

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

In this research, the researcher used classroom action research. It consisted of pre cycle, first cycle, and second cycle. It purposed to know students ability in speaking and writing skill especially on using WH-questions. In this findings, the researcher presented three points such as analysis of students' achievement before using technique, result, and data analysis. The first discussed about analysis of students' achievement before using technique. Then the result, it discussed about result of the first test in cycle I and result of the second test in cycle II. The last is the data analysis, it discussed about analysis of the first cycle, analysis of the second cycle, and the last is interpretation of the whole cycle.

#### **A. Analysis of students' achievement after using technique**

The researcher did observation at eleventh grade Bilingual Class System (BCS) of MAN 2 Kudus. The researcher discussed with English teacher of MAN 2 Kudus about the students' problem in using WH-questions such as there were still many students that did not know how to make questions with WH-questions. They were still weak on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

In the implementation of action, there were many students did not understand about WH-questions usage in sentences. Researcher thought that WH-questions usage was important in grammar and pronunciation because WH-questions usage is always used to communicate to other people. At least they would be able to use WH-questions correctly by study grammar and pronunciation.

After students were given information gap technique in using WH-questions by the researcher, they started to be able to use WH-questions in sentences and their improvement in speaking and writing increased step by step. The use of information gap technique helped the students' ability and the students' achievement in understanding WH-questions usage.

## B. Result

### 1. Result of pre test in pre cycle

Pre cycle was conducted on Friday, October 12<sup>th</sup> 2012. There were 29 students who took a test from 30 students because one of them was sick. A test was given by the researcher before conducting the action research. The purpose was to know how far the students could speak English fluently using WH-questions by performing the information gap technique relating the material was given by the researcher. Based on the observation result of teaching learning process, the teacher still taught the material of report text in the classroom by using conventional method. The teacher did conventional method which did not use the researcher's method in teaching learning process.

Teacher started to teach by explaining the material of report text. Sometimes he asked students to write WH-questions usage on the whiteboard such as how to answer from WH-questions. When teacher was explaining the material, students were asked to listen carefully what teacher said.

The pre-test result would be compared to the students' test results after using technique to know the improvement of students' ability in using WH-questions. The result of pre cycle can be seen in the table below:

**Table 6**  
**The Percentages of Students' Observation**

No	Students Participant	Scale of Score				
		%	A	B	C	D
1	Students attendance	97	√			
2	Students actively asked questions	20				√
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	30				√
4	Students participation in pair	97	√			
5	Students attentions	97	√			

Note :

A : 80% - 100%

B : 70% - 79%

C : 60% - 69%

D : < 60%

Based on the observation that was done by the researcher, the students were less motivated. They looked bored; but most of them paid attention to the teacher explanation. There were 29 students attended from 30 students. Only 6 students asked questions. 29 students paid attention. During the question answer session, almost of them were silent. There were just 9 students participated in answering the teacher question.

**Table 7**  
**The Score Analysis of Pre Test**

No	Code	Score Per Aspect					Total Score	Total Score x 4
		A	B	C	D	E		
1	R-1	3	4	3	2	3	15	60
2	R-2	3	3	5	3	2	16	64
3	R-3	4	3	3	3	3	16	64
4	R-4	3	2	4	4	3	16	64
5	R-5	2	3	3	3	4	15	60
6	R-6	3	2	3	3	2	13	52
7	R-7	3	4	4	3	3	17	68
8	R-8	3	2	3	4	3	15	60
9	R-9	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
10	R-10	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
11	R-11	3	3	3	2	3	14	56
12	R-12	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
13	R-13	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
14	R-14	2	3	3	3	3	14	56

15	R-15	3	4	3	2	3	15	60
16	R-16	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
17	R-17	2	3	3	4	3	15	60
18	R-18	3	3	3	2	3	14	56
19	R-19	3	3	3	4	3	16	64
20	R-20	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
21	R-21	4	3	3	3	2	15	60
22	R-22	3	2	3	3	2	13	52
23	R-23	3	3	4	3	3	16	64
24	R-24	2	3	3	3	4	15	60
25	R-25	2	3	3	2	3	13	52
26	R-26	4	3	3	3	3	16	64
27	R-27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	R-28	3	3	3	4	3	16	64
29	R-29	3	2	3	2	3	13	52
30	R-30	4	3	2	3	3	15	60
	n = 30							$\Sigma = 1728$ $M = \frac{\Sigma X}{n}$ $= \frac{1728}{30}$ $= 57.6$

Note:

- A : Pronunciation
- B : Grammar
- C : Vocabulary
- D : Fluency
- E : Comprehension

According to the table score analysis of pre test, the final score of pre test was counted using the formula as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{1728}{30} = 57.6$$

Where  $\sum$  represents “sum of”, X represented any raw score value, n represented the total number of students, and M represented the *mean*.

