## CHAPTER IV

## DATA ANALYSIS

## A. Result of the Study

This research was conducted by using a classroom action research. It consisted of two cycles. Before during the first cycle, the researcher did pre cycle to know the ability of students about vocabulary writing before they were given treatment, it was conducted on $1^{\text {st }}$ March 2010. The cycles were conducted on two meetings. The first meeting of cycle 1 was held on $8^{\text {th }}$ March 2010, and then on $15^{\text {th }}$ March 2010 was hold the second meeting of cycle 2. In two chapters above, the teacher not only gave treatment and games but also hold evaluation test to measure the degrees of ability students in writing vocabulary.

Before conducting the study the writer pre-observed the situation of the classroom and shared with Mrs.Yuni as the English teacher of fourth grades students of SD N 1 Kebonharjo. She said that the students of fourth grade still poor on ability in English lesson because according to her opinion, motivation of students to learn English was poor.

After observing the class situation, the writer prepared the instrument that would be used in teaching learning process. The writer prepared the material and arranged the lesson plan. The material was taken from 'Speed by English 4' book published by Yudistira. Besides that the writer also prepared pictures, checklist for observed the students' activity, group of vocabulary about noun, adjective and verb.

## B. Description and Analysis

1. Pre-Cycle

Pre Cycle meeting was conducted at the beginning of the research. The purpose of this meeting was to find out the students' vocabulary writing ability before they were given treatment through pre-test. The pretest conducted on Monday, $1^{\text {st }}$ march 2010 at 11.20 am to 00.35 p.m . Based
on the observation result of the teaching learning process, the researcher saw that teacher still taught the class by using conventional method, where teacher explained, and students listened. In the last time, students had to do some assessments. There were 35 students who took an exercises. The teacher provided 10 minutes for them to do the exercises. They had to reply by writing names of picture in English. The compositions of test are 5 fruits, 5 animals, 5 parts of body, 5 stationeries, 10 verbs and 10 adjectives. The test above was variety such as cross word and close space of word. So, every student just got 5 words which different with his/her friends' word.

To diagnose pre cycle activity, the researcher used observation where the teaching learning was in progress. The observations were about the students' activeness in joining vocabulary material and game. The result of observation will discuss more clear in the next page.

Then to measure the students' ability, researcher gave student an evaluation of pre test. It was concluded from 20 questions. Students were asked to fill in the blank using correct word. The answer consist of 5 noun, 5 verb, 5 adjective, and 5 antonym. After implementing the test, the researcher examined the answer sheet and finds the result. The results of this test were not satisfactory. It is can be seen in the following table:

Table
Score Test Pre Cycle

| NO | NAME OF STUDENTS | SCORE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1. | A. Fatah Falahi | 70 |
| 2. | Ahmad Zulfikri | 45 |
| 3. | Alfa Reza Bagus Pangestu | 45 |
| 4. | Anita Kuwin | 55 |
| 5. | Asa Widya Rizqi Isnaeni | 45 |
| 6. | Berliana Mudawimah | 45 |
| 7. | Chandra Nurhardiansyah | 65 |
| 8. | Dewi Wulan Apriliyani | 40 |
| 9. | Diah Nur Amalia | 45 |
| 10. | Fadia Afila K | 60 |
| 11. | Farhan Hanif Maulana | 65 |
| 12. | Fitriana Kumalasari | 45 |
| 13. | Fredy Mardiyanto | 70 |
| 14. | Hairis Shidiq Ghozali | 45 |


| 15. | Hana Wahyu Firmansyah | 40 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 16. | Hizbullah | 60 |
| 17. | Gunawan | 45 |
| 18. | Nurfebriyanto | 45 |
| 19. | Iswanto Dwi | 50 |
| 20. | Luthfatun N.M | 45 |
| 21. | Mega Novia Rahmawati | 45 |
| 22. | Mohammad Baihaqi | 50 |
| 23. | M. Firdaus S | 55 |
| 24. | Nila Muna | 60 |
| 25. | Rizqa Ulul Fahmi | 50 |
| 26. | Rohmat Fauzi Ridwan | 45 |
| 27. | Royyan Kafi | 40 |
| 28. | Siti Maria Ulfa | 45 |
| 29. | Siti Suraya | 50 |
| 30. | Syafika Nur Andika | 45 |
| 31. | Taufik | 60 |
| 32. | Tri Astutik | 45 |
| 33. | M.Nur Wahid | 70 |
| 34. | Siti Nurfaizah | 60 |
| 35. | Syifa Nabila | 45 |
|  | TOTAL |  |

