# CHAPTER IV DATA INTERPRETATION 

## A. Process Of The Research

## 1. Pre Cycle Test

Pre cycle test was conducted on October $10^{\text {th }}, 2010$. Based on the observation the result, most of the students had difficulties in organizing the words grammatically. It could be seen from their writing result. It found many organized words ungrammatically in the students' writing. Beside that they consumed the time only thought about the words that would be written.

The researcher gave a test that students were asked to write a descriptive text (see Appendix 9). The test was followed by 23 students as the participants of the study and they gave 30 minutes to do it. The purpose of the test was to measure students' achievement before given an action.

After giving the test, the researcher examined the answer sheet and found the results.

$$
\begin{aligned}
M & =\frac{\sum X}{n} \\
& =\frac{1135}{23} \\
& =49.35
\end{aligned}
$$

From the result above, the average score of pre cycle was 49.35. It means that the mean of students in writing descriptive text is low. And need increasing in teaching learning of writing descriptive text because minimum passing score (KKM) is 60.

## 2. Cycle 1

The activity of cycle 1 was in line with the steps of planning activity. Cycle 1 activity was only in one meeting ( $2 \times 40$ minutes). Cycle 1 was conducted on October 16, 2010. The steps were as follow: a. Planning

1) The researcher identified the teaching learning design, such as, arranging lesson plan which was according to the teaching learning process which was using 'the power of two and four'.(see Appendix 3)
2) The researcher prepared the teaching learning process resources, such as, the materials, the media, the observation sheets, and the documentation.
3) The researcher prepared attendant list in order to know students’ activeness in joining teaching learning process by using 'the power of two and four'. (see Appendix 2)
4) The researcher prepared the test paper to measure the students' writing skill in descriptive text.
b. Acting

In this step, the teacher along the researcher conducted an activity as it had been planned in the lesson plan; organized the class to start doing the strategy and collecting data while repaired the problem. The activities were as follow:

1) Teacher showed picture and asked students about it and Students answered the questions orally.
2) Teacher gave an introduction to themes that would be discussed.
3) Teacher explained descriptive text and grammatical points.
4) Teacher gave the transcript of the text to students and asked students to find 5 difficult words.
5) Teacher gave some vocabularies that related to the topic.
6) After giving some vocabularies, teacher gave a new picture and asked students to answer some questions individually.
7) After all students had completed their answer, teacher arranged them into pairs and asked them to share their answers.
8) Teacher asked students to work in groups of four to share their answers from their previous pairs.
9) After finishing the work, teacher asked a delegation of each group to read their work in front of the class and others responded it.
10) Teacher asked some of them some questions related to their work that had been read.
c. Observing

The researcher observed the activity by using observation format and implemented the test. It was used to find out to what extent the action result reached the objective. The steps were as follow:

1) The researcher observed the teaching learning process in order to know the improvement of using 'the power of two and four' in teaching descriptive writing text.
2) After doing the treatment, the teacher gave students writing test to measure their writing skill.
3) The researcher wrote the success and the problems when the teaching learning in progress which was not enough sufficient in reaching the objectives.

The analyses of the observations were as follow:
Table 4.1
Students' activeness/participation in writing class

| No. | Indicators | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | The students are concern toward teacher's explanation on descriptive text. | 5 |
| 2. | The students are enthusiastic in responding teacher's question. | 3 |
| 3. | The students concern in group work | 4 |
| 4. | The students ask question to the teacher to clarify understanding | 2 |
| 5. | The students work together in a group to solve the problem | 3 |
| 6. | The students work communication during in group work. | 3 |
| 7. | The students actively express their ideas in discussion. | 4 |
| 8. | The students are able to appreciate other students' idea. | 4 |
|  | Total | 28 |
|  | Percentage | 70\% |
|  | Category | Good |

The criteria were as follow:
1: very low $=20 \%-36 \% \quad 4$ : good $=69 \%-84 \%$
2: low = 37\%-52\%
5: very good $=85 \%-100 \%$
3: enough $=53 \%-68 \%$
It was resulted that students activeness/participation in writing activity were $70 \%$ (see appendix 5). It can be said that the use of 'the power of two and four' is effective in improving students' writing skill in descriptive text. Students showed that they were good brave through the use of the strategy.

