## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter delivers the important part of this research, they are the findings and discussion which consist of the description of data, the result of normality and homogenity testing, hypothesis testing and discussion.

## A. The Description of Data

In this study, the data of experimental class who taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those who taught by conventional method were displayed. The sample of this study were X MIPA-5 as experimental class and X MIPA4 as control class. The purpose of this study was to know whether Short Cartoon Movie as media to improve students' writing narrative text toward online learning in the first grade of MA Ma'arif Udanawu. The data were collected from the students' score of pre-test and post-test in the two classes. Briefly, the more explaination of the research finding as follow;

## 1. The Data of Experimental Class

The data of experimental class was consist of two part, they were pre-test and post-test score. The data of both classes were explained as follow;

## a. The data of pre-test

Before the experimental class had been given the treatment, the researcher conducted pre-test. The data of pre-test were used to know the background knowledge of writing narrative text and the equality of both class, experimental and control class. In the table 4.1 below was the result of pre-test;

Table 4.1 Students' Pre-test Score of Experimental Class

| No | Name | Class | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | APL | X MIPA-5 | 62 |
| 2 | AR | X MIPA-5 | 46 |
| 3 | AN | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 4 | AAS | X MIPA-5 | 64 |
| 5 | DNR | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 6 | EPA | X MIPA-5 | 74 |
| 7 | EPS | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 8 | ENA | X MIPA-5 | 64 |
| 9 | FAA | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 10 | FAA | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 11 | FSI | 60 |  |
| 12 | HRJ | X MIPA-5 | 62 |
| 13 | IFB | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 14 | IPW | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 15 | LK | X MIPA-5 | 62 |
| 16 | LMS |  | 78 |
| 17 | MW |  | 72 |
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Continuation Table 4.1 Students' Pre-test Score of Experimental Class

| 18 | MDA | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | MAD | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 20 | MKS | X MIPA-5 | 70 |
| 21 | MZJ | X MIPA-5 | 77 |
| 22 | NZS | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 23 | NNA | X MIPA-5 | 56 |
| 24 | NSN | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 25 | RH | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 26 | SL | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 27 | SRD | X MIPA-5 | 62 |
| 28 | SLZ | X MIPA-5 | 64 |
| 29 | SRA | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 30 | SIA | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 31 | SDA | X MIPA-5 | 62 |
| 32 | TBU | X MIPA-5 | 64 |
| 33 | TWA | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 34 | UMN | X MIPA-5 | 54 |
| 35 | VMA | X MIPA-5 | 55 |
| 36 | YDP | X MIPA-5 | 76 |

The scores were collected from students writing narrative text which was calculated by using analyctic scoring rubric (see data analysis method in the chapter III). Then the score of pre-test was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows to know the minimum score, maximum score, mean, mode, median and standard deviation. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.2 below;

## Table 4.2 The Descriptive Analysis of Pre-Test in Experimental Class

## Statistics

Pre-test score in experimental class

| N | Valid |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing |
| Mean | 36 |
| Median | 0 |
| Mode | 67.61 |
| Std. Deviation | 68.00 |
| Variance | 68 |
| Range | 7.842 |
| Minimum | 61.502 |
| Maximum | 32 |
| Sum | 46 |

In the table 4.2 above, the descriptive analysis of pre-test showed that the minimum score was 46 ; the maximum score was 78 ; the mean was 67.61 , the mode score was 68 ; the median score was 68 and standard deviation was 7,842 . From the table above, it indicated that the mean score of pre-test which gained by experimental class was 67.61. And the students who got the score more than the mean score was higher than those who got the score lower than the mean. It can be known from the standart deviation that showed the value of 7,842 .

