CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

Nowadays, English has become one of the important languages in the world. Realizing the importance of English, Indonesia has tried to implement English in its educational curriculum as early as possible. As the consequence, English has become a compulsory subject that is taught starting from the Elementary school for the prepared school to face the globalization era.

Some studies about the implementation of Semantic Mapping technique in reading class have been done. Most of them revealed that there is an improvement of students' reading achievement of students taught by means of Semantic Mapping technique. However, the studies mostly have focused on high and junior school level. This encouraged the writer to conduct a study about the implementation of Semantic Mapping technique in elementary school level. The writer intended to know whether the Semantic Mapping technique would also improve the students' reading achievement in lower level of education, especially in the fifth grade of elementary school.

In short, this study is conducted to reveal the effect of the implementation of Semantic Mapping technique and Vocabulary Explanation technique in elementary school level. The particular objective of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference in the reading achievement of the fifth grade of elementary school students who are taught by means of Semantic

Mapping technique and those who are taught by means of Vocabulary Explanation technique.

A quasi- experimental applying a non-randomized pre-test- post-test control group design was administered to get the data to answer the research question. The data used in this study were taken from the scores of the pre-test and post-test of the fifth grade students of SDK. St. Yohannes Gabriel year 2007-2008.

The analysis of the Pre-test using t-test assisted by SPSS showed that the mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It means that the two groups had equal reading ability at the beginning of the treatment administration. On the next analysis, the writer directly also used t-test provided in SPSS in order to know there was a significant difference between the post-test means of the two groups.

The result of the t-test provided in SPSS for the post-test of the two groups showed that the post-test mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It means that there was no significantly different between the students' reading achievement of the experimental group taught by means of Semantic Mapping technique and the one of the control group taught by means of Vocabulary Explanation technique. This proved that the use of Semantic Mapping technique in the reading class of young learners was not beneficial in improving the students' reading achievement.

5.2 Suggestion

This study reveals that the implementation of Semantics Mapping technique in reading class did not show beneficial effect on the students' reading comprehension. It was statistically proven that there was no significant difference on the reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by means of Semantic Mapping technique and the ones who were taught by means of Vocabulary explanation technique.

5.2.1 Suggestions Dealing with This Study.

There are some suggestions dealing with this study

1. The background knowledge of the students is very important to be able to comprehend the reading passage. The students have to explore and relate their background knowledge with the new information in the reading passage. The teacher should concern more about students' background knowledge.

2. It is difficult to make the students adjust to the new technique, especially because they are still young. Young learners have varied characteristics that are very different from those of the adults. Young learners are active and cannot focus as adult. The teacher must hold full authority in making the students focus on the new technique. The teacher also must think of a way to attract the students' attention.

3. The lack of experience in learning through Semantic Mapping technique makes it difficult for the students to perform a good and serious. They tend

to be busy with themselves also chat and joke with other students. It is because they still do not understand what they have to do in Semantic Mapping Technique. In order to make the students understand, the teacher must give simple and clear explanation and example.

4. The problem that the students do not consider the treatments, quizzes and the post-test after the pre-test and first treatment as serious ones can be solved by showing them the scores of their pre-test and quiz. It was because the students always feel curious with their scores. The teacher also can remind the students that their scores will be include in their final mark. This will encourage the students to perform better. Therefore, the teacher should let the students know their scores of every test and quiz given.

5. The treatment given was short time treatment, so the result might not be as good as the writer's expectations. If the treatment was done in longer time, the students might show different achievement. In implementing a new technique, it needs a quite long time to be able to show its real result for the students.

6. In conclusion, the writer realizes that this study is still far for being perfect because the reading materials, population and sample were still limited. Therefore, the writer expects that other students using a better research design, with more treatments and a wider subject for getting more and valid result, conduct a further research.

.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arikunto, Dr. Suharsimi. 1990. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Bernhardt, E. B., (1986). Reading in the Foreign Language. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), *Listening, Reading, and Writing: Analysis and Application.* (93-115). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference

Brown, Douglas H. 2000. *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Burns, Paul C. et all. 1984. *Teaching Reading in Today's Elementary Schools.* Boston: Haughton Mifflin Company.

Carrell, Patricia L. & Joan C. Eisterhold. 1983. Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly,* 17 (4), December, 553-573.

Carver, R. 1977-78. Toward a Theory of Reading Comprehension and Reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 13, 8-64.

Cook, Guy. 1990. *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dewi, Muliati. January 1991. *The Effect of Semantic Mapping and Advanced Organizer through Reading Comprehension on the Reading Achivement of SMAK Petra V students.* Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Dubin, F. 1986. Dealing with Texts. In F. Dubin, D. E. Eskey, & W. Grabe (Eds.). *Teaching Second Language Reading for Academic Purposes*. 127-160. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Dupuis, Mary M. and Eunice N. Askov. 1982. *Content Area Reading*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Evangelidou, Evangelia et al.1993. *Reading Skills.* English Teaching Forum, Vol XVIII.Vol X No.4, October.