Table 4.2
Observation of the teacher's performance in teaching writing

| No | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Explaining the objectives and motivation: <br> a. Explaining all the objectives of the study <br> b. Motivating students to have an interest to write in English | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. | Capable in managing and organizing the class into groups of study | 4 |
| 3. | Helping the groups in doing task: Guiding the process of discussion in solving the problems. | 5 |
| 4. | Presentation: <br> a. Guiding students in presenting the discussion result in a presentation. <br> b. Giving chance for students to respond and ask. | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. | Giving an understanding and stimulus: <br> a. Giving students chance to ask and answer a question <br> b. Guiding students in making a conclusion. | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. | Group and individual evaluation: <br> a. Doing group evaluation <br> b. Doing individual evaluation | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Total | 36 |
|  | Percentage | 72\% |
|  | Category | Good |

The criteria were as follow:
1: very low $=20 \%-36 \%$
4: good $=69 \%-84 \%$
2: low = 37\%-52\%
5 : very good $=85 \%-100 \%$
3 : enough $=53 \%-68 \%$

It was resulted that teacher's performance in teaching writing was $72 \%$ (see appendix 6). This can be concluded that by using the power of two and four in writing, teacher can manage the class well. He could give the materials in fun way, and teacher seemed good confident in teaching writing using this strategy. Based on the result, it can be said that the use of the power of two and four teacher showed good performance in teaching writing.

The result of implementing test was:
$M=\frac{\sum X}{n}$
$=\frac{1553}{23}$
$=67.52$
The average score of this cycle was 67.52 , it meant that there was improvement in students' writing skill.
d. Reflecting

1) The teaching that had been done by the teacher and the students' respond had maximal well because the class was conducive, since students were fully concentrated to join the activity.
2) When the activity in progress, the students' work in learning process was maximal well. It can be seen from most students actively expressed their ideas in discussion and were able to appreciate the teacher's explanation. But it found that most students were passive, most of students did not ask the teacher to clarify understanding. It was then the duty of the teacher to give some more questions related to the subject to stimulate students in order to have a will or interest to join the activity.
3) Teacher was not enough doing individual evaluation. For example, teacher was less in checking students’ individual result. For the reason, teacher should pay attention more in students' individual result.
4) Time management was a very crucial factor in teaching learning process, for that process in group needed a bit of longer time, so teacher should try to manage and provide time perfectly.
5) The students' writing result was enough. There were little organizing words ungrammatically.

## 3. Cycle II

The second cycle was done based on the result of reflection from the first cycle. The result from observation told that the quality was good, and better it was needed another action in order the next cycle makes some improvement of the quality.

The activity of cycle II was in line with the steps of planning activity. Cycle II activity was only in one meeting (2x40 minutes). Cycle II was conducted on October 23, 2010. The steps were as follow:
a. Planning

1) The researcher arranged the lesson plan based on the teaching material (see Appendix 4)
2) The researcher improved the teaching strategy
3) The researcher prepared the teaching aid
4) The researcher prepared the sheets of observation
b. Acting

In this step what had been planed in the planning would be done according to the schedule that was arranged. In this step was done the teaching scenario that had been planed by the writer.

The teaching scenario in the cycle II was same with teaching scenario in the cycle I, but in the cycle II was done improvements that had not complete in the cycle I.

The activities in teaching learning process are:
The teacher explained about the material, although it had been explained on the day before.

1) Teacher asked the students about their problems on the previous lesson.
2) Teacher explained the problem
3) Teacher gave students the information table.
4) Teacher asked students to write simple sentences together.
5) Teacher wrote down the answer on the blackboard.
6) Teacher gave some vocabularies that related to the topic.
7) Teacher gives students papers of information table and some questions based on the information table individually
8) After all students had completed their answer, teacher arranged them into pairs and asked them to share their answers.
9) Teacher asked students to work in groups of four to share their answers from their previous pairs.
10) After finishing the work, teacher asked a delegation of each group to read their work in front of the class and others responded it.
11) Teacher asks some of them some questions related to their work that has been read.
12) Teacher gave a chance to students to ask the difficult materials.
13) Teacher provided feed back the material.
c. Observing

The researcher observed the activity by using observation format and implemented the test. It was used to find out to what extent the action result reached the objective. The steps were as follow:

1) The researcher observed the teaching learning process and gave a test in order to know the improvement of using 'the power of two and four' in teaching descriptive writing text.
2) After doing the treatment, the teacher gave students writing test to measure their writing skill.
3) Wrote the success and the problems when the teaching learning in progress which was only enough sufficient in reaching the objectives.

