## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

## A. Data Description

Before conducting the research, the researcher had gained the data about students score of speaking. Based on the data, the studentsspeaking skill was still low. It can be seen from the average score of students pre-Cycle score. Before starting a Classroom Action Research, in order to measure the real situation of the students speaking skill, the researcher give the test to them. The test was held 07 April 2018 at 07.15- 08.45 am.

Table 4.1

## Students' Pre-Cycle 1

| No | Name | Criteria |  |  |  |  | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pronunciation | Grammar | Vocabulary | Fluency | Comprehension |  |
| 1. |  | 3 | 25 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 68 |
| 2. |  | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 3. |  | 2 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 56 |
| 4. |  | 3 | 17 | 4 | 16 | 12 | 52 |


| 5. | E | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. | J | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 7. | J | 5 | 23 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 60 |
| 8. | JM | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 9. | LQ | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 10. | M | 3 | 21 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 52 |
| 11. | M | 3 | 21 | 4 | 16 | 8 | 52 |
| 12. | O | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 13. | R | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 14. | RM | 3 | 27 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 72 |
| 15. | RS | 5 | 27 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 86 |
| 16. | R | 5 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 17. | SA | 3 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 32 |
| 18. | SH | 1 | 15 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 52 |
| 19. | SR | 1 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 20. | SR | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 21. | S | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 22. | S | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 23. | TM | 3 | 21 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 52 |


| 24. | S | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25. | WA | 3 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 26. | YA | 3 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 32 |
| 27. | RSQ | 1 | 27 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 64 |
| 28. | A | 5 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 62 |
| 29. | J | 2 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 30. | JJ | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 31. | MAC | 3 | 21 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 52 |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 8 6 8}$ |

Mean $/ \mu=\frac{\sum f x}{N}=\frac{1868}{31}=60,25(\mathrm{C} /$ Enough $)$
$M_{x}=$ mean score
$f_{x}=$ the students' score
$\Sigma=$ the sum of score

F = the number of students'

## Graphic 4.1

Students' Pre-Cycle score


Table 4.2
Students' percentage score pre-cycle

| No | Score | Students | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 86 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 2. | 72 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 3. | 68 | 9 | $29 \%$ |
| 4. | 64 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 5. | 62 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 6. | 60 | 9 | $29 \%$ |
| 7. | 56 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 8. | 52 | 2 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| 9. | 32 | $\mathbf{T o t a l}$ |  |

The score of the students' speaking skill was still low. The average score is 60,25 , below the minimal standard criteria (KKM). From the observation while Pre-Cycle, the researcher found that the students seemed nervous and doubtful when they want to start speak. They asked what should they do. The data score become basic foundation to do a Classroom Action Research and gave material in a teaching English especially speaking using mind mapping technique to improve students speaking skill.

## Cycle 1

## First meeting

1. Plan

The research made lesson plan for two meetings. Each meeting was $2 \times 40$ minutes. In this case the topic was about introducing yourself and our people. In preparing the lesson plan, the researcher choose the material about introducing yourself and our people. It was based on the syllabus on the first semester.
2. Action

In this stage, the researcher started implementation of activities.
a. Opening the lesson

The research asked them to come into the class to begin the lesson. After all student were come into the class, the researcher started checked their attendance and signed the agenda of that day.
b. Main Activity

After checking the students' attendance list, the researcher started the lesson. To begin learning researcher provide a stimulus about the material to be taught. Then the researcher given example mind mapping about the material. Then the students make mind mapping about the material.
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After they did their work, the student presented it in front of the class.
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Picture 4.4
c. Closing the lesson

After the students collecting their work, then the researcher asked them how was the teaching learning process on that day. The researcher also asked what part was difficult to be understand by them. They answered that was a fun, they liked mind mapping because it was full of color. The students prayed together and greeted to the researcher.

## Second meeting

a. Opening the lesson

The second meeting was conducted on 14 April 2018 at 07.15-08.45 am. The captain of the class led the students to greet the researcher. After greeting the researcher asked their condition and checked the students'
attendance by saying "who are you ?" and who is absent today?".
b. Main activity

The researcher opened the lesson . before the class was started, the researcher reviewed the previous lesson that had been explained. Then the researcher gave them an example of introducing yourself. Then they introducing in front of class.
c. Closing the lesson

Before closing the meeting, the researcher gave the students chance to ask question by saying " any question?" the students replied " no, miss." The research reminded the students to study at home what had been teach to them. After conducting and guiding the students, the research gave them Test 1. The test was held on 14 April 2018. The students were asked to answered question based on the instruction of the test. The instruction given was follows : make an mind maping about introducing yourself and your family


Picture 4.5

## Observation

These are the explanation of observation and Test 1 result in Cycle 1. The result of Test 1 can be described in the following table .

