Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ANIMATION MOVIE THROUGH RETELLING TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY

Irmayani
Institut Agama Islam Muhammadiyah Sinjai
Jln. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 20 Kelurahan Balangnipa Kec. Sinjai Utara, Kabupaten Sinjai
E-mail: irma_ryu@yahoo.co.id Tlp:+6281355718275

Abstract

This research aimed to find out the effectiveness of the use of animation movie through retelling technique to improve the students' speaking ability of the eleventh years' students of SMK Teknologi Somba Opu, Gowa. This research is a quasi experimental research and it employed a cluster random sampling technique. The researcher randomly selected two classes from four classes of the eleventh years based on their similarity in their speaking ability. Group A was as experimental group and group B became control group. The data were collected by using test. The result of data analysis indicated that the learning outcomes on speaking of the eleventh years' students of SMK Teknologi Somba Opu taught by using animation movie through retelling technique was significantly increased after the treatment. The use of animation movie through retelling technique was effective in improving speaking ability with achievement of the students was better than conventional activity as indicated by the t-test value 13.804 and the p-value (2-tailed) .000 which was not greater than .05 level of significance.
Keywords: *Speaking, Retelling, Animation movie*

Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan keefektifitas pengunaan Film animasi dengan teknik retelling dalam meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris pada siswa semester sebelas di SMK Teknologi Somba Opu, Gowa. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimental murni dan menggunakan teknik cluster random sampling. Peneliti secara acak memilih 2 kelas dari empat kelas tahun kedua kesamaan derajat kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris. Kelompok A sebagai kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok B menjadi kelompok kontrol. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan tes. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa hasil belajar siswa pada berbicara bahasa Inggris kelas sebelas SMK Teknologi Somba Opu yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan Film animasi dengan teknik retelling meningkat secara signifikan setelah dilaksanakan perlakuan. Film animasi dengan teknik retelling efektif dalam meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa dengan hasil yang lebih baik dari pada kegiatan konvensional yang diindikasikan dengan nilai t-test 13.804 dan nilai p-value (2-tail) .000 yang tidak lebih besar dari .05 tingkat signifikansi
Kata Kunci: *Berbicara, bercerita ulang, film Animasi*

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

1. Background of The Research

Speaking is one of the difficult skills when learning a foreign or a second language. Learning to speak is obviously more difficult than learning to understand the spoken language (Chastain in Mariah, 2006). The teacher gives the students sample opportunities to practice the speaking skill (River, 1986: 160). Rivers (1968:160) in Aryani (2002:2) stated that the teacher will need to give the students opportunities to practice their speaking. Many English teachers or English facilitators make an effort to make their class interesting with various methods, techniques with materials and instrument to learn language skill effectively and creatively. In other words, the teacher's responsibility is to create situations that provide opportunities and stimulate students to communicate actively with the little English that they may have at disposal, thus giving them confidence in their ability in speaking through creative thinking approach because in teaching oral English, the students should be served with conducive learning activity so they can practice their English well. In referring SMK Teknologi Somba Opu, by the researcher's observation and interview with teacher where it is found that the students' speaking ability is poor. Based on certain school's report, there is 20-30% student at second level can be categorized as good. It is caused by there is lack of speaking practice. Moreover, the researcher point out that learning to speak is obviously more difficult but it can be achieved by doing much practice in real situation. Meanwhile, the lack of attractive method or material can be included as another factor.

