CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDING

The research was started on Monday, March 15th 2010 until April 08th 2010. This research was carried through two cycles. The description of each cycle is as follow:

A. Description and Analysis of the Pre Cycle

Before conducting this action research, a pre-cycle was given. Pre-test was conducted on Thursday, 31 March 2010. They were 36 students who followed the test. In this activity, the teacher did teaching practice as usual. The teacher explained narrative text including; the definition, generic structure, and the lexicogrammatical features. She did not flash animation yet in teaching learning. She gave example of narrative reading text. In pre test, the students were asked to write a narrative based on the keyword that teacher gave. The title is snow white. The time allotment was 30 minutes. The purpose of the pre-cycle was to check the students' ability in producing narrative text. Researcher wanted to know whether or not the students could produce a narrative text. And the result of pre test would be compared to the students' test result after implementing flash animation as the media used in the teaching learning process. The pre-test result can be seen in the table below:

Table 1. The Result of the Pre Cycle

No	Name of Students	Component of Writing Scoring					Raw Score	Ripe Score
		G	V	M	R	F		
1	Adila Nur Chabsoh	3	3	2	2	2	12	48
2	Ahmad Mustofa	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
3	Alfasian Bayu Aji Hernan	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
4	Ana Setiorini	3	3	2	2	3	13	52

5	Andreas Wahyu Permadi	3	3	2	2	2	12	48
6	Andri Prayogo	2	3	2	3	2	12	48
7	Anggun Prasetia Ningtyas	3	3	2	2	3	13	52
8	Arwan Nugraha	3	3	3	2	2	13	52
9	Bernat Kliv Yesnat	3	3	2	2	2	12	48
10	Catur Wisnu Prawowo	2	2	3	3	3	13	52
11	Charlin Cahya Febriani	3	2	3	3	3	14	56
12	Cicka Abna Firdaussy	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
13	Christy Arga Satria	2	2	2	2	2	10	40
14	Dani Kusuma Septianto	3	3	2	2	2	12	48
15	Dewi Wulaningsih	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
16	Dian Putri Supriyandani	2	2	3	2	3	12	48
17	Dinda Ayu Lusia	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
18	Dinna Islammeiliani	2	3	2	3	2	12	48
19	Eka Wahyu Nugrahaini	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
20	Elsa Yan Christyani	2	2	3	2	3	12	48
21	Fera Styo Nengrum	2	3	2	3	2	12	48
22	Ginanjar Satrio Laras	2	2	3	2	2	11	44
23	Hannah Lelya	3	2	3	3	3	14	56
24	Ika Arin Ardhiyanti	3	3	2	2	2	12	48
25	Krissantus Adimas Debi	3	3	2	2	3	13	52
26	Laurensius Dony Lebda	2	3	3	2	2	12	48
27	Oky Septia Agyaksari	3	2	2	2	2	11	44
28	Pandini Isma Cholifah	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
29	Pipit Wahyu Dian Saputri	2	2	2	2	2	10	40
30	Putri Erna Wati	2	3	3	3	3	14	56

31	Rizki Norcahyani	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
32	Rizky Ananda Hermawati	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
33	Sulistiyono	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
34	Tyas Retnowatin	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
35	Vivi Olga Safitri	3	3	2	3	2	13	52
36	Lispiyani	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
∑	36	95	99	84	92	94	464	1856

G = Grammar

V= Vocabulary

M= Mechanic

R= Relevance

F= Fluency

From the result, he could calculate the average of the students or mean of the score using the following formula:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{1856}{36}$$

$$= 51, 56$$

From the analysis above, it can be seen that the average of the students' writing result in pre-test was 51, 56. From the pre-cycle result above it can be concluded that the students' ability in writing narrative text was still poor. The students had difficulties to make a narrative text. They did not have any idea to write, so they were confused with what they had to write. They found it difficult to share ideas in their brain into a written language. They also found it difficult to find out the right words. Based on the explanation above, the average of students' result in pre-test was 51, 56. It could be said that treatment was important to improve students' writing skill.

