

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **4.1 The Preliminary Study**

This chapter focused on analyzing the collecting data. Researcher collected data from class VIII-9 SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan. Researcher was gave the details of the findings from the data collected from the beginning to the end of the study.

Researcher took several steps in conducting research. First, researcher conducted. In this step, the researcher observed and identified problems in the teaching and learning process. Second, the step was called planning. After the problems were observed and identified, researcher and English teachers designed appropriate actions to be applied in the teaching and learning process. The third step were action and observation. In this step the researcher implemented actions that had been designed. After that, the researcher made observation and evaluating the data.

#### **4.2 The First Cycle of CAR (Class Action Research)**

Pre-test was conducted as a preliminary study or conducted before Classroom Action Research (CAR) to identify students' real interest in reading. In pre-test, each student was assigned to read the spoof text story and answer the exercises that had been given, in doing the test students were given 40 minutes. As shown in table 4.2.1 which explained significantly about students learning out comes.

#### **4.2.1 Planning**

The first preparation, the researcher prepares the material to be carried out. Second, prepare tools such as spoof text, markers, eraser and prints of stories about spoof text for student media, cellphones to retrieve documentation. Third, the researcher gave a pre-test to determine the students' basic ability in reading comprehension. The actions that the researcher planned for the Pre-test were the researcher planning to increase students' motivation by explaining the importance of reading comprehension and planning to explore students' background knowledge, and the researcher to prepare observation sheets and to observe and record the teaching and learning process.

#### **4.2.2 Action/Implementation**

This activity is carried out during class hours, students prepare stationery and get ready to answer every question that exists and can also ensure students are calm while doing the exam, the researcher gives students several pre-test that contain questions to be answered and on the sheet there are: multiple choice test questions to be filled. While conducting the test, the researcher asked each student whether there were any questions that confused them or not.

#### **4.2.3 Observing**

This pre-test stage observes students' understanding of the learning process. Before taking the steps and giving the pre-test, the researcher observed the students' participation in the teaching and learning process.

Although students still have a little difficulty understanding the meaning of the text, their curiosity appears to learn the spoof text. When the researcher

observed that many students had a high interest in reading the text and some other students were reluctant to read and study the material provided by the researcher. This can be seen from the students' scores on the pre-test. Details of the pre-test results could be seen below.

#### 4.2.1 The Result of Pre-Test in Cycle I

No.	Students	Pre-Test	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AA	70	Good
2	ADF	50	Average
3	AYD	60	Average
4	AZ	75	Good
5	APU	60	Average
6	AH	70	Good
7	CNP	75	Good
8	DA	60	Average
9	FW	70	Good
10	FKN	50	Average
11	GAG	60	Average
12	JI	50	Average
13	MRS	40	Poor
14	NRH	70	Good
15	NN	70	Good
16	PK	60	Average
17	RDA	50	Average
18	RAF	40	Poor
19	RA	60	Average
20	MH	50	Average
Total		1.190	
Mean		59,5	

To get the result of pre-test, firstly, the researcher calculated the mean score:

*Pre-Test:*

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum p f}{N}$$

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{1.190}{20}$$

$$\text{Mean} = 59,5\%$$

Then, to the percentage of students who passed the KKM score, the researcher used the following formula:

*Pre-Test:*

$$P = \frac{Ff}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{18}{20} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 90\%$$

Based on the results of the pre-test, it was obtained that the average pre-test score was 59,5. There were 2 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM), while there were 18 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM).

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there are only a few students who have an interest in reading in Class VIII-9 of SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan. Several other students experienced a decrease in grade during the pre-test, it happened that some of these students did not understand the pre-test questions which were translated into English, so the students could not answer the pre-test well. Even so, several other students could understand and answer the pre-test well.

The action was needed to maintain students' reading interest was to make interesting teaching materials every time they read a spoof text. This classroom action research was carried out in two cycles. Each cycle followed an action research procedures which included planning, implementation, observation and reflection. The following was an explanation of the results of this action research.

