## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND ANALISIS

## A. Profile of SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal

SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal is an junior high school located in Jl. Raya Barat Margasari. This school contains of 12 classes, 4 classes for each grade. SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal has 273 students and 22 teachers. The vision of the school is 'Devoted, achievement, innovative, grounded in the Qur'an and Sunnah."

SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal uses KTSP curriculum in teaching learning process. As a modern school, SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal enthusiastically encourages the students in English learning. Many activities are conducted to support English learning, not only intra curricular activities but also English extracurricular activity.

Not only profile of SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal, but researcher also got another data such as students' name list of 8D class as a subject of the research. Researcher also knew that standard minimum score on English subject was 72. There were 30 students participated in the research. Each student was labeled by a code as below:

Table 4.1
Students' Name List

| NO | STUDENTS' NAME | CODE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Abdul Khanif | $\mathrm{A}-1$ |
| 2. | Anggun Pitaloka | $\mathrm{A}-2$ |
| 3. | Bintan Freshlintang | $\mathrm{A}-3$ |
| 4. | Deri Rediyansah | $\mathrm{A}-4$ |
| 5. | Diah Nurahmawati | $\mathrm{A}-5$ |
| 6. | Firda Ramadanti | $\mathrm{A}-6$ |
| 7. | Hilma Najmah | $\mathrm{A}-7$ |
| 8. | Ika Nanda Maulida | $\mathrm{A}-9$ |
| 9. | Kristina Zaliyanti | $\mathrm{A}-10$ |
| 10. | Laeli Maulida | $\mathrm{A}-11$ |
| 11. | Livia | $\mathrm{A}-12$ |
| 12. | Maharani Affanka Putri | $\mathrm{A}-13$ |
| 13. | Mauludin Dimas Af | $\mathrm{A}-14$ |
| 14. | Mohammad Roki Almutazam | $\mathrm{A}-15$ |
| 15. | Muh Akhdan Zidan | $\mathrm{A}-16$ |
| 16. | Muh. Alan Widi Antoro | $\mathrm{A}-17$ |
| 17. | Muriyah | $\mathrm{A}-18$ |
| 18. | Nabila Anindhita H | $\mathrm{A}-19$ |
| 19. | Nadzir Karim Amarullah | $\mathrm{A}-20$ |
| 20. | Novihta | $\mathrm{A}-21$ |
| 21. | Puti Zuhrotun Nisa | $\mathrm{A}-22$ |
| 22. | Raul Gonzales | $\mathrm{A}-23$ |
| 23. | Sabina Ageng Bastian | $\mathrm{A}-24$ |
| 24. | Seneng | $\mathrm{A}-25$ |
| 25. | Shelinatul Shelina | $\mathrm{A}-26$ |
| 26. | Tolhah Asysyafik | $\mathrm{A}-27$ |
| 27. | Uket Nira Renggita | $\mathrm{A}-28$ |
| 28. | Uswatun Khasanah | $\mathrm{A}-29$ |
| 29. | Yusuf Bakhtiar | $\mathrm{A}-30$ |
| 30. | Naufal Al Farizy |  |
|  |  |  |

## B. Data Analysis

In this chapter, the researcher would like to describe and discuss the implementation of contextual teaching and learning technique to improve students' writing skill in recount text. It was conducted through a classroom action research which consisted of several activities which includes preliminary research, first cycle, and second cycle. Its purposes were to know students' ability in writing recount text by using contextual teaching and learning technique especially students of 8D SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal in the academic year of 2015/2016. In these findings, the researcher presents the result of research and the analysis of the data collected started from a preliminary research up to second cycle that had been done before, which includes the five elements of writing skills, consist of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanic. Before conducting the cycles, the researcher gave preliminary test (the researcher got base score students' writing skill) and compared with each cycle after being taught by using contextual teaching and learning. The descriptions of each cycle are as follow:

1. Pre-cycle

This activity was done on Wednesday, November $25^{\text {th }}$, 2015. In this step Mr. Khafid Usman as the English teacher used conventional way in teaching writing recount text. This is done to know students base score of recount writing skill. In this activity, the teacher taught the students as usual and used handbook in
teaching learning process but there were no technique during teaching learning process.