In order to know further on the students' achievement in detail, the writer used the following formula to find out the average of students' achievement. The formula was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{1790}{35} \\
& =51.14
\end{aligned}
$$

From the achievement above, the average of students from pre test was very poor. The researcher concluded that students had difficulties to write vocabulary correctly. Students still write English word according to mother tongues' pronounciation. He could the treatment to improve students' vocabulary writing ability using variation on gap tasks in the next meeting.

## 2. Cycle 1

The first cycle was conducted on Monday, $8^{\text {th }}$ March 2010 at 11.20 a.m to $00.35 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. In this meeting, the teacher taught vocabulary, especially noun and verb using picture and gesture game as treatment. This act to support variation of gap tasks. After game finished, students were given tasks to evaluate students' ability in cycle 1 . There were 35 students following teaching learning process. Teaching learning process during treatment was represented in many steps.

First, the teacher asked students to stand up and close their eyes because it would make them easier to imagine what the spelling of words. Next, the students tried to pronounce and spell those words. After that they should open their eyes. This treatment, the researcher hoped that variation of gap task could help students to produce effective vocabulary writing.

The researcher had planned to use pictures in teaching nouns and gesture or well known by total physical response in teaching verbs. So, the researcher discused with teacher about lesson plan as guidance of teaching. Beside that, the researcher prepared lesson plan, observation sheet, evaluation sheet, and some materials that could be used in game.

In this action researcher not only as the English teacher but also as observer began lesson by greeting students. Then he showed some pictures (fruits and parts of body) and made gestures to describe some verbs such as eat, drink, walk, run, read, write, and listen in front of class. Students were asked to guess what are those pictures and gestures. Some students tried to pronounce its and others write its name of nouns and verbs in the blackboard.

After that, students were divided into five groups. Every group consisted of seven students. One student was pointed to be a leader of group. He had to show pictures and make gestures that recommended by teacher. Members of groups had to remember what were those pictures and gestures and fill them into the blanks of sentences as a group task. Every student had to understand the meaning of every sentence and could write its
noun and verbs correctly. The group that could finish their task firstly was the winner. Finally, researcher gave 20 minutes to students to do the evaluation test individually.

The result of the evaluation test in cycle 1 as follows:
Table
Score Test in cycle 1

| NO | NAME OF STUDENTS | SCORE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1. | A. Fatah Falahi | 80 |
| 2. | Ahmad Zulfikri | 50 |
| 3. | Alfa Reza Bagus Pangestu | 60 |
| 4. | Anita Kuwin | 60 |
| 5. | Asa Widya Rizqi Isnaeni | 55 |
| 6. | Berliana Mudawimah | 50 |
| 7. | Chandra Nurhardiansyah | 70 |
| 8. | Dewi Wulan Apriliyani | 50 |
| 9. | Diah Nur Amalia | 60 |
| 10. | Fadia Afila K | 70 |
| 11. | Farhan Hanif Maulana | 80 |
| 12. | Fitriana Kumalasari | 50 |
| 13. | Fredy Mardiyanto | 80 |
| 14. | Hairis Shidiq Ghozali | 65 |
| 15. | Hana Wahyu Firmansyah | 60 |
| 16. | Hizbullah | 75 |
| 17. | Gunawan | 50 |
| 18. | Nurfebriyanto | 50 |
| 19. | Iswanto Dwi | 50 |
| 20. | Luthfatun N.M | 70 |
| 21. | Mega Novia Rahmawati | 55 |
| 22. | Mohammad Baihaqi | 60 |
| 23. | M. Firdaus S | 80 |
| 24. | Nila Muna | 85 |
| 25. | Rizqa Ulul Fahmi | 75 |
| 26. | Rohmat Fauzi Ridwan | 50 |
| 27. | Royyan Kafi | 60 |
| 28. | Siti Maria Ulfa | 55 |
| 29. | Siti Suraya | 60 |
| 30. | Syafika Nur Andika | 65 |
| 31. | Taufik | 70 |
| 32. | Tri Astutik | 50 |
| 33. | M.Nur Wahid | 70 |
| 34. | Siti Nurfaizah | 70 |
| 35. | Syifa Nabila | 60 |
|  |  |  |