**Table 4.2.2 The Percentage of Pre-Test in Cycle I**

No	Category	Value Range	Frequency	%
1	Excellent	100 – 90	-	-
2	Good	89 – 70	7	35
3	Average	50 - 69	11	55
4	Poor	49 - 30	2	10
5	Very Poor	< 29	-	-
<b>Total</b>			20	100

Table 4.2.2 above, it shows that of the 20 students, none of the students are included in the excellent category, and only 7 students (35%) have the ability

to speak English in the good category. While those in the enough average category amounted to 11 students (55%). Where as in the poor category there were as many 2 students (10%) and there are no students who fall into the very poor category. This result also shows an increase in students' English speaking ability.

#### **4.4.4 Reflecting**

After analyzing the results of the pre-test in the first cycle, it can be concluded that it is important to provide some feedback and motivation to students to be more enthusiastic in reading English texts. Reflection was conducted to determine whether students' reading comprehension increased after reading the spoof text, so that the researcher could determine whether the action was successful or not.

This meeting did not produce satisfactory results, due to time constraints. In addition, students do not bring a dictionary, this causes students to have difficulty in understanding the text.

### **4.3 Post Test**

#### **4.3.1 Planning**

In the first preparation, the researcher prepared the material to be carried out. Second, prepare tools such as spoof text, markers, erasers and prints of stories about spoof text for student media, cellphones to retrieve documentation. Third, the researcher prepared the material to be brought and planned to give a post-test to determine the students' basic ability in reading comprehension. The action

planned by the researcher is to increase students' motivation by explaining the importance of reading comprehension and exploring students' background knowledge, and preparing observation sheets as well as observing and recording the teaching and learning process.

#### **4.3.2 Action/Implementation**

This activity was carried out during class hours, the students prepared stationery and get ready to search every question that existed and also made sure that the students were calm while doing exams. The researcher could give students several sheets of paper containing questions to be answered. On the answer sheets there were multiple choice test questions to be filled. When reading the shared text, firstly students read the contents of the story from the spoof text and answered any available test questions. While doing the test, the researcher asked each student whether there were any questions that confused them or not. After that the researcher asked the students to do a post-test. The post test was given according to the material that had been taught previously and after that the researcher and the students could discuss each answer on the test together by using the correct language. Finally, The students were asked to collect the tests to be assessed by the researcher.

#### **4.3.3 Observing**

Like the first and second meeting cycles, this post-test stage observed students' understanding of the learning process. Before taking the steps and giving the post-test, the researcher observed the students' participation in the teaching

and learning process by reviewing the spoof text by prioritizing the pre-test, cycle and post-test.

At the 3<sup>th</sup> meeting, Tuesday, August 24, 2021, observing students' reading comprehension with spoof texts, they were very enthusiastic. Although students still have a little difficulty understanding the meaning of the text, their curiosity appears to learn the spoof text. When the researcher observed the post-test, many students had a high interest in reading the text and some students were reluctant to read and study the material provided by the researcher.

This could be seen from the students' scores on the post-test. At the 3<sup>th</sup> meeting, it was followed by taking post-test scores, by giving a test to understand the spoof text and answering several related texts to find out whether all students had understood.

At the 3<sup>th</sup> meeting, students seriously read the spoof text because this spoof text is a funny story so that they are interested in reading. In order for the teaching and learning process between students and researchers to run well, when the post test was carried out there was an increase in reading comprehension scores at the 3<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Table 4.3.1 The Result Post-Test in Cycle I**

No.	Students	Post-Test	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AA	70	Good
2	ADF	60	Average
3	AYD	50	Average
4	AZ	50	Average
5	APU	60	Average

6	AH	70	Good
7	CNP	75	Good
8	DA	50	Average
9	FW	60	Average
10	FKN	65	Average
11	GAG	70	Good
12	JI	50	Average
13	MRS	75	Good
14	NRH	60	Average
15	NN	70	Good
16	PK	60	Average
17	RDA	70	Good
18	RAF	60	Average
19	RA	75	Good
20	MH	60	Average
Total		1.260	
Mean		63	

To get the result of pre-test, firstly, the researcher calculated the mean score:

*Post-Test:*

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum p f}{N}$$

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{1.260}{20}$$

$$\text{Mean} = 63\%$$

Then, to the percentage of students who passed the KKM score, the researcher used the following formula:

*Post-Test:*

$$P = \frac{Ff}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{17}{20} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 85\%$$

Based on the results of the post-test, it was obtained that the average post-test score was 63. There were 3 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM), while there were 17 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM).

