best on the data above, the mean score of post-test in experimental class was (78.58). It has in the range of 70-79 which has categorized into adequate.

After the researcher gave score to the post-test, then it was categorized in the percentage of students' post-test result; it was as follows:

Table 4.6

The Percentage of the Students' Post-test Score in Experimental Class

| | | | Number of | Percentage |
|------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Mark | Score | Level | Students | |
| A | 90-100 | Excellent | 3 | 9.09 % |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good | 10 | 30.30 % |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate | 15 | 45.45 % |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate | 5 | 15.15 % |
| E | Below 60 | Fail | 0 | 0 % |
| | Total | | 33 | 100% |

To obtain the percentage of the students' achievement, the researcher used the following formula proposed by Cohen (2000:36):

 $P = \frac{A}{N} \ge 100\%$

where:

P = the percentage of students' grade

- A = the number of students who got the certain score
- N = the total number of students

The calculations of the pre-test percentage of students' mark in experimental class were as follows:

a. The percentage of excellent grade (A)

$$P = \frac{3}{33} \ge 100\% = 9.09\%$$

b. The percentage of very good grade (B)

$$P = \frac{10}{33} \ge 100\% = 30.30\%$$

c. The percentage of adequate grade (C)

$$P = \frac{15}{33} \ge 100\% = 45.45\%$$

d. The percentage of inadequate grade (D)

$$P = \frac{5}{33} \ge 100\% = 15.15\%$$

e. The percentage of fail grade (E)

$$P = \frac{0}{33} \ge 100\% = 0\%$$

From the calculation above, it could be found that there were 3 students who got excellent grade (9.09%), 10 students who got very good grade (30.30%), 15 students who got adequate grade (45.45%), 5 students who got grade inadequate grade (15.15%), and 0 students who got fail grade (0%). Based on the description above, it could be conclude that Picture Series media is effective to use in learning Narrative text writing.

These following diagrams were showed the result of post-test was higher than the result of pre-test.



Figure.4.1. The Result of Pre-test in Experimental Class

Figure.4.2. The Result of Post-test in Experimental Class



From two diagrams presented above the writer concluded that the result of pre-test was lower than the result of post-test in experimental class. So, it meant that there was a positive effect of using picture series in teaching writing narrative text.

2. The Data Pre-test and Post-test of Students who are Taught without Using Picture Series.

The writing ability of the students who were taught without using Picture Series media was concluded in pre-test and post-test. The following result of pre-test and post-test was described sequentially.

a. Pre-test score of the students who were taught without using Picture Series media could be seen in the following table:

| Code | Pre-Test | Grade |
|------|--|--|
| C-1 | 61 | D |
| C-2 | 60 | D |
| C-3 | 75 | С |
| C-4 | 63 | D |
| C-5 | 62 | D |
| C-6 | 64 | D |
| C-7 | 65 | D |
| C-8 | 71 | С |
| C-9 | 56 | Е |
| C-10 | 71 | С |
| C-11 | 60 | D |
| C-2 | 74 | С |
| C-13 | 71 | С |
| C-14 | 80 | В |
| C-15 | 73 | С |
| C-16 | 58 | Е |
| C-17 | 66 | D |
| C-18 | 62 | D |
| C-19 | 70 | С |
| C-20 | 62 | D |
| | Code C-1 C-2 C-3 C-4 C-5 C-6 C-7 C-8 C-9 C-10 C-11 C-2 C-13 C-14 C-15 C-16 C-17 C-18 C-19 C-19 C-20 | CodePre-Test $C-1$ 61 $C-2$ 60 $C-3$ 75 $C-4$ 63 $C-5$ 62 $C-6$ 64 $C-7$ 65 $C-8$ 71 $C-9$ 56 $C-10$ 71 $C-11$ 60 $C-2$ 74 $C-13$ 71 $C-14$ 80 $C-15$ 73 $C-16$ 58 $C-17$ 66 $C-18$ 62 $C-19$ 70 $C-20$ 62 |