Retelling commonly is famous method in learning speaking. Retelling is one of the free oral production activities, it gives challenge to the students to build up the story from what they hear or read. Kalmback in Stoicovy (2004) states that retelling is a process of re-memorizing what we listened to and read. Further, Stoicovy states that in relation to language teaching, retelling technique can be used as a way to promote the students' comprehension and understanding of discourse. This activity produces valuable practice in speaking English. Retelling story is useful in express our own words of statements in many ways. By retelling story, students can define for them what a statement in speaking is about, and what their real interests and concerns are. Brown & Cambourne (1987) mention that during the retelling process students apply and develop their language knowledge through the internalization of the texts' features. In this research, the researcher also found the students were helped about the ideas or concepts they want to communicate (retelling and dialogue during treatment). Due to media in language learning, it is also can be categorized as one of the most essential factor that contributes in successful of English learning. Keller (in Burden & Byrd, 1999) states media used for instructional purposes often have students actively involved in some way. Furthermore, many students may feel less anxious about the lesson when a television or less threatening media are used in instruction. In teaching and learning process, there are two very important ingredients, namely; teaching method and instructional media. It is proved Lan Hsieh (2010) in his research "The effect of movie viewing on learning language English as foreign language" found out that films can become an integral part of the curriculum. Whether they are an integral part of the school curriculum or supplementary teaching materials, films with their special features such as subtitles and chapter separation would help to develop an effective learning environment.

Animation movie can be categorized as one of film form/genre. Animation itself refers to the process in which each frame of a film or movie is produced individually, whether generated as a computer graphic, or by photographing a drawn image, or by repeatedly making small changes to a model (see Claymation and stop motion), and then photographing the result. Animation movie however culturally is inherent to youth life or word where the most of them like such movie genre. Therefore, this assumption can be a credit point that indicates this material will attract student's motivation through their enthusiast in speaking learning.

This study proposed a research question, is the use of animation movie through retelling technique effective to improve the students' speaking ability at SMK Teknologi Somba Opu?

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

2. Method

2.1. Type of the Research

This study was a quantitative study using quasi experimental research. The researcher divided the research object into two groups, experimental group who was given treatment, and the control group without treatment. This division was intended to test the hypothesis to know the condition after treatment. A pre-test was administered prior to the treatment to assess their current competence of language skills and a post-test is administered later to measure the effect of the treatment.

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of this research was the eleventh year students of SMK Teknologi Somba Opu. The sample of this research was selected through cluster random sampling, in which intact groups, not individuals, are randomly selected (Gay, 2006: 106). It meant that from four classes of population, the researcher chose two classes randomly to represents the experimental and control group. Cluster random sampling was more convenient when the population was quite large and it would have a much better chance of securing permission to work with all students in several classrooms than to work with a few students in many classrooms. Class A was taken as experimental group and class B was taken as control group. As a consideration, the students of both classes have the same ability. Besides the students also had the same background knowledge in learning English.

2.3. Instrument of the Research

The instrument of the research was speaking test. The test was given as pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was intended to know the prior knowledge of the students' speaking ability before giving treatment and post-test was given to know the students' ability after treatment. The speaking aspects tested in this research area; fluency, accuracy and comprehensibility. The test underwent in interview technique where the students will be given a topic, namely "the role of technology", and then the students were interviewed related to their opinion about certain topic. The questions that were proposed are 5 items.

2.4. Procedure of Data Analysis

The data about the speaking test was analysed by using the following procedures:

a. Scoring the students' speaking ability of pre-test and post-test by using the scoring criteria level introduce by (Heaton, 1991:100)

Table 2.1. Table scoring criteria level of speaking (Accuracy)

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Pronunciation is only very slightly tongue. Two or three minor grammatical mistakes.
Very Good	5	Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors
Good	4	Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but only cause confusion.
Average	3	Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue. Only a few serious phonological
Poor	2	Pronunciation is seriously influenced by the mother tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication. Many basic grammatical and lexical errors.
Very poor	1	Serious pronunciation errors as well as many basic grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practiced in the course.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Table 2.2 Table scoring criteria level of speaking (Fluency)

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Speak without to great an effort with fairly wide range of expression. Searches for words occasionally but only one or two unnatural pauses.
Very Good	5	Has to make an effort at times to search for words nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses.
Good	4	Although he has to make an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth delivery mostly. Occasionally fragmentary but succeeds in conveying the general meaning fair range of expression.
Average	3	Has to make an effort for much time often has to search for the desire meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halving delivery almost gives up making the effort at time limited range of expression.
Poor	2	Long pauses while research for the desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary and having delivery. Almost give up most the effort at the time. Limited range of expression
Very Poor	1	Full or long unnatural pauses very halting and fragmentary delivery at times gives up making effort.