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there are only a few students who have an interest in reading in Class VIII-9 of SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan. Several other students experienced a decrease in grade during the post-test, it happened that some of these students did not understand the post-test questions which were translated into English, so the students could not answer the post-test well. Even so, several other students could understand and answer the post-test well.

The action was needed to maintain students' reading interest was to make interesting teaching materials every time they read a spoof text. This classroom action research was carried out in two cycles. Each cycle followed an action

research procedures which included planning, implementation, observation and reflection. The following was an explanation of the results of this action research.

**Table 4.3.2 The Percentage of Post-Test in Cycle I**

No	Category	Value Range	Frequency	%
1	Excellent	100 – 90	-	-
2	Good	89 – 70	8	40
3	Average	50 – 69	12	60
4	Poor	49 – 30	-	-
5	Very Poor	< 29	-	-
<b>Total</b>			20	100

Table 4.3.2 above, it shows that of the 20 students, none of the students are included in the excellent category, and only 8 students (40%) have the ability to speak English in the good category. While those in the enough average category amounted to 12 students (60%). There are no students who fall into the poor and very poor category. This result also shows an increase in students' English speaking ability.

#### **4.3.4 Reflecting**

By analyzing the score measures in the post-test cycle I, the teacher concluded that the students could improve their reading comprehension. The post-test in Cycle I gave quite satisfactory results. It may also be influenced by students' feelings. Students understand the material easily because the instructions are short, clear and concise. In this cycle it can be concluded that the

students' reading comprehension increased slightly, they began to be able to answer questions. This can be observed in table 4.3.1 and table 4.3.2. Test results increased significantly students passed with standard scores.

#### **4.4 The Second Cycle of CAR (Class Action Research)**

The processes of Cycle II were:

##### **4.4.1 Planning**

The first, the researcher prepared the materials to be carried out. Second, prepared tools such as eraser and spoof text stories for student media, and cellphones to get pictures. Third, prepared research instruments, such as student worksheets. Fourth, the researcher worked on students's worksheets for the first cycle to be investigated and answered which one was the best answers. The last, explained a little about the tests given. The researcher also prepared Cycle II as a test to find out whether the students could achieve the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* in English of 75 or more and 20 students took English reading comprehension classes.

##### **4.4.2 Action/Implementation**

Cycle II was held three times on 12<sup>th</sup>,19<sup>th</sup> August 2021. One of the evaluations of Cycle II was that students were still confused with difficult words in the text. Therefore, the researcher asked them to bring a dictionary for the next meetings or borrow it from the school's library. The 4<sup>th</sup> meeting was held on August 12<sup>th</sup> 2021 which focused on motivating students to learn English in order to improve students' reading skills with spoof text. The 5<sup>th</sup> meeting was held by

the researcher on August 19<sup>th</sup> 2021 where the researcher gave an example of understanding the spoof text and asked students to remember the material so that students could answer the post-test well for the next meeting.

#### 4.4.3 Observing

At the first meeting of Cycle II, observation was also made during the implementation of the action. The researcher observed the learning process, the students focused on listening to the explanation about the spoof text. They paid attention and provided feedback when there were questions about the material. Then, the researcher gave the opportunity for students to read the spoof text that had been given, in the middle of the activity the researcher asked students to understand the reading and answer questions individually. The learning process went smoothly and most of the students understood the lesson. This could be seen when the teacher took grades by giving assignments.

