

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DATA INTERPRETATION**

#### **A. THE RESULT OF STUDY**

The study was conducted in four activities. The two activities were teaching learning activities. The first activity was pre cycle and held in April, 13<sup>th</sup> 2010. The second activity was held in April, 14<sup>th</sup> 2010. The third activity was held in April, 20<sup>th</sup> 2010. The last activity was post test and done in April, 21 2010.

#### **B. PROCESS OF THE RESEARCH**

##### **1. Pre Cycle**

Pre cycle was conducted on April, 13<sup>th</sup> 2009. There were 26 students who took a test. As stated in the previous chapter, before conducting the action research, the writer gave a test. The purpose was to know how far the students could speak English fluently by performing the information gap activity relating the material was given. Based on the observation result of the speaking teaching learning process, the writer saw that teacher still taught the class by using conventional method, where teacher explained, and students listened.

Teacher started teaching by explaining the materials. Sometimes he asked students the meaning of certain words and asked one of them to write on the blackboard. When teacher explained, students were asked to listen carefully what teacher said. If students did not know any meaning of certain vocabulary, they might ask the meaning automatically. And if they did not know the use of certain expression, teacher would give a brief explanation, while students were asked to write it down on their books.

For the next action, teacher gave some examples of each expression and asked students to imitate or to repeat after him the way in pronouncing the sentence or the words. Based on the observation that the writer did, the students were less motivated. They looked bored; most of them ignored the teacher explanation. Thus, class became somewhat noisy. There was only 10 students paid attention. During the question answer session, almost of all students were silent. There were just 5 students who responded to question and 7 students tried to asked question. After teacher asked students to practice the expression, they seen lazy. There were only 16 students who being enthusiastic did the task

**Table 1**  
**The Percentages of Students' Observation**

NO	Students Participant	Scale of Score				
		%	A	B	C	D
1	Students attendance	100	V			V V
2	Students actively asked questions	19.2				
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	26.9				
4	Students participation in group	61.5	V		V	
5	Students attentions to the teacher explanation	38.5				

Note:

- A : 85%-100%
- B : 69%-84%
- C : 63%-68%
- D : < 53%

**Table 2**  
**The result of pre tests**

<b>No</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Score</b>
1	R-1	28
2	R-2	32
3	R-3	40
4	R-4	28
5	R-5	40
6	R-6	36
7	R-7	40
8	R-8	40
9	R-9	32
10	R-10	24
11	R-11	36
12	R-12	36
13	R-13	36
14	R-14	36
15	R-15	32
16	R-16	32
17	R-17	36
18	R-18	36
19	R-19	40
20	R-20	32
21	R-21	32
22	R-22	36
23	R-23	40
24	R-24	36
25	R-25	28
26	R-26	36
<b>Sum</b>		824
<b>Mean</b>		31.7

The average of students test result of the pre cycle was 31, 7. It means that the result was low. It was needed to reach for at least 40 as minimum score in speaking. According to observer, this condition was not

interesting in learning modal auxiliary. The teacher and researcher decided to use another technique to make students interested and enjoyed in learning speaking in order to students improve their speaking. From the analysis above, the average achievement of the students' pre test was 31, 7. The writer concluded that the students had difficulties to speak English fluently in performing the story. This result is being the main consideration of the improvement of students' achievement through classroom action research using information gap technique.

## **2. Cycle 1**

### **a. Planning**

- 1) Choosing the teaching learning material I (description of teacher)
- 2) Arranging the lesson plan based on the teaching material.
- 3) Preparing the test instrument
- 4) Preparing teaching facilities.
- 5) Preparing students' attendance list.

### **b. Acting**

- 1) Teacher divided students into the four groups
- 2) Teacher distributed the work sheet.
- 3) Put the information sheets face down at the front of the class.
- 4) A member of each group was given five minutes to memorize the information from one teacher information sheet.
- 5) The member returned to their group and tells the information to the other members of their group.
- 6) Teacher explains the material. In this activity the teacher explains the use of asking and giving opinion.
- 7) Teacher gives an example of asking and giving opinion usage.
- 8) Teacher asks students to practice it.

9) Teacher asks students to make conversation using asking and giving opinion.

c. Observing.

1) Observing the students' activities.