The analyses of the observations were as follow:
Table 4.3
Students' activeness/participation in writing class

| No. | Indicators | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | The students are concern toward teacher's explanation on descriptive text. | 5 |
| 2. | The students are enthusiastic in responding teacher's question. | 4 |
| 3. | The students concern in group work | 5 |
| 4. | The students ask question to the teacher to clarify understanding | 4 |
| 5. | The students work together in a group to solve the problem | 4 |
| 6. | The students work communication during in group work. | 3 |
| 7. | The students actively express their ideas in discussion. | 4 |
| 8. | The students are able to appreciate other students' idea. | 5 |
|  | Total | 34 |
|  | Percentage | 85\% |
|  | Category | Very Good |

The criteria were as follow:
1: very low $=20 \%-36 \% \quad 4$ : good $=69 \%-84 \%$
2: low = 37\%-52\%
5: very good = 85\%-100\%
3 : enough $=53 \%-68 \%$
It was resulted that students activeness/participation in writing activity were $85 \%$ or $15 \%$ increased from cycle 1 (see appendix 7). It showed that, the use of 'the power of two and four' as an alternative way in improving students' writing skill in descriptive text was very effective.

Table 4.4
Observation of the teacher's performance in teaching writing

| No <br> . | Indicator | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1. | Explaining the objectives and motivation: <br> c. Explaining all the objectives of the study <br> d. Motivating students to have an interest to write in <br> English | 5 |
| 2. | Capable in managing and organizing the class into <br> groups of study | 4 |
| 3. | Helping the groups in doing task: Guiding the process <br> of discussion in solving the problems. | 5 |
| 4. | Presentation: <br> c. Guiding students in presenting the discussion result <br> in a presentation. <br> d. Giving chance for students to respond and ask. | 4 |
| 5. | Giving an understanding and stimulus: <br> c. Giving students chance to ask and answer a question <br> d. Guiding students in making a conclusion. | 4 |
| 6. | Group and individual evaluation: <br> c. Doing group evaluation <br> d. Doing individual evaluation | 4 |
|  | 34 Percentage | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ |

The criteria were as follow:
1: very low $=20 \%-36 \%$
4: good $=69 \%-84 \%$
2: low = 37\%-52\%
5: very good $=85 \%-100 \%$
3: enough $=53 \%-68 \%$

It was resulted that teacher's performance in teaching writing was $84 \%$ or $12 \%$ increased from cycle 1 (see appendix 8 ). This can be concluded that by using the power of two and four in teaching writing, teacher can manage the class well. He could give the materials in fun way.

In the next meeting, teacher gave writing test. This was used to know the final score of students after they were taught
using the power of two and four. The result of Cycle II test was as follows:
$M=\frac{\sum X}{n}$
$=\frac{1783}{23}$
$=77.52$
The result of the cycle II test was 77.52 . The cycle II compared with the pre cycle test and cycle I, there were differences on the score average. The score of cycle II test had improved; it means that the use of the power of two and four helps students in writing descriptive text.
d. Reflecting

1) The teaching that had been done by the teacher maximum well. The teacher motivated the students before she showed the information table in front of them. The teacher was more creative in showing the media. And the class was more conducive, since students were fully concentrated to concern in group work.
2) The students' activity in learning process was maximum well. They were more interesting in grouping, because it would help them in creating their writing.
3) There were many students enthusiast in the teaching-learning process, because the teacher more paid attention and gave motivation to the students that had difficulties in transferring their idea.
4) Teacher had provided enough time; this can be shown that most of groups can present their answer in front of the class. There was still provided a time to evaluate the activity that had just been done deeply.

## B. Research Finding And Discussion

## 1. Pre Cycle Test

In this cycle, the teacher gave a writing test. After finishing the writing, the teacher asked them to collect their writing result. The writing score is low, because they had to imagine the thing that would be written. Beside that, they got difficulties in organizing the word grammatically. After implementing the test, the researcher examined it and gave score. The score of all students that had been counted as follow:

Table 4.5
The test score of pre cycle test

| No | Name | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Abbas Asiri | 30 |
| 2 | Amhad Mustofa | 58 |
| 3 | Ana Fa’Atin | 46 |
| 4 | Faidatul Laili | 35 |
| 5 | Halimah Meliana Rosa | 48 |
| 6 | Kafiyatun Nihlah | 67 |
| 7 | Khoirul Amar | 33 |
| 8 | Lilik Fitriawati | 47 |
| 9 | M. Alwi Safiqi | 47 |
| 10 | M. Riyadul Jinan | 46 |
| 11 | Minhatus Saniyah | 77 |
| 12 | Nisa' Uswati | 56 |
| 13 | Nur Ismawan | 34 |
| 14 | Nur Kamilah | 38 |
| 15 | Rahmat Hidayat | 68 |
| 16 | Rona Nisrina Ulaiya | 82 |
| 17 | Sajidah Kamilah | 59 |
| 18 | Shofwah Fuadiyah | 64 |
| 19 | Siti Hafidoh | 49 |
| 20 | Shulthonul Wasilin | 23 |
| 21 | Tahfika | 34 |
| 22 | Ulil Kirom | 31 |
| 23 | Wahidatus Shiyamiyah | 63 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 1 3 5}$ |
|  | Average | $\mathbf{4 9 . 3 5}$ |

