

CHAPTER 1V

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISSCUSSION

A. DATA DESCRIPTION

The data of this study are qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data were taken from observation sheet and documentation. The qualitative data were taken from the mean of students score in some tests. This research is only directed to the second grade. Moreover, this chapter the researcher took 30 students as the sample. This research was accomplished in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of four steps of action research (planning, action, observation and reflection).

1. The Quantitative Data

The quantitative data were taken from the results in the class, was carried out in two cycle, there was five meetings were conducted. The results could be seen following the tables.

2. The Qualitative Data

The qualitative data were collected by using observation sheet, and documentation

a. The Observation sheet

Observation was used to see the level of students' activities and teacher's activities during teaching learning process. The observation was focused on the situation of teaching learning process which triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model was applied, students' activities and behavior, students' speaking ability in English lesson, and interaction between teacher and students it can be seen in appendices.

Based on the observation, students more active and enthusiastic in triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model.

b. Documentation

The researcher used a camera to collect the data. Camera was utilized to take photos and record the students' performance in teaching and learning process.

B. ANALYSIS OF DATA

a. First Cycle

1. Planning

In this phase, the researcher made a planning for the action based upon the problems faced by students towards speaking ability. In this case, the researcher arranged a lesson plan based on the teaching material. The researcher also prepared the test use to measure skill who has at individual. In collecting the data to know whether there are some students' improvement scores from free cycle to cycle 1.

2. Action

The action of the cycle 1 was done on February 28th and March 13th 2019. In the first meeting, before involving students in triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model, the researcher conducts the test use to measure skill who has at individual using several pictures, and the paired students must choose two pictures and they have a conversation in front of the class by discussing the pictures them choose. The contents of the

conversations must include the characteristics, information and opinions of the previous picture they selected.

In the second meeting, the writer introduced the material by giving example of descriptive about peoples, places and animals and the researcher explained to the students about the situation and conditions when using expression of giving and responding suggestions and instructions. The researcher wrote some examples and demonstrated how to pronounce it. Furthermore, the researcher gives instructions so that students pair up. After that the researcher gave several pictures to be selected and described in front of the class by conducting a conversation. the researcher divided students into six groups and give the picture for them to choose and describe. Then, they come to the front of the class to tell about the pictures or objects they choose.

In the last meeting, the researcher gave the test again in the end of cycle 1. Students in pairs and students are given pictures and they still have to choose two pictures to explain in front of the class by having a conversation with their partner. The

contents of the conversations must include the characteristic, information, and opinion of the previous picture they selected. The test is carried to measure how well the students' achievement in speaking improved.

3. Observing

In this phase, the researcher to notice all activities in the physical classroom activity. It might be about the teacher's performance, students' response and students' participation during teaching and learning process using triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model. It was found that the students got difficulties in speaking especially in grammar and pronunciation. Some students were serious in the class but there were some who still noise, and disturbed their friends. Observation was done carefully because data which was taken from this activity were used as a basic reflection.

4. Reflection

The researcher evaluated about the conclusion of implementing the action. Based on the result of free cycle and cycle 1. In free cycle, they were only 4 who passed the KKM

because they almost mastered the five criteria used by researcher such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. Although not perfect and 26 students does not meet the KKM score because the students are not confident and ultimately do not meet the assessment criteria that the researcher wants. In the five criteria the students have difficulty in grammar and pronunciation. Apart from that, the students have good abilities but only rarely practice to speaking.

In the cycle 1, they were only 19 who passed the KKM. After students get treatment from researcher. Students are confident and basically they have high learning desires, but at this stage there were still many students who did not pass the KKM because they were still many who did not master in grammar and pronunciation. But for the cycle 1 it is better than the free cycle that has been done before, the researcher felt satisfied enough because their efforts to improve students' speaking skill had been improved proven by score they get although not all the targets accomplished yet. Beside of that, students seemed to accept the material easily by using triple P model. From the reflecting phase

above, there must be more efforts to improve students' speaking ability by using triple P (Presentation, Practice and Production) model.