2) Observing the students' activities cooperation in the group.

3) Observing the teaching learning process.

d. Reflecting

In this step, the writer evaluated the steps in pre cycle and discussed the result of the observation for the improvement of students' achievement in next cycle

Second activity was conducted on April, 14<sup>th</sup> 2010. there were 26 students following this teaching learning process. In this activity, the writer implemented the step of information gap activity. The first was the teacher divided the students into four groups. Each group consisted of six and seven students. Then they were asked to sit in a circle with their own group members. The teacher asks the students about the roles, the writer gave copy script of teacher information sheet to the leader of the group. The leader of each group was given five minutes to memorize the information from one teacher information sheet. The students returned to their group and told the information to the other members of their group. After the leader of the group finishing retells the story to their member of the group, he or she asked their friend to try retelling the same information with their group friends.

According to the writer, all activities could run well. All of the students were paying attention to the teacher seriously and interestingly while presenting the lesson. The students seemed to be worried they perform the information gap activity. They looked nervous because probably they rarely did conversation in the class.

In teaching learning 1, the writer taught “the description of teacher” as the material. The teacher helped me to observe the students’ activities and the way I taught. To diagnose pre cycle activity, the researcher used two types of observation where the speaking teaching learning was in progress. The observations were about the students’ activeness in joining speaking material and how a teacher gave and managed the class.

**Table 3**  
**The Percentages of Students’ Observation**

NO	Students Participant	Total	Scale of Score			
		%	A	B	C	D
1	Students attendance	100	V			
2	Students actively asked questions	31				V
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	27				V
4	Students participation in group	88,5	V			
5	Students attentions to the teacher explanation	69,2			V	

Note:

- A : 85%-100%
- B : 69%-84%
- C : 63%-68%
- D : < 53%

Based on the observation that the writer did, the students were less motivated. They looked bored and sleepy; most of them ignored the teacher explanation. Thus, class became somewhat noisy. There was only 18 students paid attention. During the question answer session, almost of all students were silent. There were just 8 students who responded to question and 7 students tried to asked question.

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 come forward, student who was pointed would point another student or his/her partner instead. This repeated over and over until there was someone who did not have a chance to refuse tried to express this expression

#### Observation of the teachers' activities

- a. The researcher was good enough in opening the lesson in which inside of preparing the instruments, the material and did apperception.
- b. The researcher did not give enough chance to the students to be more active during teaching learning process. The researcher did not give enough feedback to the students.
- c. The researcher was good in giving explanation of the teaching material but sometimes she was too fast so that students couldn't catch the material easily.
- d. The researcher sometimes ignored students in the back row so that they didn't pay attention to the lesson.
- e. The researcher did not have enough firm attitudes in handling the trouble maker's students.
- f. The researcher's voice in pronunciation in English was good enough.
- g. Involving the students in concluding the whole lesson in that day.

**Table 4**  
**The result of cycle 1 tests**

<b>No</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Score</b>
1	R-1	40
2	R-2	48
3	R-3	52
4	R-4	32
5	R-5	60
6	R-6	40
7	R-7	52
8	R-8	60
9	R-9	52
10	R-10	32
11	R-11	56
12	R-12	48
13	R-13	48
14	R-14	44
15	R-15	56
16	R-16	56
17	R-17	36
18	R-18	44
19	R-19	52
20	R-20	48
21	R-21	48
22	R-22	44
23	R-23	48
24	R-24	44
25	R-25	36
26	R-26	48
<b>Sum</b>		1124
<b>Mean</b>		43.2

The average of students test result of the cycle 1 was 43.2. It means that the result better than pre cycle. it was higher than the minimum score at least 40. According to observer, this condition was interesting in



learning the material, but they were still confused. They did not understand the vocabulary completely. In question answer process, they still hesitant to answered and asked question. When teacher gave task, they difficult to expressed their ideas and created well word. They also said that they felt shy with their speaking. This result showed that necessary to improve the students' achievement in speaking, therefore it was needed the treatment in second cycle

### **3. Cycle 2**

#### **a. Planning**

- 1) Choosing the teaching learning material (description of teacher)
- 2) Arranging the lesson plan based on the teaching material.
- 3) Preparing the test instrument
- 4) Preparing teaching facilities.
- 5) Preparing students' attendance list.