|  | TOTAL | 2200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

In order to know further on the students' achievement in detail, the writer used the following formula to find out the average of students' achievement. The formula was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{2200}{35} \\
& =62.86
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the test result, the average of students in treatment (cycle 1) was 62.86. It increased 11.72 from pre-test and it could be concluded that a first cycle was successful enough. In first cycle, the researcher analyzed that some students still had difficult in writing vocabulary. Based on the problem above, the teacher conducted cycle 2 in order to improve the students' writing vocabulary.

The researcher observed the students activities by using observation format in order to evaluate the results, collect the data and monitor the teaching learning process. It was used to find out to what extent the action result reached the objective. The steps were as follow the researcher observed the teaching learning process in order to know the effectiveness of using variation of gap tasks towards students' activeness in engaging themselves in that game. Researcher also monitored and observed groups perform and activities in making the group task. It was done to know the success and problems when teaching learning process could be analyzed to measure progress, which was not enough sufficient to reach the objectives of study.
3. Cycle 2

The second cycle was conducted on Monday, $15^{\text {th }}$ March 2010 at 11.20 a.m to 00.35 p.m. In this meeting, the researcher taught vocabulary, especially adjective and antonym using choose a pair and imagination game as treatment. This act was to support variation of gap tasks. After
game finished, students were given tasks to evaluate students' ability in cycle 2. The researcher had planned to use cards in teaching antonym and adjective. So, the researcher discused with teacher about lesson plan as guidance of teaching. Beside that, the researcher prepared lesson plan, observation sheet, evaluation sheet, and some materials that could be used in game.

Researcher started lesson by reviewing the previous lesson. Students were asked to mention some nouns and verbs that they had mastered, and some of them came forward into class to write it at the blackboard. Next, researcher choosed one student who has unique body to stand up, such as fat or small students. He was as a model to describe adjectives and another students who has opposites shape of body with the first student to describe antonym words. Every student was given a card that contains one adjective. They had to look for their friends who had opposite word with theirs. After they succeed to meet, they were asked to make English sentences using words that they had. The sentences about were noted in paper. And the last activity, researcher gave to student individual task. Researcher gave every student a picture of animal. Student had to make some sentences that had related with their picture description.

The researcher observed the students activities by using observation format in order to evaluate the results, collected the data and monitor the teaching learning process. It was used to find out to what extent the action result reached the objective. The steps were as follow the researcher observed the teaching learning process in order to know the effectiveness of using variation of gap tasks towards students' activeness in engaging themselves in that game. Researcher also monitored and observed groups perform and activities in making the group task. It was done to know the success and problems when teaching learning process could be analyzed to measure progress that was not enough sufficient to reach the objectives of study.

Then researcher gave the evaluation of cycle 2 . This evaluation consist of five simple paragraph. Its were description of five animals. Student just fill in the blank using appropriate adjective. To help them those adjectives provided beside blanks of sentences.