The researcher gave test in the end of each cycle. It has been found that the means of students score increasing from free cycle until cycle 1. The following table is:

Table 4.1: Data from Free Cycle of Research

No	Initial Name	Criteria					Total	Score
		Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Comprehension		
1	AG	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
2	AH	1	2	1	2	2	8	32
3	A	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
4	AS	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
5	AT	2	2	2	1	2	9	36
6	D	2	3	2	2	2	11	44
7	ES	2	3	2	2	3	12	48
8	EF	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
9	GG	2	2	2	2	2	10	40
10	HAYR	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
11	IP	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
12	JF	1	2	1	2	2	8	32
13	J	2	2	2	2	2	10	40
14	M	3	3	2	3	3	14	56

15	MA	2	3	2	3	3	13	52
16	MAI	2	2	1	2	2	9	36
17	MMU	2	3	2	2	2	11	44
18	MR	2	3	2	2	3	12	48
19	NPD	2	3	2	3	3	13	52
20	N	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
21	P	2	3	2	2	2	11	44
22	DI	3	3	3	3	3	15	60
23	R	3	3	2	3	3	14	56
24	R	2	2	2	2	2	10	40
25	SH	2	3	2	2	3	12	48
26	SN	2	3	3	2	3	13	52
27	SS	3	4	2	4	4	17	68
28	S	3	3	3	3	3	15	60
29	Y	2	3	3	2	3	13	52
30	MS	2	2	1	2	2	9	36
Total (Σ)							387	1548
Mean								51,6

From the table of free cycle total score of students was 1548 and the number of students who took the test 30 students, so students' mean was:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1548}{30}$$

$$\bar{X} = 51,6$$

From the table above, students' speaking skill in English lesson was still very low. The mean of students was 51,6.

Table 4.2: Students Score of Free Cycle

No	Initial Name	FREE CYCLE	
		Score	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AG	56	Unsuccessful
2	AH	32	Unsuccessful
3	A	76	Successful
4	AS	76	Successful
5	AT	36	Unsuccessful
6	D	44	Unsuccessful
7	ES	48	Unsuccessful
8	EF	76	Successful
9	GG	40	Unsuccessful
10	HAYR	76	Successful
11	IP	56	Unsuccessful
12	JF	32	Unsuccessful
13	J	40	Unsuccessful
14	M	56	Unsuccessful
15	MA	52	Unsuccessful
16	MAI	36	Unsuccessful
17	MMU	44	Unsuccessful
18	MR	48	Unsuccessful
19	NPD	52	Unsuccessful
20	N	56	Unsuccessful
21	P	44	Unsuccessful
22	DI	60	Unsuccessful
23	R	56	Unsuccessful
24	R	40	Unsuccessful
25	SH	48	Unsuccessful
26	SN	52	Unsuccessful
27	SS	68	Unsuccessful
28	S	60	Unsuccessful
29	Y	52	Unsuccessful
30	MS	36	Unsuccessful
Total (Σ)		1548	
Mean		51,6	

From the table of free cycle, the total score of students was 1548 and the number of students who took the test 30 students, and the mean of students was 51,6. The students' speaking skill in English lesson was still low. From the criteria 4 students got successful score because they almost mastered the five criteria used by researcher such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. In other side 26 students got unsuccessful score because the students are not confident and ultimately do not meet the assessment criteria that the researcher wants. In the five criteria the students have difficulty in grammar and pronunciation. Apart from that, the students have good abilities but only rarely practice to speaking. It could be concluded that the students' speaking skill in English lesson was still low.

From the explanation above, students' speaking skill in English lesson classified low. Then the free cycle continued. Cycle 1 the analysis can be followed bellow:

Table 4.3 Data from Cycle 1 of Research

No	Initial Name	Criteria					Total	Score
		Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Comprehension		
1	AG	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
2	AH	3	4	3	3	3	16	64
3	A	4	5	3	5	4	21	84
4	AS	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
5	AT	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
6	D	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
7	ES	3	4	3	4	5	19	76
8	EF	3	5	3	4	5	20	80
9	GG	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
10	HAYR	4	5	4	5	5	23	92
11	IP	4	5	3	3	4	19	76
12	JF	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
13	J	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
14	M	2	5	3	4	5	19	76
15	MA	3	4	3	4	5	19	76
16	MAI	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
17	MMU	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
18	MR	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
19	NPD	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
20	N	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
21	P	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
22	DI	4	4	2	4	5	19	76
23	R	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
24	R	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
25	SH	4	4	4	4	5	19	84
26	SN	4	4	4	4	4	19	76

