**CHAPTER IV**

**THE DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS**

**4.1 The Data**

This study applied in quantitative data. The quantitative data was taken from the mean of the students in taking multiple choice test. This research was conducted in one class consists of VIII-2 students. It was accomplished in two cycles. Every cycle consisted of three stages of four stages of action research. They were planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. The second cycle was conducting in three meetings so there were six meetings. The students were given 10 question of multiple choice tests.

**4.1.1. The Quantitative Data**

The quantitative data was taken from the result of multiple choice test which were carried out in two cycles. The improvement of students’ reading comprehension by using Think-Pair-Share can be seen from the mean score of the students from the cycle I and II as follow:

**TABLE II**

**The Result of Students’ Scores in the Two Reading Test**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No**  **1** | **Students’ Initial**  **2** | **Cycle I**  **3** | **Cycle II**  **4** |
| 1 | AS | 40 | 80 |
| 2 | AR | 20 | 60 |
| 3 | BL | 20 | 60 |
| 4 | DPJ | 40 | 100 |
| 5 | DZM | 70 | 90 |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 6 | G | 30 | 70 |
| 7 | IPB | 40 | 90 |
| 8 | IS | 20 | 80 |
| 9 | IW | 70 | 90 |
| 10 | IP | 30 | 70 |
| 11 | JZ | 20 | 80 |
| 12 | KN | 20 | 70 |
| 13 | KDJ | 20 | 80 |
| 14 | MFR | 0 | 60 |
| 15 | PAS | 30 | 80 |
| 16 | PNA | 20 | 70 |
| 17 | RI | 30 | 80 |
| 18 | S | 30 | 80 |
| 19 | SAA | 70 | 100 |
| 20 | UPD | 10 | 50 |
|  | Total | = 630 | = 1540 |
|  | Mean | = 31,5 | = 77 |

**4.1.2. Qualitative data**

The qualitative data were analyzed from observation sheet and diary notes. In the qualitative data can be seen both teacher and students’ behavior and progress during the process teaching and learning process in cycle one and cycle two.

* + - 1. **Observation sheet**

In observation sheet, the researcher noted that students were active and enthusiastic in learning narrative text by implementing think pair share strategy. Besides that, the researcher analyzed the students activity in the class before teaching learning process. The researcher gave opening and started adaption how they learn English subject. It can look around from their activity in the class. Even though they still confused to understand especially in reading learning. It can be seen Appendix IV

* + - 1. **Diary Notes**

Diary notes were written by the writer in every meeting during conducting the research. Diary notes were done to write and report the moments of events and daily activity that happen in the class. Diary notes used to describe writer thoughts and feelings about teaching learning process. The writer recorded everything what happened during teaching learning process including reflection and evaluation of directed reading thinking activity strategy in teaching reading comprehension. The complete data could be seen in AppendixV.

* 1. **Data Analysis**

**4.2.1. Analysis Quantitative Data**

The writer gave multiple choice tests of reading comprehension at the end of cycle. During the research, it was found out that the students’ score first reading comprehension competence test of cycle 1 was lower than the second reading comprehension competence test of cycle II.

The improvement of students’ score kept growing from the first cycle until the second reading comprehension competence test of cycle II. The improvement of the students’ score in the reading comprehension by using Think-Pair-Share strategy could be seen from mean of students’ score during the research the following formula was applied:

Where := the mean of the students

= the total score

*N* = the number of students

In the first competence test, the total score of the students was 630 and the number of students was 20, the mean was:

= = 31,5

In the second competence test, the total score of the students was 1540 and the number of students was 20, the mean was:

= = 77

The mean of the students’ score in the second competence test was the highest. The number of master students was calculated by applying the following formula:

P = X 100%

Where : P: the percentage of the students

R: the number of the students who get the point above

T: the total number of students who do test

The percentage of the improvement of the students’ reading comprehensive could be seen as the follows:

P1 = x 100% = 15%

P2 = X 100% = 80%

The result showed the improvement of the students’ score from the first competence test to the second competence test. The first competence test was 15% (three students) who get 70 points, in the second competence test 80% (sixteen students) who get 70 points. It was only four students did not get good point but their score improved from the first competence test to the second competence test.

**4.2.1.1. The Data Cycle I**

The first cycle started in the first meeting. It was done in three meetings, as follows:

1. **Planning**

The plan was arranged before doing the research. First of all, lesson plan which used Think Pair Share strategy were prepared.