Table
Score Test in cycle 2

| NO | NAME OF STUDENTS | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | A. Fatah Falahi | 90 |
| 2. | Ahmad Zulfikri | 60 |
| 3. | Alfa Reza Bagus Pangestu | 65 |
| 4. | Anita Kuwin | 60 |
| 5. | Asa Widya Rizqi Isnaeni | 70 |
| 6. | Berliana Mudawimah | 70 |
| 7. | Chandra Nurhardiansyah | 80 |
| 8. | Dewi Wulan Apriliyani | 65 |
| 9. | Diah Nur Amalia | 75 |
| 10. | Fadia Afila K | 70 |
| 11. | Farhan Hanif Maulana | 90 |
| 12. | Fitriana Kumalasari | 65 |
| 13. | Fredy Mardiyanto | 80 |
| 14. | Hairis Shidiq Ghozali | 70 |
| 15. | Hana Wahyu Firmansyah | 80 |
| 16. | Hizbullah | 85 |
| 17. | Gunawan | 65 |
| 18. | Nurfebriyanto | 60 |
| 19. | Iswanto Dwi | 65 |
| 20. | Luthfatun N.M | 70 |
| 21. | Mega Novia Rahmawati | 70 |
| 22. | Mohammad Baihaqi | 65 |
| 23. | M. Firdaus S | 80 |
| 24. | Nila Muna | 90 |
| 25. | Rizqa Ulul Fahmi | 80 |
| 26. | Rohmat Fauzi Ridwan | 60 |
| 27. | Royyan Kafi | 65 |
| 28. | Siti Maria Ulfa | 70 |
| 29. | Siti Suraya | 75 |
| 30. | Syafika Nur Andika | 75 |
| 31. | Taufik | 80 |
| 32. | Tri Astutik | 65 |
| 33. | M.Nur Wahid | 75 |
| 34. | Siti Nurfaizah | 70 |
| 35. | Syifa Nabila | 65 |
|  | TOTAL | 2520 |

In order to know further on the students achievement in detail, the researcher used the following formula to find out the average of students' achievement. The formula was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{M}=\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
& \mathrm{M}=\frac{2520}{35} \\
& =72
\end{aligned}
$$

## C. Analysis of the Observation

In observation, there were some important matters, which must be paid attention during a research. This observation, the researcher took 10 items, which was focused in research. The monitoring was started since early to the last research and the checklist observation result can be seen in appendix.

This observes was executed while pre-test. Here, the writer observed students' activity when teaching learning process. The first meeting, there were 35 students' attendance in class and no student was absent. All of the students listened to teacher's explanation and none students did not pay attentions to the learning process. They were also discipline in doing a task and did by themselves. In this matter, none students did not do a task. When teaching learning process there were not students asked permission to leave the classroom even though one student. From the observation, none students were not active during a lesson.

There were many students still did not give attention to teacher's explanation. It can be shown by their attitudes during the class that most of them were talking to each other while the study in progress. Even when they were in groups of discussion, they did not show any enthusiasm in joining the activity. For instance, when teacher pointed one of them to arrange the sentences, student who was pointed would point another student or his/her partner instead.

Second monitoring, it was conducted when first cycle hold on Monday, $8^{\text {th }}$ March 2010. In this meeting, all of the students were attendance in class.

While the teacher applied variation of gap tasks which combined with picture and gesture game, they listened to teacher's explanation; they did what the teacher says and none students to be crowded also asked permission to leave the classroom. In the second activity, there were not students did not pay attention to the learning process. Fatah, Hanif, Ulfa, Firdaus, and Shidiq were the students who active in asking question because they wanted to know more vocabulary writing. When the teacher gave a task to them, none students did not do the tasks but they discipline in doing the task and three students were not active during a lesson, they were Kafi, Hana, and Reza. These students also were not cooperating to their group although a teacher had advised them to be more active.

Table 3
Observation in Cycle 1

| No | Indicators | Po | fair | Aver age | good | Very good | Total Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 1 | Student's attendance |  |  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ | 5 |
| 2 | The students are enthusiastic in listening to teachers' explanation of vocabulary |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |
| 3 | The students show curiosity by asking the questions to clarify understanding |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | 2 |
| 4 | The students are enthusiastic in responding teachers' question |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | 2 |
| 5 | The students active in group work |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |
| 6 | The students are <br> enthusiastic in <br> participating  <br> game  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |
| 7 | The students pay attention on English |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |


|  | game |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 8 | The students' <br> achievement to <br> pronounce noun and <br> verb |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |  |  | 2 |
| 9 | The students' <br> achievement to spell <br> noun and verb |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |  | 3 |  |
| 10 | The students <br> complete the task <br> correctly |  | $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | Total score |  | 6 | 18 |  | 5 | 29 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { max imum score }} \times 100 \% \\
& = \\
& =50 \\
& =58 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

It was resulted that students activeness/participation in teaching learning activity were $66 \%$ or $26 \%$ increased. According to the result of the observation above it could be concluded that more students joined the class enthusiastically. They paid attention to the lesson, although some students made noisy when they played the game, because they still confused with the researcher direction and they never played game before. They tried to cheat and discussed the answer with their friends. It could be said that the use of variation of gap tasks was effective in improving students' understanding on adverb of frequency. Students showed that they were enough understanding to make sentences in front of the class by using English through the use of the game.