**Table 4.4.1 The Result Pre-Test in Cycle II**

No.	Students	Pre-Test	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AA	70	Good
2	ADF	80	Good
3	AYD	70	Good
4	AZ	70	Good
5	APU	60	Average
6	AH	50	Average
7	CNP	60	Average
8	DA	80	Average
9	FW	70	Good
10	FKN	80	Good
11	GAG	70	Good

12	JI	70	Good
13	MRS	50	Average
14	NRH	60	Average
15	NN	70	Good
16	PK	80	Good
17	RDA	60	Average
18	RAF	80	Good
19	RA	50	Average
20	MH	70	Good
Total		1.350	
Mean		67,5	

To get the result of pre-test, firstly, the researcher calculated the mean score:

*Pre-Test:*

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum p f}{N}$$

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{1.350}{20}$$

$$\text{Mean} = 67,5\%$$

Then, to the percentage of students who passed the KKM score, the researcher used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{Ff}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{15}{20} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 75\%$$

Based on the results of the pre-test, it was obtained that the average pre-test score was 67,5. There were 5 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM), while there were 15 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM).

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there are only a few students who have an interest in reading in Class VIII-9 of SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan. Several other students experienced a decrease in grade during the pre-test, it happened that some of these students did not understand the pre-test questions which were translated into English, so the students could not answer the pre-test well. Even so, several other students could understand and answer the pre-test well.

The action was needed to maintain students' reading interest was to make interesting teaching materials every time they read a spoof text. This classroom action research was carried out in two cycles. Each cycle followed an action research procedures which included planning, implementation, observation and reflection. The following was an explanation of the results of this action research

**Table 4.4.2 The Percentage of Pre-Test in Cycle I**

No	Category	Value Range	Frequency	%
1	Excellent	100 – 90	-	-
2	Good	89 – 70	12	60

3	Average	50 - 69	8	40
4	Poor	49 - 30	-	-
5	Very Poor	< 29	-	-
<b>Total</b>			20	100

Table 4.4.2 above, it shows that of the 20 students, none of the students are included in the excellent category, and only 12 students (60%) have the ability to speak English in the good category. While those in the enough average category amounted to 8 students (40%). There are no students who fall into the poor and very poor category. This result also shows an increase in students' English speaking ability.

#### **4.4.4 Reflecting**

After analyzing the results of the pre-test in Cycle II, it can be concluded that it is important to provide feedback to students so that they are more interested in reading English texts including spoof text. Reflection was conducted to determine whether students' reading comprehension increased after reading the spoof text, so that the researcher could determine whether the action was successful or not.

At the meeting the average score of students increased more than the pre-test in the Cycle I, the results were satisfactory. In addition, some students are willing to bring a dictionary even though not all of them have at least increased.

## **4.5 Post Test**

### **4.5.1 Planning**

In the first preparation, the researcher prepared the material to be carried out. Second, prepare tools such as spoof text, markers, erasers and prints of stories about spoof text for student media, cellphones to retrieve documentation. Third, the researcher prepared the material to be brought and planned to give a post-test to determine the students' basic ability in reading comprehension.

The action planned by the researcher is to increase students' motivation by explaining the importance of reading comprehension and exploring students' background knowledge, and preparing observation sheets as well as observing and recording the teaching and learning process.

### **4.5.2 Action/Implementation**

This activity was carried out during class hours, the students prepared stationery and get ready to search every question that existed and also made sure that the students were calm while doing exams. The researcher could give students several sheets of paper containing questions to be answered. On the answer sheets there were multiple choice test questions to be filled. When reading the shared text, firstly students read the contents of the story from the spoof text and answered any available test questions. While doing the test, the researcher asked each student whether there were any questions that confused them or not. After that the researcher asked the students to do a post-test. The post test was given according to the material that had been taught previously and after that the researcher and the students could discuss each answer on the test together by

using the correct language. Finally, The students were asked to collect the tests to be assessed by the researcher.

### **4.5.3 Observing**

Like the first and second meeting cycles, this post-test stage observed students' understanding of the learning process. Before doing the steps and giving the post-test, the researcher observing student participation in the teaching and learning process by reviewing spoof text by prioritizing pre-test, cycle and post-test.

At the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, Tuesday, August 19<sup>th</sup> 2021, observing students' reading comprehension with spoof texts, they were very enthusiastic. Although students still have a little difficulty understanding the meaning of the text, their curiosity appears to learn the spoof text. When the researcher gave the post-test, many students had a high interest in reading the text and some students were reluctant to read and study the material provided by the researcher. This could be seen from the students' scores in the post-test of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting taking post-test scores, by giving a test to understand the spoof text and answering several related texts to find out whether all students have understood.