27	SS	4	5	3	4	4	20	80
28	S	3	5	3	4	4	19	76
29	Y	3	5	3	4	4	19	76
30	MS	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
Total (Σ)							558	2240
Mean								74,6

From the table of cycle 1, the total score of students was 2240 and the number of students was 30 students, so students' mean was:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{2240}{30}$$

$$\bar{X} = 74,6$$

The mean of students was 74,6. In cycle 1 is categorized unsuccessful, the result of standard of success criteria (KKM) minimum was >75 score.

Table 4.4: Students Score of Cycle 1

No	Initial Name	CYCLE 1	
		Score	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AG	76	Successful
2	AH	64	Unsuccessful
3	A	84	Unsuccessful
4	AS	80	Successful
5	AT	72	Unsuccessful

6	D	72	Unsuccessful
7	ES	76	Successful
8	EF	80	Successful
9	GG	72	Unsuccessful
10	HAYR	92	Successful
11	IP	76	Successful
12	JF	68	Unsuccessful
13	J	68	Unsuccessful
14	M	76	Successful
15	MA	76	Successful
16	MAI	72	Unsuccessful
17	MMU	72	Unsuccessful
18	MR	76	Successful
19	NPD	76	Successful
20	N	76	Successful
21	P	64	Unsuccessful
22	DI	76	Successful
23	R	76	Successful
24	R	64	Unsuccessful
25	SH	84	Successful
26	SN	76	Successful
27	SS	80	Successful
28	S	76	Successful
29	Y	76	Successful
30	MS	64	Unsuccessful
Total (Σ)		2240	
Mean		74,6	

From the table in cycle 1, the total score of students was 2240 and the number of students was 30 students, the mean of students was 74,6. And 19 students got successful score, the other side 11 students got failed score. cycle 1 is categorized

unsuccessful. After students get treatment from researcher. Students are confident and basically they have high learning desires, but at this stage there were still many students who did not pass the KKM because they were still many who did not master in grammar and pronunciation. But for the post-test 1 it is better than the pre-test that has been done before. The result of standard of success criteria (KKM) minimum was >75 score.

From the explanation above, the student's speaking skill in the cycle 1, there was an increase of students mean score from the students' speaking skill on the preliminary study to the students' speaking skill on the first cycle. It was from the preliminary study mean score from the mean class 51,6 increased to 74,6. It mean score improvement.

Students' speaking skill in English lesson was classified unsuccessful, so cycle II is need to increasing the higher score of students, so it must be increased in cycle II. And the following analysis for cycle II is:

b. Second cycle

1. Planning

After finding the fact that the students' speaking mastery was low, which was proven by their cycle 1 scores. The researcher rearranges the lesson plan which was used in the previous cycle with some modifications. Beside of that, the researcher still also prepared the observation sheet to note the classroom activities. Next, the researcher also prepared cycle II.

2. Action

The action of cycle II was done on March 20th and 22th 2019. In this meeting, the researcher tried to emphasize some aspects that have not been done yet in the first cycle. The procedures of this model were some with the first cycle. Researcher tried to the best in teaching students and motivated them to increase their ability in speaking. In this cycle II the researcher added learning so that students understood better. The researcher gives new vocabulary for students and how to pronounce it and gives examples of how to compose correct sentences, because in the first cycle students lack in grammar and

pronunciation. Not only that, the researcher played conversations from expert describing about animals, places, and person. Which includes opinion, characteristics, and information. So that students better understand what is being learned.

In the last meeting, the researcher gave the test in the end of cycle II. Students in pairs and students are given pictures and they still have to choose two picture to explain in front of the class by having a conversation with their partner. The contents of the conversations must include the characteristic, information, and opinion of the previous picture they selected. The post-test II is carried to measure how well the students' achievement in speaking improved.

3. Observation

In this phase, the researcher tried to notice all activities in the physical classroom activity. It might be about the researcher performance, students' response and students' participation during teaching and learning process using triple P model. Researcher was very careful in this phase because the students were more active and serious than the first cycle. Most of the

students were very enthusiastic to follow the instruction. Researcher also saw they did not have any problem doing their test.

