**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Research Procedure**

The research was conducted on November 2017. Before conducting the research, firstly the researcher asked permission to the headmaster and the English teacher at the school. After having the permission, the researcher conducted through the following steps:

1. Determined the subject of research, namely the students at the first semester of

The eleventh grade of SMK N 1 Abung Selatan.

1. Designed the test which was the writing test.
2. Determined the sample of research by using cluster random sampling.
3. Held the readability of the test (it was given to the students out of the research

sample).

1. Held pre-test in order to know the students’ score in narrative text writing ability

before they had treatment.

1. Analyzed the data gotten through pre-test.
2. Gave the treatment to the sample of the research by implementing semantic mapping in teaching and learning narrative text writing ability.
3. Held post-test in order to know the students’ score in narrative text writing

ability after the treatments.

1. Analyzed the data gotten through post-test. The data were analyzed by using excel formula.

10.Tested the hypothesis and made the conclusion.

11.Reported the result of the research.

1. **Data Description**

This research was conducted in three meetings. On Wednesday, November 1st, 2017 the researcher administered the pre-test. The researcher gave the pre-test and post-test to experimental class (XI AKP) and control class (XI TKJ).

In SMK N 1 Abung Selatan, English subject was taught twice a week. The researcher gave the pre-test on November 1st, 2017 in experimental and control class. In the experimental class which consists of 39 students and in the control class which consists of 38 students. When the researcher gave the pre-test all the students followed the test. Then, on Monday, November 6th, 2017 the researcher gave the first treatment in experimental class at 08.35 am and in control class at 10.30 am. There was no student absent in the experimental and control class.

The researcher gave the second treatment on Wednesday, November 8th, 2017. In this session, the students of experimental class there was no student absent and in control class there was two students absent. In experimental class, the treatment began at 08.35 am where as in control class at 10.30 am. Then, on Monday, November 13th, 2017 the researcher gave the third treatment. The treatment began at 08.35 am in experimental class and in control class at 10.30 am, the students in the experimental class and control class there was no student absent. For the last meeting, the researcher gave the post-test to the students in experimental and control class on Wednesday, November 15th, 2017. All of the students in experimental class and control class followed the post-test.

1. **Description of the First Treatment in Experimental Class**

In the first treatment was done on Monday, November 6th, 2017. The researcher taught a material about narrative text. Many students looked so nervous. In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the researcher checked attendance list. The researcher gave the general explanation about the material of learning and the researcher gave the description about the indicator.

In the main step, pre-writing, the teacher explained about narrative text (definition, generic structure, language feature and the purpose). The researcher gave the topic of narrative text to the students. The topic was about narrative story. The title is “Sangkuriang” and the the researcher gave explanation about the generic structure of the text. Then the researcher gave the same topic to the students but the title was different. The title was “The Legend of Danau Toba”.

The researcher made a discussion with the students about the new topic by using the semantic mapping. The procedure was follows:

1. The researcher wrote the topic of piece of writing “The Legend of Danau Toba” in a short form in the middle of the board.
2. The students the suggested ideas that they had about danau toba and the researcher noted the most important word and phrases from these ideas on board radiating out from the topic. If ideas were slow in coming the researcher gave some guiding questions.
3. After a reasonable number of words and phrases were on the board and these covers in the main ideas, the researcher and students the suggested how these ideas could be sequence in a piece of writing.
4. The researcher made sure that the words or phrases were actually remembered, the researcher told the students to look at the board for a minute and then cleans the board. The students then came up one by one to construct what was on the board.

The researcher asked the students to make a narrative text about the story, but the researcher guide them. In closing step, the researcher asked the students about the material to know the students understood or misunderstood about it. The researcher and the students made a conclusion and the researcher closed the learning process.

1. **Description of the Second Treatment**

The second treatment was done on Wednesday, November 9th, 2017. In the second treatment was better than the first because the students more enjoy than before. The students enjoyed the materials given. In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the researcher checked attendance list. The researcher gave the general explanation about the material of learning and the researcher gave the description about the indicator.