After knowing the descriptive analysis of pre-test in the experimental class, the researcher continued to calculate the distribution of the pre-test score in experimental class. The calculation was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.3 below;

Table 4.3 Histogram Chart of Pre-Test Score in Experimental Class


From the histogram above, it can be known that the mean score was 67.61 , the standard deviation was 7.842 , and the N valid was 36 . It indicated all score in the pre-test in the experimental class was valid and the data was distributed normally because the curve showed look like slope in the left side because some scores are close to mean and there are score far under the mean. For more detail of the score in the experimental class, can be seen in the table 4.4 below:

Table 4.4 Frequency and Percentage of Pre-Test in Experimental Class

Pre-test score in experimental class

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 46 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
|  | 54 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 5,6 |
|  | 55 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 8,3 |
|  | 56 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 11,1 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 13,9 |

## Continuation Table 4.4 Frequency and Percentage of PreTest in Experimental Class

| 62 | 5 | 13,8 | 13,8 | 27,8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 64 | 4 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 38,9 |
| 68 | 9 | 25 | 25 | 63,9 |
| 70 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 66,7 |
| 72 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 69,4 |
| 74 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 72,2 |
| 76 | 5 | 13,8 | 13,8 | 86,1 |
| 77 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 88,9 |
| 78 | 4 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 100,0 |
|  | 36 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Based on the table 4.4 above, the students who received score 46 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who received score 54 was only one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who received score 55 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who recieved the score 56 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who recieved the score 60 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who recieved the score 62 were five $(13,9 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 64 were four $(11,1 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 68 were nine $(25,0 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 70 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who recieved the score 72 was only one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who recieved the score 74 was only one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 76 were five $(13,9 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 77 was only one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved the score 78 were four $(11,1 \%)$. The frequency and the percentage of this calculation was to know the distribution of students' pre-test score along with their frequency from the overall.

## b. The Data of Post Test

After giving treatment (Short Cartoon Movie) in the experimental class, the researcher conducted post-test. The post-test was given to know the result score of students after got the treatment.

In the table 4.3 displayed the result of post-test of experimental class;

Table 4.5 Students' Post-test Score of Experimental Class

| No | Name | Class | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | APL | X MIPA-5 | 64 |
| 2 | AR | X MIPA-5 | 68 |
| 3 | AN | X MIPA-5 | 80 |
| 4 | AAS | X MIPA-5 | 74 |
| 5 | DNR | X MIPA-5 | 72 |
| 6 | EPA | X MIPA-5 | 74 |
| 7 | EPS | X MIPA-5 | 74 |
| 8 | ENA | X MIPA-5 | 79 |
| 9 | FAA | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 10 | FAA | X MIPA-5 | 82 |
| 11 | FSI | 76 |  |
| 12 | HRJ | X MIPA-5 | 80 |
| 13 | IFB | X MIPA-5 | 82 |
| 14 | IPW | X MIPA-5 | 76 |
| 15 | LK | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 16 | LMS | X MIPA-5 | 79 |
| 17 | MW | X MIPA-5 | 85 |
| 18 | MDA | X MIPA-5 | 87 |
| 19 | MAD |  | 82 |
| 20 | MKS |  | 70 |
|  |  |  | 70 |
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Continuation Table 4.5 Students' Post-test Score of Experimental
Class

| 21 | MZJ | X MIPA-5 | 88 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | NZS | X MIPA-5 | 84 |
| 23 | NNA | X MIPA-5 | 88 |
| 24 | NSN | X MIPA-5 | 85 |
| 25 | RH | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 26 | SL | X MIPA-5 | 86 |
| 27 | SRD | 79 |  |
| 28 | SLZ | X MIPA-5 | 78 |
| 29 | SRA | X MIPA-5 | 80 |
| 30 | SIA | 82 |  |
| 31 | SDA | X MIPA-5 | 75 |
| 32 | TBU | X MIPA-5 | 72 |
| 33 | TWA | X MIPA-5 | 80 |
| 34 | UMN | X MIPA-5 | 82 |
| 35 | VMA | X MIPA-5 | 88 |
| 36 | YDP |  |  |

The scores were collected from students writing narrative text which was calculated by using analyctic scoring rubric. Then the score of post-test was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows to know the minimum score, maximum score, mean, mode, median and standard deviation. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.6 after;

