

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### 5.1 Conclusions

After conducting the whole steps of this Class Action Research, the researcher will give some conclusion as the result of this research. Furthermore, related to the conclusion the researcher also gives some suggestion.

5.1.1 First, based on the result researcher can conclude that pre-test and post-test on cycle I, students still get a low score because they have not used the good strategy to help them in understanding the meaning of the text. The mean score from pre-test of cycle 1 is 46,5 and post-test of cycle 1 is 50,1. In the cycle 2, researcher use RAP strategy to help students understanding the text entries so can answer the questions on post-test. The mean score from post-test of cycle 2 is 85,3. In cycle 2, the all of students passed the KKM.

5.1.2 They find difficulties in Pre-test, but their difficulties were slowly reduced in Post-test 1 and were totally resolved on Post-test 2. The data show that the students made 744 (or: 46.50%) right answers and 856 (or: 53.50%) on Pre-Test, 802 (or: 50%) right answers and 798 (or: 50%) wrong answers on Post-test 1 and 1,366 (or: 85%) right answers and 234 (or: 15%) wrong answers on Post-test 2.

5.1.3 Their level of mastery was very high. It can be seen from the data that 16 students got very scores on the Post-test 2.

## 5.2 Suggestions

In this part, the researcher would like to give some suggestion to be considered by English teacher as follows:

5.2.1 RAP (Read-Ask-Paraphrase) would be very helpful to improve students reading comprehension, so the teacher needs maintain using RAP strategy as alternative technique of the teaching process in the first grade students of Junior High School.

5.2.2 The teacher should give clear explanation and instruction in directing her students using RAP strategy.

5.2.3 The researcher realize that this research still have some weakness. Therefore, the writer would like to accept any constructive suggestion to make this research better.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burns, P.C, Betty and Elinor. (1996). *Teaching Reading in today's Elementary School*.  
Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 7<sup>th</sup>ed.  
London: Pearson Longman.
- Harris, T. L., and Hodges, R. E. (Ed.). 1981. *Dictionary of reading and related terms*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Klingner, J. K. 2007. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Koshy, V. 2005. *Action Research for Improving Practice: A Practical Guide*.  
London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Lebzelter, S., and Nowacek, J. (1999). Reading strategies for secondary students with mild disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic* , Volume 34 (4), pg. 212-219. Accessed from <http://www.cal.org/> on December 2, 2014.
- Lems, Kristin, Miller, D. Leah and Soro, M. Tenena. (2010 ). *Teaching Reading to English Language Learners*. New York: The Guildford Press.