Table 4.3

## Students test score in cycle 1

| No | Name | Criteria |  |  |  |  | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pronunciation | Grammar | vocabulary | Fluency | comprehension |  |
| 1. |  | 3 | 21 | 4 | 16 | 12 | 56 |
| 2. |  | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 3. |  | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 4. |  | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 5. | E | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 6. | J | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |


| 7. | J | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8. | JM | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 9. | LQ | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 10. | M | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 11. | M | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 12. | O | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 13. | R | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 14. | RM | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 15. | RS | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 16. | R | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 17. | SA | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 18. | SH | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 68 |
| 19. | SR | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 20. | SR | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 21. | S | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 22. | S | 3 | 21 | 8 | 20 | 20 | 72 |
| 23. | TM | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 24. | S | 5 | 31 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 88 |
| 25. | WA | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |


| 26. | YA | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27. | RSQ | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 28. | A | 3 | 21 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 60 |
| 29. | J | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 30. | JJ | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
| 31. | MAC | 3 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 72 |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 2 2 4}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mean $/ \mu=\frac{\sum f x}{N}=\frac{2224}{31}=71,7(\mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{Good})$
$M_{x}=$ mean score
$f_{x}=$ the students' score
$\sum=$ the sum of score
$\mathrm{N}=$ the number of students'

## Graphic 4.2

Students' Test score in cycle 1


Table 4.4

Students' percentage Test score in Cycle 1

| No | Score | Students | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 88 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 2. | 76 | 15 | $48 \%$ |
| 3. | 72 | 10 | $32 \%$ |
| 4. | 68 | 2 | $6,4 \%$ |
| 5. | 64 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 6. | 60 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |


| 7. | 56 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

In the cycle 1 the students average score was 71,7 . The highest score of the students was 88 and the lowest score was 56.In cycle 1 which is the result of the initial test of the researcher to find out the speaking ability of students in English, researchers get an average score of 71.7 from 31 students. Where the highest score of students reaches 88 , while the lowest value of students is 56. By using mind mapping techniques as a medium to improve students' ability to speak English.

This shows that students who speak English almost increase than before. There was only 1 student who got 88 scores, while 4 other students got a score of 76 . This was because the students who got the big score had an increase in learning attitudes and interests, because at the time of learning researchers tried to get closer and motivate them, so they become active in every learning activity. While there are still some students who have low grades or have not yet reached the KKM. One of the students has the lowest value of 56 , whereas researchers have given the same portion to all students. After being examined more
deeply it turns out that the student has a lack of reading, writing and speaking, this is what makes the quality of students low in relation to English.

## 3. Reflection

After collecting the data, from the test and observation, the researcher did the reflecting stage. From the test result the researcher found that the students' score was still low at 56 from the KKM score. Some students' still low in speaking. Sometime they were true in organization but they were still weak in vocabulary and pronunciation.

The problem that happened in Cycle 1 was reflected to the next cycle. The researcher did the improvement of students score in speaking test with the KKM score 73.

## Cycle 2

1. Plan

Before planning the action, the researcher did some activities the activities were designing lesson plan, preparing teaching material, learning scenario, and designing schedule.

## 2. Action

In order to increase the students' skill in speaking, the researcher made the teaching learning process more interesting in teaching speaking using mind mapping technique. The cycle was principally not quite different with the first cycle action. The researcher started the action which has been formulated in the revised plan.
a. Opening the lesson

The activity was held on Saturday, 21 April 2018. The researcher asked them to come into the class to begin the lesson. After all students were come into the class, the researcher started checked their attendance and signed the agenda of that day.
b. Main activity

The teacher explained about the techniques of mind mapping. Then, the researcher gave students' the exercise to know the improvement of students' understanding.
c. Closing the lesson