Table 4.6 The Descriptive Analysis of Post-Test in Experimental

## Class

Statistics
Post-test score in experimental
class

| N $\quad$ Valid | 36 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing |
| Mean | 0 |
| Median | 79.19 |
| Mode | 79.50 |
| Std. Deviation | $80^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Variance | 5.523 |
| Range | 30.504 |
| Minimum | 24 |
| Maximum | 64 |
| Sum | 88 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The
smallest value is shown

In the table 4.6 above, the descriptive analysis of post-test showed that the minimum score was 64 ; the maximum score was 88 ; the mean was 79,19 , the mode score was 80 ; the median score was 79,50 and standard deviation was 5,523 . From the table above, it indicated that the mean score of post-test which gained by experimental class was 79,19 . And the students who got the score more than the mean score was higher than those who got the score lower than the mean. It can be known from the standard deviation that showed the value of 5,523.

After knowing the descriptive analysis of post-test in the experimental class, the researcher continued to calculate the distribution of the post-test score in experimental class. The calculation was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.7 as follows;

Table 4.7 The Histogram Chart of Post-Test in Experimental Class


From the histogram above, it can be known that the mean score was 79.19 , the standard deviation was 5.523 , and the N valid was 36 . It indicated all score in the post-test in the experimental class was valid and the data was distributed normally because the curve showed tapered or pointed upward because the score are relatively close to mean. For more detail of distribution score post-test in the experimental class, can be seen in the table 4.8 after:

Table 4.8 Frequency and Percentage of Post-Test in Experimental Class

Post-test score in experimental class

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 64 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
|  | 68 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 5,6 |
|  | 72 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 11,1 |
|  | 74 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 19,4 |
|  | 75 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 22,2 |
|  | 76 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 30,6 |
|  | 78 | 4 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 41,7 |
|  | 79 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 50,0 |
|  | 80 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 63,9 |
|  | 82 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 77,8 |
|  | 84 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 80,6 |
|  | 85 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 86,1 |
|  | 86 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 88,9 |
|  | 87 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 91,7 |
|  | 88 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 100,0 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 |  |  |

According to the table 4.7 , the students who received score 64 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who received score 68 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who received score 72 were two (5,6\%). The students who received score 74 were three ( $8,3 \%$ ). The students who received score 75 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who received score 76 were three $(8,3 \%)$. The students who received score 74 were four $(11,1 \%)$. The students who received score 79 were three $(8,3 \%)$. The students who received score 80 were five ( $13,9 \%$ ). The students who received score 82 were five $(13,9 \%)$. The students who received score 84 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who received score 85 were two $(5,6 \%)$. The students who received score 86 was one ( $2,8 \%$ ). The students who received score 87 was one $(2,8 \%)$. And the students who received score

88 were three $(8,3 \%)$. The frequency and the percentage of this calculation was to know the distribution of students' post-test score along with their frequency from the overall.

## 2. The Data of Control Class

The data of control class was consist of two part also, they were pre-test and post-test score. The data of both classes were explained as follow;

## a. The Data of Pre-test

Before the experimental class had been given the treatment, the researcher conducted pre-test. The data of pre-test were used to know the background knowledge of writing narrative text and the equality of both class, experimental and control class. In the table 4.9 below was the result of pre-test;

Table 4.9 Students' Pre-test Score of Control Class

| No | Name | Class | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | APM | X MIPA-4 | 56 |
| 2 | AFR | X MIPA-4 | 65 |
| 3 | AAN | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 4 | ACL | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 5 | AHG | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 6 | ASA | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 7 | DR | X MIPA-4 | 64 |
| 8 | DLN | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 9 | DDN | X MIPA-4 | 62 |
| 10 | DCP | 74 |  |
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Continuation Table 4.9 Students' Pre-test Score of Control Class