At the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, students seriously read the spoof text because this spoof text is a funny story so they are interested in reading. In order for the teaching and learning process between students and researchers to run well, when the post test was carried out there was an increase in reading comprehension scores at the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Table 4.5.1 The Result Post-Test in Cycle II**

No.	Students	Post-Test	Successful Criteria (>75)
1	AA	80	Good
2	ADF	80	Good
3	AYD	75	Good
4	AZ	75	Good
5	APU	90	Excellent
6	AH	75	Good
7	CNP	80	Good
8	DA	90	Excellent
9	FW	75	Good
10	FKN	85	Good
11	GAG	75	Good
12	JI	90	Excellent
13	MRS	75	Good
14	NRH	75	Good
15	NN	80	Good
16	PK	80	Good
17	RDA	75	Good
18	RAF	90	Excellent
19	RA	85	Good
20	MH	75	Good
Total		1.605	
Mean		80,25	

To get the result of post-test, firstly, the researcher calculated the mean score:

*Post-Test:*

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum p f}{N}$$

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{1.605}{20}$$

$$\text{Mean} = 80,25\%$$

Then, to the percentage of students who passed the KKM score, the researcher used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{Ff}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{0}{20} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 0\%$$

Based on the post-test results, the average post-test score was 80.25. There are 20 or all students who score above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while 0 or no other students score below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM).

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that all students have an interest in reading in Class VIII-9 SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan. All students experienced an increase in grades during the post-test, this happened because all of these students were able to understand the post-test questions which were translated into English, so that students could answer the post-test well.

Next, the action needed to maintain students' reading interest is to make interesting teaching materials every time they read the spoof text. This very satisfying final result shows that it has succeeded in improving student learning outcomes, even increasing students' reading comprehension in spoof text.

**Table 4.5.2 The Percentage of Post-Test in Cycle II**

No	Category	Value Range	Frequency	%
1	Excellent	100 – 90	4	20
2	Good	89 – 70	16	80
3	Average	50 - 69	-	-
4	Poor	49 - 30	-	-
5	Very Poor	< 29	-	-
<b>Total</b>			20	100

Table 4.4.2 above, it shows that of the of 20 students who fall into the excellent category, there are 4 students (20%), and only 16 students (80%) have the ability to speak English in the good category. While those in the enough average category amounted to none students. There are no students who fall into the poor and very poor category. This result also shows an increase in students' English speaking ability.

#### **4.5.4 Reflecting**

The researcher argued that the test was given to students in the same way as in Cycle I and Cycle II, to see whether there was an increase or not when the post-test was carried out. There was a belief about increasing students'

understanding with the successful spoof text at the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the final result was also very satisfying. The researcher thanked them, because the learning process at the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting was more satisfying for them. Eventhough there was a drastic decline in student scores at the previous meeting. Finally at the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the student's grades began to stabilize again.

#### **4.6 Data Analysis**

This research was conducted by compiling data using the CAR (Classroom Action Research) method. Each cycle consists of four steps of classroom action research (planning, action/implementation, observation and reflection). Pre-test and Post-test, Cycle I, Cycle II were each carried out in one meeting. In total, five meetings were conducted during this study. From the results of the analysis in Cycle I and Cycle II, it showed that there was a significant increase in students' reading comprehension. Tables 4.3.1 and 4.5.1 show the increase in students' reading comprehension from Cycle I to Cycle II. The study was conducted in one class with a sample of 20 people.

Based on these data, the results obtained from the average pre-test in Cycle I was 59.5%. There are 2 students whose scores are above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while the other 18 students are below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). Cycle I post-test was 63%. There are 3 students whose scores are above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while 17 other students are below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan*

*Minimum* (KKM). The same thing happened to the pre-test Cycle II was 67.5%. There are 5 students whose scores are above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while 15 other students are below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). And an increase in the post-test cycle II was 80.25%. all students' scores are above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), there are no students who have scores below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM).