4. Reflecting

The researcher analysis the result of cycle II. Most of the students respond the researcher actively because all students have dared to speak English in front of the class even the students use sang language, and have a lot of new vocabulary. Also pronunciation and grammar is very good, when the students have a conversation describing something, it is very complete. Starting from the opinions of the students about the object described, information, and characteristics of the object. Students can explain to the partner very detail and specifically. Furthermore, the teaching learning process is done very well. The researcher felt satisfied because the students have significant improvement from the score they get from free cycle, cycle 1, and cycle II. After achieving the target research of where minimally 60% students who pass the KKM, from the criteria 27 students got success. In other side 3 students got filed score., therefore the

researcher decided to stop the classroom Action Research because it had already succeeded.

From the explanation above, students' speaking skill in English lesson classified successful. cycle II the analysis can be followed below:

Table 4.5: Data from Cycle II of Research

No	Initial Name	Criteria					Total	Score
		Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Comprehension		
1	AG	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
2	AH	3	4	3	3	4	18	72
3	A	5	5	4	5	5	24	96
4	AS	4	5	4	5	5	23	92
5	AT	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
6	D	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
7	ES	4	5	4	4	4	21	84
8	EF	4	5	4	5	5	23	92
9	GG	4	4	3	4	5	20	80
10	HAYR	5	5	4	5	5	24	96
11	IP	4	5	3	4	4	20	80
12	JF	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
13	J	4	4	3	4	4	19	76
14	M	3	5	3	4	5	20	80
15	MA	4	5	3	4	5	21	84
16	MAI	3	5	3	4	4	19	76
17	MMU	3	4	4	4	4	19	76

18	MR	5	5	3	4	4	21	84
19	NPD	5	5	4	4	5	23	92
20	N	4	5	3	4	4	20	80
21	P	3	4	3	4	5	19	76
22	DI	4	5	3	4	5	21	84
23	R	4	4	3	5	5	21	84
24	R	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
25	SH	4	5	4	5	5	23	92
26	SN	4	5	4	4	4	21	84
27	SS	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
28	S	4	5	3	4	4	20	80
29	Y	3	5	3	4	4	19	76
30	MS	3	4	3	4	4	18	72
Total (Σ)							612	2448
Mean								81,6

From the table of cycle II, the total score of students was 2448 and the number of students was 30 students, so students' mean was:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{2448}{30}$$

$$\bar{X} = 81,6$$

The students' speaking skill in English lesson increased. The mean of students was 81,6. In cycle II is categorized successful, the result of standard of success criteria (KKM) minimum was >75 score.

Table 4.6: Students Score of Cycle II

No	Initial Name	CYCLE II	
		Score	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AG	80	Successful
2	AH	72	Unsuccessful
3	A	96	Successful
4	AS	92	Successful
5	AT	76	Successful
6	D	76	Successful
7	ES	84	Successful
8	EF	92	Successful
9	GG	80	Successful
10	HAYR	96	Successful
11	IP	80	Successful
12	JF	76	Successful
13	J	76	Successful
14	M	80	Successful
15	MA	84	Successful
16	MAI	76	Successful
17	MMU	76	Successful
18	MR	84	Successful
19	NPD	92	Successful
20	N	80	Successful
21	P	76	Successful
22	DI	84	Successful
23	R	84	Successful
24	R	72	Unsuccessful
25	SH	92	Successful
26	SN	84	Successful
27	SS	80	Successful
28	S	80	Successful
29	Y	76	Successful
30	MS	72	Unsuccessful
Total (Σ)		2448	
Mean		81,6	

From the table of cycle II, the students' speaking skill in English lesson was increased through triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model. The standard of maximum criteria was achieved with mean 81,6 from the total score of students was 2448 divided the number of students who done the test was 30 students.

The students' speaking skill in English lesson increased. The mean of students was 81,6. From the criteria 27 students got success. In other side 3 students got failed score. Because all students have dared to speak English in front of the class even the students use slang language, and have a lot of new vocabulary. Also pronunciation and grammar is very good, when the students have a conversation describing something, it is very complete. Starting from the opinions of the students about the object described, information, and characteristics of the object. Students can explain to the partner very detail and specifically, only for 3 students who did not meet the criteria, the three students were still lacking in grammar, pronunciation and completeness when the students explain about the object in the conversation with his

friend. But from cycle 1 and cycle II 3 students experienced a change towards a better one. The students confident to speak English in front of the class even though the students had not meet the KKM, but the students had succeeded in increasing their abilities. It could be concluded that the students' speaking ability in speaking increased. Post-test cycle II categorized success.