From the result of pre cycle above, it can be concluded that the students’ ability in using WH-questions was still poor. Most of the students were poor in all aspects especially in pronunciation, grammar, and fluency.

The average of students test result of pre cycle was 57.6. It means that the result was low. It was needed to reach for at least 75 as minimum score.

## **2. Result of test in cycle I**

### **a. Planning**

- 1) Teacher identified problem in pre-cycle and formulated the problems.
- 2) Teacher arranged a lesson plan about the material of narrative text.
- 3) Teacher prepared the test instrument.
- 4) Teacher prepared teaching facilities.
- 5) Teacher prepared the students’ attendance list.

### **b. Acting**

- 1) Teacher introduced and explains the topic.
- 2) Teacher divided students into pairs.
- 3) Teacher distributed the worksheet.
- 4) Put the information sheets face down at the front of the class.
- 5) Students listened to the teacher and do the teacher’s instruction.
- 6) Teacher showed the example of narrative text to students.
- 7) Teacher explained the material of narrative text. In this activity the teacher explained the use of WH-questions in the sentence and gave an example of WH-question using information gap technique.
- 8) Teacher asked students to work in pairs, each has accessed to some information.
- 9) Each student completed the missing information in sentences.

c. Observing

- 1) Teacher observed classroom activity.
- 2) Teacher observed the group discussion/participation students in their pair work.
- 3) Teacher observed the teaching learning process.

d. Reflecting

Reflecting is analyzing the result of observation and test in cycle I. The activities in this stage were:

- 1) Teacher analyzed the data from the observation checklist and result of the test to find out the improvement of the students' ability in using WH-questions after using information gap technique.
- 2) Teacher discussed the teaching learning process that did in order to know the weakness found in the previous activities and to plan the better activities in cycle II.

The test in cycle I was conducted on Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup> 2012 and followed by 29 students from 30 students because one of them was sick. They were 9 boys and 21 girls. Only 1 girl was absent. The test in cycle I was started at 09.30 a.m. until 12.00 p.m. The students were divided into pairs and they were given the worksheet in front of them. The students must work in their pairs. They must make some questions using WH-questions that related to text. They used information gap technique to improve their ability in speaking and writing.

In teaching learning process, narrative text as the material was taught by the researcher. The teacher helped him to observe the students' activities in teaching learning process.

**Table 8**  
**The Percentages of Students' Observation in Cycle I**

No	Students Participant	Scale of Score				
		%	A	B	C	D

1	Students attendance	97	√			
2	Students actively asked questions	33				√
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	50				√
4	Students participation in pair	97	√			
5	Students attentions	97	√			

Note :

A : 80% - 100%

B : 70% - 79%

C : 60% - 69%

D : < 60%

Based on the observation that was done by the researcher, the students were less motivated. All of them paid attention to the teacher explanation. There were 29 students attended from 30 students. Only 10 students asked questions. 29 students paid attention. During the question answer session, just 15 students participated in answering the teacher question.

**Table 9**

**The Result of Observation for Researcher in Cycle I**

No	Researcher Ability	Indicator	Score				
			A	B	C	D	E
1	Opened the Lesson	➤ Prepared media in teaching learning	√				
		➤ Checked students attendance	√				
2	Researcher Explanation	➤ Researcher explanation clearly	√				
3	Classroom management	➤ Applied the mind to the all pairs	√				

		➤ Made students to be more active		√			
		➤ Chewed out the troublemaker		√			
4	Language Usage	➤ Used English pronunciation		√			
5	Media Usage	➤ Used media to clear the explanation	√				
6	Closed the Lesson	➤ Concluded the lesson		√			

Note :

A : 80 - 100

B : 70 - 79

C : 60 - 69

D : 50 - 59

E : < 50

Based on the observation for researcher above, the researcher was good enough in opening the lesson in which inside of preparing the instruments, the material and did apperception. In giving explanation of the teaching material was good. The researcher was good enough in using media to clear the explanation and in applying the mind to all pairs but he was not good enough in making students to be more active, in chewing out the troublemaker, and in using English pronunciation.