After the data had been analyzed, the researcher counted the mean to know the average score of students. To know the mean of students score, the formula is as follow:

Mean of students' score $=\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { Number of students }}$
Mean of students' score $=\frac{1135}{23}$

$$
=49.35
$$

The mean of the students writing result of pre cycle test was 49.35. It means that the students' writing value is low.

The result of pre cycle test was not satisfactory yet. The writer was aware that most the students in VIII still had difficulties to write a descriptive text. Hence, she intended to assist them to improve their writing through their skill in organizing words grammatically. Hopefully, it could improve their ability in organizing the words in descriptive text. She considered of giving continuous improvement to get better result. And she is also aware that the strategy is an important thing to guide the students in writing descriptive text.

## 2. Cycle 1

In this cycle the researcher used the power of two and four to teach writing descriptive text. After the students finishing their writing, the teacher assessed their result. And the result was:

Table 4.6
The test score of cycle I test

| No | Name | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Abbas Asiri | 71 |
| 2 | Amhad Mustofa | 80 |
| 3 | Ana Fa’Atin | 77 |
| 4 | Faidatul Laili | 75 |
| 5 | Halimah Meliana Rosa | 84 |
| 6 | Kafiyatun Nihlah | 75 |
| 7 | Khoirul Amar | 47 |


| 8 | Lilik Fitriawati | 69 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 9 | M. Alwi Safiqi | 78 |
| 10 | M. Riyadul Jinan | 52 |
| 11 | Minhatus Saniyah | 90 |
| 12 | Nisa’ Uswati | 61 |
| 13 | Nur Ismawan | 54 |
| 14 | Nur Kamilah | 60 |
| 15 | Rahmat Hidayat | 67 |
| 16 | Rona Nisrina Ulaiya | 87 |
| 17 | Sajidah Kamilah | 67 |
| 18 | Shofwah Fuadiyah | 68 |
| 19 | Siti Hafidoh | 64 |
| 20 | Shulthonul Wasilin | 54 |
| 21 | Tahfika | 53 |
| 22 | Ulil Kirom | 52 |
| 23 | Wahidatus Shiyamiyah | 68 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 5 5 3}$ |
|  | Average | $\mathbf{6 7 . 5 2}$ |

From the students' writing result, she could calculate the mean of the score using the following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mean of students' score }=\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { Number of students }} \\
& \begin{aligned}
\text { Mean of students' score } & =\frac{1553}{23} \\
& =67.52
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

The analysis above shows that the score mean of students' writing result of the first cycle is 67.52 . It means that the students' writing value is enough. The result of the second cycle is better than the previous one. There is improvement for the students' skill although it is step by step.

## 3. Cycle II

In this cycle, the teacher implemented the power of two and four as previous cycle. After the students finishing their writing, they
collected it to the teacher. Then the researcher assessed their writing result. And the result was:

Table 4.7
The test score of cycle II test

| No | Name | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Abbas Asiri | 80 |
| 2 | Amhad Mustofa | 79 |
| 3 | Ana Fa’Atin | 79 |
| 4 | Faidatul Laili | 78 |
| 5 | Halimah Meliana Rosa | 80 |
| 6 | Kafiyatun Nihlah | 79 |
| 7 | Khoirul Amar | 75 |
| 8 | Lilik Fitriawati | 83 |
| 9 | M. Alwi Safiqi | 87 |
| 10 | M. Riyadul Jinan | 72 |
| 11 | Minhatus Saniyah | 85 |
| 12 | Nisa' Uswati | 78 |
| 13 | Nur Ismawan | 79 |
| 14 | Nur Kamilah | 70 |
| 15 | Rahmat Hidayat | 77 |
| 16 | Rona Nisrina Ulaiya | 83 |
| 17 | Sajidah Kamilah | 75 |
| 18 | Shofwah Fuadiyah | 84 |
| 19 | Siti Hafidoh | 75 |
| 20 | Shulthonul Wasilin | 68 |
| 21 | Tahfika | 68 |
| 22 | Ulil Kirom | 66 |
| 23 | Wahidatus Shiyamiyah | 83 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 7 8 3}$ |
|  | Average | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 2}$ |
|  |  |  |