From the explanation above, the students' ability in speaking was classified excellent level while doing action research on cycle II. The result below of comparison of students' score from cycle 1 and cycle 2:

Table 4.7: Comparison table of Students' Score from Free Cycle, Cycle 1 and Cycle II of Research

No	Initial Name	FREE CYCLE		CYCLE 1		CYCLE II	
		Score	Successful Criteria (>75)	Score	Successful Criteria (>75)	Score	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AG	56	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	80	Successful
2	AH	32	Unsuccessful	64	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful
3	A	76	Successful	84	Successful	96	Successful
4	AS	76	Successful	80	Successful	92	Successful
5	AT	36	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful	76	Successful

6	D	44	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
7	ES	48	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
8	EF	76	Successful	80	Successful	92	Successful
9	GG	40	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful	80	Successful
10	HAYR	76	Successful	92	Successful	96	Successful
11	IP	56	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	80	Successful
12	JF	32	Unsuccessful	68	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
13	J	40	Unsuccessful	68	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
14	M	56	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	80	Successful
15	MA	52	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
16	MAI	36	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
17	MMU	44	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
18	MR	48	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
19	NPD	52	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	92	Successful
20	N	56	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	80	Successful
21	P	44	Unsuccessful	64	Unsuccessful	76	Successful
22	DI	60	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
23	R	56	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
24	R	40	Unsuccessful	64	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful
25	SH	48	Unsuccessful	84	Successful	92	Successful
26	SN	52	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	84	Successful
27	SS	68	Unsuccessful	80	Successful	80	Successful
28	S	60	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	80	Successful
29	Y	52	Unsuccessful	76	Successful	76	Successful
30	MS	36	Unsuccessful	64	Unsuccessful	72	Unsuccessful
Total (Σ)		1548		2240		2448	
Mean		51,6		74,6		81,6	

The mean of students' ability in speaking increased on pre-test, post-test, free cycle, cycle 1 and cycle II.

In the free cycle, and the mean of free cycle is 51,6 and they were only 4 who passed the KKM and 26 students unsuccessful, because 4 students almost mastered the five criteria

used by researcher such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. Although not perfect and 26 students does not meet the KKM score because the students are not confident and ultimately do not meet the assessment criteria that the researcher wants. In the five criteria the students have difficulty in grammar and pronunciation. Apart from that, the students have good abilities but only rarely practice to speaking.

In the cycle 1, the mean of cycle 1 is 74,6 and they were only 19 who passed the KKM and 11 students unsuccessful. After students get treatment from researcher. Students are confident and basically they have high learning desires, but at this stage there were still many students who did not pass the KKM because they were still many who did not master in grammar and pronunciation. But for the cycle 1 it is better than the free cycle that has been done before, the researcher felt satisfied enough because their efforts to improve students' speaking skill had been improved proven by score they get although not all the targets accomplished yet. Beside of that, students seemed to accept the material easily by using triple P model. From the reflecting phase

above, there must be more efforts to improve students' speaking ability by using triple P (Presentation, Practice and Production) model.

In cycle II, the mean of students is 81,6. And they were only 27 who passed the KKM and 3 students unsuccessful. Most of the students respond the researcher actively because all students have dared to speak English in front of the class even the students use slang language, and have a lot of new vocabulary. Also pronunciation and grammar is very good, when the students have a conversation describing something, it is very complete. Starting from the opinions of the students about the object described, information, and characteristics of the object. Students can explain to the partner very detail and specifically. Furthermore, the teaching learning process is done very well.