Table 2.3 Table scoring criteria level of speaking (Comprehensibility)

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Easy for the listener understand the speakers attention and general meaning. Very few interruptions or clarification required
Very Good	5	The speakers' understand and general meaning is fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for the sake of clarification are necessary
Good	4	Most of what the speakers are easy to follow. His intention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey message or to seek clarification.
Average	3	The listener can understand much of what is but he must constantly seek clarification. Cannot understand many of the speakers more complex or longer sentences.
Poor	2	Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone who is to listening to the speakers
Very poor	1	Hardly anything of what is said can be understood. Even when the listener makes a great effort or interrupts, the speaker is unable to clarify anything he seems to have said.

b. Calculating the mean score, finding out the standard deviation of the pre-test and posttest, computing the frequency and the rate percentages of the students' score and testing the hypothesis of the significant difference between the means of two group on some independent variable by calculating the values of the independent t-test uses SPSS 17.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

3. Result and discussion

3.1. Result

After the treatment, the same test was carried out in order to measure whether or not the students get progress in speaking ability achievement toward the use animation through retelling technique that being compared with the use of non animation through retelling technique. To analyse the result obtained from the test, the researcher applied the t-test analysis in SPSS 17 Version.

a. The Results of Speaking Test in Experimental Class

As stated previously that after scoring the students' result, then they were classified into 5 (five) levels of classification by referring to the scoring system of Depdiknas (2008) namely very good, good, fair, poor, very poor. The following table is the statistic summary of the students' pre test and post test on speaking component assessed in Experimental group.

Table 3.1. The Rate Percentage of the Students' Speaking Tests in Experimental Group

No.	Classification	Score Range	Pre-test		Post test	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Very Good	91-100	0	0	0	0
2.	Good	76-90	0	0	30	75
3.	Fair	61-75	20	50	10	25
4.	Poor	51-60	12	30	0	0
5.	Very Poor	<50	8	20	0	0
Total			40	100	40	100

The statistical summary depicted in Table 3.1 above, pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of speaking achievement of both pre-test and post-test. The rest of the scores remained at every level of classification, namely: in pre-test, there was 8 (20%) out of them scored into very poor classification,12 (30%) out of them scored into poor classification, most of students 20 (50%) and none of them got into good and very good classification. On the other hand, in the post test, there are 30 (75%) scored good classification and 10 (25%) out of them scored into fair classification and nobody got scored into very good, poor and very poor classification.

Table 3.2. The Findings of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test on Speaking Ability Tests in Experimental Group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. Score	N
Pre-test (X_1)	58.35	5.637	61	58.50	50	67	40
Post-test (X_2)	79.15	5.623	78	78	72	89	40

Table 3.2 above shows that the mean score in pre-test is 58.35 is categorized as poor classification and in post-test is 79.15 is categorized as good classification which the scores achieved by the students tend to get increased from pre-test to post-test. As the result, the mean scores are classified around good score. It is indicated that the mean scores of students' speaking ability achievement in post-test is higher that the pre-test. It increases 20.8 points.

b. The Results of Speaking Test in Control Group

Beside in experimental group. There was a control group which revealed the students' result, then they also were classified into 5 (five) levels of classification by referring to the scoring system of Depdiknas (2008) namely very good, good, fair, poor, very poor. The following table is the statically summary of the students' pre-test and post-test on each speaking component assessed in control group.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Table 3.3. The Rate Percentage of the Students' Speaking Tests in Control Group

No.	Classification	Score Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Very Good	91-100	0	0	0	0
2.	Good	76-90	0	0	0	0
3.	Fair	61-75	18	45	22	55
4.	Poor	51-60	6	15	9	22.5
5.	Very Poor	<50	16	40	9	22.5
Total			40	100	40	100

Table 3.3 above, pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of speaking achievement of both pre-test and post-test. The rest of the scores remained at every level of classification, namely: in pre-test, there is 16 (40%) out of them scored into very poor classification, 6 (15%) out of them scored into poor classification, and 18 (45%) scored into fair classification, and none of them got into very good and good classification. On the other hand, in the post-test, there are 9 (22.5%) out of them scored into very poor classification and 9 (22.5%) scored into poor classification and 22 (55%) score into fair classification. Thus, no one student got scored into very good and good classification.

