Using Noddy Cartoon to Improve the Writing Skill of the First Year Students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar*

Novalia Tanasy

tanasynovalia@gmail.com

STKIP Yapim Maros, Indonesia

Accepted : 30 July 2017

URL : <http://journal.uncp.ac.id/index.php/ethicallingua/article/view/629>

Abstract

This research is conducted to find out: (1) whether or not the use of Noddy cartoon is effective in improving the writing skill of the first year students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar* and (2) the attitude of the first year students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar* toward the use of Noddy cartoon in improving their writing skill. The research employs quasi-experimental method with two groups namely control and experimental groups. Each group consists of 30 students. The sample is chosen by applying cluster random sampling technique. The writer uses a test of writing and questionnaire in experimental group. The data obtained through the test is analyzed by using inferential statistic through SPSS version 22.0 program. The Likert-scale is used to analyze data of the student's response to the questionnaire. In conducting the research, the writer applies Noddy cartoon episodes as the medium in improving the students' writing skill. The result of this research shows that the use of Noddy cartoon is effective in improving the writing skill achievements of the first year students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar*. It is indicated by the significant difference between the result of post-test in the experimental and control groups. The mean score of post-test in the experimental group is 76.77, which is higher than the mean score of post-test in the control group which is only 65.97. Furthermore, the data that are collected from the questionnaire show that the students have positive attitude towards the use of Noddy cartoon in learning writing, which is in scale of 83.20 or categorized as positive.

Keywords: Noddy cartoon, writing skill

Introduction

Learning to write is a continual, differentiated process that is enhanced through social connectedness, deeply embedded in notions of current adolescent culture and enmeshed with technological applications (Dennen & Jones 2006; Williams 2009). This situation has led to that new education and training approaches gain importance in our education system. Writing teachers who acknowledge these realities can honor the literacies students develop outside of school in various media contexts as literacies to be celebrated and expanded upon inside of school (Birch, 2016). Because the aim of the education is to train the students who participate in the lesson actively and can create alternative ways to solve a problem and can think critically.

There are ways a writing teacher can leverage the classroom environment to foster writing characteristics among their students (Green, 2008). Writing teachers may employ an informal pedagogy featuring authentic audience. Members want to know what effect their writing has on real readers. This can be facilitated in the writing classroom if the teacher focuses on giving reader-based feedback, i.e. describing their responses to the writing, in addition to, or instead of criterion-based feedback (Peterson 2010).

It's very important that students discover fun and enjoyable aspect of the course and they participate in the lesson actively and the usage of visual aids that can provide more meaningful learning for them by creating discussion environment (Eker & Karadeniz, 2014). Some of the visual aids are pictures, photographs, cards, movies or cartoon. Cartoon is the tools that draw students' attention and ensure the continuity of this attention, reduce tension and test anxiety and create a more comfortable learning environment (Heitzmann, 1998). While Aşçioğlu (2001) defines "the cartoon" is a humor art which takes its essence from drawing and can be created by facilitating the technical possibilities of the visual arts. Then Uslu (2007) defines cartoon as humorous drawing of certain depictions. Since cartoon is common in our books and schools in recent years, it is very effective on education which does not depend on memorization.

Rasyid (2009) stated that cartoon helps the students to illustrate those scenes in retelling the stories in a writing composition. He also added that cartoon series had inspired the students to generate ideas and also had brought them to organize narrative texts well. Preuss (2010) stated that cartoons in English are extremely popular with adults, teenagers and children alike, therefore learning through cartoon provides a good insight into English culture and living. The comic strip-characters, their roles and situations feel real, therefore making the story accessible also offer many creative ideas can be incorporated.

There are many advantages of using cartoon in classroom, for example; cartoons use every day spoken languages and informal situations. The students discover words that are rarely appear in written form, dictionaries or formal situations but that will be useful in conversation. The illustration accompanying the text facilitates access to dialogue, context and meaning. The students can familiarize themselves with some of the grammatical shortcuts and liberties of spoken English.