B. Description and Analysis of the First Cycle

The first cycle was conducted on Monday, April 05th 2010. It was held at 10.15- 11.45 a.m. The researcher had to introduce about narrative, the definition, general structure and also lexiogrammatical of narrative. She also introduced the film to the students, and gave some questions related to the material. The students paid attention seriously when the lesson was presented. Further research was explained as follows

1. Planning

The researcher made lesson plan, arranged worksheet, formed work in pairs, made evaluation from the first cycle, arranged the observation checklist and brought compact disk. .

2. Acting

In the first cycle, the researcher taught about narrative. The researcher entered to the class and greeted the students, they responded the researcher greeted, and then the researcher checked the students' attendance list, and at this time no was student absent.

Before the researcher started the lesson, the researcher gave students the model of a narrative text. She explained about the generic structure, language features, and social function. She also explained about the components in writing. And then, she gave some questions to measure their understanding about the text. After that, the researcher showed flash animation film. The title of the flash animation film is Little Red Riding Hood. She divided the students into work in pairs, and gave them an exercise to arrange the jumble paragraph into a proper story. It was meant to train their understanding about the explanation given before. This film was meant to measure how well their attention was in teaching learning process.

In teaching learning process, the researcher gave them the second flash animation film. The title of the film is Jack and the Beanstalk. In this process, the researcher asked them to paid attention and took any notes

about the film. The students had to write who were the characters, the problem, and how the film ended. This film is the reflection of the explanation as long as the process of teaching and learning before. The film provided them the generic structure of the story that would give them some ideas for their writing.

Then the researcher guided students evaluated the film that was watched by students. The researcher asked them some questions related to the film. The teacher chooses flash animation film because it will release them from the boredom and can motivated in the students process of teaching and learning. Mary says that film, when used should be carefully previewed: students should be motivated: appropriate follow-up activities should be planned.[1] It was useful because it was entertaining but also should be motivated students with appropriate follow-up activities like questions and answer.

In the last activity, the researcher asked students to write again about the story in the film. The students had to write the story based on the knowledge they got before. They had to write the story based on the component of writing and the generic structure of narrative. The score of students in the first cycle could be seen in the table below:

Table 2. The Test Result of the First Cycle

No	Name of Students	Component of Writing Scoring					Raw Score	Ripe Score
		G	V	M	R	F		
1	Adila Nur Chabsoh	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
2	Ahmad Mustofa	3	4	3	4	3	17	68
3	Alfasian Bayu Aji Hernan	3	4	3	4	3	17	68
4	Ana Setiorini	3	4	3	4	3	17	68

[1]Mary Finocchiaro, *English As a Second Language: From Theory to Practice*, (New York: Regent Publishing Company, 1974), p. 114

5	Andreas Wahyu Permadi	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
6	Andri Prayogo	3	4	3	4	3	17	68
7	Anggun Prasetia Ningtyas	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
8	Arwan Nugraha	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
9	Bernat Kliv Yesnat	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
10	Catur Wisnu Prawowo	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
11	Charlin Cahya Febriani	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
12	Cicka Abna Firdaussy	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
13	Christy Arga Satria	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
14	Dani Kusuma Septianto	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
15	Dewi Wulaningsih	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
16	Dian Putri Supriyandani	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
17	Dinda Ayu Lusia	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
18	Dinna Islammeiliani	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
19	Eka Wahyu Nugrahaini	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
20	Elsa Yan Christyani	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
21	Fera Styo Nengrum	3	3	4	3	3	16	64
22	Ginanjar Satrio Laras	3	3	3	4	4	17	68
23	Hannah Lelya	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
24	Ika Arin Ardhiyanti	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
25	Krissantus Adimas Debi	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
26	Laurensius Dony Lebda	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
27	Oky Septia Agyaksari	3	3	3	3	3	15	60
28	Pandini Isma Cholifah	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
29	Pipit Wahyu Dian Saputri	3	3	4	3	3	16	64
30	Putri Erna Wati	3	4	3	4	4	18	72