Before closing the meeting, the researcher gave the students chance to ask question by saying " any question?" the students replied " no, Miss". The researcher reminded the students to study at home what hade been teach to them. After conducting and guiding the students, the researcher gave them test. The test was held on 21 April 2018. The students were to practice in front of class based on the instruction of the test. The instruction given was follows : make an mind mapping about material and then practice speaking in front of class.
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Table 4.5
Students Test score in Cycle 2

| No | Name | Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pronunciation | grammar | vocabulary | Fluency | comprehension |  |
| 1. | AB | 5 | 31 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 86 |
| 2. | A | 5 | 35 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 100 |
| 3. | AS | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 4. | BG | 5 | 35 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 96 |
| 5. | E | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 6. | J | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 7. | J | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 8. | JM | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 9. | LQ | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 10. | M | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 11. | M | 5 | 27 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 76 |
| 12. | O | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 13. | R | 5 | 31 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 86 |
| 14. | RM | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 15. | RS | 3 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 76 |


| 16. | R | 4 | 28 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17. | SA | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 18. | SH | 3 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 24 | 76 |
| 19. | SR | 5 | 27 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 76 |
| 20. | SR | 3 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 12 | 76 |
| 21. | S | 4 | 28 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 84 |
| 22. | S | 3 | 21 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 80 |
| 23. | TM | 5 | 27 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 |
| 24. | S | 3 | 21 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 76 |
| 25. | WA | 5 | 31 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 80 |
| 26. | YA | 5 | 31 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 86 |
| 27. | RSQ | 5 | 27 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
| 28. | A | 5 | 31 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 88 |
| 29. | J | 3 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 76 |
| 30. | JJ | 5 | 31 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 86 |
| 31. | MAC | 4 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 80 |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  | 2508 |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |

Mean $/ \mu=\frac{\sum f x}{N}=\frac{2508}{31}=80,9(\mathrm{~B} /$ Good $)$
$M_{x}=$ mean score
$f_{x}=$ the students' score
$\Sigma=$ the sum of score
$\mathrm{N}=$ the number of students'

Graphic 4.3
Students' Test Score in Cycle 2


## Table 4.6

## Students' percentage of Test score in Cycle 2

| No | Score | Students | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 100 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 2. | 96 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 3. | 88 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 4. | 86 | 4 | $12,9 \%$ |
| 5. | 84 | 2 | $6,4 \%$ |
| 6. | 80 | 6 | $19,3 \%$ |
| 7. | 76 | 5 | $16,1 \%$ |
| 8. | 72 | 3 | $9,6 \%$ |
| 9. | 64 | 1 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 10. | 60 | 7 | $22,5 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

4. Reflection

After collecting the data, from the test and observation, the researcher did the reflecting stage. From the test result the researcher found that the average students' score was passed from the KKM
score. Some students' has been able to improve the ability to speak in English by increasing memorization of vocabulary and fluency in pronunciation.

## B. Interpretation of Data

In this research, the researcher intends to describe the result of students' speaking after applying mind mapping technique as a teaching media in the classroom. Having analyzed the improvement in each cycle, the researcher know that there was great improvement. For details, we can rever to the following table :

Table 4.7
Comparison of the number of students' achivment score

|  | Pre-Cycle | Cycle 1 | Cycle 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUM | 1868 | 2224 | 2356 |
| MIN | 32 | 56 | 76 |
| MAX | 86 | 88 | 100 |
| AVERAGE | 60,25 | 71,7 | 80,9 |
| LEVEL | ENOUGH | GOOD | GOOD |



From the table above both pre-cycle, cycle 1 and cycle 2 , students' speaking scores have increased. In cycle 1, students who reach kkm score are 6 students, while in cycle 2 students who reach kkm are 20 students. In this study there was a large increase in cycle 2 , even though the researchers gave the same portion to all students. However, there are significant changes. Even students who initially seemed less interested in English learning became excited. After observing more deeply the researchers found some positive conditions in students, especially class VII MTs AttoyibahCuruglemoMandalawangi. These include:

1. Students tend to actively discuss with each other;
2. Students are seen carrying a dictionary, even though initially reluctant to bring;
3. Some students tend to always want to be asked questions by researchers;

From some of the changes above, the author assumes that, with motivation and speaking that is intensive to students both inside and outside the classroom with compassion, can provide real change to students. This is what makes students experience an increase in speaking in English.