| 11 | DAP | X MIPA-4 | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | ENR | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 13 | EPW | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 14 | IRY | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 15 | INM | X MIPA-4 | 56 |
| 16 | INF | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 17 | ISF | X MIPA-4 | 78 |
| 18 | ISN | X MIPA-4 | 54 |
| 19 | KL | X MIPA-4 | 58 |
| 20 | LF | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 21 | LM | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 22 | MDR | X MIPA-4 | 62 |
| 23 | MJ | X MIPA-4 | 66 |
| 24 | ME | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 25 | NAK | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 26 | NNM | X MIPA-4 | 69 |
| 27 | RAR | X MIPA-4 | 56 |
| 28 | RHM | X MIPA-4 | 77 |
| 29 | RZ | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 30 | RA | X MIPA-4 | 66 |
| 31 | SHA | X MIPA-4 | 64 |
| 32 | S | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 33 | SNM | X MIPA-4 | 67 |
| 34 | YFF | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 35 | ZA | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 36 | ZS | X MIPA-4 | 74 |

The scores were collected from students writing narrative text which were calculated by using analyctic scoring rubric (see data analysis method in the chapter III). Then the score of pre-test was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows to know the minimum score, maximum score, mean, mode, median and standard deviation. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.10 as follows;

## Table 4.10 The Descriptive Analysis of Pre-Test in Control Class

## Statistics

Pre-test in Control Class

| N $\quad$ Valid | 36 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 68.17 |
| Median | 68.00 |
| Mode | 74 |
| Std. Deviation | 6.597 |
| Minimum | 54 |
| Maximum | 78 |
| Sum | 2454 |

According to the result of calculation descriptive analysis in the table 4.10 above, the minimum score was 54 ; the maximum score was 78 ; the mean was 68,17 , the mode score was 74 ; the median score was 68,00 and standard deviation was 6,597 . From the explaination before, it indicated that the mean score of pretest which gained by control class was 68,17 . And the students who got the score more than the mean score was higher than those who got the score lower than the mean. It can be known from the standart deviation that showed the value of 6,597 .

From the explaination before, it indicated that the mean score of pre-test which gained by control class was 68,17 . And the students who got the score more than the mean score was higher than those who got the score lower than the mean. It can be known from the standart deviation that showed the value of 6,597 .

After knowing the descriptive analysis of pre-test in the control class, the researcher continued to calculate the distribution of pre-test score in control class. The calculation was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.11 as follows;

Table 4.11 Histogram Chart of Pre-Test in Control Class


From the histogram above, it can be known that the mean score was 68.17, the standard deviation was 6.597 , and the N valid was 36 . It indicated all score in the pre-test in the control class was valid and the data was distributed normally because the curve showed tapered or pointed upward because the score are relatively close to mean. For more detail of distribution pre-test score in the control class, can be seen in the table 4.12 below:

Table 4.12 Frequency and Percentage of Pre-Test Score in Control Class

## Pre-test in Control Class

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 54 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
|  | 56 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 11.1 |
|  | 58 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 13,9 |
|  | 62 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 19,4 |
|  | 64 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 27,8 |
|  | 65 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 30,6 |
|  | 66 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 36,1 |
|  | 67 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 38,9 |
|  | 68 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 52,8 |
|  | 69 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 55,6 |
|  | 70 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 58,3 |
|  | 72 | 4 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 69,4 |
|  | 74 | 6 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 86,1 |
|  | 76 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 94,4 |
|  | 77 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 97,2 |
|  | 78 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
|  | Total | 36 | 100 | 100 |  |

According to table 4.12 above, the students who recieved score 54 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 56 were three ( $8,3 \%$ ). The students who recieved score 58 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 62 were two $(5,6 \%)$. The students who recieved score 64 were three $(8,3 \%)$. The students who recieved score 65 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 66 were two $(5,6 \%)$. The students who recieved score 67 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 68 were 5 (13,9\%). The students who recieved score 69 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 70 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 72 were four $(11,1 \%)$. The students who recieved score 74 were 6 $(16,7 \%)$. The students who recieved score 76 were three $(8,3 \%)$. The students who
recieved score 77 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 78 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The frequency and the percentage of this calculation was to know the distribution of students' pre-test score along with their frequency from the overall.