In this meeting, the teacher was doing teaching learning process. But, many students did not pay attention to the teacher. They tended make noisy in classroom, such as talking with other friend, reading another book which is not English book, and sleepy. There were only some students that pay attention to the teacher. The data can be seen below:

Table 4.2
Score of observation in pre cycle

|  | Indicators | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A few (< } \\ & 25 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Half (25- } \\ & 50 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Good } \\ & (50-75 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Majority } \\ & (>75 \%) \end{aligned}$ | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |
| 1 | Students listen to the teacher's Explanation |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 2 |
| 2 | Students show curiosity by asking Questions | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | 1 |
| 3 | Students respond and answer teacher's Questions | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 | Students understand about the material |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 2 |
| 5 | Students are discipline in doing the task |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 2 |
|  | Total Score | 2 | 6 |  |  | 8 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mxc} & =\frac{\sum x c}{S_{\max }} \times 100 \% \\
& =\frac{8}{20} \times 100 \% \\
& =40 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

From the result above, it showed that students' enthusiastic still low, it was only $40 \%$. It needed a treatment to encourage students' motivation and interest.

After that, the researcher gave preliminary test to get base score and to see how far the ability of students in writing recount text taught used conventional method by teacher. There were 30 students and the result score of preliminary research can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.3
Students' Score of Pre-Cycle

| No | Students ' Code | Item Analysis |  |  |  |  | $\Sigma$ | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | C | O | V | G | M |  |  |
| 1. | A-1 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 66 | Less |
| 2. | A-2 | 26 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 3 | 80 | Good |
| 3. | A-3 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 2 | 71 | Less |
| 4. | A-4 | sick | Sick | sick | sick | sick |  |  |
| 5. | A-5 | 21 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 56 | Less |
| 6. | A-6 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 7. | A-7 | 27 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 4 | 93 | Excellent |
| 8. | A-8 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| 9. | A-9 | 25 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 3 | 80 | Good |
| 10. | A-10 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| 11. | A-11 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 21 | 2 | 70 | Less |
| 12. | A-12 | 26 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 86 | Excellent |
| 13. | A-13 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick |  |  |
| 14. | A-14 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 3 | 80 | Good |


| 15. | A-15 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick | Sick |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. | A-16 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick | Sick |  |
| 17. | A-17 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 2 | 66 | Less |
| 18. | A-18 | 27 | 19 | 19 | 22 | 3 | 90 | Excellent |
| 19. | A-19 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick | Sick |  |
| 20. | A-20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 21 | 2 | 73 | Fair |
| 21. | A-21 | 21 | 14 | 13 | 17 | 2 | 67 | Less |
| 22. | A-22 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick | Sick |  |
| 23. | A-23 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| 24. | A-24 | 26 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 3 | 88 | Excellent |
| 25. | A-25 | 20 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 2 | 62 | Less |
| 26. | A-26 | sick | sick | sick | sick | Sick | Sick |  |
| 27. | A-27 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 28. | A-28 | 21 | 14 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 68 | Less |
| 29. | A-29 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 30. | A-30 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 29 | Less |
| Total Score |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1681 |  |

In this cycle the test was followed by 24 students, because 6 students were absent. After getting total score of test, then to know the mean score of result of tests researcher calculated the mean of test as follow:

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

## Explanation:

$\mathrm{M}=$ The average of students score
$\Sigma \mathrm{x}=$ Total students' score was 1681
$\mathrm{N}=$ Total of Students was 24
The computation of the average score was follow:

$$
\mathrm{M}=\frac{1681}{24}=70
$$

From the result above, it can be concluded that the students' writing ability on recount was still low. It can be seen from the average of score was 70 . This score was still under minimum standard score (KKM), it was 72 . There were 11 students got fair, good and excellent grade and passed the KKM and the others were still got the score less than KKM. After giving the test, it could be said that treatment was important to improve students' writing skill in order to reach the standard minimum success criteria (KKM). In this case, the researcher intended to use contextual teaching and learning technique to the next activity to make students interest and enjoy the learning process.
2. Cycle I

This classroom action research was done into two cycles. Each cycle consists of four steps: they are planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. The first cycle was conducted on Tuesday, 1 December 2015.
a. Planning

In planning step, the teacher and the researcher prepared the teaching learning design, such as, arranging lesson plan based on the teaching material. Then prepared the teaching learning material, the contextual teaching and learning, the observation checklist, and evaluation test. The last stage, the teacher prepared attendance list in order to know students' activeness in joining teaching learning process.
b. Acting

In this cycle, teacher would conduct activities according to the schedule that was arranged in planning stage. As acting, teacher explained about the social function, language features and generic structure of recount text. After that teacher gave an example of recount text and analyzed the language features of recount text together. After that researcher tried to applied contextual teaching and learning. The researcher divided the students into 6 groups, each group had 5 members. The researcher explained the material using contextual teaching and learning.
c. Observing

In this stage the researcher observed the learning process by asking the collaborator to monitor the class situation and students enthusiastic using observation scheme. The purpose of this activity was to evaluate the results, collect the data and monitor the teaching learning process. The analysis score of observations were as follow:

## Table 4.4

Observation Checklist in Cycle I

| Indicators |  | A few (< <br> $25 \%)$ | Half (25- <br> $50 \%)$ | Good <br> $(50-75 \%)$ | Majority <br> $(>75 \%)$ | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |
| 1 | Students give <br> Attention to <br> teacher's <br> explanation |  | $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  | 2 |
| 2 | Students show |  | $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  | 2 |


|  | curiosity by <br> asking <br> Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 3 | Students <br> respond <br> and answer <br> teacher's <br> Questions |  |  | $V$ |  | 3 |
| 4 | Students <br> understand <br> about the <br> material |  |  | $V$ |  | 3 |
| 5 | Students <br> discipline in <br> doing the task |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Score | 0 | 6 | 6 |  | 2 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mxc} & =\frac{\sum x c}{S_{\max }} \times 100 \% \\
& =\frac{12}{20} \times 100 \% \\
& =60 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

From the result above it can be concluded that students' enthusiasm was better than pre-cycle. Although there were some students made noisy when they did the task. In pre-cycle the score was $40 \%$ and in this cycle the score was higher, it was $60 \%$.

Some students made noisy when did the task because they asked some vocabularies and V2 to the other friends. After whole activity had finished, the researcher assessed the students' writing result. The result of test in cycle I was as follow:

Table 4.5
Students' Score of Cycle 1 Evaluation Test

| No | Students' Code | Item Analysis |  |  |  |  | $\Sigma$ | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | C | O | V | G | M |  |  |
| 1. | A-1 | 23 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 70 | Less |
| 2. | A-2 | 23 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 74 | Fair |
| 3. | A-3 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 70 | Less |
| 4. | A-4 | 25 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 72 | Fair |
| 5. | A-5 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 4 | 72 | Fair |
| 6. | A-6 | 23 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 76 | Good |
| 7. | A-7 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 4 | 86 | Excellent |
| 8. | A-8 | 23 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| 9. | A-9 | 26 | 17 | 15 | 16 | 4 | 78 | Good |
| 10. | A-10 | 25 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 3 | 73 | Fair |
| 11. | A-11 | 25 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 12. | A-12 | 23 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 67 | Less |
| 13. | A-13 | 24 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 4 | 75 | Fair |
| 14. | A-14 | 24 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 76 | Good |
| 15. | A-15 | 24 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 70 | Less |
| 16. | A-16 | 23 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 3 | 71 | Less |
| 17. | A-17 | 25 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 5 | 72 | Fair |
| 18. | A-18 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 4 | 76 | Good |
| 19. | A-19 | 24 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 70 | Less |
| 20. | A-20 | 24 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 70 | Less |
| 21. | A-21 | 24 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| 22. | A-22 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 4 | 72 | Fair |
| 23. | A-23 | 25 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 4 | 76 | Good |
| 24. | A-24 | 25 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 5 | 73 | Fair |
| 25. | A-25 | 26 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 5 | 80 | Good |
| 26. | A-26 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 5 | 75 | Fair |
| 27. | A-27 | 23 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 4 | 75 | Fair |
| 28. | A-28 | 24 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 5 | 71 | Less |
| 29. | A-29 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 76 | Good |
| 30. | A-30 | 22 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 5 | 72 | Fair |
| Total Score |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2207 |  |

To know the mean score of result of tests, researcher calculated the mean of test as follow:

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

Explanation:
$M=$ The average of students score
$\Sigma \mathrm{x}=$ Total students' score was 2207
$\mathrm{N}=$ Total of Students was 30
The computation of the average score was follow:

$$
M=\frac{2207}{30}=73.56
$$

The calculation result shows that the average of students' test result of first cycle was 73.56. The highest score was 86 and the lowest score was 67 . The average before was 70 and in this cycle 73.56. Researcher concluded that students' writing ability on recount text was improved. There was 1 student got excellent grade, 6 students got good grade, 11 got fair score and 12 students get less score of the minimum standard score (KKM) that was 72 . However the score was improved than pre-cycle.

The researcher should do cycle II. Because in the cycle I, the researcher analyzed that some students still confused to arrange ideas that had been generated by their friends into a recount text because there were some ideas that disconnected. The researcher also found that students had limited vocabulary especially change it become Verb 2, and the average of score had not reach the KKM (72), so the researcher had to continue to the next cycle.

## d. Reflecting

The class was conducive, since students were fully concentrated to join the activity. The mean of students' activeness during first cycle was $60 \%$. It means that students' participation increased than pre-cycle.