1. **Action**

Action of the first cycle started in the first meeting. The following in the procedure of the action in cycle I. The following activities are done as follows:

1. **First Meeting**
2. Students’ background knowledge about narrative text was brain.
3. The meaning and the purpose of narrative text were explained to the students.
4. Students were divided into some groups : each group consistsof 4 students
5. Narrative texts were given to each of students in class and they were asked to read it.
6. The students asked to find the meaning of the narrative text

whichgiven by the teacher.

1. **Second Meeting**
2. The students’ memories of the previous topic were recalled by asking questions orally. This meeting was continuity of the previous meeting.
3. Students were divided into 10 groups.
4. The narrative text were given to each of member and each group was asked to discuss the narrative text given.
5. The students asked to present the result of their discussion in front of the class.
6. **Third Meeting**
7. The students’ memories of the previous topic. The teacher corrected the students discussion result.
8. The students will be divided into 10 groups.
9. The first reading comprehension competence test was given to the students. That was a narrative text “A Woman and the Wolves”.
10. At the end of meeting evaluation of all students’ works during reading comprehension teaching learning process (1st – 3rd meeting) were given by teacher.
11. **Observation**

The observer of this action was an English teacher in the class. The teacher observed the students while they were learning by using Think-Pair-Share strategy and also investigated the situation and the problems found during the teaching learning process. Most of students still applied conventional strategy in reading comprehension by translating word by word. Some of them were inactive and the other disturbing their friends by making any noisy because they did not like reading. The observations were put on the observation sheet of the teacher.

1. **Reflection**

In this stage, everything that had done was reflected to make conclusion. The result of the first cycle did not reach the goal determined. So the students needed more explanation about the way to comprehend the test and they stay need reinforcement in order to support them. Therefore, the second cycle needed be done by repeating the steps in the first cycle in order to solve the problem.

**4.2.1.2.The Data Cycle II**

1. **Planning**

In this stage, the lesson plans were prepared and the teaching learning reading process was emphasized by using Think-Pair-Share. Besides preparing lesson plans, multiple choice and essay tests and narrative texts were also prepared. At this time, the students would be taught by more interesting Think-Pair-Share than taught in cycle I.

1. **Action**

In this stage, the students got more motivations before they applied learning reading comprehension process by using Think-Pair-Share strategy, the following activities are done as follows:

1. **First Meeting**
2. The students’ achievement in cycle I were reviewed and some comments, opinions and motivations were given to the students in order to make them do the best in the cycle.
3. The meaning of Think-Pair-Share, the procedure and the significance of Think-Pair-Share were clearly explained to make them easily understand a text in effective way.
4. The teacher explained about the definition of narrative text, the purpose of narrative text, and the generic structure of narrative text.
5. The definition of w-h questions and yes-no questions, how to arrange good questions by using w-h questions and yes-no questions and how to answer question well and grammatically correct were clearly explained.
6. **Second Meeting**
7. The students’ memories of the previous topic. Some motivations were given to the students’ to do best in their work. This meeting was continuity of the previous meeting.
8. The students’ were divided into 10 groups
9. The narrative text was given to each member in group and the students were asked to discuss about the meaning of the texts and generic structure of the text which given by the teacher.
10. Each member of the group was discussed and gave their opinion about the meaning and the generic structure of the narrative texts.
11. **Third Meeting**
12. The students’ memories of previous topic were recalled by asking students to express their understanding of narrative text with their own word based on experienced they learned.
13. Students were divided into 10 groups.
14. The teacher asks each group to present their result of the discussion from previous meeting
15. The second reading comprehension competence test was given to the students. That was a narrative text “The Story of the Smart Parrot”.
16. At the end of meeting the evaluation of all students’ works during reading comprehension teaching learning process was given.
17. **Observation**

The observation was still done for the last time. The activity of students was observed and it showed that most of the students were more interest in reading text because of competitive atmosphere. They were more active and they did not get problem in comprehending the narrative text by using Think-Pair-Share strategy.

1. **Reflection**

Having evaluated the students’ essay tests, it found that the students’ score showed the improvement. Based on the observation and the result of their essay tests, it could be concluded that the students had comprehended the reading text through Think-Pair-Share. The result showed the significant improvement for most of the students in reading comprehension.

**4.3. The Research Finding**

The result of the research indicated a good improvement on the students’ reading comprehension by using Think-Pair-Share. After colleting the data, the mean of the first cycle is low (31,5).

After doing correction in the action by using Think-Pair-Share correctly, the result of the first competence test had increased from the first cycle (77). It implied that Think-Pair-Share was effective in improving students’ reading comprehension.