After analyzing the results of the preliminary study, it can be concluded that most of the eighth grade students of SMP Swasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan succeeded in improving students' reading comprehension, especially spoof text. At the first meeting of the pre-test Cycle I, students' reading comprehension decreased. Then the researcher made a post-test with 10 questions to increase the score at the next meeting, this affected student success. Then in the Cycle II of pre-test there was an increase in students' reading comprehension, this can be seen from the average value of the second cycle of pre-test with a total score of 67.5%, from the previous meeting.

The most satisfying final result shows that this research has succeeded in improving student learning outcomes, even increasing students' reading comprehension in spoof text. In Cycle II, the teacher changes the procedures for reading comprehension from groups to individuals. This action is needed to maintain students' reading comprehension. It can be concluded that students enjoy learning because they feel reading spoof texts is fun, easy to accept and relaxed.

In addition, student involvement is not only student interaction using language skills during the learning process but also participation that occurs through interaction between students and researchers during the activity.

#### **4.7 Finding**

Based on the data analysis above, it was found that reading comprehension and reviewing spoof text can provide a significant improvement in students' reading comprehension, especially in English lessons, as shown in the Pre-test, Post-test, Cycle I and Cycle II, there was an increase in the scores of students who significant to students' Reading Comprehension learning. Although initially there was a decline in students' grades, in Cycle II students' reading interest increased slowly. In the learning process, students are happy and enthusiastic when studying with researcher, because spoof text has made them learn funny stories so that students are interested in reading and serious in understanding each teaching material and test given.

Based on the results of the pre-test Cycle I, it can be obtained that the average pre-test score is 59.5%. There were 2 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 18 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). Post-test in the Cycle I, the data obtained the average score is 63%. There were 3 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 17 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria*

*Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). In contrast to the pre-test data analysis in Cycle II, it showed that the average pre-test score was 67.5%. There were 5 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 15 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). The post-test in Cycle II showed that the average pre-test score was 80.25%. All students scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). The final result which is very satisfying shows that the researcher succeeded in improving students' reading comprehension with spoof text.

After analyzing the results of the preliminary study, it can be concluded that most of the Class VIII-9 students of SMP SWasta Al-Washliyah 30 Medan had an interest in reading spoof text. When the post-test was conducted, there was a significant increase in students' reading comprehension scores at the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. This turned out to greatly affect their success, where as in the previous meeting there was an increase and decrease in the value of unstable students because there were still some of them who did not fully understand about spoof text. This can be seen from the average value from Cycle I to Cycle II. At the last meeting the students got good scores from the previous meeting. This very satisfying final result showed that the researcher succeeded in improving student learning outcomes.

#### **4.8 Discussion**

This research was conducted to determine the improvement of reading comprehension with spoof text. Based on the results of the pre-test Cycle I, it can be obtained that the average pre-test score is 59.5%. There were 2 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 18 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). Post-test in the Cycle I, the data obtained the average score is 63%. There were 3 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 17 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). In contrast to the pre-test data analysis in Cycle II, it showed that the average pre-test score was 67.5%. There were 5 students who scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM), while there were 15 other students who were below the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). The post-test in Cycle II showed that the average pre-test score was 80.25%. All students scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). The final result which is very satisfying shows that the researcher succeeded in improving students' reading comprehension with spoof text.

The results in this research were shown very satisfactory final scores. Although there were many obstacles in conducting this research, all of them were successfully implemented. All students were also very enthusiastic about following the teaching materials provided by the researcher, The English teacher

from the school was also very good at helping with everything ordered. From the beginning of the meeting to the last meeting there were obstacles in anyway including students' interest in reading, but the researcher managed to change the mindset about "Reading is boring, makes students interesting to observe".

This research was getting an up and down process, the discussion of this material was carried out together so that researcher and students were able to work together so that the teaching and learning process was carried out in an coordinated manner. At the last meeting, students seriously read the spoof text because they wanted to know how the story in the text was, and how interesting the story was for them to read, so that the learning process between students and research run well. Finally all student was able to get a very satisfactory scores and the research had been successfully carried out by researcher