#### **b. Acting**

- 1) Teacher divided students into the four groups
- 2) Teacher distributed the work sheet.
- 3) Put the information sheets face down at the front of the class.
- 4) A member of each group was given five minutes to memorize the information from one teacher information sheet.
- 5) The member returned to their group and tells the information to the other members of their group.
- 6) Teacher explains the material. In this activity the teacher explains the use of asking and giving opinion.
- 7) Teacher gives an example of asking and giving opinion usage.
- 8) Teacher asks students to practice it.
- 9) Teacher asks students to make conversation using asking and giving opinion.

c. Observing.

- 1) Observing the students' activities.
- 2) Observing the students' activities cooperation in the group.
- 3) Observing the teaching learning process.

d. Reflecting

Evaluate the steps in teaching learning process, discussed the result of observation, and assessed the result of students' understanding for the improvement of students' achievement in learning modal auxiliary.

Third activity was conducted on April, 20<sup>th</sup> 2010. In this activity, the students did the same activities as in the previous meeting. the writer implemented the stage of information gap activity the first activity was the teacher divided the students into four groups. Each group consisted of six and seven students. Then they were asked to sit in a circle with their own group members. The teacher asked the students about the roles. The writer gave copy script of teacher information sheet to the leader of the group. The leader of each group was given five minutes to memorize the information from one teacher information sheet. The student returned to their group and told the information to the other members of their group. He or she asked their friend to try retelling the same information with their group friends.

According to the writer, all activities could run well. All of the students were paying attention to the teacher seriously and interestingly while presenting the lesson. The students did not seemed to be worried and nervous anymore and they participated the class well. The same as in the previous activity, in teaching learning 2, the writer still used information gap activity in teaching speaking with different material given.

In teaching learning 2, the writer taught “the description of some artist” as the material. The classroom teacher also helped me to observe the students’ activities and the way I taught in this meeting. The result of the observation can be seen as follows:

**Table 5**  
**The Percentage of Students’ Observation**

No	Students Participant	Total	Scale of Score			
		%	A	B	C	D
1	Students attendance	100	V			
2	Students actively asked questions	42				V
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	46				V
4	Students participation in group					
5	Students attentions	100	V			
		100	V			

Note:

- A : 85%-100%
- B : 69%-84%
- C : 63%-68%
- D : < 53%

After the first cycle, there were several improvements. Most of students had higher attention than the initial condition during the teaching learning process. It could be seen from class situation that less noisy than previous. This indicated there was improvement of their motivation.

When teacher gave oral question about the material, students who were responded to the teacher question was increased. Teacher gave questions in front of classroom for all students. They were answered the question cohesively. There were 12 students who responded question.

Furthermore, there were also improvement students who asked question. It was about 11 students tried to ask question. They asked question orally, about material and vocabularies that they did not know. It was resulted that students activeness/participation in speaking activity were increased. It can be said that the use of information gap technique were effective in students' activeness in engaging themselves in speaking activity. Students showed that they were enough confident to speak in front of the class by using English.

Observation of the teacher activities:

- a. The researcher was good enough in opening the lesson in which inside of preparing the instruments, the material and did apperception.
- b. The researcher gave enough chance to the students to be more active during teaching learning process
- c. The researcher developed question and answer activity by giving enough opportunity to the students asking question.
- d. The researcher was good in explaining the teaching material.
- e. The researcher was good enough in classroom management in handling the class.
- f. The researcher showed fair attitude to the students and warmed the troublemaker in the classroom.
- g. The researcher encouraged the students to be more active in the classroom.
- h. The researcher's voice was loud and clears enough, so that all the students could hear her voice.
- i. The researcher helped the students to review the teaching material, which made the students more understand what they had learnt.

**Table 6**  
**The result of cycle 2 tests**

No	Code	Score
1	R-1	64
2	R-2	64
3	R-3	60
4	R-4	60
5	R-5	64
6	R-6	56
7	R-7	52
8	R-8	64
9	R-9	56
10	R-10	60
11	R-11	68
12	R-12	60
13	R-13	56
14	R-14	56
15	R-15	56
16	R-16	64
17	R-17	52
18	R-18	56
19	R-19	60
20	R-20	68
21	R-21	52
22	R-22	52
23	R-23	56
24	R-24	52
25	R-25	52
26	R-26	60
<b>Sum</b>		1520
<b>Mean</b>		58.5

In this stage, students said that speaking was fun. They could enjoy with this activity. They did not doubt anymore to answered and asked question, because their curious was higher than their doubt. They must

brave to speak aloud in order to make their speaking better. The result 58.5 reached the minimum score at least 40. Therefore, cycle in this research was enough.