Cartoons are funny, visually appealing and its way easier to interpret than the most text books. For students, cartoon can be different between instantly engaging learners in a topic and giving up before they get started. The writer constantly seeking out ways to present cartoon material to the students with a wide range of needs and abilities, and the writer finds that Noddy cartoon is a very effective vehicle for delivering information, especially pure content knowledge as opposed to a skill or strategy, because in Noddy cartoon the students are not only watching and listening the situations but also can improve their knowledge in writing skill if they follow the instructions as well.

The writer chooses Noddy cartoon because it is suitable for beginner and middle respondents, including first year in vocational school. Mostly the students do not really pay attention to common subjects like Math and English because they put their attention more to their specific subjects like Medicine or Accounting. That is why the writer conducts a study on writing entitles "Using Noddy Cartoon to Improve the Students Writing Skill of the First Year Students of SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar".

Methodology

This research is held in *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar* with consideration that this high school is famous and one of favorite vocational school in the city where the students comes from every corner of the city. The population of the first year students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar* is about 100 students from three different classes. Each class consist about 30 students. Cluster random sampling is the technique that is used to select the sample of population. One class as the experimental group and one class as the control group, so the total numbers of this research are about 60 students.

There are two instruments that are used in this research as follows: (1) writing test, the students are tested through pre-test and post-test writing test to measure their achievements in writing, (2) questionnaire, the questions consist of 20 numbers which can explore the student's attitude in learning process.

The procedures are presented in chronological as follows: (1) the pre-test, both of control and experimental groups are presented the Noddy cartoon episode "Ten Coins for Noddy" around 10 minutes. Then the students are asked to write down the story into some paragraphs based on pictures, (2) the post-test,

after treatment (which is only given to the treatment group) both of control and experimental groups are presented the Noddy cartoon episode “Ten Coins for Noddy” once again around 10 minutes. Also they are asked to rewrite the story into some paragraphs, (3) the questionnaire, only the treatment groups are given the questionnaire sheets to measure their attitude towards the using of Noddy cartoon episodes in teaching writing.

Findings

The Students Improvement in Writing Skill

Table 1.1 Treatment with Noddy cartoon episode “Noddy and the Rainbow”

Writing component	Score	Reason of the score
1. Content	14	1. Idea is narrow but confusing
2. Organization	12	2. Clincher sentences simply relate to topic sentence
3. Vocabulary	10	3. Wording sometimes incorrect
4. Language use	13	4. It can be read aloud with ease and the sentences are connected
5. Mechanics	12	5. Several minor in spelling
Total	61	

Table 1.2 Treatment with Noddy cartoon episode “Noddy, Google Berry Moon”

Writing component	Score	Reason of the score
1. Content	14	1. Idea is interesting but still confusing
2. Organization	13	2. Topic is fair
3. Vocabulary	13	3. Wording sometimes incorrect
4. Language use	14	4. Sentence are connected with transition
5. Mechanics	13	5. Several minor in spelling, some grammar are incorrect
Total	68	

Table 1.3 Treatment with Noddy cartoon episode “Noddy, Catch a Falling Star”

Writing component	Score	Reason of the score
1. Content	14	1. Idea is interesting
2. Organization	13	2. Clincher is good
3. Vocabulary	13	3. Wording sometimes incorrect
4. Language use	15	4. Sentences are connected with transition
5. Mechanics	14	5. Few minor in spelling, some grammar are incorrect
Total	70	

Table 1.4 Treatment with Noddy cartoon episode “Noddy and the Bag Pipe”

Writing component	Score	Reason of the score
1. Content	16	1. Idea is interesting, narrow but not clear
2. Organization	17	2. Topic sentence is excellent, every paragraph relates with topic sentence
3. Vocabulary	13	3. Wording mostly correct
4. Language use	15	4. Some sentence begin in different ways, sentences are connected
5. Mechanics	14	5. Few minor in spelling, grammar are correct for most part
Total	78	

