CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the result of the research findings and discussion that include data of research findings, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. Research Finding

The present research was designed to find out the ability of the first graders of SMAN 01 BANTUR in academic year 2017/2018 in reading narrative text when they were taught reading by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and when they were taught reading without using Semantic Mapping Strategy. The subjects of the research consist of two classes. The data were described into two tables. The table 7 showed students" score and achievement in control class and the table 8 showed the students" score and achievement in experimental class. The data of this research were the pre-test scores and post-test scores of control group and experimental group. The scores are presented as follows.

1. The Data of Control Class

Table 4.1

The Students' Scores of Control Class

NO	STUDENTS	PRETEST	POSTEST	GAINED (D)
1	AF	75	80	5
2	AY	65	80	15
3	AYP	35	40	5
4	ARA	55	75	20

5	CCAA	40	65	25
6	DF	30	45	15
7	DFAH	30	40	10
8	DA	40	50	10
9	EPS	50	55	5
10	FAF	20	45	25
11	FLA	20	35	15
12	GPM	20	25	5
13	KES	15	30	15
14	LS	55	65	10
15	LNS	45	55	10
16	LW	30	40	10
17	MJ	35	40	5
18	NPAP	40	50	10
19	NRP	50	65	15
20	PNJ	50	55	5
21	RBP	60	65	5
22	RDP	30	40	10
23	SM	25	40	15
24	VI	25	30	5
25	S	30	45	15
26	NA	55	65	10
	S STUDENTS	1025	1320	295

Control class is a class which was taught reading narrative text without using Semantic Mapping Strategy. The subject of pre-test in control group consisted of 26 students. Based on the result in pre-test, the highest score is 75 and the lowest score is 15.

a. **Pretest of Control Class**

Table 4.2

The Output of Statistic Data of Control Class' Score in Pre-test

Statistics

Pretest

N	Valid	26
	Missing	3
Mean		39.42
Median		37.50
Mode		30
Sum		1025

Based on the table 4.2 above, show mean of pre-test score 39.42. It means the mean score is low.

b. **Post-test of Control Class**

Table 4.3

The Output of Statistic Data of Control Class' Score in

Post-test

Posttest

N	Valid	26
	Missing	3
Mean		50.77
Median		47.50
Mode		40
Sum		1320

Based on the table 4.3 above, show Mean of post-test score 50.77. The

gain of mean score between pretest and posttest was 11.35.

2. **The Data of Experimental Class**

Table 4.4

The Students' Scores of Experimental Class

NO	STUDENTS	PRETEST	POSTEST	GAINED (D)
1	AAY	65	75	10
2	AK	80	95	15
3	ACW	45	70	25
4	DP	60	75	15
5	DNS	45	75	30
6	DLH	55	85	30
7	EA	75	80	5
8	GDW	80	90	10

9	HNH	75	90	15
10	IA	55	65	10
11	JW	55	70	15
12	KAP	65	90	25
13	MF	45	80	35
14	MAY	50	70	20
15	NAT	55	65	10
16	NAH	35	55	20
17	NDS	70	80	10
18	N	60	75	15
19	PAC	85	95	10
20	RAAA	80	85	5
21	SS	65	90	25
22	SSA	60	80	20
13	TPW	45	70	25
24	TSAN	65	75	10
25	UH	75	85	10
26	UI	45	80	35
27	ULS	65	75	10
28	YP	45	75	30
29	ZY	55	80	25
	S STUDENTS	1755	2275	520

Based on the table 4.4 above, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 35 and the highest score was 85. The highest score of post-test was 95 and the lowest score was 55.

a. **Pre-test Experimental group**

Table 4.5

The Output of Statistic Data of Experimental Class' Score in Pre-test

Pretest		
N	Valid	29
	Missing	0
Mean		60.52
Median		60.00
Mode		45
Sum		1755

Based on the table 4.5 above, show mean of pre-test score 60.52. It means the mean score was low.

b. **Post-test of Experimental Class**

Table 4.6

The Output of Statistic Data of Experimental

Class' Score in Post-test

Posttest

N	Valid	29
	Missing	0
Mean		78.45
Median		80.00
Mode		75
Sum		2275

Based on the table 4.6 above, show Mean of post-test score 78.45. The gain of mean score between pre-test and post-test was 17.93.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis of this research were H_0 "there is no significant difference score in reading narrative text of the students taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and those taught by using conventional method". Meanwhile, the H_1 is "there is significant difference score in reading narrative text of the students taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and those taught by using a conventional method.