## b. The Data of Post-test

After giving treatment (Short Cartoon Movie) in the experimental class, the researcher conducted post-test. The post-test was given to both class to know the result score of students after got the treatment. In the table 4.13 displayed the result of post-test of control class;

Table 4.13 Students' Post-test Score of Control Class

| No | Name | Class | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | APM | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 2 | AFR | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 3 | AAN | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 4 | ACL | X MIPA-4 | 82 |
| 5 | AHG | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 6 | ASA | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 7 | DR | X MIPA-4 | 66 |
| 8 | DLN | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 9 | DDN | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 10 | DCP | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 11 | DAP | X MIPA-4 | 74 |
| 12 | ENR | X MIPA-4 | 64 |
| 13 | EPW | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 14 | IRY | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 15 | INM | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 16 | INF | X MIPA-4 | 80 |
| 17 | ISF | X MIPA-4 | 77 |
| 18 | ISN | X MIPA-4 | 66 |
| 19 | KL | X MIPA-4 | 75 |
| 20 | LF | X MIPA-4 | 76 |
| 21 | LM |  | 72 |
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Continuation Table 4.13 Students' Post-test Score of Control Class

| 22 | MDR | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 23 | MJ | X MIPA-4 | 65 |
| 24 | ME | X MIPA-4 | 68 |
| 25 | NAK | X MIPA-4 | 83 |
| 26 | NNM | X MIPA-4 | 84 |
| 27 | RAR | X MIPA-4 | 79 |
| 28 | RHM | X MIPA-4 | 82 |
| 29 | RZ | X MIPA-4 | 72 |
| 30 | RA | X MIPA-4 | 84 |
| 31 | SHA | X MIPA-4 | 80 |
| 32 | S | X MIPA-4 | 75 |
| 33 | SNM | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 34 | YFF | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 35 | ZA | X MIPA-4 | 70 |
| 36 | ZS | X MIPA-4 | 72 |

The scores were collected from students writing narrative text which was calculated by using analyctic scoring rubric. Then the score of post-test was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows to know the minimum score, maximum score, mean, mode, median and standard deviation. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.14 below;

Table 4.14 The Descriptive Analysis of Post-Test in Control Class

Statistics
Post Test in Control Class

| N $\quad$ Valid | 36 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean | Missing |
| Median | 0 |
| Mode | 74,1 |
| Std. Deviation | 74,5 |
| Minimum | 70 |
| Maximum | 681 |
| Sum | 84 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

In the table 4.6 before, the descriptive analysis of post-test presented that the minimum score was 64 ; the maximum score was 84 ; the mean was 74,11 ; the mode score was 70; the median score was 74,50 and standard deviation was 5,681. From the explaination before, it indicated that the mean score of post test which gained by control class was 74,11 . And the students who got the score more than the mean score was higher than those who got the score lower than the mean. It can be known from the standart deviation that showed the value of 5,681

After knowing the descriptive analysis of post-test in the control class, the researcher continued to calculate the distribution of the post-test score in control class. The calculation was calculated by using SPSS 16.0 for windows. The result of calculation can be seen in the histogram 4.15 as follows;

Table 4.15 Histogram Chart of Post-Test in Control Class


From the histogram above, it can be known that the mean score was 68.17, the standard deviation was 6.597 , and the N valid was 36 . It indicated all score in the pre-test in the control class was valid and the data was distributed normally
because the curve showed tapered or pointed upward because the score are relatively close to mean. For more detail of distribution score in the control class, can be seen in the table 4.16 below:

Table 4.16 Frequency and Percentage of Post-Test in Control Class

Post Test in Control Class

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 64 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
|  | 65 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 5,6 |
|  | 66 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 11,1 |
|  | 68 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 19,4 |
|  | 70 | 6 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 36,1 |
|  | 72 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 44,4 |
|  | 74 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 50,0 |
|  | 75 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 55,6 |
|  | 76 | 6 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 72,2 |
|  | 77 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 75,0 |
|  | 79 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 77,8 |
|  | 80 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 83,3 |
|  | 82 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 91,7 |
|  | 83 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 94,4 |
|  | 84 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 100,0 |
|  | Total | 36 | 100 | 100 |  |