Table 1.1 lists the students' improvement in writing skill while being treated by using Noddy episode entitles “Noddy and the Rainbow”. It tells that all of the writing components (content' score is 14, organization' score is 12, vocabulary' score is 10, language use' score is 13 and mechanic' score is 12) are classified as average with total score 61. Table 1.2 tells about the student's progress while being treated by using “Noddy, Google Berry Moon” episode where all of the writing components (content' score is 14, organization' score is 13, vocabulary' score is 13, language use' score is 14 and mechanic' score is 13) are classified as average with total score 68. Table 1.3 tells about the student's progress while being treated by using “Noddy, Catch a Falling Star” episode where all of the writing components (content' score is 14, organization' score is 13, vocabulary' score is 12, language use' score is 15 and mechanic' score is 14) are classified as average with total score 69. Table 1.4 tells about the student's progress while being treated by using “Noddy and the Bag Pipe” episode where all of the writing components (content' score is 16, organization' score is 17, vocabulary' score is 13, language use' score is 15 and mechanic' score is 14) are classified as good with total score 78.

Table 2.1 The statistical summary of students' pretest on writing component assessed in experimental group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Pretest (X1)	57.23	3.839	56	58	48	65	30
Content	12.13	1.137	12	12.32	8	14	30
Organization	11.53	1.137	12	11.59	10	14	30
Vocabulary	11.63	1.402	12	11.84	8	14	30
Language use	11.17	1.053	12	11.19	10	13	30
Mechanic	11.13	1.252	10	10.89	10	14	30

Table 2.2 The statistical summary of students' posttest on writing component assessed in experimental group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Posttest (X2)	76.77	8.332	66	76.50	60	92	30
Content	16.83	1.464	17	17.06	14	20	30
Organization	15.30	1.878	13	15.33	12	18	30
Vocabulary	15.63	2.157	18	15.60	10	18	30
Language use	14.67	2.090	12	14.78	12	18	30
Mechanic	14.47	2.145	12	14.50	10	18	30

Table 2.3 The statistical summary of students' pretest on writing component assessed in control group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Posttest (X1)	58.03	4.14	62	59.00	44	63	30
Content	12.00	1.017	12	12.17	10	13	30
Organization	11.33	1.093	12	11.52	8	13	30
Vocabulary	11.77	1.455	12	12.00	8	15	30
Language use	11.60	0.932	12	11.62	10	13	30
Mechanic	11.30	1.055	11	11.36	8	13	30

Table 2.4 The statistical summary of students' posttest on writing component assessed in control group

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Posttest (X2)	65.97	5.034	65	66.86	51	75	30
Content	13.83	1.085	14	14.00	11	15	30
Organization	13.27	1.363	14	13.39	10	16	30
Vocabulary	13.43	1.547	13	13.50	10	17	30
Language use	12.87	1.358	12	12.83	10	16	30
Mechanic	12.57	0.898	13	12.63	10	14	30

Table 2.1 explains that the pre-test of students in experimental group as follows: mean score is 57.23 which is categorized as poor, standard deviation score is 3.839 which is categorized as very poor, mode score is 56 which is categorized as poor and median score is 58 which is categorized as poor. From these data, we can say that the students pre-test is categorized as poor. Table 2.2 explains that the post-test of students in experimental group as follows: mean score is 76.77 which is categorized as good, standard deviation score is 8.332 which is categorized as good, mode score is 66 which is categorized as average

and median score is 76.50 which is categorized as good. From this data, we can say that the student's post-test is categorized as good.

Table 2.3 explains that the pre-test of students in control group as follows: mean score is 58.03 which is categorized as poor, standard deviation score is 4.14 which is categorized as poor, mode score is 62 which is categorized as average and median score is 59.0 which is categorized as poor. From this data, we can say that the student's pre-test is categorized as poor. Table 2.4 explains that the post-test of the students in control group as follows: mean score is 65.97 which is categorized as average, standard deviation score is 5.034 which is categorized as poor, mode score is 65 which is categorized as average and median score is 66.86 which is categorized as average. From this data, we can say that the student's post-test is categorized as average.

Table 3 The standard deviation of the students' pretest and posttest in experimental and control group

Group	Test	Standard deviation
Experimental	Pretest	3.839
	Posttest	8.332
Control	Pretest	4.414
	Posttest	5.034

Table 3 shows that the standard deviation of the students' pre-test in control group is 4.414 while the standard deviation in post-test is 5.034. This table also shows that the standard deviation of the students' pre-test in experimental group is 3.893 while the standard deviation in post-test is 8.332.