The result of the students' writing can also be calculated by using the following formula:

Mean of students' score $=\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { Number of students }}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Mean of students' score } & =\frac{1783}{23} \\
& =77.52
\end{aligned}
$$

The mean of students' writing result was 77.52. It means that the students' value is good. The mean of the students' writing score is also better than the previous one. It is higher than her target. The researcher feels that using the power of two and four to improve students' writing skill that included the parts, qualities, and characteristics of the objects is successful. The students' use of the target language increased as well as their skill to write. And also, the power of two and four strategy contributes for them to write a descriptive text.

## 4. The Analysis Of The Whole Test

The result of the test from the pre cycle test to cycle II test can be seen briefly as follow:

Table 4.8
The Whole Score of Students’ Writing Result

| No | Name | Score <br> Pre Cycle | Score <br> Cycle I | Score <br> Cycle II |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Abbas Asiri | 30 | 71 | 80 |
| 2 | Amhad Mustofa | 58 | 80 | 79 |
| 3 | Ana Fa'Atin | 46 | 77 | 79 |
| 4 | Faidatul Laili | 35 | 75 | 78 |
| 5 | Halimah Meliana Rosa | 48 | 84 | 80 |
| 6 | Kafiyatun Nihlah | 67 | 75 | 79 |
| 7 | Khoirul Amar | 33 | 47 | 75 |
| 8 | Lilik Fitriawati | 47 | 69 | 83 |
| 9 | M. Alwi Safiqi | 47 | 78 | 87 |
| 10 | M. Riyadul Jinan | 46 | 52 | 72 |
| 11 | Minhatus Saniyah | 77 | 90 | 85 |
| 12 | Nisa' Uswati | 56 | 61 | 78 |
| 13 | Nur Ismawan | 34 | 54 | 79 |
| 14 | Nur Kamilah | 38 | 60 | 70 |
| 15 | Rahmat Hidayat | 68 | 67 | 77 |


| 16 | Rona Nisrina Ulaiya | 82 | 87 | 83 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Sajidah Kamilah | 59 | 67 | 75 |
| 18 | Shofwah Fuadiyah | 64 | 68 | 84 |
| 19 | Siti Hafidoh | 49 | 64 | 75 |
| 20 | Shulthonul Wasilin | 23 | 54 | 68 |
| 21 | Tahfika | 34 | 53 | 68 |
| 22 | Ulil Kirom | 31 | 52 | 66 |
| 23 | Wahidatus Shiyamiyah | 63 | 68 | 83 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 8 3}$ |
|  | Average | $\mathbf{4 9 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 2}$ |

From the table above, the use of the power of two and four can improve students' writing skill in descriptive text. So, this classroom action research of the implementation of the power of two and four is successful. It can be seen from the result in each cycle.

The improvement of students' achievement in writing descriptive text can be seen thought the diagram as follow:

The Improvement of Students' Writing Skill


From the diagram above, the research conclude that there is an improvement on students’ writing skill in descriptive text using the power of two and four. Pre-cycle shows that students’ average is 49.35, it means that students’ writing skill is low because minimum passing score (KKM) is 60 .

In cycle I showed that there was improvement up to 67.52. From the cycle II the students' average increased became 77.52, it means that there was improvement in every cycle after using the power of two and four and the use of the power of two and four was so effective in improving students’ writing skill.

The power of two and four can improve students’ writing skill in descriptive text because writing is difficult and needs long time to think it and the power of two and four is a learning in small groups to foster maximum cooperation through the learning activities by their own friends with a member of two and four people in it to achieve basic competence. It designed to maximize learning collaborative (joint) and minimize the gap between students who are single with other students. Its activity is done so that the emergence of synergy that is two and four is certainly better than one and students can help each other.

This can be concluded that, students or class need some alternative strategy in creating a supportive environment in teaching learning process. Teacher can improve his/her teaching by enriching the technique, strategy, or having some alternative ways. And it can be said that the use of 'the power of two and four' is effective in improving students’ writing skill, and for the teacher on the other side, she could show very good performance in teaching writing. Since by the teachers' performance/strategy in his teaching affecting students’ learning automatically, so teacher should be creative in searching for the best strategy to overcome it.