In while teaching, the researcher gave the topic of narrative text to the students. The topic of second meeting was **“Roro Jongrang”**. The researcher gave the explanation about the generic structure of the text. Then, the researcher made a discussion with the students about the topic by using semantic mapping technique. The procedure as follows:

1. The researcher wrote the topic of piece of writing “Roro Jongrang” in a short form in the middle of the board.
2. The students then suggested ideas that they had heard or read about the story and the researcher noted the most important words and phrases from these ideas on board radiating out from the topic. If ideas were slow in coming the researcher gave some guiding questions.
3. After a reasonable number of words and phrases were on the board and these covers in the main ideas, the researcher and students the suggested how these ideas could be sequence in a piece of writing.
4. The researcher made sure that the words or phrases were actually remembered, the researcher told the students to look at the board for a minute and then cleans the board. The students then came up one by one to construct what was on the board.
5. The researcher asked the students to make five groups. There were six students for each group.
6. The researcher asked the students to make narrative text about “**Roro Jongrang”** story in a group.

In post-teaching, the researcher, asked the students about the material to know the students understood or misunderstood about it. Then, the researcher and students made a conclusion and the researcher closed the learning process.

1. **Description of the Third Treatment**

The third treatment on Monday, November 13th, 2017 was better than the second treatment because the students felt accustomed in teaching learning process through teacher written feedback. The researcher did not felt hard to explain what students should do because the students had already known what they must done step by step**.** In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the last the teacher checked attendance list.

In the main step, pre-writing, the teacher explained about narrative text and the title of the third treatment was **“Rapunzel**”. The researcher gave the explanation about the generic structure of the text. The researcher made a discussion with the students that the topic by using semantic mapping technique. The procedure was ss follows:

1. The researcher wrote the topic of piece of writing “Rapunzel” in a short form in the middle of the board.
2. The students then suggested ideas that they had heard or read about the story and the researcher noted the most important words and phrases from these ideas on board radiating out from the topic. If ideas were slow in coming the researcher gave some guiding questions.
3. After a reasonable number of words and phrases were on the board and these covers in the main ideas, the researcher and students the suggested how these ideas could be sequence in a piece of writing.
4. The researcher made sure that the words or phrases were actually remembered, the researcher told the students to look at the board for a minute and then cleans the board. The students then came up one by one to construct what was on the board.
5. The researcher asked the students to make a narrative text about their the story individually without the guiding of the researcher.

In the last step, the researcher asked the students about the material to know the students understood or misunderstood about it. The researcher and the students made a conclusion and then the researcher closed the learning process.

1. **Description of The First Treatment in Control Class**

In the first treatment was done on Monday, November 6th, 2017. The researcher taught a material about narrative text. Many students looked so nervous. In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the researcher checked attendance list. The researcher gave the general explanation about the material of learning and the researcher gave the description about the indicator.

In the main step, pre-writing, the teacher explained about narrative text (definition, generic structure, language feature and the purpose). The researcher gave the topic of narrative text to the students. The topic was about narrative story. The title is **“Sangkuriang**” and the the researcher gave explanation about the generic structure of the text. Then the researcher gave the same topic to the students but the title was different. The title was “**The Legend of Danau Toba**”.

The researcher made a discussion with the students about the new topic by using the lecturing technique. The procedure was follows:

1. Presenting information, in the learning process the researcher as central for the students to get the information, the researcher explained about the narrative.
2. Clarifying topics and issues, the researcher told the students what narrative text by encouraging students to think about the text.
3. The researcher asked the students to write a narrative by the title “**the legend of danau toba”.**
4. And the last, the researcher would asked the students to collect their work.
5. **Description of The Second Treatment in Control Class**

The second treatment was done on Wednesday, November 9th, 2017. In the second. In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the researcher checked attendance list. The researcher gave the general explanation about the material of learning and the researcher gave the description about the indicator.

In while teaching, the researcher gave the topic of narrative text to the students. The topic of second meeting was **“Roro Jongrang”**. The researcher gave the explanation about the generic structure of the text. Then, the researcher made a discussion with the students about the topic by using lecturing technique. The procedure as follows:

1. Presenting information, in the learning process the researcher as central for the students to get the information, the researcher explained about the narrative (generic structure, language features, and the example of the narrative text “Sangkuriang”).
2. Clarifying topics and issues, the researcher told the students what narrative text by encouraging students to think about the text.
3. The researcher asked the students to write a narrative by the title “**the legend of danau toba”.**
4. And the last, the researcher would asked the students to collect their work.
5. **Description of The Third Treatment in Control Class**

The third treatment on Monday, November 13th, 2017**.**In the introduction step, the teacher greeted to the students and asked the students’ condition. Next, the teacher asked the chairman led to pray together and the last the teacher checked attendance list.