Table 4 The value of t-test of writing achievement in experimental and control group

Variable	Probability value	α
Pre-test of experimental and control group	0.05	0.457
Post-test of experimental and control group	0.05	0.000

Table 4 shows the hypotheses which are tested by using inferential analysis t-test for independent sample test. Result of data analysis in pre-test and post-test of control and experimental groups says that the probability-value is higher than α ($0.457 > 0.05$) which means that there is no significant difference in pre-test. While in post-test of control and experimental group the probability-value is lower than α ($0.000 < 0.05$) and the degree of freedom is 58 which means there is significant difference.

Table 5 The percentage of students' attitude

Classification	Range of score	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly positive	85-100	15	50%
Positive	69-84	15	50%
Uncertain	52-68	0	0%
Negative	36-51	0	0%
Strongly negative	20-35	0	0%
Total		30	100%

Table 5 explains that 15 students (50%) give positive attitude by giving score interval 69-84 and classified as positive. Another 15 students (50%) give even better positive attitude by giving score interval 85-100 and classified as strongly positive. These data are derived from questionnaire which is given to the experimental group only.

Discussion

The Students Ability in Writing

Classification of percentage rate and frequency of the students' score in control group explain that their pre-test results are classified into 'poor' and 'average', meanwhile in post-test most of them are still classified as 'average' and few of they are classified as 'good'. It can be concluded that the students' writing in control group increased, but not significant.

The components of writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic in control group also increases. The mean score of analytical aspects shows the positive difference on 7.94 points which means the five analytical aspects increases which is proved by the P-value (0.000) that lower than α (0.05). This means that in over all, the students in control group have almost the equal ability before or after treatment. It is also proved by mean score and standard deviation. In pre-test, the students mean score is 58.03 and standard deviation is 4.414, while in post-test the students' mean score is 65.97 and standard deviation is 5.034. As stated in Gay (2006: 124), the difference between so close score is essentially the same to the students mean score between pre-test and post-test was relatively the same when the variables have equal intervals. Both pre-test and post-test has relatively the same knowledge in writing ability especially in writing narrative text before and after treatment.

On the other side, in experimental group based on the description of the data collected through test shows that the student ability to write increases significantly. The mean score of pre-test is 57.23 and post-test are 76.77, while the standard deviation in pre-test is 3.839 and in post-test is 8.332. In line with the students' test results in experimental group, most of the students pre-test scores are classified into 'poor' and 'average' then improve into 'good' and 'very good'

classification in post-test scores.

In analyzing the students' achievement in both groups, the writer also compares the students' result in pre-test and post-test of each groups. Firstly, the writer compares the students' result of pre-test in control and experimental group has an equal ability. It is proved by mean score of control (58.03) and experimental group (57.23) that are still around 50.00 points and classified into 'average'. Different from that, mean score in post-test of control group is 65.97 (still average) and experimental group is 76.77 (good). This means that the ability of the students from both groups are different after given treatments in which the students' ability of the experimental group is greater than the students' ability of the control group and proves that cartoon is effective to communicate with the students. It makes the students it easier to memorize the messages related with the goals. It can be mentioned that humor approach is attractive while communicating with the students. Communicating with the cartoon is an easy way that is not complex, there is a side kept in mind (Eker & Karadeniz, 2014).

Statistics test result by using SPSS show that the probability value is lower than α ($0.00 < 0.05$). It means that H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected. Writing ability of the first year students of *SMK Terpadu Mega Rezky Makassar* improves, especially for experimental group after being treated. Because visual messages or aids (in this case is Noddy cartoon), have been configured in their mind easily than reading.

The Students Attitude

The data obtained from the questionnaire on item 1 up to 20 classifies the students attitude into 'positive' and 'strongly positive' with mean score 83.20. The attitude of the students is considered as output because they are expected to have good and positive attitude toward the use of Noddy cartoon in learning writing process. The student's attitude classification data explains that Noddy cartoon helps the student's attitude turn into positive to produce better writing task. Most of the students agree that this material can build their confidence and influences their motivation to produce better writing skill.