### C. DISCUSSION

**Table 7**  
**Percentage of Observation**

No	Students Participant	Pre cycle %	Cycle 1 %	Cycle 2 %
1	Students attendance	100	100	100
2	Students actively asked questions	19.2	31	42
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	26.9	27	46
4	Students participation in group	61.5	88.5	100
5	Students attentions	38.5	69.2	100

**Table 8**  
**Mean of Students' Achievement**

No	Code	Pre cycle	Cycle 1	Cycle 2
1	R-1	28	40	64
2	R-2	32	48	64
3	R-3	40	52	60
4	R-4	28	32	60
5	R-5	40	60	64
6	R-6	36	40	56
7	R-7	40	52	52
8	R-8	40	60	64
9	R-9	32	52	56

10	R-10	24	32	60
11	R-11	36	56	68
12	R-12	36	48	60
13	R-13	36	48	56
14	R-14	36	44	56
15	R-15	32	56	56
16	R-16	32	56	64
17	R-17	36	36	52
18	R-18	36	44	56
19	R-19	40	52	60
20	R-20	32	48	68
21	R-21	32	48	52
22	R-22	36	44	52
23	R-23	40	48	56
24	R-24	36	44	52
25	R-25	28	36	52
26	R-26	36	48	60
	<b>Sum</b>	824	1124	1520
	<b>Mean</b>	31.7	43.2	58.5

### 1. The comparison of pre cycle and cycle 1

In pre cycle we can see that students' activeness were very low. This can be concluded that there were about 62% students did not give attention to teacher's explanation. It was 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 express an asking and giving opinion expression, student who was pointed would point another student or his/her partner instead. This repeated over and over until there was someone who did not have a chance to refuse tried to express this expression.

In contrast, in cycle 1, students' responds toward speaking were shown significant improvement. It was resulted that students activeness/participation in speaking activity were 69%. It increased from pre cycle. Here, 2 students who were pointed to come forward for their group did not refuse or point another partner to come forward instead.

From the result above, the average students in Pre Cycle were only 31.7 and Cycle I was 43.2, the comparison between Pre Cycle and Cycle I improved 11.5%. It meant the use of information gap can improve students' achievement in speaking.

## **2. The Comparison of Cycle 1 and Cycle 2**

In cycle 1 we can see that students' activeness were very low. This can be concluded that the students did not give attention to teacher's explanation. It was shown by their attitudes during the class that most of them were talking to each other while the study in progress or sleeping. 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 come forward, student who was pointed would point another student or his/her partner instead. This repeated over and over until there was someone who did not have a chance to refuse tried to express this expression.

In contrast, in cycle 2, students' responds toward speaking were shown the improvement. It was resulted that students activeness/participation in speaking activity increased from cycle 1. Here, 4 students who were pointed to come forward for their group did not refuse or point another partner to come forward instead.

It can be said that the use of information gap technique were effective in improving students' speaking ability and motivated them



to be more active in engaging themselves in speaking activity. In short, students' were more actively speaking in English; they leaved their laziness and embarrassment by actively speaking.

In addition, their achievement in speaking also increased. Students mean in cycle I 43.2, increased up to 58.5 in cycle II. It was higher than minimum score that must be reached. Those indicated that information gap can improve students' speaking ability.

### **3. The comparison of pre cycle and all cycle**

Interpretation takes the result of analysis, makes the interferences pertinent to the research relation studied and draws conclusion about the relations. In the best average scores of the pre cycle cycle1 and cycle 2 of the students was 31.7, 43.2, and 58.5. It shows that cycle 1 scores of the class (43.2) is better than (31, 7) the result of the cycle 2 of the class is higher than cycle 1. Based on the result above, the writer concluded that the teaching learning activity by using information gap can improve the students' achievement in speaking.