Table 4.7

The Students' Pre-test Result of Control Class

| 21 | C-21 | 71 | С |
|-----|------|----|----|
| 22 | C-22 | 69 | D |
| 23 | C-23 | 74 | С |
| 24 | C-24 | 66 | D |
| 25 | C-25 | 72 | С |
| 26 | C-26 | 59 | Е |
| 27 | C-27 | 61 | D |
| 28 | C-28 | 64 | D |
| 29 | C-29 | 70 | С |
| 30 | C-30 | 68 | D |
| 31 | C-31 | 76 | С |
| 32 | C-32 | 58 | Е |
| 33 | C-33 | 71 | С |
| Sum | | 22 | 03 |

From the data above, the mean was got by using this formula: $\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{\sum x}$

$$X = \frac{1}{N}$$
$$= \frac{2203}{33}$$
$$= 66.76$$

This figure 66.76 was then consulted to the following level of achievement:

Table 4.8

Levels of Achievement

| Mark | Score | Level Achievement |
|------|----------|-------------------|
| А | 90-100 | Excellent |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate |
| Е | Below 60 | Fail |

(Brown, 2004:287)

From the table above, it could be seen that the mean (66.76) was in the range of 60-69 which was categorized into Inadequate. It means that the writing ability in control class was inadequate.

Next the researcher continued to categorize the result of the mean score in control class.

| | | | Number of | Percentage |
|------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Mark | Score | Level | Student | |
| А | 90-100 | Excellent | 0 | 0 % |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good | 1 | 3.03% |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate | 13 | 39.39% |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate | 15 | 45.45% |
| Е | Below 60 | Fail | 4 | 12.12 % |
| | Tot | al | 33 | 100% |

The Percentage of the Students' Pre-test Score in Control Class

Table 4.9

To obtain the percentage of the students' achievement, the researcher used the following formula proposed by Cohen (2000:36):

$$P = \frac{A}{N} \ge 100\%$$

where:

P = the percentage of students' grade

A = the number of students who got the certain score

N = the total number of students

The calculations of the pre-test percentage of students' mark in experimental class were as follows:

a. The percentage of excellent grade (A)

$$P = \frac{0}{33} \ge 100\% = 0\%$$

b. The percentage of very good grade (B)

$$P = \frac{1}{33} \ge 100\% = 3.03\%$$

c. The percentage of adequate grade (C)

$$P = \frac{13}{33} \ge 100\% = 39.39\%$$

d. The percentage of inadequate grade (D)

$$P = \frac{15}{33} \ge 100\% = 45.45\%$$

e. The percentage of fail grade (E)

$$P = \frac{4}{33} \ge 100\% = 12.12\%$$

From the calculation above, it could be found that there were 0 students who got excellent grade (0%), 1 students who got very good grade (3.03%), 13 students who got adequate grade (39.39%), 15 students who got grade inadequate grade (45.45%), and 4 students who got fail grade (12.12%). It means that the writing ability of the students of experimental class was standard, because most of the students had inadequate grade.

b. Post-test score of the students who were taught without using Picture Series media could be seen in the following table:

| No | Code | Post-Test | Grade |
|----|------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | C-1 | 73 | С |
| 2 | C-2 | 63 | D |
| 3 | C-3 | 86 | В |
| 4 | C-4 | 70 | С |
| 5 | C-5 | 66 | D |
| 6 | C-6 | 70 | С |
| 7 | C-7 | 61 | D |
| 8 | C-8 | 82 | В |
| 9 | C-9 | 60 | D |
| 10 | C-10 | 79 | С |
| 11 | C-11 | 70 | С |
| 12 | C-2 | 88 | В |
| 13 | C-13 | 75 | С |

Table 4.10

The Students' Post-test Result of Control Class

| 14 | C-14 | 90 | А |
|-----|------|----|----|
| 15 | C-15 | 80 | В |
| 16 | C-16 | 61 | D |
| 17 | C-17 | 60 | D |
| 18 | C-18 | 70 | С |
| 19 | C-19 | 82 | В |
| 20 | C-20 | 67 | D |
| 21 | C-21 | 80 | В |
| 22 | C-22 | 71 | С |
| 23 | C-23 | 79 | С |
| 24 | C-24 | 70 | С |
| 25 | C-25 | 83 | В |
| 26 | C-26 | 63 | D |
| 27 | C-27 | 71 | С |
| 28 | C-28 | 61 | D |
| 29 | C-29 | 76 | С |
| 30 | C-30 | 66 | D |
| 31 | C-31 | 80 | В |
| 32 | C-32 | 63 | D |
| 33 | C-33 | 83 | В |
| Sum | | 23 | 99 |