31	Rizki Norcahyani	3	3	3	3	3	15	60
32	Rizky Ananda Hermawati	3	3	3	4	4	17	68
33	Sulistiyono	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
34	Tyas Retnowatin	4	3	4	4	4	19	76
35	Vivi Olga Safitri	3	3	3	4	4	17	68
36	Lispiyani	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
$\sum$	36	110	126	119	123	127	605	2420

After the data had been analyzed, the researcher found the sums of the score in distribution that is used to calculate the mean.

The mean is the arithmetical average that is obtained by adding the sum offset score and dividing the number of the students. The formula is as follow:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2420}{36}$$

$$= 67, 22$$

From the analysis above, it is clear that the average of the students test result of the first cycle was 67, 22. There is improvement comparing to the pre-cycle.

3. Observing

The researcher observed students in learning process at class by using observation instrument. This observation was done in learning process by using flash animation film to teach narrative writing at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 13 Semarang. There were notes for student's participation in this research. It could be seen in the table below:

Table 3. Score of Observation in First Cycle

No	Indicators	None (0%)	A few (<2)	Half (20-49)	Many (50%-69%)	Majority (>70)	Total of Score
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Students' attendance					√	5
2	The students are enthusiastic in listening to teachers' explanation of narrative			√			3
3	Students are active in answering the teacher's question			√			3
4	The students ask questions to clarify understanding		√				2
5	The students complete the task correctly			√			3
6	Students are serious in discussion			√			3
7	The students are enthusiastic watching flash animation film			√			3
8	The students are enthusiastic in doing the test				√		4
Total Score		0	2	15	4	5	26

$$\text{Score} = \frac{Total\ score}{\max imum\ score} x100\%$$

$$= \frac{26}{40} x100\%$$

$$= 65\ \%$$

4. Reflecting

From the result of the evaluation test above, showed that almost all students had finished in evaluation test but not satisfactory. The mean in the first cycle was 67, 22. The researcher analyzed that some students still had difficult in narrative writing. The students had difficulty in making a paragraph narrative. They still had difficult in grammar, diction, idiom and mechanics. They were still confused about tenses. They did not know what verbs they had to use, verb one, verb two, or verb three.

It could be seen from the observation that student's activeness was low enough. Students still did not focus on the material, they did not listen to teacher's explanation, and there were many students were still passive in learning process, in work in pairs, and working evaluation themselves.

Based on the notes above, the researcher must be more creative in delivering material by using flash animation to improve students' narrative writing. Researcher completed the student's observation in the first cycle and then she did reflecting and evaluating the learning activities in the first cycle. She tried to get solution on the problem by planning some action such as below:

a. The researcher asked students to focus on study and asked students to do work by themselves.
b. The researcher asked students to be more active in the learning process.
c. The researcher should manage class well.

d. The researcher made class condition well to get students is more active.

e. The researcher noted all of activities in class in learning process.

f. The researcher emphasized students in writing paragraph.

g. The researcher completed the evaluation sheet.

From the reflecting above, researcher got solution of the problem of learning process by using flash animation to improve students' narrative writing at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 13 Semarang. The result from the reflecting could be used to make improvement. It was also used as refflecting for doing second cycle to get maximum research and repairing the third cycle if the result of the second cycle unsatisfied.

C. Description and Analysis of the Second Cycle

Second cycle, it was conducted on Wednesday, 07 th 2010. It was held at 10.15- 11.45 a.m. The researcher used the same technique as the previous one, and the students did the same activity as same the first cycle. The students paid attention when the researcher began explaining students about the story that had been watched. Further result explained as follow:

1. Planning

The researcher planned some the activities to get maximum result in the second cycle. She tried not to do same weakness such as is the first cycle. The planning of the second cycles was the same at that is the lesson plan I, students worksheet, compact disk, observation check list and evaluation test.