**Table 10**

**The Score Analysis of Test in Cycle I**

No	Code	Score Per Aspect					Total Score	Total Score x 4
		A	B	C	D	E		
1	R-1	4	4	3	3	4	18	72
2	R-2	4	3	3	5	4	19	76
3	R-3	4	3	4	4	4	19	76
4	R-4	4	3	4	3	3	17	68



5	R-5	5	3	4	4	5	21	84
6	R-6	3	4	4	4	4	19	76
7	R-7	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
8	R-8	4	3	4	5	4	20	80
9	R-9	4	3	5	4	4	20	80
10	R-10	4	3	4	3	3	17	68
11	R-11	5	4	4	3	4	20	80
12	R-12	4	4	3	3	4	18	72
13	R-13	3	3	4	4	3	17	68
14	R-14	3	3	3	4	4	17	68
15	R-15	4	3	4	3	4	18	72
16	R-16	4	3	4	4	3	18	72
17	R-17	4	4	3	3	5	19	76
18	R-18	4	3	3	4	4	18	72
19	R-19	4	4	4	3	4	19	76
20	R-20	4	3	5	5	4	21	84
21	R-21	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
22	R-22	4	5	4	4	3	20	80
23	R-23	4	4	3	3	4	18	72
24	R-24	4	3	4	5	4	20	80
25	R-25	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
26	R-26	4	3	4	3	4	18	72
27	R-27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	R-28	3	3	4	4	3	17	68
29	R-29	3	4	4	3	4	18	72
30	R-30	3	5	4	5	4	21	84

	n = 30	$\Sigma = 2164$ $M = \frac{\Sigma X}{n}$ $= \frac{2164}{30}$ $= 72.13$
--	--------	---

Note:

- A : Pronunciation
- B : Grammar
- C : Vocabulary
- D : Fluency
- E : Comprehension

According to the table score analysis of test in cycle I, the final score of test was counted using the formula as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{2164}{30} = 72.13$$

Where  $\sum$  represents “sum of”, X represented any raw score value, n represented the total number of students, and M represented the *mean*.

From the result of cycle I above, it can be concluded that the students’ ability in using WH-questions was good enough.

The average of students test result of cycle I was 72.13. It means that the result was good enough.

### 3. Result of Post Test in Cycle II

#### a) Planning

- 1) Teacher identified the problems in cycle I and formulated the problems.
- 2) Teacher arranged improvement lesson plan about the material of Analytical Exposition text.
- 3) Teacher prepared the test instrument.
- 4) Teacher prepared teaching facilities.
- 5) Teacher prepared the students’ attendance list.

b) Acting

- 1) Teacher divided students into pairs.
- 2) Teacher distributed the worksheet.
- 3) Teacher put the information sheets face down in front of the class.
- 4) Students accepted the worksheet.
- 5) Students listened to the teacher and do the teacher's instruction.
- 6) Teacher showed the example of Analytical Exposition text to students.
- 7) Teacher explained the material. In this activity the teacher explained the use of WH-questions in the sentence.
- 8) Teacher gave an example of WH-question usage in a sentence by using information gap technique.
- 9) Teacher asked students to work in pairs, each has accessed to some information.
- 10) Each student completed the missing information in sentences.

c) Observing

- 1) Teacher observed classroom activity such as students' interest, students' behavior and students' response by this technique.
- 2) Teacher observed the group discussion/participation students in their group work.
- 3) Teacher observed the teaching learning process.

d) Reflecting

The teacher evaluated the steps in teaching learning process, discussed the result of observation, and concluded the result of students' understanding after using information gap technique for the improvement of students' achievement in learning WH-questions.

Post test in cycle II was conducted on Friday, October 19<sup>th</sup> 2012 and Wednesday, October 24<sup>th</sup> 2012 and followed by 29 students from 30 students because one of them was sick. Same with cycle I, the students were divided into pairs and they were given the worksheet in front of them. The students must work in their pairs. They must make some

questions using WH-questions that related to text. They used information gap technique to improve their ability in using WH-questions.

