CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDING

A. Data Analysis

A.1 Students's Ability in Mastering Degree of Comparison Before Treatment

The researcher got the data from beginning observation that the situation in teaching learning was running bored and the students' were passive. The English teacher didn't use the good media in teaching degree of comparison. In this case, the English teacher used conventional way in conveying the material by lecturing without media and ask them to write down the material on their book. The teacher also didn't give the chance for the students to construct the knowledge by them selves. The students just listen and imagine the abstract of knowledge without knowing the application or even mastering about the material. The students were just as the object in the learning process. As a result, the students got problem to master the material so that they talked each other, not focus, they were passive and they couldn't show their creativity.

Further, In the closing activity, the teacher gave and submitted the students' task without doing the evaluation process. It was caused that the learning process seemed without any controlling from the teacher. Besides that, the teacher also didn't give the chance for the students to analyze and reflect their work.

Then, in order to know about how far the students' ability in mastering degree of comparison, the researcher gave pre-test to the students. The pre-test was given to the students in the first meeting before conducting Classroom Action Research (CAR) or after the researcher and her partner observed the teacher when he was teaching in the class on March 3rd, 2015. There were 20 questions in multiple-choice and 10

questions in essay. The students carried out the test during 40 minutes. Here is the data into a table as follow:

Table VIII.

The Result of Student Score For Pre-Test

No	Student Initial Name	Pre-Test	
		Score	Criteria of Success (>65)
1	AI	50	Unsuccessful
2	AP	30	Unsuccessful
3	AP	45	Unsuccessful
4	ASN	60	Unsuccessful
5	ATP	50	Unsuccessful
6	AW	35	Unsuccessful
7	BK	50	Unsuccessful
8	DAW	40	Unsuccessful
9	DF	35	Unsuccessful
10	DLM	60	Unsuccessful
11	DS	30	Unsuccessful
12	EF	50	Unsuccessful
13	EN	50	Unsuccessful
14	FB	50	Unsuccessful
15	**FM**	**70**	**successful**
16	HP	40	Unsuccessful
17	**IDM**	**70**	**successful**
18	IH	50	Unsuccessful

19	IP	30	Unsuccessful
20	J	45	Unsuccessful
21	JDW	60	Unsuccessful
22	JP	30	Unsuccessful
23	LHS	60	Unsuccessful
24	LS	50	Unsuccessful
25	MH	55	Unsuccessful
26	MHN	50	Unsuccessful
27	NH	30	Unsuccessful
28	RA	45	Unsuccessful
29	RAZ	60	Unsuccessful
30	RB	40	Unsuccessful
31	RDKG	35	Unsuccessful
32	RIS	35	Unsuccessful
33	RP	50	Unsuccessful
34	RS	40	Unsuccessful
35	**S**	**75**	**successful**
TOTAL ($\sum$)		**1655**	
MEAN (X)		**47,28**	

To know the mean of students' score could be seen in the following formula :

$$\chi = \frac{\sum \chi}{N}$$

In the pre-test of the first cycle, the total score of the students was 1655 and number of students who took the test was 35, so mean of the students was :

$$x = \frac{1655}{35} = 47,28$$

The number of students who pass the test was calculated as follows :

$$P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100\ \%$$

The percentage of students who pass the pre-test in cycle I :

$$P = \frac{3}{35} \times 100\ \% = 8,57\%$$

Table IX. Distribution of Students' Ability in Mastering Degree of Comparison in Pre-Test

Criteria	Total Students	Percentage
Successful	3	8,57%
Unsuccessful	32	91,43%

From the table above, it can be concluded that the students' ability in mastering degree of comparison was low. The mean of students was 47,28. From the table above shown that 3 students got successful it was 8,57% and 32 students got unsuccessful it was 91,43%. It means that the students ability in mastering degree of comparison is low.

Then, after doing the analysis and reflection from the result of Pre-Test, the researcher collaborated with her partner formulated the cause of the problems. It was found that (1) the students couldn't identify the types of degree of comparison, (2) they couldn't use the degree of comparison, and (3) the students had no ability to building up degree of comparison. These were problems that were crucial in mastering degree of comparison. Finally, the researcher decided to apply the cycle I as a treatment for them in mastering the degree of comparison by using macromedia flash.