**4.4. Discussion**

Teaching reading comprehension by using Think Pair Share strategy gave many benefits for the students. The students felt more active and interested in learning reading comprehension. It is showed by their enthusiasm in every cycles and their response while they were asked about Think Pair Share strategy, they also got a good improvement.

But the students also got the difficulty in learning reading comprehension by using Think Pair Share strategy, it is about the time. Think Pair Share strategy needs more time, but unfortunately school gave limit time in teaching learning process. So that is why there is a students did not achieve improvement. If the school five more time, researcher believe Think Pair Share strategy will increase students’ achievement 100% and Think Pair Share strategy can be applied in every single materials in school, not only reading comprehension. So the students will be success in every single material.

* + 1. **Result of the Cycle I**

**TABLE III**

**THE RESULT OF THE CYCLE I**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **The Students’ initial** | **CYCLE I** | |
| **Score** | **Get score of over 70** |
| 1 | AS | 40 | Failed |
| 2 | AR | 20 | Failed |
| 3 | BL | 20 | Failed |
| 4 | DPJ | 40 | Failed |
| 5 | DZM | 70 | Passed |
| 6 | G | 30 | Failed |
| 7 | IPB | 40 | Failed |
| 8 | IS | 20 | Failed |
| 9 | IW | 70 | Passed |
| 10 | IP | 30 | Failed |
| 11 | JZ | 20 | Failed |
| 12 | KN | 20 | Failed |
| 13 | KDJ | 20 | Failed |
| 14 | MFR | 0 | Failed |
| 15 | PAS | 30 | Failed |
| 16 | PNA | 20 | Failed |
| 17 | RI | 30 | Failed |
| 18 | S | 30 | Failed |
| 19 | SAA | 70 | Passed |
| 20 | UPD | 10 | Failed |
| **Total ∑X** | | 630 |
| **The Mean Score** | | 31,5 |

From the table of cycle I, the total score of students was 630 and the number of students who took the test was 30 students, so the students’ mean was:

Formula, X =

X = = 31,5

From the explanation above, students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text was classified still not good when conducting action research in cycle I even though there are 3 students passed the test. The mean of students’ ability got 31,5 and to look the number of students’ who were competent in reading comprehension, the test was calculated by applying following formula:

Formula, P = x 100%

P1 = x 100% = 85%

P2 = x 100% = 15%

**TABLE IV**

**DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS’ ABILITY IN READING COMPREHENSION FOR CYCLE I**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **Total Students** | **Percentage** |
| P1 | Failed | 17 | 85% |
| P2 | Passed | 3 | 15% |

From the table analysis, the students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text was still low. The mean of students was 31,5. From the score who got over 70 were 3 students or it was only 15% and 17 students got under the score or it was only 85%. It could be concluded that the students’ achievement in reading comprehension of narrative text was still low. Post test cycle I is categorized un success. The result of standard of criteria success (SKM) minimum was >70 score. Therefore, the next action continued on cycle II.

* + 1. **Result of the Cycle II**

The writer did the cycle II to see the improvement of students result in teaching-learning processed by using Think-Pair-Share strategy. This cycle also done because many students not understand about the lesson, not serious, they felt that the time was so short, and got low score in the first test. So after this cycle done students responses are :

1. most of them felt excited when did teaching-teaching process
2. most of them got the good score
3. most of them was understood about the lesson
4. most of them did the seriously
5. most of them did the test seriously
6. most of them felt that the time was enough, they felt more relaxed and more concentration to answer the questions.

Based on the students’ responses above the writer was success in teaching the students with the good response from the students. The students excited to learn, got the good score, more relax, and more concentration, they did the test seriously, and they was understood about the lesson.

**TABLE V**

**THE RESULT OF STUDENTS’ SCORE FOR CYCLE II**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **The Student’s initial** | **CYCLE II** | |
| **Score** | **Get score of over 70** |
| 1 | AS | 80 | Passed |
| 2 | AR | 60 | Failed |
| 3 | BL | 60 | Failed |
| 4 | DPJ | 100 | Passed |
| 5 | DZM | 90 | Passed |
| 6 | G | 70 | Passed |
| 7 | IPB | 90 | Passed |
| 8 | IS | 80 | Passed |
| 9 | IW | 90 | Passed |
| 10 | IP | 70 | Passed |
| 11 | JZ | 80 | Passed |
| 12 | KN | 70 | Passed |
| 13 | KDJ | 80 | Passed |
| 14 | MFR | 60 | Failed |
| 15 | PAS | 80 | Passed |
| 16 | PNA | 70 | Passed |
| 17 | RI | 80 | Passed |
| 18 | S | 80 | Passed |
| 19 | SAA | 100 | Passed |
| 20 | UPD | 50 | Failed |
| **Total ∑X** | | 1540 |
| **The Mean Score** | | 77 |