According to table 4.16 above, the students who recieved score 64 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 65 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 66 was two ( $5,6 \%$ ). The students who recieved score 68 was three (8,3\%). The students who recieved score 70 was six $(16,7 \%)$. The students who recieved score 72 was three $(8,3 \%)$. The students who recieved score 74 was two (5,6\%). The students who recieved score 75 was two $(5,6 \%)$. The students who recieved score 76 was six ( $16,7 \%$ ). The students who recieved score 77 was one
$(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 79 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 80 was two ( $5,6 \%$ ). The students who recieved score 82 was three ( $8,3 \%$ ). The students who recieved score 83 was one $(2,8 \%)$. The students who recieved score 84 was two ( $5,6 \%$ ). The frequency and the percentage of this calculation was to know the distribution of students' post-test along with their frequency from the overall.

## B. The Result of Normality and Homogeneity Testing

After presenting all the data which have been collected throught pre-test and posttest, the researcher calculated the normality and homogeneity testing. The result of them presents as follows;

## 1. Normality Testing Result

Normality testing was used to determined whether the data obtained from pre-test and post-test was ditributed normally or not. The researcher used Kolmogrov Smirnov test in SPSS 16.0 by the significant value $(\alpha)=0.05$. The result of normality testing is presented in the table 4.17 as follows;

## a. Normality Testing Result of Pre-Test

In this study the researcher calculated the data of pre-test to know the normality of the data of both class, experimental class and control class. The output of calculation by using SPSS is presented in the table 4.17 as follows;

Table 4.17 Normality Testing Result of Pre-Test

| Tests of Normality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Shapiro-Wilk |  |  |
|  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Score of Experiment <br> Pre-test al Class | . 135 | 36 | . 093 | . 932 | 36 | . 028 |
| Control <br> Class | . 136 | 36 | . 090 | . 936 | 36 | . 040 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction
$\mathrm{H}_{0} \quad$ : The data of pre-test were distributed normally
$\mathrm{H}_{1} \quad$ : The data of pre-test were not distributed normally
Based on the output of SPSS above it displayed that the sig/p-value of pre-test from group 1 (experimental class) was 0.093 and it was higher than 0.05 (0.093 > 0.05). while, the sig/p value of pre-test from group 2 (control class) was 0.090 and it was higher than $0.05(0.090>0.05)$.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted and $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ is rejected. It means that the data of pre-test from both classes, experimental and control class were distributed normally.
b. Normality Testing Result of Post-Test

After getting the score of post test, the researcher calculated the data to know the normality of both class, experimental class and control class. The output of calculation by using SPSS is presented in the table 4.18 below;

Table 4.18 Normality Testing Result of Post-Test

| Tests of Normality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Class | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Shapiro-Wilk |  |  |
|  |  | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Writing Score in Post Test | Experimental Class | . 109 | 36 | . $200^{*}$ | . 965 | 36 | . 301 |
|  | Control Class | . 126 | 36 | . 156 | . 958 | 36 | . 193 |

a. Lilliefors Significance

Correction
*. This is a lower bound of the true
significance.
$\mathrm{H}_{0} \quad$ : The data of post-test were distributed normally
$\mathrm{H}_{1} \quad$ : The data of post-test were not distributed normally
Based on the output of SPSS above it displayed that the sig/p-value of pre-test from group 1 (experimental class) was 0.200 and it was higher than 0.05 ( $0.200>0.05$ ). While, the sig/p value of pre-test from group 2 (control class) was 0.156 and it was higher than $0.05(0.156>0.05)$. From here, it can be concluded that both of class are normally distributed because the sig/p-value were higher than 0.05 .