In teaching learning process, Analytical Exposition text as the material was taught by the researcher. The teacher helped him to observe the students' activities in teaching learning process.

**Table 11**  
**The Percentages of Students' Observation in Cycle II**

No	Students Participant	Scale of Score				
		%	A	B	C	D
1	Students attendance	97	√			
2	Students actively asked questions	63			√	
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	53				√
4	Students participation in pair	97	√			
5	Students attentions	97	√			

Note :

- A : 80% - 100%
- B : 70% - 79%
- C : 60% - 69%
- D : < 60%

Based on the observation that was done by the researcher, the students were enough motivated. All of them paid attention to the teacher explanation. There were 29 students attended from 30 students. There were 19 students asked questions. 29 students paid attention. During the question answer session, just 16 students participated in answering the teacher question.

**Table 12**  
**The Result of Observation for Researcher in Cycle II**

No	Researcher Ability	Indicator	Score				
			A	B	C	D	E
1	Opened the Lesson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Prepared media in teaching learning</li> <li>➤ Checked students attendance</li> </ul>	√				
2	Researcher Explanation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Researcher explanation clearly</li> </ul>	√				
3	Classroom management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Applied the mind to the all pairs</li> <li>➤ Made students to be more active</li> <li>➤ Chewed out the troublemaker</li> </ul>	√	√			
4	Language Usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Used English pronunciation</li> </ul>	√				
5	Media Usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Used media to clear the explanation</li> </ul>	√				
6	Closed the Lesson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Concluded the lesson</li> </ul>	√				

Note :

A : 80 - 100

B : 70 - 79

C : 60 - 69

D : 50 - 59

E : < 50

Based on the observation for researcher above, the researcher was good in opening the lesson in which inside of preparing the instruments, the material and did apperception. In giving explanation of the teaching material was good. In managed classroom, he was not good enough in applying the mind to all pairs and in chewing out the troublemaker but he

was good in making the students to be more active. He was good enough in using English pronunciation, in using media to clear the explanation, and in concluding the lesson.

**Table 13**  
**The Score Analysis of Post Test**

No	Code	Score Per Aspect					Total Score	Total Score x 4
		A	B	C	D	E		
1	R-1	5	3	4	5	4	21	84
2	R-2	4	3	5	5	4	21	84
3	R-3	5	4	4	4	5	22	88
4	R-4	5	4	5	4	5	23	92
5	R-5	5	4	4	5	4	22	88
6	R-6	4	3	5	4	5	21	84
7	R-7	5	3	4	5	5	22	88
8	R-8	5	3	4	4	5	21	84
9	R-9	5	4	5	5	5	24	96
10	R-10	4	3	5	5	4	21	84
11	R-11	5	4	5	5	5	24	96
12	R-12	5	3	3	5	5	21	84
13	R-13	4	3	5	4	5	21	84
14	R-14	4	3	5	5	5	22	88
15	R-15	5	3	5	4	5	22	88
16	R-16	5	3	5	4	5	22	88
17	R-17	4	3	5	4	5	21	84
18	R-18	5	4	4	5	5	23	92
19	R-19	5	4	4	5	3	21	84
20	R-20	5	4	5	5	4	23	92
21	R-21	4	3	5	5	5	22	88
22	R-22	5	3	4	5	4	21	84
23	R-23	5	4	5	5	4	23	92

24	R-24	5	3	4	5	4	21	84
25	R-25	5	3	4	5	5	22	88
26	R-26	4	4	5	4	5	22	88
27	R-27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	R-28	5	4	4	5	5	23	92
29	R-29	4	3	5	5	5	22	88
30	R-30	5	3	5	5	4	22	88
	n = 30							$\Sigma = 2544$ $M = \frac{\Sigma X}{n}$ $= \frac{2544}{30}$ $= 84.8$

Note:

- A : Pronunciation
- B : Grammar
- C : Vocabulary
- D : Fluency
- E : Comprehension

According to the table score analysis of post test, the final score of test was counted using the formula as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{2544}{30} = 84.8$$

Where  $\sum$  represents “sum of”, X represented any raw score value, n represented the total number of students, and M represented the *mean*.

From the result of cycle II above, it can be concluded that the students’ ability in using WH-questions was good but in grammar aspect, the students got fair score.

