## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISSCUSSION

In this chapter the researcher present research finding, hypotesis testing and discussion. The research finding discuss about the result of data analysis. The discussion section concist of discussion about the research finding.

## A. Research Findings

The present research design to find out the listening ability of the first grade at SMPN 1 Ngantru. When they were tought by using cartoon movie and when they were tought without using cartoon movie.

The subject of the reseach consist of two group/classes. The data were describe into two table. The showed students score in experimental class and the showed the students score in control class. The data of this research were the pre-test score and post-test score of experimental class and control class. The scores are presented as follows :

## 1. Data of Experimental Class

Experimental class was a class which taught by using cartoon movie.
The subject experimental class group consisted of 32 students. Students score of pre test and post test can be seen on the table below :

Table 4.1 The Students Score of Experimental Class (Pre-test and Posttest)

| NO | NAME | PRE-TEST | POST-TEST |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 1 | A P S | 90 | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A S | 65 | 92 |
| 3 | A A F | 61 | 78 |
| 4 | B W P | 70 | 94 |
| 5 | B D S | 87 | 89 |
| 6 | C D | 84 | 92 |
| 7 | D R | 80 | 92 |
| 8 | E S A | 83 | 85 |
| 9 | F A D | 87 | 93 |
| 10 | F F | 66 | 87 |
| 11 | F D | 63 | 74 |
| 12 | I A D | 93 | 82 |
| 13 | J A | 88 | 70 |
| 14 | K N | 81 | 90 |
| 15 | M R A | 85 | 84 |
| 16 | M N D | 46 | 93 |
| 17 | M N P | 63 | 80 |
| 18 | M R P | 80 | 87 |
| 19 | M R W S | 58 | 78 |
| 20 | M Y A | 85 | 82 |
| 21 | N Z F | 80 | 77 |
| 22 | O E N P | 90 | 70 |
| 23 | R Y | 86 | 80 |
| 24 | R A S | 88 | 90 |
| 25 | R P A | 68 | 81 |
| 26 | R N F | 85 | 87 |
| 27 | R D H | 73 | 83 |


| 28 | S S | 75 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | S A | 61 | 75 |
| 30 | T A R | 75 | 82 |
| 31 | T D | 80 | 78 |
| 32 | W T | 65 | 89 |

Based on the table 4.1 above, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 46 and the highest score was 93 . Beside that, the lowest score of posttest was 68 , the highest score was 96 .

## 1. Pre-test of Experimental Class

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test

## Statistic

Pre-test

| Statistics |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | NAME | SCORE |
| N Missing | 32 | 32 |
|  |  | 0 |
| Mean |  | 0 |
| Std. Error of Mean |  | 76.28 |
| Median |  | 2.062 |
| Mode |  | 80.00 |
| Std. Deviation |  | 80 |
| Variance |  | 11.665 |
| Range |  | 136.080 |
| Minimum |  | 47 |
| Maximum |  | 46 |


| Sum |  |  | 2441 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentiles | 25 |  | 65.25 |
|  | 50 |  | 80.00 |
|  | 75 |  | 85.75 |

The table 4.2 above, shows that the mean of students score in pre-test was 76,28 ; the median was 80.00 ; and the mode was 80 . The standard devitiation was 11,665 , the standard error of mean was 2,062 , the variance was 136,080 , the range was 47 , the minimum was 46 , the maximum was 93 and the sum was 2441 .

Table 4.3 Frequency Distribution of Score Pre-test

| SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 46 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
|  | 58 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 6.2 |
|  | 61 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 12.5 |
|  | 63 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 18.8 |
|  | 65 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 25.0 |
|  | 66 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 28.1 |
|  | 68 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 31.2 |
|  | 70 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 34.4 |
|  | 73 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 37.5 |
|  | 75 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 43.8 |
|  | 80 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 56.2 |
|  | 81 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 59.4 |
|  | 83 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 62.5 |


| 84 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 85 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| 86 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| 75.0 |  |  |  |
| 87 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| 78.1 |  |  |  |
| 90 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| 2.2 | 6.2 | 90.6 |  |
| 93 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |

The table 4.3 above, shows that from 32 students the frequency of pretest score there are 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 46,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 58,2 students (6,2\%) got 61, 2 students (6,2\%) got 63, 2 students (6,2\%) got 65, 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 66,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 68,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 70 , 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 73,2 students $(6,2 \%)$ got 75,4 students $(9,4 \%)$ got 80 , 1 students ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 81,1 students ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 83 , 1 student ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 84 , 3 students ( $9,4 \%$ ) got 85,1 students ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 86,1 student ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 87 , 2 students (6,2\%) got 88, 2 students ( $9,4 \%$ ) got 90 and 1 student (3,1\%) got 93.