From the table, the students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text by using Think-Pair-Share strategy improved. The standard of criteria maximum was achieved by mean 77 from the total score of students was 1540 divided the number of students who took the test was 20 students, so the students’ mean was:

Formula, X =

X = = 77

From the analysis above, students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text improved. The mean of students was 77, and to look the number of students’ who were competent in reading comprehension test was calculated by applying the following formula:

Formula, P = X 100%

P1= X 100% = 20%

P2 = X 100% = 80%

**TABLE VI**

**DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS’ ABILITY IN READING COMPREHENSION FOR CYCLE II**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criteria | Total Students | Percentage |
| P1 | Failed | 4 | 20% |
| P2 | Passed | 16 | 80% |

From the table analysis, the students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text was classified very good when doing action research on cycle II. Here, the result of students’ ability in reading comprehension from cycle I and cycle II:

**TABLE VII**

**THE RESULT OF STUDENTS’ SCORE FOR CYCLE I AND CYCLE II**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **Students’**  **Initial** | **CYCLE I** | | **CYCLE II** | |
| **Score** | **Got Score of over 70** | **Score** | **Got Score of over 70** |
| 1 | AS | 40 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 2 | AR | 20 | Failed | 60 | Failed |
| 3 | BL | 20 | Failed | 60 | Failed |
| 4 | DPJ | 40 | Failed | 100 | **Passed** |
| 5 | DZM | 70 | **Passed** | 90 | **Passed** |
| 6 | G | 30 | Failed | 70 | **Passed** |
| 7 | IPB | 40 | Failed | 90 | **Passed** |
| 8 | IS | 20 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 9 | IW | 70 | **Passed** | 90 | **Passed** |
| 10 | IP | 30 | Failed | 70 | **Passed** |
| 11 | JZ | 20 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 12 | KN | 20 | Failed | 70 | **Passed** |
| 13 | KDJ | 20 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 14 | MFR | 0 | Failed | 60 | Failed |
| 15 | PAS | 30 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 16 | PNA | 20 | Failed | 70 | **Passed** |
| 17 | RI | 30 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 18 | S | 30 | Failed | 80 | **Passed** |
| 19 | SAA | 70 | **Passed** | 100 | **Passed** |
| 20 | UPD | 10 | Failed | 50 | Failed |
| **Total** | | **630** |  | **1540** |  |
| **The Mean Score** | | **31,5** |  | **77** |  |

* + 1. **The Factors to Make Different**

The cycle I and cycle II was done and it was success to improve students’ achievement in reading narrative text through Think-Pair-Share strategy. For the first cycle students showed the good improvement of students’ achievement, it caused the writer was repaired the treatment to students. The factor to make them different are :

1. Teacher explained the lesson clearly
2. Teacher gave the students enough time to answer the questions
3. Not be so serious when taught the students
4. More patient when taught the students
5. Gave them the chance to ask about the lesson that they have not understood.

That was the factors to make the second cycle be different from the first cycle. So, make the good improving for the students’ achievement, teacher must use the good strategy.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

* 1. **Conclusions**

Based on the result of the research, it could be conducted that teaching

reading by using Think Pair Share strategy could develop the students’ ability in reading comprehension of narrative text, especially for students at eight grade class of SMP IT AR-RASYID Medan Senembah. So, the conclusions were drawn as follows:

* 1. There is an improvement of the students’ ability in reading narrative text if it is taught by using Think Pair Strategy (TPS) strategy. It is proven the mean of students’ scores in two tests: test in cycle I (31,5). Test in cycle II (77)
  2. The observation sheet indicate that there is improvement in students’ ability in reading comprehension. Furthermore, Think Pair Share (TPS) as the strategy makes students can be actively, enthusiastic, and joyfully to develop in teaching reading process.
  3. The result of qualitative and quantitative shoe that the application of Think Pair Share strategy improves the students ability in reading narrative text.
  4. **Suggestions**

Having seen the result of study, the researcher offered the following

suggestions to be considered:

1. For the Headmaster should suggest to the English teacher use Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy when teaching learning process, especially in reading comprehension.
2. For the teacher suggested to use Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy which has a pleasant learning condition, in order that the students feel more motivated and interested in learning reading comprehension.
3. The other researchers, it is suggested to conduct further research related to the topic of the study.