A.2. The Treatment And Research Finding in Cycle I

Cycle I

The cycle I was done as a treatment of the problem that faced by the students in mastering the degree of comparison. The cycle I, in this case was divided into four steps, namely Plan I, Action I, Observation I and Reflection I. Plan I was made by seeing the problems that was gotten from The Beginning Observation and the Pre Test result. Action I was the application of the Plan I. Observation I was the monitoring of action I and used as the basic of Reflection I. Reflection was made from the result of observation I and used to formulated the next step in cycle II.

a. Plan I

Based on the observation and the result of pre-test, the researcher plan first for the first treatment. The researcher prepare everything needed for the first cycle such as lesson plan, materials, daily exercise, media of learning, LCD, and post test question. Then for action I, The researcher applied the macromedia flash which was considered stimulating the students to understand definition, kinds, and the form of material.

b. Action I

The process of the action I was divided into two meetings, namely first meeting and the second meeting. Each of meetings was run for 2x40 minutes. Specifically, it can be seen:

First Meeting (2x40 minutes)

The first action was focused on how the students could identify the types of degree of comparison, building up degree of comparison, and use the degree of comparison. It was done on March 4th, 2015.

In this meeting, the researcher started the lesson by introduced the media which would be used. Then, the researcher presentating the interactive multimedia flash in front of the class by using OHP. And for the next step, the researcher explain to the students about how to use and explore the interactive menu that appeared in first slide of macromedia flash. After that, The researcher asked some of students to try operating and exploring the interactive menu in macromedia flash that contain some information such as definition of each kinds of comparison degree, the formation of comparison degree, how to build up sentence and the example of comparison degree. After exploring the interactive menu, the researcher asked to the students in order to answer some questions of the automatic quiz that appear after the explanation by turn.

The question in automatic quiz consist of 3 part. Part 1 is consist of some pictures and the students have to choose the best type of degree of comparison that match with picture, it is used to test the students ability in identifying the types of degree of comparison. Part 2 is consist of some adjective words that have to change based on the type of degree of comparison. It is used to test the student ability to use the degree of comparison. Part 3 is consist of some questions with blank, and the students have to filling the blank in order to test their ability in building up degree of comparison

After the students finished in answering the question of automatic quiz, the researcher concludes the main point of the material. After all, The first meeting was closed by the researcher by giving the Post Test I.

The Second Meeting (2 x 40 minutes)

The second meeting was done on March 6th, 2015. The process of the cycle I on the second meeting was the continue of the first meeting. In the first meeting, the researcher gave the crucial point that must be known in mastering degree of comparison and also Post Test I, but in the second meeting the researcher had the students evaluated their work and reflected it.

The evaluation process was run for 30 minutes, the students checked their friends' worksheet. Next, the researcher got the result and the fact that there were some students still didn't understand about the material that have learned before. Some students still confused and ask to the researcher about how to build up the irregular form in degree of comparison, the way how to pronounce the adjective words well and determining the syllable of adjective word. So that, The researcher gave the addition explanation about about how to build up the irregular form in degree of comparison, the way how to pronounce the adjective words well and determining the syllable of adjective word and the way how to determine the syllable of adjective word in this second meeting deeply. Finally, the Cycle I was done.

After doing the cycle I and giving Post Test I, it is found that there were 18 students who passed the Post Test I. The result can be seen as follow:

Table X

The Result of Student Score For Post-Test I

No	Student Initial Name	Post-test I	
		Score	Criteria of Success ($\geq$65)
1	AI	75	successful
2	AP	60	Unsuccessful
3	AP	50	Unsuccessful

4	ASN	75	successful
5	ATP	80	successful
6	AW	65	successful
7	BK	60	Unsuccessful
8	DAW	60	Unsuccessful
9	DF	50	Unsuccessful
10	DLM	70	successful
11	DS	50	Unsuccessful
12	EF	60	Unsuccessful
13	EN	75	successful
14	FB	70	successful
15	FM	85	successful
16	HP	50	Unsuccessful
17	IDM	90	successful
18	IH	75	successful
19	IP	60	Unsuccessful
20	J	50	Unsuccessful
21	JDW	75	successful
22	JP	50	Unsuccessful
23	LHS	80	successful
24	LS	70	successful
25	MH	80	successful
26	MHN	75	successful
27	NH	60	Unsuccessful