In the main step, pre-writing, the teacher explained about narrative text and the title of the third treatment was **“Rapunzel**”. The researcher gave the explanation about the generic structure of the text. The researcher made a discussion with the students that the topic by using semantic mapping technique. The procedure was as follows:

1. Presenting information, in the learning process the researcher as central for the students to get the information, the researcher explained about the narrative.
2. Clarifying topics and issues, the researcher told the students what narrative text by encouraging students to think about the text.
3. The researcher asked the students to write a narrative by the title “the legend of danau toba”.
4. And the last, the researcher would asked the students to collect their work.
5. **Data Analysis**

The research was aim to know whether there was any significant influence for the students’ narrative text in writing ability after they were given treatment by using semantic mapping as technique in this research. The research was conducted of the first semester of the regular class of the eleventh grade of SMK Negeri 1 Abung Selatan. The number of population was 144 students of the first semester. Two classes as sample of research, they were XI AKP and XI TKJ. In this case, the researcher used cluster random sampling when choosing the sample. Furthermore, the instrument of this research was written test especially in narrative text.

1. **Result of Pre-test**

At the first meeting the researcher conducted pre-test in order to find out the previous students’ narrative text in writing ability. The pre-test was administered on November, Wednesday 1st, 2017 at 08. 35 a.m for the XI AKP as the experimental class and at 10.30 a.m for class XI TKJ as the control class.

The analysis showed that the mean score of pre-test in control class was 58.59 The highest score was 71.5 and the lowest score was 46.5. The median score was 58.5 and mode score was 64. While in experimental class the mean score was 57.19. The highest score was 68.5 and the lowest score was 48.5. The median score was 58.5 and mode score was 64. (see appendix 15)

1. **Result of Post-test**

After conducting three meetings of treatments the researcher conducted the post-test to the sample. The researcher conducted post-test in order to see whether the students’ score increased or not. The post-test was conducted on Wednesday, May 15th, 2017 at 08.35 a.m for the XI AKP as the experimental class and at 10.30 a.m for class XI TKJ as the control class.

The analysis showed that the mean score of post-test in control class was 71.93. The highest score was 81.5 and the lowest score was 60. The median score was 71 and mode score was 71. While in experimental class the mean score was 78.27 The highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 72. The median score was 78 and mode score was 78. (see appendix 16)

1. **Result of Normality Test**

The normality test is used to measure whether the data in the experimental class and control classes are normally distributed or not.

The hypothesis formulas as follows:

Ho = the data have normal distribution.

Ha= the data do not have normal distribution .

The criteria acceptance:

H0 is accepted if Lobserved < Lcritical it means that the distribution of the data is normal.

Ha is accepted if Lobserved > Lcritical it means that the distribution of the data is not normal.

**Table 4**

**Normality of the Experimental and Control Class**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Class** | **Pre-test** | | **Post-test** | | **Calculation** |
| **Lobserve** | **Lcritical** | **Lobserve** | **Lcritical** |
| Experimental | 0.1278 | 0.1386 | 0.0724 | 0.1386 | Normal |
| Control | 0.0952 | 0.1406 | 0.12403 | 0.1406 |

Based on the Table 7, it can be seen that in the experimental and control class showed if Lobserve ≥ Lcritical. So, the calculation is that the population is in normal. (See appendix and )

1. **Result of Homogeneity Test**

Homogeneity test is used to determine whether the data obtained from the sample homogeneous or not.

The hypothesis formulas as follows:

Ho = the variance of the data is homogenous

Ha= the variance of the data is not homogenous

The criteria acceptance:

Ho is accepted if Fobserved is ≤ Fcritical, it means that the variance of the data is homogenous.

Ha is accepted if Fobserved is Lcritical, Fcritical, it means that the variance of the data is not homogenous.