## Image 4.1 Histogram Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test



The histogram above, shows that the mean was 76,28 . The standard deviation was 11,665 and total students was 32 students.

## 2. Post-test of Experimental Class

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test

## Statistic

Post-test

| Statistics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | name | score |  |
| N | Valid | 32 | 32 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean |  |  | 83,09 |
| Median |  | $82,75^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Mode |  | $70^{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |
| Std. Deviation |  | 7,271 |  |
| Variance |  | 52,862 |  |
| Range |  | 24 |  |
| Minimum |  |  | 70 |
| Maximum |  |  | 94 |


| Sum |  |  | 2659 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Percentiles | 25 |  | $77,75^{\mathrm{c}}$ |
|  | 50 |  | 82,75 |
|  | 75 |  | 89,50 |

a. Calculated from grouped data.
b. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown
c. Percentiles are calculated from grouped data.

The table 4.4 above, shows that the mean of students score in post-test was 83,09 ; the median was 82,75 ; and the mode was 70 . The standard deviation was 7,271 , the variance was 52,862 , the range was 24 , the minimum was 70 , the maximum was 94 and the sum was 2659 .

Table 4.5 Frequency Distribution of Score Post-test

| Score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency |  |  |  |



The table 4.5 above, shows that from 32 students the frequency of post-test score there are 3 student (9,4\%) got 70, 1 students (3,1\%) got 74, 2 student $(6,3 \%)$ got 75,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 77,3 student $(9,4 \%)$ got 78,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 80,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 81,3 students $(9,4 \%)$ got 82 , 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 83,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 84,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 85 , 3 students ( $9,4 \%$ ) got 87,2 students (6,3\%) got 89, 2 students (6,3\%) got 90, 3 students ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 92 , 2 students ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 93 and 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 94 .

## Image 4.2 Histogram Descriptive Statistic of Post-test



The histogram above, shows that the mean was 83,09 , the standard devitiation was 7,271 and total students was 32 students.

## 2. Data of Control Class

Control class was a class which taught without using cartoon movie.
The subject control group consisted of 32 students. Students score of pretest and post-test can be seen on the table below:

Table 4.6 The Students Scores of Control Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

| No | Name | Pre-test | Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A G | 60 | 73 |
| 2 | A Z | 83 | 89 |
| 3 | A N A | 95 | 70 |
| 4 | C K A | 75 | 73 |
| 5 | C W L | 95 | 72 |
| 6 | D T Y A | 83 | 91 |
| 7 | D L R | 75 | 81 |
| 8 | D R S | 80 | 85 |
| 9 | D S F | 88 | 92 |
| 10 | D A S | 83 | 75 |
| 11 | F S A N | 90 | 70 |
| 12 | F K P | 78 | 60 |
| 13 | H P U | 81 | 70 |
| 14 | M H S | 80 | 83 |
| 15 | M B R | 31 | 73 |
| 16 | M FA | 50 | 40 |
| 17 | M F A | 70 | 83 |
| 18 | M F | 5 | 82 |
| 19 | M A E P | 20 | 30 |
| 20 | M N R | 63 | 87 |
| 21 | N M F | 93 | 87 |


| 22 | N C A W | 86 | 72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | N P W | 72 | 87 |
| 24 | N P | 85 | 90 |
| 25 | P M S B | 25 | 70 |
| 26 | P W | 83 | 87 |
| 27 | R F Z | 85 | 78 |
| 28 | S A P L | 70 | 80 |
| 29 | S K C | 63 | 68 |
| 30 | S N A | 93 | 70 |
| 31 | U K N | 96 | 91 |
| 32 | Z S I A | 88 | 70 |

The table 4.6 above, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 5 and the highest score was 96 . Beside that, the highest score of post-test was 94 , the lowest score was 70.