## 2. Homogeneity Testing Result

The Homogeneity test was used to decide whether the data were colleccted have a homogeneous varience. In this study, the researcher used Test of Homogeneity of Varience with SPSS 16.0 for windows with significant value $(\alpha)=0.05$. The result is displayed in the table 4.19 and 4.20 as follows;

Table 4.19 Homogeneity Testing Result of Pre-Test

|  |  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Score Pre-test | Based on Mean | . 603 | 1 | 70 | . 440 |
|  | Based on Median | . 475 | 1 | 70 | . 493 |
|  | Based on Median and with adjusted df | . 475 | 1 | 65.994 | . 493 |
|  | Based on trimmed mean | . 464 | 1 | 70 | . 498 |


| $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $:$ The data of pre-test were homogeny |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $:$ The data of pre-test were not homogeny |

Table 4.20 Homogeneity Testing Result of Post-Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

|  |  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Writing Score in Post Test | Based on Mean | . 461 | 1 | 70 | . 499 |
|  | Based on Median | . 456 | 1 | 70 | . 502 |
|  | Based on Median and with adjusted df | . 456 | 1 | 68.712 | . 502 |
|  | Based on trimmed mean | . 460 | 1 | 70 | . 500 |

$\begin{array}{ll}\mathbf{H}_{0} & : \text { The data of post-test were homogeny } \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}} & : \text { The data of post-test were not homogeny }\end{array}$

The standard significant of education is $0.05(\alpha=5 \%)$. The test can be called homogeny if the significant value based on mean is higher than 0.05 . According to
both the table above, it can be seen that the significant score based on mean of pretest was 0.440 , it means higher than $0.05(0.440>0.05)$. While, the significant score based on mean of post-test was 0.499 , it means higher than 0.05 ( $0.499>0.05$ ). It can be interpreted that $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was accepted and $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ was rejected. So that, the conclution was those class having homogeneous varience.

## C. Hypothesis Testing

In hypothesis testing, the researcher compared the score of post-test. In this research, the hypothesis can be seen as follows;

1. $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ (null hypothesis): There is no significant different score in writing narrative text of the students taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those who been taught by using conventional method at the $10^{\text {th }}$ grade of MA Ma'arif Bakung in academic year 2020/2021.
2. $\quad \mathrm{H}_{1}$ (alternative hypothesis): There is significant different score in writing narrative text achievement of the students; taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those who been taught by using conventional method at the $10^{\text {th }}$ grade of MA Ma'arif Bakung in academic year 2020/2021.

While, the hypothesis testing of this research were;

1. If the significant score of $t$-test is lower than 0.05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ is accepted.
2. If the significant score of $t$-test is higher than 0.05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is accepted and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ is rejected.

In this research, the researcher had two groups of classes and both of groups are normally. Automatically, the researcher also had two mean score from the groups. It
means to test the hypothesis could be calculated by using Independent Sample T-Test through SPSS 16.0 version. The result of the calculation can be seen as follows;

Table 4.21 Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test Score
Group Statistics

| Class |  |  | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Writing Score of  <br> Posperimental  <br> Post Test Class | 36 | 79.19 | 5.523 | .921 |  |
|  | Control Class | 36 | 74.11 | 5.681 | .947 |

Based on the table above, the subject of this research there were two classes, they were experimental and control class. The experimental class which consisting of 36 students had value of the mean was 79,19 and the Standard Deviation was 5.523. While the control class which consisting of 36 students had value of the mean was 74.11 and Standard Deviation was 5.681.

Furthermore, to see the effectiveness of Short Cartoon Movie in writing narrative text achievement, the researcher also used Independent Sample T-test. The result of calculation can be seen in the table 4.22 below;

Table 4.22 Independent Sample T-test

| Independent Samples Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error <br> Difference | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Writing <br> Score of | Equal variances assumed | 461 | . 499 | 3.849 | 70 | . 000 | 5.083 | 1.321 | 2.450 | 7.717 |
| Post Test | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 3.849 | 69.944 | . 000 | 5.083 | 1.321 | 2.450 | 7.717 |

The table above showed that the significant score (sig- 2 tailed) was 0.000 . Based on the hypothesis testing rules, if the significant score of $t$-test is lower than 0.05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ is accepted. Meanwhile, if the significant score of $t$-test is higher than 0.05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is accepted and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ is rejected.