From the individual score above, the mean was got by using this formula:

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$
$$= \frac{2399}{33}$$
$$= 72.69$$

This figure 72.69 was then consulted to the following level of achievement:

| Mark | Score | Level Achievement |
|------|----------|-------------------|
| А | 90-100 | Excellent |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate |
| E | Below 60 | Fail |

Table 4.11Levels of Achievement

(Brown, 2004:287)

Based on the table above, it was showed that the mean of post-test from experimental class was (72.69). It has in the range of 70-79 which has categorized into adequate. It could be concluded that the mean of post-test was higher than the mean in pre-test.

Table 4.12

The Percentage of the Students' Post-test Result in Control Class

| | | | Number of | Percentage |
|------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Mark | Score | Level | Student | |
| А | 90-100 | Excellent | 1 | 3.03 % |
| В | 80-89 | Very Good | 9 | 27.27 % |
| С | 70-79 | Adequate | 12 | 36.36% |
| D | 60-69 | Inadequate | 11 | 33.33 % |
| E | Below 60 | Fail | 0 | 0 % |
| | Total | | 33 | 100% |

To obtain the percentage of the students' achievement, the researcher used the following formula proposed by Cohen (2000:36):

 $P = \frac{A}{N} \ge 100\%$

where:

P = the percentage of students' grade

A = the number of students who got the certain score

N = the total number of students

The calculations of the pre-test percentage of students' mark in experimental class were as follows:

a. The percentage of excellent grade (A)

$$P = \frac{1}{33} \ge 100\% = 3.03\%$$

b. The percentage of very good grade (B)

$$P = \frac{9}{33} \ge 100\% = 27.27\%$$

c. The percentage of adequate grade (C)

$$P = \frac{12}{33} \ge 100\% = 36.36\%$$

d. The percentage of inadequate grade (D)

$$P = \frac{11}{33} \ge 100\% = 33.33\%$$

e. The percentage of fail grade (E)

$$P = \frac{0}{33} \ge 100\% = 0\%$$

From the table above, it could be found that there was 1 student who got excellent grade (3.03%), 9 students who got very good grade (27.27%), 12 students who got adequate grade (36.36%), 11 students who got grade inadequate grade (33.33%), and 0 students who got fail grade (0%). It meant that the students had mastered writing because most of students got very good grade.

These following diagrams were showed the result of pre-test was higher than the result of post-test.





Figure 4.4. The result of post-test in control class



Both the table 4.12 and 4.13 showed that the result of post-test was higher than the result of pre-test in control class. It meant that there was an improvement on the students' achievement in teaching writing narrative text, but it was not as much as experimental score.

3. Difference of Writing Ability between the Students who are Taught Using Picture Series and those who are Taught without Using Picture Series.

The writer used t-test formula to know whether any significant difference between the students who were taught using picture series and those who taught without using picture series for narrative text at Tenth Grade Students of MA Darul Hikmah Menganti Jepara in the academic year 2017-2018. Before the writer found the t-test, she calculated the gained score of experimental class and control class first.

| No | Experime | Experimental class | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Pre ^C [est | Pos ^s test | Score | | | |
| | (x) | (y) | (Y – X) | | | |
| 1 | 62 | 69 | 7 | | | |
| 2 | 60 | 80 | 20 | | | |
| 3 | 55 | 66 | 11 | | | |
| 4 | 66 | 79 | 13 | | | |
| 5 | 70 | 86 | 16 | | | |
| 6 | 65 | 79 | 14 | | | |
| 7 | 69 | 83 | 14 | | | |
| 8 | 66 | 76 | 10 | | | |
| 9 | 56 | 63 | 7 | | | |
| 10 | 63 | 79 | 16 | | | |
| 11 | 64 | 80 | 16 | | | |
| 12 | 71 | 89 | 18 | | | |
| 13 | 70 | 83 | 13 | | | |
| 14 | 60 | 71 | 11 | | | |
| 15 | 68 | 80 | 12 | | | |
| 16 | 64 | 72 | 8 | | | |