## 1. Pre-test of Control Class

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test

## Statistic

Pre-test

## Statistics

|  | NAME | SCORE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid | 32 |
|  | Missing | 32 |
|  |  | 0 |
| Mean |  | 72.62 |
| Std. Error of Mean |  | 4.079 |
| Median |  | 80.50 |


| Mode |  | 83 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Std. Deviation |  | 23.072 |
| Variance |  | 532.306 |
| Range |  | 91 |
| Minimum |  | 5 |
| Maximum |  | 96 |
| Sum |  | 2324 |
| Percentiles | 25 |  |
|  | 50 |  |
|  | 75 |  |

The table 4.7 above, shows that the mean of students score in pre-test was 72,62 ; the mode was 83 and the median was 80.50 . The standard devitation was 23,072 , the standard error of mean was 4,079 , the varience was 532,306 , the range was 91 , the minimum was 5 , the maximum was 96 and the sum was 2324.

Table 4.8 Frequency Distribution of Score Pre-test

| SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| Valid | 5 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
|  | 20 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 6.2 |
|  | 25 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 9.4 |
|  | 31 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 12.5 |
|  | 50 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 15.6 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 18.8 |
|  | 63 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 25.0 |


| 70 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 31.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 34.4 |
| 75 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 40.6 |
| 78 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 43.8 |
| 80 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 50.0 |
| 81 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 53.1 |
| 83 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 65.6 |
| 85 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 71.9 |
| 86 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 75.0 |
| 88 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 81.2 |
| 90 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 84.4 |
| 93 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 90.6 |
| 95 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 96.9 |
| 96 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The table 4.8 above, shows that from 32 students the frequency of pretest score there are 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 5,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 20,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 25,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 31,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 50,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 60,2 student $(6,3 \%)$ got 63,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 70,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 72,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 75,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 78,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 80,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 81,4 students $(12,5 \%)$ got 83 , 2 students ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 85,1 student ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 86,2 students ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 88 , 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 90,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 93,2 students ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 95 and 1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 96 .

## Image 4.3 Histogram Descriptive Statistic of Pre test



The histogram above, shows that the mean was 72,62 . The standard devitiation was 23.072 and total the students was 32 students.

## 2. Post-test of Control Class

Table 4.9 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test

## Statistic

Pos-test

| Statistics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | name | Score |  |
| N Missing | 32 | 32 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Mean |  | 76,53 |  |
| Std. Error of Mean |  | 2,370 |  |
| Median |  | $78,67^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Mode |  | 70 |  |
| Std. Deviation |  | 13,409 |  |
| Variance |  | 179,805 |  |
| Range |  | 62 |  |
| Minimum |  | 30 |  |
| Maximum |  | 92 |  |
| Sum |  |  | 2449 |


| Percentiles | 25 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 50 |
|  | 75 |$\quad$|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $71,00^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 78,67 |  |
| 86,20 |  |

a. Calculated from grouped data.
b. Percentiles are calculated from grouped data.

The table 4.9 above, shows that the mean of students score in post-test was 76,53 ; the mode was 70 ; and the median was 78.67 . The standard deviation was 13.409 , the standard error of mean was 2,370 , the variance was 179,805 , the range was 62 the minimum was 30 , the maximum was 92 and the sum was 2449 .

Table 4.10 Frequency Distribution of Score Pos-test


| 89 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 87,5 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 90 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 90,6 |
| 91 | 2 | 6,3 | 6,3 | 96,9 |
| 92 | 1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 100,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

The table 4.10 above, shows that from 32 students the frequency of post-test score there are 1 student ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 30,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 40,3 students (3,1\%) got 68, 6 student (18,8\%) got 70, 2 students (6,3\%) got 72, 3 student $(9,4 \%)$ got 73,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 75,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 78 , 2 student ( $6,3 \%$ ) got 80,1 students ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 81,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 82 , 2 students (6,3\%) got 83,1 students ( $3,1 \%$ ) got 85,4 students ( $12,5 \%$ ) got 87, 1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 89,1 students $(3,1 \%)$ got 90,2 students $(6,3 \%)$ got 91,1 student $(3,1 \%)$ got 92 .

## Image 4.4 Histogram Descriptive Statistic of Post Test



The histogram above, shows that the mean was 76,53 . The standart deviation was 13,409 and total the students was 32 .

## B. Data Analysis

1. Comparison of Statistical Data in Post-Test of Control Class and

## Experimental Class

The researcher compared students score of post-test of both group (control and experiment) from class VII J and VII I. The VII J as the experimental class which concist of 32 students. Meanwhile, the VII I as the control class consist of 32 students. To compare post-test that concisted of the highest score, the lowest score and the mean score in listening ability. Than, the researcher found out the score of each group from students score in post test by using SPSS 16.0. The result of calcultion data post-test in control class and experiment class can be seen on the table 4.11 below:

Table 4.11 Descriptive Statistics of Post-test Control and Experimental Class

Statistics

|  |  | CONTROL | EXPERIMENT |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid | 32 | 32 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean |  | 76,53 | 83,09 |
| Std. Error of Mean | 2,370 | 1,285 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 13,409 | 7,271 |  |
| Percentiles | 25 | $71,00^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $77,75^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
|  | 50 | 78,67 | 82,75 |
|  | 75 | 86,20 | 89,50 |

a. Percentiles are calculated from grouped data.