**Table 5**

**Homogeneity of Experimental and Control Class**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **The biggest Variance** | **The smallest Variance** | **Fobserved** | **Fcritical** | **Calculation** |
| **Pre-test** | 5.99 | 4.68 | 1.2799 | 1.72 | Homogenous |
| **Post-test** | 5.17 | 3.21 | 1.6105 | 1.72 |

Based on the Table 8, it can be seen at the result of the pre and post test were 1.2799 and 1.6105 while the Fcritical at thesignificant level of 0.05 is 1.72. It proves that Ho is accepted because Ho accepted if Fobserved is ≤ Fcritical. it means that the variance of the data is homogenuous. (See appendix 22)

1. **Result of Readability**

Readability tests are indicators that measure how easy a document to read and understand. Based on the finding of Kouame’s research, if the mean of all items of the instrument text has mean under 4.46, the instrument is quite readable and understandable by the readers or test takers. Furthermore, the finding of Kouame’s research, if the mean of all items of the instrument text has mean under 4.46, the instrument is quite readable and understandable by the readers or test takers. Because the mean of the items (instrument) of writing test was 2.72 (lower than 4.46), it means that the instrument was readable. (See appendix 11)

1. **Result of Reliability**

Reliability is a measure of accuracy, consistency, dependability or fairness of scores resulting from administration of particular examination. Furthermore, to know the degree or the level of the reliability of writing test the writer consulted the criteria of reliability as follows.[[1]](#footnote-2)

0. 80 – 1. 00 = very high

0. 60 – 0. 80 = high,

0. 40 – 0. 60 = medium

0. 20 – 0. 40 = low

0. 00 – 0. 20 = very low

* 1. Reliability of Pre-test

The result reliability of the pretest was 0.99997371 and the criteria of reliability were very high. (See appendix 12)

* 1. Reliability of Post-test

The result reliability of the post-test was 0.9999474 and the criteria of reliability was very high. (see appendix 13)

1. **Result of Hypothetical Test**

Based on the previous explanation that the normality and homogeneity test was satisfied. Therefore, the researcher used the following t-test by independent t-test for hypothetical of test.

The hypotheses as follows:

Ha: There is significant influence of using semantic mapping technique towards students’

writing ability in narrative text at the first semester of the eleventh grade of SMK Negeri 1 Abung Selatan in the academic year of 2017/2018.

H0: There is no influence of using semantic mapping technique towards students’

writing ability in narrative text at the first semester of the eleventh grade of SMK Negeri 2 Abung Selatan in the academic year of 2017/2018.

The criteria of the test as follows:

Ha is accepted if tobserved is higher than tcritical, or (tobserved>tcritical)

Ho is accepted if tobserved is lower than tcritical, or (tobserved < tcritical)

In this case, the researcher used the level of significant α = 0.05

Based on the calculation was obtained t-test was while the df (number of sample from both control and experimental class subtracted by 2 was 75. Thus the result of level of significant 0.05 was 1.664. It can be seen that the result of ttest was tobserved > tcritical. So,Ha was accepted because >1.664. Then, it could be assumed that there was significant influence of using semantic mapping towards students’ writing ability in narrative text. (see appendix 24)

1. **Discussion**

The present research has shown that semantic mapping can improve students’ writing ability in narrative text. From the result above, it can be seen that the result of students’ post-test was higher than that in the pre-test. Besides, semantic mapping can improve each aspect of students’ writing including content, organization, vocabulary, language and mechanics.

At the beginning of activity, the pre-test was administered to know students’ achievement in narrative writing ability before they were give treatments by the researcher. The result shows that the average score between control class and experimental class were slightly different. The average score control class was 58.59 and the average score of experimental class was 57.19. Although the average score of control class was higher than experimental class, the normality and the homogeneity test show that the data were homogeneous and normal. Therefore, it can be concluded that the two groups, control and experimental class, had the same ability at the beginning of the research.

Afterwards, the students were taught through semantic mapping in the experimental class and lecturing technique in the control class. The material was three topics of narrative for three treatments. Before doing treatment, the researcher explained to the students what narrative text and semantic mapping are and how we can do the procedure of narrative text.

At the end of the research, post-test was given to measure the improvement of writing ability in narrative text in both classes after the treatment done. Based on the analysis of the data and the testing hypothesis, the result of the calculation is found that the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. From the analysis above, we know that the students who got high frequency of using semantic mapping technique got better score than the students without using semantic mapping technique in teaching narrative writing. It is proved by the increasing average score in both classes. The average score of control class was 71.93 and the average score of experimental class was 78.27. So, it can be concluded that using semantic mapping technique is one of good technique in correcting to motivate students in learning English, especially in narrative writing.

1. Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian Suatuu Pendekatan Praktek (*Jakarta*:* Rineka Cipta, 2010), p.319. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)