Students want entertainment during lesson. Cartoon has the power to achieve it through the language of humor. This language of humor learning leads the student to learn. This enables the students to participate more in class without getting bored and will provide the lessons with a fun dimension. Because a positive classroom environment created in the course by smiling is more beneficial than the lesson taught by being used the method of narration (Uslu, 2007). This is why Noddy cartoon is not only a cartoon which is good for entertainment but also can be used as teaching and learning material. Furthermore, comparing the result of writing achievement and attitude in learning, it shows that the teaching writing process with this material is more applicable, effective and useful to increase the students' achievement better than using the

conventional one. Finally it can be stated that the use Noddy cartoon improves the students' writing ability better than using conventional one.

Conclusion and Suggestion

The writer concludes that the use of Noddy cartoon can improve the students' writing ability and change their attitude into positive. The writing ability of students who use this Noddy cartoon as material and those students who just use conventional way have a significant difference. The researcher result also derives from the five components. The content aspect is the highest increasing than all because content in writing means how well a writer to rewrite the story clearly so the reader can understand the messages conveyed. Mechanic becomes the lowest score the students can get because it is about capitalization, punctuation and spelling which need more practices and applications. The researcher suggests the English teacher to encourage, give opportunities and keep motivate the students to enhance their writing ability and to be more creative in choosing materials for the process of teaching English such Noddy cartoon.

References

- Aşıcioğlu, E. A. (2001). *Yazısız karikatürlerin grafik sanatındaki yeri, yazısız karikatür uygulamaları (Places are not Written in Cartoon Graphic Art, Cartoons without Apps)*. Ankara. Hacettepe Üniversitesi. Online: http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_14_December_2014/25.pdf. Downloaded on December 18th, 2016.
- Birch, Heather J. S. (2016). *Feedback in Online Writing Forums: Effects on Adolescent Writers*. Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, Article 5. WMU. Print.
- Dennen, Vanessa Paz, and Gabriel Jones. (2006). *How's My Writing? Using Online Peer Feedback to Improve Performance in the Composition Classroom*. Self, Peer, and Group Assessment in E-Learning. IGI Global. Online: <https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/writing-using-online-peer-feedback/28805>. Downloaded on December 20th, 2016.
- Eker, C, Oğuzhan Karadeniz. (2014). *The Effects of Educational Practice with Cartoons on Learning Outcomes*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 4: no. 14. Online: http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_14_December_2014/25.pdf. Downloaded on December 20th, 2016.
- Gay, L. R. (2006). *Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Eight Edition. Colombus. Ohio: Pearson Merrill Publishing. Print.
- Green, Lucy. (2008). *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*. Aldershot. UK: Ashgate. Print.
- Heitzmann, W. R. (1998). *The Power of political Cartoons in the Classroom*. International Studies Perspectives. Online: <https://www.world-affairs.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/1998-The-Power-of-Political-Cartoons.pdf>. Downloaded on December 21st, 2016.

- Peterson S, Shelley. (2010). *Improving Student Writing: Using Feedback as a Teaching Tool*. Toronto. ON: Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. Print.
- Preuss, Simone. (2010). Building English Vocabulary: Using Cartoon-Strip Textbooks to Learn Spoken English. Online: http://learning-english.suite101.com/article.cfm/building_english_vocabulary#ixzz0qJYfXI2F. Downloaded on December 17th, 2016.
- Rasyid, Mochammad Abdul. (2009). *Utilizing Cartoon Series to Improve the Writing Narrative Text Ability of the Grade Nine Students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Negeri Nganjuk*. Online: <http://asian-efljournal.com/september05pn.php>. Downloaded on December 23rd, 2016.
- Uslu, H. (2007). *Eğitimde Karikatür (Cartoon in Education)*. Journal Education in Science and intelligence. Vol. 7: no. 84. Online: <http://baae.meb.gov.tr/index.php/joomlaorg/viewcategory>. Downloaded on December 23rd, 2016.
- Williams, Bronwyn T. (2009). *Shimmering Literacies: Popular Culture & Reading & Writing*. New York, NY: Peter Lang. Print.