Time management was a very crucial factor in teaching learning process, for that process in group needed a bit of longer time, so researcher should try to manage and provide time perfectly.

The students' average achievement in writing recount text was improved. It was from 70 become 73.56. It could be concluded that contextual teaching and learning was effective in this cycle.
3. Cycle II

The cycle II was done based on the result of reflection from the cycle I. This cycle was conducted on Wednesday, December 2 2015. In this meeting the teacher used the same technique as the previous cycle, teaching learning process of writing recount text by using contextual teaching and learning. The steps that were done by the researcher in the cycle II were:
a. Planning

In this step, like a previous cycle the researcher prepared the teaching learning design, such as arranging lesson plan based on the teaching material. Then researcher prepared the teaching learning process resources, such as:
the materials, the example of recount text, the observation scheme, test evaluation, and attendant list in order to know students’ activeness in joining teaching learning process. Moreover researcher calculated the time management well.
b. Acting

In the cycle II the researcher did improvements in teaching recount text contextual teaching and learning that had not complete in the first cycle. The activities in teaching learning process are:

1) The teacher reviewed about the material that had been explained in the first cycle.
2) The researcher asked the students' problem on the previous lesson.
3) The researcher told to students that not all ideas that had been generated had to use in arranging recount text, they may choose, remove or develop the idea.
4) The researcher remind the students to always use simple past form.
5) The researcher asked the students to open the dictionary if they did not know the v 2 of vocabularies, it made the class less of noisy when did the task.
c. Observing

As the previous meeting, in this stage the researcher observed the learning process that was helped by the English
teacher as the collaborator. The score of observation were as follow:

Table 4.6
Observation Checklist in Cycle II

| Indicators |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A few (< } \\ & 25 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Half (25- } \\ & 50 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Good } \\ & (50-75 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Majority } \\ & (>75 \%) \end{aligned}$ | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 4 |  |
| 1 | Students give <br> Attention to teacher's <br> Explanation |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 3 |
| 2 | Students show curiosity by asking Questions |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 2 |
| 3 | Students respond and answer teacher's Questions |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |
| 4 | Students understand about the material |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |
| 5 | Students discipline in doing the task |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |
|  | Total Score | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 17 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mxc} & =\frac{\sum x c}{S_{\max }} \times 100 \% \\
& =\frac{17}{20} \times 100 \% \\
& =85 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

From the result above, it can be concluded that students enthusiastically in joining teaching learning process. The result increased than the observation before. The result of this cycle was $85 \%$.

After whole activity had finished, the researcher assessed the students' writing result. The result of test in cycle II was as follow:

Table 4.7
Students' Score of Cycle II Evaluation Test

| No | Students' | Item Analysis |  |  |  |  |  | $\Sigma$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Code | C | O | V | G | M |  |  |
| 1. | A-1 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 75 | Fair |
| 2. | A-2 | 27 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 3. | A-3 | 27 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 4 | 84 | Good |
| 4. | A-4 | 17 | 9 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 55 | Less |
| 5. | A-5 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 6. | A-6 | 27 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 5 | 90 | Excellent |
| 7. | A-7 | 28 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 98 | Excellent |
| 8. | A-8 | 22 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 72 | Fair |
| 9. | A-9 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 3 | 84 | Good |
| 10. | A-10 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 22 | 4 | 79 | Good |
| 11. | A-11 | 22 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 4 | 78 | Good |
| 12. | A-12 | 27 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 13. | A-13 | 22 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 56 | Less |
| 14. | A-14 | 27 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 85 | Good |
| 15. | A-15 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 35 | Less |
| 16. | A-16 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 4 | 76 | Fair |
| 17. | A-17 | 22 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 71 | Less |
| 18. | A-18 | 28 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 4 | 95 | Excellent |
| 19. | A-19 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 34 | Less |
| 20. | A-20 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 3 | 76 | Fair |
| 21. | A-21 | 22 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 72 | Fair |
| 22. | A-22 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 51 | Less |
| 23. | A-23 | 22 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 76 | Fair |
| 24. | A-24 | 27 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 4 | 93 | Excellent |


| 25. | A-25 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 67 | Less |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26. | A-26 | 22 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 56 | Less |
| 27. | A-27 | 27 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 5 | 90 | Excellent |
| 28. | A-28 | 22 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 72 | Fair |
| 29. | A-29 | 27 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 5 | 90 | Excellent |
| 30. | A-30 | 25 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 3 | 77 | Good |
| Total Score |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2252 |  |

To know the mean score of result of tests researcher calculated the mean of test as follow:

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

Explanation:
$\mathrm{M}=$ The average of students score
$\Sigma \mathrm{x}=$ Total students' score was 2252
$\mathrm{N}=$ Total of students was 30

The computation of the average score was follow:

$$
\mathrm{M}=\frac{2252}{30}=75.06
$$

From the result above, the researcher concluded that the students' achievement in writing recount text using contextual teaching and learning had a significant improvement compared from the previous cycle. The condition of the class also was getting better and conducive. Although there were 8 students got less score, 7 students got excellent score, 8 students got good score, and 7 students got fair score.

