

CHAPTER IV

FINDING RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, discuss about research finding and discussion. In this chapter, the data of the research result will be presented and analyzed. The data are try-out, pre-test, and post-test result. The writer took two classes, class Xis1 has 22 students and Xis2 has 22 students. There forty four students of MA Masalikil Huda Tahunan Jepara, who were given pre-test and post-test.

4.1 Try-out Analysis

This analysis was meant to find out the validity and reliability of the instrument before it was used as the pre-test and post-test. This test was conducted on oct 11, 2018. Try-out test was conducted for XMia class. There were twenty students as respondent.

4.1.1 The Validity of Tryout Test

- The item test is valid if $r_{count} > r_{table}$
- The item test is invailid if $r_{count} < r_{table}$
- $r_{table} = N$
- $N = 50$
- In the table 5 % shows that $22 = 0,4044$

Table 4.1
The validity of the Tryout Test

| | | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Grammar | Total |
|--------------|---------------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|--------|
| Content | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .466* | .307 | .104 | .605** |
| | Sig. (1-tailed) | | .014 | .082 | .322 | .001 |
| | N | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Organization | Pearson Correlation | .466* | 1 | .506** | .424* | .826** |
| | Sig. (1-tailed) | .014 | | .008 | .024 | .000 |
| | N | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Vocabulary | Pearson Correlation | .307 | .506** | 1 | .291 | .775** |
| | Sig. (1-tailed) | .082 | .008 | | .094 | .000 |
| | N | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Grammar | Pearson Correlation | .104 | .424* | .291 | 1 | .648** |
| | Sig. (1-tailed) | .322 | .024 | .094 | | .001 |
| | N | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Total | Pearson Correlation | .605** | .826** | .775** | .648** | 1 |
| | Sig. (1-tailed) | .001 | .000 | .000 | .001 | |
| | N | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 22 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 22 | 100.0 |

The result calculations of r_{xy} compare with r_{table} of Product Moment by 5% degree of significance. If r_{xy} higher than r_{table} the items of questions is valid.

4.1.2 The Reliability of Tryout Test

Table 4.2

The Reliability Computation Using SPSS Calculation

| Case Processing Summary | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| N | % |
| 22 | 100.0 |
| 0 | .0 |
| 22 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .678 | 4 |

From the SPSS calculation above, showed that in Cronbach's Alpha column was 0,678 and the the r_{table} 0,4044 from the N. In the table significant 5% showed that number 22 is 0,4044. The reability can be said reable if the Cronbach's Alpha $>r_{table}$ in this part showed that $0,678 > 0,4044$. It means that the instrument of the research was reliable.

4.2 Finding

The writer has done the research and got the complete data from the research instrument test. To gain the objectives of the research the writer has analyze the data accurately. The data war analyzed in order to draw conclusion about the objective of the study.

4.3 Data Description

In the data description, it was explained about research findings. The T-test, and the instrument is valid and reliable so, it were proceed to the T-test. The findings were is the result pre-test and posttest scores of students experimental and control group.

Pre- Test

Table 4.3

Pre-Test Score of Experiment and Control Group

| Experimental Class | | | Control Class | | |
|--------------------|----------|-------|---------------|----------|-------|
| No. | Students | Score | No. | Students | Score |
| 1 | EC-1 | 48 | 1 | EC-1 | 40 |
| 2 | EC-2 | 44 | 2 | EC-2 | 40 |
| 3 | EC-3 | 38 | 3 | EC-3 | 50 |
| 4 | EC-4 | 30 | 4 | EC-4 | 40 |
| 5 | EC-5 | 32 | 5 | EC-5 | 48 |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|-------|----|----------|-------|
| 6 | EC-6 | 48 | 6 | EC-6 | 52 |
| 7 | EC-7 | 46 | 7 | EC-7 | 42 |
| 8 | EC-8 | 32 | 8 | EC-8 | 48 |
| 9 | EC-9 | 36 | 9 | EC-9 | 40 |
| 10 | EC-10 | 52 | 10 | EC-10 | 48 |
| 11 | EC-11 | 40 | 11 | EC-11 | 52 |
| 12 | EC-12 | 22 | 12 | EC-12 | 42 |
| 13 | EC-13 | 28 | 13 | EC-13 | 46 |
| 14 | EC-14 | 48 | 14 | EC-14 | 44 |
| 15 | EC-15 | 52 | 15 | EC-15 | 54 |
| 16 | EC-16 | 32 | 16 | EC-16 | 52 |
| 17 | EC-17 | 30 | 17 | EC-17 | 42 |
| 18 | EC-18 | 50 | 18 | EC-18 | 40 |
| 19 | EC-19 | 42 | 19 | EC-19 | 40 |
| 20 | EC-20 | 46 | 20 | EC-20 | 52 |
| 21 | EC-21 | 52 | 21 | EC-21 | 40 |
| 22 | EC-22 | 46 | 22 | EC-22 | 54 |
| | Σ | 894 | | Σ | 1006 |
| | Mean | 40,63 | | Mean | 41,72 |