Ferguson, George A. 1959. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.* London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Frederickson. Using Semantic Mapping after Reading to Organize and Write Original Discourse. *Journal of Reading*. October 1986. Vol. XXX. No. 1. p. 4.

Goodman, K. S. (Ed.). 1968. *The Psycholinguistic Nature of the Reading Process*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Gough, P.B. 1972. One Second of Reading. In J.F.Kavanagh & I.G.Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by Ear and by Eye* (331-358). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gronlund, Norman Edward. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Hardiani, Ratna. July 1990. *The Effect of Semantic Mapping and Experience Text Relationship on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of the First Year Students of SMA Dapena II Surabaya.* Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Harris, A. J. and Sipay, E.R. 1973. *How to Increase Reading Ability*. New York: Longman.

Harris, David P. 1969. *Testing English as a Second Language.* New York: McGraw Hill Company.

Hatch, Evelyn and Anne Lazaraton. 1991. *The Research Manual Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers

Heaton, J.B. 1979. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman Group. Ltd.

Heilman, Arthur W. et all. 1981. *Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading.* Columbus: Bell & Howell Company.

Iragiliati, Dra Emalia, M.Pd. et.al.2007. *Fun and Happy with English: English Textbook for Elementary School grade 5*. 31-33. Jakarta: Ganeca Exact

Jacobs, George M.1996. *Cooperative Learning and Group Activities*. TEFLIN. Seminar 44, 7-10 october.

James, Mark O. 1970. *"ESL Reading Pedagogy: Implication of Schema Theoretical Research" a Research in Reading English as a Second Language.* Massachusetts, Newbury-House Publisher, Inc. 187.

Johnson, Dale D, Susan D.Pittleman, Joan E. Heimlich. *Semantic Mapping: The Reading Teacher.* April 1986. p.780.

Kinsella, Kate. 1994. *"What is Coboy?" Preparing English Learners for a Culturally Based Curriculum.* Retrieved November 5, 2007, from http: //exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol35/no2/p.30.htm.

Kosasih, Yenny.2007. *The Effect of Semantic Mapping Technique and Vocabulary Explanation Technique on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of SMP YPPI I Students.Surabaya: Unpublish Thesis Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.*

La-Berge, D. & Samuels, S. J. 1974. Toward a Theory of Automatic Information Processing in Reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6,293-323.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McMillan, James H. 1992. *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the Consumer*. New York: Harper Colins Publishers.

Mukanto. 2006. *Grow with English*. Jakarta. Erlangga.

Ngadiman, Agustinus. 1990. *The Effectiveness of the Purpose-Based Model for Teaching Reading Comprehension at the English Department*. Malang: IKIP.

Nuttal, Christine. 1996. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language (new edition).* Oxford: Heinemann Educational.

Pett, James. 1982. Reading English as a Second Language Skill at the University. *English Teaching Forum*. Vol. XX.

Reutzel, D. Ray. Story Maps Improve Comprehension. *The Reading Teacher.* January 1985. p.400.

Rubin, Joan & Irene Thompson. 1994. How *to be A more Sucessful Language Learner: Toward Learner Autonomy*, 4. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Rumelhart, David E. 1980. Schemata: the Building Blocks of Cognition. In Spiro et.al. (eds). *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Elbaum Associates, Inc.

Santrock, John W.1994. *Life Span development seventh edition*. USA: The Mc Graw Hill Companies. P.18, 36, 290.

Samuels, S. Jay, and Peter Eisenberg, 1981. *A Framework for Understanding the Reading Process: Neuropsychological and Cognitive Process in Reading.* A Subsidiary of Hartcout Brace Jovanovich Publishers. p.31.

Silberstein, S. 1987. Let's Take another Look at Reading: Twenty-five years of reading instruction. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(4), 28-35.

Sugeng, Bambang. 2006. Let's Make Friend with English. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Suryabrata, Sumadi.1998. *Psikologi Pendidikan.* Jakarta. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Tjing, Foeng Ai. June 1992. *The Effect of Semantic Mapping and Experience Text Relationship on the Reading Achievement of SMA students (A1/A2 Program). Surabaya:* Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Ward, James. 1984. Techniques for Teaching Reading. *English Teaching Forum* Vol. XVIII Number 11, April 2.

Wittrock, Merlin C. 1981. *Neuropsychological and Cognitive Process in Reading.* A Subsidiary of Haircout Brace Javanovich Publishers.

Winardi, Lindawati. 1992. *The Effect of Advanced Organizers and Experience Text Relationship on the Reading Achievement of the Second Year High School Students at SMAK Frateran Surabaya. Surabaya*: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Zaid, Mohammed Abdullah. 1995. Semantic Mapping: In Communicative Language Teaching. *English Teaching Forum,* 33(3), July-September, 6. Retrieved December 8, 2007, from http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol33/no3/p6.htm

Zhang, Zhenyu. 1997. Intensive Reading: Getting Your Students to See the Forest as well as the Trees. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(1), January-March, 40. Retrieved May 10, 2007, from http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol35/no1/p.40.htm