Table 4.8: The Result of Students' Score for Free cycle, Cycle 1 and Cycle II

Meetings		Students Who Got Score >75
Free Cycle	I	4
Cycle 1	III	19
Cycle II	V	27

In the first meeting of free cycle 4 students who got point >75. In the third meeting 19 students who got point >75 and the last meeting 27 students who got point >75

Table 4.9: The Students' Mean Scores in Free Cycle, Cycle 1 and Cycle II

Mean Score	Free Cycle	Cycle I	Cycle II
	51,6	74,6	81,6

The result showed the increasing of students' score from the free cycle to cycle II. In the free cycle, there was only 4 students who got point >75 and the mean of free cycle score 51,6. In the cycle 1 there was 19 students who got point >75 and the mean of cycle 1 74,6 In the cycle II there was 27 students who got point >75 and the mean of cycle II 81,6. It can be conclude that triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model worked effectively in helping student's

ability in speaking at 11 RPL Class of Vocational Senior High School 12 Pandeglang District and this learning has applied successfully and able to increased students' ability in speaking.

C. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The result indicated that there was an increasing on the students' speaking skill by using triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model. The mean of second cycle was 81,6. It indicated that the scores and the mean in second cycle were better than the free cycle and first cycle. In free cycle the students who got point >75 up were 4 students. the cycle 1 students got point >75 were 19 students. the cycle II students got point >75 were 27 students. in other words, the students' ability in speaking improved and became well in the first meeting to the next meeting.

The researcher also analyzed qualitative data were to support research finding beside the quantitative data. The qualitative data were organized from the observation sheet and photography. All of these data indicated that the students given

their attitude and responses during teaching-learning process. Based on the result of the quantitative and qualitative data, it could be concluded that triple P (*Presentation, Practice, and Production*) model could improve students' ability in speaking especially at Vocational Senior High School 12 Pandeglang District

D. DISCUSSION

This research was conducted to find out the improving of the students' speaking skill in English lesson by using triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model. The triple P model was one of model that could be used by the teacher in teaching English to improve the students' ability in speaking.

The research that had been done by the researcher indicated that triple P model was effective or could be used in teaching speaking. It could be seen from the tables that showed us the increasing of students' score from free cycle, cycle 1, and cycle II. The increasing because of the teacher knew how to control the class and created the active class. Besides that, triple P model helped the students to understand the subject easily.

So it could be concluded that the result of the research showed that the implementation of triple P (*Presentation, Practice and Production*) model could improve the students' ability in speaking. It could be seen from the qualitative data by prove the students' score got better in the cycle 1 than free cycle, and the cycle II got better than the cycle 1.

In the free cycle, and the mean of free cycle is 51,6 and they were only 4 who passed the KKM and 26 students unsuccessful, because 4 students almost mastered the five criteria used by researcher such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. Although not perfect and 26 students does not meet the KKM score because the students are not confident and ultimately do not meet the assessment criteria that the researcher wants. In the five criteria the students have difficulty in grammar and pronunciation. Apart from that, the students have good abilities but only rarely practice to speaking.

In the cycle 1, the mean of cycle 1 is 74,6 and they were only 19 who passed the KKM and 11 students unsuccessful. After students get treatment from researcher. Students are confident

and basically they have high learning desires, but at this stage there were still many students who did not pass the KKM because they were still many who did not master in grammar and pronunciation. But for the cycle 1 it is better than the free cycle that has been done before, the researcher felt satisfied enough because their efforts to improve students' speaking skill had been improved proven by score they get although not all the targets accomplished yet. Beside of that, students seemed to accept the material easily by using triple P model. From the reflecting phase above, there must be more efforts to improve students' speaking ability by using triple P (Presentation, Practice and Production) model.

In cycle II, the mean of students is 81,6. And they were only 27 who passed the KKM and 3 students unsuccessful. Most of the students respond the researcher actively because all students have dared to speak English in front of the class even the students use sang language, and have a lot of new vocabulary. Also pronunciation and grammar is very good, when the students have a conversation describing something, it is very complete.

Starting from the opinions of the students about the object described, information, and characteristics of the object. Students can explain to the partner very detail and specifically. Furthermore, the teaching learning process is done very well. so the students were not confident when they first speak with English language but when researcher applied triple P (*Presentation, Practice, and Production*) model students had a place to be able to actively speak in English. In cycle 1 and cycle II the researcher used the same topic and step and the other words, the cycle II categorized success.

Another could be seen from the qualitative data that showed the students was active and spirit in teaching learning process.