Table 3.4. The Findings of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test on Speaking Tests in Control Group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. Score	N
Pre-test (X_1)	56.78	7.202	50	56.63	39	67	40
Post-test (X_2)	59.80	6.855	67	60.33	50	67	40

Table 3.4 above, shows that the mean score in pre-test is 56.78 and in post-test is 59.80 which The scores achieved by the students tend to get increased from pre-test to post-test. As the result, the mean scores are classified around good score. It is indicated that the mean scores of students' speaking achievement in post-test was higher that the pre-test. It increased 3.07 points.

c. Scoring Criteria Level of Speaking in Pre-test or Post-test in Experimental/Control Group

The following explanation are the statistical summary of the students' pre-test and post-test on each level of speaking assessed in experimental and control class.

1) Experimental Group

As stated in chapter 3, Heaton (1991:100) proposed that there are three levels of speaking can be criteria in judging students' speaking ability namely; accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility.

Table 3.5. The students' Pre-test and Post-test on level Speaking Tests in Experimental Group

Pre-test (O_1)					
	Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimal Score**	**Maximal Score**	**N**
Accuracy	57.23	1.346	50	67	40
Fluency	61.03	1.424	50	83	40
Comprehensibility	56.78	1.454	50	83	40
Post-test (O_2)					
	Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimal Score**	**Maximal Score**	**N**
Accuracy	81.10	1.458	67	100	40
Fluency	79.00	1.109	67	83	40
Comprehensibility	77.05	1.501	67	100	40

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Table 3.5 above shows that the total number of subjects is 40 (forty) students. The scores achieved by the students tend to get increased from pre-test to post-test. The mean score of accuracy level in pre-test is 57.23 and post-test is 81.10 where the interval is 23.87. The mean score of fluency level is 61.03 and post-test 79.00 where the interval is 17.97 and the mean score of comprehensibility in pre-test is 56.78 and post-test is 77.05 where the interval is 20.27 point. The significant improvement of students' speaking level is accuracy where it is proved by the interval result of post test which is 23.87 point. Therefore, the mean scores of each skill in pre-test vary around poor score, while in post-test the mean scores are classified around good score.

2) Control Group

Meanwhile, the following statistic is the students' level speaking score in control class both post test and pre test.

Table 3.6. The Students' Pre-test and Post-test on level Speaking Tests in Control Group

Pre-test (O_1)					
	Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimal Score**	**Maximal Score**	**N**
Accuracy	53.40	1.247	33	67	40
Fluency	59.35	1.354	50	67	40
Comprehensibility	57.65	1.485	33	67	40
Post-test (O_2)					
	Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimal Score**	**Maximal Score**	**N**
Accuracy	56.80	1.334	50	67	40
Fluency	61.90	1.247	50	67	40
Comprehensibility	60.63	1.318	50	67	40

Table 4.6 above shows that the total number of subjects is 40 (forty) students. The scores achieved by the students tend to get increased from pre-test to post-test, but the improvement is not significant than the experiment class improvement. It can be seen the interval between post-test and pre-test in each level, such as; the mean score of accuracy level in pre-test is 53.40 and post-test is 56.80 where the interval is 3.4 points. The mean score of fluency level is 59.35 and post-test 61.90 where the interval is 2.55 and the mean score of comprehensibility in pre-test is 57.65 and post-test is 60.63 where the interval is 2.98 point. Meanwhile, both of mean score in protest and post-test is classified into poor score.

d. Scoring Classification of the Students' Pre-test of Experimental/Control Group and Posttest of Experimental/Control Group of the Total Score of Speaking Tests

Having calculated the raw scores of the students' pre-test and post-test taken from each component observed, the table of pre-test and post-test of the students' scores in all components observed are presented as follows:

1) The Students' Pre-test of Control/Experimental Group of the Total Scores of Speaking Tests

The students pre-test scoring result of control and experimental group were classified into 5 (five) levels of classification by referring to the scoring system of Depdiknas namely very good, good, fair, poor, very poor. The following table is the statically summary of the students' pre-test on Speaking component assessed in experimental and control group.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Table 3.7. The Rate Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Pre-test of Experimental/Control Group of the Total Score of Speaking Tests.