Next monitoring, it was conducted on Monday, $15^{\text {th }}$ March 2010. This observation was executed while students act and followed the game. In the game, all of the students attended in class and listened to teacher's explanation. While performance game, there were five students did not pay attention to the learning process. This was one group still exercise to performance game and there was six students' active in asking questions, two students' like to be
crowded, such as Fredi and Fauzi. In this activity, there were four students asked permission to leave the classroom but all of the students discipline in doing the task and none the students were not active during a lesson also they cooperated in game performance although they still had difficulties to write vocabulary correctly.

Table 5
Observation in Cycle 2

| No | Indicators | poor | fair | $\begin{gathered} \text { aver } \\ \text { age } \end{gathered}$ | good | Very good | Total Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 1 | Student's attendance |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 5 |
| 2 | The students are enthusiastic listening teachers' explanation of vocabulary |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 |
| 3 | The studentr show <br> curiosity by <br> asking the <br> questions to <br> clarify  <br> understanding  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |
| 4 | The students are enthusiastic in responding teachers' question |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 |
| 5 | The <br> active <br> work ingroup <br> wonts  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |
| 6 | The students are enthusiastic in participating the game |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 |
| 7 | The students pay attention English game |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 |
| 8 | The students' <br> achievement to <br> pronounciate  <br> adjective and |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 3 |



It was resulted that students activeness/participation in teaching learning activity were $80 \%$ or $14 \%$ increased from cycle 1 . It showed that, the use of variation of gap tasks as an alternative way in improving students' understanding was very effective. Based on the result of observation above, it can be concluded that the majority of the students joined the class enthusiastically. All activities in the second cycle could run well. It can be seen from their responses. No students were noisy. While the researcher was presenting the lesson, majority of the students were paying attention to her. The students played the game orderly, when did their test, they were calm and paying attention to the researcher, they tried to answer the questions correctly and enthusiastically.

## D. Analysis of the Whole Meetings

Tabel
Comparison percentage students enthusiastic in response teaching learning process using variation on gap tasks on pre cycle, cycle I, and cycle 2.

| No | Cycle | Total Score | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Cycle 1 | 33 | 66 |
| 3 | Cycle 2 | 40 | 80 |

## Tabel

## Comparison the average of students score

On pre cycle, cycle 1, and cycle 2 .

| No | Cycle | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Pre cycle | 51.14 |
| 2 | Cycle 1 | 62.86 |
| 3 | Cycle 2 | 72.00 |

As whole the meetings ran well. There was some significant improvement from cycle one to cycle two.

In the pre test, all of the students have been doing the test, and the average result was 51.14 in this activity, the teacher still use conventional method. She did not use variation of gap tasks as teaching media. In teaching learning process, only half of the students are active and enthusiastic to the lesson. A half of students did not give response maximally, especially the students who sit down in backside. They like talk with their pairs. The students look boring and sleepy.

In the first cycle, the average result was 62.86 , the teacher began use memory round game to teach the students. In teaching learning process, there were many of students joined the class enthusiastically. They paid attention to the lesson, although many of students still confused with the researcher and the teacher direction. It made the class noisy, it caused that they never play the game in class before. But it can be overcome with give direction more slowly and clearly.

In the second cycle, the average result was 72.00 before the lesson began, the researcher asked the students to give more pay attention to the lesson, because the researcher would give reward to the students who wins the game. In teaching learning process, majority of the students joined the class enthusiastically. All activities in this cycle run well. According to the researcher, it caused with their interesting play the game using memory round game and they like to receive the reward.

It showed that there was some significant improvement in students' achievement. Furthermore, there was also improvement from cycle 1 until cycle 2.