To know whether there are any significant different students reading achievment between the students who are taught and the students who are no taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy, the calculating result should show Ho is rejected meanwhile H1 is accepted. To analyzed the data the researcher by using SPSS 16 version, the result can be seen on table as below.

Table 4.7

Group Statistics

	class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
score	experiment class	29	17.93	8.916	1.656
	control class	26	11.35	5.926	1.162

Based on table 4.7, it shows there are two class, it was experiment class and control class. First Control class, shows N cell there are 26, Mean of score control class (11.35), Standard Deviation for control class (5.926), and standard error mean for control class (1.162). While, in Experimental class, shows cell there are 29, Mean of score experimental class (17.93), Standard Deviation for experimental class (8.916), and Standard Error Mean for experimental (1.656).

From the result above it can conclude, that there is significant different of students' score mean between those who are taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and who are taught by using a conventional method.

Table 14

Independent Sample Test

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
score Equal variances assumed	8.143	.006	3.186	53	.002	6.585	2.067	2.439	10.730
Equal variances not assumed			3.255	49.052	.002	6.585	2.023	2.520	10.650

From the result of t-test on above it can conclude, that significant level (two tailed) is 0.002, given that the present test is one-tailed test, so the *p* value

(0.002) is divided by two: 0.002/2 = 0.001, and it is lower than 0.05 (0.001<0.05). It was found that there is significant difference of students' achievement before and after those who are taught by using Semantic Mapping and those who are not. It means that teaching reading in narrative text is effective.

C. Discussion

The mean difference between pretest and posttest of the experimental and the control group were computed to know whether the improvement of each group was significant or not. In this study, the computation showed that the mean difference between the experimental group and the control group was significant.

From the result of the pre-test, it can be found that the mean score of the pre-test of experimental group was 60.52 and the control group was 39.42. The result of post test of experimental group was 78.45 while the control group was 50.77. Based on the score, it can be seen that the score of experimental group was higher than the control group. The hypothesis that "there is a significant difference between the students' comprehension in reading narrative text taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and who are no taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy" was accepted.

From the tests, it could be concluded that Semantic Mapping Technique could improve the students' reading comprehension. Zaid (1995: 9) stated that Semantic Mapping allows students to manifest considerable improvement in writing expression, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension. The

advantages of using Semantic Mapping Strategy in teaching and learning reading were:

a. Using the Semantic Mapping Strategy in the pre-reading phase can stimulate the students' prior knowledge (schemata).

b. Using the Semantic Mapping Strategy in the whilst-reading phase helps the students to record the information obtained from the text.

c. Using the Semantic Mapping Strategy in the post-reading phase provides the students with an overall description about the text and helps the teacher to assess the students' comprehension of the text.

There were some indicators which showed that there was an improvement in their reading comprehension. They were:

(1) The students could find the explicit information of the text.

(2) The students could find the implicit information text.

(3) The students' reading scores improve from cycle to cycle which can be seen on the following table.

The result of this research was also similar to the previous studies. . First, Robert (2009) conducted a research to find the improvement of both reading comprehension and involvement in reading comprehension activities through Semantic Mapping technique. Second, Muhtar (2010), conducted the research to explore the reading comprehension of descriptive text through Semantic Mapping Strategy in the eighth year students of SMPN 1 Sine.

Based on the tests conducted, it proved that the use of Semantic Mapping Strategy was effective as a strategy to improve teaching reading achievement of narrative text to the first year students of SMAN 01 BANTUR.

The use of Semantic Mapping Strategy made the reading and learning activity more effective and being varied. The students of experimental group who taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy looked more attractive and active during the treatment given by the writer than the control group which no taught by using Semantic Mapping Strategy. The students of experimental group applied the Semantic Mapping Strategy as a strategy when they did the postest. So, the result of their postest was higher than their pretest. Finally, Semantic Mapping Strategy makes the students more motivated in learning easier to grasp the lesson. It can be concluded that in this study, the use of Semantic Mapping Strategy as a strategy in teaching reading of narrative text was effective of the first year students of SMAN 01 BANTUR in the academic year of 2016/2017.