No.	Classification	Score Range	Experimental Group		Control Group	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Very Good	91-100	0	0	0	0
2.	Good	76-90	0	0	0	0
3.	Fair	61-75	20	50	18	45
4.	Poor	51-60	12	30	6	15
5.	Very Poor	<50	8	20	16	40
Total			40	100	40	100

Table 3.7 above, pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of both pre-test of control and experimental group on speaking ability achievement in all analytical components observed. From this table, it can be seen that most of the students in pre-test of control group, 18 (45 %) out of 40 students ware categorized as fair classification, 6 (15%) out of 40 students are categorized as poor classification, and 16 (40%) students is categorized as very poor classification, and none of them are categorized as very good nor good classifications. Furthermore, in pre-test of experimental group, most of the students, 20 (50%) out of them are categorized as fair classification. The rest of the scores, 8 (20%) out of them are classified as very poor, and 12 (30%) out of 40 students are categorized as poor classification, and none of them are categorized as very good and good.

2) The Students' Post-test of Experimental/Control Group of the Total Scores of speaking tests

The students' post-test scoring of experimental and control group were also classified into 5 (five) levels of classification by referring to the scoring system of Depdiknas (2008) namely very good, good, fair, poor, very poor. The following table is the statics summary of the students' post-test on vocabulary component assessed in experimental and control group.

Table 3.8. The Rate frequency and Percentage of the Students' Post-test of Experimental / Control Group of the Total Score of speaking Tests.

No.	Classification	Score Range	Experimental Group		Control Group	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Very Good	91-100	0	0	0	0
2.	Good	76-90	30	75	0	0
3.	Fair	61-75	10	25	22	55
4.	Poor	51-60	0	0	9	22.5
5.	Very Poor	<50	0	0	9	22.5
Total			40	100	40	100

Table 3.8 above pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of both post-test control and experimental group on vocabulary achievement in all analytical components observed. From this table, it can be seen that most of the students in post-test of control group 22 (55%) out of 40 students are categorized as fair classification, 9 (22.5 %) out of 40 students are categorized as poor classification and also 9 (22.5%) students were classified into very poor classification. On the other hand, in post-test of experimental group, most of the students, 40 out of them or equivalent to 75% percent are categorized as good classification, and the rest or 10 (25%) out of 40 students are categorized as fair classification and none of them are categorized as poor or very poor classifications.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

3) The Comparison between the Students' Score of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental and Control Group

The following table shows the result of the students' score of pre-test and post-test in control and experimental group. The table shows the difference score on mean score and standard deviation of both classes.

Table 3.9 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pre-test

Group	Man Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	58.35	5.637
Control	56.78	7.202

Table 3.9 show that the mean scores of experimental group is different from control group before treatment. The mean score in pre-test of control group is 56.78 which are categorized as average classification and experimental group was 58.35 which were also categorized as poor classification. It indicated that the mean score of the students' speaking ability achievement in pre-test of experimental group is not quietly different than that of the pre-test in control group. Gay (2006:124) states that the difference between close score is essentially the same to the students mean score between experimental and control group was relatively the same when the variables have equal intervals. It is little higher in range of 1.57 points.

After the treatment, the students in both classes were given post-test to find out student's speaking ability using animation movie through retelling technique at the same level or not. By using t-test analysed with SPSS 17 Version, the results of post-test are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 3.10 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Post-test

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	79.15	3.463
Control	59.80	4.843

Table 3.10 show that the mean scores of experimental group is different from control group after the treatment. The mean score in post-test of control group was 59.80 which categorized fair at table 4.3 and 79.15 for experimental group which was categorized as good classifications at table 4.1. It indicated that the mean score of the students' speaking ability achievement in post-test of experimental group is strictly higher than that of the post-test of control group in scale of 19.35 points. To make sure that the pre-test score of both groups are not significantly different. The researcher applied t-test analysis in SPSS 17 Version

The hypotheses were tested by using inferential analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for independent sample test, that is, a test to know the significant difference between the result of students' mean scores in pre-test and post-test in control group and experimental group. Assuming that the level of significance (α) = .05, the only thing which is needed; the degree of freedom (df) = 78, then the result of the t- test is presented in the following table.