Based on the table 4.3 we can see that in experimental class, the highest is 52 while the lowest pre-test score is 30. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 54 and the lowest pre-test score was 40. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 40, 63. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 41,47.

From the students' pre-test score mean it can be assumed that students from the control class performed better than students' from experimental class in the pre-test. This assumption was tested using T-test in next section.

Table 4.4
The T-Test of Pre-Test Score of Experiment and Control Group

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------|------|----|---------|----------------|-----------------|
| Experimental | 1,00 | 22 | 40,6364 | 9,05825 | 1,93123 |
| control | 2,00 | 22 | 41,7273 | 5,35574 | 1,14185 |

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------|
| | | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Differe nce | Std. Error Differe nce | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| experi menta l | Equal variances assumed | 9,268 | ,004 | 0,38 69 | 42 | ,028 | - 5,0909 1 | 2,2435 4 | - 9,6185 5 | - ,56327 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0,38 69 | 34,0 84 | ,030 | - 5,0909 1 | 2,2435 4 | - 9,6499 1 | - ,53191 |

T-table showed that was 0,4044. It means that the result from this calculation $0,3869 < 0,4044$. It means that there was no significant difference between experimental group and control group. The average score of them almost same, so both of them and 40 and 41, it was good score to compare them because both of them has a same quality.

In the calculation of pre-test score using SPSS above, the T_{count} was 0,4044. It indicated that there was no significant between experimental group

and control group. In conclusion both experimental and control group had the different level of achievement.

Post- Test

Table 4.5

Post-test Score of Experimental and Control Group

| Experimental Class | | | Control Class | | |
|--------------------|----------|-------|---------------|----------|-------|
| No. | Students | Score | No. | Students | Score |
| 1 | EC-1 | 80 | 1 | EC-1 | 64 |
| 2 | EC-2 | 84 | 2 | EC-2 | 64 |
| 3 | EC-3 | 92 | 3 | EC-3 | 62 |
| 4 | EC-4 | 90 | 4 | EC-4 | 60 |
| 5 | EC-5 | 88 | 5 | EC-5 | 58 |
| 6 | EC-6 | 94 | 6 | EC-6 | 58 |
| 7 | EC-7 | 88 | 7 | EC-7 | 56 |
| 8 | EC-8 | 92 | 8 | EC-8 | 56 |
| 9 | EC-9 | 88 | 9 | EC-9 | 60 |
| 10 | EC-10 | 96 | 10 | EC-10 | 60 |
| 11 | EC-11 | 94 | 11 | EC-11 | 56 |
| 12 | EC-12 | 92 | 12 | EC-12 | 60 |
| 13 | EC-13 | 80 | 13 | EC-13 | 60 |
| 14 | EC-14 | 90 | 14 | EC-14 | 64 |
| 15 | EC-15 | 86 | 15 | EC-15 | 66 |
| 16 | EC-16 | 88 | 16 | EC-16 | 62 |
| 17 | EC-17 | 84 | 17 | EC-17 | 56 |
| 18 | EC-18 | 86 | 18 | EC-18 | 66 |
| 19 | EC-19 | 90 | 19 | EC-19 | 62 |
| 20 | EC-20 | 88 | 20 | EC-20 | 56 |
| 21 | EC-21 | 80 | 21 | EC-21 | 60 |
| 22 | EC-22 | 86 | 22 | EC-22 | 68 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|------|--|----------|-------|
| | Σ | 1936 | | Σ | 1334 |
| | Mean | 88 | | Mean | 60,63 |

The description from the table above presented the score of posttest. Based on the table 4.5 we can see that in experimental class, the highest is 96 while the lowest post-test score is 80. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 68 and the lowest post-test score was 56. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 88. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 60,63. The result showed that there was an improvement in post-test result than pre-test. This assumption was tested using T-test in next section.