28	RA	50	Unsuccessful
29	**RAZ**	**75**	**successful**
30	RB	60	Unsuccessful
31	RDKG	50	Unsuccessful
32	**RIS**	**65**	**successful**
33	RP	60	Unsuccessful
34	RS	60	Unsuccessful
35	**S**	**85**	**successful**
TOTAL ($\sum$)		**2305**	
MEAN (X)		**65,85**	

To know the mean of students' score could be seen in the following formula :

$$\chi = \frac{\Sigma \chi}{N}$$

In the post-test I of the first cycle, the total score of the students was 2305 and number of students who took the test was 35, so mean of the students was :

$$x = \frac{2305}{35} = 65,85$$

The number of students who pass the test was calculated as follows :

$$P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100 \%$$

The percentage of students who pass the post-test in cycle I :

$$P = \frac{18}{35} \times 100 \% = 51,42\%$$

Table XI. Distribution of Students' Ability in Mastering Degree of Comparison in Post-Test I

Criteria	Total Students	Percentage
Successful	18	51,42%

Unsuccessful	17	48,58%

From the table above, there was an improvement of the students ability in mastering degree of comparison from the pre-test. It could been seen from that the mean of students in post-test I was 47,28. From the table above shown that 18 students got successful it was 51,42% and 17 students got unsuccessful it was 48,58%. Even though, it is still needed more improvement because it could not achieve yet 65% as the target of success Classroom Action Research.

a. **Observation I**

The observation I was done by the collaborator during teaching learning process. There were many things that had been were observed as follows :

- The researcher in this case did the all steps of procedural in using macromedia flash but she was too fast when explaining the material, so that some students got confused in mastering the material.

- Even some students still looked confused and not understand about the material but the class nuance was well and they had participated actively

- Some students still make any noisy in the class

b. **Reflection I**

The cycle I was considered unsuccessful, because the students have not got the standard Competency yet, namely from 35 students, the percentage was 51,42%. Therefore, after the action was end, the researcher and her partner analyzed the cycle process and the result of action. The problem found in this case would be a base to make the next plan as a treatment or improvement.

The problems found in the first cycle were : (1) the students' still confused in build up the irregular form in degree of comparison, (2) the students ability in pronounce the adjective and determine the syllable was low so that they still got difficult to use the degree of comparison, and (3) the researcher explain too fast. So that some student got confused in mastering the material. Therefore, The researcher collaborated with her partner continued to the second meeting.

A.3 The Treatment And Research Finding in Cycle II

Cycle II

The cycle II was done as a treatment of the problem that found in the first cycle. The cycle II, in this case was divided into four steps, namely Plan II, Action II, Observation II and Reflection II. Plan II was made by seeing the problems that was gotten from the cycle I and the Post-Test I result. Action II was the application of the Plan II. Observation II was the monitoring of action II and used as the basic of Reflection II. Reflection was made from the result of observation II and used to formulated the next step in cycle II.

a. Plan II

Due to the problems and its causes, the researcher and her partner made a new plan. And the step that was done in this cycle:

1. The researcher give more examples and deep explanation about irregular form in degree of comparison by using macromedia flash. Here, the macromedia flash was edited become more colorful and more interesting than before.

2. The researcher used macromedia flash that was added with special audio fiture that can pronounce the adjective word well and can determine the syllable's quantity of adjective word correctly.

3. The researcher reviewed the material with slowly and deeply

a. Action II

The process of the second cycle was done because the first cycle couldn't overcome the students' problem in mastering degree of comparison. The score that they got was still low. In the second cycle, the researcher focused on the weaknesses/problem in the first action, and it would be done to get more improvement in two meetings that were done in the second cycle.