In this cycle, the students' improvement of writing recount text was improved in content, organization, language use,
vocabulary and mechanic. The teacher and the researcher concluded that students' ability in writing recount text were improve after being given treatment by using contextual teaching and learning approach.

The students were also enthusiastic in learning process, they were serious in paying attention when the teacher explained the material, some of students who asked questions and responded questions were increased, they were serious in making effort to write. The teacher and researcher decided to stop this cycle, because they concluded that students' ability in writing recount text was improved from the preliminary to the first and to the second cycle and it was reached the indicator of achievement.

## d. Reflecting

In this cycle, the students improvement on writing recount text was more significant. It could be seen from the average improvement score of the test and their enthusiastic in learning process. The students' improvement of writing recount text was improved in content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic.

The students' average achievement in writing recount text was improved. The highest score was 98 and the lowest score was 34. The average was from 73.56 become 75.06 . The mean of students' activeness during cycle II was $85 \%$ of total students. It means that students' participation was great and higher than $75 \%$ of total students in the research. So, the problem of teaching
writing recount text was solved. The teacher and researcher decided to stop this cycle, because they concluded that students' ability in writing recount text was improved from the preliminary to the first and to second cycle and it was reached the indicator of achievement.

## C. Final Data Analysis

After the researcher implemented contextual teaching and learning in teaching writing recount text, the researcher got the data from each cycle. It was analyzed in each cycle to see the improvement and result in every cycle and then the researcher got the result of the classroom action research. The result of research shows that there was significant improvement of students’ ability in writing recount text after taught using contextual teaching and learning. It can be seen from the result of the test from the cycle I up to cycle II.

Table 4.8
The Result of Evaluation Test from Preliminary until Second Cycle as Follows:

| No. | Cycle | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Preliminary | 70 |
| 2. | Cycle I | 73.56 |
| 3. | Cycle II | 75.06 |

The implementation of contextual teaching and learning approach also could improve students' activeness in teaching and learning process. It can be seen in the chart below:


In the chart above we could see that there was improvement of students' writing ability and students' activeness on recount text cycle by cycle.

In the preliminary research test, the students did the evaluation test, and the mean score of students writing ability on recount text was 70. In that activity, the teacher still used conventional method. The highest score was 93 and the lowest score was 29 . From the result above, the mean of students' score in writing recount text was low. The result of the average score was 70 . This score was still under the minimum standard score (72). There were There were 11 students got fair, good and excellent grade and passed the KKM and the others were still got the score less than KKM. The mean of students' activeness during pre-cycle was $40 \%$. It means that the students' attention, participation, and activity were very low.

In the first cycle, the mean result was 73.56 . In this cycle, the researcher began to apply contextual teaching and learning approach in teaching recount text. There was some significant improvement in students' score average. It was from 70 become 73.56 . There was 1 student got excellent grade, 6 students got good grade, 11 got fair score and 12 students get less score of the minimum standard score (KKM) that was 72. Researcher concluded that students' writing ability on recount text was improved. In teaching and learning process students were enthusiastic in following the lesson. The students paid more attention and joined the class enthusiastically. The mean of students' activeness during first cycle was $60 \%$. It means that students' participation was increased than before.

In the second cycle, the result was improved than previous cycle.. Their motivation and interest were also better in every cycle. The mean result was 75.06. It was higher than previous cycle. It was from 73.56 become 75.06 . From the result, the researcher concluded that the students' achievement in writing recount text using contextual teaching and learning had a significant improvement compared from the previous cycle. The condition of the class also was getting better and conducive. Although there were 8 students got less score, 7 students got excellent score, 8 students got good score, and 7 students got fair score. The average of students' activeness during second cycle was $85 \%$ of total students. It means that students' participation was great. It was passed the indicator of achievement (75\%). It was higher
$10 \%$ point than $75 \%$. Here, all the indicators of achievement was reached.

From the description of teaching learning process during the research above, it can be concluded that contextual teaching and learning approach was effective to be implemented in teaching writing recount text and could help students to improve their motivation and interest especially at the eighth grade D students of SMP Muhammadiyah Margasari Tegal in the academic year of 2015/2016.

