CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Finding

In this chapter, the researcher has done the process of pre-test, experimental treatment and post-test. Then, after finishing that processes, the researcher calculated the significant difference between two means, test of significance, and difference of average scores (mean) between experimental and control class.

Pre test had been given to both of control and experimental class, in order to measure how the condition of two classes before treatment. Both of classes got same pre test, namely write a story. After doing the pre test, the researcher conducted the experimental treatment. The researcher taught the experimental class by using animation video (Jack and the Beanstalk) and taught control class without animation video. At the end of learning process, the researcher gave post test to the two classes. They had to write the story again. It was conducted in order to analyze how far is students get understand about the text.

Table 4.1

This following table is a learning procces that is done by the researcher

Before conducting pre-test, post-test and treatment to the students, the researcher gave try out test to different class.

Experimental Class	Control Class
1. First Meeting a. Researcher gave pre-test for students	1. First Meeting a. The researcher gave pre-test for students
2. Second Meeting (with treatment) a.The researcher asked the students about narrative texts that they had known. b.The researcher explained about the	2. Second Meeting (without treatment) a.The researcher asked the students about narrative texts that they had known. b.The researcher explained about the

social purpose, generic structure, and language features of narrative text. c.The researcher showed an animation video (Jack and the Beanstalk) in three times in one day. d.The researcher and students discussed about the difficult words, generic structure, and language features from the video .	social purpose, generic structure, and language features of narrative text. c.The the researcher gave a narrative text (presentation). d.The researcher and students discussed about difficult words, generic structure, and language features of narrative text.
3. Third meeting. a. The researcher made review about the previous lesson. b. The researcher gave post- test for students. c. The researcher analyzed the result of research.	3. Third meeting. a. The researcher made review about the previous lesson. b. The researcher gave post-test for students c. The researcher analyzed the result of research.

4.2 Calculation of Writing Narrative Text by Using Animated Video of Experimental and Control Class

4.2.1 Realibility Test

The realibility test is used to examine wheter the data of the research is reliable or not. To determine it, the researcher used formula the realibility of Cronbach's Alpha. Based on the table that had been used by the researcher by using SPSS 16.00, it shows that the scale of alpha is 0.869. It means that the instrument that was used in this research has high realibility. Based on Cronbach’s Alpha, the scale of 0.869 could be categorized into very reliable instrument.

4.2.2 Normality Test

The normality test is used to examine wheter the data of the research is normal or not. The formula that the researcher used to examine the normality of the test is *Kolmogorov-Smirnov.* The data which had been examined by the researcher was pre test and post test

score that taken from both classes experimental and control class. When calculate by using this formula, if index that we get is (P) > 0,05 (α: 5%), so the data in this research is normal distribution (Nurgiyantoro dkk, 2004: 118). The hypotheses for normality test are:

a. H_0: Data is in normal distribution
b. H_1: Data is not in normal distribution

The data analysis had been helped by using program of SPSS 16. It produced index that could show wheter the data is normal distribution or not. The complete calculation could be seen in appendix page. This following table is a resume of the normality test result.

The resume of normality test result

Class	P	Information
Pretest of Experimental Class	0.142	P > 0.05 = Normal
Pretes of Control Class	0.381	
Posttest of Experimental Class	0.554	
Postes of Control Class	0.680	

Based on the hypotheses above shows that the data is in normal if H_0 is accepted. In this case, H_0 is rejected if signifance value is lower than 0.05 (α = 5%) while H_0 is accepted if the significance value is higher than 0.05.

The table above showed that index which had been gotten from data normality test of pretest from experimental class was 0.142 > 0.05 (α: 5%) and 0.381 > 0.05 (α: 5%) from pretest of control class. While normality test of post test data in experimental class was 0.554 > 0,05 (α: 5%) and 0.680 > 0,05 (α: 5%) from post test of control class. Because the calculation of index was > 0,05 (α: 5%)**.** It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. so the conclusion of the data of this research was **normal distribution.**

4.2.3 Homogeneity Test

The researcher had done the test of homogenity. It needed to know wether sample in the research come from population that had same variance or not. In this study, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained score F_{count} with F_{table}. So, if the obtained F_{count} meant that the variance was homogeneous. The complete calculation could be seen in appendix.

This following table is the resume of homogeneity of the test based on SPSS 16.00 Independent Sample Test.