First Meeting (2x40 minutes)

The first meeting was done on March 11th, 2015. In this meeting, the researcher started the lesson by presentating the interactive multimedia flash in front of the class by using OHP. And for the next step, the researcher explore the interactive menu that appeared in first slide of macromedia flash and explain to the students about the special audio fiture that can help them in pronouncing the adjective word well and can determine the syllable's quantity of adjective word correctly, it is helpful to master the use of degree of comparison. After that, The researcher explain to the students about irregular form in degree of comparison deeply and give them more example of it.

Then, the researcher asked some of students to try operating and exploring the new audio fiture and asked them use it to help them doing the automatic quiz that appear after explanation. As a result, the students in this case showed their understanding and not feel confused anymore so that they did the quiz well. Then, the researcher with her partner continued the second meeting in the Cycle II.

Second Meeting (2x40 minutes)

This second meeting was the last meeting in the research and it was done on March 13th, 2015. The researcher gave the Post Test II and Reflection session. Reflection session was done to make a conclusion and motivated them to apply it in daily activity.

After doing the cycle I and giving Post Test I, it is found that there were 18 students who passed the Post Test I. The result can be seen as follow:

Table XII

The Result of Student Score For Post-Test II

No	Student Initial Name	Post-test II	
		Score	Criteria of Success (>65)
1	AI	90	successful
2	AP	85	successful
3	AP	70	successful
4	ASN	90	successful
5	ATP	95	successful
6	AW	90	successful
7	BK	90	successful
8	DAW	60	unsuccessful
9	DF	75	successful
10	DLM	90	successful
11	DS	80	successful
12	EF	90	successful
13	EN	90	successful

14	**FB**	**80**	**successful**
15	**FM**	**100**	**successful**
16	**HP**	**80**	**successful**
17	**IDM**	**100**	**successful**
18	**IH**	**90**	**successful**
19	**IP**	**85**	**successful**
20	**J**	**70**	**successful**
21	**JDW**	**90**	**successful**
22	**JP**	**80**	**successful**
23	**LHS**	**90**	**successful**
24	**LS**	**80**	**successful**
25	**MH**	**100**	**successful**
26	**MHN**	**90**	**successful**
27	**NH**	**85**	**successful**
28	**RA**	**70**	**successful**
29	**RAZ**	**90**	**successful**
30	**RB**	**80**	**successful**
31	RDKG	60	unsuccessful
32	**RIS**	**90**	**successful**
33	**RP**	**85**	**successful**
34	**RS**	**80**	**successful**
35	**S**	**100**	**successful**
	TOTAL ($\sum$)	**2970**	
	MEAN (X)	**84,85**	

To know the mean of students' score could be seen in the following formula :

$$\chi = \frac{\Sigma\chi}{N}$$

In the post-test II of the second cycle, the total score of the students was 2970 and number of students who took the test was 35, so mean of the students was :

$$x = \frac{2970}{35} = 84,85$$

The number of students who pass the test was calculated as follows :

$$P = \frac{R}{T}\times 100\%$$

The percentage of students who pass the post-test in cycle II :

$$P = \frac{33}{35}\times 100\% = 94,28\%$$

b. **Observation II**

In the second cycle, the class condition in learning process was better than in the first cycle.

-   The researcher not explaining the material too fast

-   The students give good response and be active in the class

-   The students not make any noisy in the class, they are concentrate and enthuastic in learning degree of comparison by using macromedia flash

-   The students looked not confused anymore and become brave to give their opinion about the material

c. **Reflection II**

The students ability in mastering degree of comparison taught by using macromedia flash was improved. From the table below shown that 33 students got success score or it was 94,28% and 2 students' got unsuccess score or it was 5,72%. It could conclude that the students ability in mastering degree of comparison improved.

Post-test II cycle II was categorized successful. The result of standart of criteria success (SKM) minimum was >65 score achieved. Students ability in mastering degree of comparison was classified successful. So, the researcher and the collaborator decided to stop the action.