2. Acting

The researcher entered to the class and greeted the students, they responded the researcher greeted, and then, the researcher checked the students' attendance list, at this time no one student absent. In the second cycle, the researcher taught about the previous film.

The researcher reviews the previous film that had been watched. In this activity, the researcher and the students discussed the generic

structure of narrative text together based on the previous film at the first cycle. The researcher showed flash animation film before she gave an exercise to work in pairs. The title of the film is Goldilocks. After that, she asked the students to rewrite the story based on the film that had been watched.

At the end of the lesson, the researcher gave briefly explanations about all of the materials, and gave the students formative test to check students understanding about the lesson given by the researcher. The researcher showed the flash animation film. The title is Ali and the Flying Carpet. After all of the process had finished, researcher evaluated students by giving evaluation test. The researcher asked students to rewrite the story based on the film that had been watched.. The score of students in the second cycle could be seen in the table below:

Table 4. The Result of the Second Cycle

No	Name of Students	Component of Writing Scoring					Raw Score	Ripe Score
		G	V	M	R	F		
1	Adila Nur Chabsoh	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
2	Ahmad Mustofa	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
3	Alfasian Bayu Aji Hernan	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
4	Ana Setiorini	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
5	Andreas Wahyu Permadi	4	4	4	3	4	19	76
6	Andri Prayogo	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
7	Anggun Prasetia Ningtyas	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
8	Arwan Nugraha	4	4	4	3	4	19	76
9	Bernat Kliv Yesnat	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
10	Catur Wisnu Prawowo	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
11	Charlin Cahya Febriani	4	3	4	4	4	19	76

12	Cicka Abna Firdaussy	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
13	Christy Arga Satria	3	3	4	4	4	18	72
14	Dani Kusuma Septianto	3	3	3	4	4	17	68
15	Dewi Wulaningsih	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
16	Dian Putri Supriyandani	4	4	4	3	4	19	76
17	Dinda Ayu Lusia	3	4	4	4	4	19	76
18	Dinna Islammeiliani	3	4	3	4	3	17	68
19	Eka Wahyu Nugrahaini	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
20	Elsa Yan Christyani	3	4	3	4	3	17	68
21	Fera Styo Nengrum	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
22	Ginanjar Satrio Laras	4	3	4	4	4	19	76
23	Hannah Lelya	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
24	Ika Arin Ardhiyanti	4	3	4	4	4	19	76
25	Krissantus Adimas Debi	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
26	Laurensius Dony Lebda	4	3	4	4	4	19	76
27	Oky Septia Agyaksari	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
28	Pandini Isma Cholifah	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
29	Pipit Wahyu Dian Saputri	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
30	Putri Erna Wati	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
31	Rizki Norcahyani	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
32	Rizky Ananda Hermawati	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
33	Sulistiyono	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
34	Tyas Retnowatin	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
35	Vivi Olga Safitri	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
36	Lispiyani	4	4	3	3	4	18	72
$\sum$	36	121	135	131	133	131	651	2604

After the data had been analyzed, the researcher found the sums of the score in distribution that is used to calculate the mean.

The mean is the arithmetical average that is obtained by adding the sum offset score and dividing the number of the students. The formula is as follow:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2604}{36}$$

$$= 72, 33$$

From analysis above, it was clear that the mean of students' writing result of third cycle was 72, 33. It means that the students writing value was good. And the result of the second cycle was better than the previous one. It could be concluded that any improvement compared with the test in first cycle.