The table above, the researcher seen the difference of students score in post test of experimental class and control class. In post-test of experimental class showed that the standard error of mean was 1,285 the standard deviation was 7,271 and the mean score was 83,09 . Then, in post-test of
control class showed that the standard error of mean was 2,370 , the standard deviation was 13,409 and the mean score was 76,53 .

From the result showed that the experimental class were taught listening ability by using cartoon movie was higher than the control class who were taught listening ability without using cartoon movie. Than, in can be concluded that there was significant different score on students' listening ability between students taught by using cartoon movie and those taught by using convensional strategy. So, the using cartoon movie on students' listening ability was effective to teaching for students at first grade students at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung.

## C. Normality and Homogeneity testing

This researcher was testing the data to find out both of normality and homogeneity ofthe data. this analysis were used to determine the next step that was testing the hypothesis. The result of measuring both normality and homogeneity were presented in below:

## 1. Normality

The normality of both pre-test and post-test data measured by SPSS 22.0 versions using the formula of one Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The result was shown as below:

Table 4.12 Control Group Normality Testing


|  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRE_CON | .205 | 32 | .002 | .809 | 32 | .000 |
| POST_CON | .155 | 32 | .049 | .909 | 32 | .010 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4.13 Experimental Group Normality Testing

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The data above, the output of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in SPSS 16.0 at the table 4.12 da 4.13. It the result the normality between pre-test and post-test. In pre-test, it found that the significance of experimental variables was 0,056 and control variable 0,002 . In post-test, it found that the dignificance of experimental variable was 0,059 and control variable was 0,049 . From those data, it can be concluded that $H_{0}$ is accepted and $H_{1}$ is rejected. It means that the data of both experimental and control group were distributed normally.

## 2. Homogeneity

Homogeneity test was used to find out whether the data obtained have a homogeneous variance. The researcher used Test of Homogeneity of

Variences with SPSS 22.0 with significant value $(\alpha)=0,05$. The result is presented in the table below:

Table 4.14 Result of Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances
hasil belajar

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3,654 |  | 1 |  |

The description of the homogeneity data above, the significance value showed in number 0,061 . The test was called homogeny if the significant value is bigger than 0,05 . Based on the result of SPSS above it can be seen that the significant score was 0,061 . It was bigger than $0,05(0,061>0,05)$. It can be concluded that the students have homogeny of variences.

## D. Hypothesis Testing

Latief (2019) state that in testing hypothesis quantitatively, the theoretical hypothesis should be transformed into statistical hypothesis, which takes the form of null hypothesis and its alternative. The hypothesis of this research can be seen as follows:

1. $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ (Null Hypothesis): there is no significant difference score of students listening ability between students taught by using cartoon movie and those taught by using conventional method at the first grade at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung.
2. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ (Althernative Hypothesis): There is significant difference score of the students listening ability between students taught by using cartoon movie and
those taught by using conventional method at first grade at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung.

The hypothesis testing of this research are if the significant value is more than 0,05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted. Than, if the significant value is less than 0,05 , the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is accepted and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is rejected.

The computation was used to know the effectiveness of using cartoon movie is listening ability. The researcher used SPSS 22.0 by using formula of Independen Sample Test. The result was shown as below:

Table 4.15 Group Statistics of Two Groups

Group Statistics

|  | Class | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hasil belajar | Control class | 32 | 76,53 | 13,409 | 2,370 |
|  | Experiment class | 32 | 83,09 | 7,271 | 1,285 |

The table 4.15 above, it presented that there were two classes involved in this research, they were experimental class and control class. The result showed that member of students $(\mathrm{N})$ in the experimental class was 32 students and the member of students in control class was 32 students. The mean of the experimental class was 76,53 while the control class was 83,09 . Standart deviation of experimental class was 13,409 and the control class was 7,271 . The standard error of mean of experimental class was 2,370 and the control class was 1,285 .