Table 4.13The Students' Score of Experimental Class

| 17 | 80 | 94 | 14 |
|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 18 | 60 | 75 | 15 |
| 19 | 62 | 69 | 7 |
| 20 | 71 | 88 | 17 |
| 21 | 63 | 76 | 13 |
| 22 | 69 | 78 | 9 |
| 23 | 71 | 82 | 11 |
| 24 | 71 | 90 | 19 |
| 25 | 62 | 77 | 15 |
| 26 | 56 | 70 | 14 |
| 27 | 60 | 77 | 17 |
| 28 | 66 | 79 | 13 |
| 29 | 61 | 67 | 6 |
| 30 | 80 | 90 | 10 |
| 31 | 66 | 79 | 13 |
| 32 | 67 | 78 | 11 |
| 33 | 71 | 89 | 18 |
| Sum | 2165 | 2593 | 428 |
| | 65.61 | 70 50 | 10.07 |
| Mean | 65.61 | 78.58 | 12.97 |

Table 4.14

The Students' Score of Control Class

| No | Control class | | Gained (d) Score |
|----|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Prefest (x) | Pos ^s _test t- (y) | (Y – X) |
| 1 | 61 | 73 | +12 |
| 2 | 60 | 63 | +3 |
| 3 | 75 | 86 | +11 |
| 4 | 63 | 70 | +7 |
| 5 | 62 | 66 | +4 |
| 6 | 64 | 70 | +6 |

| 7 | 65 | 61 | -4 |
|------|-------|-------|------|
| 8 | 71 | 82 | +11 |
| 9 | 56 | 60 | +4 |
| 10 | 71 | 79 | +8 |
| 11 | 60 | 70 | +10 |
| 12 | 74 | 88 | +14 |
| 13 | 71 | 75 | +4 |
| 14 | 80 | 90 | +10 |
| 15 | 73 | 80 | +7 |
| 16 | 58 | 61 | +3 |
| 17 | 66 | 60 | -6 |
| 18 | 62 | 70 | +8 |
| 19 | 70 | 82 | +12 |
| 20 | 62 | 67 | +5 |
| 21 | 71 | 80 | +9 |
| 22 | 69 | 71 | +2 |
| 23 | 74 | 79 | +5 |
| 24 | 66 | 70 | +4 |
| 25 | 72 | 83 | +11 |
| 26 | 59 | 63 | +4 |
| 27 | 61 | 71 | +10 |
| 28 | 64 | 61 | -3 |
| 29 | 70 | 76 | +6 |
| 30 | 68 | 66 | -2 |
| 31 | 76 | 80 | +4 |
| 32 | 58 | 63 | +5 |
| 33 | 71 | 83 | +12 |
| Sum | 2203 | 2399 | 196 |
| Mean | 66.76 | 72.69 | 5.94 |

After knowing the data above, then the researcher compared the experimental and control class in analyzing the data. To know whether any significant differences between the students who were taught using picture series and those who were taught without using picture series, the writer used t-test. First, the writer calculated the mean of each class. Second, the writer looked for the standard deviation of each class and standard error of the mean from each class. After that, the writer calculated the standard error of difference between the means. The table was also used to analyze t-test formula:

Table 4.15The Comparison of Students' Result in Pre-test and Post-test ofExperimental Class and control Class