Class	F_{count}	F_{table}	P	Information
Pretest of Experimental Class	1.674	2.032	0.159	$F_{count} < F_{table}$ = Homogen
Pretest of Control Class				

Table above shows that F_{count} that taken from variant homogeneity of pretest from two classes is 1.674. The F_{count} is smaller than F_{table} (2.032) so it means that the pretest from two classes is homogeneous. To see a complete calculation, please read the appendix.

4.2.4 T-Test

The T-Test technique was used to analyze the significant difference of the students' ability in writing narrative text before and after using animated video, the researcher used paired sample T-Test through SPSS 16.00 to analyze the data.

The hypotheses formula of the T-Test are:

a. H_0: If the t_{count} is lower than t_{table}, it means that there is no significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video.

b. H_1: If the t_{count} is higher than t_{table}, it means that there is significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video.

This following is the resume of T-Test calculation from the result of scoring the experimental and control post-test.

Class	Mean	t_{count}	t_{table}	Df	P
Experimental	76.38	5.424	2.032	33	0.005
Control	60.17				

Based on the hypotheses above shows that H_0 is accepted if the t_{count} is lower than t_{table}, it means that there is no significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video. While, H_0 is rejected if the t_{count} is higher than t_{table}, it means that there is no significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video.

After calculating the data based on the calculation of SPSS 16.00 above, the t_{count} is 5.424. After being consultated by t_{table} in significant level 5% and df (33) is 2.032, the t_{count} is higher than t_{table} (5.424 > 2.032). It means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. From this case, the researcher can conclude that there is significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video**.**

4. 3 Discussion

In this part, the researcher analyzed the data that had been collected and then described the result of the research. In the first meeting of the two classes, the researcher gave try out test, then a pre test for students without any explanations about narrative text. Almost of the students found it difficult to write on the blank paper and said that they did not have any ideas.

In the second meeting (treatment process), the researcher gave different learning procces to the two classes. The control class was taught without animation video. So as usual,

almost of students could not focus and pay their attention to the researcher's explanation. They felt bored because the researcher used traditional method to explain the story. The researcher only used lecturing method and presentation by using LCD as media of slide presentation in teaching. On the other hand, the experimental class (it was taught by animation video medium) the students were more enthusiastic and more interesting in learning process. They were happy in studying because there were new learning procces.

In the last meeting, after the treatment was given, the students of experimental class were easier to write than control class in doing the post test. It happened because animation video's medium could be seen as the guidance in arranging the events of the story. So, it made them get higher score in post test than control class.

The result of the research can be seen as the table below. It is based on the calculation of One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov:

No	Result	Experimental Class	Control Class
1.	Mean of		
	a. Pre-test	a. 41.88	a. 46.02
	b. Post-test	b. 76.38	b. 60.17
2.	Standard Deviation		
	a. pre test	a. 16.34	a. 20.57
	b. post test	b. 13.13	b. 12.56

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the score of pre test between two classes have no significant difference. But, after the teacher gave the treatment to experimental class, there is significant improvement from mean of pre test to post test of experimental class (41.88 to 76.38). The students' imagination in writing narrative text can be built by watching animated video. They felt easy to express their idea in writing.

On the other side, there is little significant improvement from pre test to post test mean of control class (46.02 to 60.17). It could happen because the students were given traditional method by the researcher.

After calculating the score of T – test, the t_{count} is higher than t_{table} (5.424 > 2.032). It means that there is significant difference between the students who are taught by using animated video and those who are not taught by using animated video**.** The researcher has conclusion that using animation video medium is effective in writing narrative text. The animation video medium can help the students to write easier and it proves that by using this medium, the students ability in writing narrative text is increased.

Based on the explanation about the analysis of the result on the table above according to the research at the second year students of SMP Negeri 1 Tarik Sidoarjo, it can be summarized that writing narrative text by using animation video is better than that of without animation video. Beside that, the students who learned writing narrative text through animation video medium and those who are not have such a significant difference that the students writing scores taught by using animation video are higher than those who are not given treatment.

After doing this research, the researcher has conclusion that using animation video as medium to increase students ability in writing narrative text can motivate students to engage in language learning. One of famous linguist, Harmer (2001: 282) has an opinion that video is one of visual aids that can be used in writing class. It can make the students feel happy when the are studying in the class. It also has another advantages, it can also be used to create situation for writing classes more clearly, that the students have big motivation and enthusiasm in teaching learning process in writing class.

In a short time, the animation video medium is good method in developing writing narrative text. It is proven that the writing achievement in the experimental class is increased.