Table 3.11. The T-test Value of the Students' Pre-test on Experimental/Control Group

Variables	t-test value	Mean difference	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Pre-test	1.089	1.575	78	.279

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in Table 3.11 above on pre test of experimental/control group, the researcher found that the t-value (-1.089), the degree of freedom 78 and p-value (0.279) was greater than .05 of the level significance. It implied that there is no a significant difference between the learning outcomes of the students' speaking ability of the two groups in the beginning of the research.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Since the base level of the students' learning outcomes was at the same level, the treatment was then administered to both groups. The first group (experimental group) was taught speaking by using animation movie through retelling technique and the second group (control group) was taught the same topics of speaking by using conventional activity. The students in both groups were given post test after treatment. The writer did it to find out the final result of the students, whether their learning outcomes were the same level or not.

Table 3.12. The T-test Value of the Students' Post-test on Experimental/Control Group

Variables	t-test value	Mean difference	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Post-test	13.804	19.350	78	.000

After calculating the students' score of the post-test as the final result into the t-test formula for independent sample, the writer found that the t-test (-13.804), p-value (.000) is not greater than .05 of the level of significance. It implies that there is a significant difference between the learning outcomes of the students' speaking ability of the two groups after treatment of the research.

Table 4.8 above shows that the use of animation movie through retelling technique more effective to improve the students' speaking ability achievement than those of taught by using conventional activity. This means that the data of posttest as the final result gave significant improvement. It is concluded that the use of animation movie through retelling technique is able to give greater contribution in teaching and learning speaking.

After comparing the students' score of pre-test and post-test in both groups, the following table shows the improvement of the students' pre-test and post-test in each group before and after giving treatment, the result of t-test is calculated using inferential statistic through SPSS 17. The following also meant testing hypotheses.

Table 3.13 The T-test of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental and Control Group

Variable	A	P-Value	Remarks
Pre-test and Post-test of Control Group	.05	.001	Significantly different
Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Group	.05	.000	Significantly different

Based on statistics test shown above, it is concluded that the probability value is smaller than the level of significance .05 (.000 < .05). It means that H_1 is accepted and H_0 was rejected. It is concluded that there is a significant difference before treatment in pre-test and after treatment in post-test both for control and experimental group. In other words, there is an improvement on the students' speaking skills between pre-test and post-test in control and experimental group after the treatment. Then, it is concluded that both using animation movie through retelling technique and non using animation movie through retelling technique are able to give significantly greater contribution to the students' integrated skills performance.

3.2. Discussion

As it is stated above that before giving treatment to both groups, experimental group and control group, the researcher applied pre-test and post-test to know the students' speaking ability. By comparing the mean score, standard deviation and percentage of pre-test for experimental group and control group it was found a little difference. The data indicated that the result of the experimental group was greater than of the control group. But the difference could not be interpreted that the experimental group was better than that of the control group. They were still in the same classification, fair classification. It was also proved by the t-test value. The t-test value was 1.089 and p-value (2-tailed) was 0.279 higher than .05 of level significance. It means that there was not a significant difference between the experimental group and control group.

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

The classification of the students' score on speaking before they are given the treatment range from poor to good classification and the mean score of the pre-test is 56.78 for control group and 58.35 for experimental group while the students' score after the treatment given range from fair to very good classification and the mean score of the post-test is 59.80 for control group and 79.15 for experimental group. It indicates that the students' learning outcomes on speaking by using animation movie through retelling technique relatively high. This finding is proved by the result of the test which indicates that most of them got good score.