| Student | Students | X | Y | X | Y | X.X | Y.Y |
|---------|----------|----|-----|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| s X | Y | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | 7 | +12 | -5.97 | 6.06 | 35.64 | 36.72 |
| 2 | 2 | 20 | +3 | 7.03 | -2.94 | 49.42 | 8.64 |
| 3 | 3 | 11 | +11 | -1.97 | 5.06 | 3.88 | 25.6 |
| 4 | 4 | 13 | +7 | 0.03 | 1.06 | 0.0009 | 1.12 |
| 5 | 5 | 16 | +4 | 3.03 | -1.94 | 9.18 | 3.76 |
| 6 | 6 | 14 | +6 | 1.03 | 0.1 | 1.06 | 0.01 |
| 7 | 7 | 14 | -4 | 1.03 | -9.94 | 1.06 | 98.8 |
| 8 | 8 | 10 | +11 | -2.97 | 5.06 | 8.82 | 25.6 |
| 9 | 9 | 7 | +4 | -5.97 | -1.94 | 35.64 | 3.76 |
| 10 | 10 | 16 | +8 | 3.03 | 2.06 | 9.18 | 4.24 |
| 11 | 11 | 16 | +10 | 3.03 | 4.06 | 9.18 | 16.48 |
| 12 | 12 | 18 | +14 | 5.03 | 8.06 | 25.3 | 64.96 |
| 13 | 13 | 13 | +4 | 0.03 | -1.94 | 0.0009 | 3.76 |
| 14 | 14 | 11 | +10 | -1.97 | 4.06 | 3.88 | 16.48 |
| 15 | 15 | 12 | +7 | -0.97 | 1.06 | 0.94 | 1.12 |
| 16 | 16 | 8 | +3 | -4.97 | -2.94 | 24.7 | 8.64 |
| 17 | 17 | 14 | -6 | 1.03 | -11.94 | 1.06 | 142.56 |

| M | 32 33 ean | 11 18 428 | +5 +12 196 | 5.03 | -0.94 6.06 | 25.3 | 36.72 |
|----|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------------|--------|-------|
| | 32 | 11 | +3 | 5.03 | -0.94 6.06 | 25.3 | 36.72 |
| 33 | 32 | 11 | +3 | -1.97 | -0.94 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 32 | 22 | 11 | . 5 | 1 07 | 0.04 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| 31 | 31 | 13 | +4 | 0.03 | -1.94 | 0.0009 | 3.76 |
| 30 | 30 | 10 | -2 | -2.97 | -7.94 | 8.82 | 63.04 |
| 29 | 29 | 6 | +6 | -6.97 | 0.1 | 48.58 | 0.01 |
| 28 | 28 | 13 | -3 | 0.03 | -8.94 | 0.0009 | 79.92 |
| 27 | 27 | 17 | +10 | 4.03 | 4.06 | 16.24 | 16.48 |
| 26 | 26 | 14 | +4 | 1.03 | -1.94 | 1.06 | 3.76 |
| 25 | 25 | 15 | +11 | 2.03 | 5.06 | 4.12 | 25.6 |
| 24 | 24 | 19 | +4 | 6.03 | -1.94 | 36.36 | 3.76 |
| 23 | 23 | 11 | +5 | -1.97 | -0.94 | 3.88 | 0.88 |
| 22 | 22 | 9 | +2 | -3.97 | -3.94 | 15.76 | 15.52 |
| 21 | 21 | 13 | +9 | 0.03 | 3.06 | 0.0009 | 9.36 |
| 20 | 20 | 17 | +5 | 4.03 | -0.94 | 16.24 | 0.88 |
| 19 | 19 | 7 | +12 | -5.97 | 6.06 | 35.64 | 36.72 |
| 18 | 18 | 15 | +8 | 2.03 | 2.06 | 4.12 | 4.24 |

Based on the table above, it was known the difference result between pre-test and post-test of each class. The difference between pre-test and post-test of experimental class mean score was 12.97, while the control class was 5.94. Besides that, the mean difference square of experimental class was 445.45, and the control class was 763.78. Then, the writer calculated the result of t-test. To get the result of t-test, the computations could be seen in the following steps.

The following below were the steps to compute t-test:

- a. Finding the Mean each Variable X and Y :
 - 1. Determine Mean of variable X, with formula:

$$M_1 = \frac{\sum X}{N_1}$$
$$= \frac{428}{33}$$

= 12.97

2. Determining Mean of variable Y, with formula:

$$M_2 = \frac{\sum Y}{N_2}$$
$$= \frac{196}{33}$$
$$= 5.94$$

- b. Determining Standars of Deviation
 - 1. Score of Variable X, with formula:

$$SD_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N^3}}$$
$$= \sqrt{\frac{438.94}{33}}$$
$$= \sqrt{13.3}$$
$$= 3.65$$

2. Score of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SD_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma_{r2}}{N2}}$$
$$= \sqrt{\frac{763.78}{33}}$$
$$= \sqrt{23.14}$$
$$= 4.81$$