Table 4.6

The T-test of Post-test Score of Experiment and Control Group

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------|------|----|---------|----------------|-----------------|
| Experimental | 1,00 | 22 | 88,0000 | 4,53557 | ,96699 |
| control | 2,00 | 22 | 60,6364 | 3,61933 | ,77164 |

Independent Samples Test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Differe nce | Std. Error Differe nce | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| experi mental | Equal variances assumed | ,491 | ,487 | 62,11 9 | 42 | ,000 | 27,363 64 | 1,2371 3 | 24,867 00 | 29,860 27 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 62,11 9 | 40 ,0 29 | ,000 | 27,363 64 | 1,2371 3 | 24,863 35 | 29,863 92 |

From the result of the research show that the experimental class the students who were taught using cartoon film has the mean value 88. Meanwhile, the control class the students who were taught without using cartoon film has the mean 60. It can be said that the score of cartoon film of experimental class is higher than control class.

T-table showed that was 62,119. It means that the result from this calculation $62,119 > 0,4044$. It means that there was significant difference of students taught using cartoon film teaching and those taught without cartoon film teaching. In this case, the use of cartoon film is necessary needed in teaching writing.

4.4 Testing of the Hypotheses

In this section, the researcher described the interpretation of research finding by using statistical calculation and summerized the hypothesis. The research was held to answer the question whether the effectiveness using

cartoon film as media to improve students' writing in MA Masalikil Huda Jepara or not. The researcher wrote the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) and the Null Hypothesis (H_o) as follows:

- a. The Null hypothesis (H_o): there was no significant using carton film in learning writing narrative text.
- b. The Alternative Hypothesis (H_a): there was significant effectiveness using carton film in learning writing narrative text.

To prove the hypothesis, the data obtained in pre-test and post-test were calculated by using t_{test} formula with assumption as follows:

- a. If the probability $> 0,05$ the Null hypothesis (H_o) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected. It was proved that Cartoon film in teaching was not effective to enhance students' writing skill.
- b. If the probability $< 0,05$ the Null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It was proven that Cartoon Film in teaching was effective to enhance writing skill.

According to the analysis of result above, there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores.

4.5 Discussion

The result of this study generally show that there is effectiveness of using cartoon film in writing narrative text. It can be proved from the result of experimental and control group score. Before the students of experimental and control group got the treatment the researcher were given pre-test to know and assessing the students writing skills. The students' score from the experimental class were almost same from those who were in the control class. After giving treatment for experimental class using cartoon film, the writer found the highest is 96 while the lowest post-test score is 80. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 68 and the lowest post-test score was 56. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 88. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 60,63.

When the student taught by using cartoon film, all of the students' felt exciting in teaching learning process, because with cartoon film, the students more pay attention and enjoyable in learning process the other students that make them interested in using cartoon film. They said that cartoon film can make the students got the idea. So, it made them felt easy to understand. The writer did not give technique in control class, but the writer only give some material about and picture about narrative text. After the writer giving treatments without cartoon film the writer found that the pre-test experimental class, the highest is 52 while the lowest pre-test score is 30. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 54 and the lowest pre-test score was 40. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 40,63. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 45,47. So, it mean that the lowest and the highest score in pre-test were also higher than post-test.

Teaching writing at control class without using cartoon film feel bored with the material that was being presented by the writer, because the method was to monotonous. So, the material could not transfer well to the student optimally. According to (Hasanah,, 2016) Students enthusiastically follow the lesson so that the class becomes more conducive. From this research, it can be concluded that the improvement of writing of writing skill is influenced by four factors: classroom activities, materials, classroom management, and teacher approach. And students are more active and can understand well with the media. In addition to this, students' needed to be improvement by using cartoon film to the students'. In conclusion, using cartoon film is an effective way to solve the students' problems. Based on (Nengsih, 2012) by teaching medium in speaking a recount text by watching shaun the sheep cartoon is focused on the second grade students of junior high school. Shaun the sheep tells how sheep with other companions. It can be developed into a recount text of the experiences. Students will be motivated and active to express their opinions retelling and concludes the cartoon story shaun the sheep into the form of recount text. Teachers will also be easier in teaching the structure of

writing the recount text. And students will be attention, actively and understand the lesson easily. In addition Anggraini This research how video can improve student writing skill. To find out any factors that affect the change of writing ability of narrative text in grade XII students IPA 2 SMAN 2 Bukittinggi through this video is research action class. Students enthusiastically follow the lesson so that the class becomes more conducive. From this research, it can be concluded that the improvement of writing of writing skill is influenced by four factors: classroom activities, materials, classroom management, and teacher approach. And students more active and understand with the media.