The average of students test result of cycle II was 84.8. It means that the result was good enough.

### C. Discussion

**Table 14**  
**Percentage of Observation for Students**

No	Students Participant	Pre Cycle %	Cycle I %	Cycle II %
1	Students attendance	97	97	97
2	Students actively asked questions	20	33	63
3	Students participation in answering the teacher question	30	50	53
4	Students participation in pair	97	97	97
5	Students attentions	97	97	97

**Table 15**  
**Mean of Students' Achievement**

No	Code	Pre Cycle	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	R-1	60	72	84
2	R-2	64	76	84
3	R-3	64	76	88
4	R-4	64	68	92
5	R-5	60	84	88
6	R-6	52	76	84
7	R-7	68	72	88
8	R-8	60	80	84
9	R-9	68	80	96
10	R-10	56	68	84
11	R-11	56	80	96
12	R-12	56	72	84
13	R-13	64	68	84



14	R-14	56	68	88
15	R-15	60	72	88
16	R-16	56	72	88
17	R-17	60	76	84
18	R-18	56	72	92
19	R-19	64	76	84
20	R-20	56	84	92
21	R-21	60	72	88
22	R-22	52	80	84
23	R-23	64	72	92
24	R-24	60	80	84
25	R-25	52	72	88
26	R-26	64	72	88
27	R-27	-	-	-
28	R-28	64	68	92
29	R-29	52	72	88
30	R-30	60	84	88
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>1728</b>	<b>2164</b>	<b>2544</b>
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>72.13</b>	<b>84.8</b>

### 1. Analysis of Cycle I

The analysis of cycle I shows that the average of students' test result of first cycle was 72.13. The highest score was 84 and the lowest score was 68. From analysis above, the average of the results was 72.13. Some students had difficult in using WH-questions. The students not only had difficulty to use WH-questions but also in making conversation with their pairs, in using grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary in systematic using WH-questions.

The analysis above shows that the result of first cycle was better than previous one. There were more improvements although it was step by

step in this cycle. It shows that there were no students who get the score under 60. So, it can be continued to the next cycle.

## **2. Analysis of Cycle II**

The result of analysis in cycle II shows that the average of students' test result of the cycle II was 84.8. The highest score was 96 and the lowest score was 84. In teaching learning process, that was good enough because some students were more active and the students were easy to make conversation with their pairs. The students were easy to use WH-questions but only in grammar, they were still weak.

From the result above, the analysis shows that the result of cycle II was better than cycle I. There were more improvements in cycle II although it was step by step. It can be concluded that the use of information gap technique can improve the students' ability in using WH-questions.

## **3. The Comparison of Pre cycle and Cycle I**

In pre cycle, the students' activeness were very low. This can be concluded that there were 20 % students asked questions to the teacher and 30 % students gave participation in answering to teacher's questions. 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 practice speaking in front of class, 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 communicate this conversation.

In contrast, in cycle I, students' responds toward speaking were shown significant improvement. It was resulted that students activeness/participation in speaking activity were 33 % students asked questions to the teacher and 50 % students gave participation in answering to teacher's questions. 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 of students in pre cycle was 57.6 and cycle I was 72.13. The comparison between pre cycle and cycle I improved 14.53. It meant that the use of information gap technique can improve students' ability in using WH-questions.

#### **4. The Comparison of Cycle I and Cycle II**

In cycle, the students' activeness were 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 speak their speaking.

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, 2 students who were pointed to come forward for their pair 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' ability and motivated them to be more active in engaging themselves in speaking and writing activity. In short, students were more actively speaking and writing in English; they left their laziness and embarrassment by actively speaking and writing.

In addition, their achievement in speaking also increased. Students' mean in cycle I 72.13 increased up to 84.8 in cycles II. It was higher than minimum score that must be reached. Those indicated that information gap can improve students' speaking and writing ability.

#### **5. 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, cycle I and cycle II of the students was 57.6, 72.13, and 84.8. It shows that cycle I scores of the class (72.13) are better than (57.6) pre cycle. The result of cycle II of the class is higher than cycle I. Based on the result above, the researcher concluded that the teaching learning activity by using information gap technique can improve the students' ability in using WH-questions.

#### **Diagram Improvement of Students' Score in Using WH-Questions**