The formulation to interpret the significant value:
a. If sig $>0,05$, there is no influence of giving treatment toward pre-test and posttest score.
b. If sig $<0,05$, there is influence of giving treatment toward pre-test and post-test score.

Table 4.16 Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test


The Table 4.16 above showed that in levene's test for equality of variences
$F$ was 3,651 and sig was 0,061 . In the $t$ test for equality of means the $t$ was -

2,434 and $-2,434$. The df was 62 and 47,778 . the sig. (2-tailed) was 0,018 and 0,019 . The mean difference was $-6,563$ and $-6,563$. The standart error difference was 2, 696 and 2, 696. $95 \%$ confidence interval of the difference in lower was $-11,953$ and $-11,953$. In upper was -1.172 and $-1,140$.

Based on the hypothesis testing rules, if sig > 0,05 it indicates that there is no significant different score between the result of pre-test and post-test of experiment class. Hence, if $\operatorname{sig}<0,05$ it indicates that the is significant different score between the result of pre-test and post-test of experimental class.

From the Table 4.17 that the significant value (sig-2 tailed) was 0,018 and it was more than $0,05(0,018<0,05)$. It means that $H_{0}$ is rejected and $H_{1}$ is accepted. Therefore, it can be interpreted that there was significant difference score of listening ability of students taught by using Cartoon Movie and those taught by using conventional method. The conclusion is cartoon movie could improve the students' listening ability at the first grade at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung.

## E. DISCUSSION

This research finding above showed that the students of VII-J as experimental class who were taught by using cartoon movie got significant different score in listening ability than the control class. The mean of post-test score gained by experimental class was 83,09 . Meanwhile, the students of VII-I as a control class whom taught by convensional method only gained 76,53 as the mean of their post-test score. There was significant difference score of
listening ability between the two classes. So, it can be included that the score of experimental class was higher than the score of control class.

From this research of the first grade at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung. The students of experimental class had a better achievement of vocabulary than the students of control class. Students of VII-J who learned by using cartoon movie resulted higher scores than the studentsof VII-I who learned vocabulary without using this media. The first step, the researcher give pre test to VII-J and VII-I by giving audio and test. The test in the form of multiple choice, blank sentence and essay. Pre-test used to know the students score before they get treatment. The second is a treatment, the researcher give a treatment 2 times meeting by used cartoon movie in experiment class and give the conventional method in control class. When the researcher teach by using cartoon movie, the students can upgrade score of the listening ability. The last is post-test, the researcher give post test to VII-J ans VII-I by giving audio and test. Post test used to know the students score after they get treatment by used cartoon movie.

From the result, the output data of Independen Sample Test that the significant value (2-tailed) was 0,018 . It means that the significant level more than $0.05(0,018<0,05)$ which mean the alternative hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ha})$ was acceped, while the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected. So, it can be concluded that there was significant difference score on students' listening ability of the first grade at SMP N 1 Ngantru Tulungagung before and after being taught using cartoon movie.

From the research at SMP N 1 Ngantru Tulungagung, the students of experimental class had a better achievement of listening ability than the students of control class. Since the researcher used homogeneous selection to control external variables and the result of homogeneity testing on students' post test in the previous chapter presented that the students have homogeneous on listening ability, it can be concluded that cartoon movie was effective to improve students's listening ability and it was not influenced by external variable.

Based on this research, it can be confirmed that cartoon movie was effective used as media to improve students' listening ability of the first grade students at SMPN 1 Ngantru Tulungagung. The previous research can supported the findings of preceding researches which has been done by M . Syamsul Hadi (2019). The result of this researcher is the use of animation video can give significant difference toward the students' vocabulary learning outcomes and also theirmotivation. The second from Adinan Deurahae (2019), the result of the research is the implementing animation video in teaching vocabulary could improve the students' vocabulary mastery better for the students who become the object of the research. The third from Resti Pangestuti (2014), the result of this researcher is that the teaching english vocabulary by using cartoon video as the media is effective. The last from Boris Ramadhika (2014), the result of this researcher is the listening skills of the eight grade students of SMP N 6 Magelang improved through the use of animation videos.

From the explanation above, cartoon movie succesed in improving students' listening ability. It can be seen from the progress of the students' score after given a treatment using cartoon movie. Cartoon movie can make the students' learn actively and more interest. Althought the students are doing online learning but they can easily learn by using cartoon movie. The teacher can teach using cartoon movie to improve student's listening ability. Thus, the implementation of cartoon movie was suggested to teacher in using it was alternative media for teaching language expecially listening.