- c. Determining Standard Error
 - 1. Mean of Variable X, with formula:

$$SE_{M1} = \frac{SD1}{N1 - 1}$$
$$= \frac{3.65}{\sqrt{33} - 1}$$
$$= \frac{3.65}{\sqrt{32}}$$
$$= \frac{3.65}{5.66}$$
$$= 0.64$$

2. Mean of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SE_{M2} = \frac{SD2}{N2-1}$$
$$= \frac{4.81}{\sqrt{33-1}}$$

- $=\frac{4.81}{\sqrt{32}} = \frac{4.81}{5.66} = 0.85$
- d. Determining Standard Error of different Mean of Variable X and Mean of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{SEm_{1^2} + SEm_{2^2}}$$
$$= \sqrt{0.64^2 + 0.85^2}$$
$$= \sqrt{0.41 + 0.72}$$
$$= \sqrt{1.13}$$
$$= 1.063$$

e. Determining to with formula:

$$t_{o} = \frac{M1 - M2}{SE_{M1} - M2}$$
$$= \frac{12.97 - 5.9}{1.063}$$
$$= \frac{7.07}{1.063}$$
$$= 6.651$$

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of t-table to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df = 33 + 33 - 2 = 64, it was obtained t-table was 1.669. So it could be concluded that Ho was rejected because the result of t-test was higher than the critical value on the t-table (6.651 > 1.669). Therefore, it meant that there was significant difference in teaching writing narrative text achievement score between experimental class which was taught by using picture series and control class which was taught without using picture series.

4.2 Discussion

This section presents the discussion of the research findings and concerning on the student's achievement in writing narrative text which taught using picture series, the student's achievement in writing narrative text which taught without using picture series, and the significant different of the student's achievement in writing narrative text which taught by using picture series and those which taught without using picture series.

a. The Student's Achievement in Writing Narrative Text which Taught Using Picture Series.

The writer conducted the research in experimental group for five meetings. The first meeting for pre-test, the second, third, and the fourth meeting for treatment, and the last meeting for post-test. After giving three times treatments for experimental class using pictures series in teaching writing narrative text, the writer found that the post-test score was higher than the pre-test score. The mean of pre-test was 65.61, and the mean of post test was 78.58. So, the mean of gain score was 12.97. The smallest score in the pre-test was 55 and the highest score was 80. The data showed in post-test that the smallest score was 63 and the highest score was 94.

When the students taught by using picture series, they felt exciting in teaching learning process, because there were many colorful pictures that make them interested in writing narrative text. They said that picture series can stimulate them to imagine the content of the text before starting to write a text. So, it made them felt easy to write narrative text.

b. The Student's Achievement in Writing Narrative Text which Taught without Using Picture Series.

The writer did not give picture series media in control class, but the writer only give a theme to write narrative text. After the writer giving three times treatments without using pictures series, the writer found that the pre-test mean score was 66.76, the mean of post-test was 72.69, and the mean of gain score was 5.93. It meant that the score of experimental class was higher than controlled class. The smallest score in the pre-test was 56 and the highest score was 80. The data showed in post-test the smallest score was 60 and the highest score was 90. So, it meant that the lowest and the highest score in post-test were also higher than pre-test.

Teaching writing narrative text at control class without using media made students feel bored with the material that was being presented by the writer, because the media was too monotonous. So, the material could not transfer well to the students optimally.

c. The Significant Difference of the Student's Achievement in Writing Narrative Text which Taught Using Picture Series and those which Taught without Using Picture Series.

According to the result of calculation t-test obtained t-test was 6.651. Thus, the computation of critical value at t-table in the level of significance 5% was 1.669. The result was t-test > t-table (6.651> 1.669). It showed that the result of the t-test was higher than the t-table (6.651> 1.669). It meant that there was a significant difference between the students' writing ability who were taught using picture series and those who were taught without using picture series.

4.3 Limitation of the Research

The researcher realized that there were some constrains and obstacles in doing this research. The constrains and obstacles occurred was limited in teaching writing on topic narrative text in the first semester of tenth grade at MA Darul Hikmah Menganti Jepara in the academic year of 2017/2018. If the same researches conducted in other schools, it is still possible that different result will be gained.