The implication of teaching using animation movie through retelling technique was the improvement of students' speaking ability where it was indicated by the significant difference the percentage of students' speaking skill in experimental and control group as shown in the following description and table. Specifically, the implementation of animation movie through retelling technique implies the students level speaking ability (see in table 4.5 and 4.6) namely accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility level.

4. Conclusion

Based on the result and discussion above, it can be concluded that the use of animation movie through retelling technique significantly improves the speaking skill of the eleventh semester students of SMK Teknologi Somba Opu. It was proved by the analysis of test that shows the mean score of post-test is greater than pre-test ($X_{posttest}$ = 79.15> $X_{pretest}$ = 58.35). It can be also seen through the result of table paired sample (.000 < .05). This output indicates that there is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test of experimental group.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Lorin W. 1989. *Research in Classrooms.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Aryani. 2002. *Activating the Fifth Grade Pupil of SD Inpres Mallengkeri I Makassar to Speak English through Various Activities*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: FBS UNM.

Brown, H, Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco State University: Longman.

Burden, Paul R. & Byrd, David M. 1999. *Effective Teaching*. Second Edition. America: Kansas State University.

Burns Anne, Joyce Helen. 1999. *Focus on Speaking.* Sydney: Macquarie University

Bryne, Donn. 1986. *Teaching Oral English*. London: Longman.

Cunningsworth, Alan. 1987. *Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Clark, Herbet H and Clark, eve V. 1977. *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovan Idch Inc.

Gay, L.R., E. Mills, Peter Airasian. 2006. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman Group UK Company

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Hornby, A.S.1995. *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary.* 5th ed. NY: Oxford University Press.

Kirkpatrick, Betty. 1993. *Giant Paperback Dictionary*. London: The Bath Press.

Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*; USA: University of Nevada.

Lan Hsieh, Hsio & Friends, 2010. The Effect of Movie Viewing on Learning Language English as Foreign Language. Journal. Department of Applied Linguistic. Yuanpei University.

Lee, Kuang-Wu. 2000. English Teachers' Barriers to the Use of Computer-Assisted Language Learning. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 12, http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lee-CALL barriers. Html. Access Date: 07 December 2008.

Mariah, 2006, *Improving speaking ability of senior high school student through retelling story*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: FBS UNM.

Mitchell. R & Myles. F. 1996. *Second Language Learning Theories*. London: Hodder Headline Group.

Noni Nurdin. 2004. *A Hybrid of face-to-face Teaching and Computer Assisted Language Learning to Improve Students' English Achievement Based an Individual Learning Preferences.* Unpublished Dissertation. Makassar: PPs UNM.

Otto, Wayen. 1979. *How to Teach Reading*. London: Addison Wesky Publilshing Company Inc.

Rasyid & Nur. 1997. *Teaching English as a Language in Indonesia. Theory, Practice, and Research*. Ujung Pandang: FPBS IKIP.

Rachmawati, Noer & Hermagustiana. 2010. Does Retelling technique improve speaking fluency?. *Teflin Journal.* Volume 21, No. 1.

Richard. 1980. *Teaching Children to Read, Addison Skill of EFL*. Jakarta: Depdikbud P2 LPTK.

Ryan, Stephen. 1998. Using Films to Develop Learner Motivation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IV, No. 11, November 1998 http://iteslj.org/Articles/Ryan-Films. html/ Access Date: 12 January 2009.

Savile-Troike, Muriel. 1976. *Foundation for Teaching English as a Second Language.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Stoicovy, C.E 2004. Using Retelling to Scaffold English Language for Pa-cific Island Students. *The Reading Matrix,* Vol.4, No.1, April 2004. Retrieved 16 April 2008 from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/stoicovy/index.html

Journal of Literate
English Education Study Program
Volume 1 No 02 2020
ISSN (print) : 2745-8563
ISSN (online) : 2745-9357
Homepage : http://journal.iaimsinjai.ac.id

Wediyantoro, Prilla lukis. 2009, *Using 3-D Animation Movies as Media to Improve the Speaking Ability of the Students at YASPA English Training (YET) Course, Trenggalek.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: University of Malang.

Yaping, Jin. 1990. *How to Teach Speaking Class*. Departement of Zhejiang Normal University.