3. Observing

The researcher observed students in learning process in class by using observation instrument. This observation was done in learning process by using flash animation to teach narrative writing at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 13 Semarang. There were notes for student's participation in this research. It could be seen in the table below:

Table 5. Score of Observation in Second Cycle

No	Indicators	None (0%)	A few (<20)	Half (20-49%)	Many (50%-69%)	Majority (>70%)	Total of Score
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Students' attendance					√	5

2	The students are enthusiastic in listening to teachers' explanation of narrative				√		4
3	Students are active in answering the teacher's question			√			3
4	The students ask questions to clarify understanding			√			3
5	The students complete the task correctly				√		4
6	Students are serious in discussion			√			3
7	The students are enthusiastic watching flash animation film				√		4
8	The students are enthusiastic in doing the test				√		4
Total Score		0	0	9	16	5	30

Score $= \dfrac{Total\ score}{\max imum\ score} x100\%$

$= \dfrac{30}{40} x100\%$

$= 75\ \%$

The analysis above showed that the result of the second cycle was better than the previous one. By using flash animation the students found it easier to get idea because the teacher provide audio visual media can

arouse students imagination. The students had a lot of words based on the film, so they only arranged into a good story.

4. Reflecting

From the analysis above, the average of the second cycle test was 72, 33. The score was higher than first cycle test was 67, 22. From this result, the writer concluded that the students' achievement in writing narrative text method had a significant improvement.

From observation that researcher observed, it showed that students were more active in the second cycle. They were able to respond the teacher's explanation. Beside that, students were more active to ask to the teacher if they did not understand about the material.

Teaching narrative writing by using flash animation was able to improve the student's achievement. By analyzing result of the research in the second cycle, this research was stopped by the researcher.

The Analysis of the students' improvement in narrative writing after treatment in third cycle could be seen below:

1. Students wrote narrative text good enough. They wrote narrative text clear enough. Most of them used correct tenses in writing narrative text were some of them were still confused about the tenses. In general, they constructed the sentences properly that made it easy for the observer to understand the writing

2. The paragraphs were better organized and the ideas were well linked. One sentence was related to the next sentence so the researcher could follow the story easily and get the idea of its content easily too.

3. By more motivation and attention from the teacher, the student who got poor sore could improve their writing in order to they got better score.

4. Students did not afraid for asking to the teacher when they felt confused or did not the meaning of some words. So, it helped to them in their writing.

The researcher realized that not all of the students' writing developed drastically, but through treatments she could help students to

develop the quality of their writing. The treatment and the explanation during the teaching-learning process were very useful for them. The playing of flash animation film gave them interesting model of teaching narrative writing. Besides, the language accompanied by the gesture on the film made it easier for them to get the ideas of the film.

D. Discussion

The discussion result that related to study in the result action from the pre cycle, first cycle and second cycle that was: the students' achievement show the improvement from the pre cycle until the last cycle (second cycle).

Table 4.6

Comparison the Mean in pre cycle and in cycles

No	Action	Mean
1	Pre cycle	51, 56
2	First cycle	67, 22
3	Second cycle	72, 33

From the table above,   the students' mean was increasing, that is 51, 56 in pre cycle became 67, 22 and increase became the last became 72, 33. It means that there was improvement in every cycle after using flash animation. It could be concluded that the implementation of using flash animation film as media in the teaching of narrative writing was very effective.

E. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Flash Animation in the Teaching of Narrative Writing

1. The Advantages of Using Flash Animation in the Teaching of Narrative Writing

After conducted the research, there were some advantages of using animated film in the teaching of narrative writing:

a. The flash animation gave students the real data of a chronological action. It helped students to express their ideas not only based on their

imagination but also reality. The use of flash animation was actually meant to help them learned and memorized better because audiovisual is easier to be memorized.

b. Students' boredom in learning narrative could be avoided. The treatment gave students different nuances of teaching and learning process so they were interested in following the lesson. Flash animation that contained motion picture could attract students' attention to interpret it and express their ideas related to the film.

c. Duration of the flash animation is not more than five minutes in order to it is efficient and it is not wastes the time.

2. The Disadvantages of Using Flash Animation in the Teaching of Narrative Writing

The disadvantages were described below:

a. Flash animation spent a lot of time to prepare the equipments like computer, LCD projector, and others.

b. The teacher must capable to operate the flash animation and it just can be played in language laboratory or multimedia class.