Table XIII.Distribution of Students' Ability in Mastering Degree of Comparison in Post-Test II

Criteria	Total Students	Percentage
Successful	33	94,28%
Unsuccessful	2	5,72%

B. Research Finding

The result of students ability was indicated that there was an improvement on the students' ability in mastering degree of comparison by using macromedia flash. The mean of the pre-test was 47,28. It was very low. The mean of the post-test I cycle I was 65,85. Then the mean of post-test II cycle II was 84,85. It was indicated that the scores and the mean in second cycle were better than pre-test and post-test cycle I.

Table XIV. The Percentage of Students' Ability in Mastering Degree of Comparison in Pre-test, Post-test 1, and Post-test 2.

| Test | Success | | Unsuccessful | |
	Total of Students	Percentage	Total of Students	Percentage
Pre-test	3	8,57%	32	91,43%
Post-test 1	18	51,42%	17	48,58%

Pos t- test 2	33	94,28%	2	5,72%

The percentage of students who got score >65 also grew up. In the pre-test, the students who got score>65 were 3 students (8,57%). In the post-test I cycle I, the students who got score >65 were 18 students (51,42%). It means that there was improving about 42,85%. The post-test II cycle II, students who got score were 33students (94,28%). And the improvement was about 42,86%. It means that the mean of the score in every meeting increased. In another word the students ability in mastering degree of comparison were become better in the first meeting to next meeting.

The researcher also analyzed qualitative data to support the research finding beside the quantitative data. The quantitative data were organized from observation sheet, diary note, and interview.

All of these was data indicated that the students given their good attitude, being active and good response during teaching learning process. Based on the result of the quantitative data and qualitative data, it was indicated that the action and applying macromedia flash as media was improved.

C. **Discussion**

This discussion focuses on the result of the research as mentioned above. It is talked about the using macromedia flash to increase of the students' ability in mastering degree of comparison from the Pre Test until Post Test II .

In the Cycle I, at the first meeting, the researcher did presentated the interactive multimedia flash that contain some information such as definition of each kinds of comparison degree, the formation of comparison degree, how to build up sentence and the example of comparison degree. The interactive multimedia flash was considered helping the students in understanding the topic easily. It is because the interactive multimedia designed by using animation, backsound and many advantages that can help stimulate the students' brain so they will easier to master the material. Lerson stated that learning by hear and see is good and more effective for learner because it helps to stimulate the brain, grasp the concept, mastering the material and store it in long term memory.[1]

As a result, when the students follow the learning process, they will easier to understand because they see and hear. They see the example in picture or animation and they hear the explanation in backsound. And also they can explore the multimedia so they will active and enthusiastic in learning. It is better than learning in conventional way where the students was passive.

Systematically, the first meeting consisted of several steps, as follow:

- The researcher presenting an interactive multimedia flash in front of the class by using OHP

- The teacher guiding the students in using an interactive menu that appeared in first slide of macromedia flash

- The teacher guiding the students in exploring the interactive menu in macromedia flash

- The teacher guiding the students to answer an automatic quiz that will appear after the explanation

---

[1] Jonathon Lerson, (2009*). Educational Psychology*. New York : Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Those steps above were the treatments which have helped the students in understanding the topic. After the first meeting done, it was needed the improvement in the second meeting.

There were some problems faced in cycle I, The problems were the students' still confused in build up the irregular form in degree of comparison, the students ability in pronounce the adjective and determine the syllable was low so that they still got difficult to use the degree of comparison, and the researcher explain too fast.

These were the treatment that the researcher did in reducing the problems. The problems in the cycle I were treated by giving more examples and deep explanation about irregular form in degree of comparison by using macromedia flash that was edited become more colorful, more interesting and added with special audio fiture that can pronounce the adjective word well and can determine the syllable's quantity of adjective word correctly, and the researcher explained the topic slowly and briefly.

In stages, we could see that the used of macromedia flash helped:

1. The students' ability in using degree of comparison and pronounce the adjective word well

2. The students' ability in build up degree of comparison

3. The students' ability in identifying the types of degree of comparison

In conclusion, the use of macromedia flash can increase the students' result in mastering degree of comparison.

Based on the result of data analysis, there is an increase of students' ability in mastering degree of comparison by using macromedia flash at tenth grade students of SMK RAUDLATUL ULUUM -2 AEK NABARA.