On the table 4.22 above, it can be seen that the significant score (sig- 2 tailed) was 0.000 and it was lower than $0.05(0.000<0.05)$. It means that the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected and the alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ is accepted. From here, it can be interpreted that there was significant different score in writing narrative text of the students whom taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those taught by using conventional method. In conclusion, Short Cartoon Movie improved the students' writing narrative text ability.

## D. Discussion

The design of this research is quasi-experimental design which is done by pretest and post-test. Before giving treatment to experimental class, both of classes was given pre-test. The pre-test had been done to know that two classes having same equality. After knowing that the classes were equal, the researcher gave the treatment to experimental class. It was conducted three times. Besides, the researcher also taught the control class by using conventional method. It was also conducted three times. In the end of meeting, each class were given the evaluation of writing narrative text with urban legend theme.

According to the research finding that has been presented, the mean score of pre-test in the experimental class was 67,61 . While, in the control class, they got 68,17
as their mean score of pre-test. After being taught by using Short Cartoon Movie in the experimental class and conducting post-test to both classes, the students of X MIPA-5 as experimental class showed significant different score of writing narrative text than students of X MIPA-4 as control class. The mean score of post-test which obtained by experimental class was 79,19 . While, in control class whom taught by using conventional method only obtained 74,11 as their mean of post-test score. The experimental class got an increase in the mean score from 67,61 up to $79,19(11,58)$. Wheareas, in the control class they got the mean score increase from 68,17 up to 74,11 $(5,94)$. From here, it can be known that the increasing of mean score in the experimental class was bigger than the mean score of control one.

By using Independent Sample T-test, the researcher analyzed the score of posttest from both of class to reject or accept $\mathrm{H}_{0}$. Based on the result of calculation that is presented in table 4.22 above, $\operatorname{sig}$ (2-tailed) is 0.000 . The significance level that used in education is $0.05(\alpha=5 \%)$. From the result of the calculation, it could be compared that sig. 2-tailed $(0.000)<\alpha(5 \%=0.05)$, thus $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ that stated there is no significant different score in writing narrative text of the students taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those who been taught by using conventional method is rejected. Meanwhile the $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ stated there is significant different score in writing narrative text of the students taught by using Short Cartoon Movie and those who been taught by using conventional method is accepted. In the other word, it can be concluded that Short Cartoon Movie is contributed to be effective for improving writing ability in Narrative Text.

The use of Short Cartoon Movie as media in teaching writing achievement was effective. It can help the students to explore their ideas in narrative because there are many slide of the movie which motivated and make them enjoy. The students can write
some sentences and paragraph easily, because they can get new vocabularies, explore the ideas and develop the story after watching the movie.

This research confirmed that Short Cartoon Movie was effecive used as media in teaching writing narrative text ability. The result of this research supported the finding of previous research. The previous research conducted by Dyah Setya Astiti (2012) explained that the use of movies can make the students more interested and enthusiastic in their learning process. The result of this research showed that the use of movie is able to improve students' writing skill of narrative text in terms of ideas, organization and grammatical features. Moreover, the result of this study completed the result of previous study which found that the movie was effectively used to improve other language skills. A research written by Fitrona, et al (2016) found that the Short cartoon Movie can improve the students' speaking skill well. Again, the research done by Rahayu Sapitri (2018) found the result that English Movie gave positive influence in students' listening comprehention. Furthermore, the reseach completed by Uswatun Hasanah (2016) had the result that English Cartoon Movie was effective to improve the students' vocabulary mastery.

According to the finding and previous researches above, Short Cartoon Movie successfully improved the students' writing narrative text. It provided a relaxed atmosphere in which the students can be motivated to see and hear the situation from the movie that had been watched. So, the implementation of Short Cartoon Movie was suggested to english teacher as alternative media for teaching english language.

